

EXPLORING TEACHING ETHICS IN SOCIAL STUDIES

SUSAN PASS

Should social studies teachers formally teach ethics? The answer to this question was posed to three classes of college seniors enrolled in a social studies methods course and three classes of high school social studies classes to determine if teaching ethics is valuable to students. We found that use of a tool determined this. In order to do this, we suspended teaching the subject for one day in order to teach how to use the tool, which was developed by the Rutland Center for Ethics¹ to make ethical decisions. Once the tool was mastered, we were able to return to teaching the subject and could now interject class discussion of ethics as we taught the subject.

Ethics is a topic that many teachers shy away from teaching their students. Yet American educators are concerned that the students are coming into their classes with unacceptable ethical standards.² For example, an English teacher asked her eighth grade class to write a confidential essay on honesty and was very much surprised when almost half of the eighty-five students said that theft was okay under certain circumstances.³ Cheating was also acceptable according to the majority of her students, if you did not have enough time to study. Lying was also acceptable. Their justification was, "My parents do it all of the time."⁴ While many teachers teach ethics even when they do not know they are doing so, we believe that it is essential for teachers to include the formal teaching of ethics - even when it means putting the actual teaching of the subject aside for a day. It takes only a class period to teach a tool by which students can judge if an ethical decision has been made. Afterwards, the teacher can return to the subject and use what was learned to explore ethical decisions within that subject.

Whether they know it or not, teachers are teaching ethics all the time as they model acceptable behavior in their classrooms. However, some teachers might believe that students need to be formally taught ethics; that is, teaching how students can know that they have made an ethical decision. Ethics can be formally taught in all subjects. Social studies is a discipline that is highly conducive toward teaching ethics. Social studies

teachers often go into current events and it is useful to their students to know how to apply ethics in current events. Indeed, the National Council for the Social Studies⁵ maintains that ethics is one of the essential skills for interpersonal relationships and social participation and, therefore, should be taught as the students "express personal convictions."⁶ John Dewey also thought that a social studies subject could and should be used to teach moral judgment,

... history would most naturally become of ethical value in teaching. Intelligent insight into present forms of associated life is necessary for a character whose morality is more than colorless innocence. Historical knowledge helps provide such insight. It is an organ for analysis of the warp and woof of the present social fabric, of making known the forces which have woven the pattern. The use of history for cultivating a socialized intelligence constitutes its moral significance. It is possible to employ it as a kind of reservoir of anecdotes to be drawn on to inculcate special moral lessons on this virtue or that vice. But such teaching is not so much an ethical use of history as it is an effort to create moral impressions by means of more or less authentic material.⁷

Philosophers believe that ethics should not be treated as something remote, to be studied only by scholars locked away in universities.⁸ We believe that teachers need to know how to teach ethics and instruct their students on ethics so that a foundation of ethical behavior is established in our future citizens. There are increasing concerns about the perceived decline in moral and ethical values in American contemporary life and this concern is promoting renewed interest in moral education.⁹

Again, scholars are stating that those being prepared to be teachers should be taught how to teach children to examine their own ethics on how to be ethical.¹⁰ We believe that ethics can be taught to children enrolled in today's classrooms even if their parents and administrators are not being ethical.

Conceptual Framework

Our conceptual framework (because all the authors either graduated from or were working with that university) was taken from the new mission statement that Clemson University's Eugene T. Moore School of Education adopted in 2005.¹¹ The guiding principles of that mission statement say that students should be caring, capable, and connected. Included within this was the fact that students should act ethically and respect the rights of others.

In teaching ethics, the question of what is ethics must be answered. Ethics is a statement making a claim about how the world is and how the world should be.¹² Ethics deals with values, with good and bad, for what we do and don't do is always a possible subject of ethical evaluation.¹³

Ethical standards are: overriding, public, practicable, deal with serious matters, are not changed by the action of authoritative bodies, are impartial, and are associated with feelings of approval or disapproval that are expressed through a specialized vocabulary (e.g., duty or right).¹⁴ As society in the US has less and less time for child rearing, more and more teachers are taking over the role that used to be done by community, church, and family; namely, teaching ethics.¹⁵ It is in the school that children are being provided with the majority of adult supervision and interaction.

Challenges

Today, schools have become the major foundation of adult interaction and adult influence on student development.¹⁶ There are obstacles to teaching ethics and among these are that most people do not obtain the highest level of cognitive development as defined by both Piaget and Vygotsky.¹⁷ Kohlberg stated that not all people reach the highest stage of affective judgment¹⁸ and listed five levels of taxonomy for ethics.

<u>Level Definition</u>	<u>Stage Characteristic</u>
5. Internalize- Act consistently in accordance through with a value system	7. Knowledge develops probabilistically through a process of inquiry that is generalizable across domains.
4. Organization- Formulate a value system	6. Knowledge is uncertain but constructed by comparing and coordinating evidence and opinion on different sides of an issue.
3. Valuing- Appreciate, attach value, commit to a value system	5. Knowledge is uncertain and must be understood within a context; thus, it can be justified by arguments within those contexts.
2. Responding - Carry out a task, participate in, react to a value system.	4. Concept that knowledge is unknown in several specific cases leads to abstract generalization that knowledge is uncertain.
1. Receiving - Hear, see, observe a value system.	3. Knowledge is uncertain in some areas and certain in others.
	2. Two categories for knowing: right answers are contrasted with wrong answers.
	1. Knowing is limited to single, concrete instances.

We argue that to act ethically requires reflective judgment. In a study on reflective judgment, Kitchener, Lynch, Fischer and Wood argue¹⁹ that there are seven stages to determining ethical decisions and not even all adults reach the top stage. Stage 7 is not reached until at least the age of 24. Since most college seniors are at stage 4 or stage 5 and since most high school students are at stage 2 with a few at stage 3, we felt that the topic had to be explained at their level. Thus we used The Rutland Center for Ethics convergence idea.

Because both Kohlberg and the Reflective Judgment researchers believe that high school students have not yet obtained their highest level of ethics²⁰ we decided to teach a lesson on ethics using values clarification (here, students explored their ethical beliefs) that emphasized real and imaginary case studies.

Dialogue is useful in the students exploring their own sense of ethics²¹ and it is best to avoid absolutism and relativism. This is because those two beliefs cut off discussion, and discussion is important to exploring ethics. We did not teach that absolutism or relativism were "wrong." Indeed, many parents raise their children with one or the other of those two beliefs. Absolutism is the belief that there is only one code of morality, and relativism is the belief that, if an ethics is right for one group or person it is moral. When we encountered such positions, we asked the class if anyone knew of another idea. The class then discussed the correctness of that idea in the light of the previous absolutism or relativism statement. If an answer was given that we considered not moral, we asked if anyone had another opinion. This approach seemed to open the dialogue, and we did have some students changing their opinions to acknowledge that there might other ways of looking at reality. Our goal was for students (both college and high school) to start establishing and/or exploring their own ethical beliefs by having them learn how to apply a tool.

The College Seniors Method

To investigate the need for and student attitudes about pre-service teacher training in ethics, a study was conducted with fifty-six college seniors enrolled in three different social studies methods classes in a teacher preparation program. Over a period of one semester the three social studies methods classes were studied to determine college seniors' feelings on self-competency in the ability to teach ethics (also known as values clarification) to their students.

Group A was taught how to teach ethics without the tool or the scenarios and using traditional teaching methods (lecture and readings as we

covered the Ten NCSS Strands). Group B was taught how to teach ethics without the tool and using scenarios developed by the Rutland Center for Ethics; these are discussed under the high school student section of this paper. Group C was taught both by the tool (see high school student discussion) and the scenarios. The student rating scale of their own sense of learning ethics was administered at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester.

Instrument

A 9-item rating chart was developed. Reliability was field tested with the 56 college seniors. The Chronbach's alpha for all 9 items was .8565, which is highly reliable. Communalities for all 9 items were acceptable and the instrument had an acceptable screen plot (resembled a "U"). For validity, a Delphi technique with two professors of education and four members of the Rutland Center for Ethics Education indicated (after four months and some adjustments on the test items) that the instrument was effective in measuring what it was supposed to measure; namely, student knowledge of ethics/values clarification.

Results

The results of the study (Group C) showed that there was a statistically significant increase in students' sense of ethics and interest in learning ethics no matter what approach was used; however, the greatest increase occurred when the future teachers were taught how to teach ethics through constructivist teaching strategies and use of the tool (Group C). The post-test was given three weeks before final exams.

Statistics on All Three Classes, n=58

Group	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Std. Dev.	T	Sig.
A Ethics	3.3637	3.8368	.79903	3.339	.004
B Ethics	3.6254	3.9271	.6006	2.935	.007
C Ethics	3.6569	4.0100	.47499	3.288	.005

An Anova resulted in the following results:

Source	P	Df	F	Mean Square
Between Groups Difference in Student Ratings of Their Sense of Ethics	2	.579	5.804	.564
Within Groups Difference in Student Ratings of Their Sense of Ethics	41	1.007	.677	.322

The High School Seniors

Because of the results of the college seniors' study, we used both the scenarios and the tool with three classes of high school seniors. We prodded the moral imagination of 55 high school seniors enrolled in two regular and one honors economics classes not because they were economics classes (although three of the scenarios we used dealt directly with money income and ethical choices) but because they were in the last semester of their senior year classes and those students would be making moral judgments more or less on their own once they left home for college. Ethical understanding can be best taught by expanding the students' moral imagination, in which they can explore all possibilities before making a judgment.²²

Our goal was to develop moral sensitivity in our students. Moral sensitivity is crucial for making moral decisions.²³ Moral sensitivity tells us how our moral decisions affect others.²⁴ Once moral sensitivity is developed, it is possible to make correct, ethical judgments, since judgment involves perception, knowledge, and action.²⁵ Moral sensitivity is directly related to moral motivation and the building of moral character.²⁶ We found that not only was the instruction welcomed by the students; they asked for more. We plan to continue ethics instruction as we delve into sensitive issues throughout the rest of the school year. However, we also suggest that ethics be made an elective course for high school seniors.

Application of the Tool

We started the lesson by defining ethics and values clarification so that the students had a starting point with a clear idea as to what we were teaching. We defined ethics as our sense of right and wrong. We defined values clarification as a personal search for the most ethical decision. The Rutland Center for Ethics (under the guidance of its Director Dan Wueste) suggested that, while there are other theories of ethics, three seemed best to use with high school students because they could be simplified for novice learners.²⁷ Using these three theories, we then showed that to be ethical one would want a three-way convergence of the following ethical philosophies.²⁸

Utilitarian—The good of the many outweighs the good of a few. The aim is to achieve the greatest benefit possible at the lowest cost. Right actions are actions that create the greatest good for the greatest number. The end (the good of the many) justifies the means (the actions that create it) only if one can justify that the greatest number will be hurt by not doing that end.

Kantian—You are to treat humanity, wherever you find it (in others or yourself) with respect. Human beings deserve this; they have a right to respectful treatment. Another way of expressing the criterion of right action here is to say that the policy of a right action is universalizable (the policy could be a universal rule of action). So, a mark of wrong action is that its policy cannot be universalized. This is the golden rule idea. Kant's approach is a nonconsequentialist approach. Accordingly, those who embrace it reject the idea that the end justifies the means. Kant, however, acknowledged three types of action: good, bad, and neutral. A neutral action (like dropping a pencil) is neither good nor bad. Kant, therefore, stated that goals and means need to be either good or neutral.

Virtue Theory—The Platonic approach, like the Aristotelian approach, does not aim at identifying duties (both the utilitarian and the Kantian approaches have this aim). Both Plato and Aristotle advocate what has come to be called an ethics of aspiration. The goal with this approach is to be an excellent human being, that is, a person who has developed habits of action that lead to right action (in a word, good character). Acting rightly comes naturally to a person with good character in much the same way that outstanding performance comes naturally for a virtuoso musician or athlete (here, one's role demands as a parent supersede one's job role demands).

We taught by using the following three training cases. We used these imaginary scenarios to show how to get a convergence of Utilitarian, Kantian, and Virtue theories. We also taught that, while a convergence of all three would almost guarantee your decision was ethical, a convergence of any two would probably give some assurance of making the right decision:²⁹

The Emergency Room—You are a doctor in a hospital's emergency room. Six accident victims are brought in. All six are "at death's door," but one is much worse off than the other five. You can save that person if you devote all of your energy, resources, and attention to him. Alternatively, you can save the other five if you are willing to focus your energy, attention, and resources on them.

What should be done?

Why would that be the right thing to do? What would justify doing it?

*This is a slightly revised version of a case from Gilbert Harman's *The Nature of Morality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

The Main Room 306—You have five patients who are dying, each needs an organ transplant. You can save all five if you take a single healthy patient and harvest his organs for transplantation. The person you need is in room 306. He is in the hospital for a physical-for insurance purposes. You know from the results of the tests that have been run that he is perfectly healthy. You also know that his organs could be transplanted successfully in the needy patients. If you do nothing, he will survive without incident, but the other patients will surely die. They can be saved only if the organs of the man in room 306 are harvested and transplanted.

What should be done?

Why?

*This is a slightly revised version of a case from Gilbert Harman's *The Nature of Morality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

A Day at the Beach—You are a lifeguard at a public beach. Looking to your right you see two people floundering about and in obvious need of assistance. However, as you climb down from your lifeguard tower, you notice that your 16-year-old daughter, who was swimming off to your left, is also in danger of drowning. No one else is in a position to help.

What would you do?

What should you do?

*This is from case studies provided by the Rutland Center for Ethics (2004) at Clemson University

We looked at the above case studies in groups. After each group presented a majority (and, in some cases, a minority) report, we held a discussion. Our ground rules were that we were working not only with opinions but also beliefs, which are deeper. So, we all agreed in advance to respect each other's statements—even if we could not agree with such statements. We used the fact that researchers have said,³⁰ if you are not at the same ethical stage (or at the stage just above or just below) of the person talking, you will not understand what that person is saying. We taught that the convergence for all three case studies would be as follows:

For the emergency room, Utilitarian ethics would teach save the greatest number. Kantian ethics would argue that there are 3 types of actions (moral, immoral, and neutral). You need to save the five but you did not kill the one-in cases like this, waiting to work on the one until after you save the five is neutral action. Virtue ethics would argue that one aspires to do the greatest good for the greatest number and saving the

one would condemn the others to death (one does not aspire to commit manslaughter).

For the man in room 306, Utilitarian ethics would argue that the long-term result of that action would be for all people seeking insurance not to undergo hospital physicals, plus many people would not go to the hospital for other help; so, our medical system, insurance system, and people in general would suffer (you have not done the greatest good, you have done long term harm). The Kantians would argue that one could not take from another person unless that person consents of his or her own free will - we must respect all people's free will. Virtue ethics tells us not to aspire to steal from people and kill them (I do not aspire to be a murderer).

For the day at the beach, Utilitarian ethics would argue that if all parents did not carry out their primary duty of protecting their children, society in general would suffer (so, save your child and throw out life-savers to the two adults). Kantian ethics would argue that your responsibility as a parent is higher than your responsibility for your occupation; so, since lifeguards should never work alone, get the others to save the two adults. Virtue ethics requires you to be a good parent before you are a good lifeguard.

Extension

With the students, we held a discussion on why learning ethics today is important. Most students (honors or regular) stated that America was at a crucial time in its history and it was important for the good of the nation that the greater majority of its people make the most ethical decision possible. Many wrote that learning about ethics is not only important for the individual, but for the welfare of America as well.

One student wrote, "Everyone should know where they stand on situations; how they feel about them; the actual ethical choice to be made; and how they can become ethical to improve life for everyone." Another wrote, "It is important to learn where you stand with your beliefs, so you will be better-equipped to be productive in society." A third student wrote that, "You learn what is right and wrong and it helps you to look at the long-term consequences, as well as short-term." A fourth seemed to summarize for most of the classes, "I think learning about ethics is highly important in today's world to keep us on the up-and-up."

The next part of our instruction involved real-life ethical case studies. Again, we divided the students into groups — two classes worked in pairs, and the largest class worked in groups of threes. Each was given a different case study. They were to explain their case study to the class and

tell what the most ethical decision to make would be based on attempting a convergence of the three philosophies stated earlier in this article.

The real-life case studies that we used cover the following Ten Strands developed by the National Council for the Social Studies: I or anthropology/culture (#2, #4, and #5), II or history (#2 and #6), III or geography (#1, #7, and #8), V or sociology (#1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7), VI and X or government (#1, #3, #4, #5, #7, and #8), VII or economics (#1, #7 and #8), and IX or global connections (#1, #3, #7 and #8). However, a teacher does not have to use these case studies but, once the students understand the tool, can go into the subject and discuss ethical decisions as the course continues. We only add these studies to help a teacher, if that teacher believes students still need further instruction on how to apply the ethical tool.

Lobbying for "Liberation"

Three years ago, King Industries was named by the Department of Defense as the prime contractor for a new generation of battle tank. Though military production amounts to only a small part of King's business, the contract is enormous in dollar terms and potentially very lucrative. But things have not been going so well otherwise for King. Intense competition in its consumer products division and a national recession, which has reduced the demand for consumer durables, has resulted in huge losses for the company, which has depended on this division for 80 percent of its revenue in the past decades. Analysts say that the company is in danger of bankruptcy, and if such a bankruptcy occurs, tens of thousands of jobs in factories throughout the United States may be lost.

Ned Ordway is a longtime lobbyist for King Industries, and has spent years gathering support among legislators for legislation favorable to King, encouraging them to resist legislation and other policy decisions which would be unfavorable to King. Recently, there has been much political unrest in the country of Chad, partly due to the efforts of groups opposed to the current regime, and there is some discussion of United States military intervention in the country. However, support for this has been weak because opposition groups are seen by many analysts as no better than the current regime, and because the current situation does not pose a clear threat to the interests of the United States, though there is some concern that the political turmoil could spread to neighboring states. Legislation has been proposed that would give \$53 million to opposition groups, which will likely lead to military intervention on the part of the United States if the groups are effective at using the money to

destabilize the government. Both military intervention in Chad and military aid to a new government in Chad will increase demand for J-1 tanks and will likely hasten the timeline by which the old tanks will be replaced. This would restore the financial health of King Industries as well as provide a future government friendly to the United States with the best in tank technology.

Ned is lobbying for the legislation and coordinating attacks against groups that oppose the legislation and military intervention; however, he has some concerns about whether or not this is lobbying-as-usual, or something very different. You are a trusted friend of Ned and he asks your advice. What do you say?

That 'Ole Time' Religion

The text of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution is as follows: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. NOTE: The questions below deal only with the part of the amendment that is about religion.

Suppose you were one of the Founding Fathers. Would you have voted for the adoption of this amendment? Why (or why not)? Does this amendment allow people to have no religion at all? Is that a good idea? Why (or why not)?

Ethics and the Patriot Act

The Patriot Act increases the government surveillance power in several areas, including: *Records searches*. It expands the government's ability to look at records on an individual's activity being held by a third party (e.g., doctors, libraries, bookstores, universities, and Internet service providers). *Secret searches*. It expands the government's ability to search private property without notice to the owner. For example, the government can enter a house, apartment, or office with a search warrant when the occupants are away, search through their property, take photographs, and in some cases even seize property - and not tell them until later. *Intelligence searches*. Under the Patriot Act, the FBI can secretly conduct a physical search or wiretap on American citizens to obtain evidence of crime without proving probable cause, as required by the Fourth Amendment. Previous exceptions to the Fourth Amendment had only allowed searches if the primary purpose was to gather foreign intelligence, but the Patriot Act changes the law to allow searches when "a significant

purpose" is intelligence.

Isn't national security our primary concern these days? Don't we all have a patriotic duty to promote homeland security? Where, if anywhere, should and how we draw the line?

Does Character Matter?

Over the past few years, a great deal of attention has focused on the character of candidates for public office, and those officials serving in elective or appointed office. For over 200 years of our American democracy questions about character, ethics, and integrity have been explicit or implicit in our selection of those officials we elect or appoint to public office. We have a track record of mixed results when it comes to the leaders we choose at the local, state, and federal levels. In a bombshell confession, Bill Clinton has told why he had an affair with Monica Lewinsky: "Just because I could." The philandering 42nd president has publicly apologized numerous times for the scandal, which rocked the country and led to his impeachment in 1998—but this is the first time he's revealed what fueled his presidential peccadilloes.

What does this revelation tell you about President Clinton's character? Is this aspect of a person's character relevant for the presidency? How much of a person's personal life should he be held accountable for in his public office?

Right to Die

"Skin cancer had riddled the tortured body of Matthew Donnelly. A physicist, he had done research for the past thirty years on the use of X-rays. He had lost part of his jaw, his upper lip, his nose, and his left hand. Growths had been removed from his right arm and two fingers from his right hand. He was left blind, slowly deteriorating, and in agony of body and soul. The pain was constant; at its worst, he could be seen lying in bed with teeth clenched and beads of perspiration standing out on his forehead. Nothing could be done except continued surgery and analgesia. The physicians estimated that he had about a year to live."

Matthew Donnelly begged his brother to shoot him. He did. Was what Mr. Donnelly's brother did a criminal offense? Is euthanasia wrong why or why not?

Tuskegee Syphilis Study

In 1932, The Public Health Service, working with the Tuskegee Institute, began a study in Macon County, Alabama, to record the

natural history of syphilis in hopes of justifying treatment programs for Blacks. At the time, many medical researchers believed that syphilis in Blacks was a different disease than syphilis in whites. The study involved 600 poor, rural African American men—399 with syphilis and 201 who did not have the disease. Over 200 healthy men were injected with syphilis. Researchers told the men that they were being treated for “bad blood,” a local term used to describe several ailments (including syphilis, anemia, and fatigue). In exchange for being part of the study, the men received free medical exams, free meals, and burial insurance. When the study began, there was no effective treatment for syphilis. However, even after effective treatments were developed (in the mid-1940s), the subjects were neither informed nor treated. The study ended in 1972 after *The Washington Star* wrote about it. Some researchers try to defend the study. They say that, given the low socioeconomic level of the subjects, it would not be possible for them to get effective treatment.

Suppose it were up to you? What should you do? Why?

My Brother's Keeper?

Ninety-five percent of the 36.1 million people suffering from AIDS live in the developing world. In South Africa's most populous province, the infection rate has reached 37 percent. So severe is the impact on the African population that the U.S. Census Bureau estimates life expectancy in SubSaharan Africa will likely fall to around age 30 within a decade the lowest in a century.

One plan would allow South African pharmaceutical companies to manufacture anti-AIDS drugs like AZT without paying royalties to the American firms that hold the patents (which is a violation of international law and something that the American firms vehemently oppose). The drugs would then be several orders of magnitude cheaper than they are in the United States. (where treatment runs \$1,000 per month) and could be distributed to a large number of victims.

What should be done? Why?

Too Much Gas?

There is a growing consensus in the scientific community that increasing carbon dioxide emissions is causing global warming (i.e., the greenhouse effect). The U.S. is currently responsible for a quarter of global carbon dioxide emissions. In 1992, President George Bush, Sr., signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Global Warming. This resulted in the Kyoto Protocol, which asked America to reduce greenhouse gasses by 40 percent. President Clinton agreed to do this. However, the current George W. Bush administration has estimated that

to do this would cause massive unemployment; steep price increases for gasoline and electricity; and a sharp decrease in gross national product. This current administration argues that polluters like China and India are exempt from the restrictions that the United States is bound to because they are just emerging from the Third World. So, the current Bush administration has decided not to honor the Kyoto Protocol.

Suppose it were up to you. What should you do?

Critique

Students will take from two to three class periods to go through all the material. Teachers must allow time for thinking, discussion, presenting, and debate. We found that, if we hurried things, learning was impaired. The strengths of the unit appeared to be the three, short, ethical scenarios that introduced the lesson because they had the students analyzing the behavior and then placing themselves in the situation. Deciding how they would handle the situation was the real strong point of the instruction. This allowed the students to examine their own behavior and develop their own level of ethics without forcing the teachers to indoctrinate their own ethics into the students. As one student commented, "Learning about ethics is important because it allows you to make the correct decisions in difficult times."

One weakness of the unit was that we were learning as we taught. Trying to do all five real-life scenarios seemed to take away from everyone's learning. It is suggested that teachers might want to focus on just one real-life ethical scenario at a time, rather than do all five at the same time in groups. In this way all students can be exposed to deciding more case studies and, thus, have more practice in their personal striving for values clarification however, that might take additional class time.

Another weakness might be that only three theories of ethics were considered. For example, Nel Nodding's work on Care Theory was not used. We also did not use John Rawl's Theory of Justice or Carol Gilligan's feminist-inspired Ethics of Care upon which Nodding's work is based. We investigated these theories and agreed with Dan Wueste of the Rutland Center for Ethics that they were too complex for high school students.

Evaluation

To discover what and if the students had learned, we used the quality of their discussions and presentations. We also asked them to write down what it was that they had learned and we evaluated those essays. Finally, we administered a pre- and post-test student-rating scale. This instrument was developed by Susan Pass, adapting Dr. Fraenkel's 1990 instrument.³

Reliability was field tested with 322 high school juniors in 1992. The Chronbach's alpha for all 9 items was .8565, which is highly reliable. Communalities for all 9 items were acceptable and the instrument had an acceptable scree plot (resembled a "U"). For validity, Pass did a Delphi technique with two professors of education and four members of the Rutland Center for Ethics Education. After four months and some adjustments on the test items, results indicated that the instrument was effective in measuring what it was supposed to measure; namely, student knowledge of ethics/values clarification. A factor analysis was done to determine reliability. The rating scale chart shows that the students' means on this instrument increased from an overall 3.23 on the pre-test to an overall 4.03 on the post-test (see chart).

Conclusion

Plato wrote in his *Apology* that the unexamined life is not worth living. Teaching ethics is important to the intellectual growth of high school seniors as their departure from home to college or career is imminent. We believe that how they handle themselves and the development of their own identity and belief system should be examined in order to best prepare them for "the outside world." One student commented, "Ethics helps us to make better decisions, so that we can make the world a better place to live in." Another commented that knowing ethics is important "because it gives you the sense of knowing yourself, as well as other people." A third commented, "knowing ethics is important because it helps you make better life decisions." A fourth seemed to summarize the opinion of many students, "I think that learning about ethics is important because some people have grown up not knowing that much about ethics or values and these should, therefore, be taught to help them."

There is a need for teachers to teach ethics and values clarification to their students. The many positive responses from the students showed us how big the interest is in the subject matter. Our students asked for more lessons on ethics. Teachers report that our students are behaving much better in their classes, in the hallways, and with each other. This makes us believe that there should be an elective in ethics offered to high school seniors. However, in this time of high-stakes testing, we acknowledge that many schools do not have the time, money, or faculty to add another elective. So, this article demonstrated that an acceptable alternative would be for social studies teachers to include ethics as they go through their course topics. We urge teachers to consider adding ethics to the education of their students. We found that students enjoyed the intellectual experience of discovering their own personal beliefs and we think that it is

important they start learning how to make ethical decisions - "Know thyself" should be the first standard of any curriculum.

NOTES

1. Rutland Center for Ethics, *Seminar on Ethics* (Clemson, S.C.: Clemson University, August 15-18, 2004).
2. E. Martel, *Letter to Colleagues* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson High School, 2003).
3. E. Shuett, "Honesty is the Best Policy, Isn't It?" (Anderson, S.C.: *Anderson Independent Mail*, December 18, 2003).
4. *Ibid.*, 64.
5. National Council for the Social Studies, *Expectations of Excellence* (Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1994).
6. *Ibid.*, 149.
7. Dewey. *Democracy and Education*. online, (New York: The Free Press, 1916). http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/Projects/digitexts/dewey/d_e/chapter16.html
8. P.A. Singer. *A Companion to Ethics*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1993).
9. C. Beck, *Better Schools: A Values Perspective* (London: Palmer, 1990).
10. A. J. Reiman and Sam Johnson, "Promoting Teacher Professional Judgment," *Journal of Research in Education* 13 (2004): 1-11.
11. Clemson University *Conceptual Framework* online, (Clemson, S.C.: 2005), www.hehd.clemson.edu/schoolofedl.
12. Rutland Center, August 17, 2005.
13. Singer.
14. H.L. A. Hart, *The Concept of Law*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).
15. Robert Green, *Lecture on the Foundations of Education* (Clemson, S.C.: Clemson University, February 21, 2001).
16. *Ibid.*
17. G. P. King. "How Do We Know? Why Do We Believe?" *Liberal Education* 78 (January/February 1992): 2-8.
18. L. Kohlberg. *Theory of Moral Development* online (2005) <http://facultyweb.cortland.edu/ANDERSMD/KOHL/CONTENT.HTML>.
19. K. Kitchener, et al., "Developmental Range of Reflective Judgment: The Effect of Contextual Support and Practice on Developmental Stage." *Developmental Psychology* 29 (1993): 893-906.
20. *Ibid.*
21. L. Nucci, *Education in the Moral Domain* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
22. J. Kekes, *The Morality of Pluralism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).
23. M. J. Bebeau, "Influencing the Moral Dimensions of Dental Practice," in *Moral Development in the Professions: Psychology and Applied Ethics*, ed. J.R.

Rest and D. Narvaez (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1994).

24. T.L. Myyry and Klaus Helkama, "The Role of Value Priorities and Professional Ethics Training in Moral Sensitivity." *Journal of Moral Education* 31 (2002): 35-50.

25. M. Pardales. "So, How did You Arrive at that Decision? Connecting Moral Imagination and Moral Judgment" *Journal of Moral Education* 31 (2002): 423-37.

26. J. R. Rest, et al., *Postconventional Moral Thinking*. (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1999).

27. D. Wueste, *Lecture on Ethics*, (Clemson, S.C.: Rutland Center for Ethics, Clemson University, August 17, 2003).

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. J. Fraenkel, *Portrait of Four Social Studies Teachers* (Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association's Annual Conference, Chicago, Ill., 1990).