9-30-2014 12:00 AM

# Three Models for Educating for Empathy and Humanization through Values Dialogue in Secondary School Classes

Adam J. Hill
*The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor
Allan Pitman
*The University of Western Ontario*

Graduate Program in Education
A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Master of Education

Master's Thesis

# Three Models for Educating for Empathy and Humanization through Values Dialogue in Secondary School Classes

Graduate Student: Adam Hill
Student # 250465335

Thesis Supervisor: Allan Pitman, Ph.D.

Thesis Joint Supervisor: Kathryn Noel, Ph.D.

## Abstract

This thesis develops educable constructs of empathy and of humanization as well as a theory, a praxis, educational models, and measuring instruments of values dialogue that hypothetically can be used to foster and to measure changes in empathic and humanizing capacities among secondary school students. The theory and the praxis of values dialogue utilize a sample of Western epistemological philosophy, as well as some of the research and literature of the field of dialogic inquiry. This study then assembles educable constructs of empathy and of humanization by reviewing related research and scholarship. The empathy constructs consist of emotional literacy and of role-taking, while the humanizing construct consists of mutualities, the latter concept denoting ontological and epistemological elements, processes, understandings, and capacities that potentially can be shared among all human beings. This paper then establishes three educational models of values dialogue that can hypothetically foster the former constructs, each model nurturing one of them predominately. Next, this study outlines the procedures of the execution of the models and the assessments that double as potential instruments for testing for the presence of this study's targeted empathic and humanistic capacities. Therefore, this study presents a testable hypothesis consisting of models of values dialogue which are intended to foster empathy and humanization. This hypothesis must be empirically tested to condone or to refute the merit of values dialogue.

*Almost everything has already been thought of before, fewer things have been discussed, and almost nothing ever actually happens.*

(Unknown)

*For Socrates…*

**Acknowledgements**

I cannot properly convey the degree of appreciation that I have for the assistance of Dr. Pitman and of Dr. Noel for all of their support during the creation of this thesis. I would like to thank Dr. Pitman for taking me on as his pupil. I would also like to thank him for his excellent degree of support and of commitment to my endeavor. I am especially thankful for Dr. Noel for serving as my mediator with the research on inquiry of Gordon Wells and his associates and for acting as my voluntary writing guru; my writing has improved by leaps and bounds under her mentorship.

## Table of Contents

## List of Figures

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## Rationale

Across communities throughout the world there have been increasing calls for empathy (Krznaric, 2014; Anderson & Konrath, 2011; Coplan, 2011; Zaki, 2010). From war zones to intimate domestic relationships, the justifications for teaching and for learning empathy continue to increase and consolidate (Freedman, 2013). Empathy has growing recognition as a feature of prosocial behavior (Hoffman, 2000; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987). It is also sometimes associated with living a good life (Trout, 2009). As a result, educating for empathy has become an increasing impetus in educational programming.

Unfortunately, few theories link teaching and learning methods to the development of empathy. Furthermore, the existing theories tend to generalize about influences on empathic capacities (Coplan, 2011). Theories aside, there are some comprehensive practical approaches available which are designed to foster empathic capabilities in students. However, few studies assess the effectiveness of such approaches and whether or not they actually affect as intended, and even fewer studies assess the degree to which they affect.

Moreover, there is little written about how to influence secondary school students' empathy as well as only small attempts to document the consequences of using such instructional methods. In all, the Ontario secondary school curricula dedicate limited space to the fostering of empathic capacity and few resources for teachers to that end.

Therefore, given that there is a known void in the research of practical classroom approaches for the fostering of empathic capacities among secondary school students, this thesis will develop a hypothesis that will attempt to link a set of pedagogical approaches to teaching to the fostering of certain empathic elements and of humanization in secondary school classes. The

hypothesis will serve as the basis for three comprehensive educational models that can be used when teaching Ontario secondary school curricula.[1]

**The Research Problem**

There is still much debate as to whether one can teach empathy and, if so, which elements of empathy can be taught (Goldman, 2011). Hence, the discourse regarding teaching for empathy, particularly in public school classrooms, has just begun. There are many educational programs that teach empathy indirectly or as a secondary goal (Collins, 2007). However, currently there are few curricula dedicated specifically to educating for empathy such as Mary Gordon's (2005) *Roots of Empathy* program, which originated in Canada. Notably, Gordon's program targets students in only grades 1 to 8.

In addition, few studies attempt to address or to measure the full consequences of fostering students' empathy. Many educators assume that nurturing empathy can have only positive outcomes for students; rarely do researchers problematize the practical consequences of greater empathic capacity. This study will attempt to analyze some of the possible outcomes of teaching for empathy as well as to offer a possible method of balancing these potential consequences of increased empathy with humanization.

Therefore, this study's research problem consists of determining which, if any, elements of empathy can be taught; which educational approaches influence said elements of empathy; which approaches also consider and balance the potential consequences of increased empathic capacity; and finally, whether changes in empathic capacity can be evaluated or measured and, if so, how. Ultimately, the consequences of influencing secondary school students' empathy

[1] Secondary school consists of grades 9 through 12.

through classroom practices remain largely unknown and should be investigated so that students and society might benefit by engaging in these forms of teaching and learning.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Given the potential benefits of fostering empathy and the need for discussion about how one might teach and learn it, this thesis will attempt to develop educational models for various classroom contexts both to contribute to the discourse and to serve as resources for secondary school teachers. These models will be designed to cultivate two constructs of empathy, emotional literacy and role-taking, that will become elements of a construct of humanization. Also, in order to foster the former constructs, these models will be founded on a dialogic inquiry of values. In sum, this thesis attempts to establish a hypothesis that will become the basis of three models which can be tested to demonstrate the utility of the hypothesis. The questions that will shape this thesis, its hypothesis, and the models developed within include:

1) What elements of empathy can be taught? The researcher expects that emotional literacy and role-taking can be learned in classroom environments.
2) What curricular models can be used to teach educable elements of empathy in secondary school classrooms? The researcher expects that models founded upon values dialogue can foster emotional literacy and role-taking.
3) What ethic(s) can be taught and/or learned through discussions of values? The researcher expects that the acknowledgement of the humanity in others can be evoked through dialogues about values.

**Structure of Thesis**

This thesis will be divided into five chapters including this introduction. Chapter 2 will develop unified definitions of values and of an effective dialogue. It will then establish a definition of a theory of values discourse as well as a definition of a values dialogue praxis. This chapter will culminate in an exploration of the potential significance of values dialogue which will be followed by an assessment of the limitations of this thesis's hypothesis.

Next, Chapter 3 will explore conceptions of empathy and of humanization. Through a synthesis of conceptions, this chapter will establish educable constructs of empathy. Then this chapter will investigate the potential consequences of educating for empathy exclusively. The assessment of the former consequences will culminate in a justification for fostering empathic capacities as a part of the nurturing of humanization. Next, this chapter will adopt Paulo Freire's conception of humanization for the development of a measurable construct. At this point, this author will introduce mutualities as a method of measuring humanization. The third chapter will finish by attempting to link values discourse and values dialogue with empathic capacities and humanization by providing the research and the logic supporting this study's hypothesis.

Chapter 4 will then outline the general structure and function of the models. This chapter will also problematize the measurability of the models' affects. Next, it will describe approaches to measuring the constructs that utilize the models' assessments. This chapter will then provide an introduction to the models within which this author will acknowledge the scholars and the research that informed the models' development, as well as the models' targeted empathic and humanizing constructs.

After establishing the overall structure and function of the models, their measurability, and their targeted constructs, Chapter 4 will illustrate them. These illustrations will include the

models' learning objectives, required or suggested materials for their execution, and detailed descriptions of their methods. Then each model will contrast the actual and potential costs and benefits of its performance and describe means of assessing student comprehension in addition to the presence of empathic and of humanizing constructs.

Finally, Chapter 5 will reflect on and conclude this thesis. As a part of the reflection, this chapter will explore the potential consequences and utility of fostering empathy and humanization through values dialogue. After reflecting on the potential ramifications of this thesis's hypothesis, the final chapter will conclude this study by highlighting the merit of testing the models.

In sum, this thesis will develop a theory and praxis of values dialogue. Then it will synthesize educable empathic and humanizing constructs. After establishing the constructs, this author will connect values dialogue to the constructs' development. Next, he will identify the structure and the function of the models and problematize measuring the empathic and humanizing capacities. The following sections will then illustrate the models. Finally, this author will reflect on the potential utility of the thesis's praxis and conclude. In sum, this study will develop a hypothesis consisting of a theory and praxis of values dialogue, of educable constructs of empathy and of humanization, and of testable educational models that utilize values dialogue in order to foster the constructs among secondary school students.

# Chapter 2: Toward more Affective Dialogic Inquiries

## Defining Values

The hypothesis posited in this thesis suggests that values dialogue influences the development of empathic and humanizing capacities. In order to consider the overall meaning of the hypothesis, this chapter will analyze its composite parts, values and dialogue. Values, the foci of the dialogue described in the hypothesis, will be defined first.

The values depicted in this thesis's hypothesis are those that Immanuel Kant alludes to including those of a priori biopsychological and of a posteriori epistemological origins (Kant, trans. 1900). A value has a biopsychological origin when it exists before and after experience and reason. For example, these innate values include human instincts such as survival.

Meanwhile, a value is epistemological in origin when it is subject to "episteme" (i.e., to knowledge). As subject to knowledge, epistemological values depend on the experiences and reason that influence the development of knowledge. While biopsychological values are innate and change little, epistemological values are derived from experience and reflection and can change more often (ibid.). These experience- and reflection-based epistemic values often consist of those entities that are of the highest importance in individuals' lives such as happiness, a high quality of life, and other characteristics indicative of self-actualization.

**Conceptions of Values**

> *Generalized ideas of ends and values undoubtedly exist. They exist not only as expressions of habit and uncritical and probably invalid ideas but also in the same ways as valid general ideas arise in any subject. Similar situations recur; desires and interests are carried over from one situation to another and progressively consolidated.*
>
> (J. Dewey, 1939: 44)

Many scholars understand and conceptualize values in varying ways. This thesis's hypothesis attempts to consolidate and to synthesize some notable and philosophically significant conceptions of value and of valuation including those of Plato, Socrates, Ernest Joós, Tasos Kazepides, Friedrich Nietzsche, and of John Dewey.

Plato (trans. 1955) conceives of epistemological values as *Forms*. According to him, the absolute values of his world are unchanging objects that can be defined with certainty through reason. Moreover, Plato describes values as knowable and therefore as a form of knowledge. To Plato, *knowledge* is absolute and certain. He distinguishes knowledge from opinion where knowledge is eternal and unchanging while opinion is temporary and subjective. He measures all of the Forms relative to the Good which he describes as the "Form of Forms," establishing the Good as the highest value by which one can evaluate all other values.

Unlike Plato, Socrates's approach to value and to valuation is recapitulated through only other authors' writings. Moreover, little evidence remains of the works of Socrates's contemporaries from which to consolidate his conception of epistemological values. However, what does remain demonstrates his dedication to collaborative valuation and to the critiquing of values. After all, the Socratic dialogues (Plato, trans. 1955; Plato, ca. 427-347 B.C.) often center on dialogues about epistemic values. Most often Socrates, Plato, and the other participants in

their discourses begin with, or return to, attempts to identify and to define values. They perform collaborative inquiries about issues and entities of mutual concern such as conceptions of justice and of the Good (Plato, trans. 1955).

At most, the surviving dialogues convey a sense of Socrates's skepticism toward existing values, especially toward the patron Gods of Athens (ibid.). According to some of the surviving writings of Socrates's contemporaries, it seems that he discussed epistemological values frequently. Notably, he was indicted for discussing entities of the highest value to himself and to participants in his dialogues, as well as for challenging people's conceptions of these entities of divine value in Athenian society. In the Socratic dialogue *Euthyphro,* Socrates, when questioned how it was he had corrupted the young, recalls how Meletus "says that I am *a maker of gods* [emphasis added], and on the ground that I create new gods while not believing in the old gods, he has indicted me for their sake" (Plato, ca. 427-347 B.C., p. 3). Socrates was indicted, and ultimately executed, on the basis that he had influenced the creation of new gods, of new entities of the highest value. Most essential to this thesis's hypothesis is that Socrates influenced the creation of these new values through dialogue, specifically through collaboratively critically analyzing these entities. In this way, this thesis's hypothesis reflects a part of the legacy of Socrates and of Socratic dialogue, of his dedication to continuous, collaborative, fearless, yet respectful and honest, valuations.

Echoing Plato and Socrates, Ernest Joós (1991), when commentating on Heidegger's conception of values, defines whatever we find valuable as Good concluding that "value and the good are synonymous" (p. 19). But unlike Plato and Socrates, Joós also argues that we "know that the Good, like any other absolute, has no definition, hence the same can be said for values

also" (ibid.). Joós highlights the potential enigmatic character of entities of ultimate value but concludes that it is important to aspire to define them regardless.

Joós questions the fundamental character of values. Throughout his writings he asks Why are there values? What forces drive valuation? Joós offers the suggestion that the origins of biopsychological and epistemological values are linked to the finite nature of reality. He argues that "necessity has *meaning* for us only in a finite World" (p. 158). Therefore, Joós implies that we judge the worth of entities or acts relative to their scarcity. Joós demonstrates that values may remain undefinable but that they have origins that can be described and understood.

Like Joós, Tasos Kazepides also attempts to identify and to dissect values. Kazepides (2010) highlights the significance of "riverbed principles" and of moral principles more broadly as the epistemologically prior criteria, principles, rules and norms that support our perspectives. For him, riverbed principles are acquired or inherited without any reflection. According to Kazepides, although they cannot be acquired, these foundational propositions can and must be taught for students to engage in "sophisticated" forms of education. Moreover, he argues that "we are born into them" (p. 83). As innate a priori contingencies, these propositions serve as criteria for the rationality of moral principles. For this thesis's hypothesis, Kazepides provides an acknowledgement of grounding principles that must be brought into focus if we are to understand and to critique the rationality of our moralities and of their underlying values.

Along with Kazepides, Friedrich Nietzsche also challenges and critiques the values of the highest importance in his society, specifically those of Christian *dogmata*. In *Beyond Good and Evil,* Nietzsche (1973) attempts to establish the subjection of moralities to individuals by challenging the subjection of Christians to their moralities. He glorifies the movement "beyond

good and evil and [to] no longer [be], like Buddha and Schopenhauer, under the spell and illusion of morality" (p. 82). Although he attributes some values to racial origins, he acknowledges that the epistemic values that influence our well-being and suffering, such as "the concepts of 'God' and 'sin,' will one day seem to us of no more importance than a child's toy and child's troubles seem to an old man" (ibid.). He often denigrates Christian moralities; at one point he describes them as nothing more than the "sign-language of the emotions" (p. 110). In concluding his attempts to discredit traditional Christian values, he alludes to the development of new morals by suggesting that just as people valuate Christianity, people will continue to valuate *ad infinitum*.

Ultimately, Nietzsche (2002) calls for the "transvaluation of all values" (p. 101). He argues that society needs

> spirits strong and original enough to make a start on antithetical evaluations and to revalue and reverse "eternal values"; towards heralds and forerunners, towards men of the future who in the present knot together the constraint which compels the will of millennia on to *new* paths. (1973, p. 126)

In other words, Nietzsche stresses that new philosophers need to "traverse the whole range of human values and value-feelings" in order to "*create values"* (p. 142). In some ways, this thesis's hypothesis is an attempt to evaluate existing and potential values through a process that can contribute to the realization of Nietzsche's transvaluation. This process consists of a collaborative reflection on and an evaluation of values in which participants refine and potentially create new values. Just as this hypothesis attributes some of its legacy to Socrates, it also presents a practical methodology by which to operationalize and to actualize Nietzsche's revaluation.

Following Nietzsche, John Dewey also explores values but was among the first to analyze them systematically. Dewey's (1939) *Theory of Valuation* attempts to provide a comprehensive explanation of how values influence interests, desires, and actions. While exploring the process of valuation, he argues that valuation and the practical realization of interests and desires can be measured by observable behavior only. He maintains that "valuations exist in fact and are capable of empirical observation so that propositions about them are empirically verifiable" (p. 58). As observable patterns of behavior, Dewey claims that they can be studied empirically. Furthermore, values are verifiable but to the degree that they can be determined only upon reflection of past valuation and of past actions influenced by interests and desires. He demonstrates how values can influence and be influenced by action. Through his exploration, Dewey establishes how desires, interests, and the values that shape them are influenced by external "environing conditions" (p. 63). Considering external and environing conditions and, more broadly, all other possible stimuli that can influence value and valuation is a characteristic of an effective analysis, or revaluation, of values. In the process of valuation through a dialogue about values, participants can reflect on previous interests, desires, and actions and collaboratively explore how their values influenced these affects. From Dewey, a values dialogue will consider external and environing conditions and how they shape particular epistemological values, as well as how epistemic values together with innate values influence interests, desires, and ultimately, actions.

**Unified Definition of Values**

Considering the contributions of Plato, Socrates, Joós, Kazepides, Nietzsche, and Dewey to the meanings of value and of valuation, this author will now attempt to synthesize their

conceptions and distill them into one unified definition for this thesis's hypothesis. From Plato, one witnesses the notions of the highest Good and of the idea that the highest value can be known through reason. From Socrates, one identifies some of the potential processes by which people can deliberate about entities of the highest value and by which they can aspire through these processes to identify and to understand innate and epistemic values. From Joós, one is encouraged to approach conceptualizations of value and of valuation with a healthy degree of skepticism and with a generous degree of suspended judgment. Joós demonstrated that one can unify values as a category of entities by recognizing the scarcity of the objects and of the subjects that affect and are affected by them. From Kazepides, one could identify values as those entities that one takes for granted which undergird everything else one knows and believes, one's "riverbed principles." From Nietzsche, one witnesses the challenging of these principles and of traditional forms of valuation. He attempts to incite the spirit of a discourse of values by glorifying those who participate in it and by calling for the transvaluation of values; that is, for a critical revaluation both of values and of the processes by which people valuate. Finally, from Dewey one begins to acknowledge the linkages among values, desires, interests, and actions. These linkages are central to a dialogue designed to foster understanding of the origins of values and to facilitate the execution of valuation. They also serve as the foci of a dialogue about values, a discourse concerned with the valuing and valuation of entities of the highest and of the deepest meaning.

Therefore, the values and valuation depicted in this thesis's hypothesis refer to the existence and to the development of the deepest meanings each individual fosters and maintains; that is, of the strongest and most important meanings to each individual. The previous conceptions of value and of valuation demonstrate that every person exercises values and

valuations throughout his/her life. Based on these valuations, the entities of the highest importance consolidate in and culminate as values that influence every interest, desire, decision, and action an individual undertakes. Ultimately, this thesis hypothesizes that a collaborative critical analysis of epistemological and of biopsychological values and of the processes of valuation can influence the existence and development of value and, in doing so, influence certain empathic capacities and humanization.

**Defining Dialogue**

> *The dialogic orientation of discourse is a phenomenon that is, of course, a property of any discourse. It is the natural orientation of any living discourse.*
>
> (M. Bahktin, 1981: 279)

As with values, one often struggles with defining dialogue. Some participants within the discourse suggest that an effective dialogue is entered into with suspended judgment and so scholars of dialogue often approach defining their field in like manner (Wilson, 2012). Many who attempt to define it suggest that there is no one definition of dialogue. For example, Geoffrey Rockwell (2003) skeptically and hesitantly concludes that "*a dialogue is a unity of diverse voices*" (p. 24). Before settling with his overtly vague definition, Rockwell questioned why anyone would bother to define dialogue at all as definitions tend to limit discourse. He admired another connotation of the word "define" which is "to bring something into focus" (ibid.). This section will attempt to do just that: It will explore some conceptions of dialogue in order to bring a unified definition into focus. This author will examine several conceptions of discourse and of dialogue in order to generate a unified definition of dialogue, including those of Michel Foucault, Mikhail Bakhtin, Paulo Freire, and Gordon Wells.

**Conceptions of Dialogue**

Before conceiving of dialogue, it is important to begin by developing a theoretical conception of discourse in its broadest sense. This thesis's hypothesis adopts Michel Foucault's (1969) Theory of Discourse for this purpose. When exploring the discourse of history in its many manifestations in *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* Foucault stresses the absence of attention for ruptures and for discontinuities and, moreover, of the pattern of inconsistency in the object of historical discourse, the past. He identifies that "the use of concepts of discontinuity, rupture, threshold, limit, series, and transformation present all historical analysis not only with questions of procedure, but with theoretical problems" (p. 21). He stresses that the totality of the discourse of history is incomplete without at least acknowledging the discontinuities. Foucault analyzes statements and their formations, as well as their actual and potential relationships in discourse. Most importantly, in his conception of dialogue, Foucault argues that subjects exercise *enunciative modalities* in which each subject inhabits various statuses, sites, and positions when participating in the dialogue. Here, Foucault establishes not only the transitory nature of discourse, but also the transitory nature of its participants; their nature as participants is in flux. From Foucault, this thesis's hypothesis acknowledges the macro level of discourse wherein dialogue consists of a micro form of joint meaning-making through language. Although dialogue itself exists in a state of transition, it does not share the degree of discontinuity and of rupture of discourse.

Therefore, the models developed in this thesis are founded on a practical manifestation of discourse. Although this author is biased toward beginning the discussion of conceptions of dialogue with the Socratic, it serves the purpose of this thesis to begin with the Father of Dialogue.

Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) is best known for his works of literary criticism, but he is also known as being among the first to describe dialogic relationships, especially in his exploration and in his glorification of the Socratic dialogues. He characterizes these dialogues as being among the first examples of the novelistic genre: examples of "dialogized story." Through his analysis of the Socratic dialogues, Bakhtin identifies the significance of the rhetoric and of the diverse characterizations of the dialogues' participants, especially their varying roles from heroes to those wearing "the mask of a bewildered fool" (p. 24). From Bakhtin's characterizations of participants in dialogue, one can acknowledge the various actual and potential roles that participants enact, abandon, and transform throughout a dialogue.

Bakhtin's conception of dialogue is arguably a byproduct of his exploration of the development of the novel. In his four essays that compose the *Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin did not set out to establish a comprehensive theory of dialogue but rather to explore and to understand the relationships between works of literature and how the novelistic genre emerged from their discursion. His conception of dialogue is derived from his descriptions of the call-and-response between literary works. He emphasizes that "the novelistic word arose and developed not as the result of a narrowly literary struggle among tendencies, styles, abstract world views – but rather in a complex and centuries-long struggle of cultures and languages" (1981, p. 83). Bakhtin describes the novelistic form as a dialogue in and of itself. Accordingly, a novel consists of a "diversity of social speech types" as well as a "diversity of individual voices" (p. 262). He consolidates these diversities into what he describes as a "multiplicity of social voices" (p. 263) consisting of dialogized links and interrelationships among meaning-makers. From Bakhtin's analysis of literary discursive relationships, this thesis's definition of dialogue acquires the criteria of linguistic, cultural, and social interactions.

In addition to outlining a structure of dialogue, Bakhtin also identifies some of the power relationships within dialogues through an examination of the consolidation of dialects and European languages. He argued that

> the victory of one reigning language (dialect) over the others, the supplanting of languages, their enslavement, the process of illuminating them with the True Word, the incorporation of barbarians and lower social strata into a unitary language of culture and truth, the canonization of ideological systems, philology with its methods of studying and teaching dead languages, languages that were by that very fact "unities," Indo-European linguistics with its focus of attention, directed away from language plurality to a single proto-language — all this determined the content and power of the category of "unitary language" in linguistic and stylistic thought, and determined its creative, style-shaping role in the majority of the poetic genres that coalesced in the channel formed by those same centripetal forces of verbal-ideological life. (ibid., p. 271)

Here Bakhtin explores the process of the canonization of languages and the development of dialectic hegemonies. He describes the development of a single language amid the utterances, as well as a single national language amid social languages, and finally a unifying culture that shares the same "socio-ideological cultural horizons" (p. 299). From his critique of the subduction of languages, this thesis's conception of dialogue acknowledges the sociocultural and linguistic power dynamics existent in dialogue.

Bakhtin also highlights the significance of rhetoric and artistic license in dialogue, as within discourse there are opportunities for individualistic artistic expression (p. 277). Ironically, Bakhtin's commentary on the rhetorical and on the distinctly human components of dialogue was almost lost to the discourse until these components were re-emphasized by scholars

like Paulo Freire (2000) and Michel Foucault (1969). Here Bakhtin contributes to the ongoing dialogue about discourse by highlighting the reality that these discourses are enacted by human beings with varying personalities, interpretive lenses, and capacities of expression.

In addition, Bakhtin (1981) attempts to establish the primacy of the word in dialogue. He argues that its internal meaning, or what he refers to as the "internal dialogism of the word", penetrates the entire structure of dialogue (p. 282). He argues that these individual words cannot be isolated as independent acts separate from a word's ability to form a concept of its object. This internal dialogism finds expression through semantics, syntax, and style. Bringing the discourse back to the word, Bakhtin identifies it as the symbolic foundation of dialogue, as vital to the fabrication of joint meaning.

Finally, an important consideration for this thesis's approach to dialogue, Bakhtin highlights the importance of a dialogue's language's "proximity […] to popular spoken language" (p. 25). As a form a communication, a language's capacity to communicate meaning depends on the receptive capacity of those attempting to communicate. Therefore, as Bakhtin acknowledges, it is important that the language expressed in dialogue is reflective of the popularized spoken language of the dialogue's participants so that everyone can participate fully.

Similar to Bakhtin, Paulo Freire (2000) also concentrates on the importance of the word to dialogue. However, Freire divides the word into two dimensions, reflection and action. He argues that without action, dialogue becomes mere "verbalism," and without reflection, it becomes mere "activity" or activism. According to Freire, through dialogue "the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized" (p. 88). Thus, in order for dialogue to create and facilitate a horizontal relationship of mutual trust among participants, Freire argues that dialogues must be founded upon love,

humility, and upon faith in humanity. He concludes that if a dialogue is conducted as he depicts, it will foster trust. From Freire, this thesis's hypothesis eschews the supposed neutrality of verbalism or of pure activity in favor of a conception of dialogic inquiry established to foster transformation and humanization through the dialogic critical analysis of values and of valuation.

Finally, Freire (2000) determines that only dialogue is capable of generating critical thinking. Therefore, in order to conduct a critical analysis of valuation and of values, the investigation must be conducted dialogically. Here, Freire provides the justification for the dialogic approach to analyzing epistemic and innate values as well as the processes of valuation.

In sum, dialogue, as interpreted in this thesis, consists of symbol-mediated meaning-making, what some Vygotskians refer to as semiotic mediation. To help bring a unified definition of dialogue into focus, this thesis employs Gordon Wells's interpretation of dialogue. This author's unified definition of semiotic mediation through language will be grounded in Wells's (1999) theory of language-based learning espoused in *Dialogic Inquiry.* Wells offers a theory of dialogic learning based on a fusion of the perspectives of Lev Vygotsky and of M. A. K. Halliday. Wells argues that a comprehensive language-based theory of learning should explain how a language is learned and how a language facilitates the learning and teaching of cultural knowledge. In addition, such a theory should acknowledge that the understanding of language and of cultural artifacts arises from collaborative practical and intellectual activities. Wells concludes that a language-based theory of learning "should explain how change occurs through the individual's linguistically mediated internalization and subsequent externalizations of the goals and processes of action and interaction in the course of these activities" (p. 48). Wells's theory of dialogic inquiry incorporates many of the contributions of other scholars in the

discourse of dialogue and so provides a substantial representation of their perspectives in his theory.

In addition, Wells (2009) emphasizes the space for *reflective thinking* in dialogue. As Wells argues, "language provides a means not only for acting in the world but also for reflecting on that action in an attempt to understand it" (p. 72). He demonstrates the reflective potential of dialogue. Dialogue provides a space for what Wells describes as "inner speech" in which students "come to be able to frame questions and interrogate their own experience in the search for an answer" (ibid.). Through this process, "language becomes a tool for thinking" (ibid.). Therefore, dialogue serves as a vehicle for both reflection and meta-cognition. In conclusion, Wells's conception of dialogic inquiry will serve as the bedrock for this thesis's unified definition of dialogue and for its dependent concept values dialogue.

**Unified Definition of Dialogue**

Dialogue is ever in the process of becoming. Any definition of dialogue is understandably tentative and contingent. For the purposes of this thesis's hypothesis, drawing from the existing discourse on dialogue, the fundamental unit of a dialogue is the symbolized meaning, most often the word. This unit draws its existence from its relationship with other symbols. Through micro-fusions of meaning, participants in dialogue create and recreate macro enunciations. These enunciations are expressed by participants in diverse ways along diverse channels. Based on Paulo Freire's (2000) reflections, this thesis hypothesizes that participants can foster their humanity through dialogue with each other and that participants ultimately can develop trust through this kind of discourse. If this proposed conception is accurate, then

through active intersectionalities of meaning and through methods of meaning-making, people can more clearly witness themselves and their worlds.

**Toward a Theoretical Definition of Values Dialogue**

Taken together, a "values dialogue" is a dialogue about values and valuation. It is an investigation into the entities of the highest importance and of how they became important through dialogic inquiry. It is concerned with the potential discovery, identification, classification, development of understanding, critique, and potential revision of the participants' deepest and ultimate meanings. Through the fostering of mutual awareness of humanistic symmetries, a values dialogue contributes to the development of the humanity of participants. Furthermore, as will be demonstrated, such dialogues may also foster empathic capacities as components of humanization among their participants.

**Rationale for Values Dialogue**

The goal of this chapter is to establish more affective dialogic inquiries. Therefore, in many ways, in conceptualizing value and dialogue, this chapter has attempted to contribute to the discourse of dialogue by first attempting to understand and perhaps to build on the work of previous contributors. Specifically, this author attempts to expand on the work of Gordon Wells and that of his colleagues involved in the research in dialogic inquiry. When Wells and his team launched the Developing Inquiring Communities in Education Project (DICEP) in 1991, they sought to create opportunities in the classroom for inquiry-based learning through action research (2001). In conceptualizing values dialogue, this author aspires to continue the work of DICEP by developing a hypothesis with measurable practical applications that may foster students'

abilities to role-take and to encode and to decode emotions within the process of becoming more fully human. This thesis offers nothing more than a brief outline of examples of a kind of dialogic inquiry that focuses on the most important meanings to its participants. This author pursues this hypothesis because of its potential utility not only to foster better understandings of human intentionality and of human behavior, but also to increase measurably the empathic capacities and the humanization of secondary school students.

**Potential Significance of Values Dialogue**

> *It is the duty of these scholars to take everything that has hitherto happened and been valued, and make it clear, distinct, intelligible and manageable, to abbreviate everything long, even 'time' itself, and to subdue the entire past: a tremendous and wonderful task in the service of which every subtle pride, every tenacious will can certainly find satisfaction.*
>
> (F. Nietzsche, 1973: 142)

Therefore, as Nietzsche obliges, the significance of the potential theoretical and practical utility of values dialogue is worth exploration. The body of philosophic literature that grounds this thesis's hypothesized dialogic inquiry of values and of valuation supports a collaborative method of investigating values. Although the linkages among empathic and humanistic capacities and values dialogue have yet to be attempted in this study, their logical consistency warrant examination.

Logically, if everyone values, and if these values are established through similar processes, and further, if their existence and relationships with one another and with action can be established empirically, then their presence can be investigated collaboratively through values

dialogue. Furthermore, if the establishment of the existence of values and of their relationships to experience and to action through dialogue fosters empathic and humanistic capacities, then values dialogue potentially has educational utility for fostering the empathy and the fuller humanity of students.

**Current Limitations of Hypothesis**

It must be acknowledged at the close of this chapter that this thesis merely presents a hypothesis that must be tested if it is to promise any actual utility. This author does not pretend to know without any empirical evidence whether values dialogue will foster empathic capacity and humanization, or anything at all. However, based on the existing research and logical induction and deduction, this thesis will attempt to establish a sensible outline and testable examples of a kind of dialogic inquiry that can possibly, even plausibly, influence students' empathy and humanization. This thesis is the beginning of the potential realization of a dream of some of the greatest philosophers of all time, but it will stay a dream until its hypothesis is actually tested.

# Chapter 3: Toward Fostering Empathy and Humanization

## The Purpose of this Chapter

This chapter attempts to bridge the philosophy and the theory involved in the development of values dialogue to the scaffolding of the models. First, it will explore conceptions of empathy in order to develop measurable constructs that will serve as targeted learning outcomes of the models and that act as metrics for assessing the effectiveness of the models at fostering certain empathic capacities among students. After definitions are established, the following section will briefly address the consequences of teaching and of learning the capacities selected. This section will culminate in a justification for fostering humanization alongside empathy. Next, the chapter will examine Paulo Freire's conception of humanization in order to develop a construct. At this point, a method of measuring humanization will be developed based on Freire's understanding of humanization and on the conceptions of value, of valuation, and of empathy as previously discussed. After establishing a measurable construct of humanization, the subsequent section will attempt to make the case for values dialogue and for how it can influence each of the synthesized empathic and humanistic capacities. Finally, the last section will connect the theory to praxis for the purpose of the succeeding chapter which will endeavor to contribute something practical: that is, to provide comprehensive, useful, and testable educational resources for secondary school teachers and for their students.

**Conceptions of Empathy**

> *Moral imagination is the capacity to empathize with others, i.e., not just to feel for oneself, but to feel with and for others. This is something that education ought to cultivate and that citizens ought to bring to politics.*
>
> (T. McCollough, 1992: 7)

This section will explore several conceptions of empathy including the contributions of Theodore Lipps, Janet Strayer, Mary Gordon, Martin Hoffman, and of Amy Coplan. Each author represents a different school of thought that conceives of and measures empathy in a different way. After establishing their conceptions of empathy, the following section will limit the models' targeted empathic capacities to those that the models can influence most effectively given the typical conditions of secondary school classrooms and of teaching routines.

Before conceiving of different kinds of empathy, many authors first disambiguate empathy from sympathy. Many empathy researchers emphasize this distinction because empathy and sympathy are often used interchangeably; however, they often depict substantially different affective and cognitive processes. Theodore Lipps (1907), a progenitor of the concept of empathy, *Einfühlung*, defines it as "feeling into" someone else's being. He contrasts *Einfühlung* with *Mitfühlung*, the latter of which he describes as "feeling with" someone else. The act of feeling *with* someone else, of sharing the same affective emotion, often characterizes definitions of sympathy. When exercising sympathy, an observer often becomes entangled in the emotions of the one emoting. For this reason, some empathy researchers suggest that doctors should exercise empathy more often than sympathy with their patients (Lussier & Richard, 2010).

Lipps (1907) attributes a person's shared feeling to an affective response which includes conscious and unconscious motor mimicry. He maintains that this kind of response originates from afferent feedback rather than from a person's cognition in which he/she thinks oneself into another person's situation.[2] Lipps contributes to the establishment of the two broad categories of processes involved in empathy, affective responses and cognitive role-taking. The former empathic affects are attributed to a priori biopsychological origin, while he attributes the latter empathic cognitions to a posteriori previous experience.

Building on the distinctions of scholars of empathy such as Lipps, Janet Strayer (1987) further compartmentalizes uncontrollable empathic responses. For example, she demonstrates the existence of innate functions such as "emotional contagion." Emotional contagion describes processes like that of newborns' crying as a reaction to other newborns' crying through processes of motor mimicry (p. 230). Strayer attributes empathy partially to evolutionary survival mechanisms because of its connection with the perception of danger and with the communication of states of group members. In addition, Strayer cites many researchers of empathy who have determined that empathy increases with age. Therefore, for the purpose of this thesis's hypothesis, of educating for empathy, one must separate developable from innate, uncontrollable, empathic capacities, as only those capacities that can be influenced by experience can be educated.

Extrapolating from the work of researchers such as Lipps, Strayer (ibid.) differentiates cognitive empathic capacities from affective responses. Strayer argues that empathy has a "singular definition: the self's feeling into (*Einfühlung*) the affect of another person" (p. 236). From her definition, Strayer identifies and emphasizes some of the cognitive aspects of empathy

[2] Afferent feedback refers to neural transmission of sense data through peripheral nerves to the brain or spinal cord.

including what she refers to as "vicariously experienced emotion" (p. 218). Accounting for both affective and cognitive processes, she describes this approach to empathy as a "multidimensional perspective" (p. 235).

Strayer (ibid.) elaborates on cognitive elements of empathy establishing a criterion for role-taking. She argues that in order to experience and to engage in empathy, one must recognize a "rudimentary self-other differentiation" (p. 227). This recognition includes an acknowledgement of living beings as discrete subjects. Therefore, empathy requires a self-other merging of affective emotional response as well as an awareness of self-other differentiation. Notably, Strayer's self-other differentiation distinguishes empathy from sympathy.

Along with a self-other divergence, Strayer (ibid.) identifies the recognition of emotions as the second cognitive prerequisite for empathy. She describes emotion recognition as dependent on analytic skills involved in the decoding of nonverbal cues and of emotions within situational and verbal content (p. 221).

Another advocate of emotion recognition, Mary Gordon (2005), the founder of the *Roots of Empathy* program, also emphasizes the importance of the ability to decode someone's emotions to one's empathic capacity. She describes empathy as the ability to identify with, and to respond appropriately to, the feelings and perspectives of others. Gordon highlights the value of empathy and of the "profound, complex, and fundamental role it plays in the healthy functioning of human relations" (p. 30). She maintains that people often realize the true value of empathy only in hindsight when it is absent.

Gordon identifies the capacities to read and to understand emotions as components in what she describes as "emotional literacy" (ibid., p. 37). She describes the development of empathy through her program as learning language. Her program consists of fostering empathy

in young children by having them interact with babies. According to Gordon, *Roots of Empathy* gives

> all the children the words to describe their feelings. Focusing on the core emotions, we ask them to tell us about times when they felt sad, scared, angry or happy. Listening to the other children and sharing their own story enlarges their vocabulary and sparks recognition that is an essential part of emotional intelligence. (ibid.)

She argues that empathy includes emotional literacy and that empathic capacity can therefore be nurtured using similar teaching methods as those that foster other encoding and decoding processes. As she demonstrates, treating empathy as a literacy of the emotions presupposes the learning and teaching of expressive language and of recognition of emotional cues (ibid.).

Furthermore, Gordon (2005) conceptualizes empathy as a set of capacities that can transcend race, culture, nationality, social class, and age. She demonstrates the potential universal presence of empathy by citing researchers who used photographs of human faces and found that "without hesitation, the people can point out which photo shows someone who is afraid, someone who is happy, someone who is worried, someone who is sad" (p. 32). Based on this research, Gordon argues that "our feelings, and our expression of them, are universal" (ibid.). Therefore, she contributes to the credibility of the notion that empathy can be fostered among students.

Moreover, Gordon identifies empathy as a kind of *understanding* about our feelings, connections, and belonging. She argues that "understanding how other people feel is the first step to building caring relationships in the classroom, in the community, and in the world at large" (p. 35).

Also conceiving of empathy as a kind of understanding, Martin Hoffman (2000) defines empathy as "the cognitive awareness of another person's internal states, that is, his thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentions" (p. 29). Like Strayer, Hoffman suggests that empathy consists of a duality by arguing that, besides cognition, empathy also includes "the vicarious affective response to another person" (ibid.). He further defines this affective response as "the involvement of psychological processes that make a person have feelings that are more congruent with another's situation than with his own situation" (p. 30).

Hoffman distinguishes among three "primitive, automatic, and, most important, involuntary" (p. 36) forms of empathy and two forms based on experience and agency. The latter two forms are educable; they include *mediated association* and role-taking. In mediated association, "a victim's emotionally distressed state is communicated through language" (p. 49). Similar to Gordon, Hoffman justifies the need for emotional literacy by arguing that in order for people to approximate the meaning of other people's feelings, both parties must be able to encode and to decode emotion. Through words and body language alone, the observer must "reverse the sequence, going from the general category of feeling represented by the word to his own specific feeling and the associated past events in which he had that feeling" (p. 50). Hoffman argues that "there is always some slippage due to encoding and decoding 'errors'" (ibid.) when using linguistic expression and therefore that the meaning of a feeling is never transferred in its entirety. Therefore, Hoffman identifies mediated association as a form of empathic cognition.

Along with mediated association, Hoffman synthesizes Strayer's approach to cognitive role-taking defining it as "an advanced level of cognitive processing: putting oneself in the other's place and imagining how he or she feels" (p. 52). Hoffman describes two forms of role-

taking, *self-focused* and *other-focused*. In self-focused role-taking, a person uses past experiences of similar circumstances to imagine how another would feel. Meanwhile, in other-focused role-taking, "people focus directly on the victim and imagine how he feels" (p. 54). [3] As a result of other-focused role-taking, the observer may have feelings similar to the victim's. Hoffman suggests that the latter form of role-taking may be enhanced if the observer has more personal information regarding the victim, including understandings of "his character, life-condition, [and] behavior in similar situations" (ibid.). Furthermore, he argues that a cognitive empathic response can be improved if the observer has additional normative knowledge of how most people would feel in the same circumstance. Therefore, programs dedicated to educating for empathy can foster more effective role-taking capacities if they explore normative emotional responses to normative stimuli.

Similar to Strayer, Hoffman (2000) suggests that people have a greater empathic arousal when they exercise self-focused role-taking, which he attributes to "egoistic drift." He argues that a more powerful form of empathic arousal lay in a combination of both self-focused and other-focused role-taking. This combination is more powerful than either of these role-taking approaches alone because this form "combines the emotional intensity of self-focused role-taking with the more sustained attention to the victim of other-focused role-taking" (p. 58). Therefore, combining explorations of affective responses and of social-situational conditions may have a greater influence on future empathic arousal than the mutually-exclusive explorations of each.

Hoffman concludes his discussion of categories of role-taking by arguing that it can be more cognitively demanding than other empathic capacities because of its greater voluntary component. However, Hoffman recognizes that the existence of multiple modes of empathic

[3] Hoffman is writing from the perspective of a bystander observing the violation of a victim by an abuser.

arousal enable observers to respond empathically "to whatever distress cues are available" (p. 59). Therefore, a multi-modal approach to empathy instruction may have the greatest impact on the scope of students' empathic responses.

Contesting Hoffman's broad definition of empathy by utilizing the findings of other present-day empathy researchers and neuroscientists, Amy Coplan attempts to define empathy as precisely as possible. Coplan (2011) explains empathy as "a complex imaginative process in which an observer simulates another person's situated psychological states while maintaining clear self-other differentiation" (p.5).

Coplan (ibid.) conceptualizes empathy as a combination of "affective matching, other-oriented perspective-taking, and self-other differentiation" (p. 6). She argues that each of the former features is necessary for empathy; however, "none is sufficient on its own" (ibid.). Affect-matching depends on feelings and on degree of physiological arousal. Coplan depicts affect-matching as a component of empathy "only if an observer's affective states are qualitatively identical to a target's, though they may vary in degree" (ibid.).

Coplan (2011) restricts her definition by limiting the affective component of empathy to "the same type of emotion (or affect) as the target" (ibid.). Notably, her restricted definition of affective response shifts her definition of empathy closer to a definition of sympathy than to other scholars' definitions of empathy. Her definition of empathy separates from sympathy when she argues that in order for this affect to be empathic, it must be aroused through other-oriented perspective-taking. This restriction prevents the aroused affect from resulting by coincidence, by two people reacting to the same stimulus identically, or by afferent feedback in the form of emotional contagion.

Along with affective matchmaking, empathic arousal also includes perspective-taking, which Coplan (2011) defines as "an imaginative process through which one constructs another person's subjective experience by simulating the experience of being in the other's situation" (p. 9). Coplan stresses that empathy should be conceptualized so as to "exclude processes that involve self-oriented perspective-taking" (p. 10). She describes self-oriented perspective-taking as imagining "*ourselves* in the other's circumstances," rather than accounting for the other's perspective. Notably, self-oriented perspective-taking can include errors such as those "in prediction, misattributions, and personal distress" (ibid.). Instead, Coplan argues that empathy should be defined in terms of "other-oriented perspective-taking." This form of perspective-taking is oriented toward the other in which a person focuses on his/her simulation of the other's experiences and characteristics. In this process, "I imagine being the target undergoing the target's experiences rather than imagining being myself undergoing the target's experiences" (p. 13).

Lastly, along with affective-matching and other-oriented perspective-taking, Coplan identifies the "self-other differentiation" as the third and final criterion for empathy. A "self-other differentiation" consists of one keeping separate "one's awareness of oneself and one's own experiences from one's representations of the other and [of] the other's experiences" (p. 16). Through this orientation, one "remains aware of the fact that the other is a separate person and that the other has his own unique thoughts, feelings, desires, and characteristics" (ibid.). She concludes that "without [a] clear self-other differentiation, we are almost certain to fail in our attempts to empathize" (ibid.). Therefore, based on Coplan's arguments, fostering a self-other differentiation in students may improve their effectiveness at cognitive role-taking.

To recapitulate, Theodore Lipps disambiguates empathy from sympathy. He identifies the existence of two broad categorizations of empathy: affective responses and cognitive role-taking. Then, Janet Strayer further compartmentalizes the two categorizations by elaborating on various kinds of empathic cognitions and affects. She identifies self-other differentiation and emotion recognition as the prerequisites for some forms of cognitive empathy. Next, Mary Gordon consolidates many cognitive aspects of empathy in her construct of emotional literacy, including emotion recognition. While exploring this construct, Gordon connects emotional expression to emotional literacy, demonstrating how it depicts both emotion encoding and decoding processes. In addition, she demonstrates the universal educability of emotional literacy. Meanwhile, Martin Hoffman identifies two forms of cognitive empathy, mediated association and role-taking, that can also be taught. Hoffman distinguishes between self-focused and other-focused role-taking. He argues that a more powerful empathic response may be evoked if the observer exercises role-taking from both his/her own and the observed person's perspectives. Finally, Amy Coplan attempts to synthesize cognitive and affective components in her definition of empathy. Coplan characterizes empathy as a combination of affective matching, other-oriented perspective-taking, and self-other differentiation. In conclusion, from these various conceptions of empathy, this author will synthesize educable and measurable constructs.

**Conditions for Measuring Empathy**

Given the wide range of conceptions of empathy, this author must be selective when determining which empathic capacities to teach and, for the purposes of empirically testing the models, which capacities to measure and how to measure them. The utility of the models may be

assessed by assembling targeted constructs, by mandating them as learning objectives, and by measuring their presence using instruments such as rubrics and guided reflection. Notably, there are numerous physiological and neurological methods by which to measure empathy (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). However, not all of these measures are feasible, convenient, useful, or even possible for classroom teachers participating in action research or for participant observers. This author excludes most potential physiological and neurological methods of measuring empathy such as heart rate, skin conductance, and/or fMRI because they are of limited utility in the common classroom routine. Instead, the constructs developed in the following sections depend on the measurement of student performances in classroom interactions through peer and teacher review.

Before developing measurable constructs of empathy, one must consider validity. Validity, the concept of determining whether one is actually measuring what one is intending to measure, is an important construct and renders many suggested instruments for measuring empathy useless. To illustrate, Janet Strayer (1987) emphasizes that conclusions regarding empathy's function and structure have depended largely on what researchers have chosen to measure and on how they have measured it. Moreover, as Strayer argues,

> correlations among physiological, somatic, or verbal measures of affect and cognition in empathy may not cohere for several reasons:
>
> 1. They do not all measure empathy […];
> 2. They are not equally good measures of empathy across different samples […];
> 3. They measure separate aspects of empathy, which may not accord unless concurrently assessed; [and]
> 4. They measure separate kinds of empathy. (Strayer, 1987, p. 236)

In addition to the problems of coherence, Strayer also recognizes that measurements of empathy must be sensitive to the ages of students as studies which she and her colleagues conducted demonstrate shared situation-emotion relationships across age. These relationships consist of similar empathic responses to analogous stimuli in comparable contexts among people of similar age.

Given these concerns, simplicity and precision are keys to measuring empathy so that the data generated produce reliable and generalizable conclusions about educational processes designed to foster particular empathic capacities. Accounting for the former conditions, the following section will identify the capacities targeted by this thesis's models and the synthesized measurable constructs.

**Toward Measurable Constructs of Empathy**

Since multi-modal empathic arousal appears to have greater empathic consequences, this thesis's models target both affective and cognitive processes involved in empathy. Specifically, the models will attempt to foster emotional literacy as well as the cognitive abilities associated with role-taking. Extrapolating from the previously explored conceptions of empathy, this section will identify constructs of the desired capacities and suggest methods of measuring the presence of the constructs suitable for the classroom.

First, emotional literacy consists of the capacities to encode and to decode emotions. This construct can be divided into the semiotically mediated ability to read and to convey one's emotions as well as to read and to convey another's emotions. A problem of precision arises immediately as the language used to convey emotions can describe multiple emotional affects simultaneously. However, perfect accuracy with regard to encoding and to decoding emotions

remains arguably impossible. Therefore, the goal of fostering and of measuring emotional literacy should be increased, rather than flawless, accuracy.

One can measure students' abilities to express and to read emotions using many different methods, as there are many languages and mediums by which to mediate dialogues of emotions. For the purposes of precision, of simplicity, and of measuring the effectiveness of the models, emotional literacy will be measured by the accuracy by which students encode and decode emotions. Perhaps the best expert of A's emotion is A, and so the accuracy with which B decodes A's emotions should be measured by A. This practice involves both the emoting person's encoding and the observing student's decoding of emotion through physical, verbal, and textual language. Through dialogue, each party can check the accuracy by which he or she encoded or decoded an emotion. This peer-review process serves to foster awareness among all participating parties of both the identification and expression of emotion, the basic elements of emotional literacy. The overall process can be checked by external reviewers such as the teacher or, preferably, by other students. These peer- and teacher-reviewed investigations will judge the context of the emotional affect and the effectiveness and accuracy of the encoding and decoding processes.

Those facilitating activities involving dialogues about emotional affects should ensure that students are attending to the various methods by which one can express emotion. These methods include facial cues, macro-body language, and aspects of voice such as inflection and frequency. If conveyed through texts, then students should be directed to attend to stylistic elements. Regardless of the mediums used, students should attend to environmental factors such as atmosphere and positionality that could influence the specific situational context of the one emoting (Strayer 1987). Also, given the nature of the foundation of the models and of the

relationship between one's values and his/her emotions, students should be encouraged to investigate the influences on emotion, especially the influence of the person's values. In sum, for the purposes of this thesis, the construct of emotional literacy is the accuracy and effectiveness by which students encode and decode emotional affects.

Second, extrapolating from conceptions of role-taking previously explored, role-taking consists of the capacity to take on the vicarious contextualized role of another person. This act contains two aspects which Coplan (2011) identified, other-oriented perspective-taking and self-other differentiation. In order to assume the role of another person, one must take on his/her contextualized perspective and his/her intentionality by identifying, interpreting, and actualizing all the elements that affect him/her.

Importantly, both contextualized perspectives and intentions can be influenced by values. Given the influence of values on a person's instantaneous perspective and context, the effectiveness and accuracy by which a student vicariously takes on the contextualized role of another person can be measured by that student's capacity to assume the potential influences of that person's values. Furthermore, if a student inhabits a role in a values dialogue, then one can measure that student's ability to role-take by using an assessment that evaluates the student's awareness of the influences of values. As a measure of comprehension of values, this assessment can also demonstrate the degree of effectiveness by which values dialogue fosters the awareness of both values and valuation.

Also, if the person whose role is being emulated is the best assessor of his/her values, then he or she is the best judge of another student's attempt to identify and emulate his or her role. Likewise, through peer-review, students can check their accuracy and effectiveness by which they identified and enacted values. Through this process, students will be forced to

establish a self-other differentiation because they are assessing their ability to identify and inhabit *another* person's values. Therefore, the construct of role-taking will include the precision and effectiveness by which students identify and inhabit the influences of another person's values.

**Addressing the Consequences of Teaching for Empathy Exclusively**

> *An intelligent psychopath may have good role-taking skills, but may use them only to manipulate others for personal gain.*
>
> (J. Strayer, 1987: 225)

Until now, this thesis has neglected to address the potential consequences of fostering empathy. This neglect was deliberate; this thesis's approach to empathy has, until now, remained unspecified. The following section will explore Paulo Freire's conception of humanization; however, before developing its measurable constructs, this author will provide a rationale for fostering the targeted empathic constructs as the components with which one nurtures a fuller humanity.

As demonstrated in the research regarding empathy, developing certain empathic capacities can provide people with the ability to anticipate action (Strayer, 1987). The merits of this ability are still vehemently debated. Although empathy has often been associated with prosocial behaviours, there is little empirical evidence with which to substantiate such associations (Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987). For example, there is no consensus as to what exactly constitutes empathy, let alone how it might cause prosocial behavior (Coplan, 2011). After all, the ability to read emotions and to take on the role of another person can be used to whatever ends an agent decides.

It must be acknowledged that empathy can be used to manipulate others. If one can recognize and understand what others are feeling, particularly how and why they feel as they do, then one can use this knowledge to coax, persuade, and even coerce a person to behave in certain ways. Specifically, the elements of empathy such as emotional decoding and other-oriented perspective-taking can be used to identify and to manipulate another person's values. Therefore, certain methods of educating for empathy may promise more problems than benefits overall for society at large.

Arguably, the humanity of another person should become apparent if one can take on that person's role and simulate his/her thought processes. However, without an acknowledgement and acceptance of the full humanity of *all* people, empathy can be used to dehumanize individuals and groups. There is a strong historical precedent of manipulating cognitive and affective processes of empathy to dehumanize, such as in Nazi propaganda leading into the Second World War (1938, Time). Therefore, teaching for empathy alongside the teaching for consciousness of humanity may be a necessary compromise.

Mary Gordon (2005) makes the case for teaching humanization alongside empathy arguing that some of the greatest affronts to human rights such as the Holocaust and the South African Apartheid were the result of "a tremendous amount of propaganda, indoctrination and intimidation" conducted to convince the public that Jews and "black South Africans were alien, threatening, or something less than human" (p. 30). She identifies empathy as an essential component of humanization as "our ability to identify with the feelings and perspectives of others" depends on whether we can "see the other person as human like us;" otherwise, "we will not be able to identify with him" (p. 31). She ties humanization to the ability to recognize

another person's experiences and to the capacity to feel what that person feels or, in other words, to the empathic faculties that compose emotional literacy and role-taking.

Given some of the threats of teaching for empathy, such as the potential to provide students with a greater capacity to manipulate people to perverse ends, it is critical to balance teaching for empathy with an ethic or morality that acknowledges individuals' connections to each other, to their shared humanity, and to their human dignity. In addition, it just so happens that certain educational practices designed to foster empathy may also foster humanization; namely, values dialogue.

## A Conception of Humanization

*Humanization through critical, dialogical praxis represents the ethical ideal.*

(P. Roberts, 2000: 44)

Ironically, unlike empathy, one of the most philosophized *daseine* in recorded history, the human condition, has received almost no empirical research.[4] What it means to be a human being and to become human remains unclear and usually undefined with few available concrete definitions. Therefore, this thesis adopts the conception of humanity and of humanization of Paulo Freire.

Similar to many philosophers before him, Freire (2000) neglects to attempt to define the human condition directly. Instead, he opts to define it indirectly by exploring the processes of humanization and of dehumanization. Freire argues that people are "beings in the process of *becoming* [emphasis added] — as unfinished, uncompleted beings in and with a likewise unfinished reality" (p. 84). As a part of this process of becoming, Freire suggests that people

[4] Daseine is the plural of Dasein, what Martin Heidegger refers to as "being-in-the-world" (see *Being and Time*).

have an "ontological and historical vocation to be more fully human" (p, 55). He describes this pursuit as a "birthright of all" (p. 90).

Freire (ibid.) depicts the goal of humanization as *authentic humanism*. Quoting Pierre Furter, Freire describes authentic humanism as consisting "in permitting the emergence of the awareness of our full humanity, as a condition and as an obligation, as a situation and as a project" (p. 93). Moreover, Freire determines that humanization occurs via dialogue through which oppressors and oppressed can become more fully human. He argues that this dialogic inquiry "must be directed towards humanization — the people's historical vocation" (p. 85). In order to overcome oppression, this dialogue "cannot be carried out in isolation or individualism, but only in fellowship and solidarity" because "no one can be authentically human while he prevents others from being so" (ibid.).

Moreover, he describes our humanity as bound among the humanity of others. He argues that dehumanization "marks not only those whose humanity has been stolen, but also (though in a different way) those who have stolen it" because the oppressors experience "a *distortion* of the vocation of becoming more fully human" (p. 44). Both the oppressed and their oppressors, all people, can attempt to regain or to realize their full humanity or, in Freirian terms, their *fuller* humanity.

Therefore, regardless of whether participants in dialogue are oppressors or oppressed, their humanization depends on the humanization of those in relation to them; the oppressors lose a part of their humanity and the oppressed regain it. Freire maintains that the humanization of the oppressor and of the oppressed depends on the actions of the oppressed "who, by freeing themselves, can free their oppressors" (p. 56). Finally, in order to regain their humanity, the oppressed must "cease to be things and fight as men and women;" (ibid.) they must regain their

subjectivity. In sum, according to Freire, humanization consists of an ongoing process of development shared mutually among people who regain or enhance their subjectivity as a part of obtaining their fuller humanity and their permanent liberation.

## The Problem of Developing a Measurable Construct of Humanization: An Introduction to Mutualities

*Ubuntu — I am because we are.*

(R. Popham, 2014)

This author does not pretend to know what it means to be a human being or therefore to know the object of humanization. Arguably, measuring with precision changes in either of the former remains impossible. However, Freire demonstrates that our humanity is bound among the humanity of others through processes of both humanization and dehumanization. If our humanity depends on the humanity of others, then our humanity is a *mutuality* we can all share. Mutualities consist of qualities and faculties whose existence depend and/or depended on a relationship between human beings. More broadly, mutualities are ontological and epistemological elements, processes, understandings, and capacities that can be shared among all humans. If mutualities depend on relationships among people, then mutualities are bound among people's humanity, and people's humanization depends on the realization of these potentially shared qualities. Therefore, as our mutualities increase, so does our humanization and our humanity.

Mutualities require more explication before they can serve as a metric of humanization. A fundamental that has emerged in this thesis is that all people can valuate and therefore that all people can value. In this way, valuation and values can be bound to our condition as human

beings; values exist as potential mutualities. If our values are bound to our humanity, and our humanity depends on mutualities, then fostering awareness of our shared values is to foster an awareness of our shared humanity.

Furthermore, emotional literacy and role-taking represent distinctly human capacities. If everyone can potentially express and read emotions, and if everyone has the potential to take on someone else's role, then everyone can become more fully human through the development of the mutualities of emotional literacy and of role-taking. These previously defined capacities can contribute to the process and to the measurement of humanization.

Finally, Freire attributed a fuller humanity to an oppressed people's transformation from objects to subjects. Further, a people's shift from objectivity to subjectivity demonstrates the emergence of a mutuality. Therefore, the transition from objects to subjects represents a process of humanization. In conclusion, students' humanization can be measured by assessing their mutual shift toward an increased awareness of and respect for their subjectivity.

In sum, if the humanity of a student is bound among the humanity of his/her peers, then his/her humanization can be measured according to his/her growth in awareness of and respect for mutualities. Since this thesis's construct of humanization is measured in mutualities, its instrumental measurement may require a more wholistic approach than that of measuring emotional literacy or role-taking. Humanization may require an integrated measurement that comprises the observation of multiple mutualities including those representing empathic capacities. In closing, given the employment of values dialogue, this thesis's construct of humanization consists of increases in students' awareness of and respect for their mutualities, especially of their shared emotionality, roles, and values.

**From Values Dialogue to Empathy and Humanization**

> *What greater contribution could we make to our sustainable future than to promote a development of the heart that runs parallel to the development of the mind.*
>
> (M. Gordon, 2005: 34)

Some of the authors previously explored have also evinced the existence of mutualities and of the relationships between empathy and humanization. For example, Mary Gordon (2005) describes empathy as a distinctly human capacity, as "our emotions and the need to have them understood by others are so basic that the visible signals of how we are feeling have become essential aspects of humans around the world" (p. 33). Emotional literacy is therefore a human potential and a mutuality that, if fostered, contributes to a people's humanity.

Furthermore, Martin Hoffman (2000) also describes emotionality as an intrinsically human feature. Hoffman cited "a landmark study of Ekman, Sorenson, and Friesen (1969) in which preliterate New Guinea tribespeople identified a number of emotional facial expressions in the same way [as] subjects in Japan, Brazil, and the United States" (p. 42). Based on this research, Hoffman concluded that "certain emotions and facial expressions are universal and based on neural integration" (ibid.).

Several authors have also linked empathic responses to experiences that progenate values. Strayer (1987) demonstrates that the effectiveness of certain empathic capacities, especially of cognitive role-taking, depend on previous experience. She describes cognitive role-taking as being reliant on an understanding of one's affective emotion and of how one's reaction reflects the context in which one is affected. Furthermore, Strayer elaborates that "reflection upon such experiences should widen the range of stimuli evoking empathy, as well as provide a source of

individual differences in empathy" (p. 224). Therefore, more knowledge of diverse social contexts can contribute to the repertoire from which to role-take more effectively.

Strayer (ibid.) also demonstrates the utility of values dialogue as a vehicle with which to foster the empathic capacities of emotional literacy and of cognitive role-taking. She argues that "socialization practices that direct a child's attention to a variety of emotions in self and others seem to promote empathy" (p. 225). Therefore, educational models that investigate emotional affects, as well as the entities and processes that influence these affects, can have a significant impact on several empathic capacities.

Coplan (2011) also links empathy development to values dialogue by demonstrating how other-oriented perspective-taking relies on understanding another person's perspective and values through experience. Coplan argues that empathy is experiential in that

> (1) it is itself an experience for the observer;
>
> (2) that [*sic*] it is a representation of, among other things, the experience of a target; and
>
> (3) that [*sic*] it involves representations that are not representations of causes and [of] effects. (p. 17)

She concludes that empathy "is a representation of experiences" (ibid.). If values are influenced by experiences, then increased awareness of how experiences influence values increases a person's capacity to role-take.

To recapitulate, each model developed within this thesis will employ dialogues about values in order to teach for the constructs of emotional literacy, of role-taking, and of humanization. Therefore, the legitimacy of the hypothesis presented here depends on values dialogue and its supposed potential to foster the former empathic and humanistic capacities

among students. To this author's knowledge, this hypothesis has not yet been tested. However, it follows logically.

If developable elements of empathy include the constructs of emotional literacy and of role-taking, and if values influence actions and dispositions, then discussing and developing an understanding of values can also increase an individual's empathy. Individuals can have strong emotional associations with their values (Gordon, 2005). Therefore, to discuss values is to discuss and to grow in understanding of the influences on individuals' emotional associations. Further, if values influence thought processes and actions, then values dialogues enable individuals to begin to grasp the roles and thought processes of other participants in the dialogue. In sum, this kind of dialogue nurtures participants' capacities to role-take and to simulate other individuals' thought processes, in addition to developing participants' emotional literacy.

Moreover, values dialogue, emotional literacy, and role-taking exist in a dynamic relationship within which fostering one might foster the others. To increase in emotional literacy is to have a greater awareness of emotions, which in a values dialogue is to grow in understanding of how a person's emotions relate to a one's values. If a person grows in the ability to recognize the influences of another's values, then that person improves in the ability to take on another's role. Meanwhile, to grow in the capacity to take on another's role, is to increase in the capacity to take on the influences of another's values, which is to grow in one's understanding of the origins of another's emotions. The values dialogue and its targeted empathic capacities depend on and enhance one another.

Finally, the dynamic relationship among values dialogue, emotional literacy, and role-taking exists within the process of humanization so that an increase in understanding of values, of valuation, of emotional literacy, and of role-taking as mutualities might increase

humanization. If the process of humanization depends on the development of mutualities, then fostering the capacities of emotional literacy and of role-taking through values dialogue might foster several mutualities, including a greater awareness of potential shared values and valuation. In sum, the mutualities including values, valuation, emotional literacy, and role-taking compose a network of development of humanity.

**From Theory to Praxis**

This section acts as a conclusion for this chapter by summarizing what has been established as well as by acting as a bridge between the theory and the development of the models. Here, the praxis of a values dialogue will be established for the purpose of constructing models of the praxis that can be used and tested in secondary school classrooms.

The praxis of a dialogue about values consists of a process of collaborative meaning-making in which participants develop understandings of the deepest and of the strongest meanings. This kind of discourse consists of three processes of recognition and of development of understandings. Throughout the dialogue, participants attempt to identify what means the most. They also try to recognize how these meanings develop. Finally, during the discourse, participants attempt to identify the justifications that give the identified values their meaning.

Therefore, the praxis of a discourse about values consists of a dialogue about *dispositions* and *experiences*. Specifically, a values dialogue concerns how dispositions and experiences influence what each participant in the dialogue personally values and/or how they influence what other people value. Dispositions consist of a priori influences on values such as genetics, instincts, and intuition. Meanwhile, experiences consist of a posteriori influences on values such as sensation, sociocultural interaction, and environment. At its essence, a values dialogue is a

dialogue about stories. The dialogue involves the consideration of how participants' dispositions and experiences affect and/or affected their actions in situations of personal significance, especially in those situations and events that contributed to their values.

These three broad processes of recognition and of development of understanding can be summarized with guiding questions. These questions should evoke student discussions about choices and decisions, and about how and why participants and/or people outside the dialogue chose to do whatever it was that they did. At a minimum, each of the educational models that will be developed will offer a form of one of the following prompts:

1) What is important?
2) How is it important?
3) Why is it important?

Discussions including such questions will inevitably have strong feelings associated with them and opportunities to discuss those feelings. However, given the underlying questions of a values dialogue, it may be better suited for developing capacities to role-take and to simulate other people's thinking than to develop abilities to recognize, to understand, and to express emotions. Nevertheless, values may influence both emotionality and roles. So, although a praxical values dialogue may be better suited to foster role-taking, it should eventually influence both affective and cognitive empathic capacities and, ultimately, humanization.

After all, developing an understanding of values is at the core of a values dialogue. If values influence dispositions and actions, and if roles and thought processes are also influenced by values, then values dialogue can contribute to understandings of associations among emotions, dispositions, actions, roles, and cognition. Therefore, in many contexts, a dialogue

about values as structured may nurture participants' emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization.

# Chapter 4: The Models

## The Purpose of this Chapter

The previous chapter identified empathic and humanistic capacities, developed measurable constructs that synthesized those capacities, and established a praxis of values dialogue that may foster the constructs. Next, in this chapter this author will develop the models and their structures, and will offer an explanation of how they function. Then, this author will provide methods for measuring the models' targeted empathic and humanizing constructs. After problematizing the measurement of the constructs, this author will briefly introduce and illustrate the models. The introductions will consist of the models' origins; that is, the scholars who contributed to their designs; as well as the models' targeted empathic and humanizing constructs. Finally, this author will then explain each model in turn. Therefore, in this chapter this author will establish the framework for the development of the models and then proceed to illustrate them.

## Developing the Models

The models will be developed based on the research and experiences of scholars of empathy, of humanization, of dialogue, and of inquiry-based curriculum. They will draw on experiences derived from actual practice; this author has already practiced some variations of the following models in professional development workshops, in teacher education classes, and in secondary school classrooms in London, Ontario. However, in previous exercises of versions of these models, the author did not purposefully attempt to foster emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization, nor did he attempt to measure these capacities instrumentally. These models will draw on existing educational programs as much as possible in order to increase their

legitimacy. These models will also utilize existing practices to increase the likelihood that they affect as intended. After all, as demonstrated previously, many programs that foster empathy already exist, although most often they are not designed for secondary school classrooms and/or often are not identified as forms of empathy education.

**Structure of the Models**

The format of the models emulates curricula already in use by secondary school teachers in Ontario. This author will first describe the models' particular learning objectives. Although these models can potentially foster emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization, each model fosters each of these constructs and their various facets to different degrees. Therefore, the learning objectives will identify which capacities of the constructs the models target. In addition, the learning objectives will guide the method of each model by serving as ends by which to inform and shape means. Finally, these objectives will serve as standards by which to evaluate the utility of a model, which may include the fostering of emotional literacy, of role-taking, and of humanization.

Second, each model will include a list of required and suggested materials and an explanation of their purpose in the execution of the model. The models require very few resources; however, there are many optional teaching aides that may enhance the effectiveness of the practice of the model. Required and suggested materials and equipment may include the organization of the desks in the classroom, writing materials, and/or manipulatives. The models are designed to require as few resources as necessary for increased applicability to as many secondary school classroom contexts as possible.

Third, the method of execution of each model will be described in discrete steps. These steps will attempt to balance descriptive precision with breadth of utility. These general steps will be articulated with as much precision as possible while balancing description with generalizability so that the models can be applied to a variety of classroom contexts. After all, the ease with which each model can be comprehended will have a direct impact on its accessibility and proper execution.

Fourth, each model will briefly address the costs and benefits of practicing it as outlined. Costs depicted in these sections will exclude required materials as they are modest and affordable. Instead, the costs and benefits analysis will include intangible resources used throughout the models and other potential costs such as risks to the students and to the instructor. Meanwhile, the benefits addressed in this section will include the targeted empathic and humanistic capacities as well as any other real and potential direct and indirect benefits of practicing the model. All of the suggested real and potential benefits will remain tentative as the models have not yet been tested.

Finally, each model will include suggested instruments for measuring the constructs developed in the previous chapter. Each construct must be measured differently in each model because of the models' varied methods. These instruments will not be suited to every context in which the models could be practiced and are therefore samples of possible instruments with which to measure this thesis's target constructs. These samples will serve as standards by which to develop instruments applicable to the needs of the teacher and of the current class of students.

**Function of the Models**

The models are designed to be applicable to 2014 secondary school classrooms in Ontario. The targeted classrooms consist of 25-35 students with resources commonly found in secondary schools. These resources include: a method of displaying information such as a SMART board or chalkboard; space for everyone to sit in circles; and tables, chairs, paper and pencils for every student. The models' designs will cater to courses offered from grades 9 through 12 that use Ontario public school curricula.

Since the choice of whether to incorporate these models may be left to the teacher, implementation and actual usage of the models by the instructor will be considered in their designs. The models will likely appeal to a teacher who employs student-centered and collaborative pedagogical approaches. In addition, in order for these values dialogues to be effective, they will require an active, understanding, and respectful facilitator. Moreover, the teacher should have a basic appreciation of the value of the mutualities which the models are designed to foster; if the teacher does not appreciate the learning objectives of the models, then their execution may be less successful.

Needless to say, no single execution of a model will ever be identical to another due to the uniqueness of the instructor and of his/her context, as well as the differences in the interests, in levels of cognitive and affective development, and in the capacities of his/her students. The models will be descriptive enough to inform particular approaches to values dialogue and broad enough that they can be used to teach various aspects of Ontario public school curricula in various classroom contexts. In conclusion, this chapter will lay out each model's structure and function as necessary to influence emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization as well as

describe some possible instruments for measuring the former empathic and humanizing constructs.

**Methods of Measuring the Constructs**

Each model's assessments can be used to test for students' emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization. However, any single set of assessments derived from the execution of a model cannot determine changes in these capacities among students. Moreover, to test for changes in students' empathic and humanizing faculties, and therefore to test for the utility of the models, the assessments from one model must be compared with those from another. The completed assessments from one model can be used in tandem with other assessments derived from executing the other models or from those derived from repeating the same model at another point in time. By triangulating the data from these assessments, one can demonstrate changes in students' capacities of emotional literacy, of role-taking, and of humanization.

Notably, each model fosters empathic and humanizing capacities to different degrees and therefore the assessments from the different models cannot provide valid comparisons of students' dispositions from the practice of one model to the next. Therefore, one of the best methods of measuring for the utility of the models is to execute the same model again using different content and to compare students' assessments from the first performance of a model with those derived from a later practice of the same model.

**Introduction to the Models**

To recapitulate, this thesis aspires to develop educational methods that may foster empathy and humanization. Therefore, the preceding chapters have developed and defined

teachable empathic and humanizing constructs including emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanizing mutualities. Emotional literacy refers to the accuracy and effectiveness by which students encode and decode emotional affects. Meanwhile, role-taking conveys the precision and effectiveness by which students identify and inhabit the influences of another person's values. Finally, humanization denotes students' awareness of and respect for their mutualities, especially of their shared emotionality, roles, and values.

Although each model is designed to foster emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization, each model targets one of the former constructs predominantly. Socio-Political Problem-Solving attempts to foster humanization through its purposeful illumination of mutualities. Next, the Forum Theater of Values attempts to foster role-taking through its deliberate values dialogue interventions. These interventions explore and define the values of the persons behind the representations of perpetrators and of victims in mock oppressive scenarios. Finally, the Direct Values Dialogue attempts to teach for emotional literacy primarily through its use of the counselling psychology tool *icebergs.* Using this tool, the model facilitates the deconstruction of the various components that influence an emotion such as a person's experiences and the influences of his/her deepest values.

The following sections will outline each of the former models in detail. First, this author will briefly introduce the model by noting its origins and by identifying its targeted empathic or humanistic construct. After introducing the model, this author will articulate its learning objectives. Then he will list required and suggested materials and equipment for its execution. Following the listing and justifications for teaching and for learning aids, this author will outline the method by which the model might be executed. Following the explanation of how to conduct the model, he will explore the costs and benefits of the model's execution as described in the

method. Finally, the last portion of a model's outline will address and describe possible instruments for measuring the desired empathic and humanistic capacities. In sum, the subsequent sections will describe in detail three models which are designed to foster the mutualities that contribute to humanization, those of which include the empathic constructs of emotional literacy and of role-taking.

## Model I: Socio-Political Problem-Solving

*When will the United States and the Taliban come to the table?*

(N. Pizzale[5])

The first model, Socio-Political Problem-Solving, introduces groups of students to current socio-political conflicts and then has them assemble cases to justify whether they can be resolved. This model relies on research regarding the utility of discovery and of problem- and of project-based learning (Aulls & Shore, 2008). The model draws on discovery learning by creating spaces for students to discover the potential mutualities among parties currently in conflict. It also utilizes research regarding problem-based learning, as the students must identify the main problem in the conflict and develop a case in which they must justify why it can or cannot currently be resolved. Finally, acknowledging John Dewey's legacy of project-based learning, this model can be extended from a single class to a multi-class project. This model demonstrates a form of project-based learning because it is "child-centered" and it is "socially relevant" in that it has students engage in inquiry independently to address current conflicts between groups of human beings (p. 169).

Paulo Freire (2000) highlighted the value of "problem-posing" educational approaches such as that of Socio-Political Problem-Solving. He argued that educators "must abandon the education goal of deposit-making and replace it with the posing of the problems of human beings" (p. 79). Borrowing from Freire's disposition, Socio-Political Problem-Solving poses the problems of human beings in order to prompt investigations into the humanity of those involved in a conflict. The model is designed to foster appreciation of mutualities such as potential shared

[5] Dr. Norman Pizzale is a professor at King's University College, Western University, in London, Ontario. He asked this question to a first-year undergraduate Social Justice and Peace Studies class in 2008.

emotions, experiences, and values. Therefore, of the targeted empathic and humanistic constructs, this model attempts to foster students' humanization predominately.

**Learning Objectives**

This model should influence the following capacities:

1) Emotional literacy

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) an increased capacity to decode emotions by deconstructing their associated experiences and values, as well as their other related emotions.

2) Role-taking

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) a greater capacity to deconstruct roles and perspectives;

b) a greater understanding of how values influence roles; and

c) an increased understanding of how experiences influence values.

3) Humanization

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) a greater understanding of their shared emotional affects;

b) an increased appreciation for their shared experiences;

c) a greater understanding of their shared roles;

d) a greater awareness of their shared values; and

e) a greater appreciation for their shared humanity.

**Required and Suggested Materials and Equipment**

The model requires or suggests the use of the following materials and equipment:

1) Each group of students should have a method of writing and of displaying information for the rest of the class; and
    a) chart paper, wipe boards, bristol board, and/or access to computers with projectors could serve this purpose.
2) The students will need textbooks and/or computers with access to the internet in order to research information relative to their socio-political problems.
3) The teacher will require a printer to create enough rubrics for students to assess each of the other groups presenting their cases; and
    a) printing rubrics on both sides of sheets of paper will conserve paper and could make evaluating both the students' performance and the model's effects on empathic and humanistic capacities an efficient process.

**Method**

This section describes the phases that shape this model. First, it establishes the groups and the roles of students within the groups. The criteria of a socio-political problem will then be identified. After creating descriptions of ongoing power conflicts and/or cases depicting a set of current socio-political problems, these synopses are distributed to the groups. Next, the following subsection depicts the questions to which the students will respond to regarding their socio-political problems. The students will then research evidence and examples from resources such as textbooks and/or the World Wide Web in order to justify their responses. After developing cases for the responses, the groups will develop a case for whether the conflict can be

resolved. Subsequently, the groups will provide presentations of their justifications. During the presentations, the students will assess how the presenters defend their cases. These assessments judge students' comprehension of shared emotions, experiences, and values and of how these variables influence one another.

The following steps will shape the procedure of execution of this model:

1) Establish the groups
    a) The students will be divided into groups of three or four.
    b) Each group will consist of a scribe and of researchers.
        i. The researchers will collect evidence with which to answer the questions provided by the teacher.
        ii. The scribe will record the group's responses to the questions as well as their justifications.
2) The socio-political problems

    The following criteria will shape the creation and the distribution of the socio-political problems:

    a) Each group will be provided with a socio-political problem.
        i. If the teacher decides to use case studies, each group will be instructed first to identify the main conflict in their case.
    b) A socio-political problem consists of a current or of a potential power conflict between at least two groups of people.
        i. This model will work less effectively with historical conflicts.
        ii. However, the model could be used to analyze historical, current, and potential power conflicts.

1) Research

The following steps will shape the research process:

a) Students will receive the questions regarding their socio-political problems (see Figure 1).

   i. The teacher should provide adequate resources and time so that the students can develop and logically justify cases for each of their responses to their questions.

b) During this phase, the teacher should serve as a resource and should probe students with suggestions only if they are struggling with justifying their responses to their questions.

   i. The more student-directed the research process, the richer the overall learning experience could be for the students participating.

c) The teacher should emphasize to his/her students that "solving" the conflict is not as important as making a logical and effective case that explains why the current conflict can or cannot be resolved.

2) Presentations

The following criteria will shape the presentation of cases for and against the resolution of the socio-political problems:

a) Each group will make the case for or against the resolution of the current conflict that they investigated.

b) The rest of the class observing each presentation will be instructed to argue the opposite case to that presented using the evidence and justifications provided by the presenters.

**Figure 1: Sample Socio-Political Problem Questions**

NOTE: Please justify all responses with evidence and/or examples.

What is the main problem?

What emotions could the groups of people involved in the conflict share?

What experiences could the groups of people involved in the conflict share?

What values could the groups of people involved in the conflict share?

Based on the plausible emotions, experiences, and values of the groups involved in the conflict, can the current conflict be resolved? Why or why not?

**Figure 2: Sample Socio-Political Problem Presentation Assessment Rubric**

| | **Level 1 (Below the standard[6])** | **Level 2 (Approaches the standard)** | **Level 3 (The provincial standard)** | **Level 4 (Surpasses the standard)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge/ Understanding**<br><br>**Identifications and Evidence**<br><br>**/4** | Identifications of and evidence for shared emotions, shared experiences, and shared values demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the conflict. | Identifications of and evidence for shared emotions, shared experiences, and shared values demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the conflict. | Identifications of and evidence for shared emotions, shared experiences, and shared values demonstrate considerable knowledge and understanding of the conflict. | Identifications of and evidence for shared emotions, shared experiences, and shared values demonstrate superior knowledge and understanding of the conflict. |
| **Thinking/ Inquiry**<br><br>**Justifications**<br><br>**/4** | Justifications for whether the conflict can be resolved demonstrate limited thought and reflection. | Justifications for whether the conflict can be resolved demonstrate some thought and reflection. | Justifications for whether the conflict can be resolved demonstrate considerable thought and reflection. | Justifications for whether the conflict can be resolved demonstrate impressive thought and reflection. |
| **Communication**<br><br>**Display and Presentation**<br><br>**/4** | Case for whether the current conflict can be resolved presented with limited effectiveness. | Case for whether the current conflict can be resolved presented with some effectiveness. | Case for whether the current conflict can be resolved presented with considerable effectiveness. | Case for whether the current conflict can be resolved presented with superior effectiveness. |
| **Application**<br><br>**Use of Class Time**<br><br>**/4** | Quantity and quality of justifications for responses suggest limited use of class time. | Quantity and quality of justifications for responses suggest some use of class time. | Quantity and quality of justifications for responses suggest effective use of class time. | Quantity and quality of justifications for responses suggest excellent use of class time. |
| **Total /16** | A mark below Level 1 is a failing grade indicating achievement much below the provincial standard. | | | |

[6] The provincial standard of Ontario, Canada (see *Growing Success: Assessment, Evaluation and Reporting in Ontario's Schools*).

i. The goal is for students to use only the data provided by the presenting group to challenge the group's justifications for their responses.

ii. This criterion is vital to the effectiveness of the values dialogue in this model.

c) The rest of the class observing the presentations will use rubrics to assess the effectiveness by which the presenting groups argue their cases (see Figure 2).

**Costs and Benefits**

The potential risks and costs associated with using this model depend almost entirely on which problems the instructors select for investigation and on how they relate to the interests and needs of their students. For example, if the class contains groups of students with strong pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian sentiments, then investigating the Palestinian-Israeli conflict may risk violating students' comfort, security, and/or feelings. The teacher can assuage these risks by selecting conflicts far-removed from the classes' experiences, for example.

In spite of its possible costs, this model has the greatest potential to foster the mutualities that define humanization. Through justifying cases for shared emotions, experiences, and values, students will witness the presence of these mutualities among conflicting peoples. Moreover, this process of justification can foster students' appreciation of the consequences of the absence or of the presence of mutualities. Therefore, this model can humanize both the students investigating the mutualities and those peoples under investigation.

**Instruments of Measurement**

The rubric used in an assessment of this model can measure the students' awareness of the possible implications of the presence or absence of mutualities. Therefore, it serves as a method by which to measure students' humanization. Since this model has only one assessment, in order to measure changes in humanization, or in emotional literacy and role-taking, this model's assessment must be triangulated with the repeated use of and assessment of this model at another point in time, or with an assessment derived from employing one of the other models. For example, in order to measure changes in humanization, the presence of mutualities detected in this assessment could be compared with the presence of humanization detected in the values rankings assessment from the Direct Values Dialogue (see Figure 6).

## Model II: Forum Theater of Values

> *Theater is the most perfect artistic form of coercion […] Empathy must be understood as the terrible weapon it really is.*[7]
>
> (A. Boal, trans. 1979: 39 & 113)

When Augusto Boal (1979) began participating in the development of the Arena Theater in São Paulo, Brazil, he became a participant in a revolution of Brazilian theatrical methods. This revolution spawned a new set of theatrical styles and approaches, including the overarching theory and the various praxes of the *theater of the oppressed*. Based on his experiences with the Arena Theater, Boal concluded that "maybe the theater in itself is not revolutionary, but these theatrical forms are without a doubt *rehearsal of revolution*" (p. 141).

This model employs one of those revolutionary praxes, *forum theater*. In a forum theater, observers witness a skit depicting a scenario of oppression involving at least one oppressor and one oppressed person. After the actors perform the entire skit once, they act out the scenario again; the observers must "intervene decisively in the dramatic action and change it" (ibid.). This model will follow Boal's description of forum theater as outlined in his book the *Theater of the Oppressed*. However, this model will adapt his vision by incorporating values dialogue for the purposes of fostering emotional literacy, humanization, and especially role-taking among participants.

### Learning Objectives

This model should influence the following capacities:

[7] These quotes demonstrate Augusto Boal's position regarding the utility of the *theater of the oppressed* and of theater more broadly.

1) Emotional literacy

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) a greater ability to encode their emotions through verbal and physical expression;

b) an increased capacity to decode emotions through verbal and physical language; and

c) a greater understanding of how experiences and values influence emotions.

2) Role-taking

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) an increased awareness of how values influence roles;

b) a greater capacity to deconstruct roles and perspectives;

i. an increased understanding of the influences on roles and on perspectives; and

c) an increased understanding of how experiences influence values.

3) Humanization

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) a greater understanding of their shared emotional affects;

b) an increased appreciation for their shared experiences;

c) a greater understanding of their shared roles;

i. an increased understanding of how roles influence their shared perspectives; and

d) a greater awareness of their shared values.

**Required and Suggested Materials and Equipment**

The model requires or suggests the use of the following materials and equipment:

1) This model requires an open space large enough to incorporate all of the students in the class; and
    a) pushing all of the desks to the sides of the room should suffice in some instances.
2) The performance of this model could benefit from props related to the predetermined content of the scenarios, but props are not required.
3) The teacher could use access to a printer to create exit cards; or
    a) the teacher could have his/her students write down the reflection question and answer it using their own paper and writing tools.

**Method**

This section will outline the roles of the "Joker" and of the spectating and intervening "Spect-actors" (Brecht Forum). This author will then explain how these roles will interact in an outline of Boal's (1979) forum theater. Next, this author will provide an explanation of how to conduct a values dialogue that will support the students in creating a solution to the scenario that is less oppressive than that which was proposed by the Spect-actors initially. The last subsections will describe some possible means of assessing students' comprehension of the emotions, experiences, and values discussed throughout the forum theaters and the values dialogues. These assessments will also contribute to the measurement of changes in the students' empathic capacities and in their humanization.

1) Decide who will serve as the Joker(s)
    a) If the instructor decides that his or her students will break into their own groups to perform multiple forum theaters simultaneously, then this model will require that the entire class receive an explanation of the role of the Joker as well as an explanation of how to conduct the values dialogues.
        i. This author suggests that a teacher avoid sharing the role of the Joker with his/her students at least during the first execution of this model as this role places an enormous responsibility on the students assigned to it.
    b) Otherwise, the teacher may serve as the Joker for the purpose of performing one class-wide forum theater.
2) Joker

    The following criteria define the role of the Joker using Augusto Boal's (1979) the *Theater of the Oppressed*:

    a) The Joker is "a contemporary and neighbor of the spectator" (p. 175).
    b) The Joker "is magical, omniscient, polymorphous, and ubiquitous" (p. 179).
        i. The Joker has "all the instruments of all styles and genres" (p. 176) at his or her disposal.
        ii. The Joker "is a magic reality; he [or she] creates it. If necessary, he [or she] invents magic walls, combats, soldiers, armies" (p. 182).
        iii. "All the other characters accept the magic reality created and described by the 'Joker'" (ibid.).

iv. The Joker "is polyvalent; his function is the only one that can perform any role in the [forum theater]" (ibid.).

c) "Each scene or chapter, episode or explanation" influenced by the Joker should be original (p. 177).

i. The performing Spect-actors will repeat continuously the same solution as close to the original as possible.

1. It is the role of the Joker to influence the forum theater so as to encourage the observing Spect-actors to intervene.

ii. If no observing Spect-actors intervene, then the scene will occur exactly as it occurred the first time, unless the Joker intervenes in the skit him/herself.

d) The Joker's goal is "to restore the full freedom of the character-subject" (p. 179).

i. The character-subject is the person being oppressed.

ii. In a forum theater, the Joker is attempting to restore the character-subject's full freedom through the stimulation of the interventions of the Spect-actors.

1. Ideally, the Spect-actors will intervene of their own accord.

2. However, if they are not intervening, then it is the role of the Joker to change the scenario and/or skit, or to encourage directly the observing Spect-actors to intervene.

3) Spect-actors

The following criteria define the role of a Spect-actor:

a) The students are all Spect-actors.
    i. If the teacher decides to hold multiple forum theaters at the same time, then some of the students must be Jokers.
    ii. Spect-actors compose both those acting in the forum theater as well as those spectating.

b) A Spect-actor can take the place of the oppressed or of a bystander in the forum theater at any time.
    i. The Spect-actor may only take the place of the oppressed.
        1. He/she can also take the place of a by-stander if the teacher decides to include bystanders in the scenarios.
        2. A Spect-actor will never take the place of the oppressor.

c) The goal of the Spect-actor is to enter into the skit and to attempt to affect a solution to the scenario that is less oppressive than that which was initially proposed.

4) Forum theater

The following steps define the process of the forum theater:

a) "First, the participants are asked [by the Joker] to tell a story containing a political or social problem of difficult solution" (p. 139).
    i. Ideally, the students will develop their own oppressive scenarios based on the current content studied in the course.
    ii. If necessary, the teacher could provide the entire class or each group of students with oppressive scenarios.

iii. The teacher could also provide titles for oppressive scenarios that could serve as prompts and have his/her students develop scenarios based on the titles.

b) "Then a ten- or fifteen-minute skit portraying that problem and the solution intended for discussion is improvised or rehearsed, and subsequently presented" (ibid.).

i. The actual length of the skit will depend on the time available to the teacher.

1. However, the skit needs to be long enough so that students can logically change the course of its events.

c) "When the skit is over, the participants are asked if they agree with the solution presented" (ibid.).

i. The length and depth of the dialogue regarding the scenario and its presented solutions will depend on the nature of the scenario, on the solutions, and on the time available to the Joker.

ii. The teacher should have his/her students explain their reasoning for their agreement or disagreement with the presented outcome of the scenario.

d) "At this point it is explained that the scene will be performed once more, exactly as it was [performed] the first time. But now any participant in the audience has the right to replace any actor and lead the action in the direction that seems to him [or her] most appropriate" (ibid.).

i. "The other actors have to face the newly created situation, responding instantly to all the possibilities that it may present" (ibid.).

ii. Any observing Spect-actor "may propose any solution, but it must be done on the stage, working, acting, doing things, and not from the comfort of his [or her] seat" (ibid.).

5) Values dialogue

The following criteria define when and how the Joker can use values dialogue to intervene in the forum theater to support the Spect-actors in making their solutions to the scenario less oppressive.

a) The Joker will improvise the values dialogue depending on how the Spect-actors intervene in the scenario.

i. The Joker will utilize values dialogue to assist the Spect-actors with decreasing the oppression in the skit.

b) After a solution to the scenario is presented, the Joker will ask the Spect-actors, "How does the oppressed person feel?"

c) After discussing the possible feelings of the victim, the Joker will ask the Spect-actors, "Why is the oppressed person feeling these emotions?"

d) If the dialogue has not yet addressed the victim's values, then the Joker will ask the participants, "What values could be influencing the oppressed person's feelings?"

e) After identifying the victim's potential values in the scenario, then the Joker will facilitate another dialogue using questions 5(b) through 5(d) but replacing "oppressed" with "oppressor" (e.g., "How does the oppressor feel?").

f) Finally, the Joker will ask the Spect-actors, "Given the values that could be influencing the victim's and the oppressor's oppression, what could the oppressed or a bystander do to help or to support the oppressor in reducing and/or in eliminating his/her oppression?"

6) Repeat the scenario

a) After exhausting the values dialogue, the Joker will have the Spect-actors run the scenario again and encourage them to empathize and to be mindful of the roles of the oppressor, of the oppressed, and of any bystanders, as well as encourage them to support the oppressor to reduce his/her oppression.

b) The scenario will be repeated and have its newly presented solutions assessed dialogically until the group generates a solution that is mutually accepted by all or until the group runs out of time.

7) Assessment

The following criteria outline a possible means of assessing students' capacities of emotional literacy, of humanization, and especially of role-taking, after finding a mutually acceptable solution to the scenario or at the end of the class.

a) The teacher could have his/her students evaluate how analyzing the potential emotions, experiences, and values of the oppressed and of the oppressor affected the observing Spect-actors' capacity to change the degree of oppression in the skit.

i. This assessment could be conducted through the use of an exit card (see Figure 3) after the completion of the forum theater or at the end of the class.

**Costs and Benefits**

Most of the potential and real costs associated with this model are the same as those which might be involved in the performance of any theatrical activity. For example, students may feel embarrassed performing in front of their peers. They may also have their confidence violated depending on how they propose and enact solutions to the scenario(s). Therefore, the Joker(s) should encourage and maintain the comfort and safety of students throughout the exercise of this model. In order to help build students' confidence before enacting the forum theater(s), the teacher could have students participate in theatrical *icebreakers.*[8]

Another potential cost is that the students might create solutions that are more oppressive than the initial solution to the scenario. However, this cost can be a benefit because students can learn from examining how a situation can be made more oppressive just as they can learn from an investigation of how a situation can be made less oppressive. The Joker should embrace as teachable moments those solutions that are more oppressive in order to help and to support students in making the outcomes of the scenarios less oppressive in subsequent skits.

As with the other models, this one has many potential benefits. Of the models included in this thesis, this model has by the far the greatest potential to foster the capacity of role-taking among students. This model fosters role-taking through the facilitation of the deconstruction of roles and of the roles' related perspectives, values, emotions, and experiences. Furthermore, the model explores how these aspects influence actions and how they are affected by actions. Through the deconstruction of values, of emotions, and of experiences, this model also has a potential to foster the capacities of emotional literacy and of humanization. Oppressive situations can produce strong emotions that can be deconstructed through an investigation of

[8] (E.g., http://www.theatreteachers.com/theatre-games/71/icebreakers/7)

**Figure 3: Sample Exit Card**[9]

| **Forum Theater Exit Card**<br><br>How did the discussion about the emotions, perspectives, and values of the oppressor and of the oppressed influence how you or your classmates changed the outcome? | **Forum Theater Exit Card**<br><br>How did the discussion about the emotions, perspectives, and values of the oppressor and of the oppressed influence how you or your classmates changed the outcome? |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| **Forum Theater Exit Card**<br><br>How did the discussion about the emotions, perspectives, and values of the oppressor and of the oppressed influence how you or your classmates changed the outcome? | **Forum Theater Exit Card**<br><br>How did the discussion about the emotions, perspectives, and values of the oppressor and of the oppressed influence how you or your classmates changed the outcome? |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

[9] This page contains four copies of the sample exit card for ease of mass producing for classroom use.

associated emotions, perspectives, and values. Furthermore, a Forum Theater of Values serves as a vehicle by which to enact and to witness the humanization of the oppressed and of the oppressor, a joint-liberation sought by both Paulo Freire (2000) and his disciple Augusto Boal (1979).

**Instruments of Measurement**

This model presents a great challenge when attempting to measure changes in students' emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization, while conducting the forum theaters and the values dialogues. Therefore, this author suggests testing for the constructs of empathy and of humanization after finishing multiple forum theaters or at the end of the class. The teacher could use exit cards to assess the students' growing understanding of the constructs.

The exit cards are tools with which to assess changes in how students solve the scenarios after conducting the values dialogues. Any assessment included with this model should attempt to measure how an increased awareness and appreciation of the values, perspectives, and experiences of the victim and of the oppressor affected how the observing Spect-actors attempted to solve the scenario. In addition to judging students' comprehension of the values dialogue, this form of assessment would serve as a measure of the presence of this thesis's construct of role-taking among students.

The following question would serve as an effective assessment of students' awareness and understanding of roles after the values dialogue: How did the discussion about the emotions, perspectives, and values of the oppressor and of the oppressed influence how you or your classmates changed the outcome? This kind of assessment can be used to assess the students' comprehension of the values dialogue as well as of how values and their related experiences and

perspectives shape roles. In this way, this assessment captures students' thoughts about their reflections in the values dialogue and about how the dialogue affected students' thoughts as they approached the scenario repeatedly. Therefore, it serves as an assessment of students' meta-cognition about their meta-cognition. These assessments of students' reflections on the process of the deconstruction of roles demonstrate how these students' thoughts about roles influenced future proposed solutions to the scenario.

## Model III: Direct Values Discourse

*Do to others what you would have them do to you.*

(1973, Matthew 7:12)

When Péter Bodor (1997) first argued that an expression of emotion is "no more and no less than the tip of an iceberg" (p. 205), he may not have known that this metaphor would become a common tool in counseling psychology (Keelan, 2014; Amaral, 2013). The Direct Values Dialogue incorporates the *iceberg* technique of emotion deconstruction. Using this technique, participants deconstruct an emotion through the use of an iceberg visual. In addition to the iceberg process, the model consists of two other overlapping phases, the peer reviews and the Values Pile-Up. During the second phase, the students with their peers will review their icebergs using assessments provided by the instructor. Throughout the last phase, students will be asked the questions: What is valued?, How did it come to be valued?, and Why is it valued? Therefore, this last model attempts to mirror the theory and praxis of values dialogue. Of those included in this thesis, this model has the greatest potential impact on students' emotional literacy because it facilitates the expression and, in particular, the detailed deconstruction of emotion.

### Learning Objectives

This model should influence the following capacities:

1) Emotional literacy

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) a greater ability to encode emotions through both verbal and text-based expression;

b) an increased capacity to decode emotions both through conversation and in texts; and

c) a greater understanding of how values and experiences influence emotions.

2) Role-taking

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) an increased awareness of how values influence roles; and

b) an increased understanding of how experiences influence values.

3) Humanization

Upon the execution of this model, students should have:

a) a greater understanding of their shared emotional affects;

b) an increased appreciation for their shared experiences; and

c) a greater awareness of their shared values.

**Required and Suggested Materials and Equipment**

The model requires or suggests the use of the following materials and equipment:

1) All students need some means of writing, drawing, and displaying information; and

a) each student's method of displaying information must be accessible to at least one other student.

2) The teacher can have his/her class use Post-it notes to represent students' values visually at the bottom of their icebergs. These notes are useful because they can be attached to a display and then moved as needed during the Values Pile-Up.

a) However, any material that allows students to transport their written values from their icebergs to a display would be satisfactory.

3) The class will require a method of displaying information that enables everyone to see the information at the same time, assuming that the Values Pile-Up and he following values dialogue are performed as an entire class.
4) To create rubrics and/or guiding questions for the peer-review of icebergs and for the values rankings presentations, the teacher will require access to a printer.

**Method**

This model attempts to scaffold a range of activities that mirror the praxis of values dialogue as outlined in Chapter 3. Its method consists of three overlapping phases. In the first phase, the student will create an *iceberg* of an emotion which he/she has felt or witnessed, or of an emotion from a list provided by the instructor. Next, the student will write associated emotions, values, and experiences that influenced the emotion at the tip of his/her iceberg on its main body, underneath the water. The student will also attempt to justify these influences logically.

Then, in pairs or small groups, students will review each other's icebergs. The peers' assessments will attempt to evaluate the accuracy and the efficacy with which the author of an iceberg identified and justified the influences on his/her selected emotion.

In the third phase, students participate in a "Values Pile-Up" in which they take the values which they identified on their icebergs and, along with the other students in the class, "pile them up" on a display. The goal of the first part of phase three is to attempt to cluster similar values together. After the pile-up, in pairs, in small groups, or as a class, students will engage in a dialogue about the development of and justifications for the values clusters. This dialogue concludes with a collaborative ranking of the values clusters displayed, from most

important to least important. This portion of the model can be conducted in pairs, small groups, or together as an entire class. Finally, groups of students will present their values clusters rankings to the rest of the class. Students observing the presentations will then have the opportunity to assess other groups' justifications for their rankings of values clusters.

### Icebergs

The following steps outline the process by which students will create their icebergs:

a) Students will draw an iceberg in a body of water.
    i. This process could include an exemplar on display.
b) Students will place their chosen emotions at the top of their icebergs above the water.
    i. This emotion could be one which a student experienced or witnessed or an emotion chosen from a list provided by the teacher.
    ii. Ideally, students will create icebergs of as many different emotions as possible.
c) Students will identify other emotions and physical signs associated with the emotion depicted on the tip of their icebergs within the larger part beneath the water.
d) On Post-its, students will identify the values that influenced the identified emotions and physical signs on their icebergs, and then they will attach these notes to the bottoms of their icebergs.

i. The teacher should encourage students to write one value per Post-it note in one or two words in the largest font they can fit on the note. This will help with displaying them to the entire class later.

2) Peer-reviews

The following steps will shape the iceberg peer-reviews:

a) The teacher will have students assemble into groups of two or three.

b) Students will take turns presenting their icebergs to their partners or to small groups. They will explain and justify the relationships between the emotion at the tip of their iceberg and the emotions, physical signs, experiences, and values, they depicted beneath the water.

c) Students will work in pairs or in small groups within which they will assess the accuracy and effectiveness with which their partners decoded and deconstructed the emotions at the tips of their icebergs.

i. The teacher could use rubrics (see Figure 4) to assess his or her students' accuracy and effectiveness with which they deconstructed the emotion, or the teacher could have students answer a series of predetermined questions (see Figure 5) about their partners' icebergs.

3) Values Pile-Up

The following points will shape the process of the pile-up:

a) Students will take the Post-it notes that depict the values on the bottom of their icebergs and "pile them up" on a display on a chalkboard, chart paper, Bristol Board, or a SMART Board.

## Figure 4: Sample Iceberg Rubric

| | **Level 1 (Below the standard[10])** | **Level 2 (Approaches the standard)** | **Level 3 (The provincial standard)** | **Level 4 (Surpasses the standard)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge/ Understanding**<br><br>**Identification of Emotions, of Values, and of their Experiential Relationships**<br>**/4** | Iceberg demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of emotions, of values, and of their relationships with experiences. | Iceberg demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of emotions, of values, and of their relationships with experiences. | Iceberg demonstrates considerable knowledge and understanding of emotions, of values, and of their relationships with experiences. | Iceberg demonstrates a superior knowledge and understanding of emotions, of values, and of their relationships with experiences. |
| **Thinking/ Inquiry**<br><br>**Justifications for Emotions and for Values**<br><br>**/4** | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg demonstrate limited thought and reflection. | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg demonstrate some thought and reflection. | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg demonstrate considerable thought and reflection. | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg demonstrate superior thought and reflection. |
| **Communication**<br><br>**Display and Presentation**<br><br>**/4** | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg conveyed with minimal effectiveness in the display and in the presentation. | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg conveyed with some effectiveness in the display and in the presentation. | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg conveyed with considerable effectiveness in the display and in the presentation. | Justifications for emotions and for values in the iceberg conveyed with outstanding effectiveness in the display and in the presentation. |
| **Application**<br><br>**Use of Class Time**<br><br>**/4** | Quantity and quality of justifications for emotions, values, and experiences in the iceberg suggest minimal use of class time. | Quantity and quality of justifications for emotions, values, and experiences in the iceberg suggest some use of class time. | Quantity and quality of justifications for emotions, values, and experiences in the iceberg suggest considerable use of class time. | Quantity and quality of justifications for emotions, values, and experiences in the iceberg suggest excellent use of class time. |
| **Total /16** | A mark below Level 1 is a failing grade indicating achievement much below the provincial standard. | | | |

[10] The provincial standard of Ontario, Canada (see *Growing Success: Assessment, Evaluation and Reporting in Ontario's Schools*).

**Figure 5: Sample Iceberg Questions**

Which emotion did your partner place at the tip of his or her iceberg?

What other emotions could influence the emotion at the tip? How might these other emotions influence your partner's selected emotion? Justify your suggestion.

What experiences could influence the emotion at the tip? How might these experiences influence your partner's selected emotion? Justify your suggestion.

What values could influence the emotions in the iceberg? How might these values influence your partner's selected emotion? Justify your suggestion.

Pick a value at the base of your partner's iceberg. How does your partner justify its effect on the emotion at the tip of their iceberg?

What experiences could have influenced the selected value?

i. The teacher will encourage students to cluster similar values together on the display.

ii. The teacher should instruct students to place their Post-its so that everyone can see all the words on the notes at the same time.

iii. In most cases, the teacher should encourage students to complete this portion of the exercise relatively quickly so as to give students little time to think about where they are placing their Post-it notes[11].

b) The teacher will begin the values dialogue by asking the entire class or small groups to examine the clusters of values in the display and to consider what this suggests about what is valued most.[12]

c) After identifying each major cluster of values, the entire class or small groups will be asked what could have influenced the development of these values.

d) After exhausting the discussion about the possible experiences that might have influenced the values clusters, the instructor will have students get into pairs or small groups and then rank the values clusters ordinally from most to least important.

i. Students will be encouraged to provide examples to demonstrate the relative importance of particular values clusters when justifying their rankings.

---

[11] If students execute this portion of the activity steadily, then the values clusters will likely be much larger and more manageable in the dialogue and in the ranking activities. The more time that the students spend placing their values, the more complicated the following activities can become.

[12] Sections 3(b) through 3(d) can be conducted a number of ways depending on the needs and interests of the students. If they are having trouble discussing the values clusters as a class, the teacher can instruct the students to answer the values dialogue questions in pairs or in small groups or in a *Think-Pair-Share*.

e) Finally, assembled in pairs and/or small groups, students will present and justify their rankings to the rest of the class.
    i. Using a rubric provided by the teacher, each group will review the accuracy and effectiveness by which the other groups identify and justify their rankings of the values clusters (see Figure 6).

**Costs and Benefits**

There are some potential risks when performing this form of praxical values discourse. Most of the risks are associated with which emotions or with whose emotions are selected for the tips of the icebergs. If the emotions belong to people outside of the class, then these risks are mostly assuaged. However, if the teacher instructs that the iceberg be a representation of a student's emotion, then the peer-review of the iceberg and of the dialogues throughout the Values Pile-Up could, if mismanaged, violate the feelings of a student. Such a situation might occur by accident, or might possibly be beyond the control of the teacher.

Furthermore, the ranking portion of the Values Pile-Up may create some heated discussions in which students may begin to judge one another's values and possibly judge each other as persons. Therefore, it is important that the instructor make it clear to the students that they are assessing and judging the emotions, experiences, and values, not the people.

Although there are some potential risks, this model has far more potential benefits. Not only may this model foster emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization, but also it may do so in such a way that could be applicable to many courses in the Ontario public secondary school curricula. This model could be used in social studies courses such as Introduction to

**Figure 6: Sample Values Rankings Presentation Rubric**

| | **Level 1 (Below the standard[13])** | **Level 2 (Approaches the standard)** | **Level 3 (The provincial standard)** | **Level 4 (Surpasses the standard)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge/ Understanding**<br><br>**Identification and Understanding of Values Clusters**<br><br>**/4** | Values rankings presentation demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of values clusters and of their related emotions and experiences. | Values rankings presentation demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of values clusters and of their related emotions and experiences. | Values rankings presentation demonstrates considerable knowledge and understanding of values clusters and of their related emotions and experiences. | Values rankings presentation demonstrates superior knowledge and understanding of values clusters and of their related emotions and experiences. |
| **Thinking/ Inquiry**<br><br>**Justifications for Rankings**<br><br>**/4** | Justifications for rankings of values clusters demonstrate limited thought and reflection. | Justifications for rankings of values clusters demonstrate some thought and reflection. | Justifications for rankings of values clusters demonstrate considerable thought and reflection. | Justifications for rankings of values clusters demonstrate superior thought and reflection. |
| **Communication**<br><br>**Presentation**<br><br>**/4** | The justifications for values clusters rankings were conveyed with minimal accuracy, reasoning, and effectiveness in the presentation. | The justifications for values clusters rankings were conveyed with some accuracy, reasoning, and effectiveness in the presentation. | The justifications for values clusters rankings were conveyed with considerable accuracy, reasoning, and effectiveness in the presentation. | The justifications for values clusters rankings were conveyed with superior accuracy, reasoning, and effectiveness in the presentation. |
| **Application**<br><br>**Use of Examples and Time**<br><br>**/4** | Examples demonstrating the importance of the values as well as the overall quality of rankings justifications suggest minimal use of class time. | Examples demonstrating the importance of the values as well as the overall quality of rankings justifications suggest some use of class time. | Examples demonstrating the importance of the values as well as the overall quality of rankings justifications suggest considerable use of class time. | Examples demonstrating the importance of the values as well as the overall quality of rankings justifications suggest excellent use of class time. |
| **Total /16** | A mark below Level 1 is a failing grade indicating achievement much below the provincial standard. | | | |

[13] The provincial standard of Ontario, Canada.

Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology in order to deconstruct the emotions of oppressors and of oppressed peoples. Likewise, this model could be of use in some Family Studies courses in the deconstruction of the emotions of perpetrators and/or of victims of domestic violence. In sum, this model could be used in a lesson in a unit of study, or it could be extended into a unit-long project in which students could work in groups and deconstruct significant emotions related to the current content of the course.

**Instruments of Measurement**

The rubrics and/or guided questions used in the peer-review icebergs and in the presentations of rankings of values clusters serve as possible methods by which to assess students' comprehension of the relationships among emotions, experiences, and values. In addition, these rubrics or questions could also be used as methods by which to measure the effectiveness with which the model fosters empathic and humanistic capacities, including the constructs of emotional literacy, of humanization and, to a lesser extent, of role-taking. The students' capacity to evaluate the accuracy and efficacy of the icebergs and of the values rankings presentations may provide an estimate of their degrees of emotional literacy and of humanization.

For example, changes in empathy and in humanization could be estimated by comparing the peer-reviewed iceberg rubrics with those rubrics used to assess the presentations of the rankings of values clusters. However, since the rubrics are used in the judging of different aspects of empathy and of humanization, this measurement would provide a rough estimate of the changes in these capacities at best.

As previously suggested, a better measure of changes in students' empathy and humanization might be possible by triangulating this model's completed rubrics and/or guided questions with assessments completed through the use of the other models. One could measure changes in the capacities of emotional literacy, of role-taking, and of humanization by comparing the results from this model with those derived from the performance of another model of values dialogue. Since a researcher would require a standard or control group by which to demonstrate clear changes in the capacities of emotional literacy, of role-taking, or of humanization, this model aspires to demonstrate only the presence of these capacities.

# Chapter 5: Reflection, Potential Consequences, and Conclusion

## Reflection

This author began writing this thesis with a vision of values discourse and of its potential consequences for human beings, including its capacity to influence empathy and humanization. Throughout the previous chapters, this author has never directly stated his own position or bias. Regardless, the ideas and logic illustrated in this thesis existed before and beyond its creation and therefore do not belong to this author. This author believes that someone, somewhere, would eventually suggest a theory, praxis, and model of values discourse similar to that which he has assembled, if it has not already happened.

This author's biases may have remained concealed because he has not yet explored the potential consequences of nurturing empathy and humanization through values dialogue. The possible and plausible utility of values dialogue extends much farther than that of affecting people's empathic and humanizing capacities. The following section will explore some of the other uses and consequences of values dialogue.

## The Potential Consequences of Fostering Empathy and Humanization through Values Dialogue

As previously suggested, fostering empathy can contribute to the toolsets necessary to manipulate people to perverse ends. Therefore, to assuage the potential negative consequences of teaching for empathy, this author has suggested that empathy be taught as a part of the teaching for humanization. This section will briefly address the potential utility of a values dialogue designed to foster the constructs of emotional literacy, of role-taking, and of humanization.

First, compassionate actions and behaviors often require that the actor have sufficient capacity with which to decode emotional cues (Gordon, 2005; Hoffman, 2000). In many cases, in order to be able to justify his/her actions, the actor also needs to have an ability to understand and to assume the role of another person. Values dialogue aids in the development of the capacities necessary to role-take by fostering an expanded understanding of the values, the perspectives, and the experiences that contribute to roles. Therefore, values dialogue may contribute to the capacities necessary for compassion and for compassionate action.

In addition, values dialogues directed toward educating for emotional literacy, for role-taking, and for humanization have an enormous potential to help facilitate conflict resolution. Fostering conflicting parties' capacities to role-take as well as to encode and to decode emotions is to foster humanizing mutualities, the mutual understandings and considerations of parties' potential shared qualities. Discourse enacted in order to nurture empathy and a fuller humanity can offer individuals an opportunity to witness greater degrees of humanity in others; it can create a space for individuals within which to relate their emotions, experiences, and values to those of others.

Moreover, fostering emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization through values dialogue presents the prospect of contributing to the achievement of some utopian ideals. If all acts of violence against human beings require both an absence of empathy and of the recognition of the full humanity of victims, then to foster empathy and humanization is to reduce and potentially to eliminate the prerequisites for all forms of violation against people. By empathizing and humanizing with others, educating through values dialogue can inhibit and potentially eliminate some of the conditions necessary for violent human conflict. In conclusion,

a values dialogue dedicated to nurturing emotional literacy, role-taking, and humanization may serve as an exceptional tool for violence prevention.

Furthermore, when Friedrich Nietzsche (2002) called for the "trans-valuation of all values" (p. 101), he called for a reversal of people's subjectivity to their values. If people are subject to the influences of their emotions, experiences, and values, then to become aware of the potential influences of emotions and of how experiences influence and are influenced by values is to begin to reverse their subjectivity. Rather than emotions, experiences, and values influencing the determination of an individual's actions, the individual can begin to influence these experiential stimuli to whatever end he/she desires; this person's emotions, experiences, and values become subject to this individual. To educate for empathy and humanization through values dialogue is to affirm and to renew the agency of those who would valuate and of those who would become more fully human.

**Conclusion**

Ultimately, this author defined educable elements of empathy and of humanization and created models with which to educate and to test for changes in these capacities among secondary school students. The models developed in this thesis utilize values dialogue to that end; however, whether these models educate toward their intended capacities of emotional literacy, of role-taking, and of humanization remains unknown. Until empirically tested, the utopian ideals of the approach of values dialogue have *no place* in the classroom. More details and evidence will result from the actual empirical testing of this thesis's rendered theory, praxis, and models. Given the logical and plausible consequences of nurturing empathy and humanization through values dialogue, these models, and especially their foundational theory,

warrant empirical investigation. This author hopes that this thesis has made some contribution to the discourse of discourse. In conclusion, this thesis has proposed a theory, praxis, models, and instruments, of values dialogue; it is now the task of another to actualize it.

## References


Amaral, R. (Jan. 11, 2013). Anger iceberg – the emotions we hide below the surface. *Psychology for Growth.* Retrieved on August 13th, 2014 from http://www.psychologyforgrowth.com/anger-iceberg-the-emotions-we-hide-below-the-surface/

Anderson, P., & Konrath, S. (July 31, 2011). 'Why should we care?' — what to do about declining student empathy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on July 4th, 2014 from http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Should-We-Care-What/128420/

Aulls, M., & Shore, B. (2008). *Inquiry in education: The conceptual foundations for research as a curricular imperative.* Vol. 1. New York & London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Boal, A. (1979). *Theater of the Oppressed.* New York: Urizen Books, Inc.

Bodor, P. (1997). On the usage of emotional language: A developmental view of the tip of an iceberg. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The language of emotions: Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation* (pp. 195-208). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Brecht Forum. Augusto Boal & the theater of the oppressed. *Brecht Forum Archive*. Retrieved on August 18th, 2014 from http://brechtforum.org/abouttop

Collins, C. (2007, June). The role of dialogue-based ethical inquiry in educating for a just democracy: An intervention study. In *The 13th International Conference on Thinking, Norrköping, Sweden*. Retrieved on August 25th, 2014 from www.ep.liu.se/ecp/021/vol1/005/ecp2107005.pdf

Coplan, A. (2011). Understanding empathy: Its features and effects. In A. Coplan & P. Goldie (Eds.), *Empathy: Philosophical and psychological perspectives* (pp. 3-18). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dewey, J. (1939). *Theory of valuation.* London and Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, ltd.

Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). Empathy, sympathy, and altruism: Empirical and conceptual links. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 292-316). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenberg, N., & Strayer, J. (1987). Critical issues in the study of empathy. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 3-13). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A. M. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Random House, Inc.

Freedman, J. (2013). Stress is killing me! Time for emotional intelligence? *Sixseconds*. Retrieved on July 4th, 2014 from http://www.6seconds.org/2013/04/12/stress-health-emotional-intelligence/

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Goldman, A. I. (2011). Two routes to empathy: Insights from cognitive neuroscience. In A. Coplan & P. Goldie (Eds.), *Empathy: Philosophical and psychological perspectives* (pp. 31-44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, M. (2005). *Roots of empathy: Changing the world child by child.* Toronto: Thomas Allen Publishers.

Hoffman, M. L. (1987). The contribution of empathy to justice and moral judgment. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 47-80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Joós, E. (1991). *Dialogue with Heidegger on values: Ethics for times of crisis.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Kant, I. (1900). *Critique of pure reason* (J.M.D. Meiklejohn, Trans.). New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Kazepides, T. (2010). *Education as dialogue: Its prerequisites and its enemies.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Keelan, P. (2014). Anger management. In *Dr. Patrick Keelan, Registered psychologist.* Retrieved on August 13th, 2014 from http://drpatrickkeelan.com/counselling/anger-management/

Krznaric, R. (February 25th, 2014). Is Australia losing its empathy? *The Guardian.* Retrieved on July 4th from http://www.theguardian.com/culture/australia-culture-blog/2014/feb/26/is-australia-losing-its-empathy

Lipps, T. (1907). Das wissen von fremden ichen. *Psychologischen Untersuchungen, 1,*pp. 694-722.

Lussier, M., & Richard, C. (August, 2010). Should family physicians be empathetic*? Canadian Family Physician, 56*(8), 740-742.

McCollough, T. E. (1992). *Truth and ethics in school reform.* Washington, DC: Council for Educational Development and Research.

Nietzsche, F. (1973). *Beyond good and evil: Prelude to a philosophy of the future.* London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Nietzsche, F. (2002). *The antichrist: Fragments from a shattering mind* (D. Falls, Trans.). London : Creation Books.

Palmer, E. H., et al. (1973). *The Holy Bible: New international version*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Plato. (ca. 427-347 B.C.). *Five dialogues: Euthyphro, apology, crito, meno, phaedo* (G. M. A. Grube, Trans.) J.M. Cooper (Ed.). Indianaoplis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Plato. (1995. trans.). *The republic* (D, Lee, Trans.). London: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Popham, R. (2014). Storytelling — how every culture expresses 'ubuntu — I am because we are.' *Desmond Tutu: Peace Foundation.* Retrieved on September 5th, 2014 from http://www.tutufoundationusa.org/2014/04/storytelling%E2%80%94how-every-culture-expresses-%E2%80%9Cubuntu%E2%80%94i-am-because-we-are-%E2%80%9D/

Roberts, P. (2000). *Education, literacy, and humanization: Exploring the work of Paulo Freire.* Westport, USA: Bergin and Garvey.

Rockwell, G. (2003). *Defining dialogue: From Socrates to the internet*. Amherst, New York: Humanity Books.

Strayer, J. (1987). Affective and cognitive perspectives on empathy. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 218-244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Time. (1938). Germans from England – "JA" on a special trip out to sea. In *Life.* Time Inc., p. 21. Retrieved on August 5th, from http://books.google.ca/books?id=00oEAAAAMBAJ&pg=PA21&hl=en#v=onepage&q&f=false

Trout, J. D. (2009). *The empathy gap: Building bridges to the good life and the good society.* New York: Viking.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (2001). Introduction. In G. Wells (Ed.), *Action, talk, & text: Learning and teaching through inquiry* (pp. 1-24). New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Wells, G. (2001). The case for dialogic inquiry. In G. Wells (Ed.), *Action, talk, & text: Learning and teaching through inquiry* (pp. 171-194). New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Wells, G. (2009). *The meaning makers: Learning to talk and talking to learn.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Wilson, H.F. (2012). Living with difference and the conditions for dialogue. *Dialogues in human geography, 2*(2), 225-227. doi: 10.1177/204382061200200203

Zaki, J. (Dec. 23, 2010). What, me care? Young are less empathetic. *Scientific America*. Retrieved on July 4th, 2014 from http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-me-care/

# Vita

**Name:** Adam J. Hill

**Place of Birth:** London, Ontario, Canada

**Year of Birth:** 1989

**Post-secondary Education and Degrees:**

Western University
London, Ontario, Canada
2008-2012
B.A.

Western University
London, Ontario, Canada
2012-2014
M.Ed. Curriculum Studies

Western University
London, Ontario, Canada
2013-2014
B.Ed.

**Related Work Experience:**

Executive-Director
Students Teaching Students
Western University
London, Ontario, Canada
2010-2014

Co-Facilitator
Changing Ways
London, Ontario, Canada
2010-2012

Program Coordinator
Municipolitics
London, Ontario, Canada
2012-2014