Pre-Service Teachers' Pliable Perceptions of Ethical Practices in Student Evaluation

Daniel Jay Bergman
Wichita State University

Ethical Teaching and Student Evaluation

Ethics has been defined as dealing with the actions and practice one ought to do in a situation (Pojman, 1998). Professional ethics focuses on "those norms, values, and principles that should govern the professional conduct" (Strike & Ternasky, 1993, p. 2). The ethical responsibilities of teachers include an obligation to help students learn, which include the teachers maintaining regular work hours, having knowledge of students, planning and teaching with care, reflecting and improving one's teaching, cooperating with colleagues and parents, and positively addressing disagreements (Wynne, 1995).

The expectation of teachers to determine and enact ethical behavior is further intensified by their visible role in communities and society. Many parents and stakeholders expect teachers to act as moral agents and models for students (Campbell & Thiessen, 2001). In the classroom and beyond, teachers are viewed as exemplars of ethical behavior, clearly and confidently discerning between right and wrong. "The demands on teachers to contribute to not only the intellectual and physical but also

Daniel Jay Bergman is an associate professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction of the College of Education at Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas. His email address is: daniel.bergman@wichita.edu

the moral and social development of children have increased in emphasis and detail" (Thompson, 1997, p. 9).

Various teacher organizations, such as the National Education Association (National Education Association [NEA], 2012) and the Association of American Educators (2010), have outlined ethical and unethical behaviors via a Code of Ethics. The NEA Code of Ethics, however, primarily addresses what the professional educator should *not* do. Further, neither group provides specific statements about ethical (or unethical) teacher behaviors related to standardized testing or student evaluation. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation [JCSEE], 2003) has created *The Student Evaluation Standards*, which prescribes appropriate educator practice when evaluating students.

Despite the availability of resources for ethics instruction, ethical uncertainty and public scrutiny continue to confuse and distress classroom teachers, novice and veteran alike, about their role in student evaluation (Urdan & Paris, 1994). Studies of educators have revealed much disagreement on what is ethical and unethical in the evaluation of student learning. The results of one survey showed that teachers had strong agreement about ethical versus unethical practices in fewer than half of the presented scenarios (Green, Johnson, Kim, & Pope, 2007). A similar survey of educational leaders found even less agreement, with strong disagreement about the ethicality of one third of the example classroom assessment practices (Johnson, Green, Kim, & Pope, 2008).

A previous study by the author used a similar instrument with pre-service teachers to determine their perceptions of ethical evaluation (Bergman, 2013). The investigation found that pre-service teachers were in high agreement in more than half of the scenarios (53%), a higher rate of agreement than that found among in-service teachers and principals (Green et al., 2007; Johnson et al., 2008). Pre-service teachers also judged a majority of scenarios (20 of 36) to be ethical, with elementary pre-service teachers having a greater tendency to label a sequence as ethical than their counterparts preparing to teach in middle/secondary schools.

Preparing Ethical Teachers

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) explicitly addresses ethical teacher behavior in citing InTASC Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. However, the emphasis is on promoting reflection on one's practice: "The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on oth-

ers" (CAEP, 2013, p. 4). Elsewhere in the CAEP Accreditation Standards document, "ethical practice" is found among evidence measures for "non-academic factors" which includes commitment and dispositions. CAEP Standard #3 (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity) requires institutions to document evidence that each successful program completer "understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies" (2013, p. 9). Interestingly, the main CAEP Standards document (2013) mentions ethics or ethical practice a total of 5 times in its 54-page body, compared to 55 references to technology/technological use, 45 allusions to diversity/diverse students, and 80 phrases focused on assessment/assessing learning.

Ethical practice has been a common theme in most teacher preparation programs' conceptual frameworks or mission statements (Peterson, 2005). However, practical application of ethical and moral teaching is relatively unexamined in teacher education programs (Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2013; Schwartz, 2008). Individuals enter teacher preparation programs already possessing beliefs about teaching, including moral dispositions (Richardson, 1996; Richardson & Placier, 2001). Although accredited preparation programs often allude to ethical behavior in professional teaching dispositions (CAEP, 2013; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2008; Osguthorpe, 2013), the focus is typically on skills and knowledge, leaving out potential controversies regarding ethical and moral perspectives (Wilkerson, 2006). These controversies and contentious episodes are often what teachers—and the general public—encounter at both local and national levels, as indicated by several high-profile cheating scandals in recent years (Banchero, 2014; Dewan, 2010; Gabriel, 2010; Torres, 2010; Vegh, 2010).

Teaching ethics in education is done in various ways, including the use of case studies, role-playing, direct instruction of specific professional criteria, exemplars, problem-solving strategies, and conflict resolution (Bebeau, Rest, & Narvaez, 1999; Benninga, 2003). Many teacher education textbooks have a primary focus on ethical practices (Goodlad & McMannon, 1997; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Sockett, 1993; Strike & Soltis, 2009; Tom, 1984). Yet, the presence of this curriculum does not always result in sufficient preparation. The Character Education Partnership (2002) conducted a national survey of over 500 deans of schools of education in regard to teacher preparation. Although 90% of the respondents affirmed the need for character and ethical education, only 24% stated that their programs were "highly emphasizing" such content. More recently, Warnick and Silverman (2011) found evidence that "professional ethics is currently a neglected topic in teacher education programs" (p. 273).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this current study is to further investigate pre-service teachers' perceptions of ethical evaluation and determine what changes, if any, occur after a semester-long undergraduate course in foundations of education (history, philosophy, ethics). Past research in teacher education has found that pre-service teachers' ideas—in this case, regarding family engagement—can change significantly between the beginning and end of a one-semester course (Bingham & Abernathy, 2007). The present study does not seek to make any claims about the direct impact of a course. Instead, the focus is on determining the extent to which pre-service teachers alter their ethical perceptions over time.

Specific research questions are as follows:

(a) Between the start and end of a semester-long course, to what extent do pre-service teachers change their perceptions about ethical-based practices in student evaluation?

(b) What student evaluation/assessment scenarios do pre-service teachers tend to change from one classification to the other (i.e. "ethical" to "unethical" and vice versa)?

Methodology

Participants and Program

Participants (N = 221) included all undergraduate pre-service teachers at a large urban Midwestern university who were enrolled in a required teacher education course, "Philosophical, Historical, and Ethical Foundations of Education." Data were compiled from 10 sections of the course. These pre-service teachers were chosen due to their being in the initial phase of the teachers' professional continuum and, as such, represented a convenience sample (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Pre-service teachers in this class are typically in their upper level courses and are seeking initial certification for teaching in an elementary, middle, and/or secondary school. Two years of data were collected over the course of four semesters. The sample of participants was mostly homogeneous in race and ethnicity (>90% Caucasian), and the geographic demographics were reflective of the university community.

Although different instructors taught the course, each section featured the same major topics, texts, and assignments. The catalog description is as follows: "Students study the major contemporary educational philosophies, the historical and social development of American education, and the ethical standards and legal issues influencing schools today.

Some emphasis is placed on the students' examination of their own educational philosophy and ethics."

The two required textbooks were *The Ethics of Teaching* by Strike and Solits (2009) and *The History of American Education: A Great American Experiment* by Webb (2006). The latter text featured a chronological survey of historical developments in American education since pre-Colonial times, and also included an overview of major traditional and contemporary philosophies. The ethics book (Strike & Soltis, 2009) was comparatively shorter, yet discussed key issues related to ethical educational practice—teacher code of ethics, due process, intellectual freedom, equal opportunity, diversity—along with vignettes for case study and an ethical analysis strategy for examining and discussing scenarios. Where appropriate, historical and legal examples were connected to emphasize ethical topics of study.

In addition to weekly reading and written reflections, students wrote and submitted an analysis of their school settings—district, building, classroom—assigned for their fieldwork (practicum) placements that semester. They also completed an evaluation of a book or media source (film, television series) that featured teaching and learning. In this assignment, students compared depictions in the media source with historical examples, philosophical views, and ethical issues, if present. Formal summative evaluations required students to write an ethical analysis of a school scenario and complete a final exam made of multiple choice, matching, and essay questions highlighting key concepts and applications.

To reiterate, the purpose of this study is not to determine if any specific aspects of the one-semester foundations course influence change in pre-service teachers' perceptions. Likewise, the question of how to influence pre-service teachers' ethical perceptions is beyond the scope of the current project. Rather, the study seeks to see what differences, if any, occur in participants' views as they continue their preparation for full-time in-service teaching.

Measures and Procedures

The data-collection instrument used in this study was adapted from a tool developed by Green et al. (2007) to survey teachers and administrators (Johnson et al., 2008). The instrument contains 36 scenarios of classroom evaluation and testing, based on authentic experiences as well as assessment and evaluation standards documents (Joint Advisory Committee, 1993; JCSEE, 2003). The survey scenarios align with the following seven categories, with the number of scenarios given in parentheses: Standardized Test Preparation (6), Standardized Test Ad-

ministration (2), Multiple Assessment Opportunities (3), Communication About Grading (4), Grading Practices (13), Bias (5), and Confidentiality (3). The survey instrument is found in Table 1. For the current study, participants completed a paper version of the survey twice—at the beginning of the semester (pre) and in the final weeks of the semester (post) in their education foundations course.

To complete the survey, participants read each scenario and marked whether they believed that the particular example featured ethical or unethical actions by an educator. Using text resources related to student evaluation, the survey developers identified 10 scenarios as ethical and 26 as unethical (Johnson et al., 2008). The present study investigated agreement among participants in a manner similar to that of the previous researchers. A label of "high agreement" was assigned to scenarios for which at least 80% of the participants agreed about the ethicality of the scenario, and a label of "high disagreement" was assigned to any scenario in which 50-70% of participants agreed (disagreement could be no greater than a 50/50 split). Scenarios for which 71-79% of the participants agreed about the ethicality were considered as having neither high agreement nor high disagreement. Analysis included a sorting of the scenarios according to the seven categories and the percentage of scenarios in each category for which the participants agreed and disagreed (number of scenarios identified/total number of scenarios).

Results and Analysis

Responses of Pre-Service Teachers

Table 1 contains the pre- and post-survey percentages of pre-service teachers in regard to the ethicality of each scenario. At the start of the semester (pre-survey), participants had high agreement on the ethicality of 19 scenarios (53%) and high disagreement on 6 scenarios (17%). Eleven scenarios (31%) had neither high agreement nor high disagreement among the pre-service teachers. In the post-survey, only six scenarios (17%) had neither high agreement nor high disagreement. By the end of the course, participants with high agreement had increased by 1 scenario to 20 (56%), but high disagreement increased from 6 to 10 scenarios (28%). Table 2 provides a summary of pre-service teachers' responses and agreement on the seven categories of student evaluation.

The evaluation topic given the most attention in the survey was Grading Practices (13 scenarios). In the pre-and post-surveys, participants had high agreement regarding the same five scenarios (38%): considering student effort when determining grades, basing each student's grade for a group project on the group's product and a heavily weighted individual

Table 1
Ethical Practices in Student Evaluation Survey, Pre-/Post-Survey Percentages of Pre-Service Teachers Indicating Ethicality, and Percentages of Participants Changing between Pre- and Post-Surveys

Scenario	*Ethical (%) Pre/Post*	*Unethical (%) Pre/Post*	*% Changing Unethical to Ethical*	*% Changing Ethical to Unethical*	*Total % of Changing Responses*
Grading Practices (13 Scenarios)					
A teacher considers student effort when determining grades.	88.6/84.3	11.3/15.7	7.4	12.6	20.0
For a group project, a teacher bases each student's grade on the group's product and a heavily weighted individual component.	84.5/87.7	15.5/12.3	13.3	10.1	23.4
To encourage lively discussion in English III, a teacher counts class participation as 30% of the final grade.	83.6/90.4	16.4/9.6	13.8	7.8	21.7
A teacher weights homework heavily in determining report card grades.	80.3/86.3	19.7/13.7	16.2	10.6	26.9
A teacher lowers grades for late work by one letter grade for each day.	83.3/83.2	16.7/16.8	14.5	14.5	29.1
A teacher considers students' growth in assigning grades.	76.0/73.8	24.0/26.2	17.6	19.9	37.6
A physical education teacher gives a student a zero as a homework grade for not returning a form that requires a parent's signature.	49.5/56.7	50.5/43.3	27.6	19.6	47.2
An accounting teacher gives a student an F for the course because the student missed the final exam.	30.9/37.8	69.1/62.2	26.3	19.2	45.5
To minimize guessing, a teacher announces she will deduct more points for a wrong answer than for leaving the answer blank.	26.4/35.2	73.6/64.8	27.5	18.8	46.3
As a teacher finalizes grades, she changes one student's course grade from a B+ to an A because tests and papers showed the student had mastered the course objectives even though he had not completed some of his homework assignments.	26.9/26.0	73.9/74.0	12.4	18.4	30.9
A middle school history teacher offers extra credit opportunities to all his classes except the advanced class.	24.4/33.2	75.6/66.8	24.1	9.1	33.2
A teacher lowers report grades for disruptive behavior.	23.5/21.8	76.5/78.2	18.2	20.0	38.2
A teacher uses student peer ratings as 40% of the grade on an oral report.	21.4/26.2	78.6/73.8	20.9	15.9	36.8

Table 1 (continued)

Scenario	*Ethical (%) Pre/Post*	*Unethical (%) Pre/Post*	*% Changing Unethical to Ethical*	*% Changing Ethical to Unethical*	*Total % of Changing Responses*
Standardized Test Preparation (6 Scenarios)					
A teacher spends a class period to train his students in test-taking skills (e.g., not spending too much time on one problem, eliminating impossible answers, guessing).	95.0/96.4	5.0/3.6	5.0	3.6	8.6
A teacher administers a parallel form of a norm-referenced achievement test to her students in preparation for the state testing. The parallel form is another version of the state test that assesses the same content; however, the items on the parallel form are not the same ones as on the state form of the achievement test.	89.0/90.0	11.0/10.0	9.2	7.8	17.0
A teacher uses Scoring High on the MAT, a commercially available publication with the same format and skills as the Metropolitan Achievement Test (but not the same items), in preparation for the MAT.	87.7/93.6	12.3/6.4	11.1	5.5	16.6
A teacher adds vocabulary words from a standardized, norm-referenced verbal aptitude test to classroom vocabulary tests.	81.9/79.9	18.1/20.1	14.4	17.2	31.6
An elementary teacher quizzes students in the lunch line about the number of pints in a quart because students had missed the item on previous administrations of the state standardized test.	78.7/88.2	21.3/11.8	17.3	7.7	25.0
Based on his review of the district's mathematics frameworks, a teacher creates learning activities with specific math problems that are included in the annual achievement test.	65.9/63.8	34.1/36.2	21.8	23.6	45.5
Bias (5 Scenarios)					
A teacher allows a student with a learning disability in the language arts to use a tape-recorder when the student answers the essay questions on social studies tests.	91.4/94.1	8.6/5.9	8.2	5.5	13.7
A teacher always knows the identity of the student whose essay she is grading.	65.6/56.0	34.4/44.0	18.6	28.4	47.0
To enhance self-esteem, an elementary teacher addresses only students' strengths when writing narrative report cards.	37.3/45.4	62.7/54.6	25.8	18.0	43.8

Table 1 (continued)

Scenario	*Ethical (%) Pre/Post*	*Unethical (%) Pre/Post*	*% Changing Unethical to Ethical*	*% Changing Ethical to Unethical*	*Total % of Changing Responses*
Two teachers teach different sections of the same course. Because of his belief that students' work is rarely perfect, one teacher gives very few grades of A.	20.9/28.2	79.1/71.8	21.0	14.2	35.2
A teacher who knows a student had a bad week because of problems at home bumps the student's participation grade up a few points to compensate for his bad score on a quiz.	15.4/17.0	84.6/83.0	15.1	13.8	28.9
Communication About Grading (4 Scenarios)					
A teacher states how she will grade a test when she assigns it.	98.6/98.6	1.4/1.4	1.4	1.4	2.7
A teacher tells students what materials are important to learn in preparing for a class test.	98.6/97.7	1.4/2.3	1.4	2.3	3.7
A middle school principal directs teachers to give students a written policy that explains how report card grades are calculated in their classes.	98.6/97.7	1.4/2.3	1.4	2.3	3.7
For the final exam, a teacher always uses a few surprise items about topics that were not on the study guide.	41.6/42.9	58.4/57.1	26.5	25.1	51.6
Confidentiality (3 Scenarios)					
A teacher discloses to the parents of a student their child's score on an intelligence test.	78.4/83.5	21.8/16.5	19.4	12.9	32.3
To motivate students to perform better, a science teacher always announces that he is passing out scored tests to students in order of points earned, from the top score to the bottom score.	2.7/2.7	97.3/97.3	2.3	2.3	4.6
To calm the fears of distraught parents, a teacher compares their child's achievement scores with the results of the student's cousin who is also in the class.	0.5/1.4	99.5/98.6	1.4	0.5	1.8
Multiple Assessment Opportunities (3 Scenarios)					
A teacher assesses student knowledge by using many types of assessment: multiple-choice tests, essays, projects, portfolios.	99.1/98.6	0.9/1.4	0.9	1.4	2.3
A high school social studies teacher bases students' final semester grades on two multiple-choice tests.	26.8/32.6	73.2/67.4	24.5	19.1	43.6

Table 1 (continued)

Scenario	*Ethical (%) Pre/Post*	*Unethical (%) Pre/Post*	*% Changing Unethical to Ethical*	*% Changing Ethical to Unethical*	*Total % of Changing Responses*
A second grade teacher uses observations as the sole method to assess what students have learned.	15.5/16.9	84.5/83.1	13.3	1.5	24.8
Standardized Test Administration (2 Scenarios)					
While administering a standardized test, a teacher notices that a child has skipped a problem and is now recording all his answers out of sequence on the answer form. The teacher stops at the child's desk and shows the student where to record the answer he is working on and instructs him to put the answer to each question with the same number on the answer sheet.	76.4/69.4	23.6/30.6	17.0	23.9	40.8
While administering a standardized test, a teacher notices a child has missed a problem that the student obviously knows. The teacher stands by the child's desk, taps her finger by the incorrect problem, shakes her head, and walks on to the next desk.	3.6/3.2	96.4/96.8	2.7	3.2	5.9

Survey scenarios from "Educational leaders' perceptions about ethical practices in student evaluation," by R. J. Johnson, S. K. Green, D.-H. Kim, & N. S. Pope, 2008, American Journal of Evaluation, 29(4), 520-530. Copyright 2008 by the American Evaluation Association.

component, counting class participation as 30% of the final grade to encourage lively discussion, weighting homework heavily in determining report card grades, and lowering grades for late work by one letter grade for each day. In the pre-survey, there was high disagreement on two (15%) grading practice scenarios: homework grade of zero for not returning a signed parent form, and giving a student a course grade of "F" for missing the final exam. Participants had high disagreement on these two scenarios in the post-survey, along with two more scenarios: announcing greater point deductions for wrong answer than for blank answer, and offering extra credit opportunities to all classes except the advanced class.

For the next three categories—Standardized Test Preparation, Bias, Communication About Grading—participants did not change in their degree of agreement for any of the scenarios between pre- and post-surveys. Standardized Test Preparation had the second highest number of scenarios in the survey (6 scenarios), and participants had high agreement on two-thirds

(67%) of these scenarios. High disagreement occurred on the scenario in which a teacher creates activities that use specific math problems found in the annual achievement test. In regard to the category of Bias (5 scenarios), the results were nearly evenly split. Participants had high agreement on two scenarios and high disagreement on two scenarios, with the last scenarios receiving neither high agreement nor disagreement. The category Communication About Grading featured three scenarios (75%) in which participants had high agreement about ethicality. High disagreement occurred in regard to the fourth scenario, in which a teacher includes "a few surprise items" on the test that were not on the study guide.

The other categories on the survey—Confidentiality, Multiple Assessment Opportunities, and Standardized Test Administration—all had one scenario each to which participants went from "neither high agreement nor disagreement" in the pre-survey to high disagreement (for two scenarios) or high agreement (one scenario). Confidentiality had

Table 2
Agreement* of Pre-Service Teachers Indicating Ethicality of Assessment Scenarios in Pre- and Post-Survey Responses**

	Number of Scenarios (%)		
Category (Number of Scenarios)	High Agreement	High Disagreement	Neither High Agreement nor Disagreement
	Pre / Post	Pre / Post	Pre / Post
Grading practices (13)	5 (38) / 5 (38)	2 (15) / **4 (31)**	6 (46) / **4 (31)**
Standardized test preparation (6)	4 (67) / 4 (67)	1 (17) / 1 (17)	1 (17) / 1 (17)
Bias (5)	2 (40) / 2 (40)	2 (40) / 2 (40)	1 (20) / 1 (20)
Communication about grading (4)	3 (75) / 3 (75)	1 (25) / 1 (25)	0 / 0
Confidentiality (3)	2 (67) / **3 (100)**	0 / 0	1 (33) / **0**
Multiple assessment opportunities (3)	2 (67) / 2 (67)	0 / **1 (33)**	1 (33) / **0**
Standardized test administration (2)	1 (50) / 1 (50)	0 / **1 (50)**	1 (50) / **0**
Total	19 (53) / **20 (56)**	6 (17) / **10 (28)**	11 (31) / **6 (17)**

*High agreement (80%+), high disagreement (50-70%), neither high agreement nor high disagreement (71-79%).

Post-survey responses that change from pre-survey results are in **bold.

high agreement in two scenarios in the pre-survey, and high agreement in all three scenarios in the post-survey. Multiple Assessment Opportunities had two scenarios with high agreement in both surveys, but one scenario with high disagreement in the post-survey. Standardized Test Administration had one scenario with high agreement in both surveys, but one scenario with high disagreement in the post-survey.

Changes in Responses between Pre- and Post-Surveys

Table 1 also includes the percentages of participants who changed their responses (unethical to ethical, ethical to unethical) for each scenario, along with total percentage of participants who changed responses. A subsequent analysis was completed to account for individuals who might "cancel each other out" in switching from one view (ethical/unethical) to the other for a particular scenario.

On average for all 36 scenarios, over one fourth (26.8%) of all participants changed their view (ethical, unethical) between the pre- and post-surveys. The average percentage of participants who shifted views from unethical to ethical (14.4%) was slightly greater than that of those who shifted views from ethical to unethical (12.4%). Between pre- and post-surveys, more participants shifted from unethical to ethical views on 21 of the scenarios. A greater number shifting from ethical to unethical views occurred for only 12 scenarios. For three scenarios, the percentage of participants shifting from ethical to unethical was the same as that shifting from unethical to ethical. In these three scenarios, the net result was no change in degree of agreement between the two surveys.

For further analysis of how participants changed views from pre- to post-survey, all scenarios with high agreement in the pre-survey were separated and compared with the others. For the 19 scenarios with high agreement in the pre-surveys, the average percentage of participants changing their view in the post-survey was 15.1% (8.1% unethical to ethical; 7.0% ethical to unethical). For the remaining 17 scenarios that had high disagreement (6) or neither high agreement nor high disagreement (11) on the pre-survey, the average percentage of participants changing their response in the post-survey was 40.1% (21.6% unethical to ethical; 18.5% ethical to unethical).

For the 13 scenarios in the Grading Practices category, the average percentage of participants changing their responses between pre- and post-surveys was 33.5% (18.4% unethical to ethical; 15.1% ethical to unethical). In the Standardized Test Preparation category (6 scenarios), the average percentage of participants changing views was 24.0% (13.1%

unethical to ethical; 10.9% ethical to unethical). The average percentage of participants changing views in the 5 scenarios dealing with Bias was 33.7% (17.7% unethical to ethical; 16.0% ethical to unethical). The remaining categories all had four or fewer scenarios with varied responses, so analysis of average changes was limited.

Discussion

Past studies of perceptions about ethical practice in student evaluation have found that samples of in-service teachers and educational leaders (principals, principal candidates) have high disagreement on about one third (31% and 33%, respectively) of the scenarios presented (Green et al., 2007; Johnson et al., 2008). Previous studies of pre-service teachers have found high disagreement in one fourth (25%) of the scenarios (Green et al., 2007) and less than one fifth (17%) of the scenarios (Bergman, 2013). In a continuation of the author's previous study, the current research compared pre-service teachers' views at the beginning and end of a one-semester education foundations course, which focused on ethical, historical, and philosophical issues shaping American schools. Again, the purpose of this study was not to determine or make any claims about the impact of this particular course, but rather examine the degree to which pre-service teachers change their views on ethical practices in student evaluation.

Results indicate that following the one-semester foundations course, pre-service teachers' perceptions of ethical practice become more similar to that of in-service teachers and educational leaders. Namely, the percentage of scenarios about which pre-service teachers highly disagree increased from 17% to 28%, which is closer to the 31% high disagreement among in-service teachers and 33% of principals and principal candidates. The number of scenarios about which pre-service teacher participants highly disagreed increased from six to ten (17% to 28%), although the number of scenarios with high agreement also increased, albeit by one (53% to 56%). As a result, the number of scenarios about which pre-service teachers had neither high agreement nor high disagreement decreased from eleven to six (31% to 17%).

In the pre-survey of pre-service teachers, a majority of participants found 20 of 36 scenarios to be ethical. In the post-survey, this number increased to 21 scenarios; the lone addition was a physical education homework scenario in the Grading Practices section, which went from 49.6% ethical responses to 56.7% ethical. It is interesting to note how many scenarios pre-service teachers judged to be ethical, since the survey designers used text resources to classify 10 scenarios as ethical and 26 as unethical (Johnson et al., 2008). Although pre-service teachers' levels

of agreement may get closer to that of in-service teachers and principals between the pre- and post-survey, they still perceive more scenarios as ethical. In the study by Green et al. (2007), a majority of in-service teachers found 19 of the scenarios as ethical. In the study by Johnson et al. (2008), a majority of principals and principal candidates found 18 scenarios to be ethical.

In comparing pre-survey to post-survey responses, more participants changed their views from unethical to ethical on 21 of the scenarios, compared with only 12 scenarios having more participants changing from ethical to unethical. Clearly, pre-service teachers are changing their ideas as they continue their preparation and development for full-time classroom work. A considerable percentage of participants changing responses is understandable for the scenarios without high agreement in the pre-survey. An average of 40.1% of participants (2 in 5) changed their response to these scenarios, with a range between 25.0% and 51.6%. Even as the sample struggles to reach consensus on one of these 17 particular scenarios, individuals also vacillate from one view to the other between the pre- and post-survey. Nevertheless, even the 19 scenarios with high agreement in the pre-survey had an average of 15.1% (nearly 1 in 6 participants) changing responses. While eight of these high agreement scenarios had fewer than 10% of participants changing views, just as many scenarios had more than 20% changing, reaching as high as 31.6%.

Pre-service teachers in this study seem to struggle with determining ethical behavior related to specific instructor decisions about grading and maintaining objectivity. On average, about one third of all participants changed their pre-/post-survey responses in scenarios dealing with Grading Practices (33.5%) and Bias (33.7%). Another area with considerable shifting of personal views deals with standardized tests and assessments. On average, nearly one fourth of participants changed responses in the categories of Standardized Test Preparation (24.0%), Multiple Assessment Opportunities (23.6%), and Standardized Test Administration (23.5%). Since survey categories had different numbers of scenarios (ranging between 2 and 13), however, any comparative analyses and conclusions are limited.

Even so, a collective review of two categories—Communication about Grading, Confidentiality—reveals that pre-service teachers do have high level agreement regarding ethical practice in sharing information about assessments. Pre-survey results had high agreement in five of seven scenarios in these two categories, and post-survey results show high agreement in six of seven of these scenarios. Not surprisingly, the percentage of participants changing pre-/post-survey responses to these

scenarios is relatively low compared to the other scenarios. Although the foundations course taken by these participants (and the context of this study) does feature information about the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (Department of Education, 2015), participants may have just as much familiarity with FERPA practices from their own experiences as students.

In addition to classroom encounters, each participant has unique experiences in their fieldwork or school placements concurrently occurring throughout the semester of the study. Most pre-service teachers are placed in local public schools, including elementary, middle, and high school buildings. A previous study (Bergman 2013) found that elementary and secondary candidates did have significant differences regarding perceived ethicality of some scenarios, and differences in grade level taught may merit further investigation when comparing ethical views over time. Furthermore, any research into the influences of pre-service teachers' perceptions would benefit from examining relative impact of coursework, fieldwork, employment, and other factors.

Even though all the foundations courses included in this present study focused on the same major topics, texts, and assignments, three different instructors were involved, and could impact participants in different ways. Again, a future study could parse data according to section instructor in an attempt to determine potential variations. One project currently underway is comparing responses between pre-service teachers taught in "face-to-face" on-campus sections versus those taking the course in a completely online format.

Additional issues arise with respect to cultural norms about ethical behavior. Although the sample of participants was mostly homogeneous, differences in culture and previous experiences (e.g., religion, community, family) may affect views about ethical behaviors (Cordeiro, 1995; Li & Persons, 2011). When examining perceptions of ethical assessment, researchers and educators must be mindful of cultural differences (Gielen, Ahmed, & Avellani, 1992; Smith, Hume, Zimmermann, & Davis, 2007) as well as equity issues (Gipps & Murphy, 1994).

Historically, ethical teaching standards have developed from dialogic construction among professional educators (Smith, 2013). At a smaller scale in the classroom or in a teacher preparation program, future teachers can begin discussing and determining standards of moral conduct using a tool such as the survey used in this study and others (Johnson et al., 2008) or from more detailed vignettes (Goldblatt & Smith, 2005). This opportunity for dialogue and development could help pre-service teachers collectively reflect and refine principles for ethical practice. One caveat is that teacher candidates generally do not have the extensive

school experiences of veteran educators, which may impede a robust, authentic investigation of some issues.

Teacher educators must also be wary of assuming conversation automatically leads to definite growth and application. As Benninga (2013) points out, "simple discussions of ethical issues, e.g., just talking, can lead nowhere. Dilemmas are fun to talk about but often result in relativistic outcomes" (p. 86). Nevertheless, examination of ethical scenarios can create practical exercises for pre-service teachers with limited classroom exposure. Given the delicate nature of some of these issues, a safe hypothetical setting is especially warranted.

Furthermore, Benninga concludes, "the more that ethical dilemmas are discussed in a group, the better that professionals become at making professional decisions. Just as teachers practice learning new techniques and technologies to improve instruction, the practice of moral decision-making through discussion improves moral thinking" (2013, p. 86). Purposeful discourse and development must occur early in a teacher preparation program, so that new educators begin their careers possessing "a professional identity that positions ethics at the core" (Smith, 2013, p. 58). Incorporating an ethical framework with ongoing inquiry and application should occur program-wide, infused throughout multiple courses and practica. An overarching approach would provide opportunities for continuous review and growth, culminating with each cohort of pre-service teachers alert to moral standards in educational settings. Such individuals would enter the profession equipped for proactive ethical practice.

References

Association of American Educators. (2010). *Code of ethics for educators*. Available at http://aaeteachers.org/index.php/about-us/aae-code-of-ethics.

Banchero, S. (2014). Cheating probe roils Philadelphia school system. *The Wall Street Journal*. Available at http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304856504579337081424391 78.

Bebeau, M. J., Rest, J. R., & Narvaez, D. (1999). Beyond the promise: A perspective on research in moral education. *Educational Researcher, 28*(4), 18-26.

Benninga, J. S. (2003). Moral and ethical issues in teacher education. *ERIC Digest*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. (ED 482 699)

Benninga, J. S. (2013). Resolving ethical issues at school. *Issues in Teacher Education, 22*(1), 77-88.

Bergman, D. J. (2013). Pre-service teachers' perceptions about ethical practices in student evaluation. *Issues in Teacher Education, 22*(1), 29-48.

Bingham, A., & Abernathy, T. V. (2007). Promoting family-centered teaching: Can one course make a difference? *Issues in Teacher Education, 16*(1), 37-60.

Campbell, E., & Thiessen, D. (2001, April). *Perspectives on the ethical bases of moral agency in teaching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Seattle, WA.

Character Education Partnership. (2002). *Practices of teacher educators committed to characters. Examples from teacher education programs emphasizing character development*. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.

Cordeiro, W. P. (1995). Should a school of business change its ethics to conform to the cultural diversity of its students? *Journal of Education for Business, 71*(1), 27-29.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP 2013 Accreditation Standards*. Available at http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf.

Department of Education. (2015). *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)*. Available at http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html.

Dewan, S. (2010, August 2). Cheating inquiry in Atlanta largely vindicates schools. *The New York Times*. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/03/education/03georgia.html?_r=2

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Gabriel, T. (2010, June 10). Under pressure, teachers tamper with tests. *The New York Times*. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/11/education/11cheat.html

Gielen, U. P., Ahmed, R. A., & Avellani, J. (1992). The development of moral reasoning and perceptions of parental behavior in students from Kuwait. *Moral Education Forum, 17*(3), 20-37.

Gipps, C. V., & Murphy, P. (1994). *A fair test? Assessment, achievement and equity*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Goldblatt, P. F., & Smith, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Cases for teacher development: Preparing for the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goodlad, J. I., & McMannon, T. J. (Eds.). (1997). *The public purpose of education and schooling*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., Kim, D., & Pope, N. S. (2007). Ethics in classroom assessment practices: Issues and attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(7), 999-1011.

Johnson, R. L., Green, S. K., Kim, D., & Pope, N. S. (2008). Educational leaders' perceptions about ethical practices in student evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 29*(4), 520-530.

Joint Advisory Committee. (1993). *The principles for fair student assessment practices for education in Canada*. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Joint Advisory Committee.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2003). *The student evaluation standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Li, S. G., & Persons, O. S. (2011). Cultural effects on business students' ethical decisions: A Chinese versus American comparison. *Journal of Education*

for Business, 86(1), 10-16.
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
National Education Association. (2012). *Code of ethics of the education profession*. Available at http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/2012-NEA-Handbook-Code-of-Ethics.pdf
Osguthorpe, R. D. (2013). Attending to ethical and moral dispositions in teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education, 22*(1), 17-28.
Peterson, M. S. (2005). The ethical dilemmas of high-stakes testing and issues for teacher preparation programs. *Journal of College & Character, 6*(7), 1-11.
Pojman, L. P. (1998). *Ethical theory: Classical and contemporary readings* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (p. 102-119). New York, NY: Macmillan.
Richardson, V., & Placier, P. (2001). Teacher change. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed., p. 905-947). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
Sanger, M. & Osguthorpe, R. D. (2013). The moral vacuum in teacher education research and practice. *National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook 2013, 112*(1), 41-60.
Schwartz, M. J. (2008). Teacher education for moral and character education. In D. Narvaez & L. Nucci (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Smith, A., Hume, E. C., Zimmermann, R., & Davis, A. (2007). The global significance of locus of control in ethical decision making: A multi-country examination of university students. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 4*(2), 7-12.
Smith, D. M. (2013). A dialogic construction of ethical standards for the teaching profession. *Issues in Teacher Education, 22*(1), 49-62.
Sockett, H. (1993). *The moral base for teacher professionalism*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Strike, K. A., & Soltis, J. F. (2009). *The ethics of teaching*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Strike, K. A., & Ternasky, P. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Ethics for professionals in education: Perspectives for preparation and practices*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Thompson, M. (1997). *Professional ethics and the teacher: Towards a general teaching council*. Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham Books Limited.
Tom, A. (1984). *Teaching as a moral craft*. New York, NY: Longman.
Torres, K. (2010, August 3). 109 Atlanta educators suspected of test cheating. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. Available at http://www.ajc.com/news/atlanta/109-atlanta-educators-suspected-583484.html
Urdan, T. C., & Paris, S. G. (1994). Teachers' perceptions of standardized achievement tests. *Educational Policy, 8*(2), 137-156.
Vegh, S. G. (2010, March 6). Report: Norfolk students were shown answers during test. *The Virginian-Pilot*. Available at http://hamptonroads.com/2010/03/re-

port-norfolk-students-were-shown-answers-during-test?cid=omc
Warnick, B. R., & Silverman, S. K. (2011). A framework for professional ethics courses in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(3), 273-285.
Webb, L. D. (2006). *The history of American education: A great American experiment*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
Wilkerson, J. R. (2006). Measuring teacher dispositions: Standards-based or morality-based?
Teachers College Record. Accessible at http://www.tcrecord.org (ID No. 2493).
Wynne, E. A. (1995). The moral dimension of teaching. In A. C. Ornstein (Ed.), Teaching: Theory into practice. (pp. 190-202). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.