UNIVERSITY OF TARTU

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

VALUES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING IN ESTONIAN UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOLS: Based on the Analysis of *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*

MA thesis

AVE VEERMÄE

SUPERVISOR: *Asst. Lect*. ÜLLE TÜRK

TARTU

2018

ABSTRACT

The current paper maintains that as schools are generally expected to prepare students for making independent moral decisions to successfully function in a pluralistic society, values education should be made more explicit, for example in the form of religious education as a compulsory school subject, giving students the opportunity for a conscious choice with respect to their value system. Similarly to the national curriculum, study materials should be critically reviewed focusing on explicit and implicit values transmission. Therefore, the aim of this research is to analyse the national curriculum and the course book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* with the view to establish their compatibility in terms of values. However, having taken the deliberate decision to keep the study small, the visual aspects of the course book are not included.

The thesis consists of two chapters, the first of which gives a critical overview of the literature written in the field (in the Western countries and in Estonia) while the second chapter is concerned with the analysis of the national curriculum with respect to its underlying philosophy, and aims to compare the values set in the curriculum to those found in the course book.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

It seems like the very same society that not only offers what can be perceived as an infinite number of opportunities, but also challenges its members to make independent moral decisions, appears to have left them quite unprepared for and, thus, rather overwhelmed with the moral tasks they face. It is generally agreed that education should be adjusted to the demands of the society and reflect its values, yet there is an ever increasing need for the moral preparation of the members of the society. Complicated moral dilemmas arising from major issues in our society such as political tensions, globalisation, multiculturalism, and shifts in the interpretation of value-laden concepts, to name a few, require competence, a moral compass. Therefore, it is vital to critically review our understanding of the goals of education in general, the core values set in school curricula, the teaching methods as well as implicit and explicit values transmission in the course books used at schools.

Values have been defined in a variety of ways. According to Tuulik (2010: 71-72), values are those willingly chosen from a set of alternatives and treasured by an individual. Somewhat similarly, Schihalejev (n. d.: 13) defines values as "possible objects of desire, the desired goals of varying significance" [the author's translation] such as health, well-being and composure among many others. Sutrop (2009: 55) points out the most commonly used interpretation of the term, referring to values as something worth having, gaining or doing. Values can also be seen as objects of desire guiding our actions and are often seen as something relative, as they are values for someone (Sutrop 2009: 55). A distinction can be drawn between instrumental and terminal values. Rokeach provides a description of *instrumental values* as being preferred types of behaviour that help achieve *terminal values*, the desired states of existence. In addition, there are *combined values* [the author's translation] (e.g. health) that can simultaneously be the objects of desire as well as means of

achieving other goals (Sutrop 2009: 56). An alternative distinction can be made into different types of values, namely, biological-physical values, social-political values, moral values, aesthetic values, etc (Sutrop 2009: 56). Adherents of Aristotelian approach are not concerned with values transmission but focus on the acquisition of certain virtues through practice (Haydon 2009: 30). Virtues can be further divided into moral and non-moral virtues based on whether they are intuitive or related to moral principles (Sutrop 2009: 56).

Values expressed in school curricula are designed to give certain guidelines for teachers. "The sets of values that are embedded in the curriculum and in the pedagogical mission of the schools are prescriptions for teachers. Teachers have to include them in their pedagogical practice." (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 379) What the curricula of all societies of all times seem to have in common is the need for creating a connection between the culture securing the continuity of a particular society, a modern organisation of the society and the members of the society who whether due to their youth or for other reasons lack in the necessary abilities to live and act in that society (Ruus 2009: 124). A distinction is made between three types of curricula: *the planned curriculum*, *the implemented curriculum* and *the achieved curriculum*. The implemented curriculum involves the school culture, management and the arrangement of the daily life at school among other aspects while the achieved curriculum is linked with competences (Ruus 2009: 126). Another way of categorisation would be dividing the curricula into *the intended curriculum* which focuses on management, *the formal curriculum* which involves the developer and *the perceived curriculum* involving the teacher who actually delivers the curriculum (Willemse et al 2005: 209).

The Estonian national curriculum is value-based, according to which each school is expected to devise its own school curriculum. Values are not taught as a separate school subject but can be found in various parts of the national curriculum (for example, in the form

of core values as well as competences and cross-curricular topics, which are based on the core values) and are formed through different subjects. Therefore, for English teaching purposes, a foreign language curriculum has been devised with its own competences and cross-curricular topics, which are derived from the general part of the curriculum, but are specifically specified for foreign language teaching. For that reason, this particular research is based on the foreign language curriculum rather than the general part of the national curriculum.

The current research focuses on values transmission in the English course book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*. The research question guiding the analysis is the following: do the values of the course book correspond to the values presented in the current national curriculum? In order to answer the research question, the course book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* will be analysed with special focus on values embedded in competences which will be compared with the competences set in the national curriculum, pointing out possible shortcomings. In addition, a brief analysis will be provided on the relevance of the values transmitted in both the course book and the curriculum to an individual having more dimensions than being defined merely as a citizen or a loyal member of a society. However, the terminology used throughout the literature concerning values education should be clarified before providing the research with due historical perspective.

The transmission of values through education has been widely discussed, including the Western world, Asia and Latin America (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 378). Therefore, due to differing traditions and theories, various terms are being used. In the English literature the terms *values education*, *character education*, *moral education*, *personal and social education*, *citizenship education*, *civic education*, *religious education*, *moralogy*, and *democratic education* can be encountered (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 378). However, in

scientific literature, the term *moral education* is preferred. In the US, the term *character education* is employed but in Scotland and England, the term *value education* is being used instead (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 378). In Europe, the term *civic education* and, in the Netherlands, the terms *pedagogical mission of education* or *value forming education* are being used (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 378). Strongly agreeing with Veugelers and Vedder's line of argumentation that "all values are based on moral values," yet the term *values* can nevertheless be used instead of *moral values* "because political, work-oriented and cultural values can be seen as context situated moral values" (2003: 378). In the current research, the term *values education* will be used as there will be less emphasis placed on citizenship and a broader term appears to be more compatible with the approach that will be used here. Moreover, according to Russell (2009: 75), *values education* has been named as one of the most widely used terms and is currently the most preferred term in Great Britain, claims Berkowitz (2009: 194).

The current research will consist of two chapters, a literature review and an empirical study. The first chapter will provide a crtical review of the literature in the field of values education, focusing first on values education in the West, followed by a brief overview of values education in Estonia. The second chapter will contain the analysis of the national curriculum and the analysis of the English coursebook *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* in the light of values transmission. Then, the research findings (a set of competences detected in the course book) will be compared with the value-based competences set in the national curriculum.

CHAPTER 1. VALUES EDUCATION IN ESTONIA AND ABROAD

"The late modern society expects of its members autonomy in learning about values and making choices in an increasingly complicated social environment, and at the same time society wants social commitment, great tolerance and accepting diversity," claim Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 378). They emphasise the importance of an individual's ability to reflect on "what is right and what is wrong" and make moral judgements. Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg refer to this process using the term *moral reasoning* (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 381). In line with the previous authors, Haydon suggests that the modern society is faced with moral issues such as freedom of speech, censorship, abortion, ill-treatment of animals, genetic engineering, capital punishment etc, that must be addressed to benefit the society as a whole (2009: 33). Whereas it is generally agreed that there is a need for values education in this pluralistic society in which values are often perceived as relative, there is much less consensus on how values education should be carried out in practice. Important questions have been raised concerning the role of schools and teachers in values education, the choice of values as well as the methods used in values education. Together with providing a brief historical background, the following paragraphs aim to address the aforementioned issues.

Values Education: a Historical Overview

There is a variety of fundamentally different approaches to values education. Having emerged due to certain social conditions, these theories have each been predominant in certain decades. According to Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 377), in the Netherlands, the

main emphasis in the 1950s was laid on conformity and adaptation to society. While the 1960s were marked by self-fulfilment, social commitment and democracy, the 1980s could be characterised by an increasing interest in technical and instrumental thinking with little concern for values. The 1990s showed "a further decline of formerly coherent value systems in society and, on the other hand, the desire, as part of an ongoing process of emancipation, for further developing one's own value orientations." The authors also state their opinion that, in modern society, people have more opportunities to be more independent when making their value-related decisions (2003: 377), perhaps referring to some individualistic tendencies in the society.

Narvaez (2009: 314) notes that, in the USA, character education was one of the main goals of education before the 20th century. Factual knowledge and facts about moral life constituted the core of education. With the turn of the century, the educational goals were narrowed down to giving fundamental knowledge, including reading, writing and arithmetic, avoiding all moral debates. Lickona identifies four key factors in what he believed to be a moral decline of America, namely (1) the influence of Darwinism and the belief in genetically pre-determined morals not conditioned by the environment; (2) the influence of Einstein's theory of relativity due to which it was increasingly agreed that there is no single moral code that can be taught; (3) the impact of the Hartshorne and May's *specificity doctrine* referring to the contextual nature of certain characteristics (e.g. honesty); the influence of *logical positivism* that draws a distinction between facts and values, and claimed that, as morality belongs to the latter category, it cannot be subjected to scientific scrutiny (Berkowitz 2009: 218). Although Berkowitz refers to the apparent conflict between the first and the third factors, he seems to share Lickona's view that morality was at that time perceived to be a private choice, not a topic for discussion or a subject to be publicly taught at schools (2009: 219).

The 1960s saw the rise of more liberal and less prescriptive approaches to values education, one of the most popular of which was perhaps *values clarification*, originally developed in the 1970s (Narvaez 2009: 315, 92). Adherents of this theory adopt the position that teachers should not try to teach values by (often unwillingly) imposing their own values on their students. Instead, they should enhance their students' understanding of their own values (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 219). The theory of *rational moral education* is based on Kant's deontological ethics in which the focus is on the acquisition of universal moral principles, understanding of one's duties and following certain set rules. The importance lies in the action itself, not the characteristics, as opposed to *traditional character education* that places emphasis on tendencies, motivation and emotions, as well as *inculcation* or, in other words, putting virtuous characteristics into practice with the aim to form the desired habits (Sutrop 2009: 59; Narvaez 2009: 312). Yet, precisely this focus on (external) actions instead of (internal) motivation is the reason why this theory has attracted much criticism (Haydon 2009: 32).

In addition to *values clarification* method that gained ground in the USA in the 1970s, Kohlberg developed his *just community theory* (1981), according to which students are not given a set of pre-determined values or told how they should behave as the teacher does not impose their values on the students. Instead, they are given an opportunity to participate in the process of dilemma discussion to increase their moral reasoning. The process of dilemma discussion aims to help students become aware of their own points of view as well as their values, and assess their appropriateness, whereas teachers are not to give any feedback or assessment. Ultimately, students are expected to develop an ability to reason and see things from a variety of perspectives, thus, leading them to make just decisions. The teacher's role is to present arguments and different perspectives. Kohlberg's

moral dilemma discussions were designed to help create just communities to promote democratic values at schools. (Sutrop 2009: 60)

Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning with regard to child's development is largely based on Jean Piaget's seminal works, namely his theory of cognitive development. Drawing on Kantian tradition, Piaget saw morality as a set of rules, influenced mainly by peer interaction. Similarly to Kant, Piaget was not interested in the child's emotions, but in making moral judgements. The focal point of Piaget's theory is the child's gradual adaptation to the reality, leading to the formation of the four stages of moral development: (1) sensorimotor, (2) preoperational, (3) concrete operational and (4) formal operational stage (Russell 2009: 46-51). Piaget has been criticised for ignoring atypical when studying children and for his explanation of human behaviour by means of culturally invariable psychological structures. It is also now widely believed that cognitive development does not take place in distinct stages as he had proposed. Nevertheless, much recent research into moral development stems from Piaget's cognitive theories. (Russell 2009: 52-55)

In his attempts to extend Piaget's theory of stages of moral development, Kohlberg put forward his model of six stages of development, grouped into three levels of morality: (1) pre-conventional (I-II); (2) conventional (III-IV) and (3) post-conventional stage (V-VI). It is also worth noting that, although he considered adding the seventh stage as he believed psychological mechanisms to be inadequate for fully explaining moral development with regard to religion, in his research he discarded answers containing religious references as immature. He maintained that religion does not bear any significance in moral development. According to his theory, moral development is achieved by attempting to resolve a cognitive conflict. Kohlberg's views have also been attacked by critics on various grounds. Again, the view of subsequent developmental stages, according to which one stage is built upon the other, has been called into question

(Russell 2009: 57-58). Drawing on Kantian tradition as Piaget before him, Kohlberg laid emphasis on the intellectual and cognitive aspects of morality. Therefore, he has been criticised for his excessive focus on the rational and the exclusion of the emotional aspects (e.g. compassion), which he considered to be irrational. Additionally, his claim that his theory of stages of moral development is universally applicable has been regarded as controversial (due to its exclusive focus on rational thinking, in particular). Moral reasoning is seen to be more culture-specific than Kohlberg's theory seems to allow (Russell 2009: 59). He has been criticised for his attempts to establish universal morals and, according to some critics, it is doubtful whether the ability to make moral judgements is adequate to determine the level of moral development. Dilemma discussion appears to benefit those who are better at verbally expressing their preference for a certain type of behaviour, disregarding implicit knowledge (Russell 2009: 62).

In 1978, Kohlberg changed the focus of the program of moral education. He realised schools have to affect not only students' moral reasoning, but also behaviour, which became the basis for his *just community theory* (Russell 2009: 65). At just community schools Kohlberg set out to enhance democratic process of decision-making in order to build a sense of community. Also, hypothetical dilemmas were substituted by real ones. Now the purpose was not only to improve students' moral reasoning, but also their behaviour (Russell 2009: 65). Gilligan, however, has criticised Kohlberg's model for discriminating against women as men have a tendency to reason in terms of justice whereas women's moral decisions tend to be based on care or empathy (Russell 2009: 67). Although Gilligan's binary treatment of morality has also come under attack, many scholars have taken a similar view that Kohlberg placed excessive emphasis on justice and impartiality, underestimating several characteristics that are considered valuable by many (Russell 2009: 71, 74). In addition, the common belief of Kant, Piaget and Kohlberg in the

existence of impartial universal principles guiding a moral agent, were opposed by the adherents of particularistic views (Russell 2009: 72-75).

Lickona's critically important work Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility gave impetus to the revival of the *traditional character education* in the 1990s (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 218). In the 1980s there was a growing concern about the moral decline of America that prompted Lickona to provide a list of ten factors that were to account for this decline, which are as follows: (1) rise in violence and vandalism; (2) rise in theft; (3) rise in infidelity; (4) increasing disrespect for authorities; (5) increasing cruelty between partners; (6) constant indications of fanaticism; (7) expletive words used by the young; (8) sexual prematurity and abuse; (9) increasing self-centredness and decreasing civic duty; (10) increasing self-destructive behaviour (2009: 220). Some researches, on the other hand, believe the reason for the revival to be the "cyclical development of the American society that reflects agitation induced by quick advancement of technology and globalisation" [the author's translation] (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 220). Drawing on Aristotelian character-based ethics, *character education* focuses on the integral development of the personality (Sutrop 2009: 58). It is an umbrella term including cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions (Põder et al 2009: 17). Instead of abstract values, it concentrates on characteristics. In contrast with the method of *rational moral reasoning* drawing on Kantian duty-based ethics, in case of character education, the desirable characteristics or personal qualities are pre-determined. It also highlights the importance of tendencies, motivation and emotions. When traditional moral education is based on command, prohibition and punishment, modern character education prioritises praise and rewarding good behaviour. As a result, it has been accused of hypocrisy due to its principle of external rewarding. In addition, owing to the fact that it is

essentially prescriptive (as values are pre-determined), character education can, unintentionally or intentionally, become a tool for manipulation (Põder et al 2009: 17-18).

By and large, it can be said that the majority of the debate with regard to values education until the turn of the century centred around two contrasting paradigms: *traditional character education* and *rational moral education* (Narvaez 2009: 312). Whereas character education has often been regarded as perhaps too constraining, as the personal qualities to be achieved are given, values clarification, in turn, can be viewed as too liberal, as students are not given feedback on their values or demeanour (Sutrop 2009: 61). However, a third model, *integrative ethical education* was then developed with a view to integrating the two approaches (Narvaez 2009: 329-336). This approach was designed to bridge the gap between the two contrasting models by integrating them. In addition to enhancing students' moral reasoning and critical thinking, a universal set of values is now integrated into school curricula. There are three fundamental ideas underlying this approach, which are as follows: (1) moral development is the process of advancing expertise (reflecting an idea that moral development is a complex process, requiring the application of a variety of skills in an integrated way); (2) character education is transformative and interactive and (3) human nature is co-operative and inclined towards self-actualization (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 227-230).

The Role of the Teacher and School in the Formation of Values

Opinions are divided as to whether schools should only be concerned with giving knowledge to students or whether they should also be engaged in teaching values and transforming their students' character. Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 378) argue that globalisation and the multicultural character of our society place higher demands on its members, requiring autonomy in making choices in our pluralistic society in which they

are exposed to a great diversity of values. In line with many scholars, Willemse et al (2005: 207) consider values and norms as parts of education. Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 382) also highlight the importance of school culture, stating that values are not only expressed in subject matter or in the pedagogical and didactic actions of the teacher, but also in school culture. Students are expected to conform to the values that are interwoven in school culture. By participating in school culture, students acquire values and norms. They also claim that cultural diversity at schools gives students "more opportunities to practise their social and communicative skills, and to develop values like respect, justice and solidarity." Moreover, they add that an active participation of students at schools stimulates their moral growth and enhance conformity, critical thinking as well as social commitment. (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 383)

In her article Teaching Morality in a Plural Society (1998), Mendus argues that education should be distanced from the inculcation of moral values. She claims that state education "should be education in the skills of citizenship, not education in specific moral values" on the grounds that moral values are "relative to a given society or community" and in order to maintain political stability in a plural society, politics must be distanced from these "controversial issues." Haydon (2009: 28) maintains a fairly similar view, indicating the complexity of values education in a plural society. However, there are authors who argue that if values education is not part of formal school curriculum, values will be taught implicitly, through *the hidden curriculum* (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 248).

Many scholars (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 379; Willemse et al 2005: 205) argue that teaching is and has always been a moral task and teachers play the central role in values transmission. Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 384) and Willemse et al (2005: 207) agree that teachers are expected to stimulate the development of the moral judgement or

moral reasoning in students. Veugelers, Vedder (2003: 379), Willemse et al (2005: 207), Carr and Landon (1999: 25) claim that teaching is primarily a moral endeavour and emphasise the model role of the teacher (Veugelers and Vedder, 2003: 382), but many agree on the lack of experience in teachers and gaps in preparing teachers for moral education (Veugelers and Vedder, 2003: 386; Willemse et al, 2005: 214; Carr and Landon, 1999: 28). Sutrop (2009: 53) has pointed to an unfortunate paradox, stating that "teachers *today* have to transmit values that they acquired *yesterday*, to students starting their lives *tomorrow*" [the author's translation]. Nevertheless, a number of scholars see the teacher as the key figure in values education (Sutrop 2009: 59). Haydon referred to this phenomenon as *generational imperialism* [the author's translation] (2009: 29).

Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 386) encourage teachers to critically reflect on their values to set an example for their students. Berkowitz and Bier (2009: 209) claim that although some teachers resent the idea of their role as a character educator, it is inevitable when working with children. They explain that the teacher's behaviour has an impact on the child's development, which is why teachers have to take responsibility for their own behaviour. Shumaker and Heckel (2009: 215-216) maintain a similar view. According to Harro-Loit et al (2011: 59), teachers have to be aware of their values and value hierarchies related to their role as a teacher and possess skills and motivation to critically monitor their behavioural practices. In addition to self-reflection, teachers should be able to guide students to value-based self-reflection. Similarly, Willemse et al (2005: 206-207) indicate the importance of the teacher's behaviour in the moral development of students. Teachers are expected to stimulate students to develop their own identities and become active citizens in a multicultural society. 'To stimulate' in this particular context refers to "the development of awareness on the part of teachers of their own values, being explicit about these values, and the simultaneous creation of opportunities for pupils to develop their own

sets of values and norms." Also, research indicates a correlation between positive teacher-student relationships and students' academic achievements (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 241).

Haydon (2009: 35-38) refers to problems with teachers holding liberal views that might not be suitable for children attending religious schools as these values may contradict the ones their parents would appreciate. Teachers may also contradict themselves. He explains that a liberal teacher should promote values that are necessary in order to live in a liberal society, but has to refrain from promoting liberal moral convictions or a particular lifestyle. He maintains a view that an individual must be able to decide where they set their boundaries with regard to tolerance. On the other hand, conveying a perspective according to which a student is expected to set their own standards can be seen as biased. Due to this controversy, Haydon believes the discussion must continue. In addition, he questions the impact a teacher has on students as it competes with many other factors and, to the contrary of the opinions adopted by most scholars, considers the influence of schools as compared to family and social environment to be limited. (Haydon 2009: 28)

Sutrop (2009: 54) states that "the kind of education we have today determines the kind of society we will be living in tomorrow" [the author's translation]. Nowadays there is a wide range of character education programs and methods used at schools (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 221, 237). Also, the teacher's undeniably important role cannot be overestimated as they are the ones who interpret and mediate the values presented in the school curricula or any school materials open to interpretation.

What Values Should Be Taught?

Obviously, the first question to arise when discussing values education is about the values themselves. Namely, there seems to be little agreement on what values should be taught. According to Willemse et al (2005: 207), there are different traditions within values education, which results in focusing more on either "personal or social values, or on religious or humanistic education." Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 379), on the other hand, mention three contrasting pairs, or *dimensions*, like *person oriented-social oriented*, *conformation-independence*, *accepting values-critical reflection on values*. Also, instead of the lengthy lists of values usually given, some central values could be drawn, such as justice and human well-being. However, there is a similar disagreement regarding central values. Moreover, when at the abstract level it is agreed upon the importance of a value, at the concrete level the understanding of its essence or practical realisation can vary (Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 379).

Veugelers and Vedder's claim (2003: 379) that moral values get their meaning within a particular context apparently refers to the plurality of the modern society and the relativity of values. Homogeneous societies, if such should exist, would definitely have an advantage here. Relativity or context-specificity is precisely the factor that makes the common understanding of values so complex. However, it could be argued that there are some basic values or principles that are valid regardless of the context, and this very quality of universal applicability should be the criterion for judging the centrality of a particular value. Interestingly enough, the values or principles that are valid in all contexts are the ones underlying most major religions (e.g. love, respect, honesty and peace, to name a few). A quotation from the Bible (Luke 6, 31) "[a]nd just as you want men to do to

you, you also do to them likewise" is often referred to as the Golden Rule which states 'treat others as you want to be treated.'

It can be argued that the majority of scholars discussing values education seem to place too great an emphasis on preparing students for citizenship, marginalising more personal dimensions, and, as in case of Veugelers and Vedder (2003: 384), for "citizenship that teachers find important," which not only seems to be to the contrary of the authors' alleged democratic liberalism or liberal democracy and impose conformity on students, but also imposes a particular world view on them. The problem, in particular, lies in the fact that most school curricula implicitly convey a scientific, atheist world view although the treatment of human beings as purely rational deprives them of other dimensions, such as emotional or spiritual. This exclusively scientific approach implies indoctrination. Democracy is agreed to be based on the freedom of choice, especially in terms of world view. However, the choice must be consciously made. Therefore, alternative perspectives should be fully articulated and not be treated as marginal (Tuulik 2010: 39-40). If science-based approach to education has been pre-determined and serves as a lens through which everything else is seen and interpreted, there is no actual choice.

How to Teach Values?

Considering the stance of most scholars that schools inevitably, deliberately or not, provide an environment for values education, may it be implicitly through school culture or in a more explicit way. In order to avoid values education becoming incidental, it would be essential to be aware of the methods that are used. (Shumaker and Heckel 2009: 221)

Russell admits (2009: 45) that there is a lack of consensus as to what morality is and which methods for values education are the most effective. *Traditional character*

education model lays emphasis on social values and the formation of certain habits through practising virtues, also known as *inculcation*, while *rational moral education* based on cognitive development aims to stimulate discussions on moral issues. Kohlberg stressed the importance of considering a child's moral development while teaching them.

There are several channels for values transmission, for instance, the explicit teaching of value communication, teacher's behaviour and school culture (Vaugelers and Vedder 2003: 382). Carr and Landon (1999: 25) talk about *the hidden curriculum*, whereas *school culture* as proposed by Vaugelers and Vedder contains a more interactive aspect to the phenomenon (2003: 382). While Vaugelers and Vedder (2003: 383) argue for the explicit teaching of moral issues, Carr and Landon, on the other hand, hold a view that values are "best exhibited in actual practice" and "any attempt to articulate them fully might well only succeed in undermining or eroding them" (1999: 25). Here it can be argued that teaching values implicitly by setting an example can be very effective, although there are definitely occasions when the explicit articulation of certain values is required. Bauman (1993, cited in Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 384) also warns against an excessive focus on cognition in values education and argues that "moral phenomena […] should not be presented as being controlled by rules; this would replace the moral self with an acquirable knowledge of rules instead of constituted by values". Awareness of school culture and the active participation of students prevent values education from becoming too knowledge-oriented (Veuglers and Vedder, 2003: 384).

Although Haydon, when discussing values transmission (2009: 28), admits to the importance of the example teachers set, he points out that the teacher's impact on particular students is not the same or in any way predictable. As a result, he concludes that in that case the term *values transmission* becomes questionable. He also argues that in a pluralistic society the model of values transmission is somewhat inadequate as values are

ambiguous and difficult to interpret. Moreover, there is a wide variety of values, which means there cannot be a universal values education to transmit all the existing values as then we should admit to transmitting contradicting values (Haydon 2009: 28-29). He states (2009: 33) that even if the question regarding the choice of values could be resolved, the education system could still not meet the expectations with respect to values education. He holds a view that having virtues may not ensure that people can give a uniform answer to moral issues. He refers to the intricacies with respect to values education in a pluralistic society by drawing an analogy of the contrasting views of Aristotle, who regarded pride as one of the main virtues while humbleness was not considered as a virtue at all, and Jesus of Nazareth, whose teachings three centuries later were quite the opposite. Virtues preferred by different cultures in a pluralistic society, he explains, vary partly due to the fact that different people prefer different virtues, a virtue is given a different weight or it is interpreted in a different way (Haydon 2009: 32).

Haydon (2009: 41) doubts whether in a pluralistic society everyone could be taught the same values. Instead, he believes everyone should have the ability to analyse values and discuss them. Yet, even Piaget himself acknowledged problems regarding the gap between cognitive skills and the actual moral behaviour (Russell 2009: 52). For this particular reason, many scholars believe that in addition to value discussion, it is essential for students not only to be able to discuss values and learn how to defend their points of view, but also to gain a first-hand experience of, for example, democracy by participating in school culture (Sutrop 2009: 63; Veugelers and Vedder 2003: 383). These concerns led to the development of a variety of integrative approaches, such as Moral Anatomy, Education for Character and Child Development Project discussed below.

Values clarification is probably the first deliberately applied method of values education, developed by Louis Edward Raths. It gained in popularity in more liberal-minded

circles. At the centre of this method is the valuation process, including cognitive, affective, reflective and behavioural skills. Students are invited to participate in value discussions that would help students to become aware of their own values and form new ones. In terms of values, teachers are expected to remain neutral. However, regardless of the suitability of this method for values education in a plural society due to its relativistic nature, it has been criticised for creating an illusion of neutrality (Põder et al 2009: 14-15).

Chazan (2009: 93) claims that, according to values clarification, values are deeply personal, related to personal interests, reflections and choices, and should remain unaffected by external forces. Therefore, some scholars oppose the idea of having a fixed set of values that must be taught or acquired. Values clarification discards a number of external forces that can establish values, such as religion, social institutions, science, reason and tradition, as it is opposed to the concept of morality as compatibility with some external moral codes or as conventional behaviour. They maintain a stance that the aforementioned factors should not affect moral decision-making.

Values clarification method has been criticised for not distinguishing between values and personal preferences, as well as between moral values and non-moral values (Chazan 2009: 99). The adherents of values clarification method resist the concept of the existence of a definitive universal moral code and hold a view that values are derived from individual human experiences, which is why they believe that students should not be given a set of values but, instead, a process by which they can become conscious of their own values (Chazan 2009: 100). Many scholars believe this to be more democratic (Haydon 2009: 29). However, the method of values clarification might leave students in a confusing uncertainty and a relativity of possibly conflicting subjective values (Haydon 2009: 28). Moreover, it fails to give them a clear understanding of the actual alternatives they have. While claiming to be value-neutral, certain values are implicitly embedded in this method (Põder et al 2009:

15). Being in opposition with the concept of a universal moral code and resting on relativity, this method may not be appropriate for students holding, for example, Christian views, as it is inherently biased against their world view.

Values clarification "has left the stage," claims Berkowitz (2009: 206) primarily due to insufficient scientific evidence. Within the framework of integrative approaches to values education, there is a wide range of character education programs or values education models designed to bridge the gap between the two approaches, the rational moral education and the traditional character education. Narvaez (2009: 329-336) refers to three following integrative models. Berkowitz presents an integrative model of a moral person, *Moral Anatomy*, integrating into his model the development of a moral identity and personality. This model highlights seven components: (1) moral conduct; (2) moral character and moral internalised tendencies; (3) moral values; (4) moral reasoning; (5) moral emotion integrating values and moral reasoning (e.g. empathy); (6) moral identity and (7) meta-moral qualities. Lickona (Narvaez 2009: 330) has developed a model referred to as *Education for Character*, which attempts to integrate the right thinking and the right conduct, drawing on the theories of Plato and Aristotle, respectively. This model promotes developing virtues through moral school culture, regarding discipline as a substantial tool for the development of a moral character. According to this model, teachers are expected to create a democratic class community in which students are encouraged to be active participants. Teachers are to support values education relying on the school curriculum. They use teaching methods that create community spirit, combine high standards with effective support, enhance ethical reflection in students, helping them to consider different perspectives and the specific requirements and practice of virtues, make considered decisions and view themselves critically. Additionally, teachers should help students develop skills in solving conflicts in a peaceful manner. According to this approach, teachers are seen as role models and, at the same time,

promoters of child development. However, *Child Development Project* is considered much more systematic with respect to pedagogy and is probably one of the leading approaches. Here the emphasis is laid on co-operation, with the aim of enhancing community spirit.

The third approach designed to integrate the two previous contrasting traditions, referred to as *integrative ethical education*, aims to give a more holistic model for values education. On the one hand, its purpose is to improve reflective reasoning faculty and commitment to justice as one of the pillars of a democratic society, while acknowledging the fact that the effectiveness of a pluralistic democratic society with its institutions presupposes certain characteristics from its members. (Narvaez 2009: 312-113) This approach extends the three aforementioned projects or models, *Moral Anatomy*, *Education for Character* and *Child Development Project*, relying on current research and offering more systematic views on character and education. It is based on three main principles: (1) moral development is the development of moral competence; (2) education is transformative and interactive and (3) human nature is inclined towards co-operation and self actualising, drawing attention to particular conditions required for moral development (2009: 336). According to this model, values education should not be an addition, but an integral part of education and school culture. Teachers are expected to systematically, using both direct and indirect methods, deal with ethic skills. While direct methods include explanations and meta-cognitive guidance towards self-regulation, indirect methods involve creating an environment that would enhance that skill (teaching intuitive thinking). (Narvaez 2009: 347)

There are many programs in addition to the ones mentioned above, including *Responsive Classroom*, *Second Step*, *Positive Action*, *Resolving Conflict Creatively* and *Character Counts* among others (2009: 196, 207-208) as well as methods, for example *values clarification*, *I-can-problem-solve* (2009: 206) and *problem-based learning tasks* (Willemse et al 2005: 214), all of which involve the active participation of students.

Shumaker and Heckel (2009: 221) admit that the large number of existing programs indicates, on the one hand, that the issue of the moral development of children is being addressed while, on the other, it might show the lack of clear understanding as to what the most effective strategies and procedures could be.

Indoctrination and the Hidden Curriculum

Haydon (2009: 26) has defined *indoctrination* as "a process of forcing people to accept ideas they are unable to analyse logically." Being one of the reasons why *values clarification* method was designed, indoctrination was described by three characteristics. Firstly, it was believed to be based on a flawed presupposition that teachers know "the right values" which they are expected to transmit. *Values clarification*, in contrast, is based on an assumption that the world is continuously changing, which is why there are no final or proven answers to value-related issues. Secondly, it was seen as any pedagogical method that treats a child as passive and susceptible, someone who is expected to be transformed. Finally, it was accused of minimising an individual by presenting ideologies or impressive role-models which, in effect, would suppress children and inhibit their own moral reasoning and choices. Although Chazan criticizes this description for being vague (Chazan 2009: 111-112), nevertheless, it conveys the most significant feature, the teaching of ideas or attitudes without questioning them or without being given a choice.

However, attitudes to indoctrination vary. Whereas Kohlberg regards indoctrination as unacceptable, the traditionalists claimed to be in favour of it (Narvaez 2009: 329). Haydon (2009: 33) acknowledges the fact that the more profound the impact on people, the greater the importance of what virtues are set out to be attained.

It can be argued that school curricula according to which values education is taught in the form of compulsory Civic Education while Religious Education is either optional or

not represented, indoctrinate a certain pre-determined world-view according to which the value of a person lies in their loyalty and usefulness to the country (Sutrop 2009: 54-55) and more individual values are implicitly regarded as marginal or having no value whatsoever. Preparing students solely for citizenship while not introducing them to alternative, yet equally valid and acceptable perspectives or identities implies that being an active but obedient citizen is much more important than any religious endeavour.

While indoctrination can be understood as deliberate, *the hidden curriculum* is much more subtle, being often defined as an unintended outcome or a side-effect of an education. The word *hidden* has also been given a number of interpretations, varying from *deliberately concealed* to *inexplicit*, *unintended* or *unofficial* (Carr and Landon 1999: 21-22). In order to answer the question as to why some values remain hidden in educational contexts, Carr and Landon (1999: 24) explain that "if values are primarily exhibited in practice they are liable to be unarticulated or unspoken precisely because their role in human affairs does not obviously or immediately call for specific articulation in the form of doctrines, codes of conduct, articles of belief and so on – except, significantly, when the practices of a given institution or community are called into question."

Values Education in Estonia

Having given an overview of values education in Europe and in the USA, the following two sections will focus on values education in Estonia. First, a historical overview will be provided, followed by some current issues with respect to values education.

A Historical Overview

Values education in Estonia dates back to 1920s (Mikk 1998: 20). At basic schools values were taught through school subjects, namely Regional Studies, Moral Education and Civic Education. In 1937, new curricula were designed and values education was incorporated into other subjects, especially into Religious Education (Tuulik 2006: 174-175). At secondary schools ethics was taught as Preliminary Course to Philosophy with Spirit Science and Ethics (the author's translation) as a compulsory subject since 1923. Although from 1937 onwards ethics was substituted with philosophy, ethical issues were treated regardless. Ethics was taught in conjunction with Religious Education, History, Language and Literature. (Tuulik 2006: 15)

Contemporaries Johannes Käis (1885-1950) and Peeter Põld (1878-1930) were perhaps the most renowned promoters of values education at the time (Tuulik 2006: 173). Põld, the first professor of pedagogy, the first Minister of Education of independent Estonia and the founder of the national university, regarded values education as the pillar of education (Põder et al 2009: 9). Käis firmly believed in the dual goal of education that would integrate social as well as individual dimensions (1996: 105).

Põld (Tuulik 2010: 83-89) regarded values as educational goals and set them in a hierarchical structure, from the lowest to the highest: (1) vital values; (2) economic-technical values; (3) cognitive values; (4) aesthetic values; (5) judicial values; (6) ethical values and (7) religious values. He believed values have attained their perfection in Christian teachings and that religious values give meaning to moral values (Tuulik 2006: 23-24), regarding morality and faith as inextricable (Tuulik 2006: 129). In his very holistic approach, the two dimensions - individual and social - were closely intertwined (Tuulik 2006: 26-27).

Sutrop (2009: 51-52) touches upon the issues concerning the Soviet occupation and the devastating impact it had on our values and the ethical crisis that followed. After regaining the independence, financial well-being and success as goals of education prevailed over the development of an individual. Education was largely knowledge-oriented and there was little concern with respect to values education (Põder et al 2009: 10). On the other hand, according to Kitsing (1998: 10-14) the primary focus of the national curriculum was on the national identity and the appreciation of the national culture.

Current Issues

Education must become a priority in our society as the education given today will determine the kind of society we will be living in tomorrow, argues Sutrop (2009: 54). Schools transmit values whether it is intentional or unintentional (Põder et al 2009: 11). Now, the problem lies in the fact that while we as a society are still in the process of developing our values, they are already needed to be taught to younger generations. Globalisation with its conflicting values makes it an ongoing process and rather challenging. (Põder et al 2009: 12)

Our knowledge-oriented schools must become value-oriented (Sutrop 2009: 62) and support not only students' intellectual, but also physical, ethical as well as emotional development (Põder et al 2009: 10). In addition, sharing the views of Peeter Põld and Mari Saat among others with respect to religious education, I would strongly suggest incorporating it as a compulsory subject into our national curriculum in order to balance its underlying scientific world-view. Firstly, as already stated earlier, students must be aware of the choices they have with respect to their world-view and values. As making the choice

must be conscious, students must be aware of the alternatives, which is why values education cannot be merely implicit. Secondly, while the European culture is rooted in Christianity and our moral values are largely based on the Ten Commandments, it is unfortunate when many of us still reduce Christianity to the crusades without any deeper understanding of its true message. Moreover, globalisation or living in a multicultural society requires some understanding of different cultures, perhaps with different values.

However, there are a number of issues with respect to transmitting common values in a pluralistic society (Põder et al 2009: 10-11). Whereas in a liberal society individual freedom of choice and tolerance are considered important, not all values are equally appreciated. In her point of view, the goal of values education today is to help students become dynamic individuals in terms of values who, in the context of pluralistic values, would be able to be flexible and, nevertheless, maintain their deeper moral nature. However, the issue of liberalism may be a little more complex. Haydon succinctly explains how a liberal person actually prefers certain viewpoints to others by bringing the examples of liberal attitudes towards abortion and homosexuality. He also draws attention to the fact that the member of a liberal society does not necessarily have to be a liberal as "a society that does not accept those who are not liberal with respect to their moral values, would clearly be a non-liberal society. This society would have no place for those who believe that abortion is murder or that homosexuality is a sin" [the author's translation]. (Haydon 2009: 37) In our society, similar tendencies can be detected. The issues concerning, for instance, the Registered Partnership Act and the orientation towards genderless society have generated controversy in our society. Unfortunately, many of those who claim to be liberal and tolerant have demonstrated great intolerance towards those who have differences of opinion, for instance Christians.

Sutrop (2009: 51-53) indicates the devastating influence of the Soviet occupation on our value system. In addition to what she points out, one of the consequences of this 50-year-long time period is definitely our lack of interest in spiritual values. Taking pride in being one of the leading e-countries in the world, yet, in terms of values, we have a long way ahead.

To sum up, teaching values in a pluralistic society is a challenging issue with no unequivocal answers. Also, as stated above, there is no such thing as value-free teaching, which is why awareness is already a step forward. The teacher playing an important role in interpreting and mediating the values laid down in the school curriculum, is also a holder of certain values that he or she should be aware of. And while there are many factors contributing to the formation of values in younger generations, such as media, many seem to feel that primary responsibility for values education rests with schools. For this particular reason, it is essential to be aware of both explicit and implicit values education. Therefore, apart from the awareness of the model role of the teachers and school culture, it is highly important to review the national and school curricula and the values expressed in school textbooks as well as their compatibility.

CHAPTER 2. THE COMPATIBILITY OF VALUES IN THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM AND THE COURSEBOOK *UPSTREAM UPPER INTERMEDIATE B2+ STUDENT'S BOOK*

As already explained in Chapter 1, teachers are, more often than not, seen as the key figures in values education and, therefore, not only expected to act as role models but also to mediate the values provided in the school curriculum. The school curriculum is primarily designed to establish a set of values a particular school holds and the competences students are expected to acquire. However, apart from the values set in the school curriculum, the teacher interprets and mediates the values explicitly or implicitly embedded in study materials, for instance, a course book. Values expressed in study materials are either consistent with the ones set in the curriculum or they may represent a different perspective. In the following, the comparison of the values conveyed in the English course book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* and the values set in the national curriculum will be provided with respect to their possible compatibility.

Values in the National Curriculum

The Estonian national curriculum is value-based. Each school is expected to devise their own school curriculum which is based on the national curriculum. Values in the national curriculum are mainly set as core values, being, however, also expressed as competences and cross-curricular topics, which are based on the core values. The foreign language curriculum has been devised specifically for English teaching purposes, which will be of further interest

for this particular research. The following sections will provide the description of the national curriculum and the critical analysis of its underlying philosophy.

The Description of the National Curriculum

The national curriculum for Estonian upper secondary schools consists of three chapters: (1) general provisions (giving the scope of application and the structure of regulation); (2) general part and (3) implementing provisions. The general part, in turn, comprises six divisions: (1) core values of general upper secondary education; (2) learning and educational objectives (in the form of goals and competences); (3) concept of learning and the learning environment; (4) organization of studies; (5) assessment and graduation from upper secondary school and (6) school curriculum.

As already mentioned previously, the national curriculum is value-based. Values in the national curriculum are pre-determined and drawn from a variety of sources. According to § 2 in division 1,

> The values deemed important in the national curriculum derive from the ethical principles specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Estonia, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the basic documents of the European Union. General human values (honesty, compassion, respect for life, justice, human dignity, respect for self and others) are enshrined as core values, as are social values (liberty, democracy, respect for mother tongue and culture, patriotism, cultural diversity, tolerance, environmental sustainability, rule of law, solidarity, responsibility and gender equality).

Values are also embedded in competences presented in § 4 in division 2 of the general part (see table 1) and include the following: (1) *culture and value competence*; (2) *social and civic competence*; (3) *self-management competence*; (4) *learning to learn competence*; (5) *communication competence*; (6) *mathematics, science and technology competence*; (7) *entrepreneurship competence* and (8) *digital competence*. In addition, values are also expressed as cross-curricular topics in § 10, namely (1) *lifelong learning and career planning*; 2) *environment and sustainable development*; (3) *civic initiative and*

entrepreneurship; (4) *cultural identity*; (5) *information environment*; (6) *technology and innovation*; (7) *health and safety* and (8) *values and morals*, all of which are presented once more in the foreign language curriculum.

Table 1. Core values embedded in competences in the national curriculum.

Competences	Corresponding values
Culture and value competence	honesty, compassion, respect for life, human dignity, respect for self and others, liberty, justice, democracy, respect for mother tongue and culture, patriotism, cultural diversity, tolerance, environmental sustainability, rule of law, solidarity, responsibility, gender equality
Social and civic competence	respect for self and others, human dignity, liberty, justice, democracy, respect for mother tongue and culture, patriotism, cultural diversity, tolerance, respect for life, environmental sustainability, rule of law, solidarity, responsibility, gender equality
Self-management competence	respect for self and others responsibility
Learning to learn competence	responsibility
Communication competence	solidarity, gender equality, human dignity, respect for self and others, cultural diversity, tolerance
Mathematics, science and technology competence	compassion, environmental sustainability, respect for life
Entrepreneurship competence	liberty, responsibility

The fact that the national curriculum presents a set of pre-determined values as well as competences to be formed in students is a clear indication of the underlying integrative approach of the curriculum.

The Analysis of the National Curriculum

While the curriculum is understood to be value-based, there could be some misgivings about the current layout, according to which, for instance, the competences in the general part of the national curriculum are duplicated in the foreign language curriculum while the

definitions of them vary to a large degree, making them difficult for the teacher to follow. For example, in the main part of the curriculum, *social and civic competence* is defined as "the ability to become self-actualized, to function as an aware and conscientious citizen and to support the democratic development of society; to know and follow values and standards in society and the rules of various environments; to engage in cooperation with other people; to accept interpersonal differences and take them into account in interacting with people." The definition of the same competence in the foreign language curriculum is quite different, as seen in the following, "in order to cope with everyday communication situations, in addition to the choice of appropriate linguistic forms, it is necessary to know the cultural background of the foreign-language learning countries and the resulting behavioural rules and practices of these societies. Therefore, social and civic competences are closely linked to value-related competences. Various forms of study (e.g. teamwork, project study) and active participation in cultural programs related to the language of instruction contribute to shaping social and civic competence." The definition of the particular competence in the general part of the curriculum is primarily focused on the preparation of the students for becoming active participants in a democratic society while in the foreign language curriculum the focus is on cultural diversity.

According to Ruus (2009: 123), in curriculum design the culture, the developmental needs of the society as well as the individual, finding the balance between the past and the future orientation, tradition and innovation are all considered. The philosophical basis of the national curriculum rests on humanism and the Enlightenment, which in turn is rooted in the Renaissance (2009: 134). Humanism emphasises the centrality of the human being instead of God or nature, and the well-being of the humanity as the ultimate criterion (2009: 133). From the humanistic point of view, the central figure in the Enlightenment was Kant, who praised reason (or critical thinking) and the autonomy of an individual. He

is revered for formulating *the ultimate principle of ethics* according to which a human being should only act in a way that could become a universal law (2009: 134). However, as already argued earlier, this maxim is a secularised modification of essentially the same idea found in the Bible in Luke 6:31, which states "[a]nd just as you want men to do to you, you also do to them likewise," making this principle of reciprocity a universal guideline. The secular nature of the underlying philosophy of the national curriculum is precisely the reason why it can be blamed for being biased towards the scientific world-view.

Additionally, in line with the Enlightenment, humanism reflects a prevailing belief in technology as having the potential to turn a human life worthwhile (Ruus 2009: 134). This is also evident in the national curriculum as the list of competences to be achieved, set in § 4, include competences in Mathematics, Science and Technology, while competence in world religions as alternative world-views is not presented, not even in the description of value competence. For this reason, the scientific world-view remains predominant and unbalanced. Cross-curricular topic *values and morals* (item 8) states that "the aim is for the student to develop into a morally advanced person, who *knows the generally recognized values and moral principles in society*, follows them in school and outside school, who does not remain indifferent when they are flouted, and intervenes in accordance with his or her abilities when necessary" [italics added]. This particular item in its current wording remains largely ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations as the concept of *generally recognised values* is not specified and it is not clear if the choices students should have regarding their world-view will, in fact, be fully articulated. Therefore, knowing the *generally recognised values and principles* is probably inadequate for making fundamental decisions concerning one's world view. Moreover, Ruus (2009: 134) points out that when technology, as it advances, starts creating its own values depriving us from the criteria and

beliefs, spiritual and religious, against which we used to measure the rightness of our actions.

The national curriculum is claimed to be based on the idea that (Schihalejev n. d.: 17) "the intellectual, physical, moral, social and the emotional development of a human being are of equal importance." This, however, is contradictory to the democratic views according to which there should be a freedom choice regarding our world view. The national curriculum, on the other hand, is clearly bent towards a scientific perspective, presenting it as the only correct world view. The claim that "school provides each student with opportunities for fully developing his or her abilities and creative self-realization, the formation of a scientific world view and achieving emotional, social and moral maturity" clearly indicates the intentions underlying the national curriculum. Regardless of all the benign intentions the designers of the current curriculum had, predetermining students' world view without their conscious consent and depriving them of their rightful choice cannot be considered democratic.

It is also said that "[t]he 21st century school should prepare students for participating in a democratic society" (Schihalejev n. d.: 21) which, while not being necessarily wrong as an educational goal, is again, in a way, one-dimensional, reducing a human being, the student, to a citizen with presumably no spiritual pursuits. The fact that some curriculum designers see the process of curriculum design as "a political process" (Ruus 2009: 123), seems to indicate an apparent bias. Although the importance of student participation in values education is highlighted and turning students into objects of (values) education is disapproved of (Schihalejev n. d.: 20), unfortunately, when deciding the world-view for them, this is precisely what happens. Values education serving the interests of the society to the extent that individual choices are disregarded makes the student a mere instrument. Ruus (2009, 149-151), when describing a transactional relationship between a human

being and the environment, still presents a horizontal approach, in which the vertical dimension, the religious aspect, is again disregarded. Similarly, according to the national curriculum, Civic Education is a compulsory subject whereas Religious Education is not, which is why the latter is often taught at as an optional subject or not taught at all.

According to the integrative approach to values education, the process of valuing is concurrently an individual as well as a social phenomenon, whereas neither of the dimensions must be disregarded as the individual makes his or her choices in a particular social reality (Schihalejev n. d.: 27). In order for students to be able to make a conscious choice, they must first be aware of the alternatives. They would have the choice if they were not taught according to a curriculum establishing a pre-determined set of values and, instead, they were given the opportunity to learn about different world-views and religions, for example in Religious Education lesson. Otherwise, someone else will make that choice for them without the students even being aware of it – which would be an error against democracy, or perhaps could even be referred to as indoctrination, as democracy rests on knowledge, the ability to present and analyse alternatives and make choices. (Schihalejev n. d.: 21)

Compulsory Religious Education would ensure that every student will be introduced to different cultures and religions these cultures are based on. The Western culture is largely based on Christianity, yet many of us not only fail to understand its message but are also unwilling to learn about it. Lacking in knowledge about other cultures, customs and religions in today's multicultural society may not only create awkward situations or cause unintended offences, but can also prove hazardous. For the same reasons why Mathematics or Mother Tongue are compulsory school subjects, Religious Education should be taught to every student to ensure they have the competence to cope in this pluralistic,

multicultural society. Also, if values are not consciously taught as a subject, values education may become very unsystematic and arbitrary.

It is claimed that the national curriculum in the most important direction indicator designed to meet the needs and interests of those concerned (Ruus 2009: 129). However, following it in its current form, students are lured into a scientific world-view, in which everything is relative. Therefore, while the design of the national curriculum has definitely been well intended, it has certain shortcomings for further consideration.

Values in the Course Book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*

For already a couple of decades, some Estonian schools have re-orientated from making use of locally published course books specifically designed to meet the needs of Estonian-speaking learners of English towards the use of a wide range of visually perhaps more attractive ones issued elsewhere, mostly in Britain. One of these course books that has received general approval of many English teachers, or has at least been regarded as an acceptable study material at secondary school level, is *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*. In the following, the description of the course book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* will be given together with an overview of the syllabus.

The Description of the Course Book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*

The *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* is accompanied by a workbook, a teacher's book, a workbook key, a test booklet, and a CD. However, due to the scope of the current research, only the course book is focused on.

The organisation of the student's book is topic-based. There are ten topics, each corresponding to one of the units in the course book. The course book is divided into five

modules, each module consisting of two units. Each unit is organised following the same structure, starting with a lead-in, followed by a text related to the main topic of the unit. Vocabulary practice, listening and speaking tasks and grammar practice are followed by a reading section containing some extracts from literature or some more texts on related topics giving some information about some cultural aspects of Britain, and a writing task. The student's book also contains a table of contents, a self-assessment module following each module, a grammar reference section, a list of irregular verbs, appendix 1 containing a table of verbs, adjectives and nouns with prepositions, appendix 2 containing phrasal verbs, a further practice section, a CLIL (i.e. content and language integrated learning) section and tapescripts followed by a word list.

The Analysis of the Course Book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*

The main aim of the current research is to find out whether the values found in the course book correspond to those set in the national curriculum. In the curriculum, the competences are based on the core values listed in chapter 2, division 1, § 2, item 3 (see table 1). The competences in the general part of the curriculum in division 2, § 4 are, in turn, specified in the foreign language curriculum in item 1.4, listing general competences for the purposes of foreign language teaching. Therefore, in the following, the compatibility of the competences presented in the foreign language curriculum and the values found in *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* is analysed (see table 3), after a brief overview of the agreement of the cross-curricular topics presented in the curriculum with those covered in the course book (see table 2).

The ten units of the course book each treat a certain topic. The names of the units and the respective topics are as follows: (1) unit 1: Crossing Barriers (*communication, language, gestures*); (2) unit 2: Moods and Feelings (*feelings, emotions, happiness*); (3)

unit 3: Making a Living (*work/jobs, earning a living, money matters*); (4) unit 4: Make Yourself at Home (*dwellings, household items*); (5) unit 5: Modern Living (*modern trends, lifestyles*); (6) unit 6: Going Places (*holidays, travelling*); (7) unit 7: History (*history, historical figures*); (8) unit 8: Learning Lessons (*education*); (9) unit 9: Planet Issues (*environmental issues*) and (10) unit 10: The Cycle of Life (*health, eating habits, stages in life*). All the topics covered in the course book correspond to the cross-curricular topics provided in the foreign language curriculum, which can also be seen in table 2. The topics presented in the foreign language curriculum that are not covered in the course book include *home and neighbourhood* and *my native Estonia*, both of which are related to such cross-curricular topics as *values and morals*, the first also to *health and safety*, and the latter to *cultural identity*, *civic initiative and entrepreneurship* and *the environment and sustainable development*.

Table 2. Cross-curricular topics covered in *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+Student's Book.*

	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	U6	U7	U8	U9	U10
Lifelong learning and career planning	X		X					X		
Environment and sustainable development				X					X	
Civic initiative and entrepreneurship			X				X			
Cultural identity	X				X	X	X			
Information environment					X					
Technology and innovation	X			X				X	X	
Health and safety		X			X				X	X
Values and morals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

For research purposes, the collected data is presented in the form of tables. To demonstrate the compatibility of the competences provided in the foreign language

curriculum and the competences formed by certain tasks or texts in the course book, a symbol X is used (see table 3). A larger X marks competences that appear to be predominant in a particular unit. Each unit from the course book is coded, for example U1 referring to Unit 1, and, similarly, each competence from the curriculum is coded from C1 to C7, respectively. Due to the scope of the current research, images and other value-laden aspects of the course book are not analysed here, the focus being primarily on texts and tasks that allow for a value-based analysis. In the following, the analysis will be provided according to the competences.

Table 3. Competences developed by *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* according to units.

	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	U6	U7	U8	U9	U10
C1-culture and value competence	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
C2-social and civic competence	X	X	**X**	**X**	**X**	X	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
C3-self-management competence	X	**X**	X	X	**X**	X	X	X	X	X
C4-learning to learn competence	**X**	X	X	X	X	X	X	**X**	X	X
C5-communication competence	**X**	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
C6-mathematics, science and technology competence	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	**X**	X
C7-entrepreneurship competence	X		**X**	X	X	X	X		X	

With respect to values education, the course book offers a number of opportunities. All the competences are developed in each unit, with the exception of *entrepreneurship competence* (C7), which is absent in U2, U7-U8 and U10. C7 is developed in the form of

presentations (in U1, U3-U6 and U9), making posters (U9) or by acting out a pantomime (U5). *Culture and value competence* (C1) is, in a way, different when compared to other competences because in addition to being a competence that is developed in a student, it is also embedded in all of the topics in the course book as every topic that is treated in the course book reflects a certain value. For example, the formation of C1 in students can be the underlying purpose of all the tasks in which students are invited to reflect on their own values while, at the same time, it can be embedded in the general topic being treated, for instance in the topic of *environment* in U9. For this particular reason, C1 is marked as predominant in all units. It is also worth mentioning that while the course book offers a wide variety of tasks that encourage students to reflect on their own values, it is still up to the particular teacher to decide whether or to what extent he or she wants to focus on them and which methods of teaching he or she prefers.

Social and civic competence (C2) is addressed more extensively in U4 and U8-U10. C2 is achieved by interaction with fellow students, for example by acting out dialogues and role-plays, through discussions or when learning about social norms in communication situations by, for instance, acquiring certain linguistic forms. It can also be achieved by learning about certain writing tasks given at the end of each unit, including letters, emails, reports, articles, compositions, stories and reviews, and becoming aware of the three writing styles: informal, semi-formal and formal. In U8, C2 is taught as a general topic, in particular *education*. Referring back to the contradiction mentioned above with respect to C2 as defined in the general part of the curriculum and C2 from the foreign language curriculum, according to the former, C2 in U9 is related to the general topic discussing *environmental issues*, which is one of the global issues, and *sustainable development*, while according to the latter, C2 has no such associations.

Self-management competence (C3) appear to be predominant in U2 and U5, which focus on topics that require a certain capacity for self-reflection, such as *feelings, emotions, appearance, character* and *lifestyles*. Introspective skills allow a person to become aware of one's personal traits as well as preferences resulting from his or her personality, translating, in turn, into his or her lifestyle. C3 can also be developed by paraphrasing quotations found in the lead-in section of each unit and expressing one's opinion on them, through discussions found, again, in each unit as well as by acting out role-plays (U3, U4, U7 and U9). *Learning to learn competence* (C4) is taught as a topic in units 1 and 8. U1 focuses on communication and the need to learn foreign languages as a means of international communication. C4 is approached from a variety of angles in U8 as the general topic of this unit is *education*, but C4 is also developed by tasks that require self-reflection, such as analysing the most important factors for success at school or a number of tasks that help students understand a certain text (text analysis), or by *strategy points* (U1) or *tips* (U5) that guide the learning process, and, in fact, by all the instructions given to students throughout the course book that facilitate their learning process.

Communication competence (C5) is clearly one of the main aims of foreign language acquisition. Therefore, understandably, it is developed in a variety of ways in all units while being more focused on in U1, in which *communication* is one of the main topics. Communication skills are also enhanced through tasks that instruct students to use language for certain purposes, for example expressing preferences, comparing and contrasting, making suggestions, responding positively or negatively, making assumptions and saying goodbye, as in U1. Phrases that students need for these purposes are provided. Participating in discussions and role-plays also contributes to the acquisition of C5.

Mathematics, science and technology competence (C6) is primarily acquired by dealing with *environmental issues* in U9. However, students can also achieve it by making

presentations as they require presenting their ideas by using technological devices (U1, U3, U4, U6 and U9). Depending on the preferences of a particular teacher, written assignments such as letters, essays and reports can also be submitted online, requiring ICT skills. Reports (U3) occasionally require the ability to read graphs and interpret data presented in figures. In U8, students are expected to analyse a certain topic relying on the information presented in the form of a chart. Moreover, a text in U8, *The Cyber School* is about technological development in the educational context. U10 contains a table and a self-assessment section following it includes a text related to nature. *Entrepreneurship competence* (C7) is again mainly achieved by making presentations as by definition this particular competence is attained through courage and self-assurance (U1, U3, U4, U6 and U9). C7 can also be developed by acting out a pantomime (U5) as this would also require the aforementioned qualities. However, C7 can perhaps be perceived as a little more predominant in U3, which is focused on the topic of *making a living*.

Evidently, all of the seven competences established in the foreign language curriculum can also be detected in the course book under scrutiny. However, it depends on a particular teacher whether they take full advantage of what the course book offers. Once more referring to Haydon who argued (2009: 28) that the impact of a teacher on each and every student is unpredictable, similarly, the extent to which all the given competences are developed in students when making use of this particular course book remains largely unpredictable as different teachers may have different approaches or teaching styles and methods in addition to a number of possible interpretations the value-laden tasks of the course book are open to.

In conclusion, drawing on the data collected from the analysis of the national curriculum and its philosophical basis and the comparison of the competences presented in the foreign

language curriculum specifically specified for foreign language teaching, and the competences developed by means of the topics, texts and tasks provided in the course book *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*, it can be concluded that the competences are largely compatible. All the seven competences are properly addressed, with the exception of *entrepreneurship competence*, which cannot be detected in units 2, 8 and 10. However, this is hardly surprising due to the fact that in foreign language acquisition *entrepreneurship competence* is perhaps not a priority as compared to the other six competences.

As already mentioned above, the cross-curricular topics set in the foreign language curriculum also correspond to the general topics treated in the course book, with the exceptions of *home and neighbourhood* and *my native Estonia*, which the teacher will have to provide. If it is done in the form of presentations or projects, it will provide an additional opportunity to enhance students' entrepreneurship competence.

The analysis of the national curriculum and its underlying philosophy accounts for the scientific world-view it represents. In order for students to be able to make conscious choices concerning their world-view, they should be introduced to a variety of alternatives. Therefore, it would be advisable to review the national curriculum with respect to Religious Education, which could be made a compulsory subject equal to Civic Education, Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics.

CONCLUSION

Members of a multicultural society are required to make independent moral decisions. Throughout the times, schools have been expected to take responsibility for preparing students for moral reasoning. Therefore, schools are faced with a challenging question concerning the methods of values education.

This issue has been addressed in a variety of ways. In the Western countries, two major approaches have been predominant: *traditional character education*, drawing on Aristotelian tradition, and *rational moral education* based on Kantian deontological, i.e. rule based philosophy. However, then a third approach was designed to integrate the two previous contrasting traditions, referred to as *integrative ethical education*, which aims to give a more holistic model for values education. When the model of traditional character education has a set of pre-determined values and is focused on character building (*inculcation*) and the model of rational moral education highlights the capacity for moral reasoning, having values clarification as the primary method of values education, the integrative ethical education aims to apply both, character education and the enhancement of reflective moral reasoning.

In Estonia, values education dates back to 1920s and is closely related to the names of Johannes Käis and Peeter Põld. The values of the Estonians have been deeply affected by the 50-year-long Soviet occupation, the consequences of which have unfortunately been prolonged. Having been required to conform to the Soviet ideology, it would now be of utmost importance to ensure that the younger generations know they have the freedom to choose what they believe in. In order to have that freedom, one must be aware of the

alternatives. Therefore, Religious Education should be made a compulsory school subject similarly to Civic Education, Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics.

One of the aims of the current research was to study whether *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* meets the requirements of the national curriculum with respect to values. In the analysis the focus was on competences as they are based on values. The results of the analysis clearly indicate the compatibility of the curriculum and the course book, with *entrepreneurship competence* being the exception as it is not developed in three of the ten units in the course book. Additionally, the cross-curricular topics of the curriculum also largely overlap, the only topics not covered in the course book being the topics related to Estonia, which the teacher will have to cover using additional materials or ask students to make presentations, which would enhance their entrepreneurship competence.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

Evans, Virginia and Bob Obee. 2016. *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*. Newbury: Express Publishing.

Gümnaasiumi riiklik õppekava. 2011. Available at https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/114022018009?leiaKehtiv, accessed April 2018.

Käis, Johannes. 2004. *Kooli-raamat*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.

National Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools. 2011. Available at https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/524092014009/consolide, accessed April 2018.

The Holy Bible, New King James Version. 1990. New York: American Bible Society.

Secondary sources

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1993. *Postmodern Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Berkowitz, Marvin W. 2009. Teaduspõhine iseloomukasvatus. In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 193-213. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Berkowitz, Marvin W. and Melinda Bier. 2009. Iseloomukasvatuse interpersonaalsed juured. In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 289-311. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Carr, David and John Landon. 1999. Teachers and Schools as Agencies of Values Education: reflections on teachers' perceptions. Part two: the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Beliefs & Values,* 20:1, 21-29.

Chazan, Barry. 2009. Kõlbluskasvatus väärtuste selitamisena. In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 91-122. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Harro-Loit, Halliki, Anna-Liisa Blaubrük, Piret Hallast, Helina Harro, Nelli Jung, Külliki Korts, Olga Schihalejev and Piret Siivelt. 2011. *Väärtusarenduse analüüs – miks ja kuidas?* Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Haydon, Graham. 2009. Väärtuskasvatus: õpetajad kui väärtuste edastajad? In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 25-44. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Kitsing, Maie. 1998. Rahvuslikkus – on see väärtus tänasele koolile ja õpilasele? In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Väärtuskasvatus*, 6-16. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli pedagoogikaosakonna väljaanne nr. 6.

Mendus, Susan. 1998. Teaching Morality in a Plural Society. *Government and Opposition*, 33: 3, 355-371.

Narvaez, Darcia. 2009. Integreeriv eetiline kasvatus. In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 312-367. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Pilli, Einike and Elo Maandi. 1998. Eesti noorte eetilistest väärtustest. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Väärtuskasvatus*, 17-36. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli pedagoogikaosakonna väljaanne nr. 6.

Põder, Märt, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). 2009. *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik.* Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Russell, Josephine. 2009. Ülevaade nüüdisaegsest diskussioonist. In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 45-87. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Ruus, Viive-Riina. 2009. Õppekava on ühislooming ja -vastutus. In Margit Sutrop, Pille Valk and Katrin Velbaum (eds). *Väärtused ja väärtuskasvatus. Valikud ja võimalused 21. Sajandi Eesti ja Soome koolis*, 121-158. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Schihalejev, Olga. N. d. *Väärtuskasvatus õpetajakoolituses.* Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus.

Shumaker, David M. and Robert V. Heckel. 2009. Koolide roll iseloomu arendamises. In Märt Põder, Margit Sutrop and Pille Valk (eds). *Väärtused, iseloom ja kool: väärtuskasvatuse lugemik*, 214-253. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Sutrop, Margit. 2009. Väärtused ja haridus ühiskondlikus kontekstis. In Margit Sutrop, Pille Valk and Katrin Velbaum (eds). *Väärtused ja väärtuskasvatus. Valikud ja võimalused 21. Sajandi Eesti ja Soome koolis*, 50-67. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eetikakeskus.

Tuulik, Maie. 2010. *Kasvatuse klassika*. Tallinn: Vali Press.

Tuulik, Maie. 2006. *Kõlbeline kasvatus*. Tallinn: Vali Press.

Veugelers, Wiel and Paul Vedder. 2003. Values in Teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice,* 9: 4, 377-389.

Willemse, Martijn, Mieke Lunenberg and Fred Korthagen. 2005. Values in Education: a challenge for teacher educators. Available at http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=5&hid=5&sid=175f6e60-6809-41fa-9f8a-940b85661e86%40sessionmgr109&bdata=JnNpdGL, accessed March 2009.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Ave Veermäe
Values in English Language Teaching in Estonian Upper Secondary Schools: Based on the Analysis of *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*/ **„Väärtused inglise keele õpetamises Eesti keskastme koolides: põhinedes õpiku** *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* **analüüsil"**
Magistritöö
2018
Lehekülgede arv: 51

Annotatsioon:
Multikultuurse ühiskonna liikmeks olemine nõuab moraaliotsuste langetamise oskust. Läbi aegade on jäetud vastutus õpilastes selle oskuse arendamise ees koolidele, mistõttu seisavad koolid sageli silmitsi keeruliste küsimustega, mis puudutavad väärtusi ning nende õpetamise meetodeid.

Seda probleemi on püütud lahendada mitmeti. Lääneriikides on olnud valdavateks väärtuste õpetamise mudeliks Aristotelese filosoofial põhinev *traditsiooniline iseloomukasvatus* ning Kanti deontoloogilisel filosoofial baseeruv *ratsionalistlik kõlbluskasvatus*, mille järel kujunes välja neid kahte mudelit ühendav *integreeriv eetiline kasvatus*. Kui traditsioonilise iseloomukasvatuse mudeli puhul on olemas teatud väärtused ja tähelepanu pööratakse ka iseloomu kujundamisele ning ratsionalistliku kõlbluskasvatuse mudeli puhul peetakse oluliseks moraaliarutelusid, iseäranis just väärtuste selitamise meetodi abil, siis integreeriva eetilise kasvatusmeetodi puhul rakendatakse iseloomukasvatust, kuid arendatakse ka reflektiivsete moraaliarutelude oskust.

Eesti väärtuskasvatus ulatub 1920-ndatesse aastatesse ning seostub peamiselt Johannes Käise ja Peeter Põlluga. Kahjuks on eestlaste väärtussüsteemile sügava jälje jätnud 50-aastane nõukogude okupatsioon, mille mõjud on osutunud pikaajalisteks. Olles olnud sunnitud konformeeruma nõukogudelikule ideoloogiale, on nüüd äärmiselt oluline tagada noorematele põlvkondadele vabadus valida, millesse nad usuvad. Vabadus aga eeldab teadlikkust alternatiividest. Seetõttu peaks usundiõpetus olema koolides kohustuslik õppeaine ühiskonnaõpetuse, füüsika, keemia ja matemaatika kõrval.

Üks käesoleva uurimuse eesmärke on välja selgitada, kas paljudes Eesti keskkoolides kasutatav õpik *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book* vastab riiklikus õppekavas esitatud väärtustele. Analüüsi keskmeks on väärtustel põhinevad pädevused. Analüüsi tulemused viitavad selgelt õpiku vastavusele õppekavale. Erandiks on vaid ettevõtlikkuspädevus, mida ei arendata kolmes õpiku kümnest õppetükist. Ka õppekavas esitatud läbivad teemad kattuvad suures osas õpikus olevate teemadega. Teemad, mida õpikus ei käsitleta, on Eestiga seonduvad, mida õpetaja peaks katma lisamaterjalide abil või teevad õpilased Eesti-teemalised ettekanded, mis ühtlasi aitaks arendada ka nende ettevõtlikkuspädevust.

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Ave Veermäe,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose
VALUES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING IN ESTONIAN UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOLS: Based on the Analysis of *Upstream Upper Intermediate B2+ Student's Book*,

   mille juhendaja on Asst. Lect. Ülle Türk,

1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;

1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace´i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.

2. olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

3. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Ave Veermäe

Tartus, **15.05.2018**