VALUES AND THE TEACHING OF GEOGRAPHY — TOWARDS A CURRICULUM RATIONALE

John F. Huckle*

ABSTRACT: A commitment to values education on the part of geography teachers necessitates their examination of educational, environmental, and geographical ideologies if the curriculum is to become an effective vehicle for environmental education. Environmental philosophy suggests that teachers should extend their pupils' values awareness and teach certain fundamental human values. It also helps them to select from the available geographical traditions, that blend of geography which best reflects environmental concerns. The distinction between procedural and substantive values is a distraction in the debate, and both must be taught if the pupil is to attain a state of moral autonomy. The research literature on environmental education suggests that value and attitude theory is more suited to curriculum evaluation than design, while a consideration of moral and political education shows that teaching strategies for handling values in the classroom are already well developed.

The central argument of David Smith's article 'Values and the Teaching of Geography'[1] is a powerful one: that geography should become a more effective agent of environmental education by recognizing its responsibilities in the field of values education. It is an argument which I have presented in Britain[2], and it represents an extension of Shortle's earlier plea for the transmission of an environmental ethic via geographical education[3]. My purpose here is to move towards clarification of some of the issues which Smith raises, and to tentatively suggest that, by seeking a curriculum rationale in the field of value and attitude theory, he may have overlooked other, more productive, directions.

IDEOLOGY — THE KEY CONCEPT

In examining the beliefs and values which influence our professional activity as geography teachers, I prefer to use the concept of ideology rather than that of belief system as employed by Smith. By regarding an ideology as simply 'a set of beliefs about the conduct of life and the organisation of society', we may interpret much educational debate as a form of ideological struggle in which each group employs a distinctive ideology to further its own interests. This is the central notion contained in the writings of both the radical school

*   Mr. Huckle is Head of Geography, Bedford College of Higher Education, Bedford, England.

movement in North America[4], and the new interpretative sociology of education in Britain[5] and these movements have been influential in placing the concept of ideology at the centre of much recent curriculum theory[6]. They share a deep dissatisfaction with existing arrangements and tendencies in society, and question the role of education as servant of the technological, corporate state. Their reconstructionist ideology seeks a renewal of culture through education, and is founded on the belief that pupils should be given the means to both challenge and alter society. The sociologists have been responsible for an extended analysis of the overt and hidden elements of curriculum which Smith describes. They insist that both elements may be employed as a form of structural violence by one group in society to maintain its power over others, and contend that what counts as content, pedagogy, and evaluation determines the boundaries of the pupil's consciousness. Ireland[7] shows how environmental education is interpreted and implemented different-ly by those holding contrasting educational ideologies, while recent papers on its philosophy reflect a shift from a progressive to a more radical or reconstructionist position[8].

Both the geographical and educational communities have been generating ideologies for centuries, and the geography curriculum must be regarded as the product of an ideological struggle between those who have contrasting interpretations of man's nature, the world in which he lives, and the purpose of education. A curriculum rationale for geography in environmental education must be based upon a consideration of environmental philosophy which gives an understanding of the ethical basis of our current environmental predica-ment. This, in turn, can guide reflection on the geographical and educational ideologies which we have inherited from the past, and our construction of a suitable ideological foundation for geographical education in the future.

ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY

In the past decade, writers on the environment have gradually shifted their attention from the 'outer' physical limits to growth such as resource shortage and pollution, to the 'inner' psychological limits which will determine man's capacity to undergo the transition to a post-industrial society. There is an increased realization that a deteriorating biosphere is but a symptom of man's inner condition; of the way in which he views himself and his world. That a deficient world view, or redundant ideology, underlies the environmental crisis is the dominant theme in the popular environmental literature of recent years[9]. By offering alternative ideologies, and the related utopian visions of the future, such writers have found a widespread following amongst the student generation, and have become key influences upon those experimenting with alternative lifestyles[10] or advocating radical environmental politics[11].

Smith makes reference to White's thesis[12] that man's dominant attitude of power and control towards nature can be traced to the Judeo-Christian ethic, or the consciousness of transcendence through which man regarded himself as God's representative on earth with a licence to manipulate His creation. While Black[13] has contrasted this with the alternative Christian tradition of stewardship, there is little doubt that the industrialization and secularization of society further legitimized a belief in man's control over nature, and led to the decline of traditional values which had served to control man's environmental

impact[14]. Freed from the harsh controls of nature and from domination by political and religious institutions, industrial man in a liberal age found in science a new religion, and in technology the means to material progress and increased power over nature. Enlightenment thinking had prepared the way for a significant change in mass consciousness whereby society became more interested in means than ends. Based on competition, individualism, and materialism, western society promoted the instrumental values of efficiency, growth, size, and objectivity, with little thought as to the ultimate purposes of life. This attention to instrumental values at the expense of such terminal values as love, salvation, and social justice, has led to the crisis of meaning and identity in our lives of which the state of the environment is but one symptom. The ideology of the industrial age, or dominant social paradigm[15], enables many to believe that the universe is an atomised physical system with no cause or purpose, in which man is a mere machine with no justification or significance beyond himself[16]. Progress is only measured in material terms, and a blind reverence for technology represents both the triumph of a mechanistic, deterministic, and objectivist model of human affairs, and a faith in secular salvation.

Problems of ecological, economic, and cultural instability can then all be related to a decline of those values which regulated human activity in earlier times. Although it embraces a range of ideologies, the environmental movement of the past ten years may be seen as a reaction by soft minded believers in human values against the excesses of industrialism. In a rejection of growing nihilism[17], the movement insists that reason must again become an agent of ethical insight rather than blind calculation, that knowledge must again become wisdom rather than mere information, and that nature must again become a source of wonder rather than a playground and a setting for reductionist inquiry. While those actively seeking self sufficiency, appropriate technology, and self realization remain a minority, the re-thinking of human values which their lifestyles represent is of fundamental importance to us all[18].

In attempting to formulate an environmental ethic, environmental philosophers frequently refer to immanence, an alternative form of con- sciousness to transcendence. A belief that there is something sacred in the natural world, provided the motivation for those romantic writers and humanist philosophers who opposed industrialization from the outset. Today, some ecologists recognize in the ecosystem a source of moral insight which generates principles for human conduct. The danger of immanence however, is partly realized by those critics of environmentalism who regard the movement as an unwelcome return to a rural age. It would sanctify nature and natural principles in such a way as to prevent man's continued evolution. As Passmore[19] insists, a consciousness of immanence, coupled with mysticism, is a return to the pantheism or pagan animism of earlier times. It offers little hope for the future, although it often has a strong appeal to the young as they drift in an apparently meaningless world. In formulating an environmental ethic, philosophers find themselves in danger of committing the naturalistic fallacy; of defining the criterion of right action in terms of some empirical feature of the natural world, such as ecosystem stability, and denying the need for some autonomous moral faculty which alone can generate notions of goodness.

Tribe[20] has attempted to outline a synthesis of transcendence and immanence whereby man, as both the sacred observer and grand manipulator of the world, is responsible for the perfection of an always incomplete natural order. In arguing for a new balance between submission and control, he recognizes the duality implicit in man's environmental cognition[21], but suggests that our conception of ends is now sure enough for our decision making to exclude a premise of human domination, or a premise of total subservience of any one form of being to any other. Tribe's conception of the complementary relationship between nature and humanity in future human evolution, parallels that described by Skolimowski[22] who regards the natural environment as a necessary setting for man's continuing search for higher states of perfection; for self transcendence. In advocating ecological humanism, he insists that we abandon the instrumental and technological imperatives of the industrial age, and reinstate imperatives from the past which offer more complete images of man, nature, and human progress.

ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS AND THE CURRICULUM

Environmental philosophy then, reveals an ideological gulf between those two groups in society who O'Riordan[23] terms 'ecocentric' and 'technocentric'. Environmental educators would seem to have to decide whether their curriculum is to support the beliefs in wonder, reverence, and moral obligation, held by the former, or the alternatives of material progress, efficiency, and rationality espoused by the latter. This dilemma is however, an example of what Schumacher[24] terms a divergent problem similar to the old debate on freedom and discipline in education which has no neat solution. Reconciliation of such opposites can only come with the continual exercise of moral insight; of such higher forces as love, compassion, empathy and wisdom. Knowledge that the problem has then been transcended rather than solved, is of an existential rather than empirical nature.

Taylor[25] uses Freudian analysis to explain the personality dimensions which lie behind the ecocentric and technocentric modes. He regards the current appeal of environmentalism as a symptom of both the dominant role of the mother in child socialisation, and the weakening of ego boundaries which allows a widened sense of concern. By relating Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's[26] typology of value orientations to the personality types he describes, Taylor shows that 'middle positions' on the ecocentric-technocentric continuum are morally best. Personality types associated with ecocentrism would appear to lack the self discipline to engineer worthwhile futures, while those associated with technocentrism would appear to be lacking the necessary creativity.

Clearly the environmental education curriculum must reveal the value continuums which underlie contrasting environmental ideologies, and encourage the pupil to clarify his position with respect to them. In this sense, Smith is correct when he insists that *geography teachers must teach about values.* Such a commitment to values awareness will ensure that we seek out examples of hidden technocentric bias in our teaching[27] and that we attempt to provide balance by introducing activities and resources which reflect the interests of the ecocentric lobby. At a time when schools reflect the dominant, technocentric ideology of society, environmental education inevitably has a subversive role. In attempting to restore balance to our pupils' value

orientations, we must recognise the overwhelming influence of other agencies, and the fact that earlier socialisation may render our efforts with older pupils particularly ineffective.

The analysis offered by the environmental philosophers, causes me to go further than Smith and insist that *geography teachers should actually teach certain values*. The emphasis on instrumental rather than terminal values referred to above, coupled with an increased recognition of cultural diversity, has led industrial society to accept a notion of ethical relativism; that 'values are just a matter of opinion'. Problems of instability in the world can only be solved by reinstating those fundamental values or moral imperatives which find widespread respect across cultures. For the teacher not to teach a respect for such universals as honesty, truth, beauty and love is to condemn the pupil to a state of nihilism, the outcome of which is existential despair. While I agree that the implications of such values in the field of public policy are often obscure, I will argue below that the fields of moral and political education offer a range of approaches whereby the teacher can engage his pupils in the complexity of decision making and subsequent social action. To insist, as Smith does (page 153), that differing perceptions and interpretations of controversial issues preclude the teaching of substantive values is to evade responsibility. The educated man is surely the one who can distinguish the moral status of differing solutions, and while he may not be able to arrive at the 'one best answer', he can at least form a judgement as to their relative worth. In suggesting that 'there is no absolute', Smith is in danger of falling into the already over-crowded trap of ethical relativism.

It should also be noted that a consideration of environmental philosophy not only provides an insight into our responsibilities for values education, but reinforces Smith's comments about the scope for environmental education across the curriculum. Such education clearly has empirical, synoptic, aesthetic, and ethical elements[28], and by emphasising the need to foster wonder, contemplation, self awareness, and faith, the philosophers herald increased interaction between environmental, humanistic and transpersonal education[29].

GEOGRAPHICAL IDEOLOGIES

In discussing the role of values in geographical education, Smith makes the mistake of suggesting that there is a single geography which may have a distinctive cluster of procedural and substantive values. While he admits, (page 150), that 'facts' and forms of explanation may be 'culturally bound' his article does not take account of recent literature which attempts to reveal the evaluative emphases contained within those diverse geographical traditions which we have inherited from the past. Buttimer[30] shows how deterministic, naturalistic notions of man and his relationship to the environment, have gradually given way to a belief in rational man who has greater powers of environmental management and control. Chorley and Bennett[31] explain how geographical knowledge and theories are based on differing intuitive attitudes to reality, and that such attitudes vary from the 'eccentric' stance of the 'objective' earth scientist or spatial analyst, who relates regularities in the environment to external causes, to the 'egocentric' stance of the behavioural or humanistic geographer who regards the sources of perceived regularities to lie within man himself.

Geography encompasses both art and science, and its diverse practitioners select content and forms of explanation in order to reflect differing images of man's nature and purpose. In tracing the history of geography in terms of environmental ideologies, Chorley and Bennett show how sociological/realist and humanistic/conventionalist viewpoints have displaced those based on teleology and ecology. Both the transcendence of a teleological view, and the implicit immanence of the ecosystem model have been replaced by viewpoints which give greater recognition to man's social condition and his attitude of mind. Chorley repeats his previous argument[32] that man is no mere part of the ecosystem. His belief that the human ecology paradigm is not powerful enough to depict twentieth century man-environment relationships is a salutory warning to those who regard ecology as the foundation of environmental education. He believes that it casts man in too subordinate and ineffectual a role, and that an image of man as environmental manager and designer is better served by a realist approach based on systems analysis.

Contemporary geography embraces a range of approaches which have differing capacities to accommodate the 'soft' concerns of the environmentalist. It is unfortunate that much recent curriculum reform of geography in education has been based on the 'new' geography of the sixties with its appeals to objectivity supported by logical positivism. In reviewing the past decade in academic geography, King[33] explains that radical/sociological approaches and humanistic approaches are reactions to the ethical relativism of quantitative geography and spatial analysis.

A realisation that geographers were being coopted by the state to assist the planning and control of society, has brought a reaction similar to that of the radical sociologists of education. The radical/Marxist reaction sought to reveal the bases of political power and the mechanisms of control, while the humanist response focussed on the plight of the individual, and the impossibility of separating external reality from the ideology or world view which shapes its perception.

If a geographical tradition, or paradigm, represents an ideology which controls the selection of subject matter and modes of enquiry, it is difficult to support Fenton's argument that we should teach procedural but not substantive values[34]. Geographical procedures are not independent of the ends they are designed to bring about; just as in Rokeach's classification, instrumental values are not independent of terminal values. The examples of procedural values given by Smith (page 151) may be seen as a reflection of the dominant geographical paradigm, while the statements he offers as indicators of substantive values are not themselves values, but merely areas of concern in which pupils will be expected to exercise values. 'Environmental quality' is not a value so much as a topic open to endless interpretations. To include it in a syllabus without reference to such concerns as beauty, naturalness, uniqueness and human life support[35] which are expected to arise in the classroom, is simply to encourage relativism.

Guided by environmental philosophy, the geography teacher should design his curriculum around one or more of the available geographies. As with the choice of environmental ideology, the problem of reconciling environmental geographical, and educational ideologies is a divergent one and can only be facilitated by a sense of moral vision. Geography in the seventies has taught us

that positions of neutrality or scientific objectivity are suspect, and that the old debate on procedural values must be widened to include the substantive values which underlie our lives as geographers, teachers and environmentalists. Those concerned with development education[36] have made significant progress in recognising the influence of past socialisation, and their curriculum reforms should provide us with much inspiration[37]. We can also take support from humanistic geographers[38] for their work is guided by those values which the environmental philosophers are so anxious to reinstate.

MORAL AND POLITICAL EDUCATION

Smith argues (page 154) that teachers should 'facilitate learners in thinking through the consequences of different value positions and interpretations', and that 'appropriate strategies can be derived from research traditions in the field of attitude change'. This writer agrees with the need for values clarification, but regards the field of attitude change as an unproductive wasteland compared with that or moral and political education.

Reference to Schmieder's paper[39] will convince the reader that the objectives of decision making and appropriate environmental action are being given greater attention as environmental education embraces a more reconstructionist ideology. Although subsuming differing rationales and interpretations, moral education is essentially concerned with fostering the pupil's ability to make moral judgements and to reflect these in his behaviour. Termed values education in North America, moral education seeks to counter the relativism or values confusion in our society, and help young people develop consistent value systems on which to base their lives. It rejects the methods of inculcation or indoctrination implicit in much citizenship education[40], and also seeks to expose the irresponsible attitudes of those teachers who cling to a stance of neutrality, believing that their 'purely cognitive' curriculum is a sufficient education in itself. Moral educators are committed to the valuing process; to helping pupils in various ways to reflectively derive their own values and test them in decision making and action. Their theoretical viewpoints and suggested classroom procedures vary according to the model of the valuing process which they adopt.[41]

Moral/Values education approaches may be divided into three groups: developmental, rational, and humanistic. The developmentalists[42] seek the pupil's advance to higher stages of moral development characterised by more complex forms of moral reasoning, and their classroom techniques are generally based on the discussion of moral dilemma. The rationalists[43] also employ structured discussion in the classroom, for they are convinced that moral decisions result from relating considered values to significant knowledge. Their techniques of values analysis[44] are based on a moral philosophy which insists that the component knowledge, skills and structures of decision making can be both identified and taught. Exercises in decision making on controversial issues will foster a state of rational moral autonomy in the older pupil so that he is able to act as an independent moral agent. The humanistic moral educators[45] seek greater self awareness or actualisation and employ less structured techniques than the rationalists. Values clarification exercises are generally associated with this approach and enjoy growing popularity amongst North American teachers[46].

Harshman[47] has recently shown how the three approaches to values education may be employed in environmental education. While Banks[48] and Metcalfe[49] indicate the considerable influence of values analysis within the American social studies curriculum, Allen[50] and Cole[51] attempt to introduce values analysis and clarification into the teaching of geography, as do Kracht and Boehm.[52] There is no shortage of classroom materials and exercises for the teacher wishing to use geography as a vehicle for moral education[53], especially when it is realised that values education requires aesthetic support.

In the positive and accepting atmosphere of an open classroom[54], the teacher can foster the pupil's environmental morality by clarifying positions on value continuums, and by teaching fundamental values through exercises in values analysis. In such a classroom, the pupils would be encouraged to generate value principles on such issues as foreign aid, which Smith describes (page 153). They would realise that all positions especially that of 'leave them to starve', cannot be equally justified by references to facts and core values, and they would be encouraged to act in accordance with the principles they had generated.

Moral decision making should be supported by political education if older pupils are to be given the means to influence public policy in a democratic society. While it seeks to preserve or reinstate certain terminal values, environmental education should promote social change via the political process. Pupils will only understand this process if we allow them to participate in environmental and community action projects[55], and then analyse the experience gained in the light of the knowledge, skills and attitudes, which constitute political literacy. The *Programme for Political Literacy*[56] has devised a curriculum rationale which would foster greater participation in politics. It would help a pupil to identify issues and ideologies, and to relate proposed policies to his own concerns. In encouraging political discussion and action, it safeguards certain procedural values such as rationality and tolerance and seeks to transmit a knowledge of twelve basic political concepts. Those of natural rights, individuality, welfare and justice are central to the concerns of environmentalists who are often too ready to ignore the political realities of the world in which they live. This writer has elsewhere[57] combined the concepts of rational moral autonomy and political literacy to outline a curriculum which would transmit environmental literacy via geographical education.

VALUE AND ATTITUDE THEORY

Having established that strategies for dealing with values in geographical education are already well developed, it remains necessary to comment upon Smith's claims for value and attitude theory. My first reservation about employing such theory to generate teaching strategies is one which Smith shares: the danger of advocating strategies which are subtle forms of indoctrination rather than education, and which belong in the advertising agency rather than the classroom. While Knapp[58] has also focussed our attention upon such factors as reinforcement, adult models, quality of message, and peer group pressure, in the adoption of attitudes, the teacher's employment of these must be guided by a clear philosophical understanding of what separates values education and psychological persuasion. Secondly, it should be realized that the five strategies which Smith reviews embrace several

distinct branches of psychology each with a different image concerning the nature of man[59]. As with the theoretical geography of the sixties there is a danger of adopting a reductionist view of man which is not consistent with our environmental philosophy. By reducing him to a bundle of beliefs, attitudes, and values, Rokeach sets up a persuasive model of man which can begin to explain the complex relationships between attitudes and both intentional and actual behaviour. It is likely however that this model cannot fully accommodate the self actualizing or evolving image of man favoured by the new environmentalists, and that a more humanistic or transpersonal psychology may better serve our curriculum needs.[60] Such considerations are equally important in the choice of moral/values education approaches.

A review of the environmental education literature shows that it is in the field of curriculum evaluation rather than design, that value and attitude theory has had most influence. With the move to a reconstructionist ideology and the incorporation of values education, the evaluation of pupils' attitude change and subsequent behaviour has gained greater attention from research workers. Test instruments or inventories are now available to measure environmental attitudes and knowledge,[61] values as applied to environmental problems,[62] future world perspective values,[63] and acceptance of the 'New Environmental Paradigm'.[64] Burrus-Bammel[65] lists eleven articles on attitudes and attitude change which appeared in the leading American environmental education journal between 1972 and 1978. These, and others, show that the research has focussed on the relations between environmental attitudes and information,[66] length, level, and type of education,[67] techniques of teaching,[68] political, socio-economic, and residential background,[69] and environmental behaviour.[70] Pettus[71] provides a summary of much of this research, stating that the results are far from conclusive, and the whole field is dominated by the problems resulting from low correlations between environmental attitudes and behaviour.

O'Riordan[72] and Reich and Adcock[73] suggest that low attitude — behaviour correlations result from the failure of research designs to accommodate the intervening personal and situational variables which mediate between intentional behaviour inferred from attitude, and actual behaviour. The pupil's failure to cooperate in a recycling programme may be the result of competing personality characteristics, habit patterns, social norms, or environmental constraints, which counteract an expressed attitude. The teacher may use various encouragement cues[74] to strengthen the link between attitude and behaviour but the validity of many of the instruments being designed to evaluate affective outcomes in environmental education remains dubious. Reservations concerning the relationship between attitudes and behaviour, have caused some teachers to adopt an action orientated environmental education programme. This, they regard as the most effective means of instilling attitudes and removing the barriers preventing behavioural outcomes.

Clearly, environmental education will be judged in terms of our pupils' future behaviour and not merely by their expressions of concern. We should be cautious in interpreting pupil responses to instruments which measure verbal commitment, since not only are they unreliable indicators of behaviour, but it is likely that we all compartmentalize our cognition and behaviour and operate with a multiplicity of world views conditioned by the institutional contexts in

which we live.[75] The insistence, of some sociologists, that reality is socially constructed and that individuals may only display attitudinal and cognitive consistency within one life world, is a salutary reminder to the teacher of the limited potential of school based environmental education. Such writers also suggest that the individual will strive to maintain the autonomy of the differing ideologies associated with the distinctive sectors of his life. In a society where individuals possess a plurality of life worlds, the task of the geographer trying to reconcile personal, educational, environmental, and geographic ideologies is far from easy.

CONCLUSION

In attempting to clarify some of the issues which David Smith has raised, I have argued for a greater awareness of those values, or ideologies, which shape our work as geography teachers. Such an awareness will, I believe, help us to restore a balance between the cognitive and affective in our classrooms, and give as much attention to values and attitudes in the next decade as we have given to concepts and theories in the last. Geography will then become truly relevant, both to our pupils' concerns, and to the issues which face our planet. The task is by no means easy, but the potential rewards are limitless.

REFERENCES

[1]D.L.Smith, 'Values and the Teaching of Geography', *Geographical Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1978, pp. 147-161.

[2]J.F. Huckle, 'Geography and Values in Higher Education', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1977, pp. 13-19, & Vol. 2, No. 1, 1978, pp. 57-67.

[3]D. Shortle, 'Environmental Ethics and Geographical Education', *Geography Teacher*, Vol. 11, 1971, pp. 79-101.

[4]Particularly relevant to environmental education are: N. Postman & C. Weingartner, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, Penguin, 1971.
P. Goodman, *Compulsory Miseducation*, Penguin, 1971.

[5]M.F.D. Young, *Knowledge and Control*, Collier Macmillan, 1971.

[6]M. Skilbeck, *Culture, Ideology and Knowledge*, E203 Unit 3, Open University, 1976.

[7]D.C. Ireland, 'Social Change, Conservation and the Curriculum in Britain', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, Vol. 127, No. 5273, April 1979, pp. 261-264.

[8]UNESCO, *Trends in Environmental Education*, Paris, 1977.

[9]An overview of modern environmentalism forms the first chapter of: T. O'Riordan, *Environmentalism*, Pion, 1976, while an Australian perspective is given in: W.J. Metcalf, *The Environmental Crisis*, University of Queensland Press, 1977.

[10]R. Clarke, *Notes for the Future*, Thames and Hudson, 1975.

[11]The ECOpolitics section of *The New Ecologist*, Wadebridge, Cornwall, carries regular reports of developments in radical environmental politics throughout the world.

[12]L. White Jr., 'The Historic Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis', *Science*, 155, 1967.

[13]J.N. Black, *The Domination of Man : The Search for Ecological Responsibility*, John Black, 1970.

[14]G. Vickers, *Freedom in a Rocking Boat — Changing Values in An Unstable Society*, Penguin, 1970.

[15]D.D. Pirages & P.R. Ehrlich, *Ark II : Social Responses to Environmental Imperatives*, Freeman, 1974.

[16]H. Skolimowski, 'Knowledge and Values', *The Ecologist*, Vol. 5, No. 1, January, 1975, pp. 8-15.

[17]D. Holbrook, *Education, Nihilism & Survival*, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1977.

[18]See the section on alternative cultures

in: E. Laszlo (Ed.), *Goals for Mankind — a Report of the Club of Rome*, Hutchinson, 1977.

[19]J. Passmore, *Man's Responsibility for Nature*, Duckworth, 1974.

[20]L.H. Tribe, 'Ways Not to Think about Plastic Trees' in *When Values Conflict*, L.H. Tribe, C.S. Schelling, J. Voss (eds.), Ballinger, 1976.

[21]Y.F. Tuan, *Topophilia : A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*, Prentice Hall, 1974.

[22]H. Skolimowski, *Ecological Humanism, Tract 19 & 20*, Gryphon Press, 1976.

[23]O'Riordan, *op.cit.*

[24]E.F. Schumacher, *A Guide For The Perplexed*, Abacus, 1978.

[25]G.R. Taylor, *Rethink : Radical Proposals to Save a Disintegrating World*, Penguin, 1973.

[26]F.R. Kluckhohm & F.L. Strodtbeck, *Variations in Value Orientations*, Row Peterson and Co., 1961.

[27]M. Terry, *Teaching for Survival*, Ballantine, 1971.

[28]Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, *Environmental Education*, Scottish Education Department, H.M.S.O., Edinburgh, 1974.

[29]T.B. Roberts (ed.), *Four Psychologies Applied to Education*, Halsted Press, 1975.

[30]A. Buttimer, *Values in Geography*, Resource Paper No. 24, Association of American Geographers, 1974.

[31]R.J. Chorley & R.J. Bennett, *Environmental Systems : Philosophy, Analysis and Control*, Methuen, 1978.

[32]R.J. Chorley, 'Geography as Human Ecology' in *Directions in Geography*, R.J. Chorley (ed.), Methuen, 1973.

[33]L.J. King, 'The Seventies : Disillusionment and Consolidation', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 69, No. 1, March 1979, pp. 155-157.

[34]E. Fenton, *The New Social Studies*, Holt, Rienhart and Winston, 1967.

[35]H. Brooks, Chapter 5 in Tribe, Schelling, & Voss (eds.), *op.cit.*

[36]See alternate issues of *The New Era*, especially Vol. 60, No. 2, March/April 1979, which contains: T. Hepworth, 'What Ought We To Do? — Values and Action in the Classroom', pp. 48-54.

The role of geography in development education is outlined in: D.W. Hicks, 'Global Perspectives in the Curriculum : A Geographical Contribution', *Geography*, Vol. 64, Part 2, April 1979, pp. 104-114.

[37]World Studies Project, *Learning for Change in World Society*, One World Trust, 24 Palace Chambers, Bridge St., London, 1976.

[38]D. Ley & M. Samuels (eds.), *Humanistic Geography : Prospects and Problems*, Croom Helm, 1978.

[39]A.A. Schmieder, 'The Nature and Philosophy of Environmental Education : Goals and Objectives', UNESCO *op.cit.*, pp. 23-34.

[40]Brubaker D.L., *Alternative Directions for the Social Studies*, International Textbook Company, 1967.

[41]D.P. Superka, C. Ahrens & J.E. Hedstrom, *Values Education Sourcebook*, ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, Boulder, Colorado, 1976.

[42]L. Kohlberg, 'The Cognitive — Developmental Approach to Moral Education', *Phi Delta Kappan,* June 1975, pp. 670-677.

[43]M. Scriven, 'Cognitive Moral Education', *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1975, pp. 689-694. J. Wilson, *A Teacher's Guide to Moral Education*, Chapman, 1973.

[44]L. Metcalf (ed.), *Values Education*, N.C.S.S., Washington, 1971.

[45]J.P. Miller, *Humanizing the Classroom*, Praeger, 1976.

[46]S. Simon, L. Howe, H. Kirschenbaum, *Values Clarification : a Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*, Hart, 1978.

[47]R. Harshman, 'Value Education Processes for an Environmental Education Program', *The Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 10, No. 2, Winter 1978/79, pp. 30-34.

[48]J.A. Banks, *Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies*, Addison Wesley, 1977.

[49]Metcalf, *op.cit.*

[50]R.F. Allen, *'But the Earth Abideth Forever' : Values in Environmental Education*, Instructional Activity Series, N.C.G.E. Washington, 1976.

[51]R.A. Cole, *A New Role for Geographic Education : Values and Environmental Concerns*, N.C.G.E., 1974.

[52]J.B. Kracht & R.G. Boehm, Feelings about the Community — using value clarification in and out of the classroom,

Journal of Geography, Vol. 74, No. 4, April 1975, pp. 198-206.

[53]R.W. Colton & R.F. Morgan, *Ethics and Environment*, Schools Council Project Environment, Longman, 1975.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, *Investigating Your Environment — Teachers' Handbook*, Addison Wesley, 1975.

[54]D.E. Hawkins & D.A. Vinton, *The Environmental Classroom*, Prentice Hall, 1973.

[55]C.Ball & M. Ball, *Education for a Change*, Penguin, 1973.

[56]B. Crick & A. Porter, *Political Education and Political Literacy*, Longmans, 1978.

[57]J.F. Huckle, *A Consideration of Some Curriculum Problems involved in Developing an Environmental Ethic within Geographical Education*, unpublished MA. dissertation, University of London, 1976.

[58]C.E. Knapp, 'Attitudes and Values in Environmental Education', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 3, No. 4, Summer 1972, pp. 26-29.

[59]J. Radford & R. Kirby, *The Person in Psychology*, Methuen, 1976.

[60]G.M. Kinget, *On Being Human*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.

[61]M.P. Maloney, M.P. Ward, G.N. Braucht, 'Psychology in Action : A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Ecological Attitudes and Knowledge', *American Psychologist*, July 1975, pp. 787-790.

[62]A.A. Sarnowski, *The Development of a Technique for the Measurement of Values as applied to Environmental Problems*, Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975.

[63]D.L. Silvernail, The Assessment of Teachers' Future World Perspective Values, *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 10, No. 2, Winter 1978/79, pp. 7-11.

[64]R.E. Dunlap & K.D. Van Liere, 'The 'New Environmental Paradigm' ', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 9, No. 4, Summer 1978, pp. 10-19.

[65]L.L. Burrus - Bammel, 'Information's Effect on Attitude : A Longitudinal Study', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 9, No. 4, Summer 1978, 41-50.

[66]M.R. Cohen, 'Environmental Information Versus Environmental Attitudes', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Winter 1973, pp. 5-8.

P.B. Hounshell & L. Liggett, 'Assessing the Effectiveness of Environmental Education', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Winter 1973, pp. 28-30.

[67]H.H. Hoover & R.E. Schutz, 'Conservation Attitudes of Science Majors as compared with those of Non-Science Majors', *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1964, pp. 108-110.

A.M Pettus, R.B. Frary, & T.G. Teates, 'The Attitudes of Science and Social Studies Teachers toward Environmental Issues', *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Vol. 15, No. 5, 1978, pp. 367-372.

[68]M.L. Bowman, 'Assessing College Student Attitudes toward Environmental Issues', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Winter 1974, pp. 1-5.

[69]A. Pettus, 'Environmental Education and Environmental Attitudes', *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1976, pp. 48-51.

[70]R.G. Dispoto, 'Moral Valuing and Environmental Variables', *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1977, pp. 273-280.

J.A. Swan, 'Response to Air Pollution : A Study of Attitudes and Coping Strategies of High School Youths', *Environment and Behaviour*, September 1970, pp. 127-152.

[71]Pettus, *op.cit.*

[72]T. O'Riordan, Attitudes, Behaviour, and Environmental Policy Issues in *Human Behaviour and Environment*, I. Altman & J.F. Wohlwill (eds.), Vol. 1, Plenum, 1976.

[73]B. Reich & C. Adcock, *Values, Attitudes and Behaviour Change*, Methuen, 1976.

[74]P.H. Abelson, 'Changing Attitudes Towards Environmental Problems', *Science*, 172, p. 517.

[75]P.L. Berger et al., *The Homeless Mind*, Penguin, 1973.