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ABSTRACT

This comparative case study examines the influence of ethics education on moral reasoning among pre-service teacher preparation and social work students. This study specifically investigates the ethical values of students enrolled in a teacher preparation and social work education program by their fourth year of study; the degree of ethical knowledge of social work and teacher preparation students by their fourth year of study; the program values in the social work and teacher preparation programs; the similarities and differences in how teacher preparation students and social work students reason through moral dilemmas; and the formal ethics training of students in each program by their fourth year of undergraduate education.

In looking at teacher preparation and social work education, differences in student and programs values were identified. This study revealed that students enrolled in teacher preparation displayed a wider variance in value identification compared to students enrolled in social work. Further, teacher preparation students’ values were more individualistic and rule oriented in orientation whereas social work students often identified with values that are relational in nature. This study also revealed that social work students were familiar with the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of ethics; however, students in teacher preparation reported minimal discussion of ethical terminology or codes of ethics in their coursework.

Further, students in teacher preparation reason through ethical dilemmas adhering to either an ethic of care or an ethic of justice orientation as described in the Shapiro and Stefkovich (2011) framework for ethical decision-making and a Stage Three from Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development (1975). Many students in teacher preparation expressed a preoccupation with rules and policy compared to students in social work. In comparison, social work education students often reason through ethical dilemmas from an ethic of care, founded in relational values such as compassion and
helpfulness. Further, from Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development, social work students’
predominately reasoned from a Stage Four. This study also revealed that students’ reason from a higher
level when the ethical dilemma was professionally related and lower when the dilemma was
professionally neutral.

The findings of this study contribute to the body of literature surrounding ethics education in
professional development and higher education, the use of formal codes of professional ethics, and
moral reasoning and decision making in professional development. Lastly, several suggestions for future
studies are proposed that include a longitudinal study that compares students from year one to year four
in a range of different areas of professional education. Second, a future study should look into other
variables that impact moral behavior beyond moral reasoning, such as moral sensitivity.
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Chapter 1
Introduction and Rationale for Study

“By choosing integrity, I become more whole, but wholeness does not mean perfection. It means becoming more real by acknowledging the whole of who I am.”
- Parker J. Palmer

This case study will compare the ethical training, values, and the moral reasoning strategies used among fourth year students in teacher preparation and social work programs in order to explore whether or not the differing focus of these programs, impacts the ethical approach and preparedness of these future professionals. The author’s personal and professional backgrounds in education and social work have led her to explore these differences more closely and to potentially identify strategies to improve the academic preparation of future professionals in both professions.

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. Chapter one includes a brief introduction to the author’s personal and professional experiences in both social work and education that have influenced the development of this dissertation; an exploration of her perceived differences in social work and teacher preparation programs and the salient differences in professionals in both disciplines: differences in ethics education, the use of person-first language, social justice versus rule orientation, and differences in curricula. Lastly, chapter one will conclude with an example of these differences in practice.

Introduction

Having taken the opportunity to reflect on the study of morality and school leadership, the author believes it began during her adolescence when she wrote an essay titled “What is the Point?” in an attempt to understand what moral lesson she should be learning while serving an in school suspension. She wrote this essay while being “detained” all day in the school’s
Motivational Resource Center (MRC); however, the MRC was anything but motivating. In this essay, the author examined the ethics of school discipline present in our educational system in light of the apparent meaninglessness of this imposed discipline. She found myself wondering why school discipline could not be more beneficial to both the student and the community.

This interest in school improvement and teacher preparation is a result of the author’s experiences as a student in public education. Founded upon her personal experiences, including the aforementioned instance in the MRC, she was never able to fully understand how, in a system with such strict public scrutiny, one student could experience such a broad array of teachers with a dramatic variance in their interpersonal skills, empathy, and willingness to look beyond the surface of behavioral problems. Ultimately, as a result of her negative experiences in public education, she dropped out of high school and completed my high school education through an alternative education program.

After some reflection during graduate, the author realized that her positive and negative experiences in the school environment, including the varying relationships with her teachers and administrators, appeared to correlate with her attendance and performance issues. When she suffered adversity in her personal life, the school struggled to assist her with the issues resulting from these difficult personal experiences. Thus, she cannot be sure if her positive experiences in the school system would have been reversed if her personal circumstances had been different.

During a process of self-reflection, the author began to wonder how her negative educational experiences were influenced by external barriers and challenges to success, the ability of the teachers to address the difficulties she was facing in any meaningful way, or the personal characteristics of the teachers themselves. Perhaps it was not that the teachers were
cruel or unethical;\(^1\) rather, it may have been that the teachers, the school and the entire school community were unprepared to assist her in overcoming these external barriers to my learning.

As a result of the analysis of her personal experiences in public education and resulting failure to understand reasons for the educational system’s inability to recognize how her personal struggles impacted her success in education, she began to reflect on other aspects of her educational and professional experience, specifically her experience in the field of social work.

During her masters program in social work, she chose to work in an inner city middle school as a crisis intervention counselor where she worked with students addressing a variety of psychological, interpersonal, and/or academic problems. As an additional means to assist these students and decrease the number of out of school suspensions, the counseling office and administration implemented a separate room monitored by one or two crisis counselors for students to deescalate following a crisis or outburst. However as time progressed, much like her own personal background in education, the counseling office began to resemble a revolving door where the same students who were experiencing major life disruptions would return to the counseling office and de-escalation room due to classroom disruptions and other issues. The students that frequently returned to the counselors office, in many circumstances, did so because their personal difficulties made functioning in the traditional classroom impossible, leaving them with no other option than to either voluntarily visit or be sent to the counseling office.

\(^1\) The author believes that it would useful to describe an example of unethical treatment that I experienced while attending school in order to provide an instance of what she believe constitutes unethical behavior in education. This one example is not intended to be the most profound nor the mildest example of unethical behavior, but rather an example that is memorable while also protecting the author’s and other parties’ identities. While in elementary school the author struggled with a range of physical and emotional health problems. These problems, in combination with a fear of my teacher, led her to frequently visit the nurse’s office. In one such instance, the principal handed her a plastic bag and sent her back to the classroom where she was instructed to throw up in the bag while in the classroom among the other students. Upon returning to the classroom, the teacher instructed her to sit next to her with her plastic bag as a punishment rather than participating in a math-game classroom activity because she was “obviously too sick to participate.”
It was during this time that the author first compared the relational approach of many social workers to the often inconsistent interpersonal approaches taken by many of the school’s teachers. Further, she also began to compare the teachers’ conduct with the core principles and practices of the social work profession, which included, among other things, service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence.\(^2\) Once she entered into a doctoral program in Education Leadership, the author began to see many of these same differences appear in both the coursework and the perspectives expressed by my fellow graduate students. Early in her doctoral studies, she returned to social work textbooks in order to explore these differences more fully and to identify her “gut” feelings regarding these differences.

One of the first things she noticed was that there is a fundamental difference in the use and selection of language between social workers and educators. Based on the aforementioned personal and professional experiences, combined with her masters and doctorate coursework, she began to recognize core differences between her experiences with educators, who focused on rules, structure, compliance to policy, and punishment and her professional experiences as a social worker, which were often infused with ethical concepts, compassion, and empathy.

A review of the differences in teacher preparation and social work education programs revealed that, there is a wide discrepancy between both in the areas of ethics education, curriculum characteristics, and the personal characteristics of pre-professionals. For example, in teacher preparation references to ethics are often focused on the teacher’s legal responsibility to report issues such as child abuse. Whereas in social work, ethics is related to the professional values that all social work students are expected to adhere to. Table 1.1 reviews the fundamental

\(^2\) For additional information on the core principles of social work see chapter two of this manuscript or the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics at www.socialworkers.org.
differences in teacher preparation and social work based on the author’s aforementioned experiences. To provide a clearer understanding of these comparisons, the remainder of chapter one will further elaborate on these perceived differences by category, beginning with the differences in ethics education.

Table 1.1
*Differences in Teacher Preparation and Social Work Education Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Social Work Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education</td>
<td>Legal focus with limited discussion of ethical principles</td>
<td>Saturated with discussion of ethical principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Characteristics</td>
<td>Education courses focus on pedagogical skills with little focus on self-reflection or emotional development</td>
<td>Education focuses on developing emotional and interpersonal skills with a strong focus on self-awareness and congruence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics of Pre-professionals</td>
<td>Breadth of character traits and motivations with clear division between the personal and professional spheres</td>
<td>Homogenous political social goals and agendas with congruency between personal and professional spheres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethics Education**

One of the major differences between teacher preparation and social work programs that the author perceived is how both programs address ethics education, which served as a starting point for her exploration of the differences between these two programs. During her experience in both a masters program in social work and professional social work practice, there was an extensive discourse about ethics in our both contexts. The pre-service training during her masters program and her experiences working in the social work profession were laden with ethical terminology and discussions. However, her observations of teacher preparation training, based
on her experience as a teaching assistant and the professional practice of teaching, have demonstrated a limited discussion of ethics in both the coursework and among peers.

In social work preparation, our study of ethics was not contained solely in one course; but rather, discussions of ethics remained commonplace in the majority of the coursework. The focus of the ethical discussions was primarily upon applied ethics, rather than on theoretical and philosophical concerns. Further, while working in the profession, the author was often exposed to discussions of the regulatory code of ethics, as well as possible ethical dilemmas and the application of the code of ethics to these dilemmas.

On the contrary, based upon the author’s experience, educators at the undergraduate level rarely use the language of ethics, including terms and phrases such as “ethical dilemmas” or “code of ethics.” This is not surprising, considering that social work has a universal regulatory code of ethics and requires that all students are familiar with this code, whereas, education does not have a similar requirement. However, it is possible that teacher preparation students receive training in applied ethics without necessarily incorporating formal ethical language and courses in ethics; thus, this study will further examine this assumption.

**Person-First Language**

Another difference that the author noticed between teacher preparation and social work programs is the universal focus and use of person-first language in social work programs as compared with the inconsistent and often absent use of person-first language in the author’s experience with a teacher preparation program. Although curriculum characteristics and personal characteristics are distinct categories, many of the observed differences between these categories overlap; therefore, before discussing the discrete differences present in the professions in these categories, the overlapping differences will be discussed together. The importance of adhering to
person-first language when communicating with others was embedded in the author’s educational and professional experience in social work. Similarly, this same conversational style is present in the personal conduct of social workers, whereas teachers and undergraduate teacher preparation students do not appear to use person-first language in either the curriculum or in their personal conduct. Although to a limited degree, and to a far less extent compared to the social work profession, there is some discussion about the use of person-first language in special education (Russell, 2008). However, the majority of the discussion in education is related to the concept of person-first planning rather than the use of person-first language (Mazzotti, Kelley, & Coco, 2013; Artesani & Maller, 1998; Miner & Bates, 1997).

Essentially, the term “person-first language” refers to the order in which the speaker identifies the individual and the characteristics that are used to describe an individual. For example, from a “person-first” orientation, Shelly is a student who is diagnosed with a mental health disorder. However, from a non-person first orientation, Shelly is emotionally disturbed. Essentially, in the first example Shelly is a person first, a unique individual, and she is not defined solely by her mental health diagnosis. This perspective allows an individual to be defined by their own individuality, rather than the categories or labels that are merely characteristics of a person.

The concept of person-first language can be further understood by looking at the study of ontology, a branch of philosophy that deals with questions concerning what entities, or something that has a unique separate existence, exist and how these entities are grouped in reality. Therefore, what defines a human being, from a non-person-first orientation assumes that

---

3 Person-centered planning is terminology used in the field of intellectual and developmental disabilities to refer to a process to develop collaborative supports and references concepts such as positive relationships and respect for the individual. For additional information on person-centered planning in education see Wells & Sheehey (2012). Person-centered planning: Strategies to encourage participation and facilitate communication, *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 44(3), 32-39.
a person’s entity, or being, is defined by the adjectives and labels assigned by society. Social work suggests, rather, that from an ontological lens a person is not defined by the adjectives used to describe them; rather, they are defined by their own uniqueness and entity as a human being. Shelly is a human being, an entity by herself, and is not defined by her mental illness.

During the author’s social work training, person-first language was reinforced in both the course content and class discussion. Further, the use of person-first language was also enforced in several of her classes through the receipt of a failing grade if the student did not adhere to person-first language in course assignments. Although the use of person-first language dominated the author’s social work coursework and textbooks, the discourse is noticeably different in education.

During the author’s work experience in public education and her coursework in Educational Leadership, she never heard anyone mention the term or reference the concept of “person-first language.” More importantly, she rarely heard discussions where educators used person-first language when referring to students. For instance, the majority of the policies and rhetoric incorporate non-person first language, as students are commonly classified according to ability level. Some of the most common terms the author has encountered are: “gifted student,” “disabled,” “emotionally disturbed or mentally disabled,” “grade level,” “fifth grader,” and “traditional” or “non-traditional students.”

It is the author’s belief that what appears to be a subtle ordering of words is in reality an empowering, or in many cases disempowering, influence on students’ self-perceptions and the teachers’ perceptions of their students. For example, consider the consequences of the following discourses on the teachers’ perceptions of Shelly as well as Shelly’s own personal identity: “Shelly is gifted and a traditional student” as compared to “Shelly is non-traditional and
emotionally disturbed.” In the first example, Shelly’s non-person first description is positive and would tend to improve her self-esteem and self-perception while portraying her to others as successful and easy to deal with. Whereas the second approach undermines Shelly’s self-esteem and self-perception while creating immediate barriers and negative associations in the minds’ of those around her.

**Social Justice Orientation versus Rule Orientation**

Another key difference the author noticed between the two professions is their different approaches to change and social justice. While one profession envisions itself as an agent of change and encourages its practitioners to carefully consider the fairness of rules and to “be the deviant” when ethically necessary; the education profession has a strong rule and policy orientation. Social work, as a profession, begins from a perspective that focuses upon the concept of social justice. This same focus is present in the social work curriculum as well.

Social justice is generally a liberal perspective that seeks to increase equality and fairness in a variety of circumstances. For example, the social justice perspective is more concerned with fairness and access to educational opportunities than it is with providing the fullest opportunities to the classic conception of the “best” student. The social justice perspective places a great deal more emphasis on increasing fairness, access, and equality. This perspective is less concerned with the intent of authority and the impact of rules. Greater focus is placed upon the demands of equality, rather than the demands of the rules imposed by the governing authority.

Social work students are taught in their coursework and encouraged in their professional experiences to promote social justice, an ideal that is manifest in the code of ethics. For example, in a course titled “Organizational Theory,” the professor encouraged the class to “Be the deviant” in the future and passed out mementos encouraging change oriented behavior. This
perspective, as taught in the aforementioned course and as represented in the code of ethics, nurtures change-oriented students who look to improve their environment rather than accept it and work within it.

In the author’s personal experience, when she worked in the counseling department of an inner city school district, the school encouraged her to explore conventional solutions while the social work staff encouraged her to consider working outside the established parameters of authority when necessary. On the contrary, teacher preparation students are taught and education professionals typically adhere to a “rule orientation” perspective. This rule orientation perspective is essentially an approach to professional conduct, which places an overwhelming emphasis on rules, authority, and fairness.

For instance, often when teachers discuss ethics they are not talking from a philosophical, moral, or theoretical perspective, nor are they considering approaches to moral decision-making; rather they are most likely discussing their legal obligations in a variety of situations. One way this approach to ethics manifests itself is in discussions of mandated reporting of child abuse. In these discussions, the focus is primarily on the professional educator’s legal responsibility for reporting suspected child abuse; instead of the moral dilemmas and implications created by such conduct.

Another example of the rule orientation perspective can be commonly observed in the response of teachers to high stakes testing. Many teachers disagree with the concepts and rules imposed by No Child Left Behind,\(^4\) including the standards required to make Adequate Yearly

---

\(^4\) No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was an amendment made in 2001 to the Elementary Education and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) that was enacted to attempt to close the achievement gap in education by increasing various measures of accountability in schools.
Progress;\textsuperscript{5} even though they support the principle of educational improvement embodied in No Child Left Behind (Murnane & Papay, 2010). Unlike social workers, who are trained to change rules that they do not agree with or do not find fair, teachers are trained quite differently. Often teachers protest these standards without working to change them, while others teach to the test, and a few simply cheat.

**Differences Between Teacher Preparation and Social Work Curricula**

Further, from my experience there also appears to be a difference between the interpersonal skill training for pre-service social work students and pre-service teacher preparation students. Some of these differences in pre-service preparation most likely stem from the different challenges encountered by teachers and social workers as they navigate within their professional environments. Social workers often work with students individually or sometimes in small groups. In comparison, most teachers are prepared to work with larger groups of students. Social workers are trained through their coursework in a variety of techniques for effective and positive communication. In the author’s coursework and throughout the program generally, she learned a broad range of interpersonal skills and approaches. One technique taught in her social work program was the concept of positive communication, which is where the professional utilizes verbal and nonverbal conduct to ensure that their message carries a positive impact. We have all had the experience where someone has told us something positive; however, based on their body language, choice of words, and other verbal and nonverbal cues, we are aware that their positive message does not match up with their actual position or opinion.

One additional example of the techniques that the author learned was to avoid using questions that begin with “why.” Social workers are taught to avoid “why questions” because

\textsuperscript{5} Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) is terminology used in NCLB that is used to describe whether a school is academically successful based on the results of standardized tests.
often questions phrased in this manner can inadvertently carry a negative connotation. For example, if a child enters the classroom and the teacher asks, “Why were you in the hallway?” which may be a perfectly innocent question, may still sound accusatory in nature. Whereas, if the teacher said to the student, “I noticed that you were in the hallway, did you have somewhere else that you needed to be?” it is difficult for this very same question to be understood in a negative or accusatory manner. Although many educators display excellent interpersonal skills, there is very little, if any, focus on training pre-service teachers to conduct positive interpersonal communications with parents, students, or other colleagues. Thus, if a teacher possesses interpersonal skills then there is not an issue; although, those that could use training to improve their interpersonal skills are left without that training and must obtain those skills on their own, if they are even aware of their lack of interpersonal skills.

Examples in Practice – Rationale and Problem Statement

Before progressing any further in this dissertation, this section will briefly review several examples of the types of ethical situations teachers have faced in the classroom and some improper responses to these circumstances. To an extent, the author’s familiarity with and review of these situations inspired her search for a way to improve the preparation of teachers to handle the complex and morally laden classroom situations that they will inevitably face. In 1994, a teacher was terminated from her position for making racially insensitive comments to African American students (Teacher Tenure Appeal 15-94). Another teacher was terminated in 1995 because he called a student a “slut” and accused her of being a prostitute (Bovino v. Indiana Area School District, 1987). In another case a male teacher lost his position when he threw a young student on the floor, then picked the student up and proceeded to throw him into the wall and then into some furniture (Landi v. West Chester Area School District, 1976).
2010, there have been 307 disciplinary actions taken against teachers by the Pennsylvania Professional Practices and Standards Commission (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2008).

Over this period of time, there have been 27 public reprimands, 68 suspensions of varying lengths, 71 licenses revoked, and 141 licenses have been surrendered in lieu of discipline. To put these numbers in perspective, this means that over two years, at least one teacher in over 60% of Pennsylvania school districts has been disciplined by the Pennsylvania Professional Practices and Standards Commission. Comparatively, over an 11 year period the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) reported nationwide a total of only 267 cases of ethics violations (Strom-Gottfried, 2000). In Pennsylvania alone there were more violations of the professional practice and standards in a two-year period than over 11 years in social work nationwide.

In their private lives, teachers have also engaged in conduct that has resulted in harm to students and the loss of their jobs, even licenses. For instance, teachers have lost their jobs and/or licenses for convictions of criminal assault, terroristic threats, criminal harassment, shoplifting, illegal gambling, DUls, and involuntary manslaughter. In another, more egregious circumstance, a teacher was terminated after being arrested and pleading guilty to charges after engaging in sexually explicit internet conversations with a police officer posing as a 14 year-old boy (Northeastern v. Northeastern Association of Special Education Teachers Grievance Arbitration, 2000).

These issues highlight the fact that in their professional practice, teachers face a broad range of ethical dilemmas each day. Bullough (2011) echoes this reality by stating that teachers face conflicts among competing values, norms, and beliefs over their approach to their
professional conduct, personal conduct, and interaction with their students each school day. Teachers find themselves “embedded in a world of uncertainty and of hard choices, where what a teacher does and how he or she thinks is morally laden” (Bullough, 2011, p. 27).

Bullough argues that even today too few teachers possess “a rich moral vocabulary” or understand specific moral concepts (Bullough, 2011, p. 28). It falls upon teacher preparation programs to prepare “novice teachers to competently handle the moral judgments and decisions inherent in teaching” (Yost, 1997, p. 281). Several studies have demonstrated that teacher preparation programs fail to provide teachers with the tools to address and handle these issues. (Yost, 1997; Goodlad, 1994; Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Sirotnick, 1990).

According to Yost, these studies have demonstrated that teacher preparation programs continue to fall short when it comes to imparting upon future educators the “necessary knowledge, thinking, skills, and insight to provide a quality education for all students” (Yost, 1997, p. 281). This same position is echoed by Bullough 14 years later, suggesting that there remains a great deal of progress to be made in teacher preparation (Bullough, 2011). By the very nature of their profession, teachers face many difficult ethical decisions throughout their careers; however, until recently there has been very little professional focus and effort placed on developing this base of knowledge.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature

In an effort to provide a foundation for this research study, this literature review will examine the current research regarding the moral reasoning abilities of students in teacher preparation and several other professions in order to determine whether or not current research provides any insight into the moral reasoning strategies used by these students. After discussing the status of the literature regarding the moral reasoning of teacher preparation students, this study next examines the literature regarding the ethical education of these future professionals. The dissertation will then continue by briefly reviewing the history of the social work and teaching professions, as the unique histories of these professions foreshadow the development of the curriculum differences and personal differences discussed in the introduction.

It is the author’s belief that these distinct histories may influence the likelihood that individuals with particular value orientations will enter the profession. Further, the history of these professions also likely influences the adopted philosophies and the curriculum utilized in the preparation of future professionals. One of the key differences in the design of these programs is in the area of ethics education. Social work is embedded with ethics education and a universal regulatory code of ethics to guide practice; whereas, the profession of teacher preparation does not have a universal regulatory code of ethics governing its practitioners. The author believe that the specific training of social workers, including ethics education with a formal code of ethics, an emphasis on self-reflection, and interpersonal skill training assists in developing the social work students’ process of moral reasoning and consequently improving their ability to reason logically through ethical dilemmas.
Next, this dissertation will discuss relevant philosophical examinations of ethics, beginning with the ancient philosophers, continuing on through several Enlightenment thinkers, and ending with a brief discussion of some modern ethical approaches to applied ethics in education. As mentioned, this author believes that a key difference in social work and teacher preparation programs is the focus on ethics education and moral decision making and that these differences have an impact on both the personal characteristics and the curriculum differences discussed in Chapter one.

This dissertation engages in a broad analysis of the historical philosophical study of morality and moral decision-making, because all too often the literature in education focuses on current ideas of moral reasoning, but excludes the actual concept of morality and how it has developed over time. The literature often discusses morality without defining what is moral; thus, the author believes that it is important to engage in an examination of how philosophers have historically answered this question.

Finally this dissertation will continue with an examination of the preparation, continuing education, and guidance provided to these professionals. Included in this review will be a description of the various codes of ethics applicable to or associated with these professions in order to paint a picture of the principles and values that guide professional practice.
Moral Reasoning of Teacher Preparation Students

Several studies conducted from the late 1980s to early 2000 indicate that principled moral reasoning among pre-service teacher preparation students is lower than that of college students majoring in other disciplines (Lampe, 1994; McNeel, 1994; Yeazell & Johnson, 1988; Cummings, Dyas, Maddux, & Kochman, 2001). In addition, some studies have shown significant decreases in teacher preparation students’ moral reasoning from year one to year four while enrolled in a teacher preparation program (Lampe, 1994; McNeel, 1994); however, a study conducted by Cummings et al. (2001) did not find a decrease in teacher preparation students’ levels of moral reasoning throughout the duration of their program.

Nearly all of the aforementioned studies measured moral reasoning of college students using the Defining Issues Test (DIT). This assessment, developed by Rest (1979) is based on Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development and analyzes moral judgment using a group scored multiple-choice procedure (Rest & Narvaez, 1994). The DIT has been used in over 40 countries, and is used in approximately 150 new studies every year (Rest & Narvaez, 1994).

In general, a statistically significant relationship has been found between moral judgment and behavior; however, the relationship has usually been found to be small, indicating that determinants other than moral judgment interact simultaneously to influence behavior (Cummings et al., 2001). According to Rest & Narvaez (1994) morality is a multifaceted phenomenon that may include other determinants such as moral sensitivity, moral motivation, and moral character (p. 22).

The moral reasoning of pre-service teachers is of concern to researchers because many of these pre-service teachers will find themselves in professional roles where they will need to
make many decisions that may have a dramatic impact upon their students. If pre-service teachers are engaging in moral reasoning at a lower level than society desires, and there is no educational intervention, then it falls upon the individual alone to seek out ethical knowledge that will improve his or her moral reasoning. In fact, Chang (1994) found that most teachers reason at the “conventional level” (p. 72).

Research has found that teachers with higher levels of moral reasoning consider more viewpoints than those who have lower levels of moral reasoning (Chang, 1994). Thus, educational intervention that improves moral reasoning will increase teacher tolerance and make them more understanding of, and responsive to, socially defiant behaviors and “behaviors against social conventions” (Chang, 1994 p. 74). Teachers who have lower levels of moral reasoning tend to be more rules oriented, which helps students understand rules; however, it does not help young teachers adapt to the complex environment of the classroom (Chang, 1994).

In many schools of education, pre-service teachers have been prepared through a method akin to “filling a large handbag with discrete bits and pieces of know-how” (Goodlad, 1990, p. 225). This often leaves prospective teachers unprepared to reflect on their teaching and engage in self-improvement (Goodlad, 1990). Rarely is ethics “a major component in the preparation of future teachers who will undoubtedly face numerous situations where they must make ethical decisions” (Cartledge, Tillman, & Johnson, 2001, p. 25-26). This lack of preparation leaves many teachers unprepared to respond to many of the difficult ethical situations they will encounter throughout their careers, harming both the teacher and their students.
Brief Summary of Select Philosophical Examinations of Ethics

Philosophers have been debating the meaning of ethics and morality since at least the time of Plato and Aristotle and the debate continues to this day. Over time the perspectives and approaches to determining whether or not an act is ethical has changed dramatically. In order to frame later discussions and to provide background for the discussion of the code of ethics and determining ethical conduct, the author will briefly summarize some of the core philosophical concepts defining ethical conduct. Many of these ideas are manifest in our modern understanding of ethical and moral conduct; therefore, this review will provide us with a basic understanding of some of the foundational moral and ethical constructs of western society.

**Ancient Philosophers.** For Plato, ethics and justice are deeply related (Plato, 380 BC; Mackenzie, 1985). The just, or moral, action can be known objectively, but these cannot be known by the senses, but must be known through philosophical consideration (Plato, 380 BC). Through the myth of the Cave, Plato describes how through intellectual consideration and analysis we rise above the misperceptions of the natural world to understand the truths that are hidden from our ordinary senses (Plato, 380 BC).

Through the knowledge of these “forms,” the philosopher knows what the just actions are. Although the just action is knowable and the same for all, it is not necessarily obvious, as demonstrated by the discussion between Cephalus and Socrates in Book I of the Republic (Plato, 380 BC, 331). There, Cephalus suggests that justice is always done by returning what you owe to another; however, Plato responds by providing a counter example where this is not so (Plato, 380 BC, p. 331). This example is in line with the concepts presented in Book VII regarding the metaphor of the cave, where most people see the shadows of the forms outside the cave and not
the forms itself, here Plato uses philosophic inquiry to cast light upon the form of justice and moral conduct (Plato, 380 BC).

For Plato, moral or just conduct is based upon an absolute and knowable standard, even if the standard is only knowable by the philosophers (Plato, 380 BC). This is an absolutist position, as Plato argues for a universally true morality that is applicable to all, without regard to any personal or cultural considerations or perspectives.

Aristotle argued that morality is virtue, which is attaining the appropriate balance of feeling and actions (Aristotle, 350 BC). Similar to Plato, Aristotle’s moral conduct is absolute, as “we are noble in only one way, but bad in all sorts of ways” (Aristotle, 350 BC). Virtue is not always doing the same thing; it is repeatedly doing the right thing, which changes based upon the circumstances (Aristotle, 350 BC).

Although Aristotle rejected the concept of Plato’s forms, he still held to a philosophical concept of ethics that valued an ideal that the virtuous (moral) person ascribes to achieve (Aristotle, 350 BC). Further, when we examine the virtue of justice, Aristotle specifically rejects the idea that what is just changes from place to place, from city to city, as that which is just is more than that which is simply legal (Aristotle, 350 BC). For Aristotle, there is a natural order of justice, just like something that burns in Athens would burn in Sparta, what is unjust in Athens would also be unjust in Sparta.

Essentially, Aristotle’s virtuous person is one who achieves “happiness” or, more appropriately described, is one who “flourishes” (Aristotle, 350 BC). For Aristotle, people should seek to do what they are meant to do and to do it well (Aristotle, 350 BC). Individuals who pursue virtue and act in a virtuous manner will be happy, as for Aristotle; one’s happiness is determined by one’s character and integrity (Aristotle, 350 BC). Aristotelian ethics can be
accurately summarized as feeling the passions “at the right times, with reference to the right object, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right way” (Aristotle, 350 BC, Bergman, 2007, p. 75).

The Enlightenment Thinkers. As time progressed, philosophers began to revisit and reconsider the definition of ethical behavior. Some took the consideration of ethical behavior to extremes, as Hobbes appeared to be completely unconcerned with the concept of ethical conduct (Hobbes, 1651). Human beings were violent creatures intent upon subjecting one another to their own dominion, “every man is enemy to every man” (Hobbes, 1651, p. 632). However, like Plato and Aristotle before him, his conception of human conduct was based upon a universal concept, the Law of Nature (Hobbes, 1651).

In nature, humans have the right to do whatever they chose to do, until they entered into a contract with others to establish a government to protect the security of their lives (Hobbes, 1651). The Law of Nature leads humans to enter into governments, as it requires that because there is no hope for peace among people, each person must endeavor to use whatever means they have to preserve their own lives, which gives each person a right to everything in the world, including the body of every other person (Hobbes, 1651). The question considered is not how people can behave ethically, but instead, it is how to restrain the brutal, natural conduct of human beings.

John Locke also approached his philosophical analysis of morality from the perspective of the Law of Nature; however, his Law was not very similar to that of Hobbes (Locke, 1689). Again, like those discussed before, Locke began his philosophical inquiry from an absolutist perspective, as he argued that human beings in their natural state were governed by a knowable universal law (Locke, 1689). First, Locke believed that all persons were “equal and independent”
and should not “harm one another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions” (Locke, 1689, p. 742).

However, unlike Plato, Locke’s concept of the natural law, which governed natural human conduct, was knowable to “all mankind who will but consult it” (Locke, 1689, p.742). Thus, although the source of the ideal human conduct is absolute, it is now available to all, rather than just an elite class or portion of society. Further, for Locke, once human beings enter into society, the focus of moral conduct is found in the social contract, the set of rules that the society agrees to abide by (Locke, 1689). Even in the world before laws and government, there were ethical rules governing human conduct, which for Locke, were arrived at through reason (Locke, 1689).

Another Enlightenment thinker, Immanuel Kant, describes the moral or ethical action based upon the categorical imperative (Kant, 1797). Individuals should act in a manner that they would approve of the conduct becoming a universal law (Kant, 1797). Essentially, this means that an act or rule is moral and ethical if you would be willing to have it applied to everyone, including yourself. This categorical imperative requires that persons have dignity and must be treated as ends in themselves (Kant, 1797). The principle that persons are ends in themselves emerges from the categorical imperative and is thereby derived from pure reason (Kant, 1797). Now, we see that although morality still emerges from reason, it is now possible for all individuals to know the ethical course of action based upon their own reasoning. Further, now every individual in a society has an increased value and importance as compared to any prior point in history.

Moving into Modernity. Dewey, who was both a pedagogue and a philosopher, was a major proponent of pragmatism (Benson, 1974). Dewey argued that moral and ethical standards
are not absolute, finding that they are not exempt “from consideration of time and place—that is, from processes of change” (Dewey, 1948, p. xiii). For Dewey, fixed moral rules do not establish any sort of universal moral standard; rather, morality is a more pragmatic exercise (Dewey, 1936). Dewey believed that moral standards may be simply symbolic if they are only delivered to students through teaching; rather, moral standards must be understood through experience and the moral rules taught are only tools for moral action (Dewey, 1944).

Self-admittedly heavily influenced by Dewey, Kohlberg developed a theory of moral development that reflected “a blending of Piagetian structuralism with modern ethical formalism” (Eddy, 1988, p. 405; Kohlberg, 1975; Krebs and Denton, 2005). For Kohlberg, there are stages of moral reasoning through which individuals may progress, which can be summarized as pre conventional, conventional, and post conventional (Kohlberg, 1975; Mitchell, 2002). According to Kohlberg, there is also a difference between moral judgment and moral action, for example those who make ethical moral judgments still can fail to conduct themselves in an ethical manner (Kohlberg, 1975).

Kohlberg and Candee (1984) worked to create a model relating moral judgment to actual moral behavior. Essentially, the more mature that a person’s understanding of why a particular choice is moral, the more likely they are to make the moral choice (Colby and Kohlberg, 1987; Krebs and Denton, 2005). However, there is a three-step process to making moral judgments where the person must first determine the right course of action, then they must decide if “they are responsible for the moral course of action,” and finally they must “muster the wherewithal to carry it out” (Kohlberg and Candee, 1984; Krebs and Denton, 2005, p. 631).

Carol Gilligan, a student of Kohlberg’s, questioned some tenets of Kohlberg’s moral theory (Gilligan, 1977). Gilligan proposed a model of women’s morality based upon
relationships, which criticized Kohlberg’s model for generalizing men’s moral experience onto women (Gilligan, 1977). Similar to Kohlberg’s model, Gilligan’s model is also a stage theory of moral development; however, it is focused upon the experiences of women.

Gilligan argues that a woman’s morality emerges from a base in relationships rather than the individualistic and self-focused perspective common to men. Women approach morality from the perspective of an ethic of care, rather than justice, making their approach to morality more personal and based upon relationships and need. This moral system progresses through three stages and focuses on the progression from an egocentric moral perspective to an awareness and acceptance of the responsibility to the self and others and their interconnectedness (Gilligan, 1977).

Nel Noddings, argues for a caring orientation to moral education based upon an ethic of care, finding its foundation not in justice or fairness; but rather within relationship and interactions of “natural caring” rather than from an obligatory response (Noddings, 2002, p. 13). Noddings argues that caring for students is the primary purpose of education. The act of caring is relational, situated, shared, and can only occur when the one being “cared for” accepts the care (Noddings, 2003, p. 4). Within this perspective, Noddings believes that the traditional educational environment, for example, a lack of teacher continuity and an academic focus, must be reformed in order to optimize care and promote character education (Noddings, 2002).


**Conceptual Framework of Moral Reasoning**

After a review of the literature, this author identified three perspectives of moral reasoning that could be used as a lens to conduct research for this study. Similar to many other contemporary moral philosophers, this author will adhere to a combination theory rather than ascribing to any one particular orientation (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999). This method will enable the author to determine which reasoning strategies are the most appropriate as a means to describe the data for this study. There are three theories related to moral reasoning that will be used in this study: Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development (1975) based in a justice orientation, Gilligan’s (1977) approach to moral decision making based in an ethic of care, and Shapiro & Stefkovich (2001) multi-paradigm approach towards ethical decision making based in the ethic of care, critique, justice, and the profession.

A seminal theory of moral reasoning, as previously mentioned earlier in this dissertation is Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development. Kohlberg, building on Piaget’s stages of cognitive development (Piaget, 1932) adopted a definitive six-stage model of moral reasoning. This six-stage approach conceptualized moral reasoning as a cognitive process of decision making residing within the individual rather than a process of solely learning societal norms (Kohlberg, 1975).

Kohlberg’s conceptualizes moral reasoning into six cognitive developmental stages which include: 1) obedience orientation, 2) morality of instrumental egoism and simple exchange, 3) morality of interpersonal concordance, 4) morality of law and duty to social order, 5) morality of consensus building, and 6) morality of non-arbitrary social cooperation. These
stages, according to Kohlberg, are sequential with stage one representing the lowest level of
moral development and stage six as the highest level.

In response to some of the criticisms of Kohlberg’s theory, James Rest, Darcia Narvaez,
Muriel Bebeau, and Stephen Thoma, as part of the Center for the Study of Ethical Development
at the University of Minnesota, devised the Neo-Kohlbergian Approach to Morality Research
(1999). Although the author is not going to discuss this approach in this study, she believes that
it is important to note that criticisms of Kohlberg exist and other researchers have modified the
theory.

In lieu of definitive stages of moral development, the Neo-Kohlbergian approach
developed schemas rather than stages of moral development to acknowledge that development is
not a hierarchal process but rather a “change in frequency…moving from the less to the more
complex” (Rest, Narvaez, Thoma & Bebeau 2000, p. 384). Rather than a six-stage model, the
Neo-Kohlbergian approach is organized into three schemas of moral development including: 1)
personal interest schema (derived from Kohlberg’s stage two and three); 2) maintaining norms
schema (derived from Kohlberg’s stage four); and 3) post conventional schema (Kohlberg’s
stage five and six).

Prior to Kohlberg’s theory, most moral philosophers believed that moral decision-making
was a direct result of being socialized into a particular culture’s norms, beliefs, and values. This
perspective, stemming from the popularity of behaviorism predominant at the time, assumed that
moral decision-making was a learned behavior more than a process of decision-making (Rest &
Narvaez, 1994). Kohlberg’s theory transitioned the focus of morality from socialization to a
process of decision making or moral reasoning; however, following decades of research showing
a moderate correlation between moral reasoning and moral behavior it was determined that there
are other factors that influence one’s moral behavior beyond one’s ability to reason through ethical decisions (Rest & Narvaez, 1994).

Rest and Narvaez (1994) recognized that morality is a multifaceted phenomenon of study and developed The Four Psychological Components of Determining Moral Behavior Model. This model divides morality into four components including: 1) moral sensitivity (awareness of how actions affect other people); 2) moral judgment (when a person judges which decision is morally justifiable; 3) moral motivation (the importance of moral values) and 4) moral character (courage, toughness, strength). According to Rest, based on 25 years of studying moral reasoning and behavior, moral behavior is influenced by all of the above factors rather than solely a process of cognitive decision-making.

In addition other frameworks used to assess moral reasoning strategies; this study also incorporates the Shapiro & Stefkovich framework for ethical decision making into its analysis (2001). This framework uses a multiple paradigm approach towards ethical decision making comprised of: the ethic of care, the ethic of critique, the ethic of justice, and the ethic of profession (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001). This approach is used to assess and identify the students’ approaches to moral reasoning.

The following paragraphs will provide a brief introduction to these paradigms. However, these concepts, such as justice, are far more complex than are presented here and these descriptions are only intended to serve as an introduction to a complex phenomenon. Further, although these paradigms are discussed separately, in many instances, individuals will reason from a combination of paradigms rather than from strictly one approach. Therefore, a multi-paradigm approach, rather, is a starting point for discussion and analysis of moral reasoning.
The ethic of care is relational and focuses on values such as compassion, empathy, and kindness (Gilligan, 1977; Noddings, 2002). Individuals who approach ethical decisions from this paradigm may take into consideration questions such as, how will my decision impact another’s wellbeing? and how will my decision make someone feel? In addition to the ethic of care, the Shapiro and Stefkovich framework also identifies another paradigm of ethical decision making, the ethic of justice, which is based in concepts such as fairness, law, and policy (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001). An individual approaching decisions from this paradigm may consider questions such as, how does the law and policy inform my decision? and how can I choose the outcome that is fair and just for everyone involved?

Beyond the ethic of justice, the paradigm also includes the ethic of critique, which is based in concepts such as power and privilege. Therefore, an individual approaching decision making from this paradigm may consider questions such as, “Does my decision disenfranchise individuals from a particular group (such as race or gender) while privileging another group?,” “Does my decision silence any particular group of people?,” and “Did my decision involve everyone’s voice or were particular voices silenced?”

Lastly, this framework adds an additional paradigm, the ethic of the profession. This paradigm incorporates elements such as professional codes of ethics, professional values, the community’s values, and the interplay between a person’s professional values and their own personal values. An individual approaching a decision from this paradigm may consider questions such as, “How are their own personal values in conflict with or aligned with the standards of their profession?,” “How do my community’s values relate to my own personal or professional values?,” and “How do I resolve a conflict between my personal values and the standards of my profession?”
Ethics Education in Professional Preparation

Ethics Education in Teacher Preparation

Although discussions about the role of ethics in education started much earlier, with authors such as John Dewey, discussions about ethics education in teacher preparation programs did not begin until the middle 1980s and continued extensively through the late 1990s (e.g. Starratt, 1991; Strike, 1988; Soltis, 1986; Watras, 1986; Beyer, 1991, 1997; Campbell, 1997). During the early 2000s, there was only limited discussion about ethics education in teacher preparation programs, although, in the last several years more work has begun to be published on the topic (e.g. Warnick & Silverman, 2011; Campbell, 2006).

There are few empirical studies that have specifically examined the effectiveness of ethical training programs in the field of education (Winston, 2007); rather, most articles review the various strategies that universities are currently using to incorporate ethics into the curriculum or the classroom. Within the literature a number of authors have argued for different strategies and combinations of individual components of ethics curriculum to integrate into professional programs of teacher preparation; whereas other studies just review the strategies that are currently in use. Among teacher preparation students, Cummings found that moral reasoning could be advanced by deliberate educational interventions, such as ethics courses and instruction (Cummings, Maddux, Richmond, & Cladianos, 2010).

These courses utilized dilemma discussion, and interestingly, this course used an online discussion forum, which was found to be beneficial to students’ ethical development. This study
also found that there was no real difference between the use of hypothetical rather than real dilemmas (Cummings, Maddux, Richmond, & Cladianos, 2010).

Several authors argue that teacher preparation programs should employ an applied ethics approach that uses case studies to engage students in reflection on realistic scenarios as a means to connect practical dilemmas to theory and moral principles (Campbell, 1997; Soltis, 1986; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011). Another strategy for incorporating ethics into teacher preparation is to include in ethics education courses the National Education Association Code of Ethics (NEA) (1975). The ethical code includes basic responsibilities and principles that all educators should follow. The majority of authors discourage using the code of ethics as the only topic of study in any ethics curriculum; however, some authors believe that it is effective as a foundation of ethical training (Soltis 1986; Watras, 1986). While Soltis (1986) recognizes the importance of learning about codes of ethics, he argues that knowledge of ethical codes is only one element of becoming an ethical professional.

Looking at other undergraduate pre-professional training, a study of students majoring in communications found that ethics education speeds up moral development (Canary, 2011). Essentially, communications majors who have taken an ethics course have more advanced moral development than others who have not taken an ethics course (Canary, 2011). These courses utilized instructional strategies that focused on realistic, practical situations, discussion of moral and ethical dilemmas, dialogue among the students, and discussion of students’ personal issues (Canary, 2011).

Other educational programs have explored the effectiveness of various approaches to ethics education. One study examined the teaching of professional ethics to medical students and found that the use of discussion groups was more effective than the formal teaching of ethics.
(Smith, Fryer-Edwards, Diekema, & Braddock, 2004). Another study examined the ethics education of nursing students and found that moral reasoning was higher among nursing students who took a course devoted to ethics rather than those who simply had ethics education interspersed into their regular coursework (Krawczyk, 1997). Additionally, this study also found that courses that were discussion-based were more effective than lecture-based courses (Krawczyk, 1997).

In addition to codes of ethics, another approach to ethics education suggests using a rational approach of decision making as a component to ethics education. Warnick and Silverman (2011) build upon the case study approach by developing a nine-step framework to use when conducting a case study analysis. According to the authors, adhering to a procedural process will increase the objectivity of ethical decision making and will integrate the various components of ethical education, such as codes and theories, into the decision making process (Warnick & Silverman, 2011). Further, Soltis (1986) described an ethics course at Ohio State University that encouraged the use of “moral negotiation,” which refers to systematically weighing the relative consequences of any moral situation (p.3).

Similar to the use of a code of ethics in ethics education, several studies discuss incorporating a critical understanding of basic ethical theories, such as Plato, Kant, and Dewey as a component of ethical training (Soltis, 1986); however, none of these studies promote a solely academic approach in lieu of applied ethics. According to Soltis (1986), “There is no doubt that formalism of philosophical ethics can be useful for analyzing ethical situations once identified as such but ethical sensitivity to everyday situations usually is not what the teaching of philosophical ethics is about…it is not a practical enterprise” (p. 3).
Beyond the specific approaches to ethics education, other studies recommend integrating ethics throughout the entire curriculum rather than only discussing ethics within the context of one course. According to Beyer (1997) “teacher educators must prevent moral discourse from being sequestered in foundations courses and peripheral or irrelevant courses in educational psychology, curriculum, teaching, and to field experiences in schools and the community (p.250). The moral aspects of teacher preparation must be prevalent throughout all areas of teacher preparation, including courses in the sciences and the arts (Beyer, 1997).

**Ethics Education in Social Work Preparation**

The discussion of ethics and values in social work can be traced back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century; although, it was not until the mid 1970s that a “critical mass on social work ethics” began to appear (Reamer, 2002, p. 6). Since the middle of the 1980s, the study of ethics education in social work has erupted with literature covering a range of concepts such as the use of ethical dilemmas, ethical decision making, instructional techniques, strategies to protect clients’ rights, and ethics relating to risk management in professional practice (Reamer, 2002).

A study conducted in 2013 that surveyed a random sample of 1,215 licensed social workers and nurses in the United States found that 60.2% of social workers reported having professional ethics instruction in their academic coursework, as compared to 51.2% of nurses (Grady, et. al., 2013). This study found that the social workers generally had more ethics education overall as compared to nurses. Further, the social workers were more confident in their ability to make moral judgments and believed that ethics resources were more helpful (Grady, et. al. 2013).
The literature on ethics education in social work education is diverse and reviews a multitude of strategies for teaching ethics. Several articles argue that ethics education needs to be comprehensive and include a range of topics (Reamer, 2002; Lewis, 1987; Faith & Muzzin, 2001; Reid & Billups, 1986; and Linzer, 2001). Lewis argues that ethics education requires ethical teaching, highlighting the importance of modeling ethical behavior as an instructor of ethics (1987). Additionally, several authors stress the importance of including opportunities for students’ to assess values using ethical dilemmas and ethical frameworks of moral judgment in ethics courses (Reamer, 2002; Linzer, 2001).

In addition to assessing judgment in ethics education, other author’s encourage students to reflect on their own personal values (Reamer, 2002; Linzer, 2001) while other encourage self-reflection as it relates to interactions with clients and knowledge about public policy (Faith & Muzzin, 2001). Faith and Muzzin also encourage social work education programs to assist students to understand and explore the role that religion and spiritual values play in social work practice (Faith & Muzzin, 2001). Linzer has noted that the purpose of ethics courses should be expansive so as to enhance a student’s ability to explore and discover their own values and philosophical beliefs, the nature and function of these values, and the role of their values in both practice and policy (Faith & Muzzin, 2001).

The literature exploring the methods used to instill the values and ethics of the social work profession into social work preparation programs continues to explore various instructional techniques and curriculum topics to improve the delivery and retention of these lessons for students. For instance, Faith and Muzzin found that schools of social work need to examine their curricula in order to evaluate whether or not these programs are providing a comprehensive ethics education program to their students that meets the students’ future professional needs.
The methods used must continue to be expanded and improved to include techniques that promote moral reasoning skills and develop each student’s philosophy of helping by incorporating instructional strategies that make use of ethical decision making models.

Similarly, Banks suggests that ethics education needs to include a focus on inter-professional ethics in social work education (2010). Banks argues that inter-professional ethics is a new area of study belonging to the field of professional ethics that is based in the idea of “inter-professional working” (Banks, 2010, p. 281). This term is defined as “different professionals working closely together, with shared goals and perhaps with elements of interchangeability of roles” (Banks, 2010, p. 281). The study of ethics from this approach would require professors of ethics education to encourage students to “explore differences in power ascribed to particular professions and the impact of these on inter-professional practice” (Banks, 2010, p. 287). In many ways, the moral and ethical values of both the teacher preparation and social work professions have emerged from their historical foundations and development, which we explore in the following section.
The History of K-12 Teaching and Social Work Professions

Although this study does not intend to compare or contrast these two professions, it does intend to examine the preparation of future professionals to address moral dilemmas that occur in both practices. The historical development of both professions can shed light on the training regimen of pre-service professionals and provide an understanding of why these professions exist in their current manifestation. Further, the examination and discussion of the applicable codes of ethics also illuminates the ethical values and training presented to students, young professionals, and even those who have spent a lifetime in their profession. As a result, a brief review of these issues is relevant to this dissertation.

The History of Education

Education in the early American colonies originated from the Puritan belief that reading is a necessary skill for participating in religious observances (Watras, 2008). During this time, the British Parliament passed a series of acts requiring that every family provide religious training to their children. As literacy began to disseminate throughout the colonial communities, the accumulation of knowledge began to be seen as “fulfilling God’s design” and instilling a sense of life purpose (Watras, 2008 p. 27).

This sense of purpose varied according to the religious affiliation or geographical location throughout the American colonies (Watras, 2008). Additionally, during this time, conflict surrounded the debate over the role that government should play in education. Some people valued the belief that intellectual freedom and the pursuit of knowledge could only be achieved through government involvement in education; whereas, others argued that government
control would result in a restriction of free inquiry and limit the purpose of education to supporting the British government’s power over the colonies (Spring, 2001).

Additionally, settlement patterns heavily influenced the origin of the multiple competing philosophies of education in the colonies. Many of these conflicting viewpoints still exist today. Due to the widespread settlement patterns and the agrarian society that developed in the South, the establishment of a formal school system and the development of any communal activities was difficult to institute (Wagner, 2003). In comparison, the colonies in the north were more densely settled, permitting the earlier formation of an official system of schooling.

The early history of education in the United States is marked by varied beliefs about the purposes of schooling, which stemmed from a complex series of factors. These purposes were influenced by differences in settlement patterns, political conflicts surrounding the function of education, conflicts surrounding the role of religion in education, and cultural disputes regarding all aspects of education, including who should be educated and about what topics. Benjamin Franklin’s perspective illustrates the fundamental nature of this debate regarding education, as he argued for the use of education for self-improvement, for furthering the art of self-responsibility, and to use moral betterment as a means towards individual success (Wagner, 2003).

Not only did philosophies of early education differ, but there existed conflicts regarding who should be educated and for what purpose. Few early theorists in colonial America discussed educating females. Thomas Jefferson stated in 1818 that female education had “never been a subject of systematic contemplation” (Jefferson, 1818, p.1). Jefferson envisioned systems of education designed as “little republics” in which local citizens would provide for elementary schools to which “all the free children, including male and female, would be admitted without charge” (Jefferson, 1818, p. 1). Essentially, Jefferson viewed the purpose of education as a basic
preparation for citizenship. Another Revolutionary Era theorist, Benjamin Rush, believed that women should be educated in several subject areas, including American grammar, handwriting, astronomy, arithmetic, bookkeeping, history, travel, music, and Christianity (Wagner, 2003).

Therefore, the early history of education in the United States consisted of multiple theories of educational systems and what ultimately resulted was a range of visions and forms of schooling developed either locally or by small groups or individuals (Wagner, 2003). Native Americans, African Americans, and women were often excluded from schooling and what developed was a “patchwork array of educational institutions” with different philosophies of education (Wagner, 2003, p. 100). However, the institutions that developed did not focus on improving the conditions of these excluded groups.

The original establishment of formal schooling in the United States resulted from an array of varying purposes of education and beliefs regarding what should be included in the curriculum. These varying philosophies informed the classroom as the sets of principles that guided professional action varied greatly among teachers. These beliefs or value statements regarding the purposes of education would seem to greatly influence teacher behavior, as a teacher’s professional approach is connected to his or her beliefs about learning, students, knowledge, and what is worth knowing. Thus, the very nature of the creation of the institution of public education in the United States continues to inform the development of the profession, its practitioners, and the public’s expectations of the responsibilities of the education profession.

Due to the diverse range of philosophies of education present in the early United States, there was a multitude of beliefs addressing the proper approaches for classroom instruction. John Dewey, a progressive theorist believed in the importance of experience as a necessary component of education (Dewey, 1938). In comparison, Horace Mann, the first secretary of the
State Board of Education in Massachusetts, believed that education was “the great equalizer” of the conditions of men” and supported the structure of common state supported schools that were free, public, and controlled locally (Mann, 1848). As the demand for teachers increased in the early 18th century, more women entered the teaching profession and the character of the profession began to change (Waller, 1932). During this time, a distancing began to occur between the communities and the teachers, resulting in what was referred to at the time as an “impenetrable veil” between the teacher and the community (Waller, 1932, p. 49).

During the early part of the 20th century, professional teaching organizations, such as the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), were founded and began to pursue the process of professionalizing the teaching profession. In 1918, The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, appointed by the NEA, called for a high school curriculum designed to accommodate individual differences in scholastic ability. This commission developed a set of seven principles to guide the fundamental purposes of formal education, including: health; fundamental processes (writing, reading, oral and written expression, and math); worthy home membership (to ensure that the individual is a worthy member of a family); vocation; worthy use of leisure, and the development of ethical character (Department of the Interior Bureau of Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 1918).

The Development of the Social Work Profession

Like the profession of education, the social work profession emerged from decentralized roots that over time grew into a modern profession. According to one historian, the origin of social work can “be viewed as humanitarianism in search of a method” (Cohen, 1958, p. 5). Essentially, Cohen is stating that social work found its source in volunteerism and social service,
which eventually became a profession. The social work profession originated from volunteers and largely remained unpaid until the development of the settlement house movements. Many early social workers were women from the upper and middle class who chose to live in the poorer neighborhoods to aid in understanding their clients and the experience of the living poor.

In the early 1800s, the first private social welfare agencies were established; these early agencies would eventually develop into the modern social work profession. These agencies were largely religious groups and clergymen who sought to provide the poor with food and shelter. Essentially, the services provided by these agencies focused on humanitarianism and the promotion of general social welfare. However, in some cases these groups attempted to cure emotional or physical difficulties using religious practices, which were removed from the profession as it secularized and professionalized (Zastrow, 1992, p.3).

By the late 1800s, there were a large number of private social welfare organizations established in the United States (Zastrow, 1992). Found mainly in urban areas, these organizations provided home visitations and help for people who were poor and unemployed, physically and mentally impaired, and children who were orphaned (Zastrow, 1992).

Additionally, these workers, who were mainly women, were primarily responsible for visiting their clients, providing sympathy, and encouraging them to seek employment, if necessary (Zastrow, 1992). Although these early social workers sought to understand their clients and experience the realities of their lives, they still identified poverty as result of personal inadequacy and not an environmental or social issue (Zastrow, 1992).

The origin of modern social work practice, as we understand it today, emerged in the United States as a result of the industrial revolution. The influx of immigrants to urban cities resulted in an increase in social problems. It was during this time that Jane Addams, who is often
referred to as the founder of social work practice in the United States, started the Settlement House Movement in Chicago in 1889, although, settlement houses already existed in London (Polikoff, 1999). Addams founded Hull House in Chicago, which marked the start of the Settlement House Movement (Jane Addams Hull House Association, 2011).

According to Addams, the purpose of the Hull House was to create “a community of women whose main purpose was to provide social and educational opportunities for working class people, many of whom were immigrants living in the surrounding neighborhood” (Polikoff, 1999). The volunteers who worked at Hull House conducted extensive research about the local neighborhood in order to implement more appropriate services for its residents (Polikoff, 1999).

The Hull House Neighborhood, as it was eventually referred to, did not permit discrimination based upon race, language, or tradition within its walls. The Hull Houses would provide multicultural residents with free entertainment, presentations on current events, recreational clubs, classes in history, art, literature, and several other areas of study (Polikoff, 1999). Original settlement houses strived to be all-encompassing places of residence that addressed the whole person (Polikoff, 1999).

Many settlement house volunteers or workers were members of the middle or upper class and would choose to live in the poorer neighborhoods so they could share similar experiences with their clients. The original philosophy of the settlement house movement focused on environmental reform and ascribed to change techniques that are still prevalent in the social work profession today, such as social action, community organizing, and social group work. Interestingly, in addition to instigating change in the local neighborhoods, the settlement houses often participated in drafting legislation and organizing social policy (Zastrow, 1992).
The first social workers were paid for their services in the late 1800s and the first social work training programs were close to follow (Zastrow, 1992). By 1904, the first one-year social work program was offered by the New York Charity Organization Society. These early social work programs focused on environmental reform to address society’s social problems (Zastrow, 1992). Many of these early environmental reforms are still used today.

In 1917, the first handbook guiding the practice of social workers was published, which focused on how social workers should interact, diagnose, and treat their clients (Zastrow, 1992). During the remainder of the 1900s, social work continued to adopt influences from various theories that developed during this time, including Psychodynamic Theory and Sociological Theory (Zastrow, 1992).
Professional Codes of Ethics

Internationally, the literature in teacher preparation, social work, business, engineering, as well as other professions is inundated with discussion and debate surrounding the use of professional codes of ethics to inform practice (e.g. McKinney & Moore, 2008; Davis, 1991; Nelson-DiFranks, 2008; O’Neill & Bourke, 2010). According to Kopeikin-Brill (2001), “[c]odes of ethics are windows into a profession” (p. 223). Within the field of teacher preparation, there is a considerable amount of debate regarding the purpose of ethical codes. Currently there is no single code that applies to all teachers in the United States.

Warnick and Silverman (2011) state that codes of ethics “illuminate previously obscured moral dimensions of teaching practice” while also highlighting the importance of educational ethics to the practice of the profession (p. 274). Comparatively, Campbell believes that codes are not the end all solution to moral behavior; however, they are able to “contribute broadly and positively to a deeper examination of ethics in teaching, as long as its limitations are recognized (2000, p. 205). Further, Lovat argues that codes “can only assist in the overall growth and enhancement of the profession. Endorsement of such a code of conduct would signal a new maturity for the professions and bring it into line with other high status professions” (Lovat, 1998, p. 204).

Although there is considerable support for the use of a universal code of ethics for teacher preparation, the literature is also saturated with criticism of formal professional codes. Terhart (1998) discusses several criticisms of codes of ethics, such as the argument that as society and culture changes the codes risk losing their validity and may end up being used as
control instruments by school administrators. Further, codes have also been criticized for being “inadequate, bureaucratic, and legalistic” (Watras, 1986, p. 13).

As previously mentioned, the literature about ethical codes is not limited to the field of teacher preparation. A study conducted in 2008 determined that 90% of social workers had read their code of ethics (DiFranks, 2008). Further, this study concludes that most social workers agree with the principles of the NASW Code of Ethics and do not experience undue amounts of distress as a result of discrepancies between their own beliefs and the ethics prescribed by the NASW Code (DiFranks, 2008).

The profession of social work encompasses a universal code of ethics that guides the profession; however, the use of a universal code is still not without debate. Although Spano and Koenig (2008) support the general principles of the NASW Code of Ethics, they urge social workers to ask critical questions and analyze the code by seeking to understand who will gain or lose from a particular interpretation of the code. This is similar to the discourse that is occurring in the educational community, encouraging professionals to use the code as a foundation for professional standards and discussion about professional ethics.

**Examples of Code of Ethics: Teacher Professional Preparation**

Unlike the profession of social work, there is not universal code of ethics that applies to professionals or that is utilized in the education of future teachers. A 2009 review of education programs revealed that 9% of teacher preparation programs required a course in ethics, as compared to 71% in business, 60% of nursing, and 51% of social work (Glazner & Ream, 2007, p. 281). Many professional organizations in the field of education have adopted codes of ethics, including the Council for Exceptional Children, The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the National Education Association (NEA), and various state codes
of ethics. Despite the existence of these codes, ethics is rarely a major component of preparation of future teachers (Cartledge, Tillman, & Johnson, 2001) nor is compliance with any particular code universally mandated.

**Code of Ethics of the Council for Exceptional Children.** The Council for Exceptional Children adopted a code of ethics in 1983, comprising eight principles (See Appendix A). First, this code requires that the teacher be committed to developing the highest educational and quality of life potential for exceptional individuals. Under this code, special education professionals must promote and maintain a high level of competence and integrity in practicing their profession.

Third, special education professionals engage in professional activities that benefit exceptional individuals, their families, other colleagues, students, or research subjects. They should also strive to enhance their knowledge and skills regarding the education of exceptional individuals. In accordance with their responsibilities toward exceptional individuals, the professional should work to uphold and improve the laws, regulations, and policies governing the delivery of special education, related services, and the practice of their profession. Finally, they should not condone or participate in illegal or unethical acts or violate the professional standards adopted by the Council of Education.

**National Education Association Code of Ethics.** The NEA is the largest professional organization and largest labor union in the United States. In 1975 the NEA adopted a Code of Ethics that they believe should guide the profession of teaching (See Appendix B). The NEA Code of Ethics includes two principles, identified as (1) Commitment to the Student and (2) Commitment to the Profession. It states, “the educator strives to help each student realize his or her potential and effective membership of society. Therefore, the educator works to stimulate the
In fulfillment of the obligation to the student, the educator shall not:

“Unreasonably restrain the student from independent action in the pursuit of learning, shall not unreasonably deny the student’s access to varying points of view, shall not deliberately suppress or distort subject matter relevant to the student’s progress, shall make reasonable effort to protect the student from conditions harmful to learning or to health and safety, shall not intentionally expose the student to embarrassment or disparagement, shall not on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, marital status, political or religious beliefs, family, social, or cultural background, or sexual orientation, unfairly exclude any student from participating in any program, deny benefits to any student, grant any advantage to any student. Furthermore, the educator shall not use professional relationships with students for private advantage and not disclose information about students in the course of professional service unless disclosure serves a compelling professional purpose or is required by law” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle I).”

Regarding the second principle proposed by the NEA, educators are expected to “exert every effort to raise professional standards” and “to promote a climate that encourages the exercise of professional judgment” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II). The NEA Code of ethics also tasks professional educators “to achieve conditions that attract persons worthy of the trust to careers in education” and “to assist in preventing the practice of the profession by unqualified persons” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II). These two provisions appear to focus more on improving working conditions and protecting the profession than actual professional practice or the education of children.

In the fulfillment of their obligations to the profession, the NEA code provides that “the educator shall not, in an application for a professional position, deliberately make a false statement or fail to disclose a material fact related to competency and qualifications” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II). The NEA code also provides that educators are responsible for protecting the profession from interlopers and those that would falsify their
qualifications, providing that they “shall not assist any entry into the profession of a person known to be unqualified in respect to character, education, or other relevant attribute” and they shall not assist a non-educator in the unauthorized practice of teaching” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II).

The NEA code also prohibits educators from disclosing, “information about colleagues obtained through the course of professional service unless disclosure services a compelling professional purpose or is required by law” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II). The NEA code also enforces professional conduct toward other educators, requiring that educators “shall not knowingly make false or malicious statements about a colleague” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II). The code also addresses other practical professional matters, as it prohibits the acceptance of “any gratuity, gift, or favor that might impair or appear to influence professional decisions or actions” (National Education Association, 1975, Principle II).

**The Association of American Educators (AAE): Code of Ethics for Educators.** The AAE is a national nonprofit organization, established in 1944, that claims to be a non-partisan organization that focuses on student academic achievement (See Appendix C). The organization believes that:

“professional educators should belong to an organization that promotes their profession above personal gain. Strikes and boycotts are detrimental to students and to the reputation of teachers as professionals and keepers of the status quo in education are self-serving and misguided. We know that students learn differently so a one size fits all learning environment is counterintuitive” (Association of American Educators, 2013, Overview).

The AAE code is comprised of four principles (1) ethical conduct towards students; (2) ethical conduct towards practices and performance; (3) ethical conduct towards professional colleagues;
(4) ethical conduct towards parents and communities. The AAE code identifies teachers as “professionals of public trust” and recognizes the responsibility of maintaining a professional and ethical image in a position of public trust (AAE Code, 2013, Principle 1). The full text of this code has also been included in the appendices of this dissertation.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment. (Hereafter referred to as the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct or NAEYC code) this code is the educational code of ethics that is most similar to the NASW code compared to any other code that I reviewed in fields relating to teacher preparation (See Appendix D). This code is comprehensive, directive, and provides both detailed examples of behavior and the moral obligations of the education professional in early childhood education. Additionally, the NAEYC code includes a definitions section that explains to the reader the meaning of ethics, values, ethical dilemmas, codes of ethics, and morality (NAEYC Code of Ethics, 2005, p. 5).

This code is six pages and contains a preamble, identifies core values that are important to the profession, an adopted conceptual framework, ideals, and various sections and principles that direct the practice of professionals (NAEYC Code of Ethics, 2005). In addition to the code, there is a personal commitment statement that serves as a “personal acknowledgement of an individual’s willingness to embrace the distinctive value and moral obligations of the field of early childhood care and education” (NAEYC Code, 2005, p. 6). Further, this code adheres to an ecological perspective of professional practice, meaning the educator should simultaneously consider multiple levels of practice, including the individual level, the family level, and the school community level.
Principle 1.1 states, “above all, we shall do no harm to children. We shall not participate in practices that are emotionally damaging, physically harmful, disrespectful, degrading, dangerous, exploitative, or intimidating to children. This principle has precedence to over all others in this code” (NAEYC Code, 2005, p. 3). This statement serves as the foundational value of the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct. It is from this perspective that the remaining sections of the code discuss the ethical responsibilities of professionals educating young children with focus on responsibilities toward families, colleagues, community, and society (NAEYC, 2005).

State Codes of Ethics. In addition to nonprofit organizations, disciplines within education, unions, and many state departments of education are developing professional codes or standards in education, such as Alaska, Idaho, New Jersey, Texas, Alabama, New York, Nebraska, Arkansas, Mississippi, Michigan, Minnesota, Tennessee, Georgia, and Illinois. For example, the New York Department of Education adopted a code of ethics in 2002. This relatively short code of ethics, discusses principles relating to student wellbeing, commitment to the profession, respecting confidentiality, and advancement of the professional learning community.

The New York State Code of Ethics for Educators (See Appendix E) is a non-regulatory code of ethics, established in 2002, that is comprised of six principles of conduct. These principles are as follows: (1) Educators nurture the intellectual, physical, emotional, social, and civic potential of each student (New York State Code of Ethics for Educators, 2002, Principle One); (2) “Educators create, support, and maintain challenging learning environments for all” (New York State Code of Ethics for Educators, 2002, Principle Two); (3) “Educators commit to their own learning in order to develop their practice” (New York State Code of Ethics for Educators, 2002, Principle Three); (4) “Educators collaborate with colleagues and other
The code of ethics that is currently used to guide social work practice was developed in 1996 and was revised in 2008 (National Association of Social Workers, 1996). According to the NASW, the organization has “an obligation to articulate its basic values, ethical principles, and ethical standards” (NASW, 2008, Purpose of the NASW). The code serves six primary purposes (See Appendix F).

First, the code of ethics identifies the core values upon which the mission of the social work profession is based. The second purpose, which is essentially a corollary of the first, is that the code summarizes the broad ethical standards, which reflect the core values of the profession. These broad ethical standards are then used throughout the code to guide social work practice.

The third purpose of the code is to provide a framework for helping social workers identify relevant considerations when there is a conflict among their professional obligations or when other ethical uncertainties arise. The code also serves to assist in socializing new practitioners to the profession’s mission, values, ethical principles, and ethical standards. A fifth purpose of the code is geared toward the public and the clients specifically, as it seeks to provide a set of ethical standards to which the general public can hold the professional accountable.

Finally, along the same lines, the code articulates the standards that the social work profession itself can use to assess whether or not other professionals have engaged in unethical conduct. The NASW has formal procedures that are employed to adjudicate ethics complaints filed against its members. Social workers are obligated to cooperate in the implementation of the code, participate in adjudication proceedings, and abide by NASW disciplinary rulings and sanctions (NASW, 1996).
The Core Values of the Social Work Code of Ethics

The code defines six core values that serve as the cornerstones for social work practice: service, social justice, dignity and the worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence. The code provides an ethical principle for each core value, which is intended to provide an ideal standard of ethical behavior to aspire to.

Beyond each ethical principle is a detailed description of the expected behaviors of a social worker adhering to the code. For example, the profession of social work values social justice and the ethical principle underlying this value states that social workers challenge social conventions to increase social justice. Thus the ideal behaviors necessary to abide by this principle include pursuing social change, engaging in activities that seek to promote sensitivity, working to increase knowledge about oppression, culture, and diversity, and other similar behaviors.

In addition to the values and ethical principles of the profession, the code also reviews the ethical standards relevant to the practice of social work. These include: ethical responsibilities to clients and colleagues, practice settings, and broader society. Similar to the prior section of the code, within each ethical standard is a list of ethical behaviors that must be employed to meet the ethical standard. For example, social workers have the following ethical behaviors to their clients: commitment, self-determination, professional competence, cultural competence, and social diversity, in addition to several other ethical behaviors.
Contribution to the Literature

Most studies that have measured moral reasoning of college students have used the Defining Issues Test (DIT). Developed by Rest (1979) the DIT, based on Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development, analyzes moral judgment using a group scored multiple-choice procedure (Rest, 1994). The DIT has been used in over 40 countries, and is used in approximately 150 new studies every year (Rest, 1994).

Although the DIT provides valuable data to compare the levels of moral reasoning among a wide range of participants, few studies have examined moral reasoning of college students using solely qualitative methods. Johnson (1985, 1989) assessed moral reasoning of teachers using interviews and observational data; however, to this author’s knowledge there are no qualitative studies that have conducted a case study comparison of two programs of study. Further, there are no studies that have compared the moral reasoning, values, and ethics education of social work and teacher preparation students specifically. Further, there are no qualitative studies that examined how individual student’s values, ethics preparation, and program philosophies, influence a student’s level of moral reasoning.

Rather than generalizing to the entire population, this study will attempt to begin to delve deeper into the multi-complexity of moral reasoning in two programs, one in education and one in social work, to begin to understand how ethics education, curriculum, program philosophies, adherence to a code of ethics, and an individual’s values, interact to influence a student’s process of moral reasoning. Additionally, where this study contributes to the literature is to also begin to assess whether the relevancy of ethical dilemmas to an areas of study in ethics education influences the student’s process of moral reasoning.
CHAPTER 3
Research Methodology

Purposes of the study

The purposes of this exploratory case study are to: (1) to identify the core philosophies of social work and teacher preparation programs at one public, state-funded, rural university with approximately 6,000 students on the East coast (2) explore the similarities and differences between the values of each programs’ students and with the core philosophy of their respective program. (3) examine the formal ethics training of students in each program by their fourth year of undergraduate education. (4) and explain how students in teacher preparation and social work programs reason through moral dilemmas.

Context

This dissertation is based on an exploratory case study design to understand the influence that ethics education has on moral reasoning among fourth year students enrolled in a teacher preparation or social work program at “Bailey University” (Bailey University is a pseudonym) located on the East coast of the United States in a rural area with an approximate university enrollment of 5,300 students. For the remainder of this dissertation Bailey University will be referred to as BU. The researcher chose this location because the university has both an undergraduate social work and undergraduate teacher preparation program located on the same campus.

Most students enrolled at BU are of Caucasian decent 89% and 6% are African American (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The race/ethnicity of the community surrounding BU is
97.5% Caucasian, 1% African American, 0.7% Asian, and 0.4% Native American or Alaskan Native (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The median annual household income surrounding BU is $28,382. The student to faculty ratio at BU is 22:1 (U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

**Research Questions**

The research questions that guide this study are:

1) What are the core philosophies of the teacher preparation and social work programs at BU?
2) How do students’ values compare with the philosophies of the teacher preparation and social work programs at BU?
3) What type of formal training in ethics do students in teacher preparation and social work have by the start of their fourth year of undergraduate education at BU?
4) How do students in teacher preparation and social work reason through moral dilemmas at BU?

**Sample**

16 undergraduate students enrolled in either teacher preparation or social work at BU were interviewed for the study. This non-probability purposive sample included eight fourth year social work students and eight fourth year teacher preparation students. Tables 3.1 and 3.2 present the breakdown of student interviews by major in teacher preparation and social work.

In this study, all of the students had to meet the following criteria: (1) they were enrolled in either their fourth year of a teacher preparation or social work at the university selected for this study (2) they must have been eighteen years of age or older to participate. The application and the materials necessary for the study participants were obtained and approved through the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at the researcher’s university and the IRB at BU (See Appendix G).
Table 3.1: Majors of Students’ Enrolled Social Work Program

![Graph showing majors of students enrolled in Social Work Program. The graph indicates 7 students are majoring in Social Work, and 1 student is majoring in Social Work with a special education minor.]

Table 3.2: Number of Teacher Preparation Students by Major and Minor

![Graph showing the number of teacher preparation students by major and minor. The graph indicates:
- 3 students are pursuing Dual Certification in Early Childhood Education (Pre-K-4) and Special Education.
- 1 student is majoring in Dual Major in Secondary Education and Special Education.
- 2 students are majoring in Early Childhood Education (Pre-K-4).
- 1 student is majoring in Middle Education (4-8).
- 1 student is majoring in Physical Education.]
Researcher Bias

The author’s interest in ethics and moral decision-making is influenced by both her negative and positive experiences in education that had a meaningful impact as a student in the public school system. On several occasions, the author observed and personally experienced what she considered to be unethical behavior while a student in the public school system. These experiences fomented her interest in the values and behaviors of educators as they manifest in their conduct.

Attempting to exclude your personal goals and concerns from the design of your research is neither possible nor necessary (Maxwell, 2005). Traditionally, experiential knowledge is referred to as bias; however, it also serves as a valuable component of the research process (Maxwell, 2005). In qualitative research, the instrument is the researcher; therefore, the author believes that it is necessary to share the subjective experiences that influence her work.

Research Design

Because the process of moral decision-making and value adoption can be a complex phenomenon and is specific to each individual, it is appropriate to choose a qualitative research methodology for this study. Qualitative research methods aim to explore and understand the meaning an individual or a group assign to a particular phenomenon (Creswell, 2009, p. 4). This study aimed to explore and to understand the values, perceptions, and knowledge of teacher preparation and social work students regarding moral decision-making.

This research study was designed to explore and understand students’ ethical knowledge, perceptions, and values; therefore, a qualitative research study is the appropriate instrument for

---

4 For additional information about the author’s perceived bias, refer back to chapter one of this dissertation.
gathering the data. The benefit of this approach is that it allows the researcher to explore these issues as the primary instrument and places the responsibility for analyzing the data on the researcher (Merriam, 1988). Therefore, this approach is the most appropriate methodology for the research questions being examined by this dissertation while maximizing the researcher’s flexibility to properly explore these issues (Merriam, 1988).

Although the general characteristics of qualitative research are similar, there are different types of qualitative research that have evolved from various disciplines (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006). This study used an instrumental case study design, which is an examination of a “bounded system” to provide insight into a phenomenon or to redraw a generalization (Stake, 1994). A “bounded system” is an integrated system that exists in a specific time and space, which in this study, consisted of undergraduate students bounded to two programs of study at a particular university (Stake, 1994).

A case study methodology permitted the researcher to explore the entire bounded system, rather than focusing exclusively on the individual participants. This holistic approach of inquiry is congruent with the author’s constructivist worldview and background in community social work practice, which aims to consider the interaction between the person and their environment.

**Sampling**

Due to the nature of this study, purposeful sampling is the most appropriate choice for selecting participants (Maxwell, 2005). This sampling strategy allows the researcher to choose participants that have the particular characteristics that the researcher is interested in studying. This study utilized a purposive sample because explicit criterion was required to select a sample in order to explore a specific issue of importance (Merriam, 1998). In this case, the researcher studied fourth year students enrolled in teacher preparation and social work programs at BU.
The following criteria were used to select participants for the research study: eight students who were in their fourth year of teacher preparation and eight fourth year students who were enrolled in the undergraduate social work program at BU. The researcher elected to include fourth year students from each program in order to explore the students’ beliefs, values, and ethical knowledge after completing the majority of their undergraduate education. This qualitative purposeful sample provided the researcher with a sufficient amount of data to provide insight and yet at the same time remain manageable within the time constraints of a doctoral program.

The researcher chose 16 students, eight in each discipline, because that number was manageable for the timeline required to complete a dissertation. Thus, a key guideline for qualitative research, recommended that “sampling should be carried out to the point of saturation,” which is the approach utilized in this study. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 202). Further, the researcher’s review of the literature demonstrated that there is no specific number of participants to include in a qualitative research study; therefore, there are no specific recommendations for qualitative researchers regarding the number of participants to include in a sample (Morse, 2000).
Data Collection

Document Analysis

The first step in the process of data collection involved a document and artifact analysis of available course descriptions, department posters and brochures, and program information available on the web, including program mission statements, course descriptions, and graduation requirements. Documents, otherwise referred to as texts, are “crafted communications-visual, graphic, and electronic representations of language and objects” (Freebody, 2003, p.174). The purpose of conducting a document analysis is to code these records and documents for underlying philosophies, and information relating to the study of ethics and moral decision-making.

Interviews

Prior to conducting the interviews, the researcher piloted the interview with two other graduate students from the field of education and two other individuals with professional backgrounds to receive feedback and ensure that the data being collected were accurate for the purposes of this study. Once the researcher was satisfied with the interview protocol, the researcher emailed a recruitment email (Appendix H) to the department chairs in social work and in teacher preparation, and they proceeded to send the email to all students who met the participant criteria. In addition to the recruitment email, both department chairs scheduled an opportunity for the researcher to speak to all of the potential research participants before a weekly seminar class (See Appendix I for Dissertation Recruitment Handout). Students interested in participating provided the researcher with contact information and the interviews
were scheduled via email. Prior to conducting the interviews, the researcher obtained informed consent (See Appendix J). For their participation, students received a ten-dollar gift card to either Dunkin Donuts or a regional convenient store.

Qualitative research methods, including record and document analysis and interviewing, were the most appropriate methods of data collection for this study. Semi-structured interviews were used. This approach is particularly well suited for case study research and use pre-determined yet flexible questions (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006). These interviews invite interviewees to express themselves openly and freely and to define the world from their own perspectives, not solely from the perspective of the researcher (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

The interviews were conducted in a pre-determined location chosen by each participant to increase their comfort level. For example, interviews were conducted in the student lounge area at BU, at local restaurants, and in participants’ homes. The researcher allotted 45 minutes for each interview; however, the actual time varied from 15 to 90 minutes between the participants.

All interviews were recorded using a digital Sony Portable Audio Recorder, an advanced recording device that allowed the researcher to collect data in areas with a high level of background noise. An advantage of this recording method is that it is typically less obtrusive and provides opportunities for participants to directly share with the researcher.

**Interview Content**

The interview began with the participants completing a modified version of the Rokeach Value Survey (1973) (See Appendix K). Rather than completing this survey in its entirety, the researcher used the survey to provide examples of commonly held values in order to facilitate a
conversation. This survey has received widespread use and is considered the most widely used scale for measuring personal and social values (Braithwaite & Law, 1985).

**Modified Rokeach Assessment**

Following the completion of the modified Rokeach Survey, each student was asked to elaborate on the values they considered most important. The original Rokeach Survey (1973) was designed to measure the values individuals perceive to be significant in their lives. The survey instructed participants to rank order 18 terminal values and 18 instrumental values. This survey defined terminal values as the goals that a person hopes to achieve in their lifetime (Rokeach, 1973). Further, he defined instrumental values as those values that refer to modes of behavior undertaken to achieve terminal values (Rokeach, 1973).

Examples of terminal values are freedom, social recognition, world peace, friendship, and family security (Rokeach, 1973). Examples of instrumental values include: cleanliness, obedience, responsibility, self-control, cheerfulness, independence, and honesty (Rokeach, 1973). To distinguish between instrumental and terminal values, consider whether the value can be translated into a behavior. An instrumental value can translate into a behavior. For example, a person can behave cheerfully; however, a person cannot do the same for the value of family security.

Rather than having participants rank the values according to importance, this researcher modified the Rokeach Survey by instructing participants to place an “X” anywhere on a five-inch line. An “X” placed to the far left would be interpreted as values that the participant believed were less important, and an “X” placed to the far right corresponded to values that the participant perceived as more important. In this study, the Rokeach Value Assessment was modified for two reasons. First, the original survey instructed participants to rank order each set of values; this
method of ranking values would take considerable time and would not fit within the time allotted to conduct interviews. Second, since the dissertation is only using the Rokeach Survey to facilitate conversation about the participants’ values, it was deemed unnecessary to complete the survey in its entirety.

The discussion in the first section of the interviews consisted of questions relating to the modified version of the Rokeach Survey. Participants elaborated on the values that they identified as important or not very important according to their responses on the Rokeach survey. Following the discussion about the student’s values, the researcher asked questions relating to ethics education including: Have you already taken, or are you currently taking, a course in ethics? Was this course mandatory or an elective? Were you exposed to the topic of ethics in any of your other classes? If yes, what was the content of those lessons? How was the lesson instructed? Are you familiar with professional codes of ethics in your major of study (teacher preparation or social work)? If yes, can you describe any of the features of these codes? To review a detailed description of the interview protocol, see Appendix L.

After discussing the student’s knowledge and understanding of a code of ethics and exposure to ethical training, the researcher explored the participants’ processes of moral reasoning by reading two short ethical dilemmas, one specifically related to their area of practice and one more generalized. The researcher’s goal was to describe these students’ process of moral reasoning and to explain the different moral reasoning processes employed by these students. Each student was provided one dilemma more specific to their profession and one neutral dilemma (not based in their professional practice). This allowed the researcher to determine whether the students’ process of moral reasoning is influenced by the relevancy of the ethical
dilemma to their professional practice. For a detailed description of the moral dilemmas, see Appendix L.

Data Analysis

The process of analyzing the data occurred throughout the duration of the study and included several strategies discussed in the qualitative research literature. The researcher conducted a record and document analysis of relevant course materials that students’ mentioned in the interviews, department websites, and artifacts and signs displayed in the department areas on campus. The documents were analyzed according to themes and were then organized into excel spreadsheets coded by color.

In this proposed study, the researcher is primarily interested in understanding and exploring the complex phenomenon of moral decision-making, values, and beliefs. Triangulating the data sources, such as information stemming from students and course descriptions, provided the researcher with a more complete understanding of this complex phenomenon. The researcher is interested in multiple and conflicting voices and interacting interpretations; therefore, the review of documents is an important strategy for pursuing these questions (Hodder, 2000).

All of the researcher’s field notes and interviews were transcribed, reviewed by the researcher for errors, and coded according to themes. Coding involves organizing and categorizing the data (Maxwell, 2005). First, the researcher read through all of the interviews, writing notes in the margins to highlight preliminary themes. Further, the researcher had two other colleagues in education review two interview transcripts each, for member checking, to compare initial themes. Following this review, the researcher’s initial categories were entered into an excel spreadsheet and organized according to these themes. Initially, as a result of the
initial coding, five themes emerged from the data; these themes, including all supporting quotations, were entered into excel and coded according to color. The data were analyzed from multiple levels and included themes from (1) within the individual student interviews, (2) the comparison of interviews within each individual program, and (3) comparisons between the social work education and teacher preparation programs.

After the data were organized into themes in excel, the researcher conducted another review of the data and copied all of the themes and quotations onto large poster boards that were organized according to research question. This process allowed the researcher to see the data visually for longer periods of time, while also permitting analysis across research questions.

Validity

In order to increase the internal validity of this research study the researcher implemented several strategies. Qualitative validity means that the researcher uses certain procedures to verify the accuracy of the findings (Creswell, 2009). Several methods or strategies will be used to increase the internal validity this proposed study.

This study incorporated the technique of member checking throughout the dissertation process. Member checking is a process of submitting drafts for review and is one of the most needed forms of validation in qualitative research studies (Glesne, 2011). Throughout the duration of the study the researcher solicited peers, her dissertation committee members, and the study’s participants for feedback, guidance, and suggestions in order to improve the quality of the interview protocol and the research design.

The researcher used triangulation because it reduces the likelihood of misinterpretation (Stake, 1994). Triangulation is generally considered a process of using multiple perceptions to
clarify meaning and verifying the repeatability of an observation or interpretation (Stake, 1994 p. 443). This study incorporated multiple sources of data including: semi-structured interviews, document analysis, researcher memos, and participant feedback. Table 3.3 illustrates how the author utilized multiple sources of data to support the findings for this dissertation.

Table 3.3
Triangulation of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Type of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Philosophies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Values</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning Strategies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

This study explores the ethical training, values, and moral reasoning strategies used by fourth-year students in teacher preparation and social work programs to determine whether these programs impact the ethical approach and moral reasoning of these future professionals. This chapter summarizes the data collected from the program websites, course descriptions, and the interviews of 16 students that were conducted for this study. The results are presented separately to provide a clearer picture of each program of study. Chapter five will take the analysis further by comparing both programs and offering explanations based on these comparisons.

Chapter four describes the program philosophies, student values, ethics education, and moral reasoning strategies present in BU’s teacher preparation program. The end of the chapter will finish with a description of the same aspects of BU’s social work education program.
Teacher Preparation Program

To gain a more in-depth understanding of the philosophies adopted by BU’s teacher preparation program, this study interviewed eight fourth-year students. Table 4.1 provides a list of the interviewees’ pseudonyms and their major of study within the Department of Education. For the remainder of this dissertation students will be referred to by their pseudonyms and program of study. For example, Jane, a teacher preparation student, will be referred to as Jane-TP; Gloria, a social work student, will be referred to as Gloria-SW. Including the program abbreviation will minimize confusion, especially in chapter five, when comparing the two programs.

Of the students interviewed for this study, several combinations of teacher preparation majors were represented. One student majored in physical education; two students majored in early childhood education; two students majored in early childhood education with a minor in special education; one student majored in elementary education; one student dual majored in special education and criminal justice; and one student majored in secondary education and minored in special education, women studies, social studies, and math. (See Tables 3.1 and 3.2 for a distribution of students by major.)
Table 4.1: Descriptions of Teacher Preparation Students Interviewed by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Preparation Student (TP)</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Program of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 1</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 2</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Early childhood education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 3</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Secondary education; four minors: special education, women studies, social studies, math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 4</td>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Early childhood education &amp; special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 5</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Elementary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 6</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Early childhood education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 7</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Early childhood education &amp; special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP Student 8</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Special education &amp; criminal justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question One: The Teacher Preparation Program’s Core Principles

**Program Values.** Students were asked to identify values that they perceived their program emphasized throughout its coursework, classes, and choice of instructional materials. In addition to the students’ perceptions of the program values, the researcher analyzed materials accessible on BU’s Department of Education web pages, including: special education, elementary education, secondary education, early childhood education, and the department’s homepage. Lastly, the researcher reviewed the course descriptions searching for references to values, ethics education, and the use of person-first language to better understand the principles emphasized by the teacher preparation program.
The eight teacher preparation students’ referenced six values at least twice during the interviews: importance of adapting instruction; importance of cheerfulness as a teacher; honesty; skills and knowledge required to be a mandated reporter of child abuse; obedience/rules; and the importance of creativity in the classroom. See Table 4.2 for a complete list of values. At least one student referenced the following values once as program values: importance of academic integrity; focus on aligning instruction with standards; cultural awareness; providing meaningful instruction; open-mindedness; responsibility; significance of preparedness as a teacher; professionalism; importance of self-respect; and a sense of accomplishment.

Focus On Instrumental Values. The eight teacher preparation students made more references to instrumental values than to terminal values. Therefore, according to the students, the program focused on instrumental values. As a result, the curriculum appeared to be action oriented, preparing the students to be professionals who behave in a particular way. All of the values that students referenced more than once were instrumental values that guide behaviors, namely, importance of adapting instruction; importance of cheerfulness; cleanliness; creativity; honesty; the knowledge and skills required to report child abuse; obedience/rules; and organization.

Mary-TP described how she believed the program reinforced the importance of being cheerful: “I think [the program values] cheerfulness. The [professors] have taught a lot of younger-aged students and with younger students you need to constantly be cheerful and happy, no matter what.” Kelly-TP, an early childhood education student, also perceived the program to value cheerfulness: “If you are having a bad day, you put on a smile, even if you really do not want to teach that day.”
Being a responsible professional was another instrumental value identified by several students. Lori-TP, enrolled in early childhood education, mentioned that the program values “professional responsibility, definitely... it is your responsibility to instill the value of learning” to students. Similarly, Jen-TP, who is enrolled in early childhood education and special education, reported that the program placed value upon “being responsible for yourself, learning how to handle [yourself] and being organized.”

Although they focused on instrumental values, several students discussed terminal values, including: professionalism; self-respect; sense of accomplishment; respecting peers, colleagues, and professors; and the importance of academic integrity. For example, Lori-TP said, “we need to respect ourselves so that our students will be able to respect us.”

Jen-TP said, “I think a lot of [the professors] value a sense of accomplishment.” This is a terminal value. However, after referencing this value, she corrected her response and said that she valued a sense of accomplishment more than she felt the department did. She clarified:

I will tell you that value [of a sense of accomplishment] is more me. Not that my professors don’t value [it]; but, the professors in general education are really good about it, recognizing that this [course] is not something that you will do forever.

Therefore, it appears that the interviewed students perceived BU’s teacher preparation program to be focused on instructing students to behave in a specific way in a particular environment, rather than believing in specific principles that are intended to guide behavior across contexts.

**Rule Orientation.** Several students mentioned goals that were related to rules or abiding by policy, such as the importance of mandated reporting, obedience to rules generally, aligning instruction with standards, and respecting campus property. The discussion of rules included several statements on the significance of mandated reporting. For example, Kelly-TP said, “I can’t tell you the number of times we have had drilled into us what the correct chain of command
is relating to mandated reporting of child abuse and about what your legal obligations are.”

Gloria-TP made a similar comment about the importance of mandated reporting: “…because of everything that has happened recently [regarding child abuse] the importance of reporting is highly valued.” Betty-TP discussed how she believed the program valued rules and obedience: “[the program] wants you to be obedient, to get your work done, and they want somebody who is polite.”

Essentially, the values that students perceived the teacher preparation program to reinforce were fundamentally instrumental rather than terminal and professionally neutral. By professionally neutral, this author is referring to principles that are unrelated to teaching and are similar to ideas perpetuated by moral philosophers, values that are in the pursuit of the “greater good” and apply universally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Identified</th>
<th>Times Referenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapting Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience/Rules</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning Instruction with Standards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting Campus Property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting Peers, Colleagues, Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advertised Values: Discourse Analysis of Teacher Preparation Program Websites.

The researcher also conducted a discourse analysis of relevant web materials to provide a clearer picture of the values embedded in the teacher preparation course curricula. BU’s Department of Education’s websites focused on strategies to attract prospective students into their program by describing future job prospects, program accreditations, student access to technology on campus, and skills preparation for future employment. For example, the Early Childhood Education homepage says, “You will increase your marketability for future employment by completing coursework and field experiences for a dual degree” (BU, Early Childhood Education website, 2013). Similarly, the Secondary Education homepage marketed to students by discussing the access to technology on campus: “There is a media center where students can use and sign out various technologies” (BU, Secondary Education website, 2013).

The Special Education homepage reviewed the requirements necessary for certification. This homepage also stated that the graduate will “possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to be certified and meet state requirements” (BU, Special Education website, 2013). Similar to the Department of Education and Special Education homepages, the Secondary Education homepage discussed prospective students’ marketability, job prospects, access to technology, and career opportunities (BU, Secondary Education website, 2013).

Further, the Early Childhood Education homepage reiterated the program’s achievements. However, unlike the other web pages within the Department of Education’s website, the Early Childhood Education’s homepage mentioned that the program adhered to a “whole-child approach” (BU, Early Childhood Education website, 2013). Further, the Early Childhood Education homepage included a link on the sidebar to the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment; however, despite this reference, the principles
mentioned in the code did not appear to transmit to the students’ perceptions of the program. For example, the first section of the NAEYC code presents the principle “Do no harm to children.” “…we should not participate in practices that are emotionally damaging, physically harmful, disrespectful, degrading, exploitative, or intimidating to children” (NAEYC, 2013, p. 3). However, when the researcher asked students to identify important program values, only one student mentioned any specific value or principles referenced in any professional codes of ethics in education, even though the Early Childhood Education program makes several mentions of the NAEYC code.

Based on the students’ perceptions and the review of relevant web-based materials, BU’s teacher preparation program appeared to emphasize instrumental values specific to the field of education. The values referenced the most were: importance of adapting instruction; importance of cheerfulness; honesty; skills and knowledge required to be a mandated reporter of child abuse; obedience/rules; and the importance of creativity in the classroom. Further, the program is structured to attract prospective students using marketing strategies that are individualistic and cater to the students’ job prospects, career marketability, skills preparedness, and relevant program accreditations.

However, despite the focus on prospective students’ job prospects, there was minimal to no mention of the idealistic or emotional reasons to pursue a teaching degree. The only exception was found on the Early Childhood Education webpage, which stated that the program adheres to the “whole child” and provided a link to the NAEYC code. However, despite the inclusion of the link and references made to the NAEYC code, the students enrolled in early childhood education did not identify these principles when asked to report on program values.
Research Question Two: Comparison of Students’ Values to Program Values

Following the completion of the Rokeach Survey, the students were asked to identify their most and least important values. They were also asked to explain why these values were important to them or not. The eight education students interviewed identified approximately 21 values; 10 values identified were referenced by at least three of the eight students. See Table 4.3 for the personal values students most identified as important to them personally. The breakdown of most important values for the teacher preparation students is: ambition/goal setting and a sense of accomplishment (7); equality (6); family security (5); tolerance (5); honesty (5); self-respect (4); politeness (3); and freedom (3).

Table 4.3: Teacher Preparation Students’ Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Identified</th>
<th>Times References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambition/Goal Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many values identified by the students are representative of values often used to describe modern democratic principles, such as freedom, hard work, family security, and honesty. Unlike the program values, which students perceived as stressing instrumental values, the students themselves demonstrated a slight preference for terminal values or overarching lifetime goals, such as equality, honesty, and freedom.
Focus on Terminal and Instrumental Values. Of the 21 values identified by the teacher preparation students, 12 were terminal values and nine were instrumental values. Of the 12 values mentioned by more than one student, seven were terminal and five were instrumental. Therefore, teacher preparation students focused slightly more on terminal values compared to instrumental values in relation to their own lives. Examples of terminal values identified were: self-respect, sense of accomplishment, freedom, family security, and equality. Examples of instrumental values identified were: forgiveness, politeness, courage, independence, and pleasure. The author will discuss the values identified most by the teacher preparation students. For a full list of the identified values, see Table 4.4.
**Table 4.4: Teacher Preparation Students’ Values by Number of References**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambition/Goal Setting/Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individualistic Values versus Relational Values.** Many of the values these students identified as important were individualistic rather than relational in nature. Individualistic values such as self-control, self-respect, and personal independence are self-directed. In contrast,
relational values such as forgiveness, helpfulness, and kindness are defined by their occurrence between individuals. Self-respect (4), self-control (3), financial security (2), personal accountability (1), and pleasure (1) are examples of individualistic values identified by teacher preparation students. The focus of most teacher preparation students’ identified values appeared to be on the question of how can an individual be good rather than how can “we” in reference to others be good. For instance, Lori-TP said, “It is important to be able to respect yourself to be able to live with yourself and face yourself in the mirror everyday.” Jane-TP discussed her value of personal freedom: “Freedom is really high because I like to be free to choose. I would like to be free to choose whatever I want to do.” It is important to note, however, that several education students highly valued inter-relational values, such as honesty, tolerance, and equality, though, less frequently.

**Ambition/Goal Setting/Sense of Accomplishment.** Ambition/goal setting/sense of accomplishment was the value identified most often; it was mentioned by seven of the eight students interviewed. Kelly-TP discussed the importance of a sense of accomplishment as a major purpose in her life: “I feel like a purpose in life is one of the most important values. I do not want to be going through the motions and not really have a purpose or a sense of accomplishment.” Gloria-TP suggested that people who pursue goals are much easier to deal with: “I feel like if someone can feel accomplished they are going to be a much better person for you to deal with. I think someone who feels like they have accomplished something is a much happier person.” Rob-TP, who is studying physical education, also stressed the importance of having and pursuing goals: “You may not be the smartest, you may not be the best, but you need to have a general goal. If all that you are going to be is a burger flipper, then you best be the best damn burger flipper that there is.”
**Equality.** Six of the eight students identified equality as an important personal value. Rob-TP described equality as important when he said, “You need to treat people with more respect and give them equal opportunity.” Jen-TP related her beliefs about equality to women’s struggles for equal opportunity, specifically as it related to sports. She reflected on her personal experience in public education, remembering a time when sports programs were not as readily available to women. She said, “I remember a time when things were dictated to you a little more. I see a lot of these kids. These girls come to school and there were always sports for them to play, for me, there wasn’t.”

Gloria-TP discussed equality as it related to her work with students with disabilities: “I think equality is related to my work with special needs students. When you are around them, especially adults, they [adults with disabilities] are not children. A coloring page is not an adequate fine motor skill exercise for an adult. He is a 25-year-old man who has normal hormones, normal behaviors, and normal desires.” Most teacher preparation students identified equality as it related to equal opportunity and equal access to resources without going into specific detail defining the concept.

**Importance of Family Security.** Several teacher preparation students also discussed family and family security as an important value. According to Rob-TP, “I am a big family guy… you might not be able to give much, but give as much as you can to your family.” Lori-TP said, “Family security is important because if you are not family [oriented], you do not have people backing you up.” Similarly, Jane-TP reiterated the importance of family in her life: “I value family security, absolutely, because I would not be who I am today without my family, and I think [family] is more important than anything.” These teacher preparation students’ statements
reflect the significance they place on securing their family’s future. Furthermore, their statements also suggest the important supporting role family plays in their individual lives.

**Comparison of Students’ Values to Program Values in Teacher Preparation**

Within BU’s teacher preparation program, similarities and differences were found between the students’ values and the program values. The program placed significant weight upon instrumental values that are skills focused and related to teaching. The teacher preparation students’ identified personal values that mixed terminal and instrumental values, but tended to express a preference for terminal values.

Some instrumental values were congruent between the program and the students; for example, ambition, goal setting, and a sense of accomplishment. These similarities emerged during a review of the program’s advertisements for prospective students and in the interviews with the students. Accentuating opportunity is attractive to potential students because it suggests prospects for future success, while accomplishment appealed to the students interviewed because it fulfills other values while also serving as an end in itself.

Since many of the values stressed in the teacher preparation program were instrumental and focused on desired behaviors, it is less clear which terminal values are important to the program. This is evidenced in a review of the course descriptions throughout BU’s Department of Education. There was no consistency in the course descriptions regarding the definition of ethical values and what ethics means in the context of teaching. For example, some courses, such as Multicultural Education and Strategies for Teaching Students with High Incidence Disabilities, accentuated the importance of person-first language when discussing students. Other course titles blatantly made use of non-person-first language, exemplified by Mentally Disabled I
& II, Student Teaching and Practicum for the Mentally/Physically Disabled I, and Physical Education and Recreation for the Disabled. A perfect example of this inconsistency occurred in the course description listings for SPEC340 and SPEC345, listed in order: the first course focused on how teachers can meet the educational and social needs of gifted students while the other course focused on the needs of pre-service teachers for handling students with disabilities. This language indicated a fundamental variance in the approach taken toward different groups of students.

Across the teacher preparation curricula, although the importance of ethical guidelines and teacher-student relationships were mentioned, the courses appeared to focus on skill development. Where ethics discussion did occur, several of these courses addressed ethics only from a legal perspective. Several courses did not mention values or ethics at all. For example, special education courses discussed the importance of “addressing awareness and attitudes,” “the emotional needs of students,” and the importance of adhering to a “people-first” philosophy; however, most of the other course descriptions in the teacher preparation program focused on skills training and avoided any discussion of social/emotional training.

There was very little program-wide consensus on ethics education. In fact, based on the course descriptions alone, it was obvious that there was a broad range of opinions on the ethical values in teacher preparation. Further, even though the Early Childhood Education web page provided a link to the NAEYC code, there was little evidence to suggest that the program implemented the code into its curriculum; this was reflected in the incongruence between the program values as identified by students, the students’ personal values, and the values expressed in the NAEYC code.
This variation and inconsistency of program values discovered during the researcher’s analysis of the course descriptions, titles, and web materials, appeared to match the inconsistency of values among teacher preparation students. Although there was agreement regarding some individual student values, generally there were many differences among the values they identified as important.

Further, the teacher preparation students did not appear to have a conflict between their personal values and the program’s values. Only one student, a dual major in criminal justice and special education, appeared to have such a conflict. Gloria-TP, who was unhappy with how the program’s instructors avoided conflict when discussing ethical dilemmas, described this conflict: “They don’t want to get into that kind of conversation [in education] because they don’t want an argument. Whereas criminal justice does not mind being controversial, so they are more willing to open up that conversation and have people debate it.”

Research Question 3: Ethics Training in the Teacher Preparation Program

In the teacher preparation program, there appeared to be more variance in the messages transmitted to students in relation to ethics education and value orientation. The term “ethics” was referenced twice in special education courses and twice in the foundational education courses. In some instances, there was an orientation towards ethics as relational and student-centered, whereas in many other instances the descriptions took a legal orientation or focused on skill development. A similar discontinuity was observed in the fluidity of references to codes of ethics in education. In some course descriptions, there was an obvious reference to the NAEYC code; in other course descriptions the discussion of ethics was unrelated to the NAEYC code.

Ethics Education: Focus on Practical Application. Ethics instruction in teacher preparation focused on practical discussions of ethics as they relate to professional responsibility
requirements with a focus on abiding by the law. Students perceived that their ethics instruction surrounded discussions of issues such as mandated reporting of child abuse, colleague and family relations, and bullying. When asked to describe her exposure to ethics education in her coursework, Lori-TP described ethics as it applied to the mandated reporting of child abuse, bullying, and parental relations:

Maybe [we discussed ethics] in classroom management [related to] problems in the classroom, problems with parents, or outside of the classroom, but still relating to school. For example, if a child is being abused you have to go through the right channels to report it and make sure that a child is safe. We also discussed legal issues with bullying.

Similarly, Mary-TP described her exposure to ethics instruction during the discussion of mandated reporting in a family collaboration course: “We had to take a course in family collaboration that had a lot to do with ethics. Just like mandatory reporting and what you should and should not report. I found it helpful. Some of [the codes] I thought, this is obvious.” Mary-TP also described an assignment relating to ethics that she completed for her family collaboration course: “Some of the worksheets are a waste of time. I know this already, but then other [codes] really make you think—you had to weigh the pros and cons. Is it worth reporting or not? Should you talk to other teachers about it or not?”

During the interviews, only three of the teacher preparation students expressed familiarity with any codes of ethics in their profession. All three referenced only the NAEYC code. When comparing the 33 program values identified by the teacher preparation students interviewed, only 11 of the program values these students identified were present in the NAEYC code. The three students who expressed familiarity with the NAEYC code identified two values from the code as program values: one student identified the provision of “Do No Harm”; and two students identified the provision describing standards for “Colleague Relations.”
There was some confusion among the teacher preparation students about the true meaning of ethics. They could articulate that ethics is about specific topics, such as mandated reporting, bullying, colleague relations, children with disabilities, and diversity. However, their understanding appeared to be segmented and focused on particular issues in education rather than permeating everything they do as an educator. For example, Betty-TP believed that ethics instruction was not necessary for her because she had always viewed herself as a “polite” person. Mary-TP referred to ethics as discussion of Vygotsky and Piaget, who are learning theorists and cognitive developmentalists, respectively, not ethical theorists. This is understandable, considering that the students were familiar with the discussion of ethics, but only as it primarily related to particular circumstances that they are likely to face as educators, such as reporting a case of child abuse, adapting instruction for students with disabilities, and correctly filling out IEP documents. See Table 4.5 for a summary of the ethics instruction.

**Table 4.5: Teacher Preparation Students’ Perception of Ethics Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>All Coursework Focused on Ethics</th>
<th>Practical Discussion of Ethics</th>
<th>Ethics Workshop</th>
<th>Ethics does not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Four: Teacher Preparation Students’ Moral Reasoning

Discussion of Dilemma 1. Cody, a student diagnosed with intermittent explosive disorder, had a recent outburst and punched another student in class. Following this disruption, many parents of other students in the class have expressed concern for their children’s safety and want Cody returned to a special education room. However, Cody’s academics and social skills have improved significantly since he has been moved to an inclusive classroom and this is Cody’s first physical altercation in the classroom.

In response to Dilemma 1, four of the eight teacher preparation students reasoned from an ethic of care orientation, directed towards the care for the student with a disability: one of these four students reasoned from an ethic of care directed towards a group orientation. Three students reasoned from an ethic of justice orientation: two reasoned focusing on the larger group and one reasoned from an ethic of justice orientation without specifying whether the focus was on the individual or the group. The other three education students reasoned from an ethic of justice perspective centered on discussions of fairness and equality. See Table 4.6 for the summary of the moral reasoning strategies teacher preparation students used for Dilemma 1.
Table 4.6: Moral Reasoning Strategies and Focus of Teacher Preparation Students in Dilemma 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Preparation Student</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethic of care focuses on emotional wellbeing, connectedness to others, and relations with others. Four students expressed care and concern for Cody, the student with a disability. They said that Cody should remain in the inclusive room because the inclusive environment is helping him. Lori-TP said, “Staying in the traditional room is helping him and if you can come up with a behavior plan to help him work through the aggressiveness when he starts to feel aggressive, then he should stay in the inclusive room.” Jane-TP said that he should remain in the inclusive room because he is “benefiting from it.” Betty-TP, who self-identified as a special education major, said that she “has a soft spot for them [students with disabilities]” and is concerned for their success and wellbeing. Kelly-TP said she “loves inclusion” and believes that “[Cody] needs a little bit more of a chance, because everyone has a bad day.”

Students who reasoned from an ethic of justice orientation based their decisions on concepts relating to fairness, equality, and the rules or policies related to a particular decision (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011). In Dilemma 1, three students reasoned from an ethic of justice.
Several students referenced fairness in their arguments as to whether Cody should stay in the inclusive room or be returned to the special education room. “If everyone works together and gets the correct formula, you can have the best of both worlds,” said Rob-TP. Mary-TP said that it “would not be fair for Cody to be labeled the ‘ugly duckling.’”

Stemming from the ethic of justice perspective, three students referenced the concept of punishment in relation to Cody when reasoning through Dilemma 1. In expressing concern that it could be harmful or unhelpful to punish Cody for his outburst, Jane-TP focused on the best way to achieve a fair result for Cody. Specifically, she said, “when you punish, punish, punish them [students with disabilities] it just does not get any better.”

In contrast, two other students who reasoned from an ethic of justice orientation discussed strategies for reforming Cody’s behavior from a punishment perspective that was focused on the consequences of rule violations. Mary-TP said:

If I was the parent and my kid got punched by a kid with a disorder like that, I would want him moved back, so I think that he should do the half-days thing or maybe move him back for a week or two and let him get his thoughts, not as a punishment, but just to think about what he did and why.

Although Mary-TP states that her recommendation is not a punishment, her reasoning for placing him back in the special education room is similar to the goals of punishment, especially considering that the dilemma gave evidence that Cody would strongly prefer to be in the inclusive room. Rob-TP suggested that Cody receive suspension as a form of punishment. He said that Cody should be disciplined and should receive “maybe three or four days [in the special education room and] then bring him back.”

The ethic of the profession is based in concepts such as professional codes of ethics, professional values, the community’s values, and the interplay between a person’s professional
values and their own personal values (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011). None of the teacher preparation students responded to Dilemma 1 from a perspective of the ethic of the profession or the ethic of critique. Each answer was based in the ethic of care or the ethic of justice.

Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development was also used to analyze the students’ moral reasoning for this study. Kohlberg’s stages are categorized as follows: 1) obedience orientation; 2) morality of instrumental egoism and simple exchange; 3) morality of interpersonal concordance; 4) morality of law and duty to social order; 5) morality of consensus-building; and 6) morality of non-arbitrary social cooperation. The author found teacher preparation students varied in the strategies used when reasoning through Dilemma 1. Two students reasoned from Stage Two; four students reasoned from Stage Three; one student reasoned from Stage Four; and one student reasoned from Stage Five.

Jane-TP reasoned from Stage Three when she argued, “Cody should stay in the regular education room… he is benefiting from it… in a situation like this, the class should be made aware of the issue. I don’t feel that children should be kept in the dark about these things.” Notice that Jane-TP was able to consider the perspective of more than one other individual (Stage Three), yet she still did not consider the societal or global impact of her decision (Stage Four).

Gloria-TP, who is majoring in special education and criminal justice, displayed the highest level of moral reasoning among any of the students interviewed. Since she is the only one who reasoned from Stage Five, this next section will include her as a point of reference to assess the other stages of reasoning. She appeared to be an outlier compared to the 15 other students. According to Kohlberg, the Principled Level of Moral Reasoning is rarely attained prior to age 20.
A person reasoning from Stage Five considers the competing morals when making a decision. Gloria-TP, who displayed an advanced level of moral reasoning in Dilemma 1, reasoned, “I’m a big fan of inclusion when it’s best for everybody, which I don’t always agree it is. I think the greater good needs to be looked at… as far as the greater good versus the risk, I think keeping him in an inclusive setting would be the best bet.”

**Teacher Preparation Student Discussion of Dilemma 2.** In Dilemma 2, the student is the purchasing manager for a company that needs building repairs following a series of violent storms that devastated it and other businesses in the local community. The student’s friend, Michael, is a local contractor and would really benefit from the work following the damages to his own facilities. However, the company’s policy is to obtain three estimates, report the lowest bid to the company owner, and go with the lowest bidder.

Much like the interview discussions of Dilemma 1, the teacher preparation students did not focus their discussion on the ethic of critique or the ethic of the profession. The focus of their analysis stemmed from the ethic of justice and the ethic of care. The discussion of Dilemma 2 from the perspective of the ethic of justice relied heavily on concepts of potential punishment and discipline for violating the company’s rules. Table 4.7 summarizes the eight teacher preparation students’ moral reasoning approaches used for Dilemma 2.
### Table 4.7: Moral Reasoning Strategies and Focus of Teacher Preparation Students in Dilemma 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Preparation Student</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most teacher preparation students referenced concerns about consequences and punishment if they did not follow the company’s policy to obtain the three estimates. Only one of the eight students reasoned solely from an ethic of justice orientation, and two students included reasoning from this perspective while also using an ethic of care orientation. Even though seven of the eight students reasoned from the ethic of care orientation, issues of punishment did not encroach into many students’ analysis; rather, punishment was generally expressed as an afterthought describing a consequence of their reasoning that they hoped to be fortunate enough to avoid.

Six of the eight students expressed concern about the potential consequences if they chose not to abide by company policy and obtain the three estimates. Illustrating this concern, Jen-TP said, “As far as business ethics, he should absolutely do what the company says to do because he is giving his friend preferential treatment, but everybody working under him doing what he is told is in danger of losing their jobs as well… If it comes right down to it, he’s not the
owner, so he is going to have to follow company rules.” Further, Kelly-TP was explicit about her concern for punishment stating, “I would want to know whether I would be penalized if I did not follow company rules.”

Overall, seven of the eight teacher preparation students used the ethic of care orientation in their analysis; however, two of these students also approached the problem from an ethic of justice orientation. Four students reasoned from an ethic of care oriented towards caring for the community rather than care for the individual. Lori-TP argued that supporting the community through using the local business “builds a sense of community pride.” Similarly, Jane-TP said that helping the community grow was important and sought to help the local business “because [by] spending money in your community, helping your fellow business owners succeed, you are helping your community grow.”

Although it was referenced fewer times than a community-care orientation, two students discussed care for their friend when supporting their reasoning in Dilemma 2. Two students approached their reasoning from this orientation. Betty-TP said, “If I knew that my friend could do good work, then I would pick my friend.” Similarly, Mary-TP said, “I value friendship a lot. I think that since Mr. Schultz is a long-time friend of Michael’s they should take that into consideration even though it might not be the right business or financial move.”

Most teacher preparation students reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Two when responding to Dilemma 2. Six students reasoned from Stage Two and two students reasoned from Stage Three. Recall that most teacher preparation students reasoned from Stage Three in response to Dilemma 1. The students’ level of moral reasoning appeared to decrease from Dilemma 1 to Dilemma 2. Lori-TP, reasoned from Stage Two when she viewed her friendship with Michael from the perspective of reciprocity of benefits, rather than a friendship based on mutual
commitment: “I would go with the local person because he will remember that he helped...they will be more likely to say, you helped them out, let’s help you out.”

**Cheating to Avoid Compliance.** Two students discussed strategies to advocate for change in response to the problem presented by Dilemma 2. However, three students suggested ways to avoid complying with the company policy rather than advocating for a policy change. Rob-TP, who approached his decision by using strategies to advocate for change, said, “I would go before the board and defend the difference to the board.” Similarly, Jen-TP said, “I would go up and talk to the purchasing manager. Explain to him the situation and why I think we should amend the policy to allow us to use the local business.”

Three students discussed strategies to avoid complying with company policy. Jane-TP said, “If it is a situation where no one is going to know, no one is going to say anything, then why not benefit the community?” Similarly, Betty-TP said, “I don’t want to say cheating, but you could look at other places that you know are going to be higher [bids] than his.” Kelly-TP said, “I guess that I would get around that [the policy] as much as I could, help out the local business owner instead... I hope that I wouldn’t get into much trouble, but I bend the rules sometimes if it is to benefit other people.”

In summary, the teacher preparation students interviewed for this study majored in several different education programs, for example, early childhood education, secondary education, special education. These students perceived their respective programs to value the importance of: adapting instruction; cheerfulness as a teacher; honesty; the skills and knowledge required to be a mandated reporter of child abuse; obedience/rules; and creativity in the classroom. The program curriculum focused on the importance of instrumental and action-oriented values emphasizing skill development. In comparison, the students defined values
demonstrating a slight preference for terminal values, with most identifying: ambition/goal setting and sense of accomplishment; equality; family security; tolerance; honesty; self-respect; politeness; and freedom.

Although there were many values identified, most students did not appear to experience a conflict due to incongruence between their personal values and the program values. Further, the ethics instruction emphasized skills preparation, focusing on practical application and professional responsibility. The students demonstrated a preference for moral reasoning strategies from the ethic of care and the ethic of justice. With Dilemma 1’s classroom issue, most students reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Three; however, they reasoned from Stage two for Dilemma 2. The students reasoned from a higher level when the dilemma pertained to their profession than when it did not.
Social Work Education

To gain more in-depth understanding of the philosophies adopted by BU’s social work program, this study included interviews with eight fourth-year social work students. The remainder of this chapter will focus on the social work program according to the research questions. Table 4.8 provides the social work students’ pseudonyms and their educational background. (See Tables 3.1 and 3.2 for additional information about the specific program majors.) Social work students will be referred to by their pseudonyms and program of study, for example, Joan-SW. All eight students were social work majors; one student is also pursuing a minor in special education; and one student is considering leaving social work to pursue a law degree.

Table 4.8: Descriptions of Teacher Preparation Students Interviewed by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Interview Subjects</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Program of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 1</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 2</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 3</td>
<td>Chrissie</td>
<td>Social Work &amp; Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 4</td>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 5</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 6</td>
<td>Patti</td>
<td>Social Work (pursuing law degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 7</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Student 8</td>
<td>Cyndi</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question One: What are the core philosophies of BU’s social work program?

Students’ Perceptions of Program Values. Students were asked to identify values that they perceived their program emphasized in the coursework, classes, and the choice of instructional materials. In addition to the students’ perceptions of the program values, the researcher analyzed materials accessible on BU’s Department of Social Work homepage. Lastly, the researcher reviewed the course descriptions for references to values, ethics education, and the use of person-first language to better understand the principles that are important to the social work program.

The eight students identified 20 values; 17 were core values expressed in the NASW Code of Ethics. Further, of the 20 identified values, 11 were terminal values and nine were instrumental. See Table 4.9 for the complete list of values. The instrumental program values were: communication; compassion; competence; cultural competency; non-intimidation; preparedness; non-judgmental; recognizing bias; and positive client interaction. The terminal values identified were NASW Code of Ethics and social work values: dignity and worth of person; self-determination; human relationships; diversity; equality; knowledge; respect; professionalism; tolerance; and understanding. Seventeen values were relational and three values were individualistic. Essentially, nearly all of the values social work students identified as program values were relational.
### Table 4.9: Social Work Students’ Perceptions of Program Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Identified</th>
<th>Times Referenced</th>
<th>In Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity and Worth of Person</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality/Fairness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Intimidiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Judgmental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Client Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discourse Analysis of Social Work Department Homepage.** BU’s Department of Social Work homepage is focused on attracting students who are helpful, compassionate, and driven to serve others. The only information displayed on the Social Work homepage is a poem
by Regina Brett, a 2008 and 2009 Pulitzer Prize-nominated poet. This brief excerpt demonstrates the program’s desire to attract students who believe in the values expressed in Brett’s poem.

“What do Social Workers Make?

They make infertile couples celebrate a lifetime of Mother’s Days and Father’s Days by helping them adopt a crack baby no one else wanted.

They make a boy with Down syndrome feel like the smartest kid on the bus.

They make a 10 year-old believe that he is loved and wanted, regardless of how long he lasts in the next foster home.

They make a couple communicate so well they decide not to get divorced.

They make a teenager decide to stop cutting herself.

They make a man whose wife has Alzheimer’s cherish the good times, when she remembered him.

They make a dying cancer patient make peace with her past, with her brief future, and with her God.

If you are interested in these things, please join us!”

(Brett, BU Department of Social Work homepage, 2013).

In addition to the poem, the Social Work homepage provided links to additional web pages, including the NASW principles, appropriate student conduct, bachelor of social work curriculum checklist, helpful links, the social work club, and level II application. However, due to website maintenance, the only active link was to the NASW principles. The page accessed via the link reviewed several of the key values of the social work profession, including “service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence” (BU, Social Work web page, 2013).

**Discourse Analysis of Course Descriptions.** BU’s social work program has 20 courses. Language used is consistent throughout the course descriptions. The core values of the social work profession were referenced throughout the descriptions; for example, “advocating for social and economic justice; promoting change; values and ethics; following a strengths perspective”
SW Practice I, a foundation course, accurately illustrates the language used throughout the social work course descriptions. It stated:

First of three practice sequence courses, is designed to introduce knowledge, values and skills for generalist micro practice. Emphasizes self-knowledge, use of self as a change agent, understanding social work values, oppression and strategies for combating it, and developing skills for problem-solving, good interpersonal interviewing, and beginning-level research. Students will understand the interdependence of policy, research and practice, and the need to empower clients and themselves to advocate for social and economic justice (BU, Social Work course descriptions, 2013).

The researcher also reviewed the course descriptions and other web materials for person-first language. All language in the course descriptions was person first, except for Regina Brett’s poem, which contained one instance of non-person-first language. The poem referred to a “crack baby”; if the poem were adhering to person-first orientation the baby would be referenced first. It might read instead as “a baby who is addicted to crack” rather than the colloquial and negative “crack baby” (BU, Social Work homepage, 2013).

The author’s review of the web-based materials revealed that the core values of the social work profession, as exemplified by the NASW Code of Ethics, permeated the language and message of BU’s social work program. A common thread, consistent throughout the course descriptions, was the reference to the foundational principles of the social work profession. This included the importance of advocating for social justice, empowering clients, and the pursuit of self-knowledge.
Research Question 2: Comparison of the Values of Social Work Program Students and Program Values

Social Work Students’ Values. The previous research question described the values of BU’s social work program. This section will first review the social work students’ values then compare how students’ personal values compared to the values of BU’s social work program. The social work students completed the same modified Rokeach Survey, which was used to facilitate discussion of the students’ values. See Table 4.10 for an illustration of these values. The eight social work students interviewed identified the following values as being the most important: ambition/goal setting/sense of accomplishment (3); forgiveness (3); friendship (3); honesty (3); and helpfulness (3). See Table 4.10 for a complete list of values.

Three social work students identified ambition/goal setting/sense of accomplishment to be an important personal value. Chrissie-SW, formerly a teacher preparation student now enrolled in social work, valued the importance of getting the most out of life: “I picked a sense of accomplishment because you only have one life so you want to make sure that you get the most out of it.” Joan-SW, who shares the value of pursuing goals, stated: “It is really important that people have a goal in life and try to achieve that goal.”

Three social work students identified forgiveness as an important value; however, only one student, Shirley-SW, elaborated on this value further and identified forgiveness as important. She said: “Everyone makes mistakes and I feel like you shouldn’t hold people to something. It is in the past and if they asked you for forgiveness I feel like you should forgive them.” Three students identified honesty as an important value; however, none of them elaborated on it during the interview.
Three social work students identified helpfulness as an important value. When asked why she values responsibility, trust, and helpfulness, Cyndi-SW responded, “I always put other people before me, always have and always will.” Patti-SW expressed her interest in helping others; however, she foresaw herself leaving the social work profession for law after she graduates due to a conflict between her personal values and the values of the social work profession. She explained, “I just know that I want to work with people. I feel like I have the abilities to help people, just not maybe in a social work aspect. Like maybe on a bigger scale with the community in a broader sense.”

Chrissie-SW said that she valued a comfortable life because, “As social workers, a lot of people don’t have comfortable lives and if I can make a few people have a comfortable life in my lifetime, then I feel like I did something right.” She described how she also valued an exciting life, but said it is a value that she hopes everyone can share and experience, rather than it being value that she solely wants for herself. Chrissie-SW stated, “I want everyone to have some sort of exciting life that they can look back on and go—that was so much fun!”
Table 4.10: Social Work Students’ Values by Number of References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambition/Goal Setting/Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Client Self-Determination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comfortable Life</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness/Helping Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recognizing Personal Values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Love</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison with Program Values. There appeared to be congruence between the social work students’ personal values and the values of the social work program; however, it is unclear whether the students began the social work program with values similar to the program or whether their values changed as a consequence of being enrolled in the program. Due to this transparency of values in the social work program, it could be obvious to students whether they “fit in” to the program or are alienated due to value differences.

Patti-SW discussed feeling alienated in the social work program. She described the social work profession as being based in “compassion.” In her opinion, the social work program placed
too much emphasis on one’s identity as a social worker, especially where the values of the social work profession conflicted with the values that Patti-SW feels are an important part of being an American citizen. She explained, “I’m an American citizen and I’m a citizen of the United States. I guess my loyalties lie with what allows us to even be here and have our programs, whereas at [BU], it is [centered around] helping everyone and then we will worry about being a citizen.”

Despite the personal conflict Patti-SW has faced between her personal and professional values as a result of the social work program, she discussed how her political affiliation has changed since being enrolled. She said: “I grew up in a Republican family—a really right wing [family], I’ve strayed away from that now. I definitely call myself a moderate. Social workers tend to be really moderate and the courses [discuss it] in a liberal approach. How they approach that [discussion of social welfare] to me is biased.” Despite the change in her beliefs, the conflict between her personal and professional values has caused Patti-SW to consider leaving the social work profession for a future career in law, helping people from a community-oriented approach.

**Research Question Three: Ethics Education in Social Work**

The social work program does not have a mandatory ethics course; rather, all students must take an ethics workshop. All BU undergraduate students must take a course that meets the ethics requirement of the university’s general education standards for graduation.

The social work students interviewed for this study expressed familiarity with the NASW Code of Ethics and perceived their coursework to be saturated with discussions of ethics. Five of the eight students believed that the ethics instruction provided in their coursework focused on applied ethics rather than theoretical ethics. Further, no students in social work perceived ethics
to “not apply” to their undergraduate coursework in social work. See Table 4.11 for a summary of the students’ perceptions of the ethics instruction they received in their program.

Table 4.11: Social Work Students’ Perceptions of Ethics Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>All Coursework Focused on Ethics</th>
<th>Practical Discussion of Ethics</th>
<th>Ethics Workshop</th>
<th>Ethics does not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the interviews, social work students appeared familiar with the principles outlined in the NASW code and were able to articulate and make reference to aspects of the code in discussion. Chrissie-SW said, “I would definitely say the core social work values are important, like dignity and worth of the person.” Similarly, Sarah-SW referenced the value of human relationships as an important program value, stating, “[They discuss the social work value of] human relationships—they reference all of the core values.”

Not only were the social work students familiar with the NASW Code of Ethics, they perceived their coursework to be inundated with discussions of ethics and the NASW code. Joan-SW said:

We are really focusing on the code of ethics and we have to live by those ethics. We have to keep a copy of them and we have to refer to them. We have to live by it [the code]. And when I think about it, if it was not a specific course, it was something that we are always being referred to and we always have to refer back to.
Similar to Joan-SW, Sarah-SW believed that ethics was often discussed in the curriculum: “I think that is something that comes up in all of my assignments [code of ethics], especially in my last semester. I notice it even more and our professors try to shove it down our throats a little bit more.”

Grace-SW shared a similar sentiment when she said, “I think in all of my social work classes—it [the code of ethics] came up and they tried to always make it a point, do you have your code of ethics? Why don’t you look at it when you do your assignment?” The students interviewed also overwhelmingly agreed that the ethics instruction followed the principles expressed in the NASW code. Additionally, several students mentioned that the discussion of ethics was often related to applications of practice and ethics was discussed frequently in relation to current issues relevant to their field practice and their work as future professionals.

Social work students also seemed to understand that the values of the social work profession are important for all social workers to possess. For most social work students, with the exception of Patti-SW, this resulted in a strong alignment between their personal and professional values. Patti-SW identified her interest in helping people, a social work value; however, she does not necessarily believe that her value-orientation aligns with values of the social work profession. She describes this conflict:

I grew up in a Republican family. I’ve strayed away from that now I would say. I definitely call myself a moderate. Social workers tend to be really moderate and that’s kind of like they bring it up in a liberal approach. I feel like whenever we’re talking about social welfare programs, and how they approach that, to me it is biased. I get that they want to help people in social programs, but sometimes rules are put in place like first and foremost before I’m a social worker I’m an American and a citizen of the United States. My loyalties lie with what allows us to even be here and have our programs and stuff like that, whereas the program [believes in helping] everyone [first] and [being an American] citizen [second].
Understanding of Codes of Ethics. All eight students interviewed were universally able to identify values from their professional codes of ethics. Further, every student interviewed expressed familiarity with the NASW Code of Ethics and its contents. Most students also referenced specific codes that stood out to them as being important and memorable. In fact, of the 32 values they identified, only three were not present in the NASW Code of Ethics. The social work students recited verbatim from the NASW code, and referenced codes that were “compassion focused,” that is, on the dignity and worth of the person, and respecting confidentiality. Table 4.12 identifies the number of references to specific portions of the NASW code during the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to Language in NASW Code</th>
<th>Social Work Students Referencing Code Language in Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dignity and Worth of a Person</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Confidentiality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the interviews, social work students appeared to have a grasp on both codes of ethics and the concept of ethics education. These students’ perceptions of ethics aligned more accurately with their professional code. They also identified ethics as relevant to every aspect of their work as a social worker. Of all the students interviewed, only one student did not appear to
understand that codes of ethics are professionally based rather than institutionally based. This student thought that the code of ethics did not apply because she was working in a hospital setting as part of her field placement.

The terms “ethics” and “social work values” were mentioned five times in the social work course descriptions (BU, Social Work course descriptions, 2013). For example, Social Work Practice II stated: “This course will utilize a variety of active learning techniques to help students; and integrate social work values and ethics with practice” (BU, Social Work course descriptions, 2013). Social Work 102: Introduction to Social Work described several of the foundational social work principles:

[This course] introduces the history and conceptual framework of the social work profession to students. It provides an overview of social work knowledge, social work ethics, traditional values, and commitments; and provides a foundation in the historical roots and theoretical underpinnings of the social work profession (BU, Social Work course descriptions, 2013).

These courses exemplified how BU’s social work program includes the values of the social work profession in its course descriptions.

The social work program appeared to emphasize the discussion of ethics and saturated its coursework with references to ethics. In the course descriptions and the website content, the discussion and representation of the program values often referenced the discussion of ethics, specifically as represented in the NASW Code of Ethics. Students’ perceptions of the social work program’s values also align neatly with the NASW Code of Ethics and the discussion of ethics in the course descriptions and program’s webpage.
Comparison of Students’ Values and Program Values

There appeared to be congruency for seven of the eight social work students between their respective personal values and the social work program’s values. Most students did not express stress arising from tensions between their personal values and the program values, despite the program’s evident alignment with the NASW principles.

The students perceived the program to emphasize many of the same values that they consider important in their personal lives. For example, the program and the students emphasized relational values, such as helpfulness. However, despite both the program and students’ preference for relational values, several students referenced personal values outside of the focus of the social work program when describing their personal values. They identified the following individualistic personal values as important: ambition/goal setting, self-control, imagination, self-respect, risk taking, and a comfortable life. Therefore, although the social work students shared a similar preference towards helping others, several students expressed an interest in their own professional advancement.

Although the program appeared to emphasize the importance of helping others, several social work students discussed personal values relating to self-improvement rather than only helping others. Chrissie-SW stated, “I picked a sense of accomplishment because you only have one life and you want to make sure that you get the most out of it. No accomplishment is too big or too little.” Patti-SW also discussed the importance of advancement, “It is really important that people have a goal in life and they try to achieve that goal.”
Research Question 4: Social Work Students’ Moral Reasoning

Dilemma 1. Similar to teacher preparation, six of the social work students interviewed responded to Dilemma 1 from the ethic of care orientation by expressing care and concern for Cody’s success and his emotional wellbeing. All of the social work students who reasoned from an ethic of care emphasized the care for the individual (Cody) compared to care for the classroom or the community. Further, five of the students reasoned from a strictly care orientation, focused on care for the individual, and one student reasoned from both a care and justice orientation. See Table 4.13 for Dilemma 1 summary of the students’ reasoning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Student</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrissie</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyndi</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In support of keeping Cody in the inclusive room, Sarah-SW argued, “his grades improved. His overall attitude towards school improved.” Joan-SW said that Cody “improved better with his grades and putting him back in the special education room would just digress the situation.” Chrissie-SW said that Cody is “doing so well and inclusion is everywhere… so we want to make
sure that he feels accepted here.” Shirley-SW said, “No one is perfect. I feel like you should give him another chance.” She was primarily concerned about how the discipline would make Cody feel, stating “I feel like putting him back into the special education classroom is just going to make him feel like no matter what he does he is going to be punished in some ways.” All of these students focused on Cody’s wellbeing when reasoning through their response to Dilemma 1.

Two social work students reasoned from an ethic of justice orientation. Patti-SW, who plans on leaving the social work profession following graduation and self-identified her personal values as being in conflict with the social work program, said, “If you coddle a child and make them feel different they will be different, so once you place a child in a setting with other kids, it is kind of like track. You run the best time when you are placed with the best runners.” Further, Cyndi-SW referenced educational policy when she stated, “There is a law out there that kids have to be in the classroom and can’t be singled out in a special education room.”

Recall that Kohlberg’s Stages are categorized according to the following distinctions: 1) obedience orientation; 2) morality of instrumental egoism and simple exchange; 3) morality of interpersonal concordance; 4) morality of law and duty to social order; 5) morality of consensus-building; and 6) morality of non-arbitrary social cooperation. In response to Dilemma 1, only one social work student reasoned from Stage Two; three students reasoned from Stage Three; and four students reasoned from Stage Four. Therefore, most social work students approached Dilemma 1 from Kohlberg Stage Four.

Sarah-SW, who reasoned at Stage Two, stated she thought “that Cody should remain in the inclusive room [because] his grades and overall attitude has improved.” Notice that Sarah-SW was able to consider another person’s role but no other perspective. A person who reasons at
Stage Two only considers the perspective of one or two individuals in any situation and never considers the societal impact or society’s perspectives on an ethical decision. Sarah-SW only considered how the inclusive room was benefiting Cody, avoiding any discussion about the other students in the classroom or the teacher’s perspective.

Three social work students reasoned from Stage Three, which is the first Conventional Level of reasoning according to Kohlberg. A person who reasons from this stage considers interpersonal expectations and perspectives of more than two individuals, considering how a decision will impact society, the community, and/or the world. At Stage Three, one finds the motivation to act morally in one’s desire to live up to societal or group expectations. Further, a person reasoning from this stage views a relationship as based on mutual loyalty, whereas Stage Two reasoning only considers relationships as mutual arrangements of reciprocity rather than as moral commitments.

Cyndi-SW reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Three: “I feel like putting him back in the special education room is just going to make him feel no matter what he does, he will be punished in some way… everyone makes mistakes.” Notice this student not only considered Cody’s perspective, she also related Cody’s situation to others outside the context of the discussion that may be in a situation similar to Cody. Although Cyndi-SW recognized the impact of her decision on others, she did not consider the laws of society or the impact of the decision on society-at-large, establishing her reasoning at Stage Three not Stage Four.

Most social work students interviewed responded to Dilemma 2 from Kohlberg Stage Four, which considers the importance of law and duty to social order. Individuals who reason from Kohlberg Stage Four often reference the law, society, institutions, or belief systems that
serve to provide order in society. The central value that is often associated with Kohlberg’s Stage Four is the significance of the law.

Elizabeth-SW reasoned from this orientation. Notice that Elizabeth-SW took the perspective of others into consideration when she stated, “Cody should remain in the inclusive room, because it was one outburst and he does have a disorder and we cannot label people and [isolate] them and place them over there. Plus, this was a policy [inclusion] that was put in place.” Her ethical analysis considered the perspective of the student, other individuals with disabilities, and the laws that govern inclusion.

**Dilemma 2.** When discussing Dilemma 2, three social work students reasoned from an ethic of care orientation, one from an ethic of justice orientation, and four from both the ethic of care and ethic of justice orientations. Social work students illustrated a range of reasoning strategies compared to Dilemma 1. Four social work students reasoned from a combination approach that integrated the ethic of care and the ethic of justice; three students reasoned from an ethic of care that demonstrated a group focus, or care to either the individual or the larger community; and one student focused strictly from the ethic of justice. See Table 4.14 for the moral reasoning strategies used by students in Dilemma 2.
Table 4.14: Moral Reasoning Strategies and Focus of Social Work Students in Dilemma 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Student</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Group-Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrissie</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Group Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyndi</td>
<td>Care &amp; Justice</td>
<td>Individual Focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one student referenced the values of the social work profession in her decision. Shirley-SW said, “If he does good work [your friend], then maybe his boss would say ok, maybe if it’s someone we can count on then. I would feel like it is unethical to lie. That is why I am pursuing a degree in social work, because of my commitment to social work values.” Similar to four education students, two social work students also focused on an ethic of care perspective oriented toward the community. Elizabeth-SW, who reasoned primarily from this orientation, said, “I feel like they should [go with Michael] because it’s helping the community.” Patti-SW expressed her concern for small towns: “I feel like small towns need to survive with their small businesses.”

Shirley-SW expressed support for her friendship with Michael, which is an ethic of care orientation. She reported that she “would go in and report to the boss the different prices or whatever and if he really knew that Michael needed the business or whatever I would say, “Listen, this is my long-time friend.”” Cyndi-SW said she would base her decision on “the policy
for his business and valuing his friendship with Michael,” which represents a combination approach of both the ethic of care and the ethic of justice. Further, Elizabeth-SW, the one student in social work who approached this dilemma from a similar strategy yet who reasoned solely from an ethic of justice orientation, said: “I do think that Mr. Shultz should get the other two estimates just so they can see … I know there is a policy in place about going with the lowest bidder, but I think that he could go with the board or whoever he interacts with.”

The author observed a significant decrease in students’ reasoning from Dilemma 1, when the context of the dilemma related to the social work profession, and Dilemma 2, when the context of the dilemma was unrelated to the social work profession. Five social work students reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Two; one student reasoned from Stage Three; and two students reasoned from Stage Four. Four students’ levels of reasoning decreased from Dilemma 1 to Dilemma 2. Since five of the eight social work students reasoned from this stage, the author will only provide an example of students who reasoned from Stage Two. Cyndi-SW, who reasoned from Stage Two, said, “Sometimes you need to be selfish, you need to make sure that your business is going to be ok.” This student only considered the impact of her decision on herself, rather than considering the impact of her decision on others.

In summary, BU’s social work program was aligned with the principles discussed in the NASW Code of Ethics. Most of these values were relational and emphasized helping and providing service to others. The author found the ethics instruction to focus on the core values of the social work profession and all of the students were familiar with the NASW Code of Ethics. Lastly, most of the students reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Four for Dilemma 1, which was related to the social work profession, and Stage Two for Dilemma 2, which was unrelated to the
practice of social work. The next chapter will compare the social work and teacher preparation programs.
Chapter 5

Analysis and Discussion

When, after several hours reading, I came to myself again, I asked myself what it was that had so fascinated me. The answer is simple. The results were not presented as ready-made, but scientific curiosity was first aroused by presenting contrasting possibilities of conceiving matter. Only then the attempt was made to clarify the issue by thorough argument. The intellectual honesty of the author makes us share the inner struggle in his mind”-Albert Einstein

Comparison of Teacher Preparation and Social Work Programs

The great words of Albert Einstein are an appropriate place to situate the analysis and discussion in this dissertation. This author’s journey of exploring professional ethics education and moral reasoning strategies in professional education programs began with this study and will continue to evolve. The author hopes that her work will inspire others to consider the concept of ethics education in professional preparation programs.

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the results presented in chapter four regarding the comparison of BU’s teacher preparation and social work programs. This chapter will also attempt to resituate these results within the body of research that already exists on ethics education and moral reasoning among teacher preparation and social work students. In addition to discussing the emerging themes, this chapter will revisit the assumptions about social work and teacher preparation programs discussed in chapter one.

Several assumptions that served as the inspiration for this dissertation were introduced in chapter one (see Table 1.1 for review). The first assumption, based on the researcher’s experiences, was that teacher preparation programs appeared to maintain a legal focus towards ethics with a limited discussion of ethical principles, whereas social work programs were filled
with discussion of ethical principles. This assumption will be addressed in the following sections.

In this chapter, the author will review themes that emerged relating to differences in ethics instruction, each program’s curricula, students’ values, and the varying strategies students used to reason through moral dilemmas. The author will assess the differences found in this study regarding the amount and type of ethics instruction incorporated into both programs. The individual values of the students in one program will then be compared against the values of students in the other program. The author will compare the students’ values and their approaches to reasoning through Dilemma 1 of Cody’s inclusion in the classroom and Dilemma 2 of giving the friend Michael preferential treatment for a bid.

Three themes emerged in ethics education in teacher and social work preparation: 1) the legal orientation of ethics in teacher preparation compared to the value orientation of ethics in social work; 2) the students’ familiarity with professional codes of ethics in their respective professions; and 3) ethics as behaviors in teacher preparation compared to ethics as values in social work. The author will situate the themes within the field of literature.

**Ethics Education**

Neither the teacher preparation program nor the social work program at BU has a mandatory ethics course. However, all students in social work at BU are required to take an ethics workshop. No equivalent workshop is mandated for teacher preparation students. In addition, all BU undergraduate students must take at least one course that meets the ethics requirement of the University’s general education standards for graduation. A broad range of courses meet this requirement. Students in both programs mentioned taking courses with an ethics component, such as Introductory Moral Philosophy, Problems in Philosophy, and World
Politics. The students interviewed said that these courses used various forms of instruction, including analyzing ethics in film, class discussions, and term papers. They also said the ethics instruction in these introductory courses focused on theoretical ethics and moral philosophy, including discussions of Plato and Aristotle as several examples. The author’s review of the data suggests distinct differences in the approaches used to educate BU teacher preparation and social work students about ethics. In teacher preparation, ethics has a legal focus, whereas in social work ethics instruction focuses on professional values. Both the students and the course descriptions in BU’s teacher preparation program mentioned ethics education specifically as it relates to the law. The teacher preparation students’ interviews revealed a focus on the legal obligations of future professionals. For example, when asked about her exposure to ethics in her coursework, Mary-TP said, “…definitely [mandated] reporting [of child abuse]. That was the main [area of discussion]. If a child arrives at school with a black eye do you assume that something bad happened or do you assume that he fell off of the monkey bars?” Similarly, when asked about exposure to ethics in her coursework, Lori-TP said, “Yes we discussed ethics. If a child is being abused you have to go through the appropriate channels to report it and make sure that the child is safe. Also, regarding issues such as bullying, it is important to make sure the child who is being bullied is safe.”

The legal orientation towards ethics in teacher preparation was also observed in the course descriptions listed on the program website. For example, in the special education course Cognitive Development for Diverse Learners the description reads, “…designed to address the definitions, characteristics, and educational, social, and emotional needs of diverse learners. Emphasis will be given to the legal rights and responsibilities inherent in the field of special education” (BU, Special Education, 2013). Another special education course for
infants/preschoolers with special needs contained a description that had both a legal and behavioral focus. It stated that students would learn to “…develop an Individual Education Program (IEP) to meet the needs of child and families in various learning environments such as home, center, school and the community. Lastly, the significance of professional and ethical practice will be emphasized” (BU, Special Education, 2013). The concentration of a legal focus on ethics in teacher preparation may be influenced by recent media coverage concerning alleged child abuse scandals occurring in public institutions. These alleged crimes, may have heightened the awareness of the importance and legal responsibilities associated with the mandated reporting of child abuse.

In comparison, responses by social work students regarding their exposure to ethics were noticeably different. Rather than referring to ethics for specific incidents in professional practice, they often directly associated ethics to the core values of the social work profession. For example, Grace-SW said, “I think when [ethics] came up in class it was an open discussion, how would you respond to an event and what values should we follow as they relate to the social work profession.” Similarly, Patti-SW said, “We had ethics training this year. We have always had it [ethics].” Shirley-SW said, “Ethics is something that they constantly drill into our heads. I think [there is emphasis on the] whole value system of the [NASW] code and not breaking it.” According to the social work students interviewed, ethics instruction directly related to the values of the profession as expressed in the NASW Code of Ethics. This is markedly different from ethics discussion in teacher preparation courses, which instead focus on the laws and policies associated with issues like mandated reporting of child abuse and bullying.

**Familiarity with Codes of Ethics.** During the interviews each student was asked if he or she was aware of any codes of ethics in their profession. All social work students identified the
NASW Code of Ethics, and could cite specific values articulated in the code. Only three out of eight teacher preparation students interviewed, however, were aware of any professional codes of ethics guiding their profession (see Table 5.1).

**Table 5.1: Students’ Familiarity with Professional Codes of Ethics by Program**

![Bar chart showing comparison between Social Work and Teacher Preparation students]

This disparity was further supported by the fact that the program values often referred to by social work students were predominately the values described in the NASW Code of Ethics, while the program values teacher preparation students identified were primarily outside of the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment (hereafter referred to as the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct or NAEYC code). Social work students identified a total of 32 values; only three were not included in the NASW Code of Ethics. Teacher preparation students identified 31 values; only 11 values were present in the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct (see Table 5.2). Only three teacher preparation students expressed familiarity with any codes of ethics in their profession. They referenced the NAEYC code. Of those three students, one student
identified the code provision of “Do No Harm” and two students identified the code provision of “Colleague Relations” (NAEYC Principles I & II, 2013).

Table 5.2: Number of References to Values Included in Codes of Ethics By Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Values Included in the NASW Code</th>
<th>Values Not Included in the NASW Code</th>
<th>Values Included in the NAEYC Code</th>
<th>Values Not Included in the NAEYC Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Identified by Interviewees in Applicable Programs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the interviews, social work students appeared to be familiar with the principles outlined in the NASW code and referenced specific parts of the code. This author observed results similar to the study conducted by DiFranks (2008), which reported that 90% of social workers have read the NASW Code of Ethics. This study supports DiFranks’ findings, as all eight social work students were familiar with the NASW code and could articulate specific
principles in the code. DiFranks (2008) also observed that the ethics instruction in social work programs is faithful to the principles expressed in the NASW code. Similarly, the social work students interviewed agreed that the ethics instruction they received in the BU social work program followed the principles supported by the NASW.

Further, this study also supports DiFranks (2008) in that most social workers do not experience undue stress due to discrepancies between their personal values and the values of the social work profession. In this study, only one student expressed conflict due to tensions between her personal and professional values.

Kopeikin-Brill (2001) states “Codes of ethics are windows into a profession” (p. 223). This study affirms this statement and demonstrates that the NASW Code of Ethics is a key component of BU’s social work program. Similarly, Grady et al. (2008) surveyed a random sample of social workers and found that 60.2% of social workers reported having professional ethics instruction in their academic coursework; accordingly, this researcher anticipated that most BU social work students would be familiar with their profession’s code of ethics. All eight BU social work students reported engaging in some form of ethics education during their coursework and displayed an understanding of the contents of the NASW Code of Ethics.

By contrast, there was some confusion among the teacher preparation students regarding the topic of ethics. They could express that ethics relates to certain topics, such as mandated reporting of child abuse, bullying, colleague relations, children with disabilities, and diversity; however, their knowledge focused on particular issues in education rather than on professional values.

This study also supports the findings of Beyer (1997), which observed that teacher preparation programs often take a “technical approach to learning, classroom management,
student achievement, and teacher competency” (p. 247). Further, Freeman (1998) stated that teacher preparation programs often focused on “the basics, leaving lessons about values, morals, and ethics to family and religious institutions” (p. 30). This disconnect was illustrated in this study: a teacher preparation student professed that ethics instructions was not necessary because she has always viewed herself as a polite person. In another instance, a student identified her exposure to ethics instruction via the theorists Vygotsky and Piaget, who are learning and developmental theorists, not ethicists. The social work program’s ethics instruction related to values inculcation, whereas the teacher preparation program instructed ethics as it related to expected behaviors.

The analysis of ethics education in teacher preparation at BU partially supports the findings of Cartledge, Tillman, and Johnson (2001), namely, that ethics is rarely a major component of teacher preparation. Ethics education at BU is not absent from the curriculum; however, it primarily relates to the “legal rights and responsibilities” of ethics rather than a discussion of moral reasoning or values (BU, Course Descriptions, 2013). The focus is on legal responsibilities, such as mandated reporting of child abuse, and generally follows a “rule orientation” towards ethical behavior.

**Focus of Ethics Instruction.** In the social work program, ethics was transmitted to the students as a particular set of values that all students’ were expected to adhere to. In the teacher preparation program, ethics was understood as a prescribed set of behaviors. Several social work students identified “client self-determination” as a common value stressed throughout their curriculum. This value is terminal, rather than instrumental, and instructs the social work students to believe in the client’s right to have autonomy in life decisions. In comparison, many teacher preparation students identified “adapting instruction” as a common program value. This
value is instrumental and instructs the teacher preparation students to “do something”; it tells the students how to behave rather than what to believe. This distinction between terminal and instrumental values can be further illustrated by the instrumental value of “organization.” People can interpret the goal of organization differently. For example, one student’s interpretation of organization could be that organization is important because it supports the larger goal of inspiring students to become lifetime learners, whereas another student could interpret the goal of organization as a necessary step to work towards securing a professional career.

The different professional value orientations may originate from their historical roots. From very early on in the development of social work, values and beliefs served as the cornerstone of the profession thereby rendering its origins as “humanitarianism in search of a profession” (Cohen, 1958, p.5). In contrast, the early history of education in the United States at times consisted of competing philosophies, resulting in a “patchwork array of educational institutions” (Wagoner, 2003, p. 100). From within these competing philosophies, it was very difficult to establish concrete professional values in education, which may have resulted in the profession emphasizing preparation of behavioral and skills development in lieu of values.

Upon closer examination, value differences were also evident among different programs within BU’s Department of Education, (e.g., special education, early childhood education, and secondary education). Kelly-TP illuminated one difference between the elementary education program and the K-8 program when she said:

[the different programs] cover almost the same grades but they are very different. They [K-8] are worksheet based and [have kids] sitting and writing, whereas we [the early childhood education program] are interactive and hands on, and believe that hands-on learning is a very important value. It is a value that they drill into our minds. I don’t know why [the programs are different]. My roommate my freshmen and sophomore year was an elementary education major, and what she
is doing and what I am doing are very different between the two departments. The philosophies are very different. Neither one is wrong, but they are very different.

Gloria-TP shared a similar perspective regarding differences among the programs within BU’s Department of Education:

Once you meet everyone, you could separate the duals from the straight majors [dual majors including a major in special education], they are very different. We have two sections of block [courses required for the major] this semester and they are mixed together. Next semester they should split the sections, duals in one section and straights in the other because our personalities are so similar to the dual majors, but not as much as the straight majors. It is to the point that we notice [the differences]. Sometimes, there are disagreements on inclusion. There is a special education way of looking at things and then there is a general education way of looking at things.

BU’s Department of Education is segmented: it comprises several programs with a large number of course offerings, and this poses a unique challenge to establishing a set of universal values. By contrast, social work contains one program comprising a limited number of courses that may facilitate more continuity in values.

Comparison of Each Program’s Curricula

This section compares BU’s teacher preparation and social work curricula, highlighting four differences the author observed in the following facets of each program’s curriculum: (1) value differences; (2) marketing strategies for prospective students; (3) rule orientations; and (4) the use of person-first language.

First, the social work curriculum emphasized relational values while the teacher preparation curriculum emphasized individualistic values. Second, there were noticeable differences in the marketing strategies used by each program to attract prospective students. The social work program focused on helping and caring for others, while the teacher preparation program accentuated students’ professional job prospects and opportunities for career success.
Third, there was an observable difference between the rule orientations of both programs; specifically, social work was value rule oriented and teacher preparation was policy and law rule oriented. Fourth, there was a noticeable difference regarding how each program used person-first language in its course descriptions.

**Program Values: Individualistic versus Relational.** The teacher preparation program emphasized values that were individualistic, whereas the social work program emphasized relational values. This difference is not a dichotomy, but rather a continuum in which the social work program placed greater emphasis on relational values and the teacher preparation program emphasized individualistic values. For example, the teacher preparation program emphasized organization, cheerfulness, providing meaningful instruction, and creativity.

According to the teacher preparation students interviewed, their program prepared them to value organization, creativity, and the importance of providing meaningful instruction to students. Although the program emphasized individualistic values, the benefits of these values were not solely individualistic, as the intent of these values is to provide children with a meaningful educational experience. However, since the curriculum focused on individualistic values rather than relational values, the author believes the BU students may focus their attention internally rather than relationally when an issue arises in the classroom.

Unlike the teacher preparation program, which focused on individualistic values, the social work program promoted relational values throughout the course curriculum. It stressed relational values such as the importance of human relationships, dignity and worth of a person, equality, and fairness. These values may orient the social work students more on their relational identity than their individualistic identity as a professional.
Therefore, due to this difference in academic preparation, the author believes several potential consequences could result. Although there is limited literature available on this topic, the author offers several interpretations of the impact of this finding. First, the social work students may be better equipped to think more relationally than individualistically and be more proficient in recognizing situations occurring outside of themselves in their interactions with others. Second, although social work and teacher preparation students may both recognize relational cues, they may interpret these relational cues differently. The social work students may interpret an issue as being relational and a teaching preparation student may interpret the same issue as being individualistic. Third, it is possible that there may be no difference between social work students and teacher preparation students’ abilities to recognize or interpret relational cues, but rather the difference occurs in how they respond to these indicators.

**Marketing For Prospective Students.** The teacher preparation program markets to prospective students by conveying a diverse message, with an emphasis on personal and professional development. BU’s Department of Education homepage, the Special Education homepage, and the Secondary Education homepage all contained information about certification requirements, the qualifications required to obtain future employment, students’ future marketability as a graduate from the program, and access to technology in classrooms. All of the aforementioned marketing materials are designed to target students to whom career development is a priority.

The only exception to this generalization was found in the early childhood education program, which included a similar marketing strategy to attract prospective students; however, there were more references to service to others compared to BU’s other teacher preparation program websites. This particular website mentioned adhering to a “whole child approach” in the
course curriculum and also included information on the NAEYC code which is largely based on relational and service-focused values, similar to the NASW Code of Ethics.

BU’s early childhood education program appeared to use a slightly different marketing strategy compared to the Department of Education’s other programs. Although there could be many reasons, several early childhood education students perceived their major to emphasize emotions such as the importance of cheerfulness, imagination, and hands-on learning in the classroom; they considered the other programs in the department to be different from the early childhood education program. It is not clear why BU’s early childhood education program appeared to be more aligned with a professional code of ethics than the other education programs. Despite efforts to integrate the NAEYC code into the early childhood education curriculum, when questioned about major program values, the early educational students interviewed failed to echo the principles expressed in the NAEYC code. In contrast, most of the social work students identified many of the social work values espoused by the NASW Code of Ethics as major values in their program at BU.

The importance of serving others is a message promoted throughout BU’s social work program. This message is evident in the program website, course descriptions, and was present in the students’ perceptions of the program’s core values. For those pursuing a degree in social work, serving others is more important than promoting one’s own personal advancement.

There was no mention of personal accomplishments, career advancement opportunities, or job security on the social work program website. One significant difference in the programs was how they advertise for students on their respective web pages. The social work’s homepage includes a poem written by Regina Brett. This poem draws students who focus on relational
values, such as compassion and helpfulness, and devalues individualistic values, such as financial security and professional advancement.

The social work program’s emphasis on service to others as opposed to individual achievements may stem from the profession’s origins. Social work began as “humanitarianism in search of a profession” and was rooted in volunteer work, idealism, and the spirit of helping others (Cohen, 1958, p. 5). The aforementioned historical social work values still permeate the current BU course curriculum. These values, bolstered by the NASW Code of Ethics, may be why service to others continues to be a core value of the social work program and the profession.

**Person-First Language.** In chapter one the author presented several assumptions that served as the inspiration for this dissertation. One of these assumptions was that social work programs adhere to a person-first orientation, whereas teacher preparation programs did not emphasize the use of person-first language. The author’s review of the data supported this assumption, and revealed more consistent use of person-first language in BU’s social work program compared to the teacher preparation program, which sometimes failed to use person-first language.

In her analysis the author found inconsistent use of person-first language in the teacher preparation course descriptions, ranging from explicitly person-first to non-person-first. One course description in special education said that the course adhered to a “person-first philosophy,” while another course description for the same program was titled “Mentally and Physically Disabled I.”

Further, there were also discrepancies in the language used and a bias towards higher-performing students in the course descriptions. In a course designed to prepare teachers to work with “gifted” students, the course description used person-first language and focused on serving
students’ needs. However, in the very next course description, which was a class designed to prepare students to work with individuals diagnosed with a disability, the course name and description did not adhere to person-first language. This course focused on meeting the teacher’s rather than the students’ needs. Although there have been attempts to integrate a “people-first” or “person-centered planning” in the field of special education (Mazzotti, Kelley, & Coco, 2013; Artesani & Maller, 1998; Miner & Bates, 1997), there still is room for improvement in higher education to develop and adhere to a person-first philosophy consistently throughout the curriculum. Failure to do so sends mixed messages about the importance of person-first philosophy, as some course descriptions appeared to follow the orientation, while others were titled with language that disregarded person-first principles.

In comparison, the social work program maintained a person-first orientation throughout its websites and course descriptions. The author found one instance of non-person-first language on the social work website, in the poem displayed on the program’s homepage. There, the poem described a child as a “crack baby” instead of identifying the child as an infant who was addicted to crack in utero.

**Comparison of Students’ Values By Program**

Upon reviewing the data, several themes emerged when comparing the personal values of the teacher preparation and social work students. Value differences were observed in the following areas: (1) value of obedience; (2) value of helping; (3) professional and personal value congruency in both programs; (4) terminal versus instrumental values; and (5) advocacy in the curriculum. This section will expand upon these themes.

Among the eight teacher preparation students interviewed, several values were identified as being the most important: ambition/goal setting (7); equality (6); honesty (5); family security
In contrast, the eight social work students interviewed for this study identified these values as being the most important: ambition/goal setting (3); forgiveness (3); friendship (3); honesty (3); and helpfulness (3). The values referenced most by both social work and teacher preparation students were the personal values of ambition/goal setting and honesty; however, these were the only similarities found (see Tables 5.3 and 5.4).

Overall, teacher preparation students identified more values compared to social work students. There were some similarities in values identified; however, significant and interesting differences exist between the programs. First, although students in both programs identified ambition/goal setting/sense of accomplishment as the most popular value, all but one of the teacher preparation students placed a great weight on this value while only three social work students placed similar weight on this value. Five teacher preparation students highly valued family security and tolerance, while only one and two social workers shared these values, respectively. Four teacher preparation students highly valued self-respect and only one social work student shared this valuation. Finally, helping others tied for the most common value among social work students with three students highly valuing it; however, no teacher preparation students placed any weight on this value.
Table 5:3: *Comparison of Social Work and Teacher Preparation Students’ Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Social Work Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambition/Goal Setting/Sense of</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ambition/Goal Setting/Sense of</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Helpfulness/Helping Others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Admit Mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Client Self-Determination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comfortable Life</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognizing Personal Values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Mistakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Self-Love</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Self-Determination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable Life</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness/Helping Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Financial Security</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing Personal Values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Personal Accountability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Love</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4: Comparison of Values Important to Students by Program of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Social Work Students</th>
<th>Teacher Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness/Helping Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Self-Determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition/Goal-Setting/Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- #: Social Work Students
- #: Teacher Preparation
In addition to values that students identified as important, the author found that both groups of students considered obedience to be a value unimportant to their lives. Three students in teacher preparation and two students in social work elaborated on their discomfort with this particular value. During the interview, Jane-TP associated her aversion for the value of obedience by relating the significance of the value to women’s rights concerns. She said, “Obedience—that is probably my lowest one! Why do we have to be obedient? This is my feminist side. No you should not be obedient!”

Jen-TP also disliked the value of obedience and related the definition to a lack of critical thinking, which could result in abhorrent events such as the Holocaust.

Obedience is nice in the way [when] I tell my child when they are very little to do something, but I’ve always raised my kids to have a mind of their own. Strict obedience means they are not thinking for themselves. It is important for the mind to be [active]… a lack of obedience from some people would have [prevented events] like the Holocaust.

Kelly-TP said, “I don’t like the word obedience, it just sounds like obedience is a second-class person.” Similarly, two social work students identified obedience as a less important value. For example, one student explained, “Obedience, I don’t feel that some people get to beat their own drum.” Chrissie-SW agreed: she also devalued obedience, stating, “I think the only person you have to obey is yourself.”
Professional and Personal Value Congruency. In both programs, most students did not appear to be feeling undue stress as a result of conflict between professional and personal values. However, one social work student and one teacher preparation student stated that they were contemplating leaving their respective professions due to such a conflict. The author highlights these two students’ stories as they illuminate the factors that can influence the likelihood that a student will leave the program.

Jane-TP, following a negative performance review, said she was contemplating pursuing a career outside of education upon graduation because she cannot foresee herself working in the education environment. She said that she “felt helpless and unprepared to teach children with disabilities and felt unsure of her future as a teacher.” Jane-TP stated that it was “[not] my regular education kids, but my inclusion kids and my lower education kids, the ones that have attitude problems, attention deficit disorder, dyslexia, or other behavioral problems. They are very rebellious. They have a problem with authority. Those are the kids that are killing me.”

Further, Jane-TP also reported being very dissatisfied with her experiences with criticism while working with education professionals during her student teaching. She described the feedback she received as being unduly critical rather than constructive. Jane-TP said:

I am a double major and a triple minor. I am getting my masters and my PhD—my PhD in women’s studies. I will be perfectly honest with you, I got a review from a vice principal. He is very arrogant. In my life I have never had a negative review, and this was quite possibly the most negative review anyone could have gotten. It was so terrible. He told me that I suck at life… it is not just a matter of making a switch and doing something better.

According to Jane-TP, her supervisor resorted to global criticisms rather than specific recommendations for improvement and demonstrated an overly critical approach. She explained her impression that education professionals are not comfortable with conflict.
The author also found that Jane-TP’s personality and values were observably different when compared to the other teacher preparation students interviewed. The interview with Jane-TP was the longest of the 16 students who were part of this study. A self-proclaimed feminist, Jane-TP expressed values that other students did not express, and she was extremely outspoken compared to the other teacher preparation students interviewed. For example, when discussing the values that she believed to be important, Jane-TP referenced “equality” enthusiastically, stating:

Equality, clearly, is the most important because as a country we have built our foundation on cooperation of everyone and for one race or one gender to be held above another when everyone has played their part in creating the world that we live in. Why should one, especially, gender be considered less than another when neither gender could exist without the other?

In another instance, Jane-TP continued to discuss her values and reported that pleasure is an important value to her. She was the only student from either program to mention pleasure as an important value. She said:

Pleasure is important—especially mental. Everyone says I’m a very physical person. I am a physical being, but you can’t have physical pleasure in the absence of mental pleasure. You have to have both. If your mind is not happy, you cannot be physically happy.

There was little agreement across the board for teacher preparation students when they identified the values important to them compared to the values they perceived as important to their program. However, this disconnect between personal values and program values was of little concern to any of the teacher preparation students. It was clear that the teaching preparation program focuses more on instrumental values than terminal values. This emphasis on instrumental values makes it difficult to determine which universal goals the program deems all students should adhere to. This gives teacher preparation students a lot of freedom to define their
own identities and values within their professional preparation. This “freedom” to interpret the instrumental goals, such as adapting instruction and the importance of providing meaningful instruction, may give teacher preparation students more freedom than social work students to create their own professional identities.

In social work the author observed a stronger alignment between the students’ personal and professional values and the values of their program and the NASW. Most students interviewed did not experience distress stemming from an incongruence of values between themselves and the program; however, if there was a difference in values, the student appeared discontented and eager to leave the profession.

In the social work program, which is based in terminal values, the students were aware of the values that their program perceived as important, making it more transparent as to whether they fit in with the profession’s goals or not. However, a study conducted by Osteen (2011) suggests that social work students may adopt two separate identities, a personal identity and a professional identity, in order to resolve conflicts between their personal and professional values during their social work career. This separate identity may allow social workers who do not support all of the ideals of the profession to find a way to achieve a balance between the tensions caused by their personal and professional values.

The interviews revealed one social work student who was intending to pursue a career in law rather than social work upon graduation. This finding supports the research conducted by Ressler and Hodge (2003) who found that social work educational settings were unfavorable towards faculty and students who believe in conservative values. Patti-SW identified her interest in helping people, a social work value; however, she did not necessarily believe that her value orientation as a self-identified moderate democrat is in line with values of the social work
profession. As a result, Patti-SW stated that she is planning to pursue a law degree following graduation because she believes that her policy-focused orientation towards helping is better suited for that profession than it is for social work.

In her interview, Patti-SW identified the social work profession as overly helpful and based in compassion. She said she felt the program stressed the importance of being a social worker first and an American citizen second. Interestingly, Patti-SW also expressed that her beliefs have changed since her experience in the social work program—she has gone from being a conservative to a moderate/conservative democrat, which is very dissimilar to her family’s beliefs. However, despite this change in beliefs, Patti-SW experienced an ethical conflict with her field placement agency’s policy on reporting clients who are of illegal immigrant status and the social work program about reporting on this issue. The position held by both parties on this issue was in direct conflict with Patti’s personal values.

Consequently, Patti-SW felt compelled to leave the social work profession and pursue a career in law. However, she desired to continue helping people from a community-oriented approach, just from a profession that better fits her ethical framework.

I grew up in a Republican family—a really right-wing [family]. I’ve strayed away from that now. I definitely call myself a moderate. I feel that social workers tend to be really moderate and the courses [discuss the profession] from a liberal approach. How they approach that [discussion of social welfare] to me is biased.

Patti-SW did not foresee a future as a social worker despite the history of social work and the settlement house movement, and the profession’s focus historically on environmental reform, community organizing and social action, and many community-oriented careers options. Therefore, either Patti-SW was unaware that the social work profession has careers in
community-based practice or the conflict between her personal and professional values was too large for her to overcome.

Social work students also seemed to understand the values that the social work profession believed to be important for all social workers to possess. For most social work students, this resulted in a strong alignment between their personal and professional values. The NASW presents unambiguous values for social work students that often make it clear to students whether they “fit in” to the program or will feel alienated due to value differences.

The author had expected that a high degree of value transparency in the social work program would result in more students experiencing value conflicts between their personal and professional codes of ethics as compared to teacher preparation; however, this was not what this study found. Similar to the teacher preparation program, only one social work student experienced a serious value conflict, prompting her to leave the profession. Therefore, since social work students are not experiencing undue stress from a conflict between their personal and professional values, several possibilities may be occurring. First, individuals who believe in social work values may self-select into the social work profession. Based on how the social work program and profession advertise their core values, the author would expect it to be obvious to students whether their traits and values aligned with the values promoted. Second, social work students’ values may change as a result of being enrolled in a social work program. Patti-SW, who admitted that her political affiliation had changed from conservative to moderate democrat during her four years of study, is one example. Third, as previously mentioned, social work students who experience a value conflict may develop two separate identifies, a social worker identify and a personal identity as a means to resolve any value conflict (Osteen, 2011).
Because the social work program was centered on the core values of the social work profession, the program’s values at BU are easily identified on the course websites, course descriptions, and in social work classes. Therefore, there was minimal confusion as to what the program advocates and its position on particular issues. This transparency of values, in most cases, seemed to provide a clear and concise message to students.

Since social work students could easily identify program values, comparing their personal and professional values was straightforward. Seven of the eight students embraced the similarities in their own values to the social work values, reinforcing their decision to become a social worker. However, this obvious discrepancy left Patti-SW feeling alienated and she desired to leave the profession to pursue a law degree.

The cases of Patti-SW and Jane-TP illustrate a possible dilemma in professional training programs. The social work program conveyed a consistent message that may place students in direct value conflict, perhaps hurting the enrollment of social work programs, especially when the social work profession has increasingly been interested in conducting evidenced-based practice. This transparency left the author with several questions regarding the benefits and costs of the program. Is it beneficial for a program to establish a clear set of values that all students are expected to adhere by, and that are indicative of personality traits that will result in future professional success? Or is the opposite true, does an over-adherence to values dissuade prospective students with different skill sets who could advance and innovate the profession?

A strict adherence to unyielding professional standards that are politically restrictive may impact the growth of the profession and student enrollment in a program. Comparatively, the teacher preparation program did not appear to tell students what they should believe, whereas social work can have a decidedly liberal slant, which was a source of conflict for Patti-SW. The
author contends that the social work program should review and adopt some aspects of the teacher preparation program’s marketing strategy, and also be more open to a range of political perspectives when presenting and using problem-solving techniques based upon the NASW Code of Ethics.

Patti-SW identified with the core social work value of helping others and with the importance of service. However, she self-identified her skill set as policy driven, analytical, and less conducive for direct clinical practice. Although her personality may be perceived as “unsocial work-like,” she could have pursued a career as a community social worker or worked in public policy. By being transparent, a program runs the risk of dissension. Patti-SW may have brought a fresh and positive perspective to the profession; however, because of the conflict she experienced with the profession’s values and its strict commitment to a very specific interpretation of these values, she has opted not to pursue the profession.

**Terminal versus Instrumental Values.** In general, social work students identified nine terminal values and 16 instrumental values. Teacher preparation students identified 14 terminal values and eight instrumental values. The social work students demonstrated a preference for personal values that are instrumental, such as helping, ambition/goal setting, and honesty; the teacher preparation students identified a slight preference for terminal values, such as equality, family security, and self-respect. Therefore, social work students demonstrate a preference towards behaviors that are intended to achieve a goal, whereas teacher preparation students demonstrate a preference for the overarching lifetime goals in lieu of the behaviors. Although there was a preference, students from both programs still identified goals from both categories.

**Advocacy.** Advocacy is a core principle of the social work profession, but students did not identify it as a core value in their program. This could be consistent with arguments that the
social work profession is becoming more clinically focused and is losing its foundations in social justice. As the profession navigates from an art to a “science,” it is moving away from its roots in advocacy and social justice into a practice focused on direct services and clinical counseling (Canaan & Dichter, 2008, p. 278). In the case of BU, the importance of advocacy was mentioned frequently in the course descriptions; however, the students did not identify advocacy or social justice as either a personal value or a program value.

Therefore, perhaps if BU’s social work program was more community-social work focused, students like Patti-SW may have realized that there are other avenues to pursue with a social work degree outside of individual and clinical practice. The legitimizing of the profession, as it is often referred to, is emphasizing direct and evidence-based practices at the cost of community-focused social work (Allen-Meares & Ruffolo, 2007). This is one criticism regarding the profession’s direction as it moves towards greater reliance on evidence-based practice (Webb, 2001; Gambrill, 2006). BU students may not have identified the importance of advocacy to the social work program for two reasons. The BU program could be experiencing the aforementioned change that is happening within the larger profession. Thus, these students may not be aware that opportunities exist to practice social work at the macro level because the program is becoming more clinically driven. The other possibility is that because students do not identify advocacy or social justice as an important personal value, they are less likely to identify the value as a core program value, even if it is being discussed in their classes.

**Moral Reasoning Differences**

**Ethic of Care and Justice.** Across both dilemmas—Dilemma 1 about Cody remaining in the classroom and Dilemma 2 about Michael receiving preferential treatment for his bid—there was very little difference in the reasoning approaches of the students in both programs. There
were very few distinctions between the use of the Shapiro and Stefkovich (2011) frameworks among teacher preparation and social work students. Most of the distinctions between students in both programs occurred in their individual analysis of the dilemma, not in their ethical orientation. Teacher preparation students tended to have a broader range of reasons for coming to their particular conclusions than did social work students. For instance, in both dilemmas the same number of students in each program reasoned from each orientation. When reviewing the responses oriented from the ethic of justice, teacher preparation students tended to focus more on punishment and rule orientation than the social work students, who were more focused on issues of fairness and rule orientation. As mentioned in chapter two, none of the social work students referenced the use of punishment to control Cody’s behavior. However, one social work student, did reference punishment from a very different perspective than any of the teacher preparation students; in fact, her discussion of punishment was not focused on punishment itself but the effect of the punishment on the student. Thus, the student was not discussing punishment per se, she was discussing an effective act on a student. This student discussed punishment from an ethic of care orientation wherein she expressed concern about the impact of the punishment on Cody’s mental wellbeing and confidence, and not on punishment as discipline.

For Dilemma 2, four teacher preparation students and two social work students reasoned from an ethic of care oriented towards the care of the community. Lori-TP said supporting the community through using the local business “builds a sense of community pride.” Similarly, Jane-TP reasoned that helping the community grow was important and sought to help the local business “because [by] spending money in your community, helping your fellow business owners succeed, you are helping your community grow.” Elizabeth-SW, said, “I feel like they should [go with Michael] because it’s helping in the community.” Patti-SW expressed her
concern for small towns: “I feel like small towns need to survive with their small businesses.” Although it was referenced fewer times than a community-care orientation, several students discussed care for their friend when supporting their reasoning in Dilemma 2. Two students in both social work and education, respectively, approached their reasoning from this orientation.

**Cheating to Avoid Compliance.** Two teacher preparation students and one social work student discussed strategies to advocate for change rather than finding ways to get around company policy. However, three teacher preparation students and one social work student suggested ways to avoid complying with company policy rather than advocating for changing the policy with other strategies.

Of the two teacher preparation students who approached their decision with strategies to advocate for change, Rob-TP said he would “defend the difference between their actions and the policy to the board.” Similarly, Jen-TP said, “I would go up to and talk to the purchasing manager. Explain to him the situation.” Further, Elizabeth-SW, the one social work student who approached the dilemma from a similar approach, said, “I do think that Mr. Shultz should get the other two estimates just so they can see and as far as the Board, I know there is a policy in place about going with the lowest bidder, but I think that he could go with the Board or whoever he interacts with.”

Three teacher preparation students discussed strategies to avoid complying with company policy—essentially these students advocated cheating. Jane-TP said, “If it is a situation where no one is going to know, no one is going to say anything, then why not benefit the community?” Similarly, Betty-TP said, “I don’t want to say cheating, but you could look at other places that you know are going to be higher [bids] than his.” Further, Kelly-TP said, “I guess that I would get around that [the policy] as much as I could, help out the local business owner instead... I hope
that I wouldn’t get into much trouble, but I bend the rules sometimes if it is to benefit other people.” Cyndi-SW also discussed the possibility of cheating when she said, “If you talked to Michael about putting down an estimate, maybe then give him the business, for it to be less than three thousand or less than the others.”

Based on these responses, it appears that a small number of students in both programs were willing to find alternative ways to abide by company policy while accomplishing a goal counter to the expressed policy. These students seem to take an approach that seeks to try to follow the rules and avoid punishment, yet still achieve the outcome they desire.

Comparison Of Moral Reasoning: Kohlberg. According to Kohlberg’s Stages of Moral Development, overall the social work students demonstrated a slightly higher level of moral reasoning compared to the teacher preparation students. This difference was more profound in Dilemma 1 than Dilemma 2; however, a teacher preparation student was the only one who reasoned from a Post-Conventional Level. The largest number of social work students (4) reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Four, whereas the largest number of teacher preparation students (4) reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Three. Although the social work students reasoned at a slightly higher level overall, only one student demonstrated reasoning abilities beyond the Conventional Level.

The reason more social work students reasoned from Stage Four compared to teacher preparation students was because the latter viewed the situation from the classroom perspective rather than a perspective that considers the impact beyond the classroom. This difference could be a result of BU’s social work curriculum, which emphasizes approaching issues from a systems perspective: (1) micro (individual); (2) mezzo (family); and (3) macro (community,
society, world). This approach may have encouraged the social work students to consider the larger impact of their decisions on society, resulting in more Stage Four responses.

A significant decrease was evident in both social work and teacher preparation students’ level of moral reasoning between Dilemma 1 and Dilemma 2. In general, students appeared to reason from a higher level when the focus was related to their profession. However, when the dilemma was unrelated to their profession, both groups tended to reason from a lower level. This difference could be due to two factors: (1) Students may demonstrate more sophisticated reasoning when the topic is professionally related rather than profession neutral; or (2) Several students, especially in social work, did not consider Dilemma 2 to have a moral focus; therefore, they made their decision solely on the business policy.
CHAPTER 6

Conclusions and Implications

The author began this dissertation with two goals: (1) to explore ethics education and moral reasoning to improve the performance of future educators in the complex situations that they face everyday; and (2) to make sense of her own negative experiences within the education system with the intent of identifying strategies to reduce the likelihood other students will have to experience similar circumstances. Working in public education is in many ways a high-stakes environment because one ethical decision has the potential to have a lifetime of consequences for a student.

It is of the utmost importance to improve the understanding of teacher preparation students regarding their ethical obligations and their ability to make moral decisions, in what are oftentimes extremely complex, unanticipated circumstances. As a result, the author hopes to better prepare students to deal with these often-unanticipated situations by improving the ethics curriculum taught to them in their professional programs of study. To gain a greater depth of understanding of the ethics instruction and moral reasoning strategies used among teacher preparation and social work students, the following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the core philosophies of teacher preparation and social work preparation at one university? (BU)

2. How do students’ values compare with the philosophies of the teacher preparation and social work programs at one university? (BU)

3. What type of formal training in ethics do students have by the start of their fourth year of undergraduate education at BU?
4. How do teacher preparation and social work students reason through moral dilemmas at one university? (BU)

This study makes significant contributions to the literature in several disciplines of study both within and outside the field of education. This study contributes to the literature in ethics/moral education in professional preparation programs; to the literature on moral reasoning; to social work and teacher preparation education; and to the body of literature on professional codes of ethics. This study illuminates how the ethics education and values instilled into a professional program have the potential to influence both students’ values and the way they reason through moral dilemmas.

To date, no studies have compared the ethics education and the values of students in teacher preparation and social work preparation. Currently, no studies have compared the relevancy of moral dilemmas to professional practice with particular focus on students in social work and teacher preparation. This chapter will summarize this study’s key research findings and the implications for policy, practice, and future research.

**Summary and Discussion of Key Findings**

**Ethics Instruction in Teacher Preparation**

A study conducted by Cartledge, Tillman, and Johnson (2001) found that ethics is rarely a component of teacher preparation programs. Another study argued that ethics in teacher preparation should be integrated throughout the curriculum rather than being sequestered into foundational courses (Beyer, 1997). Consequently, pre-service teachers may be left without the training or preparation to reason through the complex dilemmas that they will undoubtedly face in the classroom. This study supported these findings and showed that:
1. *Ethics instruction was inconsistently integrated into the teaching preparation curriculum and weighted towards a legal orientation of ethics rather than a value orientation.*

Students in teacher preparation often referred to ethics and ethics instruction in terms of their legal obligations or as the consequences of failing to report child abuse. In addition, the course descriptions weighted the instruction of ethics towards the law rather than treating ethics as values or moral decision-making. Several course descriptions referenced the importance of ethics as moral decision-making; however, the focus was overwhelmingly weighted on the legal ramifications and responsibilities over the value orientation of ethics. It is not apparent whether this is a change in the focus of ethics instruction or a response to recent media attention to alleged child abuse crimes in public institutions.

**Social Work Program NASW Congruency.** A study conducted by DiFranks (2008) determined that most social workers had read their code of ethics and did not experience undue amounts of distress as a result of discrepancies between their personal beliefs and the values in the NASW Code of Ethics. This study supported these conclusions. The second key finding of this study showed that:

2. *Social work students were familiar with and able to articulate the principles and values included in the NASW Code of Ethics and perceived the social work program to reinforce and inculcate NASW principles.*

**Person-First Language**

In the pre-service training of professionals, some professors are integrating the “person-first philosophy” into the curriculum. Blaska (1993) discussed a special education undergraduate course at a university in the Midwest that integrated the person-first philosophy throughout a 10-week course incorporating discussions, activities, and the expectation that all coursework should
adhere to a person-first orientation. Similarly, the author’s introductory course in social work also adhered to a similar format, with person-first language in all coursework and class discussions. This study found that person-first language was used inconsistently in BU’s teacher preparation program, but was used predominantly in the social work program. Thus, the third finding of this study is:

3. *The social work program more consistently adhered to person-first language than the teacher preparation program.*

Despite one use of non-person-first language in a poem on the social work department’s homepage, there was consistent use of person-first language throughout the course descriptions. Comparatively, a range of person-first language was evident on the teacher preparation program’s website ranging from person-first phrases like the term “person-first philosophy” to the use of non-person-first language. This inconsistency in the use of language may inadvertently transmit mixed messages to students about the value of adhering to a person-first philosophy (BU, Teacher Preparation website, 2013).

**Comparison Of Program Values: Individual versus Relational**

There was an apparent difference in the value orientation between the social work and teacher preparation programs. As a result, the fourth finding of this study is:

4. *On a continuum, the social work program appeared to emphasize relational values, whereas the teacher preparation program emphasized individualistic values.*

Whereas the social work program appeared to place more significance on values such as helping, compassion, and service, the teacher preparation program emphasized values such as career opportunities, professional development, and access to resources on campus. In this instance, the author recommends that each program learn from the other; specifically, each should integrate a
more balanced approach, marketing to prospective students using strategies that simultaneously promote an individual’s professional development and service to the profession and community.

The author believes the teacher preparation program would benefit from a change in perspective. The teacher preparation program should modify its message to prospective students to include more references to the relational benefits of pursuing a degree in teaching. By emphasizing individualistic values, the teacher preparation program may be inadvertently encouraging teachers to focus their attention on their own behaviors rather than on the relationships between themselves and their students. Although the program clearly informed its students of the many career opportunities and benefits of pursuing a career in public education, the advertising materials failed to tell students how they can make a real difference in their community and in the lives of others. This refocus may enable BU to draw additional candidates who possess a different set of values to its teaching program.

Social work is traditionally rooted in the value of service to others, which served as the foundation of the profession in its infancy. Although the author agrees with the foundations and values of the social work profession, she does not believe there is any harm in showing prospective social work students how they can both serve and help others while simultaneously considering their own career advancement. Therefore, the author recommends that the social work program integrate additional references to career opportunities available. If each program reviewed the other program’s marketing materials and adopted a few strategies, the author believes the overall quality of the message given to prospective students would improve dramatically.

Due to this focus on serving others, the author believes the social work program may benefit by projecting some individualistic values into its marketing strategies aimed at
prospective students. BU’s social work program may benefit from including in its advertising how prospective students can meet their individual goals while primarily working to serve others. This would better demonstrate to prospective BU social work students that there are personal benefits to helping others, and people who have social work degrees need not live in poverty and sacrifice their own career development to serve others. Many financially secure and successful change-oriented people work in government institutions, schools, and in policy reform.

**Value Congruency Across Both Programs**

Based on the value delineation incorporated into the Rokeach Survey (1973), there appeared to be more congruency between the social work students’ value categorization than to the teacher preparation students’ value categorization when these value categorizations are compared to the values of their respective programs. Therefore, the fifth finding of this study is:

5. *The teacher preparation students exhibited a slight preference for terminal values, or overarching life goals, while the preparation program emphasized instrumental values. Simultaneously, the social work students displayed a sizeable preference for instrumental values, while the social work program appeared to emphasize terminal and instrumental values equally.*

As a result of its value orientation, the teacher preparation program focused more on skill development and behaviors, which are intended to achieve a goal, whereas the teacher preparation students expressed a slight preference for terminal values. This discrepancy in value distinction could explain the inconsistencies and variations found between the program’s values and the students’ values. As previously noted, the teacher preparation program is based on instrumental values rather than terminal values, which made it difficult to determine the specific
terminal values the program endorsed. Therefore, due to the program’s emphasis on instrumental values that build skills and classroom-specific behaviors over the terminal values slightly preferred by students, there is no clear message regarding the applicability of these terminal values to the education profession. There was greater variation among the values that teacher preparation students identified as program values. For example, while the teacher preparation students were aware of the importance of adapting instruction as a program value, only one student identified the NAEYC code principle of “do no harm” to students. The author would expect the value of doing no harm to have been universally identified.

Comparatively, the social work students displayed a preference for instrumental values. Meanwhile, the program emphasized both terminal values and instrumental values, with a slight preference for terminal values. With the instructional strategy focused more on terminal values, the program values may be more transparent to students, resulting in students’ increased understanding of what is considered important in the program.

The author recommends that, despite the potential risks of increasing the professional value transparency, teacher preparation programs adopt mission statements and establish core program principles in order to ensure that the curriculum adheres to a set of universal values. Further, the author recommends that BU and other similar teacher preparation programs place additional focus on terminal values rather than focusing almost exclusively on instrumental values. It becomes easier to stray from core values if the curriculum’s focus becomes preoccupied with skills and behaviors at the expense of remaining committed to a core set of principles.
Differences in Moral Reasoning

Several studies have documented that moral reasoning among pre-service teachers is lower than for college students majoring in other professions (Lampe, 1994; McNeel, 1994; Yeazell & Johnson, 1988; Cummings, Dyas, Maddux, & Kochman, 2001). In addition, Chang (1994) found that most teachers reason at the Conventional Level according to Kohlberg’s Stages of Moral Development (p. 72). This study supports the findings of Chang (1994), as five of the eight teaching preparation students reasoned at Kohlberg’s Conventional Level; two were at the Pre-Conventional and one at the Post-Conventional Level. Of these five teacher preparation students, most (4) reasoned at Kohlberg’s Stage Three for Dilemma 1. For Dilemma 2, six of the teacher preparation students reasoned from a Pre-Conventional Level on Kohlberg’s scale, reasoning only at Stage Two. Meanwhile, the remaining two reasoned at a Kohlberg Stage Three, which placed them at the Conventional Level.

All of the social work students reasoned at the Conventional Level in Dilemma 1; however, the students primarily reasoned from Kohlberg Stage Four. However, like the teacher preparation students, the social work students reasoned at a lower level for Dilemma 2 than they did for Dilemma 1 with five students reasoning at a Pre-Conventional Stage Two, and three from the Conventional Level with one reasoning at Stage Three and two at Stage Four.

This study also revealed several significant findings about the students’ moral reasoning. First, there may be a relationship between the level of moral reasoning applied to a particular dilemma and its association with the student’s profession. This issue should be explored in future research, as it may suggest that ethics instruction may need to be expanded or clarified so that it is clear to students how these principles can apply in other aspects of their life. Further, students
in both programs did not consistently reason from one orientation or stage of moral reasoning across the two dilemmas. The sixth key finding of this study is:

6. *Students in both social work and teacher preparation displayed a higher level of moral reasoning when the ethical dilemma was profession based rather than profession neutral. Students in both programs changed their moral reasoning orientation and did not always reason from the same ethical paradigm when the ethical dilemma was professionally based or profession neutral.*

Further, there was a difference between the moral reasoning of social work and teacher preparation students on a dilemma focused on an issue arising within their own profession. The seventh finding of this study is:

7. *Students in social work demonstrated a higher level of moral reasoning compared to teacher preparation students when the ethical dilemma was related to their profession.*

Also, students in the teacher preparation program tended to have a more varied approach in their ethical reasoning orientation than did the social work students. The eighth key finding of this study is:

8. *Where students in social work favored reasoning strategies based in the ethic of care, teacher preparation students displayed more variation in reasoning strategies, approaching ethical decisions from an ethic of care and an ethic of justice.*

**Comparison of Value Orientation versus Rule Orientation**

The author found that both programs emphasize in its curriculum the importance of abiding by to a particular set of professional guidelines; however, where the social work program emphasized adhering to values, the teacher preparation program emphasized adhering to policy and law. The final key finding of this study is:
9. The teacher preparation program emphasized the importance of adhering to the program’s policies, school policies, and educational law. The social work program emphasized the importance of adhering to the “values,” which serve as the foundations for the social work profession.

Therefore, both programs emphasized the importance of adhering to rules however, rules in teacher preparation are found in law and policy, while rules in social work are found in the values of the profession as expressed in the NASW Code of Ethics. The social work program required students to adhere and follow the principles and values outlined in the NASW Code of Ethics. The teacher preparation program stressed the importance of adhering to school policy and the relevant educational laws that are intended to guide their professional behavior.

**Implications for Research**

The main limitation of this study—due to time constraints and the limitations of conducting a dissertation—is the focus on moral reasoning without considering other factors that impact moral reasoning, such as moral sensitivity and moral motivation. Future studies may consider other factors that influence a person’s ability to reason and make moral decisions, including those identified above. Further, it is important to consider that moral reasoning does not necessarily equate to moral action/or moral behavior (Cummings, et al., 2001).

This original intent of this study was to focus primarily on students’ moral reasoning strategies; however, since the questions related to student reasoning were implemented late in the interview protocol, students spent considerably less time reasoning through the dilemmas compared to other areas of the interview. Students spent much more time discussing their personal and program values. Therefore, the author’s first recommendation for future studies is
to advise researchers to present the dilemmas earlier in the interview protocol or consider introducing the dilemmas at a follow-up interview.

A second recommendation relates to the use of the modified Rokeach Value Assessment used in this study. An unexpected consequence of permitting students to place an “X” anywhere on the line was that many students placed an “X” to the far right or the far left for the majority of values. This slight modification to the survey made it difficult to determine, solely based on the survey results, the impact of the values compared to other values. Therefore, the original rank ordering of values, although time consuming and difficult, would “force” participants to consider the strength of the value in relation to other values. Another strategy could be to determine an alternative way to categorize the values, having students rank order smaller categories, rather than two large categories, thereby decreasing the amount of time necessary for participants to rank order a set of values.

Third, future studies could consider incorporating a longitudinal research design to assess whether students’ values adhere to the social work program at year one, or whether students’ values change while enrolled in the program. One social work student said that her values to changed as a result of being enrolled in the program. Future studies that consider a longitudinal design could assess students’ values as they progress through the social work or teacher preparation program.

Fourth, future studies could interview social work and teacher preparation students from universities in urban locations or consider implementing other disciplines, such as business, medicine, law, or the hard sciences. As departments of education nationwide adopt professional codes of ethics, the author recommends a study that considers the influence of these codes on teacher preparation programs and students in those respective states. Fifth, future studies could
consider the differences between students in undergraduate education compared to students in graduate education programs within the same profession and in different professions.

**Implications for Policy**

As state departments of education nationwide continue to adopt codes of ethics, the author would encourage these states to establish codes that meet the following criteria based on the findings of this study. First, incorporate statewide code of ethics that focus on terminal values that are the overarching goals of the profession. What should all educators value? Second, state departments of education should establish codes whose focus includes descriptions of specific behaviors (i.e., instrumental goals) that are desirable to the profession. Third, state departments of education should advertise the state code of ethics and encourage universities and schools to implement the code into professional preparation and professional development. Fourth, state departments of education should consider collaborating with other states to ensure that a consistent vision of values becomes transparent to prospective students and consumers of public education. Finally, the author recommends that states’ code of ethics incorporate a section for inter-professional ethics and begin to understand the interdisciplinary focus of a global community.

**Implications for Practice**

The author recommends that both professional programs establish a set of values that clearly delineate the ethical standards for future professionals. For example, the BU teacher preparation program should include more terminal values in its curriculum to complement the prevailing instrumental values, which already serve as the foundation for the program of study. By increasing the transparency of the program and professional values, students may begin to
establish their professional identity in congruence with the professional identify created in the program. BU’s social work program should do the opposite by softening its approach and being more inclusive of students, such as Patti-SW, who may not align politically with the program and profession’s values, in order to expand the professional base and continue to be open to innovation.

Although not a finding directly discussed in this dissertation, the students in this study did not appear to personally value ethics instruction that was worksheet based and solely based in theoretical ethics. They enjoyed relevant class discussions about controversial issues. Professional programs should revisit ethics instruction throughout the coursework and integrate applied ethics. Instruction should include discussion of controversial topics (profession based and professionally neutral) in addition to theoretical ethics. The students interviewed from the teacher preparation program did not find the current worksheet-based instruction in ethics particularly meaningful, which supports the aforementioned claim that ethics instruction should be revisited and incorporated in a more meaningful way into the curriculum.

Regarding the social work profession’s focus on advocacy in the NASW Code of Ethics, and due to the limited references in both the students’ values and the student identified social work program values, the author recommends that the BU social work program reevaluate its curriculum to determine whether the value of “social justice and advocacy” remain at the forefront of social work education.

Finally, professional programs of study should not only focus on their respective professional codes, but rather work to build the student understanding of these codes and values that will guide their professional interactions. It is important that programs consider some level of inter-professional ethics as students will often collaborate with other professionals in their
future careers. For example, social workers often collaborate with medical professionals, social workers, attorneys, and teachers. Similarly, teachers will inevitably engage with a similar body of professionals; they need to be prepared to interact with them in a socially acceptable and ethical manner. Further, as noted earlier in this dissertation, the cross-professional study of ethics appears to be a fertile ground for improving and understanding one’s own professional code of ethics.

The author believes that teacher preparation and social work preparation programs are preparing individuals who will someday hold key leadership positions in their respective communities, within the schools districts they work in, and as citizens of a larger global community. By beginning to understand both the reasoning and ethical paradigms future leaders adhere to when making moral decisions, administrators in public education can develop effective strategies to discuss moral issues with their faculty. This author recommends that administrators in both social work and education openly discuss ethical conflicts with their staff and colleagues in a concerted effort to frame a discussion about conflict from a lens prioritizing competing tensions rather than confrontation.

Limitations

There are several limitations of this study that need to be addressed. First, because the researcher interviewed fourth year students in social work and teacher preparation programs, it is not possible to determine whether any existing students’ value differences were a result of students’ value differences upon entering into the program.

Because of this limitation, the researcher spent considerable time interviewing the students in order to more deeply understand the origin of their knowledge about ethics, value
assessment, and process of moral decision-making. Future studies should consider incorporating a longitudinal research design to address this issue.

Because of the small sample size of 16 students and the qualitative nature of this work, this study is not intended to make generalizations to the larger population, but rather it provides a detailed description of students within a bounded context. Future studies could include a larger sample size of social work and education students to generalize to a broader context.

This study is also limited due to the time constraints required to complete a doctoral dissertation. The interviews were scheduled according to student availability and multiple interviews were not feasible due to financial limitations. Ideally, it would be beneficial to conduct several interviews with each participant in order to more comprehensively identify their personal values.
Concluding Remarks

Professionals find themselves in situations requiring difficult ethical decisions in practice, many times without any assistance or adequate ethics education to prepare them for these critical situations. One bad ethical decision as a professional, as the author knows all too well, can have serious ramifications for students and clients. Therefore, it is essential that professional training programs review the quality of ethics instruction present in the curricula or begin to assess the strategies programs use to restrict students from entering a profession. That being said, gatekeeping approaches must be flexible enough to allow access to individuals who possess unique skills sets that may be an asset to the profession, especially where the profession may not necessarily be aware of the potential for innovation, like the example of Patti-SW in social work.

This exploratory case study compared two professional programs of study, social work and teacher preparation, at a rural university to assess the influence of ethics education on moral reasoning. This study reviewed a broad range of data and found many potential avenues for future research. First, it appears that ethics education may impact the moral reasoning of students in social work and teacher preparation; however, professionally focused ethics education may only be of benefit to students when making ethical decisions in their particular professional arena.

Further, the exposure of students in social work to their professional code of ethics resulted in them being more familiar with and exposed to ethics throughout their education than teacher preparation students. These social work students reasoned from a slightly higher stage than did the teacher preparation students. As a result, the author believes that the importance of
ethics education during undergraduate preparation of professional students is extremely important and cannot be understated.

Finally, a significant difference emerged regarding the types and amount of ethics education students received in their programs. Professional training programs should review the approaches their departments are using to instruct students in ethics. This review should focus on improving the quality of ethics instruction and the value of this instruction to the students. Ethics instruction will inform these complicated and difficult future decisions; as a result, it should not be handled only in a worksheet or a video, it should be done in a way that builds student capacity to handle these tough professional circumstances in a positive manner.
Appendix A:

Codes of Ethics for the Council for Exceptional Children

"We declare the following principles to be the Code of Ethics for educators of persons with exceptionalities. Members of the special education profession are responsible for upholding and advancing these principles. Members of The Council for Exceptional Children agree to judge and be judged by them in accordance with the spirit and provisions of this Code.

A. Special education professionals are committed to developing the highest educational and quality of life potential of individuals with exceptionalities.

B. Special education professionals promote and maintain a high level of competence and integrity in practicing their profession.

C. Special education professionals engage in professional activities, which benefit individuals with exceptionalities, their families, other colleagues, students, or research subjects.

D. Special education professionals exercise objective professional judgment in the practice of their profession.

E. Special education professionals strive to advance their knowledge and skills regarding the education of individuals with exceptionalities.

F. Special education professionals work within the standards and policies of their profession.

G. Special education professionals seek to uphold and improve where necessary the laws, regulations, and policies governing the delivery of special education and related services and the practice of their profession.

H. Special education professionals do not condone or participate in unethical or illegal acts, nor violate professional standards adopted by the Delegate Assembly of CEC.

CEC Standards for Professional Practice Professionals in Relation to Persons with Exceptionalities and Their Families

Instructional Responsibilities

"Special education personnel are committed to the application of professional expertise to ensure the provision of quality education for all individuals with exceptionalities. Professionals strive to:
1. Identify and use instructional methods and curricula that are appropriate to their area of professional practice and effective in meeting the individual needs of persons with exceptionalities.

2. Participate in the selection and use of appropriate instructional materials, equipment, supplies, and other resources needed in the effective practice of their profession.

3. Create safe and effective learning environments which contribute to fulfillment of needs, stimulation of learning, and self-concept.

4. Maintain class size and case loads which are conducive to meeting the individual instructional needs of individuals with exceptionalities.

5. Use assessment instruments and procedures that do not discriminate against persons with exceptionalities on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, age, political practices, family or social background, sexual orientation, or exceptionality.

6. Base grading, promotion, graduation, and/or movement out of the program on the individual goals and objectives for individuals with exceptionalities.

7. Provide accurate program data to administrators, colleagues, and parents, based on efficient and objective record keeping practices, for the purpose of decision making.

8. Maintain confidentiality of information except when information is released under specific conditions of written consent and statutory confidentiality requirements.

Management of Behavior

Special education professionals participate with other professionals and with parents in an interdisciplinary effort in the management of behavior. Professionals:

1. Apply only those disciplinary methods and behavioral procedures which they have been instructed to use and which do not undermine the dignity of the individual or the basic human rights of persons with exceptionalities, such as corporal punishment.

2. Clearly specify the goals and objectives for behavior management practices in the persons' with exceptionalities Individualized Education Program.

3. Conform to policies, statues, and rules established by state/provincial and local agencies relating to judicious application of disciplinary methods and behavioral procedures.

4. Take adequate measures to discourage, prevent, and intervene when a colleague's behavior is perceived as being detrimental to exceptional students.

5. Refrain from aversive techniques unless repeated trials of other methods have failed and only after consultation with parents and appropriate agency officials.

Support Procedures

1. Adequate instruction and supervision shall be provided to professionals before they are required to perform support services for which they have not been prepared previously.

2. Professionals may administer medication, where state/provincial policies do not preclude such action, if qualified to do so or if written instructions are on file which state the purpose of the medication, the conditions under which it may be administered, possible side effects, the physician's name and phone number, and the professional liability if a mistake is made. The professional will not be required to administer medication.
3. Professionals note and report to those concerned whenever changes in behavior occur in conjunction with the administration of medication or at any other time.

**Parent Relationships**

Professionals seek to develop relationships with parents based on mutual respect for their roles in achieving benefits for the exceptional person. Special education professionals:

1. Develop effective communication with parents, avoiding technical terminology, using the primary language of the home, and other modes of communication when appropriate.
2. Seek and use parents' knowledge and expertise in planning, conducting, and evaluating special education and related services for persons with exceptionalities.
3. Maintain communications between parents and professionals with appropriate respect for privacy and confidentiality.
4. Extend opportunities for parent education utilizing accurate information and professional methods.
5. Inform parents of the educational rights of their children and of any proposed or actual practices which violate those rights.
6. Recognize and respect cultural diversities which exist in some families with persons with exceptionalities.
7. Recognize that the relationship of home and community environmental conditions affects the behavior and outlook of the exceptional person.
Appendix B:

National Education Association Code of Ethics

Preamble
The National Education Association believes that the education profession consists of one education workforce serving the needs of all students and that the term ‘educator’ includes education support professionals.

The educator, believing in the worth and dignity of each human being, recognizes the supreme importance of the pursuit of truth, devotion to excellence, and the nurture of the democratic principles. Essential to these goals is the protection of freedom to learn and to teach and the guarantee of equal educational opportunity for all. The educator accepts the responsibility to adhere to the highest ethical standards.

The educator recognizes the magnitude of the responsibility inherent in the teaching process. The desire for the respect and confidence of one's colleagues, of students, of parents, and of the members of the community provides the incentive to attain and maintain the highest possible degree of ethical conduct. The Code of Ethics of the Education Profession indicates the aspiration of all educators and provides standards by which to judge conduct.

The remedies specified by the NEA and/or its affiliates for the violation of any provision of this Code shall be exclusive and no such provision shall be enforceable in any form other than the one specifically designated by the NEA or its affiliates.

PRINCIPLE I

Commitment to the Student
The educator strives to help each student realize his or her potential as a worthy and effective member of society. The educator therefore works to stimulate the spirit of inquiry, the acquisition of knowledge and understanding, and the thoughtful formulation of worthy goals.

In fulfillment of the obligation to the student, the educator--

1. Shall not unreasonably restrain the student from independent action in the pursuit of learning.
2. Shall not unreasonably deny the student's access to varying points of view.
3. Shall not deliberately suppress or distort subject matter relevant to the student's progress.
4. Shall make reasonable effort to protect the student from conditions harmful to learning or to health and safety.
5. Shall not intentionally expose the student to embarrassment or disparagement.
6. Shall not on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, marital status, political or religious beliefs, family, social or cultural background, or sexual orientation, unfairly--

   a. Exclude any student from participation in any program
   b. Deny benefits to any student
   c. Grant any advantage to any student

7. Shall not use professional relationships with students for private advantage.

8. Shall not disclose information about students obtained in the course of professional service unless disclosure serves a compelling professional purpose or is required by law.

PRINCIPLE II

Commitment to the Profession
The education profession is vested by the public with a trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professional service.

In the belief that the quality of the services of the education profession directly influences the nation and its citizens, the educator shall exert every effort to raise professional standards, to promote a climate that encourages the exercise of professional judgment, to achieve conditions that attract persons worthy of the trust to careers in education, and to assist in preventing the practice of the profession by unqualified persons.

In fulfillment of the obligation to the profession, the educator--

1. Shall not in an application for a professional position deliberately make a false statement or fail to disclose a material fact related to competency and qualifications.

2. Shall not misrepresent his/her professional qualifications.

3. Shall not assist any entry into the profession of a person known to be unqualified in respect to character, education, or other relevant attribute.

4. Shall not knowingly make a false statement concerning the qualifications of a candidate for a professional position.

5. Shall not assist a non-educator in the unauthorized practice of teaching.

6. Shall not disclose information about colleagues obtained in the course of professional service unless disclosure serves a compelling professional purpose or is required by law.

7. Shall not knowingly make false or malicious statements about a colleague.

8. Shall not accept any gratuity, gift, or favor that might impair or appear to influence professional decisions or action.
Appendix C:

The American Association of Educators Code of Ethics

This Code of Ethics for Educators was developed by the distinguished AAE Advisory Board and by the Executive Committee of AAE. It contains four basic principles relating to the rights of students and educators.

OVERVIEW

The professional educator strives to create a learning environment that nurtures to fulfillment the potential of all students.

The professional educator acts with conscientious effort to exemplify the highest ethical standards.

The professional educator responsibly accepts that every child has a right to an uninterrupted education free from strikes or any other work stoppage tactics.

PRINCIPLE I: Ethical Conduct toward Students

The professional educator accepts personal responsibility for teaching students character qualities that will help them evaluate the consequences of and accept the responsibility for their actions and choices. We strongly affirm parents as the primary moral educators of their children. Nevertheless, we believe all educators are obligated to help foster civic virtues such as integrity, diligence, responsibility, cooperation, loyalty, fidelity, and respect— for the law, for human life, for others, and for self.

The professional educator, in accepting his or her position of public trust, measures success not only by the progress of each student toward realization of his or her personal potential, but also as a citizen of the greater community of the republic.

1. The professional educator deals considerately and justly with each student, and seeks to resolve problems, including discipline, according to law and school policy.

2. The professional educator does not intentionally expose the student to disparagement.

3. The professional educator does not reveal confidential information concerning students, unless required by law.

4. The professional educator makes a constructive effort to protect the student from conditions detrimental to learning, health, or safety.

5. The professional educator endeavors to present facts without distortion, bias, or personal prejudice.
PRINCIPLE II: Ethical Conduct toward Practices and Performance
The professional educator assumes responsibility and accountability for his or her performance and continually strives to demonstrate competence.

The professional educator endeavors to maintain the dignity of the profession by respecting and obeying the law, and by demonstrating personal integrity.

1. The professional educator applies for, accepts, or assigns a position or a responsibility on the basis of professional qualifications, and adheres to the terms of a contract or appointment.

2. The professional educator maintains sound mental health, physical stamina, and social prudence necessary to perform the duties of any professional assignment.

3. The professional educator continues professional growth.

4. The professional educator complies with written local school policies and applicable laws and regulations that are not in conflict with this code of ethics.

5. The professional educator does not intentionally misrepresent official policies of the school or educational organizations, and clearly distinguishes those views from his or her own personal opinions.

6. The professional educator honestly accounts for all funds committed to his or her charge.

7. The professional educator does not use institutional or professional privileges for personal or partisan advantage.

PRINCIPLE III: Ethical Conduct toward Professional Colleagues
The professional educator, in exemplifying ethical relations with colleagues, accords just and equitable treatment to all members of the profession.

1. The professional educator does not reveal confidential information concerning colleagues unless required by law.

2. The professional educator does not willfully make false statements about a colleague or the school system.

3. The professional educator does not interfere with a colleague's freedom of choice, and works to eliminate coercion that forces educators to support actions and ideologies that violate individual professional integrity.
PRINCIPLE IV: Ethical Conduct toward Parents and Community

The professional educator pledges to protect public sovereignty over public education and private control of private education.

The professional educator recognizes that quality education is the common goal of the public, boards of education, and educators, and that a cooperative effort is essential among these groups to attain that goal.

1. The professional educator makes concerted efforts to communicate to parents all information that should be revealed in the interest of the student.

2. The professional educator endeavors to understand and respect the values and traditions of the diverse cultures represented in the community and in his or her classroom.

3. The professional educator manifests a positive and active role in school/community relations.
Appendix D:

National Association for the Education of Young Children Preamble

NAEYC recognizes that those who work with young children face many daily decisions that have moral and ethical implications. The NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct offers guidelines for responsible behavior and sets forth a common basis for resolving the principal ethical dilemmas encountered in early childhood care and education. The Statement of Commitment is not part of the Code but is a personal acknowledgement of an individual’s willingness to embrace the distinctive values and moral obligations of the field of early childhood care and education.

The primary focus of the Code is on daily practice with children and their families in programs for children from birth through 8 years of age, such as infant/toddler programs, preschool and prekindergarten programs, child care centers, hospital and child life settings, family child care homes, kindergartens, and primary classrooms. When the issues involve young children, then these provisions also apply to specialists who do not work directly with children, including program administrators, parent educators, early childhood adult educators, and officials with responsibility for program monitoring and licensing. (Note: See also the “Code of Ethical Conduct: Supplement for Early Childhood Adult Educators,” online at www.naeyc.org/about/positions/pdf/ethics04.pdf. and the “Code of Ethical Conduct: Supplement for Early Childhood Program Administrators,” online at http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/PSETH05_supp.pdf)

Core values

Standards of ethical behavior in early childhood care and education are based on commitment to the following core values that are deeply rooted in the history of the field of early childhood care and education. We have made a commitment to

• Appreciate childhood as a unique and valuable stage of the human life cycle
• Base our work on knowledge of how children develop and learn
• Appreciate and support the bond between the child and family
• Recognize that children are best understood and supported in the context of family, culture, community, and society
• Respect the dignity, worth, and uniqueness of each individual (child, family member, and colleague)
• Respect diversity in children, families, and colleagues
• Recognize that children and adults achieve their full potential in the context of relationships that are based on trust and respect

Conceptual framework

The Code sets forth a framework of professional responsibilities in four sections. Each section addresses an area of professional relationships: (1) with children, (2) with families, (3) among colleagues, and (4) with the community and society. Each section includes an introduction to the primary responsibilities of the early childhood practitioner in that context.
The introduction is followed by a set of ideals (I) that reflect exemplary professional practice and by a set of principles (P) describing practices that are required, prohibited, or permitted.

The ideals reflect the aspirations of practitioners. The principles guide conduct and assist practitioners in resolving ethical dilemmas.* Both ideals and principles are intended to direct practitioners to those questions which, when responsibly answered, can provide the basis for conscientious decision making. While the Code provides specific direction for addressing some ethical dilemmas, many others will require the practitioner to combine the guidance of the Code with professional judgment.

The ideals and principles in this Code present a shared framework of professional responsibility that affirms our commitment to the core values of our field. The Code publicly acknowledges the responsibilities that we in the field have assumed, and in so doing supports ethical behavior in our work. Practitioners who face situations with ethical dimensions are urged to seek guidance in the applicable parts of this Code and in the spirit that informs the whole.

Often “the right answer”—the best ethical course of action to take—is not obvious. There may be no readily apparent, positive way to handle a situation. When one important value contradicts another, we face an ethical dilemma. When we face a dilemma, it is our professional responsibility to consult the Code and all relevant parties to find the most ethical resolution.

Section I

Ethical Responsibilities to Children

Childhood is a unique and valuable stage in the human life cycle. Our paramount responsibility is to provide care and education in settings that are safe, healthy, nurturing, and responsive for each child. We are committed to supporting children’s development and learning; respecting individual differences; and helping children learn to live, play, and work cooperatively. We are also committed to promoting children’s self-awareness, competence, self-worth, resiliency, and physical well-being.

Ideals

I-1.1—To be familiar with the knowledge base of early childhood care and education and to stay informed through continuing education and training.
I-1.2—To base program practices upon current knowledge and research in the field of early childhood education, child development, and related disciplines, as well as on particular knowledge of each child.
I-1.3—To recognize and respect the unique qualities, abilities, and potential of each child.
I-1.4—To appreciate the vulnerability of children and their dependence on adults.
I-1.5—To create and maintain safe and healthy settings that foster children’s social, emotional, cognitive, and physical development and that respect their dignity and their contributions.
I-1.6—To use assessment instruments and strategies that are appropriate for the children to be assessed, that are used only for the purposes for which they were designed, and that have the potential to benefit children.
I-1.7—To use assessment information to understand and support children’s development and learning, to support instruction, and to identify children who may need additional services.
I-1.8—To support the right of each child to play and learn in an inclusive environment that meets the needs of children with and without disabilities.
I-1.9—To advocate for and ensure that all children, including those with special needs, have access to the support services needed to be successful.

I-1.10—To ensure that each child’s culture, language, ethnicity, and family structure are recognized and valued in the program.

I-1.11—To provide all children with experiences in a language that they know, as well as support children in maintaining the use of their home language and in learning English.

I-1.12—To work with families to provide a safe and smooth transition as children and families move from one program to the next.

**Principles**

P-1.1—Above all, we shall not harm children. We shall not participate in practices that are emotionally damaging, physically harmful, disrespectful, degrading, dangerous, exploitative, or intimidating to children. This principle has precedence over all others in this Code.

P-1.2—We shall care for and educate children in positive emotional and social environments that are cognitively stimulating and that support each child’s culture, language, ethnicity, and family structure.

P-1.3—We shall not participate in practices that discriminate against children by denying benefits, giving special advantages, or excluding them from programs or activities on the basis of their sex, race, national origin, immigration status, preferred home language, religious beliefs, medical condition, disability, or the marital status/family structure, sexual orientation, or religious beliefs or other affiliations of their families. (Aspects of this principle do not apply in programs that have a lawful mandate to provide services to a particular population of children.)

P-1.4—We shall use two-way communications to involve all those with relevant knowledge (including families and staff) in decisions concerning a child, as appropriate, ensuring confidentiality of sensitive information. (See also P-2.4.)

P-1.5—We shall use appropriate assessment systems, which include multiple sources of information, to provide information on children’s learning and development.

P-1.6—We shall strive to ensure that decisions such as those related to enrollment, retention, or assignment to special education services, will be based on multiple sources of information and will never be based on a single assessment, such as a test score or a single observation.

P-1.7—We shall strive to build individual relationships with each child; make individualized adaptations in teaching strategies, learning environments, and curricula; and consult with the family so that each child benefits from the program. If after such efforts have been exhausted, the current placement does not meet a child’s needs, or the child is seriously jeopardizing the ability of other children to benefit from the program, we shall collaborate with the child’s family and appropriate specialists to determine the additional services needed and/or the placement option(s) most likely to ensure the child’s success. (Aspects of this principle may not apply in programs that have a lawful mandate to provide services to a particular population of children.)

P-1.8—We shall be familiar with the risk factors for and symptoms of child abuse and neglect, including physical, sexual, verbal, and emotional abuse and physical, emotional, educational, and medical neglect. We shall know and follow state laws and community procedures that protect children against abuse and neglect.
P-1.9—When we have reasonable cause to suspect child abuse or neglect, we shall report it to the appropriate community agency and follow up to ensure that appropriate action has been taken. When appropriate, parents or guardians will be informed that the referral will be or has been made.

P-1.10—When another person tells us of his or her suspicion that a child is being abused or neglected, we shall assist that person in taking appropriate action in order to protect the child.

P-1.11—When we become aware of a practice or situation that endangers the health, safety, or well-being of children, we have an ethical responsibility to protect children or inform parents and/or others who can.

Section II

Ethical Responsibilities to Families

Families* are of primary importance in children’s development. Because the family and the early childhood practitioner have a common interest in the child’s wellbeing, we acknowledge a primary responsibility to bring about communication, cooperation, and collaboration between the home and early childhood program in ways that enhance the child’s development.

Ideals

I-2.1—To be familiar with the knowledge base related to working effectively with families and to stay informed through continuing education and training.

I-2.2—To develop relationships of mutual trust and create partnerships with the families we serve.

I-2.3—To welcome all family members and encourage them to participate in the program, including involvement in shared decision making.

I-2.4—To listen to families, acknowledge and build upon their strengths and competencies, and learn from families as we support them in their task of nurturing children.

I-2.5—To respect the dignity and preferences of each family and to make an effort to learn about its structure, culture, language, customs, and beliefs to ensure a culturally consistent environment for all children and families.

I-2.6—To acknowledge families’ childrearing values and their right to make decisions for their children.

I-2.7—To share information about each child’s education and development with families and to help them understand and appreciate the current knowledge base of the early childhood profession.

I-2.8—To help family members enhance their understanding of their children, as staff are enhancing their understanding of each child through communications with families, and support family members in the continuing development of their skills as parents.

I-2.9—To foster families’ efforts to build support networks and, when needed, participate in building networks for families by providing them with opportunities to interact with program staff, other families, community resources, and professional services.

Principles

P-2.1—We shall not deny family members access to their child’s classroom or program setting unless access is denied by court order or other legal restriction.
P-2.2—We shall inform families of program philosophy, policies, curriculum, assessment system, cultural practices, and personnel qualifications, and explain why we teach as we do—which should be in accordance with our ethical responsibilities to children (see Section I).

P-2.3—We shall inform families of and, when appropriate, involve them in policy decisions. (See also I-2.3.)

P-2.4—We shall ensure that the family is involved in significant decisions affecting their child. (See also P-1.4.)

P-2.5—We shall make every effort to communicate effectively with all families in a language that they understand. We shall use community resources for translation and interpretation when we do not have sufficient resources in our own programs.

P-2.6—As families share information with us about their children and families, we shall ensure that families’ input is an important contribution to the planning and implementation of the program.

P-2.7—We shall inform families about the nature and purpose of the program’s child assessments and how data about their child will be used.

P-2.8—We shall treat child assessment information confidentially and share this information only when there is a legitimate need for it.

P-2.9—We shall inform the family of injuries and incidents involving their child, of risks such as exposures to communicable diseases that might result in infection, and of occurrences that might result in emotional stress.

P-2.10—Families shall be fully informed of any proposed research projects involving their children and shall have the opportunity to give or withhold consent without penalty. We shall not permit or participate in research that could in any way hinder the education, development, or well-being of children.

P-2.11—We shall not engage in or support exploitation of families. We shall not use our relationship with a family for private advantage or personal gain, or enter into relationships with family members that might impair our effectiveness working with their children.

P-2.12—We shall develop written policies for the protection of confidentiality and the disclosure of children’s records. These policy documents shall be made available to all program personnel and families. Disclosure of children’s records beyond family members, program personnel, and consultants having an obligation of confidentiality shall require familial consent (except in cases of abuse or neglect).

P-2.13—We shall maintain confidentiality and shall respect the family’s right to privacy, refraining from disclosure of confidential information and intrusion into family life. However, when we have reason to believe that a child’s welfare is at risk, it is permissible to share confidential information with agencies, as well as with individuals who have legal responsibility for intervening in the child’s interest.

P-2.14—In cases where family members are in conflict with one another, we shall work openly, sharing our observations of the child, to help all parties involved make informed decisions. We shall refrain from becoming an advocate for one party.
Section III

Ethical Responsibilities to Colleagues

In a caring, cooperative workplace, human dignity is respected, professional satisfaction is promoted, and positive relationships are developed and sustained. Based upon our core values, our primary responsibility to colleagues is to establish and maintain settings and relationships that support productive work and meet professional needs. The same ideals that apply to children also apply as we interact with adults in the workplace. (Note: Section III includes responsibilities to co-workers and to employers. See the “Code of Ethical Conduct: Supplement for Early Childhood Program Administrators” for responsibilities to personnel (employees in the original 2005 Code revision), online at http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/PSETH05_supp.pdf.)

A—Responsibilities to co-workers

Ideals

I-3A.1—To establish and maintain relationships of respect, trust, confidentiality, collaboration, and cooperation with co-workers.

I-3A.2—To share resources with co-workers, collaborating to ensure that the best possible early childhood care and education program is provided.

I-3A.3—To support co-workers in meeting their professional needs and in their professional development.

I-3A.4—To accord co-workers due recognition of professional achievement.

Principles

P-3A.1—We shall recognize the contributions of colleagues to our program and not participate in practices that diminish their reputations or impair their effectiveness in working with children and families.

P-3A.2—When we have concerns about the professional behavior of a co-worker, we shall first let that person know of our concern in a way that shows respect for personal dignity and for the diversity to be found among staff members, and then attempt to resolve the matter collegially and in a confidential manner.

P-3A.3—We shall exercise care in expressing views regarding the personal attributes or professional conduct of co-workers. Statements should be based on firsthand knowledge, not hearsay, and relevant to the interests of children and programs.

P-3A.4—We shall not participate in practices that discriminate against a co-worker because of sex, race, national origin, religious beliefs or other affiliations, age, marital status/family structure, disability, or sexual orientation.

B—Responsibilities to employers

Ideals

I-3B.1—To assist the program in providing the highest quality of service.
I-3B.2—To do nothing that diminishes the reputation of the program in which we work unless it is violating laws and regulations designed to protect children or is violating the provisions of this Code.

Principles

P-3B.1—We shall follow all program policies. When we do not agree with program policies, we shall attempt to effect change through constructive action within the organization.

P-3B.2—We shall speak or act on behalf of an organization only when authorized. We shall take care to acknowledge when we are speaking for the organization and when we are expressing a personal judgment.

P-3B.3—We shall not violate laws or regulations designed to protect children and shall take appropriate action consistent with this Code when aware of such violations.

P-3B.4—If we have concerns about a colleague’s behavior, and children’s well-being is not at risk, we may address the concern with that individual. If children are at risk or the situation does not improve after it has been brought to the colleague’s attention, we shall report the colleague’s unethical or incompetent behavior to an appropriate authority.

P-3B.5—When we have a concern about circumstances or conditions that impact the quality of care and education within the program, we shall inform the program’s administration or, when necessary, other appropriate authorities.

Section IV

Ethical Responsibilities to Community and Society

Early childhood programs operate within the context of their immediate community made up of families and other institutions concerned with children’s welfare. Our responsibilities to the community are to provide programs that meet the diverse needs of families, to cooperate with agencies and professions that share the responsibility for children, to assist families in gaining access to those agencies and allied professionals, and to assist in the development of community programs that are needed but not currently available.

As individuals, we acknowledge our responsibility to provide the best possible programs of care and education for children and to conduct ourselves with honesty and integrity. Because of our specialized expertise in early childhood development and education and because the larger society shares responsibility for the welfare and protection of young children, we acknowledge a collective obligation to advocate for the best interests of children within early childhood programs and in the larger community and to serve as a voice for young children everywhere.

The ideals and principles in this section are presented to distinguish between those that pertain to the work of the individual early childhood educator and those that more typically are engaged in collectively on behalf of the best interests of children—with the understanding that individual early childhood educators have a shared responsibility for addressing the ideals and principles that are identified as “collective.”

Ideal (Individual)

I-4.1—To provide the community with high-quality early childhood care and education programs and services.

Ideals (Collective)
I-4.2—To promote cooperation among professionals and agencies and interdisciplinary collaboration among professions concerned with addressing issues in the health, education, and well-being of young children, their families, and their early childhood educators.

I-4.3—To work through education, research, and advocacy toward an environmentally safe world in which all children receive health care, food, and shelter; are nurtured; and live free from violence in their home and their communities.

I-4.4—To work through education, research, and advocacy toward a society in which all young children have access to high-quality early care and education programs.

I-4.5—To work to ensure that appropriate assessment systems, which include multiple sources of information, are used for purposes that benefit children.

I-4.6—To promote knowledge and understanding of young children and their needs. To work toward greater societal acknowledgment of children’s rights and greater social acceptance of responsibility for the well-being of all children.

I-4.7—To support policies and laws that promote the well-being of children and families, and to work to change those that impair their well-being. To participate in developing policies and laws that are needed, and to cooperate with families and other individuals and groups in these efforts.

I-4.8—To further the professional development of the field of early childhood care and education and to strengthen its commitment to realizing its core values as reflected in this Code.

**Principles (Individual)**

P-4.1—We shall communicate openly and truthfully about the nature and extent of services that we provide.

P-4.2—We shall apply for, accept, and work in positions for which we are personally well-suited and professionally qualified. We shall not offer services that we do not have the competence, qualifications, or resources to provide.

P-4.3—We shall carefully check references and shall not hire or recommend for employment any person whose competence, qualifications, or character makes him or her unsuited for the position.

P-4.4—We shall be objective and accurate in reporting the knowledge upon which we base our program practices.

P-4.5—We shall be knowledgeable about the appropriate use of assessment strategies and instruments and interpret results accurately to families.

P-4.6—We shall be familiar with laws and regulations that serve to protect the children in our programs and be vigilant in ensuring that these laws and regulations are followed.

P-4.7—When we become aware of a practice or situation that endangers the health, safety, or well-being of children, we have an ethical responsibility to protect children or inform parents and/or others who can.

P-4.8—We shall not participate in practices that are in violation of laws and regulations that protect the children in our programs.

P-4.9—When we have evidence that an early childhood program is violating laws or regulations protecting children, we shall report the violation to appropriate authorities who can be expected to remedy the situation.
P-4.10—When a program violates or requires its employees to violate this Code, it is permissible, after fair assessment of the evidence, to disclose the identity of that program.

**Principles (Collective)**

P-4.11—When policies are enacted for purposes that do not benefit children, we have a collective responsibility to work to change these policies.

P-4-12—When we have evidence that an agency that provides services intended to ensure children’s wellbeing is failing to meet its obligations, we acknowledge a collective ethical responsibility to report the problem to appropriate authorities or to the public. We shall be vigilant in our follow-up until the situation is resolved.

P-4.13—When a child protection agency fails to provide adequate protection for abused or neglected children, we acknowledge a collective ethical responsibility to work toward the improvement of these services.
Appendix E:

New York State Code of Ethics

Statement of Purpose

The Code of Ethics is a public statement by educators that sets clear expectations and principles to guide practice and inspire professional excellence. Educators believe a commonly held set of principles can assist in the individual exercise of professional judgment. This Code speaks to the core values of the profession. "Educator" as used throughout means all educators serving New York schools in positions requiring a certificate, including classroom teachers, school leaders and pupil personnel service providers.

Principle 1: Educators nurture the intellectual, physical, emotional, social, and civic potential of each student.

Educators promote growth in all students through the integration of intellectual, physical, emotional, social and civic learning. They respect the inherent dignity and worth of each individual. Educators help students to value their own identity, learn more about their cultural heritage, and practice social and civic responsibilities. They help students to reflect on their own learning and connect it to their life experience. They engage students in activities that encourage diverse approaches and solutions to issues, while providing a range of ways for students to demonstrate their abilities and learning. They foster the development of students who can analyze, synthesize, evaluate and communicate information effectively.

Principle 2: Educators create, support, and maintain challenging learning environments for all.

Educators apply their professional knowledge to promote student learning. They know the curriculum and utilize a range of strategies and assessments to address differences. Educators develop and implement programs based upon a strong understanding of human development and learning theory. They support a challenging learning environment. They advocate for necessary resources to teach to higher levels of learning. They establish and maintain clear standards of behavior and civility. Educators are role models, displaying the habits of mind and work necessary to develop and apply knowledge while simultaneously displaying a curiosity and enthusiasm for learning. They invite students to become active, inquisitive, and discerning individuals who reflect upon and monitor their own learning.

Principle 3: Educators commit to their own learning in order to develop their practice.
Educators recognize that professional knowledge and development are the foundations of their practice. They know their subject matter, and they understand how students learn. Educators respect the reciprocal nature of learning between educators and students. They engage in a variety of individual and collaborative learning experiences essential to develop professionally and to promote student learning. They draw on and contribute to various forms of educational research to improve their own practice.

**Principle 4: Educators collaborate with colleagues and other professionals in the interest of student learning.**

Educators encourage and support their colleagues to build and maintain high standards. They participate in decisions regarding curriculum, instruction and assessment designs, and they share responsibility for the governance of schools. They cooperate with community agencies in using resources and building comprehensive services in support of students. Educators respect fellow professionals and believe that all have the right to teach and learn in a professional and supportive environment. They participate in the preparation and induction of new educators and in professional development for all staff.

**Principle 5: Educators collaborate with parents and community, building trust and respecting confidentiality.**

Educators partner with parents and other members of the community to enhance school programs and to promote student learning. They also recognize how cultural and linguistic heritage, gender, family and community shape experience and learning. Educators respect the private nature of the special knowledge they have about students and their families and use that knowledge only in the students' best interests. They advocate for fair opportunity for all children.

**Principle 6: Educators advance the intellectual and ethical foundation of the learning community.**

Educators recognize the obligations of the trust placed in them. They share the responsibility for understanding what is known, pursuing further knowledge, contributing to the generation of knowledge, and translating knowledge into comprehensible forms. They help students understand that knowledge is often complex and sometimes paradoxical. Educators are confidantes, mentors and advocates for their students' growth and development. As models for youth and the public, they embody intellectual honesty, diplomacy, tact and fairness.
Appendix F:

National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics

Preamble

The primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty. A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession’s focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living.

Social workers promote social justice and social change with and on behalf of clients. “Clients” is used inclusively to refer to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are sensitive to cultural and ethnic diversity and strive to end discrimination, oppression, poverty, and other forms of social injustice. These activities may be in the form of direct practice, community organizing, supervision, consultation administration, advocacy, social and political action, policy development and implementation, education, and research and evaluation. Social workers seek to enhance the capacity of people to address their own needs. Social workers also seek to promote the responsiveness of organizations, communities, and other social institutions to individuals’ needs and social problems.

The mission of the social work profession is rooted in a set of core values. These core values, embraced by social workers throughout the profession’s history, are the foundation of social work’s unique purpose and perspective:

- service
- social justice
- dignity and worth of the person
- importance of human relationships
- integrity
- competence.

This constellation of core values reflects what is unique to the social work profession. Core values, and the principles that flow from them, must be balanced within the context and complexity of the human experience.

Purpose of the NASW Code of Ethics

Professional ethics are at the core of social work. The profession has an obligation to articulate its basic values, ethical principles, and ethical standards. The NASW Code of Ethics sets forth these values, principles, and standards to guide social workers’ conduct. The Code is relevant to all social workers and social work students, regardless of their professional functions, the settings in which they work, or the populations they serve.
The NASW Code of Ethics serves six purposes:

1. The Code identifies core values on which social work’s mission is based.
2. The Code summarizes broad ethical principles that reflect the profession’s core values and establishes a set of specific ethical standards that should be used to guide social work practice.
3. The Code is designed to help social workers identify relevant considerations when professional obligations conflict or ethical uncertainties arise.
4. The Code provides ethical standards to which the general public can hold the social work profession accountable.
5. The Code socializes practitioners new to the field to social work’s mission, values, ethical principles, and ethical standards.
6. The Code articulates standards that the social work profession itself can use to assess whether social workers have engaged in unethical conduct. NASW has formal procedures to adjudicate ethics complaints filed against its members.* In subscribing to this Code, social workers are required to cooperate in its implementation, participate in NASW adjudication proceedings, and abide by any NASW disciplinary rulings or sanctions based on it.

The Code offers a set of values, principles, and standards to guide decision making and conduct when ethical issues arise. It does not provide a set of rules that prescribe how social workers should act in all situations. Specific applications of the Code must take into account the context in which it is being considered and the possibility of conflicts among the Code’s values, principles, and standards. Ethical responsibilities flow from all human relationships, from the personal and familial to the social and professional.

Further, the NASW Code of Ethics does not specify which values, principles, and standards are most important and ought to outweigh others in instances when they conflict. Reasonable differences of opinion can and do exist among social workers with respect to the ways in which values, ethical principles, and ethical standards should be rank ordered when they conflict. Ethical decision making in a given situation must apply the informed judgment of the individual social worker and should also consider how the issues would be judged in a peer review process where the ethical standards of the profession would be applied.

Ethical decision making is a process. There are many instances in social work where simple answers are not available to resolve complex ethical issues. Social workers should take into consideration all the values, principles, and standards in this Code that are relevant to any situation in which ethical judgment is warranted. Social workers’ decisions and actions should be consistent with the spirit as well as the letter of this Code.

In addition to this Code, there are many other sources of information about ethical thinking that may be useful. Social workers should consider ethical theory and principles generally, social work theory and research, laws, regulations, agency policies, and other relevant codes of ethics, recognizing that among codes of ethics social workers should consider the NASW Code of Ethics as their primary source. Social workers also should be aware of the impact on ethical decision making of their clients’ and their own personal values and cultural and religious beliefs.
and practices. They should be aware of any conflicts between personal and professional values and deal with them responsibly. For additional guidance social workers should consult the relevant literature on professional ethics and ethical decision making and seek appropriate consultation when faced with ethical dilemmas. This may involve consultation with an agency-based or social work organization’s ethics committee, a regulatory body, knowledgeable colleagues, supervisors, or legal counsel.

Instances may arise when social workers’ ethical obligations conflict with agency policies or relevant laws or regulations. When such conflicts occur, social workers must make a responsible effort to resolve the conflict in a manner that is consistent with the values, principles, and standards expressed in this Code. If a reasonable resolution of the conflict does not appear possible, social workers should seek proper consultation before making a decision.

The *NASW Code of Ethics* is to be used by NASW and by individuals, agencies, organizations, and bodies (such as licensing and regulatory boards, professional liability insurance providers, courts of law, agency boards of directors, government agencies, and other professional groups) that choose to adopt it or use it as a frame of reference. Violation of standards in this *Code* does not automatically imply legal liability or violation of the law. Such determination can only be made in the context of legal and judicial proceedings. Alleged violations of the *Code* would be subject to a peer review process. Such processes are generally separate from legal or administrative procedures and insulated from legal review or proceedings to allow the profession to counsel and discipline its own members.

A code of ethics cannot guarantee ethical behavior. Moreover, a code of ethics cannot resolve all ethical issues or disputes or capture the richness and complexity involved in striving to make responsible choices within a moral community. Rather, a code of ethics sets forth values, ethical principles, and ethical standards to which professionals aspire and by which their actions can be judged. Social workers’ ethical behavior should result from their personal commitment to engage in ethical practice. The *NASW Code of Ethics* reflects the commitment of all social workers to uphold the profession’s values and to act ethically. Principles and standards must be applied by individuals of good character who discern moral questions and, in good faith, seek to make reliable ethical judgments.

**Ethical Principles**

The following broad ethical principles are based on social work’s core values of service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence. These principles set forth ideals to which all social workers should aspire.

**Value:** *Service*

**Ethical Principle:** *Social workers’ primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems.*

Social workers elevate service to others above self interest. Social workers draw on their knowledge, values, and skills to help people in need and to address social problems. Social
workers are encouraged to volunteer some portion of their professional skills with no expectation of significant financial return (pro bono service).

**Value: Social Justice**

**Ethical Principle:** Social workers challenge social injustice.
Social workers pursue social change, particularly with and on behalf of vulnerable and oppressed individuals and groups of people. Social workers’ social change efforts are focused primarily on issues of poverty, unemployment, discrimination, and other forms of social injustice. These activities seek to promote sensitivity to and knowledge about oppression and cultural and ethnic diversity. Social workers strive to ensure access to needed information, services, and resources; equality of opportunity; and meaningful participation in decision making for all people.

**Value: Dignity and Worth of the Person**

**Ethical Principle:** Social workers respect the inherent dignity and worth of the person.
Social workers treat each person in a caring and respectful fashion, mindful of individual differences and cultural and ethnic diversity. Social workers promote clients’ socially responsible selfdetermination. Social workers seek to enhance clients’ capacity and opportunity to change and to address their own needs. Social workers are cognizant of their dual responsibility to clients and to the broader society. They seek to resolve conflicts between clients’ interests and the broader society’s interests in a socially responsible manner consistent with the values, ethical principles, and ethical standards of the profession.

**Value: Importance of Human Relationships**

**Ethical Principle:** Social workers recognize the central importance of human relationships.
Social workers understand that relationships between and among people are an important vehicle for change. Social workers engage people as partners in the helping process. Social workers seek to strengthen relationships among people in a purposeful effort to promote, restore, maintain, and enhance the well-being of individuals, families, social groups, organizations, and communities.

**Value: Integrity**

**Ethical Principle:** Social workers behave in a trustworthy manner.
Social workers are continually aware of the profession’s mission, values, ethical principles, and ethical standards and practice in a manner consistent with them. Social workers act honestly and responsibly and promote ethical practices on the part of the organizations with which they are affiliated.

**Value: Competence**

**Ethical Principle:** Social workers practice within their areas of competence and develop and enhance their professional expertise.
Social workers continually strive to increase their professional knowledge and skills and to apply
them in practice. Social workers should aspire to contribute to the knowledge base of the profession.

**Ethical Standards**

The following ethical standards are relevant to the professional activities of all social workers. These standards concern (1) social workers’ ethical responsibilities to clients, (2) social workers’ ethical responsibilities to colleagues, (3) social workers’ ethical responsibilities in practice settings, (4) social workers’ ethical responsibilities as professionals, (5) social workers’ ethical responsibilities to the social work profession, and (6) social workers’ ethical responsibilities to the broader society.

Some of the standards that follow are enforceable guidelines for professional conduct, and some are aspirational. The extent to which each standard is enforceable is a matter of professional judgment to be exercised by those responsible for reviewing alleged violations of ethical standards.

1. **SOCIAL WORKERS’ ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO CLIENTS**

   1.01 *Commitment to Clients*

   Social workers’ primary responsibility is to promote the well-being of clients. In general, clients’ interests are primary. However, social workers’ responsibility to the larger society or specific legal obligations may on limited occasions supersede the loyalty owed clients, and clients should be so advised. (Examples include when a social worker is required by law to report that a client has abused a child or has threatened to harm self or others.)

   1.02 *Self Determination*

   Social workers respect and promote the right of clients to self-determination and assist clients in their efforts to identify and clarify their goals. Social workers may limit clients’ right to self-determination when, in the social workers’ professional judgment, clients’ actions or potential actions pose a serious, foreseeable, and imminent risk to themselves or others.

   1.03 *Informed Consent*

   (a) Social workers should provide services to clients only in the context of a professional relationship based, when appropriate, on valid informed consent. Social workers should use clear and understandable language to inform clients of the purpose of the services, risks related to the services, limits to services because of the requirements of a third-party payer, relevant costs, reasonable alternatives, clients’ right to refuse or withdraw consent, and the time frame covered by the consent. Social workers should provide clients with an opportunity to ask questions.

   (b) In instances when clients are not literate or have difficulty understanding the primary language used in the practice setting, social workers should take steps to ensure clients’
comprehension. This may include providing clients with a detailed verbal explanation or arranging for a qualified interpreter or translator whenever possible.

(c) In instances when clients lack the capacity to provide informed consent, social workers should protect clients’ interests by seeking permission from an appropriate third party, informing clients consistent with the clients’ level of understanding. In such instances social workers should seek to ensure that the third party acts in a manner consistent with clients’ wishes and interests. Social workers should take reasonable steps to enhance such clients’ ability to give informed consent.

(d) In instances when clients are receiving services involuntarily, social workers should provide information about the nature and extent of services and about the extent of clients’ right to refuse service.

(e) Social workers who provide services via electronic media (such as computer, telephone, radio, and television) should inform recipients of the limitations and risks associated with such services.

(f) Social workers should obtain clients’ informed consent before audio taping or videotaping clients or permitting observation of services to clients by a third party.

1.04 Competence

(a) Social workers should provide services and represent themselves as competent only within the boundaries of their education, training, license, certification, consultation received, supervised experience, or other relevant professional experience.

(b) Social workers should provide services in substantive areas or use intervention techniques or approaches that are new to them only after engaging in appropriate study, training, consultation, and supervision from people who are competent in those interventions or techniques.

(c) When generally recognized standards do not exist with respect to an emerging area of practice, social workers should exercise careful judgment and take responsible steps (including appropriate education, research, training, consultation, and supervision) to ensure the competence of their work and to protect clients from harm.

1.05 Cultural Competence and Social Diversity

(a) Social workers should understand culture and its function in human behavior and society, recognizing the strengths that exist in all cultures.

(b) Social workers should have a knowledge base of their clients’ cultures and be able to demonstrate competence in the provision of services that are sensitive to clients’ cultures and to differences among people and cultural groups.
(c) Social workers should obtain education about and seek to understand the nature of social diversity and oppression with respect to race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, religion, immigration status, and mental or physical disability.

1.06 Conflicts of Interest

(a) Social workers should be alert to and avoid conflicts of interest that interfere with the exercise of professional discretion and impartial judgment. Social workers should inform clients when a real or potential conflict of interest arises and take reasonable steps to resolve the issue in a manner that makes the clients’ interests primary and protects clients’ interests to the greatest extent possible. In some cases, protecting clients’ interests may require termination of the professional relationship with proper referral of the client.

(b) Social workers should not take unfair advantage of any professional relationship or exploit others to further their personal, religious, political, or business interests.

(c) Social workers should not engage in dual or multiple relationships with clients or former clients in which there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the client. In instances when dual or multiple relationships are unavoidable, social workers should take steps to protect clients and are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries. (Dual or multiple relationships occur when social workers relate to clients in more than one relationship, whether professional, social, or business. Dual or multiple relationships can occur simultaneously or consecutively.)

(d) When social workers provide services to two or more people who have a relationship with each other (for example, couples, family members), social workers should clarify with all parties which individuals will be considered clients and the nature of social workers’ professional obligations to the various individuals who are receiving services. Social workers who anticipate a conflict of interest among the individuals receiving services or who anticipate having to perform in potentially conflicting roles (for example, when a social worker is asked to testify in a child custody dispute or divorce proceedings involving clients) should clarify their role with the parties involved and take appropriate action to minimize any conflict of interest.

1.07 Privacy and Confidentiality

(a) Social workers should respect clients’ right to privacy. Social workers should not solicit private information from clients unless it is essential to providing services or conducting social work evaluation or research. Once private information is shared, standards of confidentiality apply.

(b) Social workers may disclose confidential information when appropriate with valid consent from a client or a person legally authorized to consent on behalf of a client.

(c) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of all information obtained in the course of professional service, except for compelling professional reasons. The general expectation that
social workers will keep information confidential does not apply when disclosure is necessary to prevent serious, foreseeable, and imminent harm to a client or other identifiable person. In all instances, social workers should disclose the least amount of confidential information necessary to achieve the desired purpose; only information that is directly relevant to the purpose for which the disclosure is made should be revealed.

(d) Social workers should inform clients, to the extent possible, about the disclosure of confidential information and the potential consequences, when feasible before the disclosure is made. This applies whether social workers disclose confidential information on the basis of a legal requirement or client consent.

(e) Social workers should discuss with clients and other interested parties the nature of confidentiality and limitations of clients’ right to confidentiality. Social workers should review with clients circumstances where confidential information may be requested and where disclosure of confidential information may be legally required. This discussion should occur as soon as possible in the social worker-client relationship and as needed throughout the course of the relationship.

(f) When social workers provide counseling services to families, couples, or groups, social workers should seek agreement among the parties involved concerning each individual’s right to confidentiality and obligation to preserve the confidentiality of information shared by others. Social workers should inform participants in family, couples, or group counseling that social workers cannot guarantee that all participants will honor such agreements.

(g) Social workers should inform clients involved in family, couples, marital, or group counseling of the social worker’s, employer’s, and agency’s policy concerning the social worker’s disclosure of confidential information among the parties involved in the counseling.

(h) Social workers should not disclose confidential information to third party payers unless clients have authorized such disclosure.

(i) Social workers should not discuss confidential information in any setting unless privacy can be ensured. Social workers should not discuss confidential information in public or semipublic areas such as hallways, waiting rooms, elevators, and restaurants.

(j) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of clients during legal proceedings to the extent permitted by law. When a court of law or other legally authorized body orders social workers to disclose confidential or privileged information without a client’s consent and such disclosure could cause harm to the client, social workers should request that the court withdraw the order or limit the order as narrowly as possible or maintain the records under seal, unavailable for public inspection.

(k) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of clients when responding to requests from members of the media.
(l) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of clients’ written and electronic records and other sensitive information. Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that clients’ records are stored in a secure location and that clients’ records are not available to others who are not authorized to have access.

(m) Social workers should take precautions to ensure and maintain the confidentiality of information transmitted to other parties through the use of computers, electronic mail, facsimile machines, telephones and telephone answering machines, and other electronic or computer technology. Disclosure of identifying information should be avoided whenever possible.

(n) Social workers should transfer or dispose of clients’ records in a manner that protects clients’ confidentiality and is consistent with state statutes governing records and social work licensure.

(o) Social workers should take reasonable precautions to protect client confidentiality in the event of the social worker’s termination of practice, incapacitation, or death.

(p) Social workers should not disclose identifying information when discussing clients for teaching or training purposes unless the client has consented to disclosure of confidential information.

(q) Social workers should not disclose identifying information when discussing clients with consultants unless the client has consented to disclosure of confidential information or there is a compelling need for such disclosure.

(r) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of deceased clients consistent with the preceding standards.

**1.08 Access to Records**

(a) Social workers should provide clients with reasonable access to records concerning the clients. Social workers who are concerned that clients’ access to their records could cause serious misunderstanding or harm to the client should provide assistance in interpreting the records and consultation with the client regarding the records. Social workers should limit clients’ access to their records, or portions of their records, only in exceptional circumstances when there is compelling evidence that such access would cause serious harm to the client. Both clients’ requests and the rationale for withholding some or all of the record should be documented in clients’ files.

(b) When providing clients with access to their records, social workers should take steps to protect the confidentiality of other individuals identified or discussed in such records.

**1.09 Sexual Relationships**

(a) Social workers should under no circumstances engage in sexual activities or sexual contact with current clients, whether such contact is consensual or forced.
(b) Social workers should not engage in sexual activities or sexual contact with clients’ relatives or other individuals with whom clients maintain a close personal relationship when there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the client. Sexual activity or sexual contact with clients’ relatives or other individuals with whom clients maintain a personal relationship has the potential to be harmful to the client and may make it difficult for the social worker and client to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. Social workers—not their clients, their clients’ relatives, or other individuals with whom the client maintains a personal relationship—assume the full burden for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries.

(c) Social workers should not engage in sexual activities or sexual contact with former clients because of the potential for harm to the client. If social workers engage in conduct contrary to this prohibition or claim that an exception to this prohibition is warranted because of extraordinary circumstances, it is social workers—not their clients—who assume the full burden of demonstrating that the former client has not been exploited, coerced, or manipulated, intentionally or unintentionally.

(d) Social workers should not provide clinical services to individuals with whom they have had a prior sexual relationship. Providing clinical services to a former sexual partner has the potential to be harmful to the individual and is likely to make it difficult for the social worker and individual to maintain appropriate professional boundaries.

1.10 Physical Contact
Social workers should not engage in physical contact with clients when there is a possibility of psychological harm to the client as a result of the contact (such as cradling or caressing clients). Social workers who engage in appropriate physical contact with clients are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries that govern such physical contact.

1.11 Sexual Harassment
Social workers should not sexually harass clients. Sexual harassment includes sexual advances, sexual solicitation, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

1.12 Derogatory Language
Social workers should not use derogatory language in their written or verbal communications to or about clients. Social workers should use accurate and respectful language in all communications to and about clients.

1.13 Payment for Services
(a) When setting fees, social workers should ensure that the fees are fair, reasonable, and commensurate with the services performed. Consideration should be given to clients’ ability to pay.
(b) Social workers should avoid accepting goods or services from clients as payment for professional services. Bartering arrangements, particularly involving services, create the potential for conflicts of interest, exploitation, and inappropriate boundaries in social workers’ relationships with clients. Social workers should explore and may participate in bartering only in very limited circumstances when it can be demonstrated that such arrangements are an accepted practice among professionals in the local community, considered to be essential for the provision of services, negotiated without coercion, and entered into at the client’s initiative and with the client’s informed consent. Social workers who accept goods or services from clients as payment for professional services assume the full burden of demonstrating that this arrangement will not be detrimental to the client or the professional relationship.

(c) Social workers should not solicit a private fee or other remuneration for providing services to clients who are entitled to such available services through the social workers’ employer or agency.

1.14 Clients Who Lack Decision Making Capacity

When social workers act on behalf of clients who lack the capacity to make informed decisions, social workers should take reasonable steps to safeguard the interests and rights of those clients.

1.15 Interruption of Services

Social workers should make reasonable efforts to ensure continuity of services in the event that services are interrupted by factors such as unavailability, relocation, illness, disability, or death.

1.16 Termination of Services

(a) Social workers should terminate services to clients and professional relationships with them when such services and relationships are no longer required or no longer serve the clients’ needs or interests.

(b) Social workers should take reasonable steps to avoid abandoning clients who are still in need of services. Social workers should withdraw services precipitously only under unusual circumstances, giving careful consideration to all factors in the situation and taking care to minimize possible adverse effects. Social workers should assist in making appropriate arrangements for continuation of services when necessary.

(c) Social workers in fee-for-service settings may terminate services to clients who are not paying an overdue balance if the financial contractual arrangements have been made clear to the client, if the client does not pose an imminent danger to self or others, and if the clinical and other consequences of the current nonpayment have been addressed and discussed with the client.

(d) Social workers should not terminate services to pursue a social, financial, or sexual relationship with a client.
(e) Social workers who anticipate the termination or interruption of services to clients should notify clients promptly and seek the transfer, referral, or continuation of services in relation to the clients’ needs and preferences.

(f) Social workers who are leaving an employment setting should inform clients of appropriate options for the continuation of services and of the benefits and risks of the options.

2. SOCIAL WORKERS’ ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO COLLEAGUES

2.01 Respect

(a) Social workers should treat colleagues with respect and should represent accurately and fairly the qualifications, views, and obligations of colleagues.
(b) Social workers should avoid unwarranted negative criticism of colleagues in communications with clients or with other professionals. Unwarranted negative criticism may include demeaning comments that refer to colleagues’ level of competence or to individuals’ attributes such as race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, religion, immigration status, and mental or physical disability.
(c) Social workers should cooperate with social work colleagues and with colleagues of other professions when such cooperation serves the wellbeing of clients.

2.02 Confidentiality

Social workers should respect confidential information shared by colleagues in the course of their professional relationships and transactions. Social workers should ensure that such colleagues understand social workers’ obligation to respect confidentiality and any exceptions related to it.

2.03 Interdisciplinary Collaboration

(a) Social workers who are members of an interdisciplinary team should participate in and contribute to decisions that affect the wellbeing of clients by drawing on the perspectives, values, and experiences of the social work profession. Professional and ethical obligations of the interdisciplinary team as a whole and of its individual members should be clearly established.

(b) Social workers for whom a team decision raises ethical concerns should attempt to resolve the disagreement through appropriate channels. If the disagreement cannot be resolved, social workers should pursue other avenues to address their concerns consistent with client wellbeing.

2.04 Disputes Involving Colleagues

(a) Social workers should not take advantage of a dispute between a colleague and an employer to obtain a position or otherwise advance the social workers’ own interests.

(b) Social workers should not exploit clients in disputes with colleagues or engage clients in any inappropriate discussion of conflicts between social workers and their colleagues.
2.05 Consultation

(a) Social workers should seek the advice and counsel of colleagues whenever such consultation is in the best interests of clients.

(b) Social workers should keep themselves informed about colleagues’ areas of expertise and competencies. Social workers should seek consultation only from colleagues who have demonstrated knowledge, expertise, and competence related to the subject of the consultation.

(c) When consulting with colleagues about clients, social workers should disclose the least amount of information necessary to achieve the purposes of the consultation.

2.06 Referral for Services

(a) Social workers should refer clients to other professionals when the other professionals’ specialized knowledge or expertise is needed to serve clients fully or when social workers believe that they are not being effective or making reasonable progress with clients and that additional service is required.

(b) Social workers who refer clients to other professionals should take appropriate steps to facilitate an orderly transfer of responsibility. Social workers who refer clients to other professionals should disclose, with clients’ consent, all pertinent information to the new service providers.

(c) Social workers are prohibited from giving or receiving payment for a referral when no professional service is provided by the referring social worker.

2.07 Sexual Relationships

(a) Social workers who function as supervisors or educators should not engage in sexual activities or contact with supervisees, students, trainees, or other colleagues over whom they exercise professional authority.

(b) Social workers should avoid engaging in sexual relationships with colleagues when there is potential for a conflict of interest. Social workers who become involved in, or anticipate becoming involved in, a sexual relationship with a colleague have a duty to transfer professional responsibilities, when necessary, to avoid a conflict of interest.

2.08 Sexual Harassment

Social workers should not sexually harass supervisees, students, trainees, or colleagues. Sexual harassment includes sexual advances, sexual solicitation, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.
2.09 Impairment of Colleagues

(a) Social workers who have direct knowledge of a social work colleague’s impairment that is due to personal problems, psychosocial distress, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties and that interferes with practice effectiveness should consult with that colleague when feasible and assist the colleague in taking remedial action.

(b) Social workers who believe that a social work colleague’s impairment interferes with practice effectiveness and that the colleague has not taken adequate steps to address the impairment should take action through appropriate channels established by employers, agencies, NASW, licensing and regulatory bodies, and other professional organizations.

2.10 Incompetence of Colleagues

(a) Social workers who have direct knowledge of a social work colleague’s incompetence should consult with that colleague when feasible and assist the colleague in taking remedial action.

(b) Social workers who believe that a social work colleague is incompetent and has not taken adequate steps to address the incompetence should take action through appropriate channels established by employers, agencies, NASW, licensing and regulatory bodies, and other professional organizations.

2.11 Unethical Conduct of Colleagues

(a) Social workers should take adequate measures to discourage, prevent, expose, and correct the unethical conduct of colleagues.

(b) Social workers should be knowledgeable about established policies and procedures for handling concerns about colleagues’ unethical behavior. Social workers should be familiar with national, state, and local procedures for handling ethics complaints. These include policies and procedures created by NASW, licensing and regulatory bodies, employers, agencies, and other professional organizations.

(c) Social workers who believe that a colleague has acted unethically should seek resolution by discussing their concerns with the colleague when feasible and when such discussion is likely to be productive.

(d) When necessary, social workers who believe that a colleague has acted unethically should take action through appropriate formal channels (such as contacting a state licensing board or regulatory body, an NASW committee on inquiry, or other professional ethics committees).

(e) Social workers should defend and assist colleagues who are unjustly charged with unethical conduct.
3. SOCIAL WORKERS' ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN PRACTICE SETTINGS

3.01 Supervision and Consultation

(a) Social workers who provide supervision or consultation should have the necessary knowledge and skill to supervise or consult appropriately and should do so only within their areas of knowledge and competence.

(b) Social workers who provide supervision or consultation are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries.

(c) Social workers should not engage in any dual or multiple relationships with supervisees in which there is a risk of exploitation of or potential harm to the supervisee.

(d) Social workers who provide supervision should evaluate supervisees’ performance in a manner that is fair and respectful.

3.02 Education and Training

(a) Social workers who function as educators, field instructors for students, or trainers should provide instruction only within their areas of knowledge and competence and should provide instruction based on the most current information and knowledge available in the profession.

(b) Social workers who function as educators or field instructors for students should evaluate students’ performance in a manner that is fair and respectful.

(c) Social workers who function as educators or field instructors for students should take reasonable steps to ensure that clients are routinely informed when services are being provided by students.

(d) Social workers who function as educators or field instructors for students should not engage in any dual or multiple relationships with students in which there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the student. Social work educators and field instructors are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries.

3.03 Performance Evaluation

Social workers who have responsibility for evaluating the performance of others should fulfill such responsibility in a fair and considerate manner and on the basis of clearly stated criteria.

3.04 Client Records

(a) Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that documentation in records is accurate and reflects the services provided.
(b) Social workers should include sufficient and timely documentation in records to facilitate the delivery of services and to ensure continuity of services provided to clients in the future.

(c) Social workers’ documentation should protect clients’ privacy to the extent that is possible and appropriate and should include only information that is directly relevant to the delivery of services.

(d) Social workers should store records following the termination of services to ensure reasonable future access. Records should be maintained for the number of years required by state statutes or relevant contracts.

3.05 Billing

Social workers should establish and maintain billing practices that accurately reflect the nature and extent of services provided and that identify who provided the service in the practice setting.

3.06 Client Transfer

(a) When an individual who is receiving services from another agency or colleague contacts a social worker for services, the social worker should carefully consider the client’s needs before agreeing to provide services. To minimize possible confusion and conflict, social workers should discuss with potential clients the nature of the clients’ current relationship with other service providers and the implications, including possible benefits or risks, of entering into a relationship with a new service provider.

(b) If a new client has been served by another agency or colleague, social workers should discuss with the client whether consultation with the previous service provider is in the client’s best interest.

3.07 Administration

(a) Social work administrators should advocate within and outside their agencies for adequate resources to meet clients’ needs.

(b) Social workers should advocate for resource allocation procedures that are open and fair. When not all clients’ needs can be met, an allocation procedure should be developed that is nondiscriminatory and based on appropriate and consistently applied principles.

(c) Social workers who are administrators should take reasonable steps to ensure that adequate agency or organizational resources are available to provide appropriate staff supervision.

(d) Social work administrators should take reasonable steps to ensure that the working environment for which they are responsible is consistent with and encourages compliance with the NASW Code of Ethics. Social work administrators should take reasonable steps to eliminate
any conditions in their organizations that violate, interfere with, or discourage compliance with the Code.

3.08 Continuing Education and Staff Development

Social work administrators and supervisors should take reasonable steps to provide or arrange for continuing education and staff development for all staff for whom they are responsible. Continuing education and staff development should address current knowledge and emerging developments related to social work practice and ethics.

3.09 Commitments to Employers

(a) Social workers generally should adhere to commitments made to employers and employing organizations.

(b) Social workers should work to improve employing agencies’ policies and procedures and the efficiency and effectiveness of their services.

(c) Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that employers are aware of social workers’ ethical obligations as set forth in the NASW Code of Ethics and of the implications of those obligations for social work practice.

(d) Social workers should not allow an employing organization’s policies, procedures, regulations, or administrative orders to interfere with their ethical practice of social work. Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that their employing organizations’ practices are consistent with the NASW Code of Ethics.

(e) Social workers should act to prevent and eliminate discrimination in the employing organization’s work assignments and in its employment policies and practices.

(f) Social workers should accept employment or arrange student field placements only in organizations that exercise fair personnel practices.

(g) Social workers should be diligent stewards of the resources of their employing organizations, wisely conserving funds where appropriate and never misappropriating funds or using them for unintended purposes.

3.10 Labor Management Disputes

(a) Social workers may engage in organized action, including the formation of and participation in labor unions, to improve services to clients and working conditions.

(b) The actions of social workers who are involved in labor management disputes, job actions, or labor strikes should be guided by the profession’s values, ethical principles, and ethical standards. Reasonable differences of opinion exist among social workers concerning their primary obligation as professionals during an actual or threatened labor strike or job action.
Social workers should carefully examine relevant issues and their possible impact on clients before deciding on a course of action.

4. SOCIAL WORKERS’ ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES AS PROFESSIONALS

4.01 Competence

(a) Social workers should accept responsibility or employment only on the basis of existing competence or the intention to acquire the necessary competence.

(b) Social workers should strive to become and remain proficient in professional practice and the performance of professional functions. Social workers should critically examine and keep current with emerging knowledge relevant to social work. Social workers should routinely review the professional literature and participate in continuing education relevant to social work practice and social work ethics.

(c) Social workers should base practice on recognized knowledge, including empirically based knowledge, relevant to social work and social work ethics.

4.02 Discrimination

Social workers should not practice, condone, facilitate, or collaborate with any form of discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, religion, immigration status, or mental or physical disability.

4.03 Private Conduct

Social workers should not permit their private conduct to interfere with their ability to fulfill their professional responsibilities.

4.04 Dishonesty, Fraud, and Deception

Social workers should not participate in, condone, or be associated with dishonesty, fraud, or deception.

4.05 Impairment

(a) Social workers should not allow their own personal problems, psychosocial distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties to interfere with their professional judgment and performance or to jeopardize the best interests of people for whom they have a professional responsibility.

(b) Social workers whose personal problems, psychosocial distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties interfere with their professional judgment and performance should immediately seek consultation and take appropriate remedial action by seeking
professional help, making adjustments in workload, terminating practice, or taking any other steps necessary to protect clients and others.

4.06 Misrepresentation

(a) Social workers should make clear distinctions between statements made and actions engaged in as a private individual and as a representative of the social work profession, a professional social work organization, or the social worker’s employing agency.

(b) Social workers who speak on behalf of professional social work organizations should accurately represent the official and authorized positions of the organizations.

(c) Social workers should ensure that their representations to clients, agencies, and the public of professional qualifications, credentials, education, competence, affiliations, services provided, or results to be achieved are accurate. Social workers should claim only those relevant professional credentials they actually possess and take steps to correct any inaccuracies or misrepresentations of their credentials by others.

4.07 Solicitations

(a) Social workers should not engage in uninvited solicitation of potential clients who, because of their circumstances, are vulnerable to undue influence, manipulation, or coercion.

(b) Social workers should not engage in solicitation of testimonial endorsements (including solicitation of consent to use a client’s prior statement as a testimonial endorsement) from current clients or from other people who, because of their particular circumstances, are vulnerable to undue influence.

4.08 Acknowledging Credit

(a) Social workers should take responsibility and credit, including authorship credit, only for work they have actually performed and to which they have contributed.

(b) Social workers should honestly acknowledge the work of and the contributions made by others.

5. SOCIAL WORKERS’ ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION

5.01 Integrity of the Profession

(a) Social workers should work toward the maintenance and promotion of high standards of practice.

(b) Social workers should uphold and advance the values, ethics, knowledge, and mission of the profession. Social workers should protect, enhance, and improve the integrity of the profession
through appropriate study and research, active discussion, and responsible criticism of the profession.

(c) Social workers should contribute time and professional expertise to activities that promote respect for the value, integrity, and competence of the social work profession. These activities may include teaching, research, consultation, service, legislative testimony, presentations in the community, and participation in their professional organizations.

(d) Social workers should contribute to the knowledge base of social work and share with colleagues their knowledge related to practice, research, and ethics. Social workers should seek to contribute to the profession’s literature and to share their knowledge at professional meetings and conferences.

(e) Social workers should act to prevent the unauthorized and unqualified practice of social work.

5.02 Evaluation and Research

(a) Social workers should monitor and evaluate policies, the implementation of programs, and practice interventions.

(b) Social workers should promote and facilitate evaluation and research to contribute to the development of knowledge.

(c) Social workers should critically examine and keep current with emerging knowledge relevant to social work and fully use evaluation and research evidence in their professional practice.

(d) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should carefully consider possible consequences and should follow guidelines developed for the protection of evaluation and research participants. Appropriate institutional review boards should be consulted.

(e) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should obtain voluntary and written informed consent from participants, when appropriate, without any implied or actual deprivation or penalty for refusal to participate; without undue inducement to participate; and with due regard for participants’ wellbeing, privacy, and dignity. Informed consent should include information about the nature, extent, and duration of the participation requested and disclosure of the risks and benefits of participation in the research.

(f) When evaluation or research participants are incapable of giving informed consent, social workers should provide an appropriate explanation to the participants, obtain the participants’ assent to the extent they are able, and obtain written consent from an appropriate proxy.

(g) Social workers should never design or conduct evaluation or research that does not use consent procedures, such as certain forms of naturalistic observation and archival research, unless rigorous and responsible review of the research has found it to be justified because of its
prospective scientific, educational, or applied value and unless equally effective alternative procedures that do not involve waiver of consent are not feasible.

(h) Social workers should inform participants of their right to withdraw from evaluation and research at any time without penalty.

(i) Social workers should take appropriate steps to ensure that participants in evaluation and research have access to appropriate supportive services.

(j) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should protect participants from unwarranted physical or mental distress, harm, danger, or deprivation.

(k) Social workers engaged in the evaluation of services should discuss collected information only for professional purposes and only with people professionally concerned with this information.

(l) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should ensure the anonymity or confidentiality of participants and of the data obtained from them. Social workers should inform participants of any limits of confidentiality, the measures that will be taken to ensure confidentiality, and when any records containing research data will be destroyed.

(m) Social workers who report evaluation and research results should protect participants’ confidentiality by omitting identifying information unless proper consent has been obtained authorizing disclosure.

(n) Social workers should report evaluation and research findings accurately. They should not fabricate or falsify results and should take steps to correct any errors later found in published data using standard publication methods.

(o) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should be alert to and avoid conflicts of interest and dual relationships with participants, should inform participants when a real or potential conflict of interest arises, and should take steps to resolve the issue in a manner that makes participants’ interests primary.

(p) Social workers should educate themselves, their students, and their colleagues about responsible research practices.

6. SOCIAL WORKERS’ ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE BROADER SOCIETY

6.01 Social Welfare

Social workers should promote the general welfare of society, from local to global levels, and the development of people, their communities, and their environments. Social workers should advocate for living conditions conducive to the fulfillment of basic human needs and should promote social, economic, political, and cultural values and institutions that are compatible with the realization of social justice.
6.02 Public Participation

Social workers should facilitate informed participation by the public in shaping social policies and institutions.

6.03 Public Emergencies

Social workers should provide appropriate professional services in public emergencies to the greatest extent possible.

6.04 Social and Political Action

(a) Social workers should engage in social and political action that seeks to ensure that all people have equal access to the resources, employment, services, and opportunities they require to meet their basic human needs and to develop fully. Social workers should be aware of the impact of the political arena on practice and should advocate for changes in policy and legislation to improve social conditions in order to meet basic human needs and promote social justice.

(b) Social workers should act to expand choice and opportunity for all people, with special regard for vulnerable, disadvantaged, oppressed, and exploited people and groups.

(c) Social workers should promote conditions that encourage respect for cultural and social diversity within the United States and globally. Social workers should promote policies and practices that demonstrate respect for difference, support the expansion of cultural knowledge and resources, advocate for programs and institutions that demonstrate cultural competence, and promote policies that safeguard the rights of and confirm equity and social justice for all people.

(d) Social workers should act to prevent and eliminate domination of, exploitation of, and discrimination against any person, group, or class on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, religion, immigration status, or mental or physical disability.
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Date: July 26, 2012

From: The Office for Research Protections - FWA#: FWA00001534
Philip C. Frum, Compliance Coordinator

To: Michelle M. Salopek
Re: Determination of Exemption

IRB Protocol ID: 40574
Follow-up Date: July 25, 2017

Title of Protocol: Influence of Ethics Education on Moral Reasoning Among Pre-Service Education and Social Work Students

The Office for Research Protections (ORP) has received and reviewed the above referenced eSubmission application. It has been determined that your research is exempt from IRB initial and ongoing review, as currently described in the application. You may begin your research. The category within the federal regulations under which your research is exempt is:

45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Given that the IRB is not involved in the initial and ongoing review of this research, it is the investigator’s responsibility to review IRB Policy III “Exempt Review Process and Determination” which outlines:

• What it means to be exempt and how determinations are made
• What changes to the research protocol are and are not required to be reported to the ORP
• Ongoing actions post-exemption determination including addressing problems and complaints, reporting closed research to the ORP and research audits
• What occurs at the time of follow-up

Please do not hesitate to contact the Office for Research Protections (ORP) if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you for your continued efforts in protecting human participants in research.

This correspondence should be maintained with your research records.
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Invitation for Participation

Dear (Pre-Service Teacher or Social Worker):

My name is Michelle Salopek and I am a graduate student in Educational Leadership at the Pennsylvania State University. I am in the process of conducting a research study necessary for completion of my Ph.D degree under the advisement of Dr. Jacqueline Stefkovich, Professor of Education at the Pennsylvania State University. I am currently seeking research volunteers to participate in the aforementioned study. You have been contacted by your course instructor on my behalf to request your voluntary participation in this study.

The purpose of this study is to describe and understand the ethical reasoning capacity and strategies of pre-service education and social work students as they progress through their pre-professional education. As part of my study I would like to gain an understanding of your moral values and reasoning, as well as your experience obtaining ethics education in your program of study. Finally, I would like to explore and discuss the moral and ethical values that are most important to you.

Participation in this study will take just a bit of your time. Participation in the study would consist of participating in an interview with me about you, your educational experience, your ethical values, and your analysis of several different ethical dilemmas. I would expect this interview would last no longer than one (1) hour. As a token of gratitude for your participation I would offer you a ten-dollar gift card to a regional convenient store.

I would very much appreciate your participation in this study. If you would be willing to participate, please contact me by email at michellesalopek@gmail.com. Please include in this email your contact information and the best method by which I may contact you to schedule our interview. Finally, I will contact you to arrange for a convenient time and location for your interview. Please be advised that you must be at least 18 years of age or older to participate in this study.

I appreciate your time in considering this matter. If you have any questions or concerns regarding participation in this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at my email address. Sincerely,

Michelle Salopek
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Recruitment Handout

Michelle M. Salopek  
Educational Leadership  
Penn State University

Research Questions:
1) What are the core philosophies of the education (Elementary Education) and social work programs?
2) How does student’s values compare with the philosophies of the education and social work programs?
3) How do students in education and social work reason through moral dilemmas?
4) How much formal training in ethics do students have by their fourth year of undergraduate education?

Research Design:
Qualitative comparative case study

Methodology:
1) Conduct semi-structured interviews with ten fourth year students in both programs;
2) Conduct a document analysis of available web-based course materials/program information; and
3) Classroom observations (if possible).
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Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research: The Pennsylvania State University

Please thoroughly read and review the information provided below regarding your participation in this research project. If after your review of this document, you consent to participate in the research project, please follow the instructions contained herein. If you have any additional questions regarding this research project, feel free to contact the Principal Investigator identified below.

Title of Project: Influence of Ethics Education on Moral Reasoning among Pre-service Education and Social Work Students

Principal Investigator: Michelle Salopek
200 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 574-7877
michellesalopek@gmail.com

Advisor: Dr. Jacqueline Stefkovich
207C Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-3779
jas71@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to explore the ethics education provided to pre-service social work and education students and to understand how students in both programs reason through moral dilemmas.

2. Procedures to be followed: Participants will be asked to undergo one interview that will be audio recorded for clarity and accuracy. Prior to the interview the participants will be asked to complete a survey regarding the importance of thirty-six different values to them. The interviews will be centered upon the participant’s analysis of two moral dilemmas.

3. Duration: The interview and survey combined will take approximately one hour to complete.

4. Benefits: By participating in this study you have the opportunity to add to the body of knowledge and literature available on the topics of ethics education and moral reasoning of pre-service teachers and pre-service social workers. Further, by participating in this you may learn more about yourself, your personal and professional values, and your moral reasoning strategies. The information you and the other participants provide through this study will assist in developing a deeper understanding of the ethics education and moral reasoning strategies of pre-service teachers and pre-service social workers.
5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. The data, including the audiotapes, will be stored and secured at the residence of the principal investigator in a password protected folder on the principal investigator’s computer. Your responses will remain confidential and no names or other identifiable information will be linked to your responses. Data will be reported in a summary form only or if individual quotes or other data are used, any reference to the particular participant will be deidentified through use of a pseudonym. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the Research Project, no personally identifiable information will be shared. Only the Principal Investigator and her Advisor will have access to the audio recordings. All audio recordings will be destroyed by December 31, 2013.

6. **Right to Ask Questions:** If you have any questions regarding your participation in this Research Project, you have the right to ask them. Please contact the Principal Investigator at (814) 574-7877 or by email at michellesalopek@gmail.com with any questions, complaints, or concerns about this research.

7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this Research Project is voluntary. You can stop participating at any time. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to or feel uncomfortable answering. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise receive, including any remuneration for your participation in the Research Project.

8. **Compensation:** For your participation in this Research Project, all participants will receive a five ($10.00) dollar gift card to a regional convenient store. All remuneration will be provided at the end of the interview.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study based upon the information provided above, sign and date this document in the space provided below. Please be advised that by agreeing to participation in this Research Project, you are also agreeing to the audio recording of the interview as well, as required by Pennsylvania Law.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. Please submit original form, signed in blue ink, to the Principal Investigator prior to the start of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Name (Please Print)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Obtaining Consent</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Modified Rokeach Value Survey

**Directions:** Below you will find a list of commonly held values based on the Rokeach Value Assessment developed by Milton Rokeach in 1973. On the measurement scale indicated next to each value, place an “X” on the line that corresponds to how important that value is to you. For example, the further you place the “X” to the right on the line, the more important that value is to you, the further to the left, the value is less important. Continue this process for the remaining values until you are completed. Please be aware that you can place the “X” anywhere along the line, including between numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Values</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World of Beauty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World at Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Comfortable Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Exciting Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumental Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad-Mindedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obedience

Helpfulness

Responsibility

Forgiveness


Please review, but do not answer, the questions below regarding your responses to the above survey. These questions, in addition to others, will be addressed during the interview.

1. After reviewing the values on the Rokeach survey, what values do you consider to be the most important in your life?
2. Why are these particular values important to you?
3. What values are the least important to you?
4. Why are these particular values not as important to you?
Appendix L:

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Section 1: Eligibility Requirements

1. Researcher Introduces Purpose of the Study and reviews informed consent.
2. Are you currently enrolled in the Education or Social Work program at your University?
3. What year are you in your program?
4. Are you at least 18 years of age?

Section 2: Modified Rokeach Value Assessment

I am very interested in understanding your commonly held values. The Rokeach Value Survey is designed to assess values by having the participant rank their values according to their importance to them. If you have any questions please let me know.

Below you will find a list of commonly held values. On the measurement scale indicated next to each value, place an “X” on the line that corresponds to how important that value is to you. For example, the further you place the “X” to the right on the line, the more important that value is to you, the further to the left, the value is less important. Continue this process for the remaining values until you are completed. Please note, you can place the “X” anywhere along the line, including between numbers.

Section 3: Student commonly held values (Research Question 1 and 2)

1. After reviewing the values on the Rokeach survey, what values do you consider to be the most important in your life?
2. Why are these particular values important to you?
3. What values are the least important to you?

4. Why are these particular values not as important to you?

Section 4: Program Philosophies (Research Question 1 and 2)

1. After completing three years in your area of study at this university, take a moment to reflect on your coursework, the course textbooks, and your course lectures. What values do you believe are important to your program of study at your university?

2. What evidence suggests these particular values are important in your program?

Section 5: Ethics Education Interview Questions (Research Question 4)

1. Have you already taken, or are you currently taking, a course in ethics?

2. Was this course mandatory or an elective?

3. Were you exposed to the topic of ethics in any of your other classes?

4. If yes, what was the content of those lessons?

4. How was the lesson instructed?

5. Are you familiar with Professional Codes of Ethics in your major of study (education or social work)?

6. If yes, can you describe any of the features of these codes?

Section 6: Moral Reasoning Strategies (Research Question 3)

Take a moment to read the following two ethical dilemmas. The first dilemma is a “neutral dilemma” meaning that it not specific to your area of study. The second dilemma is a situation
that is related to your area of study, either social work or education. When you are finished reading the dilemma let me know.

**Dilemma 1: Teacher Preparation Students**

Last year, the Freedom School District adopted an inclusion-based program to integrate all students diagnosed with disabilities into traditional education classrooms. The principal of the middle school, Ms. Shultz, decided to assign you to an inclusive classroom, which will include a range of ability levels and one student with a serious mental health condition.

Cody, a fifth-grade student, who is diagnosed with an intermittent explosive disorder, a mental health disorder that can result in aggressive outbursts of disruptive behavior, is in your classroom. Prior to being moved into the traditional classroom, Cody often felt depressed and eagerly sought to be in class with his friends. Now, since the move, Cody’s grades have improved and his parent’s express that his overall attitude towards school is more positive.

Last week, following several weeks of positive behavior, Cody unexpectedly lashed out and punched another student, as a consequence of his disorder. Following the incident, the parent’s in your classroom were outraged and are demanding that Cody be moved back to the special education classroom. Following the outbursts from the parents, Ms. Shultz requested a meeting with you to discuss Cody’s placement.

1. Should Cody return to the special education room or remain in the inclusive room?
2. Why?
3. What did you base your decision on?
Dilemma 1: Social Work Students

Based on the Case Study 8.1 p. 117: When All Means All (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011)

Last year, the Freedom School District, a grade 5-8 middle school, adopted an inclusion-based program to integrate all students diagnosed with disabilities into traditional education classrooms. As the school social worker, your responsibilities include counseling students and crisis intervention when necessary.

One of the students you visit regularly is Cody, a fifth-grade student, who is diagnosed with an intermittent explosive disorder, a mental health disorder that can result in aggressive outbursts of disruptive behavior.

Prior to being moved into the traditional classroom, Cody often felt depressed and eagerly sought to be in class with his friends. Now, since the move, Cody’s grades have improved and his parent’s express that his overall attitude towards school is more positive.

Last week, following several weeks of positive behavior, Cody unexpectedly lashed out and punched another student, as a consequence of his disorder. As the social worker, you were called to the classroom to resolve the situation. Following the incident, the parent’s in Cody’s classroom were outraged and are demanding that Cody be moved back to the special education classroom. Following the outbursts from the parents, Ms. Shultz, the principal, requested a meeting with you to discuss Cody’s placement.

1. Should Cody return to the special education room or remain in the inclusive room?
2. Why?
3. What did you base your decision on?
Dilemma 2: Profession-Neutral Dilemma

Based on the dilemma “Purchasing Football Equipment” from Ethics for School Business Officials by Hartman, W., & Stefkovich, J.

Following a string of violent storms, a business in your community desperately needs to make building repairs. The purchasing manager, Mr. Shultz, is instructed by the company’s purchasing agent to acquire three estimates prior to selecting a contractor.

As part of the company policy on the use of contractors, any expenses that exceed 3,000 dollars require at least three estimates prior to entering into a purchase agreement. Based upon these estimates the company’s chief financial officer will hire the lowest bidder, unless there is specific and identifiable quality concerns. Unfortunately, many other businesses in your community have also suffered damages as a result of the recent storms, including Imler & Sons building contractors, owned by Michael Imler. Mr. Shultz is a long time friend of Michael and knows that he really needs the work to fund his own building repairs.

Mr. Shultz knows that if he acquires the other two estimates, both estimates will almost inevitably be cheaper than the estimate given by Michael, as the other businesses are from outside of the area and have access to cheaper resources.

1. Should the business owner give preference to the local business owner? Why or Why not? If yes, how large of a preference should local vendors be given?

2. Should Mr. Shultz acquire the two other estimates? If he does, should he follow the policy and go with the lowest bidder?

3. What would you do if you were Mr. Shultz?
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