EHV and academic results: Data collected in 2 x 1-year projects in Mainland China, 2007/8
人文价值教育与学习成绩: 从 2007、2008 年在中国大陆进行的人文价值教育项目中所收集的数据

EHV Classes (N=70, combining 2007 and 2008, ie 70 classes, mixture of maths, Chinese and some English   )

	First 5 months			Latter 5 months		
	mean score	mean % achieving pass	mean % achieving distinction	mean score	mean % achieving pass	mean % achieving distinction
mean	80.15	82.99	27.8	81.80	85.44	32.87
sd	9.35	17.02	24.5	8.12	16.33	25.46

人文价值教育班级(N=70, 包括 2007 年和 2008 年的班级，即数学、语文和部分英语班级总数为 70)

	前五个月			后 5 个月		
	平均分	平均合格率(%)	平均优秀率(%)	平均分	平均合格率(%)	平均优秀率(%)
平均数	80.15	82.99	27.8	81.80	85.44	32.87
标准差	9.35	17.02	24.5	8.12	16.33	25.46

Control Classes (N= 41) ie equivalent class doing same test

	First 5 months			Latter 5 months		
	mean score	mean % achieving pass	mean % achieving distinction	mean score	mean % achieving pass	mean % achieving distinction
mean	79.95	83.05	27.80	79.82	83.24	29.90
sd	11.15	19.35	23.89	9.72	18.45	23.91

对照班（N=41）即进行相同测试的对应班级

	前五个月			后 5 个月		
	平均分	平均合格率(%)	平均优秀率(%)	平均分	平均合格率(%)	平均优秀率(%)
平均数	79.95	83.05	27.80	79.82	83.24	29.90
标准差	11.15	19.35	23.89	9.72	18.45	23.91

Teachers are often concerned about whether focusing on EHV in their teaching will have an adverse effect on academic results. In Mainland China, where the teachers' promotions and even their jobs depend on getting good academic results for their classes, many

teachers are reluctant to try anything that may take time away from the "drill and practice" that they believe is necessary to get good results.

老师们经常会担心，在教学中进行人文价值教育是否会对学生的学习成绩产生不利影响。在中国大陆，教师的晋升与否甚至他们能否保住工作本身都取决于所教班级学习成绩的好坏，所以，许多老师都不愿意从大量的"操练与练习"中抽出时间来做人文价值教育，他们认为这些"操练和练习"才是获得好成绩所必需的。

In contrast, these is a growing body of literature, worldwide, that is reporting significant positive effects of character education on academic achievement (see for example Ellenwood, S. (2006). Revisiting character education: From McGuffey to narratives. *Journal of Education*, 187, 3)

相反，当今世界有越来越多的文献表明，人格教育对学生的学习成绩发挥着积极的作用（见文章:Ellenwood, S. (2006). Revisiting character education: From McGuffey to narratives. *Journal of Education*, 187, 3）

These data were collected from primary school teachers from 21 schools in a district in western China who had participated in a SSEHV project for one year. They were asked to submit records of their average class test scores for each month of the project (excluding the 2 months of summer holidays) as well as the average percentages for the month of students achieving pass and distinction on the tests.

这些资料是从中国西部地区21所小学的老师中获得的，这些老师曾参加了为期一年的人文价值教育。他们按要求递交项目施行过程中每个月（除暑假的两个月外）学生的考试平均分以及考试的平均合格率与平均优秀率。

It may be argued that there are too many extraneous factors that can influence these test results, including that the levels of difficulty of the tests may have varied from month to month. Nevertheless, we considered it to be important for these teachers to have data about their own test results rather than to use some arbitrarily chosen standardized tests. Furthermore, since the data were collected from 70 classes in 21 schools we can feel reasonably confident that there would be some "averaging out" effect on variables of this kind – and as our data set increases over time, with future projects, we anticipate that the sample size will become large enough to minimize these effects.

还有太多额外的因素会影响考试结果，比如每个月考试的难度水平也许会有所差异，这一点可能会引起争议。但是，我们认为老师应从他们自己编制的考试而非任意选取的一些标准测试中获得相关数据，这一点很重要。另外，因为这些数据是从21个学校的70个班级中获取的，所以我们有理由相信，这样会抵消这类额外变量所带来的影响。同时，我们的数据会在将来的项目中随着时间推移而慢慢累积，所以我们预计样本量会变得更大，足以使那些额外因素的影响降到最小。

In the larger schools there were parallel classes, i.e. classes of the same grade level, following the same curriculum and doing the same tests, but taught by teachers who were not participating in the SSEHV project. From these schools, data were collected from these parallel classes as a form of control. Valid data were returned for 70 EHV classes and 41 control classes – classes ranged in size from 20 to 60.

在更大的学校会有一些平行班级，也就是指同一年级的其他班级，他们使用相同的课程、做同样的测试，但其任教的老师却没有参加人文价值项目。从那些学校中我们收集了这些平行班的数据作为对照。有效数据返回到 70 个人文价值教育班级以及 41 个对照班级---这些班级的规模为 20-60 人不等。

A series of t-tests indicated only one statistically significant difference in these data, so we cannot claim that the EHV had a significant impact on the academic scores, and other factors such as difficulty of the tests or curriculum content could have affected changes in the students' academic scores. Nevertheless, there are some interesting patterns that suggest that it certainly did not have any detrimental effect and that, compared to the non-EHV classes, the increases in academic scores were slightly higher:

一系列的 t 检验表明那些数据中只有一项存在显著性差异，所以我们不能因此而下结论说，人文价值教育对学习成绩产生重大的影响，其他因素如测验的难度或课程内容本来也会影响学生考试成绩的变化。然而，有些有意思的图表却显示人文价值教育肯定没有产生不利影响，并且与非人文价值教育班级相比，人文价值教育班级的学习成绩提高的幅度略微大一些。

- **Between first and last five months of the project.** For the EHV classes there was a slight increase in mean score while the mean score remained the same for the control classes. While in both groups the average percentages of students achieving passes on the monthly tests remained more or less the same, for both there was an increase in the average percentages of the classes achieving distinction. However, it can be seen that the increase was statistically significant for the EHV group (t=1.67, p<0.05) but not for the control group. For the EHV group there was a slight increase in the mean percentages of students achieving pass while for the control group this remained the same.
- 项目前 5 个月和后 5 个月的比较。人文价值教育班级的平均分略有提高，而对照班的平均分保持不变。两组班级每个月测试的平均合格率大致相同，而平均优秀率却都有所提升。但是可以看出，人文价值教育班级的提升在统计学上有显著意（t=1.67, p<0.05）但是对照班级的提升却不显著。人文价值教育班级学生的平均合格率略有增长，而对照组的平均合格率却保持不变。
- **Between EHV and control groups.** The gaps between the EHV and control groups became larger in the second five-month period than in the first. Of particular interest are the mean percentages of students achieving distinctions: for the first five

months the mean for the control group was slightly higher, whereas for the last five months the EHV group had the higher mean.

- **人文价值教育班级与对照班级比较。**两组班级在后 5 个月的差异在比前 5 个月的差异要更大。特别有意思的是学生的平均优秀率方面：前 5 个月对照组更高一些，而后 5 个月人文价值教育组更高。

The next table shows the numbers of classes on which the means went either up or down (by one point or more) between the first and second five months.
以下表格显示: 比较后 5 个月与前 5 个月的数据得出的平均值增长或降低(一分或更多)的班级数量

Numbers of classes on which scores increased

	Mean score	% pass rate	% distinction rate
EHV classes (N=70)	33 (47.1%)	32 (45.7%)	37 (52.9%)
Control classes (N=41)	15 (36.6%)	14 (34.1%)	21 (51.2%)

平均值增长的班级数量

	平均分	合格率	优秀率
EHV 班级 (N=70)	33 (47.1%)	32 (45.7%)	37 (52.9%)
对照班级(N=41)	15 (36.6%)	14 (34.1%)	21 (51.2%)

Numbers of classes on which scores decreased

	Mean score	% pass rate	% distinction rate
EHV classes (N=70)	14 (20%)	16 (22.9%)	23 (32.9%)
Control classes (N=41)	18 (43.9%)	11 (26.8%)	11 (26.8%)

平均值降低的班级数量

	平均分	合格率	优秀率
EHV 班级 (N=70)	14 (20%)	16 (22.9%)	23 (32.9%)
对照班级(N=41)	18 (43.9%)	11 (26.8%)	11 (26.8%)

It can be seen from this table that almost half of the EHV classes had increased mean scores and increased average percentage pass rate in the second half of the year, while less than one-third decreased on these two variables. At the same time the percentages of control classes with increased mean scores and rates was lower than those of the EHV classes and the percentages decreasing were lower. An interesting observation occurs with the percentages of students achieving distinctions. The percentages that increased were approximately the same (EHV group slightly higher) but there was actually a higher percentage, around one-third of the EHV classes on which these percentages decreased, compared to 26.8% of the control classes. Nevertheless, when taking into account the significant differences in means on these two variables, it appears that the decreases in the EHV classes were much smaller (average of 3.28) compared to those in the control classes (average 6.24).

从以上表格中可以看出，在后半年中几乎有一半的人文价值教育班级的平均分和平均合格率都有所提高，而不足三分之一的班级这两项的数值下降了。同时平均分和合格率提高的对照班级在所有对照班级中所占的比重比相应的人文价值教育班级的比重要更低，而平均分与合格率下降的对照班级比重比人文价值教育班级的比重更高。在学生的优秀率方面我们观察到了一个有趣的现象。优秀率升高的两组班级的比重大致相同（人文价值教育班级组的比重更高一点），但是优秀率下降的人文价值教育班级的比重相对于对照班级的 28.8% 来说就更高了，大约为 1/3。然而，当我们考虑到优秀率下降的两组班级在平均分方面存在的显著差异时发现，与对照班级（平均分下降 6.24）相比，人文价值教育班级平均分的降低量则显得更小（平均分降低 3.28）。