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ABSTRACT

Through everyday classroom interactions, teachers influence their students’ actions and the choices those students will make in life. Such interactions may have profound impact on the students and their well-being, whether teachers are cognizant of their influence as role models and moral educators or not.

Morally sensitive teachers are better equipped to perceive, or become aware of, those classroom interactions that have direct implications for students’ well-being. As well, such teachers have the ability to interpret influential aspects of teacher-student interactions in moral terms.

Previous research and theory in psychology, philosophy, and curriculum development is in accord in suggesting that moral sensitivity is an area of interest and concern to practicing teachers, and that teachers’ preparedness to face the challenges of classroom interactions by advancing their moral sensitivity can contribute to a betterment of education and a better care for students’ lives.

In Study 1, three sources of knowledge on moral sensitivity were utilized in order to develop a comprehensive measure of teachers’ sensitivity to the moral dimension of schooling. Those three sources included: (a) the teachers’ professional code of ethics, (b) findings from observations of the moral life of classrooms, and (c) a moral issues questionnaire developed as part of Study 1 to collect practicing teachers’ testimonials of issues and stories they perceived as having moral meaning. A triangulation method was utilized to validate the already established notions of morally significant aspects of teaching on the one hand, and to extend the understanding of teachers’ situatedness in the
moral context of schools on the other. After carefully analyzing the information obtained from the three sources, at the end of Study 1 an open-ended semi-structured questionnaire was developed.

In Study 2, the Teachers' Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ) was developed and validated as a measure of high school teachers' moral sensitivity. The TCQ comprises four stories revolving around teacher-student interactions, each accompanied by a series of seven prompt questions guiding the process of identifying the issues of concern in the scenario, as well as individuals affected by the issues, and any action that might need to be taken in response to the depicted interactions. Each story corresponds with four categories of moral issues, and the overall score of moral sensitivity is derived from the number of categories in which issues of concern are identified along with affected parties and proposed solutions, and justification for their inclusion on moral grounds is provided.

The overall results provide initial support for the relativity and validity of the TCQ as a measure of secondary school teachers' moral sensitivity. The TCQ exhibited a very high inter-rater reliability and a moderately high test-retest reliability. A significant and positive correlation was found between the TCQ and a measure of moral reasoning, as well as a positive correlation between the TCQ and a measure of verbal fluency. Areas of future improvement include shortening the time required to complete the measure and developing an alternative format that would allow self-scoring or automatic scoring by a computer. Directions for future studies are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The one thing needful is that we recognize that moral principles are real in the same sense in which other forces are real; that they are inherent in community life, and in the working structure of the individual. If we can secure a genuine faith in this fact, we shall have secured the condition which alone is necessary to get from our educational system all the effectiveness there is in it. The teacher who operates in this faith will find every subject, every method of instruction, every incident of school life pregnant with moral possibility.


The present study builds on the Aristotelian notion of “human excellence [being] of two kinds, intellectual and moral” (Aristotle, 1998, p. 20). Since ancient times, both intellect and morality have been at the focus of education in a range of its forms. Teaching has been viewed as a moral endeavour due to the moral nature of educational content, and because it involves “a subtle moral relationship between teacher and student, an attempt to bring important content to the awareness of a student, and the ability to analyze situations and to use instructional skills appropriate to these situations” (Tom, 1984, p. 11).

The nature of this subtle relationship between teacher and student is moral, not because all teaching necessarily possesses the moral dimension, but because the human aspect of the teacher-student relationship introduces the inevitable potential for the moral dimension to be revealed. Whether in fact a particular instance of interaction between a
teacher and a student is illuminated with the moral dimension will depend on one’s recognition of this dimension and its interpretation in moral terms—i.e., his or her moral sensitivity.

The present study attempts to address several specific issues pertaining to teaching and moral sensitivity. To begin, the role of moral sensitivity in moral development and its interconnectedness with other components of morality are discussed. It is argued that due to the moral nature of education as stated above, teachers’ moral sensitivity plays a special role in teacher-student interactions. Several educational approaches that show promise of increasing teachers’ moral sensitivity in initial teacher preparation and ongoing professional development are discussed. Among those are: increasing teachers’ cognitive awareness and internalization of moral concepts; providing opportunities for moral reasoning (pre-action), reflection and justification (post-action), as well as moral action (practice) and the consideration of consequences of various courses of action for oneself and others; and finally, encouraging frequent reflection on, and reevaluation of, one’s position and moral motives.

The present study focuses on the moral dimension of teaching rather than the intellectual one due, in part, to the realization that research in the area of teachers’ moral sensitivity is scarce in contrast to those studies that focus on students’ knowledge and skills in the intellectual domain. Another significant factor in deciding the focus of the present study was that of the potential implications of this imbalance in research being paralleled in the public school system where morality is no longer viewed as either an underlying force or predominant subject of enquiry (Lickona, 1991). It is hoped that the results of the present study will extend the understanding of the potential of moral
education by shedding light on some mechanisms of moral development. Additionally, the present study is aimed at providing educators with a tool to aid them in their efforts to assess secondary school teachers' moral sensitivity. Such a first step is a prerequisite to the development and implementation of programs whose objective is to promote teachers' moral sensitivity.

Over the past few decades, some educators noticed the focal shift away from the matters of morality, which has led to the development of programs that bring discussions of values, virtues and vices, moral dilemmas, and other forms of moral education back to the classrooms (Lickona, 1991). Although each of these endeavours has its merit, the focus of these approaches has often been on a small number of distinct elements of moral growth rather than on a holistic and integrated view of moral development. Some of these endeavours have attended predominantly to only one of the key components of moral development, namely that of students' moral reasoning abilities.

Potential for the Moral Dimension of Teaching

The present study is concerned with establishing that the potential for the dimension of morality is integral to all educational endeavours. Specifically, the present study focuses on high school teachers and their abilities to perceive the moral dimension of teacher-student interactions. It is proposed that students' learning and well-being can be improved as a result of teachers' increased awareness of the moral dimension of teacher-student interactions, as well as teachers' developed moral sensitivity in responding to such a moral dimension. Several recent approaches to assessing individuals' moral sensitivity are discussed, and a measure of moral sensitivity specific to high school teachers is developed and examined.
Preeminent theories of moral development, particularly those formulated by Kohlberg (1969, 1970, 1976, 1984; also Candee & Kohlberg, 1987), Gilligan (1982), Noddings (1992), and Rest (1979, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1986), serve as a guide in an examination of what constitutes a moral person and how moral development can occur in an individual. Further discussion focuses on how morality relates to teaching, and on the role of education in promoting the moral advancement of individuals, especially through focusing on the moral sensitivity component of moral development. Finally, implications specific to the teaching profession are elaborated upon in a discussion of how educators can be aided in fulfilling their role as moral models for students.

Based on such theoretical exploration, issues of moral significance most characteristic of teacher-student interactions are examined via an open-ended questionnaire designed to obtain real-life situations that educators perceive as having some moral significance. Based on the results of the first study, and in consideration of other sources of knowledge about morality in schools, a measure of secondary teachers' moral sensitivity is developed, and its reliability and validity examined.

Construct Explication

In order to effectively situate this discussion of moral sensitivity and moral development in relation to classroom learning and education more broadly, it is essential to clarify what constitutes the moral dimension of human life, and what role morality plays in human interactions. An answer to the question of what constitutes a moral person needs to be attempted, as does the question of significance of the moral dimension of education.
First of all, it is proposed that being moral means to acknowledge, understand, accept and appreciate that all humans share some fundamental worth because they are humans, and to live a life that is consistent with this assumption. That includes, but is not completed by, having an understanding of moral concepts and subscribing to some fundamental principles of how one ought to be with others, such as the Golden Rule. In addition to having moral knowledge, a moral person exhibits a blend of moral sensitivity, moral reasoning abilities, moral motivation, and moral character—a combination that leads to more consistent moral behaviour and to the strengthening of one’s moral identity.

The moral dimension of education is related to addressing, through educational pursuits, the questions of how human beings ought to act in situations that involve the physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being of oneself, or of other human beings. The moral dimension of education may be explicit and intentional, but also implicit and invisible—both to the students and to the teacher. Nevertheless, given the power relationship between the teacher and the students, including the teacher’s inherent role as a moral model, classrooms always appear potent with moral possibility (Dewey, 1909/1998; Jackson et al., 1998).

In the subsequent discussion, the term moral encounter will be used to refer to an instance of a person’s exposure to, and interaction with, a morally charged context (one that includes a moral dimension). For example, beating a classmate, being beaten, seeing another being beaten, or reading or hearing a story about someone having been beaten are all examples of moral encounters. More generally, it is proposed here that any encounter that exposes an individual to a situation, whether real or hypothetical, where someone’s well-being is at stake, can be considered a moral encounter. Human interactions
encompass the potential for a moral dimension, whose degree of salience may depend on
the circumstances and how those are interpreted. In a particular situation, an individual
may or may not become aware of the moral nature of an encounter involving others, he or
she may choose to make a conscious decision to respond to the encounter by taking or not
taking a course of action, and subsequently may or may not assume responsibility for that
decision or behaviour. Whatever the case may be, the significance of moral encounters
lies in providing opportunities for individual moral action and reflection, which may in
turn lead to a person’s increased moral sensitivity, and ultimately to an improved ability
to appropriately respond to future moral encounters. It is hereby proposed that in contrast
to moral dilemma discussions that involve the presence of an external prompt to consider
the moral aspects of the situation, moral encounters can play an even more important role
in education, thanks to their potential to transform students into moral persons with
increased sensitivity to the moral dimension of human interactions.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Theories of Teaching and the Moral Dimensions of Teaching

Throughout history, education has been seen as serving different purposes. Depending on the particular historical period or place, those purposes were driven by the interests of the government, the church, or individuals and local communities. Often, the government or the church would develop curricula aimed at maintaining a desired type of workforce, at controlling the ambitions of citizens, and at maintaining order in the society. More recently, education has been seen more as a means of empowering individuals and groups for self-defining their role in the society and their purpose in life. In any and all of these cases, the state and its administrative authorities have assumed the responsibility for the formal educational system, and with it also the power to control it (Reble, 1993).

At a different level, classroom teaching, too, is characterized by a power relation between the teacher and the students (Tom, 1984). Traditionally, the teacher was seen as an authority figure with the ability to select curricular content, establish rules of proper behaviour, and maintain order. Even in the more liberal classrooms where the power arrangement is not as obvious, it is the teacher who is ultimately responsible for the students' learning and, to some degree, also for their general well-being. The teacher controls ways in which both the content and form of lessons are chosen (although he or she may choose to give the students a voice in that process), how the content is presented and discussed, and what contexts it is connected to (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Jackson et al., 1998; Tom, 1984). Whereas the teacher and the students have distinct roles
in the educational process, including different degrees of responsibility for learning and well-being, a power differential exists in the classroom.

The presence of the power differential between the teacher and the students makes teaching a moral enterprise (Tom, 1984). More generally, whether education follows a programmatic design or occurs spontaneously, and irrespective of the method of delivery or its situatedness in terms of place and time, teaching is related to the question of how individuals (students) value themselves and other people, and how each chooses to live in a social world. In the classroom, the teacher and the students in his or her care engage in daily interactions that can, and often do, have profound impact on all parties, but perhaps most significantly on the students (Barcena, Gil, & Jover, 1993; Boostrom, 1998; Goodlad, 1992; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Tippens, & Simon, 2001; Tobin, & Hook, 1993; Tom, 1984).

Turiel (1983) made a distinction between social conventions and morality. A range of activities and interactions that take place in schools are social in nature, and many acts by teachers and students alike can be seen as "just the way this is done." For instance, shaking hands on greeting someone rather than rubbing noses or kissing on both cheeks is the conventional form of greeting in most communities in Canada. There is nothing moral per se in shaking hands rather than rubbing noses, but underlying this is a moral sentiment—one that signifies greeting other people as a matter of respect for them. It is important for teachers to be cognizant of the distinction between the moral and social dimensions of human interactions, particularly in a multicultural society where different ethnic groups have different social conventions. For example, it can be the case in some groups that males are brought up to regard themselves as superior to females—which can
be regarded as a socially acceptable practice. Nevertheless, if a male student acts on this belief in a Canadian school, the onus is on the teacher to determine whether the moral implications of such practice are acceptable. What is required is that the teacher possess the necessary knowledge on the social conventions of the different groups, as well as the knowledge of moral concepts relevant to the situation. Whereas wearing a turban may be regarded as a perfectly acceptable social convention, treating females inequitably may be interpreted as an immoral practice. These examples highlight the importance of teachers' being morally sensitive—to determine when a social convention has unacceptable moral consequences.

Those educational theorists and practicing teachers who subscribe to the notion that teaching is a moral endeavour are likely better equipped to address the challenges posed by the presence of the moral dimension of classroom dimensions than those who focus mainly on the academic (intellectual) content. It is proposed here (and will be further discussed later) that curricular content, particular methods of teaching, and the kinds of classroom interactions employed, all provide a multitude of opportunities for moral learning. In the present discussion, curriculum is viewed, in a broad sense, is “an explicitly and implicitly intentional set of interactions designed to facilitate learning and development and to impose meaning on experience” (Miller & Seller, 1990, p. 3). This definition includes the notion of a hidden curriculum, a set of implicit educational intentions that incorporates the roles and norms related to teacher-student interactions (see Jackson et al., 1998; Kohlberg, 1970).
Curricular Orientations and Activities of Teaching

The intended purposes of formal educational pursuits—the curricula—will influence the formatting of teaching interactions and activities. In order to achieve the goals prescribed by a curriculum, educators make choices of the theoretical foundations to inform the development, implementation, and evaluation of curricular content, as well as choices of specific activities to incorporate in teaching.

It should be noted that actual acts of teaching are not limited to the formal classroom, i.e. that teaching can occur outside of the institutional setting of the school. Green (1971) has argued that the so-called institutional acts of teaching, such as taking attendance, keeping reports, or consulting parents, are not a necessary condition for the conduct of teaching. In contrast, teaching does require the presence of some logical as well as some strategic acts by teachers. Examples of the logical acts of teaching, according to Green, would be explaining theories, demonstrating experiments, or comparing concepts. The strategic acts of teaching include planning lessons, motivating students, and evaluating their work. The choice and conduct of the logical as well as strategic acts of teaching involve the potential for a moral dimension. Specific logical and strategic acts by the teacher may have a profound impact on students’ learning, and students’ well-being may be affected as well.

The following is a complete account of the logical, strategic, and institutional acts of teaching as suggested by Green (1971):

1. *Logical acts of teaching:* explaining, concluding, inferring, giving reasons, amassing evidence, demonstrating, defining, and comparing;
2. *Strategic acts of teaching*: motivating, counselling, evaluating, planning, encouraging, disciplining, and questioning; and

3. *Institutional acts of teaching*: collecting money, chaperoning, patrolling the hall, attending meetings, taking attendance, consulting parents, and keeping reports

Based on Green's (1971) analysis of the different acts of teaching, teachers may spontaneously engage in acts of teaching in their encounters with students outside of the school. Such teachers' acts as encouraging students to pursue their interests, questioning students' choice of friends, or explaining to students the role laws play in society, would all seem to count as acts of teaching, whether or not they occur on school grounds. These examples lend support to the view that teachers' actions continue to affect students' lives outside of school and that teachers' moral responsibility inevitably extends beyond the boundaries of classroom learning, as will be discussed later.

*Curricular Orientations*

In the history of both educational theory and practice, a variety of orientations to the theoretical foundations that determine the development, implementation, and evaluation of curricular content have been formulated. Nevertheless, schools and individual teachers often subscribe to only a small subset of such orientations that form metaorientations (Miller & Seller, 1990). In contemporary educational practice, the following three curricular metaorientations appear to be most widely accepted by teachers:

1. *Transmission*, emphasizing the teacher's responsibility to pass knowledge (facts, skills, values, etc.) onto the students;
2. **Transaction**, inviting students to construct knowledge and negotiate meanings in a learning dialogue; and

3. **Transformation**, focusing on enabling meaningful personal, social, and moral changes in the students (Miller & Seller, 1990)

Each of these teaching metaorientations, or curriculum positions, can of course take on a variety of forms, and can aim at fulfilling specific purposes serving the state, the community, or the individual. Each of these positions can facilitate students’ learning, and each can be effective in a particular context. They however differ qualitatively when it comes to the roles the teacher and the students assume, the conceptualization of the origins of knowledge, as well as degree to which the teacher and the students are enabled to assume the ownership of knowledge and be personally transformed in the learning process.

Teachers who subscribe to the transmission position may be able to present a great volume of information to the students in the form of lectures, although there may be little opportunity for group work or other forms of active learning. In contrast, transactionists aim at creating appropriate conditions for the active participation of all students, so learning can be discovered by students through active processes (cognitive, affective, or psychomotor). Finally, curricular approaches based on the transformation position often invite students to challenge existing knowledge, theories, and perceived boundaries of enquiry, and become qualitatively different (presumably better, in one way or another) persons.

Each of these metaorientations to teaching involves learning in both academic, subject matter content, and in morality. Apart from the explicit moral “coursework”—
through ethics courses, moral dilemma discussions, values clarification, critical thinking exercises, and the like—every curriculum orientation potentially embeds moral messages that are conveyed to the students in one way or another. For example, the mere choice of a curriculum position can convey important messages about the teacher’s (or school’s) beliefs with respect to what content is important for the students, what level of cognitive abilities or factual knowledge the students are thought to be at, what motivates them, how they may best learn in the classroom, how the teacher should relate to them, etc. What the students learn in the school reflects not only the subject matter content, but potentially also the way it is presented, how the students are invited to interact with the material and others, how much time the teacher invests in connecting with individual students, determining their personal goals, and so forth.

Subscribing to a particular curricular orientation involves determining the appropriate working arrangement between the teacher and the students in a particular context, such as a specific subject or program of study. The same arrangement is usually maintained throughout the term of the program, and the same curricular orientation applies to the different domains of learning (cognitive, affective, psychomotor). What may vary are the activities chosen for specific portions of teaching. One approach to categorizing the types of teaching activities will be discussed in the following section.

Types of Knowledge and Activities of Teaching

Education can be a complex undertaking. More often than not, teaching focuses on helping students develop a combination of knowledge, beliefs, values, and skills in a particular context and at a specific level. Each combination of these factors may warrant
a particular approach, or a particular activity of teaching. Green (1971) proposed two dimensions or axes along which four different types of teaching can be defined.

The first distinction that Green (1971) makes is that between “teaching that something is the case” and “teaching someone to do something.” This distinction seems to parallel the notion that there are two types of knowledge—declarative and procedural—as is maintained by cognitive psychologists (e.g., Gagné, Yekovich, & Yekovich, 1993). It seems intuitive that while some teaching activities could be quite appropriate in facilitating the acquisition of declarative knowledge by students, other kinds of activities might better support the development of procedural knowledge or skill.

The other distinction Green (1971) makes has to do with the “attention to the manifestation of intelligence—either intelligence in behaving or intelligence in believing” (p. 33). In other words, Green distinguishes between the lower and higher levels of understanding, demand for reasons, and seeking the truth. Using these two distinctions, Green has proposed that depending on the circumstances, teaching can take one of the four forms shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities of Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention to the manifestation of intelligence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping knowledge and belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Based on categories introduced by Green (1971).*
Table 1 reveals the distinctions of emphasis on the level of understanding or demand for reasons, as well as the corresponding domains, yet this classification of the types of teaching is not meant to suggest that clear-cut boundaries exist between these types of teaching (Green, 1971).

Indoctrinating and instructing are both types of teaching appropriate for the cognitive domain—teaching knowledge and beliefs. The main difference between these two forms of teaching is the degree to which the meaning of learning is elaborated upon. “In instructing, the concern is not simply that a person be taught to do or believe, but that he [or she] be taught to do or believe for some good reason, and moreover for a reason which he [or she] regards as good and sufficient” (Green, 1971, p. 30). In contrast, indoctrinating occurs, “when the concern to transmit certain beliefs because they are reasonable is changed simply into a concern to transmit beliefs” (Green, p. 30). In moral education, indoctrinating would mean expecting students to uncritically adopt certain moral values, whereas instructing would enable students to consider such values and make their own determination whether they have a good and sufficient reason to subscribe to them. Instructing involves a form of conversation through which reasons can be explained and meanings negotiated.

When shaping students’ behaviour is the teaching goal, the choice of teaching activity is between conditioning and training. The difference is again in the extent to which reasons for particular behaviours are explained and their meanings discussed. According to Green (1971), “conditioning is an activity unlike training in the respect that the behavior it aims at shaping is not expressive of intelligence” (p. 26).
The purpose of the conversation involved in instructing and training is to help students see that the knowledge or belief being taught is reasonable, or that the behaviour being taught is justified. It can be left upon the students themselves to reason through the material being taught, to seek and find “the truth” about the material, and to evaluate and critique it before making the new knowledge internal—as long as teachers encourage students’ reasoning about what is being taught.

As will be shown in the following section, some moral education endeavours tend to lean more towards indoctrinating and conditioning than instructing and training. Whereas the focus of the present discussion is on the development of moral sensitivity—which is interconnected with moral reasoning, moral motivation, and moral character (Rest, 1983, 1984) and requires moral reflection—it is hereby proposed that only teaching that values and emphasizes the importance of reasoning skills, and attaching personal meaning to the content of learning, can produce students well educated in the matters of morality.

Approaches to Moral Education

Avoidance of Moral Content

When it comes to overt curriculum, some educators make a conscious choice to deny moral content an explicit place in the curriculum, often not recognizing that by doing so, they are still sending a moral message—one of indifference to the experiences and well-being of others. Such educators thereby avoid discussing the meanings of (moral) value-laden concepts inevitably present in students’ lives. Teachers sometimes believe that by opening up to discussing moral matters, they might be accused of advocating for a particular religion, or perceived as promoting one culture’s values over
those of another. As will be shown later in a discussion of domain theory, this line of reasoning appears to be in error, inasmuch as some moral values can be viewed as independent of socio-cultural conventions (Turiel, 1983, 2002).

*The Values Clarification Approach*

Proponents of the values clarification approach maintain that beliefs and values (including moral ones) are a matter of individuals’ personal choice, and the school’s authority over students’ choices of values or ways of living is, and ought to be, limited. Students are encouraged to share and rationalize their beliefs and personal (internalized) values, and reflect on the origins and validity of those values, without judging or challenging values of other students. By having a value is meant having chosen freely from available options after a careful consideration of each option, being satisfied with one’s choice and willing to affirm the choice publicly, and acting consistently upon that choice (Simon, Howe, & Kirschenbaum, 1972). This conceptualization applies to all values, including moral, prudential, religious, aesthetic, etc. The underlying assumption in the values clarification approach is that students are empowered in the process of discovering and clarifying what they value.

In this curricular approach, students are encouraged to identify and examine their own values, and reaffirm their commitment to those values by acting upon them. Although students are prevented from acting in ways that may be harmful to themselves or others, their participation in the determination of which choices are undesirable is constrained. The latter is often accomplished by removing undesired options from the realm of students’ choice without opening the issue up to a discussion (Simon et al.,
1972), which seems to weaken the transactional and transformational potential of this approach.

In the values clarification approach, students are directed to reflect critically on their beliefs and values, although one set of values is not evaluated against another. This approach has the potential to empower students by enhancing their personal autonomy or fostering their freedom of religious belief. Nevertheless, as a moral education endeavour, the values clarification approach has somewhat limited utility because, although students in a values clarification classroom have opportunities to share and clarify their values, little moral validation of the students’ choices is offered by the instructor. It is therefore unclear whether the values to which students subscribe as a result of the values clarification procedure are necessarily morally defensible.

*The Character Education Approach*

In early 1990s, a perception of moral decay of the American society inspired Thomas Lickona (1991) and others to revive the character education movement, once popular in the 1920s. Lickona’s basic suggestion was that schools can and should teach the fourth and fifth R’s—respect and responsibility—and assume an active role in educating for young people’s character.

Character educators hold that morality can be learned from the lives and examples of exceptional figures found throughout human history, as well as in fiction, songs, folktales, news stories, etc. Such figures, heroes, and saints demonstrate what are perceived to be the highest moral qualities. These qualities, condensed into a “manageably small” number of universal moral values, constitute the core of the character education approach. From the pedagogical perspective, character education
lacks support for the development of reasoning skills in students. Rather, students are presented with a “bag of virtues” (Lickona, 1991) from which individual virtues need to be “unpacked” and adopted by students (or instilled in them, from the teacher’s perspective) one at a time. Schools subscribing to this approach might hold “an honesty month,” “a kindness week,” etc., during which the appropriate virtue is in the spotlight and student life revolves around it (Berkowitz, 1998). Such schools are not only uncritically transmissionist, but they promote the idea that individual components of morality can be taught in separation, without connection, and without reflection or discussion which might reveal overarching principles related to the concept of a moral person. Major criticism of the character education approach has come from many writers including Alfie Kohn. In his paper, “How not to teach values,” Kohn (1997) describes contemporary character education as largely “a collection of exhortations and extrinsic inducements designed to make children work harder and do what they are told” (Kohn, p. 428), which might be different from helping students become moral persons, equipped with the necessary abilities to reason independently about moral matters in life.

The Cognitive-Developmental Approach: Moral Dilemma Discussions

The next approach to moral education to be discussed here is that of moral dilemma discussions, as introduced by Lawrence Kohlberg (1976; also Blatt, 1974; Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975). The moral dilemma approach was built in part upon the Socratic method of questioning, and in part upon Piaget’s cognitive developmental theory that suggested that gradual development of one’s cognitive abilities is enabled by moments of cognitive disequilibrium caused by cognitive conflict. The presence of such a disequilibrium prompts the transformation of one’s understanding and reasoning into a
new quality at a higher level. Kohlberg took this theory to the moral domain, suggesting that moral dilemmas can provide the disequilibrium needed for a developmental progression in an individual's moral reasoning to take place. The notion of moral dilemmas is closely linked with Kohlberg's theory of moral development through stages that will be discussed in more detail later. Pedagogically, Kohlberg's approach is clearly one of transaction, where the "moral truth" is not presented as absolute and ready to be adopted. It is rather constructed in a collective discussion. This approach does, nevertheless, include a transformational element in that the discussions advance students' understanding to higher and more complex levels. A major deficiency of Kohlberg's approach rests in its focus on dilemmas that are theoretical and academic, rather than being on real-life moral issues. Furthermore, many real life situations of moral significance do not have fitting dichotomous representations (they are not "either—or" situations), or they are not dilemmatic. Attempting to resolve Kohlbergian dilemmas thus does not necessarily equip students with the ability to act morally in everyday situations, as such exercises may not lead to the development of "practical wisdom" in students (see Fedeles, 2003a).

**The Values Analysis Approach**

Yet another approach to moral education was developed by the Association for Values Education and Research (AVER). Essential to this approach is the assumption "that it is both possible and desirable to teach people to be rational in their moral judgments and actions" (AVER, 1991, p. iv). This in turn presupposes that value issues, including moral issues, can be resolved by rational means.
Proponents of the values analysis approach have asserted that good teaching of rational morality needs to encompass not only moral rules and standards of moral reasoning: A good teacher “engages us in moral thinking with him [or her], attuning us to the fruitful question, the important distinction, and the weighting of a bit of evidence” (Coombs, 1980b, p. 30). The principle used in making a judgment should be put to some or all of the following principle tests:

1. *New Cases Test* – determining whether the principle yields acceptable judgments when applied to other relevantly similar cases;

2. *Role Exchange Test* – determining whether the principle yields an acceptable judgment when viewed from the perspective of the person likely to be most adversely affected by the action being judged;

3. *Universal Consequences Test* – determining whether the consequences of everyone who is likely to act on the principle indeed acting on it would be acceptable;

4. *Subsumption Test* – determining whether the principle can be deduced from a mere general principle already regarded as acceptable (Coombs, 1980b)

The values analysis approach can be used effectively with adults as well as children. From the developmental point of view, it appears most meaningful to start with asking children the questions that they need to learn to start asking themselves (Coombs, 1980b). This is important in terms of the children’s becoming familiar with the spirit of this method, and learning to distinguish between legitimate, relevant, and important questions and those that are not such. This may seem like a straightforwardly transmissionist curricular approach—which may nevertheless be the most appropriate
option for young children. Once those children’s cognitive abilities become more advanced, transactional and transformational learning can occur, involving higher levels of sophistication and abstraction, along with greater amounts of knowledge.

The primary criticism of the values analysis approach has come from character educators who claim that critical thinking and scientific reflection have no value without content, that the particular values that individuals subscribe to need to be considered in, and reflective skills applied to, specific life situations (see Berkowitz, 1998; Lickona, 1991). Those critics have also suggested that the values analysis approach puts excessive demand upon students’ cognitive ability, and is therefore not suitable for general audiences. However, similar kind of criticism could be raised about the other approaches to moral education; content without a method to integrate knowledge into the structures of one’s mind, which includes validation of new knowledge, could be seen as mere indoctrination, suppressing the growth of one’s potential for free choice and independent reasoning abilities.

Moral Responsibility of School to Students and Society

*Assumptions of Worthwhileness and Truthfulness in Teaching*

It has been argued that teaching is a moral endeavour. Tom (1984) further proposed that teaching is moral “in at least two senses. On the one hand the unequal relationship between teacher and student makes this an inherently moral relationship, while on the other hand teaching presupposes that something worthwhile is to be taught” (p. 76). Jackson et al. (1998) have elaborated on the latter claim by suggesting that teachers and students benefit from “the mutually shared assumption that the material being taught is important and the activity being engaged in is worthwhile” (p. 24).
Jackson and his colleagues have further proposed that this *assumption of worthwhileness* is "one of the enabling conditions that allow instruction to take place" (p. 24). Without it, teachers might be seen as making curricular choices that do not contribute to students' learning and development, and might be a waste of school's resources and students' time.

The other enabling condition of the "curricular substructure," proposed by Jackson et al. (1998), is the *assumption of truthfulness*. This assumption facilitates the creation and maintenance of "a framework of mutual trust" (Jackson et al., p. 17) between the students and their teacher, within which everyday classroom interactions can take place. Being able to rely on this framework enables teachers and students to focus on the worthwhile interactions without the need to frequently call trust into question.

*Teachers' Influence on Students*

According to Tom (1984), classrooms, by design, are environments that facilitate interactions through which the teacher can exert an influence on the students and the choices those students make in their lives. Whether such influence happens to be borne out of an ethics curriculum whose nature is overt and plainly visible, or one that happens to be hidden or "invisible," the potential for the influence is always present (Jackson et al., 1998). In most cases, the influence can even extend beyond the classroom, as the students frequently follow, and are often transformed by, actions of their teacher. Dewey (1975/1998) emphasized the importance of such transformational learning that crosses the boundary between the school and the "real world" by proposing that:

There cannot be two sets of ethical principles, one for life in the school, and the other for life outside of school. As conduct is one, so also the principles of conduct are one. The tendency to discuss the morals of the school as if the school were an institution
by itself is highly unfortunate. The moral responsibility of the school, and of those who conduct it, is to society. (Dewey, p. 7)

Students Becoming Moral Persons

As Berkowitz (1998) pointed out, enabling one to become a moral person involves focusing on a range of complementary dimensions of morality. Those involved in educating others in the moral domain thus need to attend to the various components of morality and their interconnectedness, as well as the developmental nature of morality (Bergem, 1993; Goodlad, 1992; Kohlberg, 1976, 1984; Piaget, 1932/1965). Perhaps the most opportune time to provide guidance and direction for teachers’ moral development in relation to in the classroom is found in teachers’ professional education, whether in teacher education programs or in continuing professional development endeavours.

Coombs (1980a) has proposed the following as the attainments of the morally educated person, which may be viewed as prerequisite dispositions for teachers educating others in moral matters;

1. Knowledge of what one’s society regards as morally right or wrong;
2. Knowledge of moral concepts such as equality, justice, stealing, cheating, lying, prejudice, discrimination, etc.;
3. Ability and inclination to apply principle tests (see Coombs, 1980b) to the rules and standards used in making moral judgments;
4. Ability and inclination to seek all information relevant to a value question;
5. Resolution to do what one has decided is a right action, and to refrain from doing what one has decided is wrong;
6. Ability to clarify personal values using appropriate activities (Coombs, 1980a)
Educating Teachers in Matters of Morality

Tom (1984) asserted that “while much is in dispute concerning what it means to act in a moral way, there is a widespread agreement that we need to take great care when our actions affect other people” (p. 79). In classroom interactions, such care is directed towards the students: “The primary responsibility of a teacher, technically and morally, is to the students being taught” (Goodlad, 1990, p. 14). It follows that “teacher education, first and foremost, must prepare teachers to assume this responsibility” (Goodlad, p. 14). In line with this argument is Bergem’s (1993) proposition that “in addition to developing didactical competence, teacher education programmes should also be explicitly aiming at developing a professional ethical competence in teachers-to-be” (Bergem, p. 298).

Although many such programs have exerted some effort into incorporating an ethics component into teacher preparation, comprehensive approaches to this issue are rare (Goodlad, 1992). It has been suggested that among the fundamental elements of teacher education should be “nurturing prospective teachers’ reasoning and reflection on the true nature of the endeavour for which they are being trained” (Bergem, 1993, pp. 297-298). Nevertheless, others have argued (Freiberg, 1986) that a more effective approach to teacher education would involve a combination of these primarily cognitive elements with practical, hands-on opportunities to act upon the learned moral principles. A comprehensive program addressing the various dimensions of teaching, involving a variety of students’ backgrounds and learning needs, addressing the rapidly evolving amount of knowledge, developing skills to enable students to orient themselves in the society, and preparing them to make choices and bear the associated consequences, is desirable if teacher education is to provide a truly transformative experience.
Unfortunately, academic programs aimed at providing initial teacher preparation have often been criticized for remaining unreflective in their efforts to prepare teachers for their value-laden work (Goodlad, 1992).

Research indicates that many teachers view respect, equality, caring, and responsibility as relevant to classroom interactions (Blasé, 1983; Joseph & Efron, 1993; Powney et al., 1995). Teachers also generally acknowledge that they face ethical dilemmas on a frequent basis, and believe that they should uphold high moral principles in their lives both in and outside of school (Kutnick, 1988), thus acting as moral role models (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Su, 1990). Despite possessing such intuitions and convictions, many teachers have confused notions of how they might engage in moral education (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Su, 1990), or even what counts as moral (Boyd, 1980).

Teachers who are aware of, and attend to, the moral dimension of classroom interactions, are generally less likely to view their role in the classroom in purely technical terms, and they appear more ready to make important life lessons a part of school learning (Fedeles, 2003a; Jackson et al., 1998; Wright & Fedeles, 2002). Providing aspiring teachers with opportunities to consider the ethical implications of teaching, assisting them in working through the ethical issues and questions they will face in the classroom, and providing early opportunities for their engagement with such issues in the classroom, becomes a renewed imperative for teacher educators. For teacher education programs to be effective in preparing future educators for their careers, an examination of the understanding of how teachers conceive of morality, and how sensitive they are to morally charged situations, needs to become a part of curriculum
In order to develop, implement, and evaluate ways of improving teachers' moral sensitivity through educational interventions, a reliable and valid measure of teachers' sensitivity to the moral domain of teaching needs to be developed.

Theories of Moral Development

Theories of moral behaviour and development provide the framework for considering the various aspects of a person's response to a moral encounter. Those may involve cognitive processes occurring in an individual during a moral encounter, behavioural responses associated with such an encounter, as well as other internal processes and sentiments that may play a role in determining the course of the response and facilitating its execution. Although various theorists have emphasized the significance of one of these mechanisms over others, in synergy they paint a more complete, holistic, qualitatively different picture of the complex human functioning (Hoffman, 2000). Whereas each of the existing theories of moral functioning and development makes a unique contribution to the understanding of human moral development, the present discussion focuses on the interaction effects among them, rather than on contrasting them by means of highlighting each theory's distinctiveness, as such critiques can be found elsewhere (e.g., Colby & Damon, 1983; Gibbs, 1977; Siegal, 1980). In the present discussion, a particular emphasis is placed on issues pertinent to the development of a measure of secondary school teachers' moral sensitivity.

Piaget

In his early research work on the morality of children, Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget observed that like other types of knowledge, moral knowledge is constructed and reconstructed by individuals in the process of interacting with the environment (Piaget,
Children’s thinking evolves from largely egocentric, characterized by one’s inability to balance his or her own views with another person’s perspective, towards more balanced, autonomous moral reasoning that involves critical thinking and perspective taking (Piaget, 1932/1965). Piaget rejected the position of earlier sociologists, namely Durkheim (1925/1961), who had maintained that one becomes a moral person solely by internalizing the society’s established norms. In contrast, Piaget suggested that individuals construct their own moral worlds by working through problems that require fair resolutions (Piaget, 1932/1965). Based on his views, the educational imperative of the day shifted towards providing the learners with opportunities for personal discovery, problem solving, and interactions within social groups.

Although Piaget is often considered as a stage theorist, it was his view that although individuals generally progress in their moral development from lower stages to higher ones, such process is reversible, and processes corresponding with more than one stage can coexist in an individual, allowing him or her to access processes from one or more stages at any point in time. According to Piaget (1932/1965), there are “no inclusive stages which define the whole of a subject’s mental life at a given point” (p. 85). One of the limitations of Piaget’s theory was the focus on moral knowledge and reasoning with little regard for its interconnectedness with other components of moral development, such as moral sensitivity or moral character.

Kohlberg

In late 1960s, Lawrence Kohlberg extended Piaget’s largely cognitive research further into the moral domain. One of Kohlberg’s chief contributions to the study of morality was in systematically analyzing the gradual progression of individuals through
several stages of moral development, presumably in response to the moral encounters that occur in their lives. Kohlberg proposed that as individuals mature morally, they have to face challenges to their established ways of thinking. By working their way through such challenges, they advance to higher stages of moral development (Kohlberg, 1976). This notion is similar to the Russian socio-cultural psychologist Lev Vygotsky’s concept of a zone of proximal development. Vygotsky (1986) suggested that the most effective conditions under which students can learn are ones that challenge the students to discover the limitations of their existing knowledge, and inspire them to advance to a higher level.

In formulating his stage theory of moral development, Kohlberg was able to bridge the cognitive-psychological foundations of moral development laid by Piaget with socio-cultural models of development, thus emphasizing the interconnectedness of intra-personal and inter-personal processes in an individual.

Kohlberg identified six stages of moral development, as well as three corresponding levels of moral thinking: pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional (Kohlberg, 1976). The underlining assumption in his work is that all cultures and societies share some elements of morality such as regard for human life and well-being, which makes them independent of social conventions or normative obligations (Kohlberg & Turiel, 1971). Based on that assumption, Kohlberg proposed that his model of stepwise moral development involving six stages has universal validity. In formulating his theory, Kohlberg nevertheless did not yet fully appreciate the implications of the disconnection of the social and moral elements in human development, as will be discussed later.
One of the key contributions of Kohlberg's research to the advancement of teaching is that moral education needs to focus on creating conditions that will facilitate students' advancement to the next stage of moral reasoning. In Kohlberg's (1976) model, each stage of moral development is characterized by the presence of a well-developed, stable set of cognitive structures. A progression to a higher stage thus involves equilibration—a process whereby an individual undergoes a sequence of qualitative changes to his or her thinking (Kohlberg, 1976, 1984). Like Piaget, Kohlberg was a proponent of guided discovery learning through interactions with one's peers as well as more experienced others. At the same time, he emphasized the importance of individual reflection, thus finding a balance between the views of Piaget and those held by Durkheim. Drawing upon Dewey's (1934) view that the school needs to be a place of community life, Kohlberg and his colleagues extended this balanced approach to moral learning into educational practice by initiating the development of "just community" schools (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989). The basic principle behind just community schools was to provide opportunities for students to develop a sense of belonging to a group that is responsive to its members' individual needs, and to practice an active role in such a democratic community. This approach combines theoretical learning through discussions of moral dilemmas (all too often used as isolated learning objects) with numerous opportunities to develop practical prosocial skills in a just community.

Turiel

A series of longitudinal studies of moral development conducted in the 1970s revealed some inconsistencies in Kohlberg's stage model (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989). An examination of these inconsistencies subsequently led Elliot Turiel and his
colleagues to the development of what has become known as domain theory (Turiel, 1983, 2002). At the core of domain theory is the realization that the scenarios used by Kohlberg and others involve a combination of moral and social issues. Turiel (1983, 2002) has proposed that the significance of this distinction rests in the fact that social norms appear to be based on arbitrary social conventions, whereas moral norms transcend societal arrangements and can have universal applicability. According to this conceptualization, actions within the moral domain would have an intrinsic effect on another person's well-being, irrespective of the social conventions regulating such actions (Turiel, 1983, 2002).

Morality and convention, although often interconnected in human interactions, can thus be viewed as two distinct, parallel developmental frameworks. According to Turiel (1983, 2002), several factors may affect how an individual works his or her way through a situation that is charged with both a moral dimension and convention. These factors include the salience of the features of the situation and the individual's level of developmental advancement. Turiel (1983) suggested that the inconsistencies found with Kohlberg's stage theory were in fact a result of individuals' imperfect efforts to coordinate the moral and social domains in responding to complex, multi-domain situations. Such cognitive coordination would seem to be a particularly difficult task for young children. Based on this realization, Turiel (2002) was later able to show that young children exhibit a much greater ability to respond to moral encounters than had been documented in Kohlberg's research. Given the constraints of young children's cognitive abilities and the complex nature of multi-domain encounters, it would seem to follow that children could benefit from learning to discern the difference between moral and social
aspects of situations early in life. Their ability to detect the social and moral dimensions of situations could be supported by a careful selection of scenarios at the appropriate developmental level. Additionally, students can be guided by their teachers in the process of recognizing the presence or absence of effects of individuals’ action or inaction on other human beings.

The appreciation of the distinction between the moral and social aspects of situations is equally important in adults. The chief educational implication of Turiel’s findings is that teachers themselves need to be trained in the ability to differentiate between the moral and social attributes of situations (whether discussed in classes or otherwise encountered by students). Subsequently, teachers need to be able to direct students’ thinking toward recognizing the distinctions between the moral and social domains, and responding accordingly. By being able to distinguish between moral and non-moral attributes of situations, teachers need not be afraid to engage in discussing morality with their students, without the danger of being accused of inappropriately or incompletely discussing a particular set of values, or a particular religion, in a public school classroom (Turiel, 1983, 2002). Teachers also have the power to maximize their students’ comprehension of the social and moral meanings of situations, and thus indirectly affect their ability to make more sensitive and well-reasoned decisions about the choices they make in their lives. One problem with domain theory is that it has not been widely accepted. Furthermore, even with the moral and social domains conceptually separated, some parents may still feel uncomfortable with teachers taking on the responsibility for explaining some value-laden concepts to students.
Catalysts of Moral Development

The present discussion has so far revolved around individuals' cognitive abilities in relation to their moral functioning. Nevertheless, becoming a moral person entails more than being able to reason about moral matters at a certain level of sophistication. In Martin Hoffman's (2000) view, an individual's prosocial moral structure is a complex network consisting of empathic affects, cognitive representations, and motives. In their meta-analysis of intervention studies focusing on moral reasoning, Schlaefli, Rest, and Thoma (1985) warned that improving students' moral reasoning may not have a corresponding effect on the state of the students' moral sensitivity, moral motivation, or ego strength—complementary factors facilitating the translation of moral judgments into moral actions. Rest (1983, 1984a; Rest, Thoma, & Edwards, 1997) proposed that moral sensitivity, moral motivation, and moral character each play an important role in the ongoing process of one's moral maturation. On another level, moral sentiment and caring, such mechanisms as feeling, empathy, or moral intuition, as well as factors within an individual's social environment all affect the ways in which that individual attends to a morally charged situation (Liszka, 2002). In other words, being able to reason about a hypothetical moral situation does not in itself provide the assurance that one will perceive the moral dimension of situations, choose to act on his or her convictions and judgments, or appropriately evaluate the actions he or she takes (Rest, 1983, 1984a). In the following section, some of the catalysts of moral development and consistent moral behaviour will be discussed in relation to the goals and purposes of education.
The Four Component Model of Moral Development

In 1983, James Rest introduced a comprehensive model of moral development that emphasized an individual's gradual progression from perceiving the presence of moral elements in a situation to exhibiting consistently moral behaviour (Rest, 1983, 1984a). Rest formulated a system that recognized the contributions of other aspects of morality beyond moral reasoning to the development and execution of a person's ability to lead a moral life. More importantly perhaps, in his Four Component Model of moral development, Rest (1983, 1984a) emphasized the interconnectedness of the components needed for consistent moral behaviour to occur. Rest and his colleagues argued that "the inner processes of moral development are more complicated than Kohlberg's (1969) six stages" (Rest, Thoma, & Edwards, 1997, p. 5). This realization warranted the subsequent development of a more comprehensive model of morality—the Four Component Model. Moral educators have recognized the utility of Rest's conceptual model of moral development for informing moral education endeavours that strive to conceive a "complete moral person" (Berkowitz, 1998).

The four major components of morality and moral development, as proposed by Rest, Thoma, and Edwards (1997), are:

(a) Moral sensitivity (how the situation is interpreted, how the perceiver role-takes and empathizes with those affected by what the actor does);

(b) Moral judgment (determining which alternative line of action is morally justified);

(c) Moral motivation (the degree to which the actor prioritizes acting morally above other values); and
(d) *Moral character* (self-regulation, ego strength, discipline, follow through on one's reflected convictions). (pp. 5-6)

*Figure 1. The Four Component Model of Moral Development (Rest, 1983, 1984a).*

*Interconnectedness of the Components of Morality*

By suggesting that moral knowing and moral character serve their own purposes, until or unless they are advanced—by means of moral sensitivity and feeling—to the level at which moral reasoning transforms into moral action, Thomas Lickona (1991) revealed the interconnectedness of the elements of morality, and the importance of their interplay during a moral encounter. Knowledge of moral concepts in itself is not
sufficient for moral behaviour unless this knowledge is activated, either by means of moral sensitivity (spontaneously perceiving the moral dimension of situations) or by the presence of an external prompt (e.g., the presentation of a moral dilemma).

In order for an individual to exhibit consistent moral behaviour, all four components in Rest's (1983, 1984) model are required. To help students become moral persons, comprehensive moral education endeavours therefore need to develop all four components in Rest's model in students, and attend to the interconnectedness of the components.

Of particular importance in this process is the development of students' sensitivity to the moral dimension of interactions, which is a necessary factor in determining students' ability to spontaneously respond to moral encounters. In order to adequately address this dimension of students' moral development, teachers themselves need to be well rooted in the mechanisms of moral development, and have developed a high degree of moral sensitivity. Being able to assess teachers' moral sensitivity is an important first step towards helping students become moral persons.

Activation of the Components of Morality and the Distinct Role of Moral Sensitivity

Since the conception of the Four Component Model in the early 1980s, various authors have studied the semantic links and causal relationships among these components of morality, including the order in which they are activated in a person's encounter with a morally charged situation (Haidt, 2001; Rest, 1983, 1984a). Rest (1983, 1984a) himself argued that in many situations, the four components come on the scene in the order in which they appear in the model: Being morally sensitive leads one to making a moral judgment, which is followed by the engagement of moral motivation, which in turn
activates one’s moral character. Under appropriate circumstances, this sequence of steps would lead to the individual consistently exhibiting moral behaviour. Admittedly however, not all of a person’s moral encounters initiate precisely this sequence of events. Figures 2 to 5 show some of the many ways in which the components of moral development proposed by Rest (1983, 1984a) may be activated in response to a moral encounter.

Figure 2. Moral sensitivity can activate moral reasoning, which may in turn lead to moral action.

Figure 3. Moral sensitivity can lead to moral action outside the operation of reasoning (Blum, 1994). Deliberation, whether with the intent to justify one’s actions, or to refine one’s future behaviours, may subsequently follow the action. Moral sensitivity is viewed as involving automatized cognitive processes resulting from one’s previous moral actions and subsequent reflections thereon.
**Figure 4.** Deliberating can further affect a person’s ability to perceive a situation as moral (moral sensitivity).

**Figure 5.** In a particular moral encounter, moral reasoning can both precede and follow a moral act. In this case, a particular moral action can inform one’s moral reasoning, resulting in a justification of the act and, perhaps more importantly, refined moral behaviour in subsequent moral situations.
Figure 6. Moral intuition can facilitate quick moral action, without the activation of moral reasoning. The latter can later serve the function of reflection-on-action (Schon, 1987) and contribute to the improvement of moral sensitivity.

Some authors have argued that not all of the four components are necessary for moral action to occur (Blum, 1994; Haidt, 2001). The simplest example might involve a spontaneous act whose moral dimension may only be revealed ex post facto, and may not even become obvious to the person or persons who partook in the act. Other types of moral encounters may result in one or more of the components being skipped. For instance, Blum's (1994) proposal that moral sensitivity "can lead to moral action outside the operation of judgment entirely" (p. 31) suggests that moral reasoning in the full sense of the word may not constitute a part in one's response to a moral encounter (see Figure 3). A possible explanation could be found in cognitive psychology that defines a phenomenon termed *procedural knowledge* (e.g., see Gagné et al., 1993). Procedural knowledge is a form of knowing that is characteristic of automatized cognitive processes, such as driving a car. Such processes are cognitive in nature, although they involve little or no reasoning. It could be that a person can instantaneously respond to a moral prompt by performing moral action, without needing to engage in moral deliberation. One could
develop such procedural knowledge through a multiplicity of certain kinds of moral encounters accompanied by reflection and justification ("feeling good" about one’s actions)—which in turn underscores the importance of reasoning in moral growth. Such moral reasoning need not always occur prior to a moral act, but could as well follow one or a sequence of such acts at a later time (see Figures 3 and 5). This explanation seems to correspond with Haidt’s (2001) notion of moral intuition, which will be discussed later.

Despite such perceived irregularities in the order of activation of the four components in Rest’s (1983, 1984a) model, it can nevertheless be argued that for consistent moral behaviour to occur, each of the four components needs to be involved in one’s moral engagement, regardless of the sequence in which they become activated. Which of the four components in Rest’s model is activated first during a moral encounter, perhaps depends largely on how one becomes aware of the situation. For example, an individual may spontaneously perceive an event or circumstance involving others as being of concern for another’s well-being (thus being of moral nature), which would activate her or his moral sensitivity (Narvaez, 1996). In a different scenario, prompted by an unrelated event or thought (such as one originating in a character in a novel), a person may engage in reflection upon past events, or may envision consequences of a particular (even hypothetical) course of action, which might lead to a change in one’s moral knowledge through moral reasoning, and thus possibly to a change in that person’s future moral behaviour. In a class where students are presented with (and thus externally prompted by) moral dilemmas, one’s moral reasoning would likely be the first component activated. In yet another set of circumstances, a strong determination to act morally may lead a person to activate moral motivation before any other component.
Finally, a person of strong moral character may find it natural to engage in consistent moral action without, or prior to, activating the other components of morality. Whichever component happens to be the first one activated in one’s moral engagement with a situation, one or more of the other components are likely to be activated as well (Haidt, 2001; Rest, 1984b). As a result, a moral engagement may yield several outcomes—moral thought, moral behaviour, strengthening of one’s moral character, and others.

The purpose of this discussion is to help illustrate the complexity of moral engagement, the range of factors involved, and the inherent connections and interactions that exist among them. Suggestions that a person needs to develop all four components of morality in order to yield consistent moral action go back to Rest’s (1983, 1984a) early work in this area. Hass (1998) warned about the danger of missing the necessary balance between the four components. For instance, in his discussion on the inclination to act upon one’s values, Hass suggested that as individuals, we:

- can severely constrict our concern and switch off our ability to empathize, even when face-to-face with the tearful eyes of another we have wronged. We can also endlessly stretch our capacity for concern in order to preserve the earth’s natural resources for future generations. Yes, we have the ability to be empathic. But we must want to activate that ability. (p. 13)

Hass’s (1998) argument underlines the fact that the mere possession of moral knowledge, or even the capacity to empathize with another, may not be sufficient to actually produce moral behaviour. Similarly, being able to reason about problems in moral terms does not guarantee that an individual will choose to act morally. Rest (1983, 1984a) suggested that an accord involving all four components in his model is needed for
moral behaviour to occur consistently. Moral sentiment (Hume, 1777/1960) and moral integrity (Rest et al., 1997) have also been suggested as catalysts of consistent refinement and reintegration of the essential components of the moral person, or moral growth (Berkowitz, 1998; Rest et al., 1997).

Studies and Measures of Moral Reasoning

Over the past several decades, a number of researchers dedicated their work to the study of moral reasoning (judgment) and to designing a valid instrument for its measurement. The core stimulus for a moral response in this ‘mainstream’ of moral reasoning research has become the moral dilemma. Kohlberg’s (1969, 1976; also Candee & Kohlberg, 1987) Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), Rest’s (1975; also Rest et al., 1997) Defining Issues Test (DIT), Gibbs et al.’s (1982, 1984; also Basinger & Gibbs, 1987) Socio-Moral Reasoning Measure (Short Form) (SRM-SF), and Lind’s (1995, 1996) Moral Judgment Test (MJT) represent the key accomplishments in this area. The authors of these instruments have made significant contributions to the advancement of moral reasoning research. At the same time, some authors, namely Freiberg (1986), have criticized this approach by arguing that moral dilemma discussions “[force] participants to use their reasoning abilities apart from any consideration of action” (p. 191). Freiberg proposed that participatory explorations of the moral domain, such as role-taking exercises, add the behavioural dimension that benefits the participants by “acquainting [them] with the relationships of moral reasoning and action” (p. 192). This proposition seems to challenge the more traditional moral education approaches that are based on moral dilemma discussions by pointing out the indirect and presumably weak effect these approaches have on individuals’ moral convictions and behavioural change.
In order to fully understand the principles of moral development, however, one needs to look beyond the research on moral reasoning. An individual with advanced moral reasoning skills first needs to come to realize that a situation is morally charged in order to engage in moral reasoning about it. Also, once that individual arrives at a judgment about the morally appropriate response to the situation, the elements of motivation may determine whether the individual chooses the moral course of action or not. Other factors, such as knowledge, memory, and other cognitive processes and structures, may play a significant role in a moral engagement. Among the more obvious and frequently occurring factors are: one's possession of moral concepts (Coombs, 1980b), critical thinking skills (Milnitsky-Sapiro, 1996), moral conviction (Thomas, 1997), moral identity (Lapsley, 1996), the consistency of moral behaviour (Bebeau, Rest, & Narváez, 1999) or one's moral integrity (Berkowitz, 1998), as well as moral intuition (Haidt, 2001, 2002, 2003).

Moral Intuition

In a tradition underlined by rationalism, moral behaviour is conceived of as the outcome of a conscious, rational moral endeavour. Moral knowledge and moral judgment are arrived at by means of reasoning and reflection (Kohlberg, 1969; Piaget, 1932/1965; Turiel, 1983). This approach emphasizes the engagement of an individual with a morally charged situation through a logical sequence of steps, often parallel to a progression from moral sensitivity to moral reasoning, leading to moral action. This rationalist tradition is complemented by the social intuitionist model whose proponents suggest that "moral intuitions (including moral emotions) come first and directly cause moral judgments" (Haidt, 2001, p. 814). Haidt conceptualized moral intuition as "the sudden appearance in
consciousness of a moral judgment, including an affective valence (good—bad, like—dislike), without any conscious awareness of having gone through steps of searching, weighing evidence, or inferring a conclusion” (p. 818).

Hume (1777/1960) likened such moral judgments to aesthetic judgment, where “One sees or hears about a social event and one instantly feels approval or disapproval” (Haidt, 2001, p. 818; see also Schiller, 1795/1965). It should be noted that like moral sensitivity, moral intuition, too, is held to be cognitive in its nature, despite the fact that it does not involve reasoning (Haidt, 2001). Another similarity of these two phenomena can be found in the order in which they usually appear in a moral engagement in relation to moral reasoning and moral action. Proponents of the traditional componential model of moral development hold that the moral sensitivity component typically precedes both moral reasoning and moral action in one’s response to a moral encounter. Social intuitionists, on the other hand, assign that role to moral intuition, arguing that “moral judgment is caused by quick moral intuitions and is followed (when needed) by slow, ex post facto moral reasoning” (Haidt, 2001, p. 817).

Relationship between Moral Reasoning and Moral Intuition

Perhaps the two approaches—rationalist and social intuitionist—can shed some new light on each other, allowing for a more comprehensive view of the processes involved in a moral engagement. From the social intuitionist perspective, moral intuition can play the role of the moral perception element of moral sensitivity (see Endicott, 1999; Narváez, 1996) that, according to Blum (1994), can lead directly to moral action without first engaging in moral deliberation about the situation. At the same time, from the rationalist viewpoint, moral sensitivity can serve an important reflective function that
enables the agent to refine his or her moral knowledge—and indirectly moral intuition—following moral action. Although Liszka (2002) argued that moral knowledge represents "a more systematic and reflective acquisition of moral insight" (p. 314) than moral intuition, it would nevertheless appear that moral knowledge and moral intuition are characterized by qualitatively different principles. Whereas what has been termed moral knowledge would seem to be organized as declarative knowledge consisting largely of static information, such as moral concepts, rules, and principles, both moral sensitivity and moral intuition can be viewed as involving automatized cognitive processes, a form of procedural knowledge (see Gagné et al., 1993). Such automatized cognitive processes provide the moral agent with the invaluable ability to act upon moral prompts (e.g., of someone’s imminent danger or great discomfort) without hesitation or delay that might result from an engagement in extensive moral deliberation about the situation. As suggested by Haidt (2001), perhaps the deliberative stage can instead follow the action in such cases. While post-hoc deliberation may not affect the course of action taken in the given situation, it can result in refined procedural knowledge about a particular type of situation. Such deliberation can in turn serve as an important feedback mechanism, resulting in a better informed, more appropriate (spontaneous) choice of moral action (involving a “jump” from moral sensitivity to moral action) in similar situations in the future.

Moral Norms and Internalization

Moral Norms

In articulating his domain theory, Elliot Turiel (1983, 2002) proposed that moral values may be distinct from socially constructed ones, and that moral values form a
system of norms that morally inclined individuals aspire to. Hoffman (2000) asserted that although such "[moral] norms may be initially external and often at variance with one's desires, they eventually become part of one's internal motive system" (p. 122), mostly as an outcome of socialization. According to Hoffman, this internalized system of moral norms subsequently serves to guide an individual's autonomous behaviours. Hoffman argued that, in children, this process enables parental control to be replaced by self-control, at which point "moral action becomes the individual's attempt to achieve an acceptable balance between egoistic and moral motives, both of which reside within oneself" (p. 122).

**Internalization of Moral Norms**

As Hoffman (2000) proposed, a person's moral structure (moral code) evolves from largely egoistic to other-interested, and finally matures to a balanced code through the process of internalization. "A person's moral structure is internalized when she or he accepts and feels obligated to abide by its organizing principles and consider others without regard to external reward and punishment" (pp. 134-135).

The process of internalizing external moral values nevertheless appears to involve certain risks. A particular threat to one's successful moral development and striving to continue achieving greater degrees of moral integrity rests in the possibility of an individual consciously reducing his or her personal moral code by dismissing certain moral concepts or widely recognized types of moral obligation. Nisan (1985) proposed that individuals tend to create personal moral codes based on sets of moral standards and rules of behaviour they are ready to accept and aspire to. Such a reductionist approach to
developing personal moral codes nevertheless seems to pose a considerable threat to a successful integration of individuals as moral persons into society.

In his argument, Nisan (1998) distinguished between conventional morality—defined as socially prescribed moral norms, a societal or communal moral code—and practical morality. Nisan’s suggestion that the prescriptive nature of morality is socially constructed is nevertheless in conflict with Turiel’s (1983) contention that morality and social convention fall into two distinct and mutually exclusive domains—i.e. moral norms are culture independent. Assuming that Turiel’s thesis is valid, it might be argued that Nisan (1998) perhaps made the error of ascribing the responsibility for the prescriptive aspect of morality to the society, while his intention was solely to point out the fact that the individual has the capacity to select and subscribe to only a subset of moral values, thus developing his or her own, self-constructed, moral code. The process of defining one’s own personal moral code involves the assumption that “moral demand is not understood as imposing an absolute obligation” (Nisan, p. 4). This would in turn suggest that one can select moral values or principles from a pool of universal moral values and principles, and try to live up to only so selectively defined moral ideal. In reality, such individuals would however be “allow[ing] themselves to diverge from morality, in order to achieve a personal objective, believing that in doing so they are not removing themselves from the moral community” (Nisan, p. 4). Nisan’s (1998) second assumption is that such individuals still are, or “seek to be ‘reasonably moral’” (p. 5). The rationale behind establishing one’s personal moral code is that “an important consideration in [a person’s] ethical choices, that is, choices which he [or she] perceives as desirable and correct, is the consideration of loyalty to one’s identity, loyalty which
requires that a person give expression to values which [he or] she perceives as central to [him or] her” (Nisan, p. 5). So conceptualized a mechanism of developing an internal system of moral values, a would-be symbiosis of two moral systems (one absolute and one relative), would seem to significantly weaken the emphasis on the moral imperative. This liberal system, aiming at an “acceptable level of moral perfection” (Nisan, p. 6), would seem to contradict the idea of morality as an ideal all humans need to be striving for. Interestingly enough, a similarly reductionist approach to establishing the moral imperative by the individual can be found in Noddings’s (1984, 1992) conceptualization of ethical caring, which will be discussed later. In contrast, a number of authors nevertheless maintain that morally sensitive individuals aspire to—and are faithful to—the grand ideals of morality, rather than just to a conveniently reduced subset of principles and considerations (Liszka, 2002).

Moral Emotions, Moral Sentiment, and Caring

Moral Emotions and Moral Sentiment

Emotions can be considered to be spontaneously or quickly formed judgments about matters or events in a person’s life (Solomon, 1980). Emotions play an important role in moral development, as they may deepen our perception and understanding of the moral dimension of situations (Oakley, 2002). According to Liszka (2002), moral emotions “affect us more deeply than mere formal rules, orders or commands, or other abstract criteria might” (p. 18). Common moral emotions include guilt, shame, admiration, disgust, remorse, regret, outrage, or sympathy. Liszka proposed that moral emotions are experienced mostly in response to isolated events, while over time, they
develop into various types of moral sentiment. Examples of moral sentiment include duty, honour, nobility, and caring.

Caring

Like other moral principles, caring is “an abstraction, a moral imperative, a fundamental value, a philosophical ideal. It says that we must always consider others” (Hoffman, 2000, p. 225). Among moral sentiments, caring is perhaps the most outward oriented, and most closely linked to such automatized processes as moral intuition and moral sensitivity.

In response to the perception that the Kohlbergian tradition views morality primarily as a matter of justice and duty, Carol Gilligan (1982) and Nel Noddings (1984, 1992) suggested to consider caring as the most suited supplement to the more traditional views of moral development. Gilligan claimed that earlier studies of morality had placed undue emphasis on rationality while paying little attention to the spontaneous, affective dimension of moral development.

Relation of caring to teaching. In relation to teaching, caring can be understood both as an element of the processes embedded in education, and as an educational goal. In both of these roles, caring can be a significant factor in delivering personally meaningful and transformational education. It is proposed here that caring be understood as referring to a particular “way to morality,” as a unique “belief about how we should view and interact with others” (Noblit, 1985, p. 680). The basis for this conceptualization rests in a caring person’s acknowledgement of the worth of others, and additionally valuing relationships with those others, and understanding that such relationships involve a special kind of personal “commitment on the part of both parties” (Bosworth, 1995, p.
However, mature, ethical caring (as discussed later) is directed neither wholly outward towards other individuals nor inward towards the self; it is guided by a balance of attending to both oneself and others (Noddings, 1992).

Preference for caring vs. preference for justice. The concepts of caring and the ethic of care, were first introduced into the moral debate primarily in response to what was perceived as biased attempt to research morality whereas Kohlberg's (1976) findings were derived from exclusively male samples, and female moral development was not explored. The primary purpose of Carol Gilligan's (1982) first major book, In a Different Voice, was to show that "women tend to espouse an ethic of care that stresses relationships and responsibilities, whereas men tend to espouse the ethics of justice that stresses rules and rights" (Tong, 1993, p. 80). Gilligan pointed to the fact that Lawrence Kohlberg's justice theory and the corresponding Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) were gender-biased in that Kohlberg created a scale of moral judgment possibly well suited for men, but presumably not for women.

Gilligan (1982) suggested that an approach to assessing the levels of human moral development based solely on justice and not incorporating caring is inadequate and in error. In her criticism of Kohlberg's primary assumptions, Gilligan pointed out the overemphasis on rationality, the notion of effectiveness, and clear-cut thinking. She asserted that, according to Kohlberg, doubt and intellectual soul-searching are not characteristic of morally mature individuals.

Gilligan's (1982) proposals that to counterweigh Kohlberg's approach based on the principles of justice, morality ought to be looked at from the female point of view, and the ethic of care offered serious academic attention, seem appropriate. Her claims
that the MJI discriminates against women, however, did not receive support from recent studies that revealed that no differences exist between male and female scores on the MJI (Skoe, 1998; Walker, 1995). To be precise, men and women appear to have about the same ability to solve moral dilemmas that revolve around the justice perspective. Similarly, both women and men appear to be able to score at about the same level on measures of caring such as Skoe’s (1998) *Ethic of Care Interview (ECI)*. The difference between the genders thus seems to rest not in an individual’s ability, but in his or her preference for, or inclination to, choose one of these two views of the world over the other.

Noddings (1984) entered the gender debate by proposing that for most women, caring appears to offer a more important viewpoint of morality than does justice. At the same time, a majority of men usually favour relying on the principles of justice over caring in their approach to moral issues. Noddings’ unique contribution to formulating a theory of caring in moral development was by emphasizing the role of relationships in a person’s life. According to Noddings, caring would be meaningless outside of caring relationships of two or more individuals and the reciprocity that such relationships involve. Whether one subscribes to the notion of a necessary reciprocity in caring relationships as strongly as Noddings does, it would seem fundamental to acknowledge the interrelatedness of the parties involved in a caring relationship, as well as the effect of either party’s action or inaction upon the relationship, its caring character, and the internal balance of the caring relationship. Whereas caring and morality share at their core the concern for human life and well-being, Noddings’ conceptualization of caring is thus one of relational ethics.
Moral responsibility in caring. Noddings (1984) deemphasized the moral imperative by suggesting that one has no moral obligation to extend caring beyond his or her own circles or “chains” of those with whom one happens to already have close relationships. This can in turn mean that from the moral point of view, everyone can freely choose to offer or not to offer help to a stranger who was hit by a car in a traffic accident, which would make Noddings’ model of caring somewhat problematic.

Considering Noddings’ (1984) proposal that it is morally permissible to leave a less than perfectly balanced caring relationship, one may derive a fairly logical extension of her philosophy that any act is justifiable on the grounds of a lack of a well balanced caring relationship. When in doubt, one just needs to decide that taking care of his or her ill mother is terribly constraining in leading one’s own life before that person can justifiably disengage from the relationship with the mother and leave for an extended vacation.

Noddings (1984) even went as far as to claim that a mother-to-be has no moral obligation to care for the baby in her womb and can freely choose to have an abortion at any stage of the fetus’s development. The rationale is that the unborn baby is unable to reciprocate the caring attitude offered by the mother. The mother is thus left with an unbalanced caring relationship which she has the right to quit.

Natural caring vs. ethical caring. Noddings (1984) introduced the notion of two kinds or levels of caring, differing in the extent of thought that precedes caring action. The first level, called “natural caring,” is motivated by the basic human affect—joy. Noddings sees joy as a naturally occurring phenomenon, closely connected with love and with a “memory” of past experiences of caring and being cared for. A mother attending to her crying baby exhibits natural caring. Hardly any caring mother would stop to consider
whether she should be attending to the child or not before taking action. Noddings speculated that mothers are simply closely “connected” with their babies in some very personal and loving way. On the other hand, ethical (or moral) caring is proposed as a more complex level of caring in that it acknowledges the moral significance of its implications. Although Noddings (1984) suggested that moral caring is no “better” than natural caring, it is proposed here that the conscious nature of caring, along with the moral implications it introduces, make moral caring somehow more significant in terms of interpersonal relations. That would seem to make moral caring arguably greater in value than caring that occurs naturally and unconsciously.

Therefore, it is proposed here that an ethic of caring can only be developed after what Noddings (1984) termed natural caring has matured into moral caring. This maturation involves the learning of moral concepts, as well as a rational understanding of the significance of caring for oneself and others. Thayer-Bacon (1997) complements this view by proposing that to have an ethic of caring means to:

- develop the ability to be receptive and open to other people and their ideas,
- willing to attend to them, to listen and consider their possibilities. . . . Caring about other people . . . requires respecting others as separate, autonomous people . . . worthy of caring. It is an attitude, that gives value to others, by denoting that others are worth attending to in a serious or close manner. An attitude of acceptance and trust, inclusion and openness, is important in all caring relationships. (pp. 22-23)

In contrast to moral norms (see Hoffman, 2000), norms in the domain of caring are self-constructed rather than internalized from some external source. A norm in caring
sets a personal standard of living. It is not general or universal in that it does not prescribe how other humans should act even under apparently very similar circumstances (Blustein, 1991). This non-universalizability of caring is one major factor that distinguishes Noddings’ philosophy from Kohlberg’s ethic of justice. The latter prescribes principles that are to apply to all situations that are considered significantly similar, regardless of the personal circumstances of whoever happens to be found in those situations. In an ethic of caring, the choice of the course of one’s morally caring action or inaction in any situation is anchored in that individual’s personal code of ethics, or moral (ethical) ideal.

Noddings’ (1984) typology of natural and moral caring can be interpreted in such a way that natural caring is a spontaneously occurring quality, which may “grow into” moral caring as one’s moral ideals develop. Very small children have been found to exhibit various caring acts, but because those are judged to be primarily behaviouristic responses and not results of moral thought, such children’s actions are not normally typified as moral caring. Adults, on the other hand, usually refer to their moral ideal (or personal moral code) in the decisions and choices they make which involve other people, whether directly or indirectly (Blustein, 1991). That includes deciding whether to act in a caring way and how exactly. Blustein (1991) agreed with Noddings in saying that for a person to adopt a caring attitude, “it must be the case that either I am motivated to act on the reason by prior caring,” natural caring, “or that I could come to be motivated to act on the reason as a result of serious reflection on my current motivations”—moral caring (Blustein, 1991, p. 23). It would then appear that a mother’s natural caring becomes moral caring as soon as the mother reflects upon her attending to the baby’s crying and
perhaps imagines what might happen to her baby if she did not attend to him or her in a caring way. In general, it is the realization of moral implications of one’s actions through reflection (which may be prompted by other people, particular conditions, or particular actions or reactions) that transforms and “advances” natural caring into moral caring.

*Relation of caring to moral sensitivity.* One way of conceptualizing this link between natural and moral caring might perhaps be in terms of moral sensitivity. Enhancing one’s sensitivity to the moral significance of human interactions might support the development of that person’s moral ideal, and eventually lead to that person’s assuming a more caring attitude in interacting with other people. Blustein’s (1991) claim would suggest that a “serious reflection” on one’s motivations to act in a morally good way might be an important catalyst of moral growth. If true, this claim would seem to have an important implication for teaching, where the emphasis on caring through modelling caring behaviours and prompting individual reflection could facilitate students’ moral development.

There are two major ways in which the introduction of caring into regular school curricula can materialize (Fedeles, 1998a). One option is to strive to educate students in caring, i.e., see caring as a goal of educational endeavours. The other option focuses on caring as a component of education, i.e., as a tool to be used in educating students to be moral persons. The two options are of course interconnected, and can be implemented in parallel. The development and practical application of programs aimed at elevating caring in school learning could provide the much needed empirical support for Noddings’ philosophical work.
Relation of caring to moral reasoning and moral action. According to Bosworth (1995), a direct relationship exists between caring and being more sensitive to the situation and needs of others. Caring could therefore serve as the necessary link from moral knowing and moral reasoning on the one hand and moral action on the other. Furthermore, moral action on the grounds of caring is likely to take form of more consistent and trait-like behaviour than that of a series of occasional isolated caring acts. One’s caring attitude makes it easier to extend her or his sensitivity beyond the boundaries of her or his own circles and reach out to assume responsibility for others’ (strangers’) well-being (Noddings, 1984).

Transformational nature of caring. Finally, it is proposed here that exposure to caring has a transformational effect. If this assumption is correct, and if caring can be seen as a sensitivity-enhancing way to morality, then assuming a caring attitude would, at least generally, make one a better person, both morally and socially. Both of the latter qualities are desirable for the individual alone, for those with whom he or she interacts, and also for the society at large. It could be speculated that caring persons generally break fewer rules and hurt others less frequently. Presumably, a genuinely caring person reflects upon his or her action (Bosworth, 1995; Noddings, 1984), which changes the attitudes with which that person will be entering into new morally charged situations with others.

It appears that as a component of education or instructional tool, “Caring fosters teacher/student connection and encourages possibilities for learning that may not otherwise occur” (Noblit, Rogers, & McCadden, 1995, p. 684). Starratt’s (1991) view of caring that involved openness to encountering others in their authentic individuality
implies that one of the effects of caring is a better understanding of who my partners are in the classroom. A better understanding of the students by the teacher can in effect enable the teacher to attend to each student in a more personal, and thus arguably more personally meaningful, manner. Noblit, Rogers, and McCadden (1995) further suggest that “Genuine caring is expressed by a teacher’s attempt to assist students in reaching their full potential” (p. 683).

Moral integrity is also an issue when it comes to the students and their exposure to the moral content of curriculum. There are two kinds of moral messages embedded in the curriculum—explicit and implicit. The former can take form of moral rules, principles, discussion, or guidance offered by the teachers. The latter, implicit or hidden curriculum (Jackson et al., 1998; Kohlberg, 1975) is the underlying continuum closely linked to the power relationship between the teacher and the students, interactions occurring in the classroom, and the awareness of their implications for others. Lack of balance or harmony between the explicit and implicit forms of curriculum have the same effect upon students as does a lack of moral integrity of the teacher. Because students are very sensitive to the true character of the teacher (Jackson et al., 1998), attempts to fake one’s attitude (caring, moral, or other) are easily recognized. The latter may in effect change the students’ attitudes toward the teacher, threaten the teacher’s rapport with students and break the trust of the students, and eventually diminish the authority of the teacher.

Bosworth (1995) suggested that “there is more to caring than the mere act itself. A kind of sensitivity should guide a person’s act of caring” (p. 688). It can be inferred that in the teacher, this kind of sensitivity determines the ease with which a
transformation occurs from a series of singular caring acts into a pattern or flow of consistently caring behaviours. Also, this kind of sensitivity could be of utility in distinguishing those teachers whose practice is based on the vastly unplanned and perhaps unintentional, natural caring, and those whose caring acts are guided predominantly by some sort of awareness of the implications of their work with students, responsibility for such work, accompanied by conscious attention to the moral value of the curriculum. It is proposed here that the sensitivity to the moral implications of human interactions could be enhanced through a carefully planned exposure to a spectrum of caring (and, with a teacher’s guidance, uncaring) behaviours. The validity of this thesis would, however, need to be established through empirical research and a careful analysis of empirical evidence. In any event, a greater degree of sensitivity to moral implications of human interactions would seem to potentially serve as a bridge between moral awareness, knowing, understanding, and reasoning on the one hand, and consistent moral action and moral integrity on the other.

The Study and Measurement of Moral Sensitivity

Although a great deal of research has been dedicated to the study of moral reasoning, the remaining competencies comprising Rest, Thoma, and Edwards’ (1997) model have only recently started receiving considerable attention from the research community. The present work aims to contribute to the emerging body of research by considering the importance of the first of the four components in Rest’s model, moral sensitivity, within the domain of teaching. Specifically, a measure of secondary level teachers’ moral sensitivity was developed and examined as part of this study. Based on a set of four short stories representing a number of categories of issues of moral
significance, this new test uses an efficient paper-and-pencil approach to measuring teachers' moral sensitivity to events and interactions occurring in the classroom.

Rest and his colleagues themselves have argued that moral sensitivity is an essential component of morality if moral behaviour is to occur (Rest, Bebeau, & Volker, 1986). These authors have further suggested that in the examination of moral sensitivity, stimulus materials are needed that provide clues to a moral issue, but do not pre-process or interpret the issue for the learner, as is usual in dilemmas used to assess moral reasoning competence (or in cases typically used in university courses on ethics).

Recent research in the areas of empathy and internalization (Haidt, 2001), caring (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984, 1992), and moral sensitivity specific to the professions (Bebeau & Rest, 1982; Bebeau, Rest, & Yamoor, 1985) has provided vital foundations for a further exploration of moral sensitivity. Studies in cognitive psychology, social constructivism, as well as intuitionism—despite coming from unique perspectives—indicate that the operation of moral mechanisms in an individual are more complex and highly interconnected than previously thought in a predominantly cognitive developmental line of research on morality. It appears that moral behaviours can, and do, occur in isolation from moral reasoning, that one may engage in moral reasoning after rather than before acting morally, that reflection and moral reasoning may lead to a reconfiguration of one's moral identity and to enhancing one's moral sensitivity. Indicators of such a richness in the moral functioning of an individual have inspired the present study on the moral sensitivity of teachers.

The relative paucity of research on moral sensitivity may be accounted for by several reasons. First and foremost, moral sensitivity of an individual is difficult to assess
because it has long been difficult to define. Secondly, it may be difficult to separate the component of moral sensitivity from moral reasoning and moral action. Hence, a measure of moral sensitivity would likely exhibit significant correlations with both moral reasoning abilities and with moral action (Bebeau et al., 1999). Thirdly, as is the case with moral action, moral sensitivity best transpires in real, natural situations. An instrument may not be a valid measure of moral sensitivity if what it assesses is moral action in a controlled setting. For example, a mere presence of an investigator during an observation might affect a participant’s reasoning and actions, and consequently impact on his or her perceived moral sensitivity.

The present work is intended to shed new light on some of the issues surrounding the role of moral sensitivity in the functioning of an individual, and its connection to classroom interactions between teachers and students. It is intended to contribute to the extant research on moral sensitivity by creating and validating a new measure of moral sensitivity that focuses specifically on teachers’ encounters with students. In order to inform the development of a measure of moral sensitivity for teachers, measures of moral sensitivity that had previously been developed in other domains are examined thoroughly.

Based on Rest’s (1986) conceptualization, Bebeau et al. (1999) formulated the following definition of moral sensitivity:

Moral sensitivity is the awareness of how our actions affect other people. It involves being aware of the different possible lines of action and how each line of action could affect the parties concerned (including oneself). Moral sensitivity involves . . . having empathy and role-taking skills. Moral sensitivity is necessary to become aware that a moral issue is involved in a situation. (p. 22)
It has been proposed that being morally sensitive involves being able to perceive the elements of a situation of concern, and to interpret that situation in moral terms (Blum, 1994; Endicott, 1999; Lapsley, 1999; Narváez & Endicott, 1999). For Blum (1994), moral sensitivity involves a “process that bridges the gap between moral rules (principles) and particular situations” (pp. 30-31). This process leads to the decision regarding the specific action to be taken, and the execution of such (hopefully moral) action (Lapsley, 1999). While acknowledging that moral sensitivity usually precedes moral reasoning, Blum (1994) proposes that moral sensitivity “can lead to moral action outside the operation of judgment entirely” and that moral sensitivity “can involve moral capacities not encompassed by moral judgment” (Blum, 1994, p. 31).

Blum (1994) also proposes that moral sensitivity “depends on the agent’s already possessing certain moral categories” (p. 37), including the memory of one’s past experiences and one’s beliefs (Pajares, 1992). Having the requisite moral concepts would thus appear fundamental to an individual’s moral sensitivity. For instance, a teacher lacking the concept of discrimination might not treat certain students the same way as others, without perceiving such behaviour as morally problematic. Once such a teacher internalizes the concept as a moral one, he or she will likely become sensitive to acts of discrimination, and may choose to modify his or her behaviour to prevent or correct acts of discrimination in the classroom, whether actual or perceived. A conscious effort to engage in deliberation and reflection post-action can thus promote an advancement of one’s moral knowledge and increased adequacy of one’s spontaneous, intuitive response to certain types of situations.
Research indicates that a strong relation exists between how a moral problem is conceived, and what action one takes based on those conceptions (Bergem, 1993; Oser & Althof, 1993). The awareness of a situation being moral, whether as a result of one’s sensitivity or as a consequence of an external prompt, can then lead the person to engage in moral reasoning. “It is precisely because the situation is seen in a certain way that the agent takes it as one in which he feels moved to deliberate” (Blum, 1994, p. 37, original emphasis). The process of deliberation can of course occur prior to, or following, whatever action the agent chooses to take in response to the situation. In either case, deliberation about moral situations can inform and enhance an individual’s moral sensitivity to future situations, which may in turn expedite his or her advancement in moral reasoning, and perhaps result in an increased likelihood of engaging in consistent moral action. In Blum’s (1994) words:

Once an agent begins deliberating in a situation, the process of deliberating can further affect her perception of the situation. . . . It can lead her to see different aspects, to see as applicable moral concepts that she initially did not, and to see previous aspects with a different degree of salience. That perception will then provide the context for the next level of deliberation. (p. 37)

Moral sensitivity involves a mechanism whereby a person becomes aware of the moral dimension of a particular situation prior to entering into the stage of cognitive deliberation (Blum, 1994), and the ability to determine the key moral dimensions of that situation that will help guide subsequent moral reasoning.

By suggesting that deliberation can further affect a person’s perception of the situation, Blum (1994) reveals the interconnectedness of the individual competences that
contribute to an individual’s moral development (Rest, 1983, 1984a). If a person’s ability to perceive the moral dimension of situations can improve through unplanned, incidental exposure to morally charged contexts, it would be reasonable to assume that the effect of a deliberate educational intervention could be similar, if not greater. Such an intervention would likely include prompts helping one to take notice of yet unrecognized moral dimensions of situations, and a discussion of the effects of increased moral sensitivity.

In spite of the interactions occurring between the four components of morality in the production and improvement of moral behaviour, Rest (1983, 1984a) has suggested that the application of the respective components in an individual’s response to a morally charged situation often occurs in sequence. The application of the processes involved in moral sensitivity precedes the application of the processes related to moral reasoning, and so forth (Rest 1983, 1984a). Nevertheless, although a greater degree of moral sensitivity in an individual may lead to behaviours that are more consistently moral in nature, other factors are likely to influence the course of action taken. In other words, the occurrence of moral action does not necessarily imply that the individual’s moral sensitivity or moral reasoning skills are advanced. A person may spontaneously offer their seat to an older person boarding the bus without interpreting the encounter as a moral one. Cognitive processes like automation and creation of procedural knowledge can have similar effects to those resulting from a person’s increased moral sensitivity or engagement in moral reasoning. In absence of such automated processes and external prompts, one’s ability to perceive issues of concern and interpret situations in moral terms (i.e., being morally sensitive) can promote moral reasoning and moral action. The transformational nature of moral sensitivity can also be assumed. The higher the moral sensitivity of an individual,
the better the chances of that individual engaging in moral reasoning (at a higher level), as well as exhibiting moral behaviour. This assumed chain dependency makes increasing moral sensitivity of individuals a worthwhile educational pursuit.

Awareness of Consequences Test

Earlier studies related to what has been termed as moral sensitivity were focused on defining and exploring such concepts as empathy or altruism. Schwartz (1967) put forward a model of moral sensitivity based on altruism, utilizing two variables as mediators of the relationship between one's personal moral norms and moral action: awareness of consequences (AC) and ascription of responsibility (AR). These variables play a significant role in the initial phase of moral engagement during which one enters into a cognitive exploration of the moral aspects of a situation. Awareness of consequences is defined as the spontaneous tendency to become aware of the consequences of one's actions. Ascription of responsibility, on the other hand, is the tendency to ascribe responsibility for actions and/or their consequences to, or away from, the self (Schwartz, 1967).

Schwartz's (1967) results suggest that whereas in general, awareness of consequences is not a strong predictor of helping behaviour (moral action), it becomes a predictor when consequences of one's action are less obvious. A similar differential has been found with ascription of responsibility. When salience of responsibility is high, study participants are more likely to help regardless of their AR score (Schwartz, 1967). In contrast, those at higher levels of moral sensitivity, as assessed by the AR score, are able to pay attention to morally charged situations that are much more subtle. Findings from several follow-up studies indicate that the awareness of consequences and ascription...
of responsibility “indeed have a strong mediating influence on the translation of personal moral norms to moral action” (Volker, 1983, p. 10). Their effect can be rather obvious in situations where moral sensitivity leads to one’s engagement in moral reasoning, and ultimately to moral action. Perhaps more importantly however, these two variables involve post-hoc cognitive mechanisms that can significantly contribute to an individual’s moral growth.

Whereas Schwartz’s (1967) examination of moral sensitivity did not involve a consideration for a specific social or professional domain, most of the subsequent research in the moral sensitivity arena evolved as domain specific. In most cases, moral sensitivity research has revolved around a particular profession. In this context, Bebeau (2002) proposed that professional settings necessitate a focus on “ethical sensitivity,” rather than on the more general moral sensitivity, “to signal the distinctive expectations of the profession that derive from the norms and codes that govern professional practice” (Bebeau, 2002, p. 283), although other authors have used the terms “moral sensitivity” and “ethical sensitivity” interchangeably when referring to professional morality. In contrast to Bebeau’s view of dentistry as strongly connected with the imperatives of the professional code of ethics, it is proposed in the present study that moral obligations of teachers are viewed in a larger context that transcends classroom interactions and deeply affects students’ lives outside of school. To reflect this expanded view of teachers’ moral responsibilities, the term “moral sensitivity” will be used in the present study.

*Moral Sensitivity Rating Scale*

It has been argued that studying moral sensitivity in a professional context bears significant benefits (Rest et al., 1986). Among such benefits is the fact that most
Interactions between the professional and clients (patients, students), peers, as well as the public are governed by an established code of professional conduct.

Volker (1983) reviewed earlier research in moral sensitivity and examined the issues involved in moral sensitivity as they pertain to the counselling practice. By extending the findings from Schwartz's (1967) study into the specific context of the counselling profession, Volker (1983) asserted that:

Counselors who exhibit greater awareness of consequences will be more likely to perceive professional ethical dilemmas that arise in counseling practice.

Counselors who ascribe greater responsibility to self will be more sensitive to professional ethical dilemmas that arise in counseling practice. (p. 13)

Volker (1983) conceptualized moral sensitivity in terms of one's ability to perceive the moral elements that are present in a situation. He proposed a model of moral sensitivity in counseling practice based on the following three components:

1. perception of the critical facts which define a situation as a professional ethical dilemma,
2. perception of the potentially harmful consequences to self and others, and
3. the participant's perception that he or she has responsibility to take some action which will influence events so as to resolve the dilemma. (pp. 38-40)

In synchrony with the model, individuals who are able to simultaneously perceive the critical facts in a situation, potential consequences of actions to themselves and others, and ascribe responsibility to act to themselves, demonstrate the greatest moral sensitivity. The Moral Sensitivity Rating Scale (MSRS) developed by Volker (1983) along the three components suggests five distinct ratings. These ratings range from no
sensitivity detected to the participant advocating direct and clear responsibility for a counselor to act in a morally appropriate way.

Although his contribution to the advancement of moral sensitivity in counseling is evident, Volker's (1983) conceptualization of moral sensitivity in terms of one's perceptions surrounding a professional moral dilemma appears too narrow. It could be proposed that whereas the presence of a moral dilemma may warrant one's engagement in moral deliberation and arrival at a moral position (moral judgment) accompanied by moral action, the moral dimension of professional (and non-professional) interactions extends beyond moral dilemmas. It is proposed here that non-dilemmatic, yet still morally charged situations require a similar degree of attention as do moral dilemmas. Moral sensitivity thus involves more than a mere recognition of a dilemma and its embeddedness in a moral context. A non-dilemmatic moral encounter, such as a joyful experience of witnessing a caring act by a stranger, also demands moral thought (deliberation, reflection), even if no action or intervention in the situation is needed. Through moral inspiration or reinforcement, perhaps the outcome of this type of moral encounter is one's personal learning and moral growth, rather than any immediate responsive action toward other individuals.

Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test

Perhaps the most comprehensive contribution to-date to research in moral sensitivity specific to the professions has been made by Bebeau et al. (1985, 1999). Bebeau and Rest (1982) designed and developed the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (DEST) that assesses dental students' ability to recognize the ethical issues embedded in carefully selected ethical dilemmas specific to their profession (Fravel & Bebeau, 1999).
The dilemmas, based on frequently occurring ethical problems in dentistry, are presented in four audio-taped "radio drama" vignettes of dentist-patient interactions (Bebeau, Rest, & Yamoor, 1985). Dental students are first asked to listen to the vignettes and then to assume the role of the dentist in the vignette and offer a response to the patient and the situation. Following each vignette, the participants are presented with a series of seven to ten probe questions that serve to query the participants about their responses. The following is a summary of the types of prompt questions associated with the vignettes (Bebeau & Speidel, 1983):

1. Explain why you said what you did.
2. Tell how you would expect the patient to understand and react to what you said.
3. What would you say are the issues in this situation?
4. What arguments could be made against the position you took?
5. What is in the best interest of the patient, all things considered? Why?
6. What information about the patient influenced your decision?
7. What do you think a dentist should do in a case like this?
8. Practically speaking, what would you do?

Both the participants’ suggested solutions to the issues presented in the vignettes and their responses to the probe questions are audio-taped and later transcribed for scoring (Bebeau et al., 1985). Responses to prompt questions can receive scores of 1, 2, or 3, representing low, moderate, and high degrees of moral sensitivity, respectively.

Scoring manuals have been developed for each vignette once the scoring criteria were established. The two general categories of criteria that emerged in the process were:
(a) sensitivity to the special characteristics of the patient, and (b) perception of the responsibility of the dentist (Bebeau et al., 1985). The noticeable similarity between these categories and the variables proposed by Schwartz (1967) in his model of general moral sensitivity based on altruism—awareness of consequences and ascription of responsibility—offer confirmation that both approaches to moral sensitivity do indeed tap into the same domain.

The issues presented in the dramas on the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test were based on reports of frequently occurring ethical problems in dentistry, as offered by practicing dentists. The dramas obtained through this process were then checked for realism and technical accuracy by experienced practitioners, and subsequently tested by groups of students and faculty. Four dramas (out of the original eight) that were perceived to be the most realistic, relevant and stimulating cases for discussion, were developed into Form A of the DEST, which is the primary form used in the test’s administration. The remaining four dramas made their way into university course materials and are currently used in ethics training programs in the United States (Bebeau et al., 1985).

Validation studies of the DEST and the specialized Geriatric Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (GDEST) developed by Ernest (1990) for dentistry students who work with geriatric patients, support the following conclusions by Bebeau (1994) and Fravel and Bebeau (1999):

(1) Ethical sensitivity can be reliably assessed. Calibrated raters achieved item agreement ranging from 84.7% to 88%, while reliability estimates for individual cases range from .83 to .92. DEST scores correlate .69 with the
practitioners' intuitive ratings of moral sensitivity, while low correlations were obtained between the DEST and measures of verbal fluency, technical knowledge, and word count (.20 to .40).

(2) Students and practitioners vary in their ability to recognize the ethical issues in their profession, and the DEST is sensitive to institutional differences and to the differences related to the length of professional preparation. The DEST distinguishes levels of sensitivity irrespective of the participants' technical knowledge of dentistry, suggesting that the measure may not be as profession-specific as previously thought.

(3) Ethical sensitivity is distinct from moral reasoning abilities, as documented by consistently low correlations between the DEST and DIT (.06 to .12). That in effect means that professionals may be skilled at interpreting the ethical dimensions of a situation (be ethically sensitive), but unskilled at working out a balanced view of a moral solution (moral judgment), and vice versa.

(4) The DEST exhibits high internal consistency (Cronbach alphas ranging from .70 to .78), which supports the notion that moral sensitivity is a distinct construct.

(5) Ethical sensitivity can be enhanced through instruction, both during the pre-service and in-service years of one's education.

The elegance of the DEST becomes apparent in the scoring process. Although a production measure, yielding rich verbal response data, the DEST is scorable with a fair degree of precision by the participants themselves. In the typical administration, both the
participant and a practicing dentist (a member of the American College of Dentists) apply
the DEST coding scheme to the participants’ transcribed responses. The two then meet to
discuss the cases and compare the scores each of them arrived at. This interaction
between the scorer and the participant is valued as an important element in the
assessment process, offering support from an experienced colleague, as well as
encouraging self-assessment and promoting reflection on one’s professional knowledge
and practice.

Although this approach is relatively time consuming, one important implication of
this type of protocol is that it benefits both the participants and the practicing dentists
who agree to serve as scorers;

By realizing that students often fail to recognize special characteristics or needs of
the patient, which are often obvious to the experienced professional, the faculty
member is better able to see the student’s failing as a deficiency in skill or
perception rather than as a fatal character flaw. Deficiencies in skills and
perceptions, after all, can usually be remediated through instruction and
experience. (Bebeau et al., 1985, p. 234)

Assessing Moral Sensitivity in the Teaching Domain: The Lisa Boek Dilemma

In 1986, Norwegian professor Trygve Bergem pioneered an enquiry into the
opportunities and challenges associated with assessing moral sensitivity in the teaching
domain. Bergem (1986, 1993) studied “how a number of prospective teachers respond to
the ethical demands inherent in a hypothetical dilemma (the so-called Lisa Boek
Dilemma)” (Bergem, 1993, p. 299). The Lisa Boek Dilemma reflects problematic
cooperation between an otherwise well-liked and experienced male teacher, Lars Kolle,
and a recently hired new female teacher, Lisa Boek. The conflict between the two teachers escalates as Lars accepts credit for what was principally Lisa’s work. Lisa faces a dilemma when asked for her opinion on Lars by the principal of another school where Lars has applied for the position of vice-principal. Bergem’s (1993) key study was designed to address the following four questions:

1. What ethical issues inherent in the dilemma are identified by the teacher students?

2. Why are some students able to identify more problems than other students?

3. What solutions do students propose to the problems identified in the story, and how do they justify their responses?

4. What impact do students’ professional moral reasoning abilities have on their teaching proficiency (as assessed by experts)? (p. 299)

Bergem’s (1993) chief finding in terms of what he calls social sensitivity (defined as teachers’ coreactive abilities in their interaction with students) was that sensitivity was strongly related to the student teachers’ ability to spontaneously recognize the various stakeholders in a morally charged situation. A significant relationship was also identified between sensitivity and the participants’ role-taking ability. Furthermore, there appeared to be a strong link between the students’ social sensitivity and their “ability to give a complex and many-sided interpretation of the dilemma” (Bergem, 1993, p. 305).

While providing moral sensitivity groundwork in the realm of education, specifically teacher education, Bergem’s (1993) approach appears to be flawed on at least two accounts. First, Bergem reduces the scope of moral sensitivity to a person’s perceptive abilities in relation to a moral dilemma. While responding to a moral dilemma
enables one to exhibit some aspects of his or her moral sensitivity, it does not provide opportunities for an examination of one’s response when faced with non-dilemmatic moral encounters. These remain unexamined in Bergem’s studies. The second issue worth pointing out is that although Bergem attempted to conceptualize sensitivity in terms of teacher-student interactions, the Lisa Boek dilemma he developed revolves around a conflict between two colleague teachers. Although teacher-teacher interactions too involve matters of moral significance, and provide opportunities to examine teachers’ sensitivities, Bergem (1993) affords little consideration to the perhaps more important teacher-student interactions.

**Moral Sensitivity Test**

Several years later, McNeel, Frederickson, Talbert, and Lester (1992) and McNeel and Frederickson (1999) proposed and developed a more comprehensive measure of moral sensitivity, one specific to the lives of college students. Originally entitled “Understanding Difficult Situations,” this test became known as the Moral Sensitivity Test (MST). Inspired by the successes of Bebeau et al.’s (1982) Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (DEST), McNeel and Frederickson (1999) developed a set of “radio drama” scenarios specifically directed at the issues and problems typically faced by college students. The four tape-recorded scenarios on the MST revolve around date rape, cheating, alcohol abuse, and racism. After listening to each of the scenarios on the tape, participants are instructed to respond by tape-recording the advice they would like to offer to the main character in each of the scenarios, as if they were the main character’s close friend. This process, involving the identification of issues or concerns relevant to the moral dimensions of the dilemmas, is facilitated by use of written probe questions.
accompanying each scenario. In each scenario on the MST, six manifestations of moral sensitivity are rated as 1, 2, or 3, and the moral sensitivity score for each scenario is obtained as the sum of the six ratings. Overall moral sensitivity is arrived at by adding the scores for all four scenarios.

McNeel et al. (1992) suggested that persons presumed on other bases to be morally sensitive (such as a counselor, college residence advisor, dean of student development, campus pastor, and philosopher) tend to score highly on the Moral Sensitivity Test. This finding serves as an important, albeit informal, source of validation of the MST as a measure of moral sensitivity.

McNeel et al. (1992) have suggested that the Moral Sensitivity Test "shows promise as a component for use in ethics enrichment in educational settings" (p. 5), whereas it has been used successfully to heighten college students' awareness of moral issues, as well as to enhance students' application of moral concerns in real life situations. McNeel et al.'s (1992) findings thus lend support to the idea that measures of moral sensitivity have the potential to enrich postsecondary curricula, and play a significant role in the development of moral personhood in students. This finding is echoed by the work done by Bebeau (1994) who has been successful in using variations of the DEST to stimulate discussion on ethics issues in both undergraduate and graduate courses in dentistry.

Racial Ethical Sensitivity Test

Also based on the DEST, the Racial Ethical Sensitivity Test (REST) was introduced by Brabeck et al. (2000) as a test of moral sensitivity to acts of racial and gender intolerance in school settings. In this case, five scenarios are presented to
participants in videotaped format. Participants then take part in a tape-recorded semistructured interview, based on the protocol used in the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (Bebeau & Rest, 1982). The authors of the REST report to have found this test to be a reliable measure of individuals’ moral sensitivity to instances of racial and gender intolerance that is stable over time (Brabeck et al., 2000).

Recently, Brabeck and Sirin (2001) introduced a CD-ROM version of the REST, REST-CD, with hopes of significantly improving the efficacy of the test’s administration. With REST-CD, the standard face-to-face semi-structured tape-recorded interview that requires a transcription of responses is substituted with a fully structured self-administered interview facilitated by a computer. The most significant contribution of this stand-alone application is in the introduction of fully technology-driven test administration. The presence of an interviewer or costly transcribing are no longer required.

Each of the five scenarios from the original test is presented on the CD-ROM in video format and accompanied by an interactive interview during which the participant types his or her responses using a computer keyboard. According to Brabeck and Sirin (2001), these authors were able to confirm the hypothesis that the REST-CD is a reliable and valid measure of ethical sensitivity to instances of racial and gender intolerance. The significance of this finding, if successfully replicated, is in uncovering the potential of computer technologies to facilitate the administration of other measures of moral sensitivity. In addition to the reduction in time and other costs associated with standard test administration, computer-facilitated testing offers the benefits of enhanced privacy, test completion at a convenient location and time, progressing at an individual pace.
(unless a test is timed), as well as the ability to receive immediate feedback on one’s performance.

A successful transition from a paper-and-pencil or interview-based format to technology-facilitated administration nevertheless requires that consideration be given to the level of potential research participants’ comfort with computer technologies, general computer and typing skills, as well as access (if administered remotely). Once the technological considerations have been addressed, the REST-CD shows promise for facilitating the development of moral sensitivity as well as serving as an evaluation tool. The placement of the REST-CD application on the digital medium potentially creates such learning opportunities as post-administration reflection exercises, test-retest comparisons, automated comparisons against aggregate data from administrations across participants, etc., all of which can increase the application’s educational value.

*Test for Ethical Sensitivity in Science*

Latest on the list of measures of moral sensitivity is the Test for Ethical Sensitivity in Science (TESS). This new measure was designed to assess an individual’s moral sensitivity specific to the domain of science but, unlike the DEST, “it is not strictly a professional measure as it is not associated with a professional code of ethics” (Clarkeburn, 2002, p. 450).

Clarkeburn (2000, 2002) refuted the notion that moral sensitivity must be assessed using the “radio drama” approach in order to yield satisfactory scores. “Radio drama” measures involve the tape recording of responses to guiding questions about situations that are presented to participants either on tape or in written form. Clarkeburn (2000) points to the fact that although interviews have been shown to produce richer data
(Bebeau et al., 1985), their administration comes at a higher cost. Such costs include laborious administration, time needed for transcribing the recorded interviews, and the cost of producing professional audio materials. A decisive factor in choosing the format of a measure of moral sensitivity may be that a paper-and-pencil measure "provides an opportunity for larger study samples" (Clarkeburn, 2002, p. 451). In response to the needs of a university community, the TESS was designed using stories but is a paper-and-pencil measure. According to Clarkeburn (2002), a typical participant will complete the TESS in under 15 minutes, and an experienced scorer needs only 2 minutes to score it. The efficiency of administration and scoring of the TESS appears to be superior to most other measures in the moral sensitivity domain. At the same time, however, the TESS comes short of providing such benefits as the "teachable moments" that tend to add educational value to such tests as the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test.

Developed as a one-story test, the TESS introduces the participant to only a small number of moral issues. This raises some concern over the power of this test to generalize to other areas of potential moral concern. Further examination of the possibility of expanding the TESS, or developing alternative forms for validation purposes, seems warranted.

The Present Study

The exploration of the moral sensitivity component of moral development, including the various approaches to the development of measures of moral sensitivity, and the emerging body of research in this area, have advanced the understanding of the mechanisms embedded in moral sensitivity and its situatedness within the larger picture of moral development. Nevertheless, although research using the extant measures of
moral sensitivity (see Table 2 for an overview) has provided insight into how moral sensitivity can be reliably tested, different authors have focused their efforts on developing tools that best address the assessment, and in some cases also educational, needs of their professional communities. Whereas the measures discussed earlier in this section have such domain specific focus, reflected in the choice of issues and interactions depicted in stimulus materials, their utility in, and generalizability to, other domains—such as education—may be somewhat limited due to the choice of issues and scenarios included in these measures.

The purpose of the present research, therefore, was to develop a valid and reliable measure for assessing moral sensitivity in the teaching domain. The development of such a measurement tool is a prerequisite for the design of educational interventions aimed at fostering teachers’ moral sensitivity.
Table 2

*Extant Measures of Moral Sensitivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Description</th>
<th>Year introduced</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Number of stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Consequences Test (ACT)</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Sensitivity Rating Scale (MSRS)</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (DEST)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lisa Boek Dilemma</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatric Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (GDEST)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Sensitivity Test (MST) for college students</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Ethical Sensitivity Test (REST)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Interview; Digital</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for Ethical Sensitivity in Science (TESS)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY 1: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ISSUES OF MORAL SIGNIFICANCE IN TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTIONS

The first goal of Study 1 was to determine the critical issues of moral significance perceived by elementary and secondary school teachers as pertinent to everyday interactions occurring between teachers and students, both inside and outside of classrooms. Three distinct sources of knowledge were utilized in this study in order to facilitate the development of a comprehensive measure of teachers' moral sensitivity. First, the teachers' professional code of ethics provided a theoretical foundation for a comprehensive examination of moral issues related specifically to teacher-student interactions. The focus was on teachers and their responsibility for the learning and overall wellness of the students placed in their care. Secondly, previous research on the moral life of schools, involving observations of teachers interacting with students in school settings, was utilized as a source of empirical insight into teachers' moral sensitivity (see Jackson et al., 1998). Finally, a moral issues questionnaire was constructed as part of the present study, and administered to a group of both experienced and aspiring teachers. A triangulation method was used in order to validate the issues of moral significance emerging from the three sources, and to facilitate a better understanding of the complex nature of teachers' work with regards to their professional and moral obligations and, particularly, their awareness of the implications of their choices and actions.
Thus, the primary goal of Study 1 was to inform the development and validation of a measure of teachers' moral sensitivity, including the determination of the appropriate format, content, target audience, as well as the effective application of such a measure.

As can be seen in Figure 7, the design of the present study included an examination of three sources of knowledge on moral sensitivity, which is at the focus of the present discussion.
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Figure 7. In the present study, three sources of knowledge on moral sensitivity were used, yielding a comprehensive view of the issues of moral significance in teacher-student interactions.

The Teachers’ Professional Code of Ethics

Teachers’ professional conduct in the classroom is governed by the code of ethics drafted and maintained by the appropriate licensing bodies and professional organizations in the given jurisdiction. Such a code of ethics represents a set of moral rules that are deemed important for the proper conduct of teachers with respect to students. At its core, the teachers’ code of ethics establishes standards for the education and professional conduct of teachers, thereby providing for safe and effective learning environments for
students placed in the teachers’ care. A professional code of ethics thus represents a normative moral element for defining the role of the teacher in the classroom.

By recognizing the influence of teachers on students in informal and outside-of-the-classroom situations, the concepts of moral obligation and moral sensitivity are extended beyond the definitions usually engendered in the teachers’ professional codes of ethics. Researchers of morality in domains other than education have held that professionals’ responsibilities with respect to their work are, for the most part, encoded in their respective professions’ ethics guidelines (e.g., see Bebeau, 1994). It is proposed here, however, that the teacher’s obligations extend beyond the classroom, and their moral obligation is to the students both inside and outside of school. A test of moral sensitivity thus needs to reflect this potential scope of teachers’ influence on students (see Clarkeburn, 2002). The present study attempts to recognize and examine the multitude of teacher-student interactions, regardless of the context, place, or time of their occurrence.

In the province of British Columbia, the obligation to “establish . . . standards for the education, professional responsibility and competence” (BCCT, 2003a, p. i) of public school teachers falls into the jurisdiction of the British Columbia College of Teachers (BCCT). Although the BCCT does not itself propose a particular professional code of ethics to teachers, it recognizes that:

Many of the College’s members belong to organizations which have codes of ethics and other standards of practice. The College acknowledges that these are of value in providing standards of professional behaviour. . . . Educators acknowledge their professional obligation to the well-being and educational
growth of students. . . . Educators recognize the public trust of their positions and respect the privileged nature of their relationships with students. (BCCT, p. i)

The BCCT further mandates that teachers be “fit and proper persons” for their profession and they “must have an understanding of the legal and professional ethical responsibilities of being a teacher” (BCCT, 2003a, p. iii). To facilitate the development of such fitness and understanding, the College’s policies mandate that teacher preparation programs “have content which provides for inquiry and dialogue regarding the ethics, standards and practices of teaching as a profession” (BCCT, 2003b, p. 29).

Additionally, the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation (BCTF), the professional union representing over 43,000 public school teachers in the province, developed a code of ethics in order to regulate the actions of its members. The Code supplements the efforts of the BCCT by providing guidelines for the BCTF members “for maintaining high standards of professional service and conduct toward students, colleagues, and the professional union” (BCTF, 2003, p. 1).

Out of the Code’s ten rules of conduct, the first three bear direct relevance for teacher conduct in the context of teacher-student interactions. Those three rules are;

1. The teacher speaks and acts towards student with respect and dignity and deals judiciously with them, always mindful of their rights and sensibilities.

2. The teacher respects the confidential nature of information concerning student and may give it only to authorized persons or agencies directly concerned with their welfare.
3. The teacher recognizes that a privileged relationship with students exists and refrains from exploiting that relationship for material, ideological, or other advantage. (BCTF, 2003, p. 1)

The remaining seven guidelines pertain to other responsibilities of teachers not directly affecting their interactions with students, and thus are not of interest in the present study.

Observations of the Moral Life of Classrooms

The effects of a teacher's choices and actions in his or her interactions with the students bear implications that extend beyond the walls of the classroom, and beyond those norms prescribed by the professional code of ethics. It would appear that those classroom interactions are most significant that bear implications for the well-being of the students and for their learning. Research on morality in the classroom indicates that teachers are often inattentive to these implications (Jackson et al., 1998; Simon, 2001). The present study was designed to test the hypothesis that teachers' interactions with their students, and the implications of these interactions, extend beyond the classroom.

A collection of rich anecdotal evidence of encounters with teachers and students engaged in various classroom situations was gathered by Jackson et al. (1998). The purpose of that study was to describe how teachers, through their everyday conduct and practice, can create environments in which students can "catch" positive ways of regarding and treating other people and their efforts (Jackson et al., 1998). According to the authors, the emphasis was on activities that are not usually considered as having moral meaning, such as components of classroom management, teachers' curricular choices, preferred instructional methods, etc. Jackson et al. (1998) propose that teachers'
choices and actions observed in schools embody moral lessons about interactions with other humans.

Based on their observations, Jackson et al. (1998), developed a system consisting of eight categories of school contexts that are characterized by the presence of the moral dimension:

1. Moral instruction as a formal part of the curriculum
2. Moral instruction within the regular classroom
3. Rituals and ceremonies
4. Visual displays with moral content
5. Spontaneous interjection of moral commentary into ongoing activity
6. Classroom rules and regulations
7. The morality of the curricular substructure
8. Expressive morality within the classroom

The first five of these categories involve activities that these authors classify as, "avowedly moral. They are deliberate attempts to promote moral instruction and to encourage moral behaviour" (Jackson et al., 1998, p. 3). The following three categories involve activities that, "embody the moral. To recognize the moral in these activities requires us to probe beneath the surface of events" (pp. 3-4, original emphasis).

The many areas in which a teacher’s performance appears to bear moral significance seem to include the seriousness of purpose, respect for people and learning, trust, stability and predictability of procedures, fairness (Jackson et al., 1998), as well as thoughtfulness and the teacher’s style (van Maanen, 1991b).
Moral Issues Questionnaire

One of the purposes of Study 1 was to gather stories surrounding issues of moral significance as experienced by teachers in their everyday interactions with students. An open-ended questionnaire was developed with the aim of collecting a range of issues of moral significance occurring in classroom interactions between teachers and students, as experienced and interpreted by teachers. By gathering an anecdotal account of morally significant classroom situations and teachers' choices and actions in those situations, this moral issues questionnaire served as an important source of knowledge of moral encounters in both elementary and secondary school classrooms.

Method

Participants

A total of 106 participants took part in this study. Of those, 98 were preparing to become public school teachers in an initial teacher preparation program in a large university in Western Canada. Their reported specializations included English as a Second Language (18), Expressive Arts (16), Special Education (15), Mathematics, Science and Technology (13), Humanities (9), Early Childhood Education (8), First Nations Education (6), English (2), as well as Drama (1), Human Kinetics (1), Language Education (1), Music (1), and Social Studies (1). In addition, three master's and two doctoral level students completed these questionnaires. Their reported areas of specialization were: Business Education, Curriculum Studies, Educational Administration, Higher Education, and Science Education (1 each). One faculty member specializing in Curriculum Studies also participated. Two participants did not provide information on their status in the university.
Among the 106 participants, 84 (79%) were female, while 17 (16%) were male. The remaining five participants (5%) did not provide information on their gender. Participants reported a range of teaching experiences at the elementary and/or secondary level.

In addition, about half (52) of all participants (49%) reported having teaching experience other than that at the elementary or secondary school level. Such experiences included coaching (3), teaching swimming (2) or skating (1), leading a camp (2), working in a daycare (1), or volunteering (1). The extent of such teaching experiences varied from several months (8) to a year (3), year and a half (1), 2 years (11), 3, 4, or 5 years (3 each), 6 years (1), 7 years (2), 8 years (1), 9 years (2), 10, 11, or 12 years (1 each), 15.5 years (1), and 32 years (1).

Information on the participants’ instruction or training in ethics or morality was collected, including formal or informal study or self-study, or some other format. (No definition of ethics or morality was offered to the participants in this task.) A great range of courses and other influences emerged, including specific courses in Education (76), Philosophy (6), as well as History, Home Economics, Legal Ethics, Political Science, and Religion (1 each). Other influences on ethical or moral development reported by the participants included upbringing at home, involvement in church activities, Sunday or Bible school, participation in youth groups, self-study and personal reflection, and a variety of workshops and seminars ranging in focus from conflict resolution, harassment prevention and leadership skills to yoga. A few participants also reported considering their involvement in professional development activities or conversation with colleagues as forms of their ethics or morality training.
Materials

An open-ended questionnaire was developed to facilitate collecting a range of experiences involving teacher-student interactions that teachers themselves consider as bearing some moral or ethical significance. Because this questionnaire was aimed at collecting as rich a variety of teachers' experiences as possible, it was determined that the instructions given in the questionnaire ought to allow for individual interpretations of what constitutes moral or ethical significance. For that reason, definitions of such terms as ethics, morality, or "ethical or moral significance," were not provided, leaving the conceptualization of these terms to the teachers themselves.

Along with several items of demographic nature, the questionnaire contained brief instructions inviting participants to consider, and put forward, examples of situations or issues from their teaching and interacting with students that, in their view, bear some ethical or moral significance. They were further asked to explain why they considered the situations they listed to be ethical or moral. Finally, participants were invited to consider possible issues, concerns, affected parties (stakeholders), and consequences of specific action or inaction.

The moral issues questionnaire presented to the participants consisted of a cover letter, a brief demographic data sheet, and the following set of instructions (see Appendix A):

1. When you think of your experiences as a teacher (recently or in general) and your interactions with your students, what situations or issues come to mind that, in your view, bear some ethical or moral significance?
2. For each of the situations or issues you can recall, explain what, in your view, makes it an ethical or moral one.

3. You may wish to consider possible issues, concerns, affected parties (stakeholders), consequences of specific action or inaction, or other aspects of the situation. Feel free to include as much detail as you wish.

**Design and Procedure**

Those invited to participate in this study included teachers working towards their graduate degree in the field of education, those enrolled in an initial teacher preparation program in a university, as well as several education faculty members. No specific criteria for participation in this component of the study were established, although only students and faculty members in the field of education were targeted.

Potential participants among post-baccalaureate as well as graduate students were informed about the study either by means of a short presentation during one of their classes, or in an informal one-on-one conversation with a researcher or research assistant. With their instructor's permission, some students had an opportunity to complete the questionnaire at the end of a class. Others were given a copy of the questionnaire to complete and return to the investigator in a pre-addressed envelope. Education faculty with a perceived interest in ethics or morality (based on entries in a research directory published by the university) were approached by a letter outlining the study and inviting them to complete the questionnaire or schedule a short block of time for a personal interview as the alternative format.
Results and Discussion

The diverse sample provided for a very rich pool of stories about teachers and students that involved one or more issues of moral significance, as perceived by the participants. At the same time, whereas many of the issues proposed by the participants were specific to a particular age group or grade level, it became obvious that a single measure of moral sensitivity based on the proposed issues could not capture all relevant moral issues occurring in interactions in both elementary and secondary classrooms. A decision was made to proceed with developing a measure of moral sensitivity specific to teacher-student interactions in the secondary school setting. The richness of the data collected in the first study that was specific to the secondary level, as well as a greater proportion of what were perceived as somewhat more subtle moral issues (Jackson et al., 1998), provided support for this decision.

All coherent stories involving teacher-student interactions were extracted from the completed questionnaires and typed up with any personal names modified in order to eliminate any potential privacy concerns. Such retyped responses were then presented to a panel of six Education graduate students who first read all of the stories, then identified the issues of moral significance found in these stories, and finally ranked those issues according to the following two criteria: (1) How realistic each issue appeared in the context of classroom learning; and (2) How appropriate and relevant each issue seemed for inclusion in a test developed specifically for secondary school teachers.

Once the issues of moral significance found in the completed questionnaires were listed and ranked, those issues that received the highest rankings were taken to serve as
core for the development of categories of issues of moral significance. The following categories and subcategories emerged (see also Appendix B):

1. Creating a safe and supportive learning community
   a. Class management, discipline, and attitudes: Grouping, labelling, streaming, and tracking students; respect, honesty, attitude, care, yelling, safe learning environment, bullying, theft, cheating, lying, trust.
   b. Religion and spirituality, culture, values at school and at home:
      Teacher's responsibilities, teacher's own values, values at school and at home, celebrating the holidays of various cultures and religions, relativism, care, attitude, parental expectations and approval of students' options and choices.
   c. Equality, discrimination, and fairness: Race, gender, socioeconomic status, aboriginal issues, stereotyping, fairness of assessment.
   d. Special needs of students: Discrimination, differentiation, sensitivity to students' individual needs (particularly in terms of their learning), support provided.
   e. Language: Freedom of speech.

2. Relating to students and understanding their problems
   a. Hugging, touching, abuse, and personal relationships: Sensitivity to students' emotional needs, care, inappropriate teacher-student relationships.
b. Health and personal issues: Taking drugs, abortion, abuse in the family (incest), single parenting, health and food issues.

c. Sexual behaviour, sexuality.

3. Teachers' professional duties

a. Avoidance of ethical issues by the teacher: Values at school and at home, choosing path of the least resistance, parental expectations and approval of students' options and choices, challenges of multicultural classrooms.

The administration of the moral issues questionnaires proved helpful in several ways. First, the quantity and quality of the data that emerged from the questionnaires validated the hypothesis that teachers were generally well aware of the moral dimension of their interactions with students. Secondly, many of the issues proposed by the participants as issues of moral significance corresponded either with the guidelines for professional conduct found in the teachers' professional code of ethics, or observational research on morality in schools, or both. Finally, a long list of specific issues extending beyond the classroom and falling outside of the realm of teachers' professional code of ethics emerged, giving support to the notion that teachers do indeed affect their students' lives more generally, not only with regards to learning and in-classroom behaviours. Participants' stories added a very human and personal dimension to the examination of morality in teacher-student interactions.

Juxtaposition of the Three Sources of Knowledge on Moral Sensitivity

Three distinct sources of knowledge were used in developing a comprehensive understanding of what constitutes issues of moral significance in the classroom. First,
issues of moral significance present in teacher-student interactions were derived from teachers’ professional code of ethics developed and maintained by the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation, the province’s school teachers’ professional union (BCTF, 2003). The second source of knowledge regarding morally significant issues utilized in this study was research involving observations of teachers and students interacting in classroom settings that focused on examining the presence and transparency of the moral dimension of classroom interactions. Finally, a questionnaire was devised whose purpose was to gather relevant personal experiences by both practicing teachers and teachers-in-training. The emerging issues were pooled and included in further analysis as one set of issues.

A panel of education graduate students subsequently sorted and ranked the issues according to their relevance. The issues were clustered to form logically distinct moral categories believed to be representative of the moral life in secondary school classrooms (Appendix B). Due to the focus of the proposed measure of moral sensitivity on teachers’ interactions with students, those issues not specifically related to teacher-student interactions—such as reports of a teacher interacting with a colleague—were not included in the emerging categories. Also not included were issues deemed ambiguous and situations that did not appear to warrant significant implications for either the students or their teacher. Once the TCQ was constructed, its reliability and validity were examined in Study 2.

The utilization of three distinct sources of knowledge—one (teachers’ professional code of ethics) prescriptive and two descriptive—in Study 1 enabled the development of a comprehensive overview of issues of moral significance that occur in
teacher-student interactions in elementary and secondary schools. The professional code of ethics for teachers, research literature on the "moral life of schools" (Jackson et al., 1998), and an original questionnaire on moral issues administered to a group of teachers with different degrees of teaching experience, yielded two main outcomes: (a) validation of the issues found in teachers' professional code of ethics, and (b) creation of an expanded set of issues of moral significance and associated moral standards. A summary of the outcomes from the three sources is provided in Appendix B.

Utilizing the triangulation method served two main purposes. First, it provided a validation mechanism of the relevance of moral issues represented in the teachers' professional code of ethics in contrast to the findings emerging from observations of the moral dimension of classroom interactions, as well as to the issues of moral significance identified by the teachers who completed the moral issues questionnaire. Secondly, utilizing the three sources of knowledge provided an opportunity to combine the issues specifically ascribed to the teaching profession in its codes of ethics (see Bebeau, Rest, & Yamoor, 1985) with both broader and more subtle issues transpiring through teachers' everyday interactions with students (Jackson et al., 1998). This approach to the development of test items, in which reports of critical incidents were combined with review of research and content analysis, was later enhanced by involving expert judges who provided guidance for further refinement of the test items and the accompanying scoring procedure (see Crocker & Algina, 1986).

The triangulation method applied in Study 1 provided an important validation element to the consideration of the issues outlined in the teachers' professional code of ethics by juxtaposing them against existing research on moral life in schools, as well as
by providing comparisons with issues emerging from experiences and stories that were put forward by practicing teachers. In addition to validating the “core” issues of moral relevance to public school teachers, two of the sources of knowledge utilized in Study 1 (research literature and questionnaires) provided a rich account of moral issues occurring in teachers’ interactions with students that often went beyond the realm of the formal code of ethics. The rich pool of issues provided a solid base for the subsequent development of the Teachers’ Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ), described in the following chapter.

Since the purpose of the TCQ was to assess the moral sensitivity of teachers, it was necessary to develop stimulus material that presented a realistic picture of everyday classroom interactions involving teachers and students. Several complementary sources of knowledge about the moral dimension of classroom interactions were employed in an effort to develop a comprehensive test consisting of scenarios whose scope spans over a range of moral issues. The issues sought were not meant to represent moral dilemmas of the kind often used in measures of moral reasoning, where two competing moral choices are presented for consideration (see Bebeau, 2002).

The first of the three sources of insight exploited in the present study was the teachers’ professional code of ethics. Parts of the latter provide explicit guidance to educators on their role in the classroom, and emphasize teachers’ responsibility for students’ learning and overall well-being (see BCTF, 2003). Secondly, research on the moral life of schools was examined that provided support for the argument that moral issues transpire through everyday classroom events that affect students’ moral development (Jackson et al., 1998). Finally, practicing teachers as well as those preparing
to become public school teachers in a post-baccalaureate program provided examples of morally charged interactions between teachers and students that they had encountered in their classrooms (Appendix B). The range of issues emerging from these three sources of knowledge on the moral dimension of classroom interactions provided the assurance that the newly developed measure of moral sensitivity for teachers would adequately address the issues considered to be both important from the professional perspective and indeed present in real classrooms. The triangulation approach was chosen as a validation mechanism, guaranteeing that only the most salient moral issues were selected for inclusion in the new measure.

For the purposes of the present study, the moral significance of teacher-student interactions was conceptualized in terms of the implications such interactions bear for the well-being of the stakeholders, most importantly the students. Attention was paid to the physical and emotional well-being of individual students, as well as whole classes of students, and to the elements of teacher-student interactions that can, and often do, serve as catalysts for safe and effective learning.

Moral sensitivity involves, among other things, an individual’s ability to spontaneously perceive the presence of moral elements in a situation (see Blum, 1994). A test of moral sensitivity, therefore, needs to revolve around the recognition of the moral elements in a situation and their appreciation in moral terms, rather than a person’s ability to choose issues of moral concern from a list—an approach that would be confounded with one’s knowledge of moral concepts, as well as some degree of moral reasoning (Clarkeburn, 2000). Consequently, moral sensitivity needs to be measured by means of a production test on which participants spontaneously generate and propose aspects of
situations they view as moral, in contrast to a recognition measure whereby participants are presented with a pre-established finite list of options from which they may pick one or more items of their choice.

The third condition was related to the goal of developing the new measure as one that could be used to determine levels of teachers' moral sensitivity in teacher education programs and professional development initiatives. Whereas the criteria for such administration would in many cases include a trouble-free administration to groups of teachers as well as quick and inexpensive scoring (Clarkeburn, 2000), it was deemed necessary to develop the new test as a paper-and-pencil measure. Some authors have suggested (Bebeau et al., 1985) that an interview format enables participants to provide lengthier responses that contain more cues to the participants' thinking, which tends to result in somewhat higher moral sensitivity scores. However, as both interviews and written tests seem to yield equally valid and reliable data (Bebeau et al., 1985), the choice of format may depend on the purpose for which a test is used (Clarkeburn, 2000). When the test is to be administered to groups and where time demands could be a concern, the written format seems to be more appropriate.
The Teachers' Professional Code of Ethics
- Respect
- Judiciousness
- Students' rights and sensibilities
- Confidentiality
- Privileged relationship with students

Observations of the Moral Life of Classrooms
- Effects of formal and informal curriculum
- Explicit moral rules, regulations, visual displays, comments
- Rituals, ceremonies
- Moral effects of curricular substructure

Moral Issues Questionnaire
- Safe and supportive learning environment
- Relating to students and understanding their problems
- Professionalism

Issues of Moral Significance in Teacher-Student Interactions

Figure 8. Issues of moral significance in teacher-student interactions emerging from the three sources of knowledge on moral sensitivity.
Considerations

The measures of moral sensitivity discussed in one of the earlier chapters serve as valuable research tools in the exploration of moral development in their respective domains of enquiry. Research utilizing these measures involved studies in which groups at different stages of moral development were compared, other studies that contrasted students at different stages in a study program, as well as studies that were designed to evaluate educational interventions with a moral sensitivity component. Many of those studies also provided comparisons of the distinct contributions of moral sensitivity and moral reasoning to an individual’s moral development (Bebeau, 2002).

By proposing that moral sensitivity within a professional domain be referred to as “ethical sensitivity,” so as to emphasize the normative elements characteristic of professional ethics, Bebeau (2002) pointed out the central role codes of ethics play in establishing rules of ethical professional practice. The development of some measures of moral sensitivity nevertheless follows less constrictive routes. For instance, Clarkeburn’s (2002) Test of Ethical Sensitivity in Science (TESS), although domain-specific, was not built upon any particular code of ethics, as it was not seen as “professional” in the same prescriptive sense that Bebeau (1994, 2002) proposed. The measure of moral sensitivity for high school teachers proposed within the framework of the present study follows a different path yet. As part of the triangulation design, it gathers issues of moral significance occurring in teaching practice from an established code of ethics, supported
by both a teacher certification body and a professional teacher organization. The examination of this normative source of knowledge about ethical teaching is complemented by the study of two descriptive sources—research literature on the moral life of schools, and a separate study designed to establish predominant issues of moral significance occurring in teacher-student interactions, as reported by a group of practicing teachers.

A thorough examination of the distinct characteristics of the existing measures as well as their effectiveness, combined with the consideration of the unique context of classroom interactions and the accompanying issues of moral significance, enabled the establishment of a set of conditions and criteria to guide the process of devising a test of moral sensitivity specific to the teaching domain. Once developed, the new Teachers’ Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ) was administered to a group of teachers with varying educational backgrounds, as well as different degrees of teaching experience. Subsequently, the reliability of the TCQ was examined, as was the validity of this new measure in comparison with two other measures.

The conceptualization of moral sensitivity for this study was informed by the outcomes that emerged from the triangulation procedure used in Study 1. As was already stated in the previous chapter, the moral dimension of teacher-student interactions extends beyond the notions encompassed by teachers’ professional codes of ethics. The effects of teachers’ awareness of this dimension, and conscious behaviour based upon such awareness, have significance for students’ well-being and their learning. Moral sensitivity as considered here takes account of teachers’ awareness of the moral dimension of their interactions with students.
As has already been suggested, one significant aspect of a teacher’s moral sensitivity is that teacher’s persistent concern for the learning and both physical and emotional well-being of the students placed in that teacher’s care. As has been indicated in the discussion of results of Study 1, some people perceive moral issues as controversial simply on the grounds that the notion of morality is value-laden, and values are often perceived to be a matter of individual choice. In Study 2, teachers’ moral sensitivity has therefore been conceptualized in terms of their concern for students’ learning and well-being, and this choice of term has been reflected in the title of the emerging measure, as well as in the instructions incorporated in this measure.

The specific motivation behind the development of a measure of teachers’ moral sensitivity was to enhance teachers’ moral sensitivity, as well as to enable teacher educators to identify the needs of teachers-in-training as well as those with years of teaching experience in terms of the sensitivity aspect of their moral development. An understanding of teachers’ levels of moral sensitivity and the patterns of their moral development was thought to further provide insight into how teachers’ needs can be better addressed by instructional means. It seemed desirable to develop a measure of teachers’ moral sensitivity that could be utilized as an educational tool aimed at increasing the moral sensitivity of both aspiring and practicing teachers—in both initial teacher education programs and professional development initiatives.

The intent in developing this measure of moral sensitivity was that it be practical to administer and relatively easy to score. As a measure of moral development, the newly developed test of moral sensitivity was expected to correlate moderately with a well established test of moral reasoning (Bebeau & Brabeck, 1987). In other words, teachers’
moral sensitivity, as assessed by the new measure, was expected to be related to other aspects of teachers' moral growth. As a paper-and-pencil test, the TCQ was also expected to exhibit a small but significant correlation with a measure of verbal ability.

Given the complex nature of high school teachers' jobs and the variety of players involved in learning-related interactions, the task of examining teachers' moral sensitivity is rather complex. Every day, teachers interact with students, their parents and other relatives, other teachers and school staff, counselors, visitors, and others. The teachers' moral sensitivity could be examined in relation to any of these subjects, with possibly different outcomes based on the teacher's role in each interaction. For the purposes of the present study, what is of key importance is the impact, both potential and actual, that teachers have on the students. Consideration of the students includes their well-being, their learning, and their development as moral persons. In many cases, the influence of the teacher on his or her students is exhibited in classroom interactions involving acts of teaching. Nevertheless, much anecdotal evidence exists that attests to the fact that students are affected by the choices and actions of their teachers in environments other than the classroom (e.g., Jackson et al., 1998).

It seems possible, although not inevitable, that in different settings, teachers might exhibit varying degrees of ability to perceive and adequately interpret moral situations. A teacher's choice of words and actions in the classroom may be determined (and emphasized) by the specific role the teacher assumes in front of students. If news reports are any indicator, some teachers assume a very different identity during their time away from school. Such anecdotal evidence of competing moral codes in a single individual
appears alarming in that it challenges the popular notion of the teacher as a person with a high degree of moral integrity who acts consistently as a role model.

Developing a measure of moral sensitivity that could encompass all interactions in which teachers can demonstrate moral sensitivity would be impossible, or at the very least impractical. Therefore, the newly developed test focuses on the teacher’s sensitivity to the moral dimensions of teacher-student interactions, as well as to the moral dimension of the students’ learning and physical and emotional well-being. On the one hand, the imposition of this condition greatly reduces the complexity of the interactions in which a teacher typically engages. On the other hand, it partially extends the notion of teacher’s moral sensitivity beyond the walls of the classroom. With the above condition in mind, the new test of teachers’ moral sensitivity focuses on a set of moral categories deemed representative of the most relevant issues in teachers’ interactions with students. It does not afford consideration to the moral dimension of interactions occurring among teachers, between teachers and other parties such as parents or school counsellors, or such choices or actions that do not have direct implications on students’ learning or well-being.

The TCQ

Method

Participants

Out of the total of 63 participants in the present study, 57 completed the TCQ and obtained scores of moral sensitivity, MS. Mean moral sensitivity for this sample was 2.82 and standard deviation was .65. The distribution of scores approximated the bell curve, which would be expected in a sample with varied demographic characteristics such as age, level of education, and amount of teaching experience.
The age of the participants ranged from 22 (8, or 12.7%) to 61 (1, or 1.6%). Many of the participants (15) were in the 22-23 year group, representing 28.3% of the sample. 71.4% (45) of all the participants were female, while 25.4% (16) were male, and 3.2% (2) did not provide information about their gender.

Of those who reported the degree of their teaching experience, 43.6% (24) had 1 year of teaching experience or less, 31% (17) reported having between 2 and 4 years of teaching experience, and 25.5% (14) indicated experience of 5 or more years (see Table 3). Of all participants, 76.9% (40) reported up to 1 year of teaching experience specific to the secondary level, while 9.6% (5) reported between 2 and 4 years or such experience, and 13.5% (7) of participants had 5 or more years of high school teaching experience. Additionally, 52.8% (28) of participants indicated having up to 1 year of other teaching experience, while 30.2% (16) had between 2 and 4 years, and 17% (9) had 5 or more years of such other teaching experience.

Table 3

*Degree of Teaching Experience (N = 55)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1 years</th>
<th>2-4 years</th>
<th>5+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall teaching experience</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

The TCQ. The TCQ consists of four vignettes, or scenarios, depicting teachers and students engaged in classroom interactions that fall into several moral categories as developed in the previous step. Participants who completed the TCQ were instructed to
read carefully each of the four scenarios and respond to a series of prompt questions about them. A scoring procedure was developed that yields a score of moral sensitivity, MS. Based on the MS score, a participant can be said to have a lower, medium, or higher degree of moral sensitivity.

The next step involved merging the categories that emerged from the three sources—research literature, teachers' code of ethics, and questionnaires completed by teachers—and deciding which of those categories of moral issues ought to be represented on the newly developed test of moral sensitivity (Appendix B).

Initially, two scenarios were constructed based on the newly developed categories, utilizing some elements from the stories that emerged from the literature and those put forward by the teachers who completed the questionnaires. Both scenarios comprised an extensive list of issues of moral significance (Appendix B). Each scenario was accompanied by the following instructions followed by seven prompt questions (the symbol 'X' would be replaced by the first name(s) of the teacher or teachers appearing in a specific scenario):

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond in complete sentences or paragraphs. Please read one question at a time and answer each question fully before moving on to read the next question. Do not go back to questions already answered.

1. What individual or individuals would you say is/are affected by what happened in this scenario?

2. What concerns, if any, do you have about X's thoughts, choices, and actions as a teacher? Explain why in your view these are concerns.

3. What would you say X should do differently to be a better teacher? Why?
4. What *would* you do differently?

5. What argument could be made against the position or positions you took?

6. What would you say are the issues in this particular situation? Please number the issues you listed according to their relative importance (1 = Most important). Explain why each issue is important.

7. Looking at the big picture, what is in the best interest of X and all concerned? Why?

The two scenarios were subsequently discussed with faculty members in Education and Psychology, and it was determined that the length (874 and 889 words, respectively) and complexity of both would likely make it difficult for participants to focus on task at hand. The complexity of the scenarios would also likely have an adverse affect on the task of developing a reliable scoring guide (Clarkeburn, 2000).

It was decided that four shorter scenarios would make up a test that would be easier and more comfortable both to complete and to score. It was also decided that shortening the initial scenarios would likely result in a greater reliability and validity of the outcomes. This decision was supported by reactions from several Education graduate students who reported that they would be rather reluctant to complete a questionnaire that contained such multifaceted stories, and would respond more favourably to a series of shorter and simpler stories.

The two initial scenarios provided a good foundation for the development of four shorter ones. Adjustments to the original stories were made, so a greater balance could be achieved between the number of issues and affected parties appearing in each scenario and the severity of the issues. Further, the level of recognizability of the embedded moral
issues was balanced across the four scenarios in order to maximize the variance of scores (Crocker & Algina, 1986).

The current version of the TCQ consists of four relatively short scenarios (314, 282, 227, and 423 words, respectively) depicting interactions between teachers and students, each followed by brief instructions and a set of seven prompt questions (see Appendix C). The readability of the TCQ, as determined by the Flesch-Kincaid Index, corresponds with language abilities of a typical grade 8 student. All four scenarios draw upon the same item domain, yet the selection of items varies from one scenario to the next (Crocker & Algina, 1986). Due to the various combinations of items in each of the four scenarios, it was hypothesized that the interaction effects among the issues would account for a portion of the variance in scores.

While each scenario targets a distinct set of issues of moral significance, a participant’s performance on all four scenarios translates into the overall score of moral sensitivity, MS. Each scenario was developed in such a way that the core moral issues that participants are likely to identify as issues of concern correspond with four main moral categories in each scenario. In other words, a total of four moral categories were believed to encompass the core issues embedded in each scenario. Among the four scenarios, the TCQ captures moral issues believed to belong to nine categories (Appendix E).

*Quick Word Test.* In order to establish the discriminant validity of the TCQ by verifying that what it measures is more than mere verbal skills or general intelligence, the Quick Word Test: Level 1 (Borgatta, 1964) was administered to the participants along with the TCQ. The Quick Word Test is a multiple-choice, objective, and self-
administered measure of English vocabulary skills designed for adolescents and adults. Each of the 100 items on this test consists of a target word followed by a series of four option words one of which is a synonym for the target word. Out of the four option words, participants are instructed to circle the word that means the same as the target word. The test score is calculated as the number of correct responses. The test authors report strong validity and reliability, including split-half reliability coefficients greater than .90 and correlations greater than .80 with the Verbal, Total, and IQ scales on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (Borgatta & Corsini, 1964, 1967).

In the present study, a shortened version of the Quick Word Test consisting of 50 self-report items was used (Appendix D). This shortened version reduced the time needed for administration and scoring, while having a reported reliability equal to that of the full version (Borgatta & Corsini, 1960). The scores on the shortened version can range from 0 (no correct responses) to 50 (all responses correct). Manual scoring was helped by developing a semi-transparent matrix that accelerated counting correctly identified option words by highlighting table cells that contain the correct answers.

It was hypothesized that the correlation between a participant's score on the TCQ and that on the QWT would be nonsignificant, thereby providing discriminant validation for the TCQ in the present study by demonstrating that these two tests measure concepts of a different nature.

*Defining Issues Test.* The Defining Issues Test and its revised version, DIT-2, is a multiple choice, objective, and self-administered measure of moral reasoning. It assesses the way people define crucial moral issues in a hypothetical conflict situation (Rest, 1979). DIT-2 consists of five dilemmas representing modern social problems. For each of
the dilemmas, participants evaluate a set of 12 issues by rating the importance of the issue in deciding what ought to be done in the situation presented in the dilemma. Participants first rate each item as being of great, much, some, little, or no importance. Subsequently, participants rank the four issues identified as being of greatest importance. Responses are analyzed as activating three schemas; Personal Interest, Maintaining Norms, and Postconventional Schema. The authors of the Defining Issues Test propose that the scores on the DIT-2 measure developmental adequacy, specifically ways in which people conceptualize how cooperation can be organized in a society (Rest & Narváez, 1998).

The authors of the DIT-2 report that its readability is at the grade 9 level (Rest & Narváez, 1998).

Reliability and validity of the DIT-2 have been well established. Various studies have shown that the participant's level of education accounts for 30% to 50% of the variance of DIT-2 scores, which is accompanied by strong longitudinal gains. The DIT-2 shows significant relationship with measures of cognitive capacity, particularly moral comprehension (r = .60s), as well as recall and reconstruction of postconventional moral arguments. Higher DIT-2 scores are also significantly linked to desirable professional decision making and prosocial behaviours. In combination with measures of cultural ideology, the DIT-2 has been reported to predict up to two thirds of the variance of controversial public policy issues. Reliability of the DIT-2 is considered adequate, with both Cronbach alpha and test-retest reliability in the upper .70s and low .80s. Test authors also report discriminant validity of the DIT-2 from verbal ability and general intelligence, as well as equal validity for both genders (Rest & Narváez, 1998).
Design and Procedure

Several strategies were employed simultaneously to recruit participants. The target population included practicing teachers, graduate students in the field of education, as well as those preparing to become teachers in an initial teacher preparation program in a university. Instructors in a Faculty of Education of a major public Western Canadian university were approached about facilitating a brief (5-10 minute) introduction of the present study to their students by the present author or a research associate, followed by an invitation to participate in this study. The target population consisted of post-baccalaureate and graduate students in the field of education with an expressed interest in secondary education. Students interested in participating were asked to provide their contact information on a sign-in sheet. These students were later provided additional information about the study and supplied with a test envelope. In addition to a cover letter, two copies of consent form, a brief demographic data form, and a prize draw slip, each envelope contained one copy each of the TCQ, Defining Issues Test, and Quick Word Test.

Most participants were introduced to the present study and invited to listen to a short presentation delivered either at the beginning or end of one of their classes. Some responded to announcements posted in the Faculty of Education building. As compensation for their time and contribution, all participants who provided their contact information were automatically included in a random draw for one of up to five prizes of $50 each, one per 20 participants. Once data collection was deemed completed, the draw was conducted and cheques were mailed to the winners. Participants in the initial study involving a battery of three tests—the TCQ, Quick Word Test, and DIT-2—were offered an
opportunity to retake the TCQ no less than 2 weeks after completing the initial battery. All of those who participated in the TCQ retest received a compensation of $15. In total, 13 participants took part in the retest.

On the demographic data form included with the test battery, participants were asked to indicate whether they may be contacted about participating in a shorter retest, consisting solely of the TCQ, for which they would automatically receive a separate cash reward of $15. Those who agreed to be contacted were invited to participate in the retest; some of them later declined quoting a loss of interest in the study or lack of time as reasons. Most of those who agreed to participate in the retest did so between 2 and 4 weeks after participating in the initial study, based on the date on which their original envelope was received. Envelopes containing the TCQ were mailed to those who agreed to participate in the retest, and a cheque in the amount of $15 was mailed upon receipt of each participant’s retest envelope. Thirteen completed TCQs were returned as part of the retest, all of which were scorable. All of these tests were included in the data analysis.

Although well over 200 individuals indicated interest in completing the test battery consisting of the newly developed TCQ, Quick Word Test, and DIT-2, and obtained the test package, far fewer packages were ultimately received. In total, 63 participants returned the package, most of whom completed all three measures. Some returned packages were missing consent form and contact information, disqualifying them from being included in the study. Two individuals returned the packages indicating their choice to withdraw from the study, quoting the time demands posed by the test battery as the reason.
The DIT-2 and TCQ were each designed as a measure of a unique component of moral development. While the DIT-2 is a test of moral reasoning, the TCQ was developed to measure an individual's moral sensitivity. According to Rest's (1987) Four Component Model of moral development, each of the four components makes a unique contribution to an individual's growth as a moral person. Each of the components needs to be present in order for an individual to exhibit consistent moral behaviour. Based on Rest's (1987) model, it could be expected that a moderate correlation would exist between a participant's score on the DIT-2 and that on the TCQ. Research has shown (e.g., Bebeau & Brabeck, 1987) that the correlations between the Defining Issues Test and moral sensitivity tests, namely the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test (DEST), have been consistent, but rather moderate at .2 to .3. More recent studies (Bebeau, 1994; Fravel & Bebeau, 1999) have shown even lower correlations between the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test and the DIT, ranging from .06 to .12. These values suggest that an individual's ability to perceive certain aspects of situations and interpret them in moral terms is consistently related to that individual's ability to develop a balanced view of a moral situation, although the relationship between those two abilities is weak to moderate.

Participants in the present study were asked to complete the DIT-2 along with the TCQ, so the hypothesized presence of a consistent positive correlation between the two measures could be tested, thereby providing convergent validation of the relationship between the two tests of moral development.

A scoring checklist and an algorithm to be used to derive scores of moral sensitivity from the checklists were developed based on the nine categories (Appendix
E). As well, a set of instructions were devised to guide the rater through the scoring process. However, preliminary scoring using this checklist revealed that the two raters occasionally experienced difficulty decisively matching an issue reported by a participant with only one of the eleven categories on the checklist. This was perceived as a potential reliability threat, which prompted further revision of the categories.

To remedy the problem, two pairs of categories were collapsed into two single categories, and the wording of these new categories was changed. The fine-tuning of the categories yielded a new scoring checklist, and improved the instructions for the rater. Both raters reported that the refined checklist was noticeably less ambiguous, thus easier to use. The improvements resulted in a decrease in the difficulty deciding on the best fit for some issues previously experienced by the raters.

The scoring checklist provides an instant visual representation of the distribution of the issues reported by a participant on the categories on the TCQ. Nevertheless, in order to obtain the actual scores for the given participant, a scoring formula needs to be applied to the checklist. This component of the scoring process is removed from marking issues on the checklist for two reasons. First, it can reduce the amount of work required of an external rater, especially in case multiple raters are used. Secondly, the risk of bias by the rater and a possible temptation to tweak the marks on the checklist, thus influencing the actual scores, is lowered.

Once a rater completes the scoring checklist, the actual scores for the given participant are arrived at by applying a straightforward calculation formula. A moral sensitivity score, MS, is obtained for each participant. Additional scores may be
calculated for research purposes, or to provide a more detailed insight into the various aspects of a participant's moral sensitivity.

The TCQ scoring procedure involves two steps. First, reading through the participant's responses, the scorer notes issues of moral significance proposed by the participant in the appropriate cells on the scoring checklist. A total of nine categories are included in the checklist, and these categories are the same across the four scenarios. The categories have been devised to capture all of the moral issues occurring in the four scenarios. Non-moral issues or other aspects of the participant's responses are not noted or marked.

For each scenario, the scoring checklist represents a matrix where the nine categories of moral issues are presented as rows and the seven test items are shown as columns. Each response considered as clearly identifying a moral issue is noted by way of a mark ("✓" or "x") in the appropriate cell of the matrix. The scorer is instructed to only assign one mark per response. If a response is complex and involves a number of different moral issues, the scorer needs to mark it in the category that represents the best fit for the response. However, in case a response is multifold, involving a list of distinctly identified issues whose moral nature is clearly reasoned, it would be considered as several separate responses and marked accordingly.

In items number 2 (concerns), 3 (should do), 4 (would do), 5 (counter-argument), and 7 (best for all), participants identify the issues of moral significance present in the scenarios, the concerns they have about those issues, and actions that may be required in response to those issues and concerns. In addition, item 1 involves identifying the individuals affected by the issues present in each scenario. Item 6 provides an opportunity
for the participant to enumerate and subsequently rank the issues of concern based on their relative importance. The same procedure for marking responses in a matrix defined by moral categories and test items applies to each of the four scenarios, although each scenario comes with a distinct set of four categories of moral issues.

The second step in scoring TCQs involves transforming marks from the scoring checklist to scores. This part of the scoring procedure can be separated from the previous one. Whereas it involves following a rather straightforward transformation algorithm, this step can be performed by an assistant who has not been trained in using the checklist. This procedure provides some relief for the trained scorer, particularly in cases where the number of TCQs to score is greater.

Although various partial scores can be calculated based on items, scenarios, or moral categories represented on the TCQ, the score of particular import here is the overall moral sensitivity score, MS. Two key factors contribute to the MS score: (a) the number of categories of issues of concern identified by the participant in each story, and (b) the number of individuals affected by the concerning issues in each story. The following section provides a conceptual explanation of the scoring procedure and the meaning of the MS score.

Each of the four scenarios on the TCQ is based on a set of four fundamental categories of issues of moral significance. The fact that a participant identifies one or more issues corresponding with a particular moral category is viewed as an indication of that participant’s sensitivity to that category. The intentional redundancy embedded in the range of test items assures that participants are given an abundance of opportunities to consider whether an issue is of moral significance or not. The number of instances of
identification of a particular category of issues of concern is not considered relevant; what is important is that the particular category of moral issues is indeed identified. By providing multiple opportunities to consider issues of potential concern from different perspectives (what the issue is, what should be done, what one would do, what would be in the best interest of all concerned, etc.), this mechanism of multiple parallel prompts is believed to improve the chances of a category being identified.

Each moral category identified by a participant counts toward his or her overall moral sensitivity score, MS. All categories across all four scenarios are weighted the same. An equal contributor to the overall MS score is the indicator of sufficiency of the number of individuals identified in item 1 as those being affected by the moral issues found in each of the four stories. The following formula may help explain the calculations involved in deriving the moral sensitivity score. First, the moral sensitivity subscore based on each individual story (scenario) is determined as follows:

\[
MS_{story} = C_{story} + I_{story}
\]

where

- \( C_{story} \) ... number of categories identified in the story (items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7)
- \( I_{story} \) ... 1 if the number of individuals identified in the story was \( \geq 3 \);
  0 otherwise (item 1)

Subsequently, the overall moral sensitivity score, MS, is calculated as the mean of all per-story MS_{story} subscores, as follows:

\[
MS = (MS_1 + MS_2 + MS_3 + MS_4) / 4
\]

Whereas moral sensitivity subscales based on individual stories produce scores in the range of 0 to 5, the overall moral sensitivity scale too yields scores in the same range.
Intuitively, the MS scores of 0 and 1 denote lower levels of moral sensitivity, scores of 2 and 3 represent the mid-range, and scores of 4 and 5 show higher levels of an individual's moral sensitivity. This interpretation of the range of MS scores confirms the initial conceptual hypothesis that three broad levels of moral sensitivity can be identified. A similar three-tier system was recently proposed by Clarkeburn (2000, 2002) for the Test of Ethical Sensitivity in Science (TESS).

The conceptual interpretation of the distribution of MS scores is as follows: Participants who score at the lowest level perceive only the most obvious moral elements (issues, actions, affected individuals) of situations, or are unable to provide adequate rationales for putting issues forward as moral ones. Individuals who receive scores in the middle of the MS range identify a number of significant moral elements in situations involving teacher-student interactions and their interpretation of the issues is clearer, yet the picture painted by their responses is not comprehensive. For example, some individuals severely impacted by developments in some of the stories are overlooked, or a balance of perspectives in a complex situation is not achieved. Towards the higher end of the spectrum in terms of their MS scores are those participants who exhibit sensitivity to the greatest number of moral elements present in the stories, and they exhibit a solid understanding of the moral nature of those elements.

Higher scores on the TCQ obviously appear more desirable than lower ones. It is important to note, however, that individuals with even the lowest measured levels of moral sensitivity might have the ability to exhibit exceptional moral behaviour. This could be due to the fact that moral reasoning and moral action can occur when an individual is subjected to an external prompt about the moral dimension of a situation.
Also, it would seem obvious that an individual might exhibit moral behaviour without being aware of its moral nature. Further, some participants may be unable, for a variety of reasons, to demonstrate their levels of moral sensitivity on a paper-and-pencil measure such as the TCQ. Developing alternative formats of the TCQ, such as interviews, could prove useful in facilitating the expression of moral sensitivity. Also, other ways of assessing individuals’ moral sensitivity could be of utility, such as direct observations, self-reports, or other-reports. Each assessment tool nevertheless comes with its own set of challenges and limitations, including the ease and costs of administration, bias, an increased potential for the Hawthorne effect, and others.

In her design of the Test of Ethical Sensitivity in Science (TESS), Clarkeburn (2000) conceptualized lower levels of moral sensitivity in terms of a participant’s limited ability to recognize moral issues in a situation. In her model, demonstrated awareness of implications of the issues so recognized automatically moves an individual to the second tier of moral sensitivity. Finally, a great degree of the recognition of both presence and implications of moral issues places a person into the top tier. The approach taken in the present work differs from Clarkeburn’s (2000) in the way the components of perception and interpretation are conceptually integrated within moral sensitivity (see Blum, 1994; Endicott, 1999; Lapsley, 1999; Narváez & Endicott, 1999). The design of the TCQ presupposes that a degree of both moral perception and moral interpretation needs to be present to accredit an individual with even a limited degree of moral sensitivity. A mere enumeration of issues, albeit moral, receives no credit on the TCQ if no rationalization is present that indicates a degree of the participant’s understanding that, or why, those issues ought to be considered moral.
An associated issue is that of one’s position on moral issues. Whereas the TCQ is aimed at assessing an individual’s sensitivity to the moral dimension of situations, the moral sensitivity score obtained on this test does not take into consideration the specific position or recommendation the individual may make regarding desirable action or outcome of a scenario. As a measure of moral sensitivity, the TCQ merely assesses one’s ability to perceive the moral elements (issues, actions, affected individuals) present in a situation, and interpret these elements in moral terms. Moral reasoning, as well as moral motivation and moral character are all components of moral development closely connected to moral sensitivity, yet each makes a unique contribution to individuals’ moral growth.

Results and Discussion

Relations of the TCQ to Gender, Age, Level of Education, and Teaching Experience

Gender. To examine the relation of gender to the TCQ, a t-test was conducted. A significant relationship was found between the participants’ score of moral sensitivity and gender, t(55) = -2.343, p < .05. The mean MS score for male participants was 2.5 (n = 15, SD = .6), which was lower than the mean MS score for female participants, 2.94 (n = 42, SD = .63).

In order to examine whether the verbal nature of the TCQ might be a potential confound when considering differences between men and women participants, a one-way Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, with the MS score as the dependent variable and scores from the QWT as a covariate. Results revealed that even when accounting for the difference in performance on a verbal ability measure, female participants (M = 2.93, SD = .1) obtained higher scores on the TCQ than did male
participants \( \bar{M} = 2.52, \bar{SD} = .16 \), \( F(1, 55) = 4.741, p < .05 \). This finding indicates that factors other than verbal ability might explain the difference in scores on the TCQ obtained by women and men.

One possible explanation of this finding could be a likely significant correlation between moral sensitivity as assessed by the TCQ and caring, whereas women tend to score slightly higher on tests of caring than do men (Skoe, 1993; Skoe, Pratt, Matthews, & Curror, 1996). Another, similar argument giving support to the gender difference on the TCQ could be that moral sensitivity is a concept closely related to empathy, and it has been shown that women typically score higher on measures of empathy than do men (Eisenberg, Strayer, & Shantz, 1990).

**Age.** The relation between the score of moral sensitivity and the participants' self-reported age was found to be nonsignificant ( 0.04, NS). This finding suggests that factors other than age may contribute significantly to the development of moral sensitivity in individuals. With respect to teachers, the implication of this finding seems to be the importance of further investigation into the possibilities of enhancing teachers' moral sensitivity by means of educational interventions.

**Level of education.** No significant relationship was detected between the participants' self-reported status in university (level of education) and their MS scores, \( t(50) = -1.42, p = .161 \). Whereas preservice teachers \( n = 39 \) exhibited mean MS score of 2.8, graduate students \( n = 13 \), of whom seven were master's students and six were doctoral students) demonstrated mean MS score of 3.1. The remaining five participants who were neither post-baccalaureate nor graduate students averaged an MS score of 2.3. This finding might lend support to one of the following claims: (a) dedicating more time
to obtaining formal education does not by itself lead to an increase in moral sensitivity, or (b) graduate programs do not differ significantly from undergraduate education in their ability to enhance students' moral sensitivity.

Increased exposure to morally charged contexts is nevertheless likely to be a contributing factor to the enhancement of one's moral sensitivity. The higher level of moral sensitivity in graduate students, although not significantly different from that of preservice teachers, might be an indicator of a greater amount of exposure to morally significant teaching situations. Consequently, it could be argued that an effective educational intervention could be devised that enhances moral sensitivity among the teaching population by providing teachers with opportunities to discuss, and reflect upon, classroom situations of moral significance. Such an intervention could undoubtedly benefit preservice teachers and graduate students of education alike, and ultimately have an affect on the moral development of those teachers' students as well.

Table 4

*Mean Moral Sensitivity by Level of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean TCQ</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentage of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teaching experience.* It was expected that a significant positive relationship might be found between individuals' scores of moral sensitivity and the degree of their teaching experience. Results of correlational analyses nevertheless revealed (see Table 4) no
significant relationship between the participants’ TCQ scores and their level of overall teaching experience, teaching experience at the secondary school level, or other teaching experience. This finding would seem to indicate that a greater degree of teaching experience by itself may not be a sufficient catalyst for the enhancement of teachers’ moral sensitivity, although it can be expected that an increased exposure to the moral content of teacher-student interactions plays a role in this process. Perhaps a specifically structured educational intervention, containing appropriate prompts to the moral dimension of interactions occurring in schools, might be successful in this regard.

Table 5

*Relations of Teaching Experience to the TCQ (N = 50)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCQ</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall teaching experience</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teaching experience</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teaching experience</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It could be speculated that following an initial period of enculturation to the profession, teachers experience a rather steady flow of morally significant stimuli. With increased teaching experience, teachers might default to a toolbox of strategies that previously proved successful in addressing moral issues as they emerge in classroom interactions. It is difficult to determine the extent to which such automatized behaviour may involve the teacher’s awareness of the situation in concern as being a moral one. It would appear likely, however, that the moral nature of the issue may contribute to a
further refinement of the teacher’s ability to respond to the situation in the most fitting way.

Reliability Evidence for the TCQ

**Internal reliability.** The TCQ comprises four scenarios involving teacher-student interactions, each of which addresses a different set of moral issues, affected individuals, and proposed courses of action. Due to the distinctive nature of each of the four scenarios, the overall internal reliability of the TCQ (Cronbach’s alpha = .30) thus does not provide the appropriate mechanism for assessing the measure’s internal reliability.

**Test-retest reliability.** Following the initial administration of a battery of tests consisting of the TCQ, QWT, and DIT-2, a randomly selected sample of 13 participants completed the TCQ again as a retest. The retest was administered approximately 2 to 4 weeks following the completion of the initial test battery. Intraclass correlation was used to determine the relationship between the original scores and those on the retest, as well as to examine the mean difference between the two administrations of the TCQ. The relationship between the MS scores obtained during the initial administration and those received during the retest was positive and significant (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intraclass correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest reliability</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

Table 6

**Test-Retest Reliability of the TCQ**
Inter-rater reliability. A random selection of 16 completed TCQs (28%) were scored by a second rater. The two raters, each of whom had a master’s degree in the field of education, were given the same detailed instructions on scoring the TCQs and otherwise received no special training. Intraclass correlation was used to assess the extent of agreement between the two raters in terms of both order and difference. The inter-rater agreement obtained by the two scorers based on an intraclass correlation coefficient was very high (.90**, p < .001), higher than initially predicted. This finding provided evidence of a high degree of stability of the scoring procedure. Such high inter-rater reliability may be, in part, a result of the specific scoring method developed for the TCQ.

Table 7
Inter-Rater Reliability of the TCQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intraclass correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .001.

Validity Evidence for the TCQ

Relation of the TCQ to the Quick Word Test. A completed shortened form of the Quick Word Test: Level 1 was obtained from 60 participants. The participants’ scores ranged from 13 to 47, with the mean of 37.5 and standard deviation of 6.70.

A positive significant relationship (.27*, p < .05) was found between the participants’ scores on the TCQ and those on the Quick Word Test. Previous research examining other measures of moral sensitivity in relation to verbal fluency (Bebeau,
1994; Fravel & Bebeau, 1999) has evidenced small to moderate correlations (.20 to .40) between these two variables. This finding appears appropriate, given the verbal nature of the stimulus stories, prompt questions, and responses collected on the TCQ.

Relation of the TCQ to the Defining Issues Test. Among the received packages were 60 that contained a completed DIT-2 Answer Sheet. In order to control the overall cost of the present study, some packages were distributed with a photocopy of the machine readable DIT-2 answer sheet rather than the original. Data received on the photocopied forms had to be manually transferred to original forms before processing. The DIT-2 answer sheets received were sent, in two batches, to the Center for the Study of Ethical Development at the University of Minnesota for scoring. Scores were received on computer disks accompanied by printed summaries. Seven participants either did not provide a sufficient number of responses, or failed internal consistency checks. Those participants were purged from further processing. Valid scores were obtained for the remaining 53 participants, and their N2 scores based on the DIT-2 were used in the present study.

Data analysis further revealed a positive correlation between the TCQ and DIT-2 ($r = .33^*, p < .01$). This finding provides support for the convergent validity of the TCQ by demonstrating its positive relationship with the level of moral reasoning. It also supports the contention that while both the DIT-2 and TCQ are measures of moral development, they access somewhat different capacities within the moral domain. Both moral reasoning and moral sensitivity can contribute significantly to one’s development as a moral person, and can improve the chances of that individual’s exhibiting consistent moral behaviour.
Although the indicators of reliability and validity presented here suggest that the newly developed TCQ has merit in assessing moral sensitivity of individuals, further research is needed in order to strengthen the evidence. Administering the TCQ to additional and larger samples is one way of potentially securing a greater degree of confidence in the reliability of this measure. At the same time, a comprehensive strategy to gathering evidence of construct, content, and criterion-related validity of the TCQ as a measure of moral sensitivity is needed in order to support the preliminary findings emerging from this study (Hubley & Zumbo, 1996).
GENERAL DISCUSSION

Based on the conceptualization of moral sensitivity as one of the integral components of moral development, interconnected with moral reasoning, moral motivation, and moral character (Rest, 1983, 1984), and on the Aristotelian understanding of education as an inherently moral endeavor (see Tom, 1984), the present study sought to investigate teachers’ attentiveness to the moral dimension of teacher-student interactions. This objective was accomplished through a comprehensive examination of issues of moral significance in teacher-student interactions utilizing three distinct sources of knowledge; teachers’ professional code of ethics, research of the moral life of schools involving observations of teachers interacting with students, and teachers’ testimonials of everyday classroom situations and issues of moral concern. Using the triangulation method, issues of moral significance emerging from these sources were combined to provide a foundation for the development of a measure of secondary school teachers’ moral sensitivity. Those issues most closely corresponding to actual issues of moral significance that secondary level teachers face in their classrooms, as determined by a panel of experienced educators, informed the development of the four scenarios on the TCQ.

The four scenarios included in the TCQ depicted teachers and students interacting in everyday classroom situations. Each scenario was accompanied by a set of seven questions whose purpose was to guide the participant in the process of identifying the issues of concern in each specific scenario, individuals affected by the issues, and any action that might need to be taken in response to the depicted interactions. In line with the
conceptualization of moral sensitivity as involving both the perception of issues of concern and the interpretation of these as moral issues (Narváez, 1996), each response to the prompt questions needed to be clearly stated and reasons given for its inclusion as an issue of concern. The responses that matched one or more predefined categories of moral concern received credit towards a score of moral sensitivity. The TCQ yields a level of moral sensitivity based on both the quantity of issues, stakeholders, and actions identified by the participant as being of concern, and the quality of their interpretation in moral terms.

Based on the sample that participated in the present study, the TCQ showed high inter-rater reliability, as well as moderately high test-retest reliability, considering the limited sample size. A key finding was the empirical support for the presence of a significant positive relationship between the participants' status in university and their moral sensitivity. This result is important for future research efforts aimed at enhancing teachers' moral sensitivity by means of educational interventions. Whereas moral sensitivity does not appear to be significantly related to age or years of teaching experience, it is assumed that the enhancement of teachers' moral sensitivity could be introduced at any point in one's teaching career, whether in an initial teacher education program, or as part of teachers' professional development endeavours.

The present study confirmed the initial hypothesis that the TCQ would exhibit a significant positive correlation with the Quick Word Test, which echoes earlier findings with other measures of moral sensitivity administered in written or interview format. Similarly, the third measure administered along with the TCQ and Quick Word Test—the Defining Issues Test—showed significant positive correlation with the TCQ, confirming
the initial hypothesis that moral sensitivity and moral reasoning represented two closely linked concepts. While moral sensitivity and moral reasoning each make a distinct contribution to a person’s moral development, convergent validation in the present study confirmed that both of these components of morality tap into the same domain.

Strengths of the Study

Building upon the foundations laid by previous research in psychology, philosophy, and curriculum development, it was hypothesized that moral sensitivity is an area of interest and concern to practicing teachers, and that teachers’ preparedness to face the challenges of classroom interactions as morally sensitive individuals could contribute to a betterment of education and a better care for students’ lives.

In Study 1, three sources of knowledge of moral sensitivity were utilized in developing a comprehensive model of teachers’ sensitivity to the moral dimension of their interactions with students. In addition to the prescriptive and inevitably limited system of moral values embedded in the teachers’ professional code of ethics, two descriptive sources of knowledge were employed. Observations of practicing teachers, as reported by Jackson et al. (1998) provided evidence of the moral richness of classroom interactions, and eight moral categories characteristic of school environments were suggested. Finally, a questionnaire was developed as part of the present study, which was then used to collect practicing teachers’ testimonials of issues and stories they perceived as having moral meaning. A triangulation method was utilized to validate the already established notions of morally significant aspects of teaching on the one hand, and to extend the understanding of teachers’ situatedness in the moral context of schools on the other. This approach enabled the expansion of knowledge on what constitutes morality
with respect to the role of teachers beyond the constraints of the teachers’ professional code of ethics and beyond students’ experiences within the school.

In Study 2, a new measure of moral sensitivity specific to high school teachers was developed and validated. The new measure, the TCQ, consists of four scenarios based on real classroom interactions, each followed by a series of seven prompt questions. The questions are meant to facilitate the identification of issues of moral significance in teacher-student interactions, stakeholders affected by such interactions, and appropriate responses to such encounters once they are perceived as moral. The TCQ can be administered in written form and scored using a simple scoring checklist and a simple calculation. The two raters involved in the present study have shown a high degree of agreement in scoring the questionnaires, which gives promise to a high reliability of this measure and its easy adoption in schools. Overall, the present study has yielded promising evidence of reliability and validity for the TCQ. Upon further refinement, this measure could be used as an effective tool for the assessment of the moral sensitivity of high school teachers.

It is hoped that one of the important applications of this new measure could be in enabling teacher educators to develop intervention programs to enhance the sensitivities of teachers before they enter the teaching profession, as well as to develop opportunities for practicing teachers’ ongoing professional development. Positive experiences from the well researched intervention program at the University of Minnesota (based on the Dental Ethical Sensitivity Test) could help guide the development of educational programs specific to the teaching profession.
One of the benefits of the TCQ—especially if a version is developed and validated that would allow administering this measure online—is its potential for self-scoring by the participant, or immediate scoring by an online system, an approach that empowers the participant and creates conditions for instant learning and professional growth.

Limitations of the Study

Whereas the findings in the present study were based on a relatively small and opportunistically gathered sample, more research is needed to help establish the power of the TCQ to generalize to other populations. Although three sources were used in the process of gathering the issues of concern that many teachers face in their everyday interactions with students, the list of issues obtained, and particularly the list of categories that were reflected in the TCQ, is finite and therefore likely not inclusive of all possible issues of concern that may arise in teacher-student interactions. Further research may contribute other stories and issues that could be considered in further improving this test in the future, potentially making it both further refined and more comprehensive.

It is recognized that the scenarios on the TCQ were developed largely based on the experiences of public school teachers who have acquired most of their teaching experience in Western Canada. Potentially, the concerns of teachers serving in other regions and cultures could differ significantly from those that Western Canadian teachers experience. Furthermore, the conceptual understanding of what constitutes morality and what obligations teachers have with respect to their students' learning and well-being continues to evolve. As some of the issues captured by the present version of this test might not have been viewed as issues of moral concern several years ago, new issues will
likely emerge in the future that may be perceived as more salient, more controversial, more closely linked to the purposes of formal education, etc., than those incorporated into the present version of the TCQ. Continuous improvement of both the scenarios and categories of moral issues implemented in this measure on the one hand, and the scoring system on the other, will likely improve its ability to continue serving educators in identifying ways to improve teachers' moral sensitivity well into the future.

One of the limitations of the present version of the TCQ is the amount of time needed for its administration as well as for scoring. Further administrations of this test and subsequent data analyses may shed light on how the TCQ can be shortened. Perhaps one or more of the seven prompt questions currently attached to each scenario could be eliminated while maintaining the test's power to assess the moral sensitivity of teachers. Based on the feedback received from the participants in the present study, some participants have found the seven prompt questions to be somewhat redundant, but others have expressed their appreciation for the opportunities created by the multitude of prompt questions to address issues embedded in the four scenarios on the TCQ from different perspectives.

It appears noteworthy that several participants have put forward a wider range of responses and discussed different issues in response to the various prompt items. Those participants tended to obtain somewhat higher scores of moral sensitivity than their peers who provided rather similar responses to more than one prompt question. On the one hand, a more extensive set of prompt items may be seen as a practical hindrance, but on the other, some individuals clearly benefit from more, and more varied, prompts. Further
insight into the possibility of removing some of the prompts from the present measure, along with a careful consideration of the implications of such a move, appear warranted.

Brabeck and Sirin (2001) suggested that moral sensitivity could be effectively measured by a test whose administration is facilitated by technological means. Developing an electronic version of the TCQ and allowing teachers to self-administer it either using a CD-ROM or on the Internet may be yet another valid approach to improving the practicality of administration and scoring of the new measure. However, although such an approach would likely appeal to many teachers who might prefer typing their responses rather than writing them by hand, others may nevertheless prefer a true paper-and-pencil measure. In order to accommodate the different preferences without creating a disadvantage for some, providing a choice of medium for the administration and scoring of this measure might perhaps work best.

Finally, a refinement of the prompts may be a worthwhile next step. The presence of prompts, their number, and their level of specificity are all related to how moral sensitivity is conceptualized. Whereas perception has been proposed as one of the two core conceptual elements in the notion of moral sensitivity (the other one being interpretation), due care ought to be exercised in revising instructions and prompt questions in order to balance the benefits of greater detail with the risk of leading the participant, or providing more space for the activation of participant’s moral reasoning, thus reducing the power of the TCQ as a measure of moral sensitivity.

It is important to recognize that the TCQ was designed specifically to assess high school teachers’ sensitivity to the moral aspect of teacher-student interactions, where students’ learning and well-being were brought to the forefront of attention and concern.
Yet other types of interactions are likely to play a significant role in teachers’ moral development as well, namely interactions with other teachers, administrators, and students’ parents and guardians. In its present form, the TCQ does not account for the impact such professional relationships may have on teachers’ moral growth and specifically their moral sensitivity.

Although the stories represented on the TCQ are based on classroom incidents and issues reported by experienced teachers, an argument could be made that they are nevertheless hypothetical, construed scenarios. As seems to be the case with tests of moral reasoning based on moral dilemmas, an individual’s response to artificial prompts on a test of moral sensitivity may yield a response that is different from that individual’s response to a similar situation occurring in a real classroom. It would therefore seem worthwhile pursuing an exploration of possibilities of assessing moral sensitivity in real life settings rather than in response to a test.

Recommendations for Future Research

Whereas the improvement of moral sensitivity is likely to be facilitated by thoughtfully prepared educational interventions, more emphasis needs to be placed on this aspect of moral development in initial teacher preparation, as well as in graduate programs taken by teachers. Given the finding that teachers’ moral sensitivity does not appear to rise spontaneously in response to the mere level of teaching experience, it would also seem essential that professional development initiatives be devised to address the needs of practicing teachers in their ability to recognize, and prepare to respond to, the various aspects of the moral dimension of classroom interactions.
The present study illuminates some opportunities for the use of the TCQ in enhancing teachers' sensitivity to the moral dimension of their interactions with students. The TCQ shows promise of benefiting teachers and teacher educators in these efforts. It is however imperative to recognize that in its present form, the TCQ can only serve as a preliminary measure of the phenomenon. More empirical research is needed to provide the necessary evidence of reliability and validity to support the adoption of this new measure as an educational tool, leave alone as a potential screening mechanism that might be used in teacher preparation programs. It would be highly inappropriate and morally objectionable to use this tool, in its present form, in any way that could prevent or discourage aspiring teachers from entering the teaching profession, or that might label some individuals as being of inadequate moral abilities.

Representativeness of Moral Issues

More research is needed in order to further assess this measure's effectiveness in measuring moral sensitivity of teachers. Particularly, studies with larger and more diverse samples can shed light on how this measure generalizes to other populations. Despite the fact that the moral issues presented in the four scenarios on the TCQ are believed to be largely independent of cultural conventions (Turiel, 1983, 2002), their situatedness in specific school contexts may make them well suited for administration in some regions and to some cultural and ethnic groups, but less so in others. Although the moral nature of the issues presented in these scenarios may be evident, it is hypothesized here that the perceived salience of these issues, or the degree of spontaneity with which these issues can be recognized, may be culture-dependent. Further research is therefore needed to assess the validity of the culture-dependency hypothesis by administering the TCQ to
various groups in a range of school settings, as well as culturally diverse populations and various geographic regions.

**Moral Sensitivity and Moral Action**

In the present study, the convergent validity of the newly developed measure of moral sensitivity, the TCQ, was explored and successfully confirmed using a measure of moral reasoning, the DIT-2. Given Blum's (1994) conceptualization of moral sensitivity as a component of moral development that can lead to moral action outside the operation of reasoning, it would seem worthwhile to empirically test the hypothesis that moral sensitivity may be related to moral action even more closely than it is related to moral reasoning. Administering the TCQ alongside a measure of moral action would provide an important mechanism for empirically validating Blum’s conceptualization of moral sensitivity, as well as serve as a method of further convergent validation for the TCQ.

**Generalized Moral Sensitivity**

A recent wave of interest in exploring and measuring moral sensitivity, of which the present study was a continuation, is noteworthy in that the various components of morality and moral development receive the appropriate attention in research circles. One area in which the boundaries of research completed to date need to be extended yet is that involving the possibility of devising a generalized, domain-free measure of moral sensitivity. On the other hand, the various measures of moral sensitivity emerging from recent research have significantly contributed to the advancement of knowledge in this area of morality. On the other hand, nevertheless, it would seem the development of a measure of generalized moral sensitivity could provide moral theorists and educators with an important tool whose reliability and validity might potentially be improved by
means of significantly larger scale administration and subsequent analysis. Whereas moral sensitivity has often been seen as transpiring in specific situations—hence the range of recent attempts to devise measures of moral sensitivity specific to various populations or professional groups—the viability of the proposition to develop a generalized measure is yet to be assessed.

In closing, this study provided the much needed insight into the realm of moral sensitivity in the education domain, highlighting the finding that teachers’ moral obligations, or at the minimum, the range of teachers’ moral concerns, extend beyond those proposed in the teachers’ professional codes of ethics. Nevertheless, more research is needed to make the TCQ a more efficient and powerful measure of teachers’ moral sensitivity. It is hoped that the TCQ will contribute to the enrichment and advancement of educational opportunities for teachers, so they can help better equip new generations of learners with moral as well as intellectual knowledge on their journey through life.
REFERENCES


Fravel, B. J., & Bebeau, M. J. (1999, November) *The role of the American College of Dentists in assessing ethical sensitivity.* Poster session presented at the annual conference of the Association for Moral Education, Minneapolis, MN.


APPENDIX A

Moral Issues Questionnaire
| Your subject area(s) or teaching specialization: | |
| Your gender: | [ ] Female | [ ] Male |
| Full-time equivalent of your teaching experience at elementary or secondary level: | | years |
| Full-time equivalent of any other teaching experience you have: | | years |
| Please list any instruction or training in ethics or morality you have received, whether formal, informal, self-study or other. Please name course(s), institution(s), length of study or training, as applicable. | | Please continue … |
Please use the remaining pages (you may use both sides of paper) to respond to the following items. You may wish to refer to these items by number.

1. When you think of your experiences as a teacher (recently or in general) and your interactions with your students, what situations or issues come to mind that, in your view, bear some ethical or moral significance?

2. For each of the situations or issues you can recall, explain what, in your view, makes it an ethical or moral one.

3. You may wish to consider possible issues, concerns, affected parties (stakeholders), consequences of specific action or inaction, or other aspects of the situation. Feel free to include as much detail as you wish.

Thank you very much for your participation and all the best in your future teaching.

Michal Fedeles
Co-Investigator
APPENDIX B

Moral Issues Emerging from the Moral Issues Questionnaire
### Creating a safe and supportive learning community

#### Class management
- Grouping
- Labeling
- Streaming
- Tracking
- Respect
- Honesty, lying
- Attitude
- Caring
- Yelling
- Safe learning environment
- Bullying
- Theft
- Cheating
- Trust, confiding (not lying)
- Class management

#### Discipline
- Labeling
- X
- Streaming
- X
- Tracking
- X
- Respect
- X
- Honesty, lying
- x
- Attitude
- x
- Caring
- x
- x
- Yelling
- x
- Safe learning environment
- X
- Bullying
- Theft
- X
- Cheating
- x
- Trust, confiding (not lying)
- X
- x
- Class management
- X

#### Attitudes
- X
- Caring
- x
- x
- x
- x
- Respect
- x
- Honesty, lying
- x
- Attitude
- X
- x
- x
- Yelling
- x
- Safe learning environment
- X
- Bullying
- Theft
- X
- Cheating
- x
- Trust, confiding (not lying)
- X
- x
- Class management
- X

### Religion/spirituality

#### Culture
- Teacher responsiveness
- x
- Own values
- x
- Values at school and at home
- x
- Holidays
- Religious groups (e.g., Jehovah’s Witnesses)
- Relativism
- Caring
- x
- Attitude
- Parental expectations/approval
- x

#### Values at school and home
- x
- Own values
- x
- Values at school and at home
- x
- Religious groups (e.g., Jehovah’s Witnesses)
- Relativism
- Caring
- x
- Attitude
- Parental expectations/approval
- x

### Equality

#### Discrimination
- Race
- Gender
- SES
- Aboriginal issues
- Stereotyping
- Fairness, fair assessment
- x

#### Fairness
- Fairness, fair assessment
- x

### Special needs

#### Discrimination
- x

#### Differentiation
- x

#### Support
- x

### Language
- Freedom of speech

### Relating to students and understanding their problems

#### Hugging, touching
- Sensitivity
- x
- Caring
- x
- Inappropriate T-S relationships
- x

#### Abuse
- Emotions
- x
- Trust
- x
- Obligation
- x

#### Relationships
- Health and personal issues
- x

#### Health and personal issues
- Drugs
- x
- Abortion
- x
- Abuse (incest)
- x
- Single parenting
- x
- Health/food
- x

#### Sexual behaviour
- x

### Teachers’ professional duties

#### Avoidance of ethics
- Values at school and at home
- x
- Least resistance
- x
- Parental expectations/approval
- x
- Multiculturalism
- x
APPENDIX C

Teachers’ Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ)
Procedure

We ask that you complete, in one session, the three attached measures:

- The Quick Word Test (QWT),
- The Teachers' Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ), and
- The Defining Issues Test 2 (DIT-2).

Please start by completing the items of demographic nature found on the following page, and then continue on. The entire exercise will require no more than 90-120 minutes to complete. Feel free to handwrite, type or print. Only use the space provided for each answer.

Once completed, please return the package to the person who gave it to you, or return it in the pre-addressed return envelope provided to you.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, please feel free to contact the Investigators by e-mail or telephone.

On the demographic data sheet, please indicate whether you wish to participate in the retest, consisting solely of the Teachers' Concerns Questionnaire, approximately one week from today. You can complete the retest at a time convenient for you.

There is no further action in which you would be asked to participate.

Compensation

In appreciation of your time and contribution to advancing this research, the Investigators will administer a random draw for up to five prizes of $50 each (one prize of $50 drawn per every 20 returned questionnaires), payable in cash or by cheque. By participating in this study, your name is automatically entered into the draw. The draw will take place within 48 hours of either the number of completed questionnaires reaching 100, or the study being deemed completed by the Investigators, whichever occurs first. The draw will be administered by the Principal Investigator and Co-Investigator. If the winning entry contains contact information, the winner will be notified immediately and will have 48 hours to claim the prize. If the winning entry does not contain contact information, or if the Investigators deem the contact information to be incomplete or incorrect, another entry will be drawn. No subsequent draws will take place, whether or not the winner claims the prize within 48 hours of notification. No subject shall receive more than one prize of $50.

In addition, all subjects participating in the retest will be given $15 in cash or gift certificates upon return of the questionnaires.

Right to Refuse to Participate or Withdraw

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy to your academic standing, employment, and the like.

If the measure is completed, it will be assumed that you have given consent to participate in this study.

Should you have any questions or concerns related to your rights or treatment as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information line of the UBC Office of Research Services at (604) 822-8598.

Confidentiality

Your identity will be kept strictly confidential. The completed measures will be kept in locked filing cabinets in locked rooms. The demographic data sheets will be kept separately, in another locked filing cabinet.

Only the Investigators and the Co-Investigator's dissertation committee members and examiners will have access to the completed questionnaires. Collected data will be presented in the Co-Investigator's doctoral dissertation, mostly in aggregate form. Where appropriate, individual participants and their corresponding questionnaires may be referred to by an alias and/or by the voluntarily entered demographic data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please enter today's date and time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your current affiliation with UBC (check all that apply):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Administrative appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Doctoral student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Master's student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] B.Ed. student (Teacher Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Other: __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long: ________________ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your age: ________________ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your gender: [ ] Female [ ] Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalent of your teaching experience at elementary or secondary level: ________________ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalent of any other teaching experience you have: ________________ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your primary subject area(s) or teaching specialization and grade level(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other subject(s) you are teaching now or have taught in the past, and grade level(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue ...
Teachers' Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ)

Version of July 26, 2002
the winner will be notified immediately and will have 48 hours to claim the prize. If the winning entry does not contain contact information, or if the Investigators deem the contact information to be incomplete or incorrect, another entry will be drawn. No subsequent draws will take place, whether or not the winner claims the prize within 48 hours of notification. No subject shall receive more than one prize of $50.

In addition, all subjects participating in the retest will be given $15 in cash or gift certificates upon return of the questionnaires.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy to your academic standing, employment, and the like.

Your identity would be kept strictly confidential. The completed measures would be kept in locked filing cabinets in locked rooms. The demographic data sheets would be kept separately, in another locked filing cabinet.

This study is part of the Co-Investigator's graduate research. Only the Investigators and the Co-Investigator's dissertation committee members and examiners would have access to the completed questionnaires. Collected data would be presented in the Co-Investigator's doctoral dissertation, mostly in aggregate form. Where appropriate, individual participants and their corresponding questionnaires may be referred to by an alias and/or by the voluntarily entered demographic data.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, please feel free to contact the Investigators by e-mail or telephone. If you consent to participate in this study, you will be offered an opportunity to see the final product of this research.

Should you have any questions or concerns related to your rights or treatment as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information line of the UBC Office of Research Services at (604) 822-8598.

I hereby consent to participate in the "Understanding the Concerns Teachers Pay Attention to in Their Interactions with Students" research project. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time without penalty.

Name (please print) ___________________________________________________________________________ Signature

Email address or telephone number ___________________________________________________________________________ Date

I hereby acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

Signature ___________________________________________________________________________ Date
Story 1: JOY

INSTRUCTIONS: The following story is based on experiences of real teachers. Please read it carefully. After you have read the story, you will have an opportunity to express your perceptions, feelings, and reactions as a teacher. Your honest responses will help us understand better what kinds of concerns teachers pay attention to in the context of their interactions with students.

One day, Anna came to school late and shaken. Another female student did not show up at all. When her teacher, Joy, asked Anna if anything was wrong, Anna just burst into tears and would not stop. While giving other students some work, Joy led Anna to her office where she later learned that Anna’s friend – the other female student not showing up for school – just had an abortion, and Anna had just taken her there. Of course, the friend’s parents did not know. Both of these students were Asian, and abortion and even having a sexual relationship before marriage were culturally not acceptable.

Learning about one of her students getting an abortion was a bit too much for Joy. Like Anna, she felt like crying her eyes out. But Anna needed someone to support her. So Joy explained to her that because her friend was old enough not to need parental permission for the abortion, Anna need not worry about having done something wrong. She explained what her and her friend’s options were, referring to outside agencies and the school counsellor who was always there for students. Joy explained that the feeling of guilt she and her friend had for not telling their parents would eventually lessen and that one day when they both felt it was right, they could tell their parents if they felt the need to. Although Joy promised not to say anything, she was concerned about the effect the new experience might have on Anna’s and her friend’s attendance and school work, so she eventually told the school counsellor. The counselor promised not to say anything, but was glad to be aware of the situation in case anyone approached him about either girl.

With the passing of time, things seemed to be going well for Anna and her friend, they even found ways to thank Joy for her support.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please share with us your reactions to the story by responding to the questions below. Assume that Joy is a close friend of yours, and you want her to do really well as a teacher. Please respond in complete sentences or paragraphs, to help us fully understand your perceptions, feelings, and reactions. Do not assume that some things are obvious, rather spell them out. Also, please give detailed reasons for each statement or claim you make.

1. What individual or individuals would you say is/are affected by what happened in this story? In what ways is each affected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual affected</th>
<th>How is this individual affected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another female student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual affected</th>
<th>How is this individual affected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another female student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What concerns, if any, do you have about Joy's thoughts, choices, and actions as a teacher? Explain why in your view these are concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your concerns</th>
<th>Explain why these are concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What advice would you give Joy to help her become a better teacher? Especially, what, if anything, should she have done differently in this situation? Also, how can your advice help Joy become a better teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should Joy have done differently?</th>
<th>How can this advice help Joy become a better teacher?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What, if anything, would you do differently in this situation? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you do differently?</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. Perhaps someone (another teacher) might argue against your position. How would you rationalize the position you took in Question 4?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A possible argument</th>
<th>Rationalization of your position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What, if anything, would you say are issues of potential concern in the story? Please number the issues you listed according to their relative importance (1 = Most important). Explain what makes each issue important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>What makes the issue important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Looking at the big picture, what course of action (or inaction) is in the best interest of Joy and all concerned? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of action</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS: The following story is based on experiences of real teachers. Please read it carefully. After you have read the story, you will have an opportunity to express your perceptions, feelings, and reactions as a teacher. Your honest responses will help us understand better what kinds of concerns teachers pay attention to in the context of their interactions with students.

Mark was quite surprised when he caught Nancy – whom he had perceived as one of his brightest students – cheating on a written assignment. Nancy’s essay was just too similar to that of another student in his class. Whole paragraphs seemed identical, except for a few typos in the other student’s paper. As far as Mark could tell, Nancy had never done that sort of thing before. But when he approached her about this problem, Nancy confessed right away, explaining that she was dealing with some family issues, reconsidering her options for college, and was not able to focus and get much work done. It seemed strange to Mark because Nancy appeared to be doing well in school and never seemed to need much help.

So Mark asked Nancy to see him in his office. He always enjoyed the occasional opportunities to chat with her alone. After a short while, Nancy opened up, and it turned out her problem was her new boyfriend who was perhaps not the best choice for her. Nancy was spending all of her free time with him, and both apparently enjoyed being together, but he was sort of a ‘bad kid.’ Mark felt good about getting Nancy to talk, but was not sure how to react. He still had to deal with her cheating. He was certain he wanted to give Nancy a second chance, but hoped to avoid having to defend his decision in front of Nancy’s classmates. So he decided to give Nancy the option to write another essay in his office that afternoon, as he sort of knew Nancy would do well, and she did. In the end, both seemed quite happy with that solution.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please share with us your reactions to the story by responding to the questions below. Assume that Mark is a close friend of yours, and you want him to do really well as a teacher. Please respond in complete sentences or paragraphs, to help us fully understand your perceptions, feelings, and reactions. Do not assume that some things are obvious, rather spell them out. Also, please give detailed reasons for each statement or claim you make.

1. What individual or individuals would you say is/are affected by what happened in this story? In what ways is each affected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual affected</th>
<th>How is this individual affected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What concerns, if any, do you have about Mark’s thoughts, choices, and actions as a teacher? Explain why in your view these are concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your concerns</th>
<th>Explain why these are concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What advice would you give Mark to help him become a better teacher? Especially, what, if anything, should he have done differently in this situation? Also, how can your advice help Mark become a better teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should Mark have done differently?</th>
<th>How can this advice help Mark become a better teacher?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What, if anything, would you do differently in this situation? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you do differently?</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Perhaps someone (another teacher) might argue against your position. How would you rationalize the position you took in Question 4?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A possible argument</th>
<th>Rationalization of your position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What, if anything, would you say are issues of potential concern in the story? Please number the issues you listed according to their relative importance (1 = Most important). Explain what makes each issue important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>What makes the issue important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Looking at the big picture, what course of action (or inaction) is in the best interest of Mark and all concerned? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of action</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS: The following story is based on experiences of real teachers. Please read it carefully. After you have read the story, you will have an opportunity to express your perceptions, feelings, and reactions as a teacher. Your honest responses will help us understand better what kinds of concerns teachers pay attention to in the context of their interactions with students.

"Silence! Be quiet, all of you!" Rick had to start yet another day by yelling, in order to bring noise in his classroom to a bearable level. He knew some students were going through a 'difficult period,' facing pressures to join different groups, start smoking or try drugs, but he remembered what it was like when he was in high school, and was quite sure that period would pass, whether or not he did anything. 'It's a part of high school experience,' he would say to himself.

The grimaces his students were making were unsettling. Then he noticed the victorious look on Howard's face, and he knew. The secret romance Rick and Howard's older sister Paula had been hiding for the past few weeks was out. 'Oh, sh--' – he almost said it. But why would he need to defend himself? Paula was not one of his students, and she was old enough to date. Rick changed the topic: "Any news about Mike's bike?"

Mike was a popular student whose motorcycle disappeared from the school parking lot the day before. "He got it back," someone said. "How?" It turned out the bike miraculously reappeared on school grounds that morning. Another student just probably could not resist the temptation. "Well, the main thing is that it is back, right?" Rick concluded. He was ready to start the lesson.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please share with us your reactions to the story by responding to the questions below. Assume that Rick is a close friend of yours, and you want him to do really well as a teacher. Please respond in complete sentences or paragraphs, to help us fully understand your perceptions, feelings, and reactions. Do not assume that things are obvious, but rather spell them out. Also, please give detailed reasons for each statement or claim you make.

1. What individual or individuals would you say is/are affected by what happened in this story? In what ways is each affected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual affected</th>
<th>How is this individual affected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. What concerns, if any, do you have about Rick’s thoughts, choices, and actions as a teacher? Explain why in your view these are concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your concerns</th>
<th>Explain why these are concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. What advice would you give Rick to help him become a better teacher? Especially, what, if anything, should he have done differently in this situation? Also, how can your advice help Rick become a better teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should Rick have done differently?</th>
<th>How can this advice help Rick become a better teacher?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. What, if anything, would you do differently in this situation? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you do differently?</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. Perhaps someone (another teacher) might argue against your position. How would you rationalize the position you took in Question 4?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A possible argument</th>
<th>Rationalization of your position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What, if anything, would you say are issues of potential concern in the story? Please number the issues you listed according to their relative importance (1 = Most important). Explain what makes each issue important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>What makes the issue important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Looking at the big picture, what course of action (or inaction) is in the best interest of Rick and all concerned? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of action</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 4: LUCY AND HEATHER

INSTRUCTIONS: The following story is based on experiences of real teachers. Please read it carefully. After you have read the story, you will have an opportunity to express your perceptions, feelings, and reactions as a teacher. Your honest responses will help us understand better what kinds of concerns teachers pay attention to in the context of their interactions with students.

Lucy was glad Heather did not mind letting her observe her remedial grade ten class, even interact with the students if they did not mind. Lucy had always wondered how different Heather’s students would be from her ‘normal’ grade tens. Her first impression was that those nine kids in Heather’s class were eager to participate in group discussions, but when it came time to solve math problems on their own, many seemed confused. Almost all of the students were done quickly – but most arrived at the wrong answer, or gave up rather easily.

Joey was clearly one of the more active kids, eager to solve problems on the blackboard. He was quick to pull his calculator out of his pocket and start punching in numbers. Then it came time to multiply 1432.55 by 0.1. Joey instinctively pulled out his calculator – but Lucy stopped him. “Do you really need a calculator to solve that?” she asked. “Yes.” “Joey, look at the problem. Are you sure you cannot solve it without a calculator?” After a short pause, Joey still insisted he needed to use his calculator. When Lucy later asked Heather how come a tenth grader cannot multiply by 0.1, Heather’s reply was that that was something the students were supposed to learn in an earlier grade, and she did not have the time to go over it again. And, after all, they were permitted to use calculators.

The most hesitant to approach math problems on her own was Tina. She did not mind having Lucy sit by her side and watch, but she was simply not getting anywhere with her exercises. Lucy decided to chat with Tina a bit, hoping to find out how she could be helped. Tina said she ‘sort of liked’ math, but could not solve any of the problems, so she figured she probably was not all that smart. But when Lucy sat down with her and offered little prompts, Tina could suddenly see how each problem consists of a few very simple steps that she could manage easily. She ended up solving all the problems correctly, and felt quite satisfied with her accomplishments. In her later talk with Heather, Lucy learned that Tina’s dad was a math teacher in a gifted class at another high school. According to Heather, he did not have the patience to help Lucy with her problem, as she was a slow learner. Interestingly enough, he did not even feel the urge to come to Lucy’s school and talk to her teacher about her needs.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please share with us your reactions to the story by responding to the questions below. Assume that both Lucy and Heather are close friends of yours, and you want them to do really well as teachers. Please respond in complete sentences or paragraphs, to help us fully understand your perceptions, feelings, and reactions. Do not assume that some things are obvious, rather spell them out. Also, please give detailed reasons for each statement or claim you make.
1. What individual or individuals would you say is/are affected by what happened in this story? In what ways is each affected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual affected</th>
<th>How is this individual affected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What concerns, if any, do you have about Lucy's and/or Heather's thoughts, choices, and actions as teachers? Explain why in your view these are concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your concerns</th>
<th>Explain why these are concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What advice would you give Lucy and/or Heather to help them become better teachers? Especially, what, if anything, should they have done differently in this situation? Also, how can your advice help them become better teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should Lucy and/or Heather have done differently?</th>
<th>How can this advice help them become better teachers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What, if anything, would you do differently in this situation (whether in Lucy’s position, or Heather’s)? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you do differently?</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Perhaps someone (another teacher) might argue against your position. How would you rationalize the position you took in Question 4?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A possible argument</th>
<th>Rationalization of your position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What, if anything, would you say are issues of potential concern in the story? Please number the issues you listed according to their relative importance (1 = Most important). Explain what makes each issue important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>What makes the issue important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Looking at the big picture, what course of action (or inaction) is in the best interest of Lucy, Heather, and all concerned? Clearly explain your reasons/rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of action</th>
<th>Your reasons/rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Quick Word Test (QWT), Short Version, Level 1, Form AM
Quick Word Test
Level 1 – Form AM

(Edgar F. Borgatta and Raymond J. Corsini)

INSTRUCTIONS: From the four choices given for each item, please circle the word that means the same as the first word. If you do not know the answer, GUESS. Work quickly and ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS.

EXAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>Seam</th>
<th>Glad</th>
<th>Fast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1 pouch | sack | lean | flag | toss |
| 2 drink | wink | rain | tope | edge |
| 3 frizz | cool | sear | hall | haul |
| 4 hasty | tart | mean | rash | rich |
| 5 stout | tall | bold | ugly | mete |
| 6 strip | peel | cash | rope | hula |
| 7 newel | post | raid | ally | moan |
| 8 salve | salt | work | find | ease |
| 9 rinse | soap | wash | soar | dash |
| 10 watch | tick | bolt | tend | grab |
| 11 pluck | bite | drum | fowl | pick |
| 12 eject | omit | cart | oust | rush |
| 13 jetty | pier | tide | crag | fast |
| 14 relic | lean | bite | hang | ruin |
| 15 order | cash | beat | rank | send |
| 16 teepee | tent | warm | swim | riot |
| 17 ashen | pale | coal | dark | sick |
| 18 alibi | read | true | base | plea |
| 19 booth | pick | shed | twin | lave |
| 20 suave | oily | leak | hero | prig |
| 21 | noose  | hand  | loop  | nose  | flay  |
| 22 | mince  | step  | cake  | chop  | meat  |
| 23 | admit  | gate  | send  | omit  | avow  |
| 24 | imply  | hint  | joke  | flat  | full  |
| 25 | maize  | stun  | game  | trap  | corn  |
| 26 | rouse  | bird  | wood  | wake  | fall  |
| 27 | agile  | teen  | leap  | deft  | reed  |
| 28 | shore  | bank  | true  | land  | trim  |
| 29 | orbit  | site  | chew  | herb  | path  |
| 30 | adorn  | gold  | gild  | gilt  | barb  |
| 31 | rhyme  | hoar  | skin  | song  | poem  |
| 32 | sober  | weep  | wash  | dirk  | cool  |
| 33 | aloft  | cool  | high  | room  | barn  |
| 34 | right  | turn  | true  | road  | hand  |
| 35 | check  | book  | menu  | curb  | toss  |
| 36 | rivet  | flow  | tray  | bolt  | part  |
| 37 | haunt  | lair  | hush  | wild  | home  |
| 38 | spawn  | eggs  | loan  | yard  | bold  |
| 39 | weary  | pine  | mesh  | lime  | tire  |
| 40 | knave  | apse  | ship  | mall  | jack  |
| 41 | dwarf  | pier  | spin  | tree  | runt  |
| 42 | incur  | dose  | wolf  | meet  | hurt  |
| 43 | sieve  | many  | sift  | rain  | surf  |
| 44 | humid  | damp  | male  | plot  | mist  |
| 45 | evade  | foil  | raid  | sway  | trim  |
| 46 | strut  | step  | cord  | play  | twig  |
| 47 | chill  | drag  | lean  | argue | felt  |
| 48 | guise  | male  | rope  | fast  | form  |
| 49 | lunge  | jerk  | leap  | pull  | pass  |
| 50 | drill  | bore  | work  | push  | dell  |
APPENDIX E

Teachers’ Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ): Scoring Checklist
**Teachers’ Concerns Questionnaire**  
**SCORING CHECKLIST**  
*Version XI* © 2003 Michal Fedeles

**Instructions:** Read through the participant’s responses to items (questions) on the TCQ, proceeding item by item. When a response contains a concern/issue that falls into one of the below categories, place a mark ("✓" or "x") in the box corresponding with that category and item number. Include only those concerns/issues that are explicitly stated and (at least partially) explained, rationalized, or placed in context. Use only one mark per concern/issue; if necessary, go with the best fit. Some concerns/issues reported may not fit any of the below categories; those will not result in a mark. Once a box is marked, there is no need to mark it again. In the last row of each table, underline or circle the individuals reported in Item 1. Item 6: Instead of a mark, enter the rank number(s) reported by the participant (more than one rank number in a box is fine).

### STORY ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item (question):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion, students’ physical/emotional well-being</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty, lying, confidentiality</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness, approachability, caring, and responsibility by teacher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values in school and at home, parental involvement/expectations</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underline or circle the individuals reported in Item 1:* Joy Anna Friend Parents Class Other

### STORY TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item (question):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness, fair assessment, equal treatment of all students, seeking the truth</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty, cheating, lying, confidentiality</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness, approachability, caring, and responsibility by teacher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to students, inappropriate teacher-student relationships</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underline or circle the individuals reported in Item 1:* Mark Nancy Boyfr Chtr2 Class Other

### STORY THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item (question):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management, organization/control, yelling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, smoking, students’ physical/emotional well-being</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty, cheating, lying, theft, confidentiality</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness, approachability, caring, and responsibility by teacher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underline or circle the individuals reported in Item 1:* Rick Paula Howard Mike Class Other

### STORY FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item (question):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness, fair assessment, equal treatment of all students, seeking the truth</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness, approachability, caring, and responsibility by teacher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of individual/special needs of students and their learning</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values in school and at home, parental involvement/expectations</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underline or circle the individuals reported in Item 1:* Lucy Heather Joey Tina Class Other