

LEARNING FROM ETHICISTS:

**PART 2: HOW MORAL PHILOSOPHY IS TAUGHT AT
LEADING ENGLISH-SPEAKING INSTITUTIONS
IN THE PACIFIC REGION WITH COMPARISON TO PART I AND
AGGREGATE FINDINGS**

By

**THOMAS COOPER
THE EAST-WEST CENTER
and
EMERSON COLLEGE
c 2016**

Graphics by Angela Carlson-Bancroft
Assisted by Michael Duggan

ABSTRACT

This research includes 1) the previously unpublished findings of a current 2015-6 study (labeled part II) about the teaching of ethics at leading English-speaking institutions in the *Pacific* region, 2) a comparison of those findings with the previous companion study (labeled part I) conducted at leading institutions in the *Atlantic* region in 2008, and 3) the aggregate findings of the two studies as parts of a single research project.

The purpose of the overall research was to determine how ethics is taught at selected leading English-speaking institutions of higher education, the challenges such ethics teachers and their students face, how individual faculty enhance their teaching effectiveness over time, in what senses of the word “ethics” can ethics be successfully taught, what types of creative pedagogical tools these faculty have developed, whether the ethics professor should “take a stand” or be “neutral” in the classroom, and many related questions. Ideally the findings can help individual, institutions and possibly the public better understand and improve ethics instruction.

PART I: When interviewed in 2008, forty ethicists and moral philosophers at six leading English-speaking institutions (Cambridge, Harvard, Oxford, Princeton, University of Edinburgh, and Yale) and from five leading ethics or philosophy programs, departments, or institutes affirmed the importance of and reasons for teaching moral philosophy and ethics as a discipline as published in 2009 in *Teaching Ethics*. However, although united on some issues, those same professors were divided about whether ethics instruction could or should foster moral improvement/character

development, about whether an ethics instructor should reveal her own beliefs and positions to students, and other issues.

PART II: The companion study, conducted in 2015-6, and reported here for the first time, analyzed interviews conducted with forty other ethicists and moral philosophers at eighteen leading English-speaking institutions (e.g. Stanford, Berkeley, University of British Columbia, Australian National University, etc.) in the *Pacific* region. The second study showed both similarities (e.g. about whether ethics faculty should “take a stand” in the classroom or be “neutral referees” and other issues) and differences (e.g. about whether “moral improvement” may be taught and more) from the first study.

THE OVERVIEW --PARTS I AND II: Despite exceptions, in both studies most participants stated that a passion for the subject matter, for teaching, and for assisting students was more important to outstanding ethics teaching than introducing new technologies (which half do not employ), taking teacher training, studying video-recordings of their teaching, and working with mentors. The most widely employed tool for enhancing pedagogical effectiveness was the application of student feedback. Veteran ethics faculty revealed that in the aggregate, despite exceptions, they had changed their teaching preferences and modes in twenty ways listed in the findings.

In both studies most participants felt that it is more important to teach students an intellectual process than to stress retention of class content. Many revealed and explained pedagogical innovations that they had discovered which are now compiled into an inventory of creative tools (see Appendix I). Supporting statistics, methods, criteria for defining “leading”, the list of participants, issues, analysis, recommendations, and other findings are provided.

Background

We must be skeptical of even our own assumptions. I like the bumper sticker: 'Don't believe everything you think.'

Ernesto Dal Bó, University of California, Berkeley (2015)

I encourage a healthy skepticism toward all established theories and a general critical stance. But beyond and within that process, I am aiming to teach them most of all one thing -- intellectual integrity.

David Leal, Oxford University (2008)

Field research (Part I) was conducted in 2008 to determine how ethics and moral philosophy were being taught in six leading English-speaking universities - Harvard, Oxford, Yale, Cambridge, Princeton, the University of Edinburgh -- and in five additional leading departments or programs elsewhere in the Atlantic region. Supported by a Page grant, by sabbatical endorsement from Emerson College, and by guest scholar-in-residence status at the University of Edinburgh, Union University, and field locations above (Harvard, Oxford, Yale, Cambridge, Princeton, etc.) the researcher visited and/or

corresponded with scholars at eleven British and U.S. campuses in a study now entitled “Part I –Atlantic Region.” A complete summary of findings of “Part I” was published in 2009 in *Teaching Ethics* (volume 10, number 1) while an abridged overview was concurrently published in *Ethical Space* (volume 6, number 1).

Seven years later a companion study (“Part II-Pacific”) was conducted in 2015-6 to determine how ethics and moral philosophy were and are being taught at leading *Pacific* region English-speaking institutions in the United States, Canada, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and Hong Kong. Within *this latter* study the “Pacific region” of the United States meant California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington. This 2015-6 study of the Pacific region. entitled “Part II-Pacific”, is reported below for the first time. Part II was supported by an anonymous invited grant, by guest scholar status at Stanford, UC-Berkeley, the East-West Center, and the University of Hawaii, and by full year sabbatical endorsement by Emerson College.

Purpose

Although the purpose of Part I was to study Atlantic region ethics instruction and Part II was to inspect Pacific region instruction, both studies constitute a larger project with these purposes: 1) to determine how ethics classroom instruction is taught in many leading English speaking institutions 2) to learn from respected ethics teachers how they enhance their teaching effectiveness over time 3) to gather an inventory of creative teaching tools and resources potentially helpful to ethics faculty

4) to ascertain in what sense of the word “ethics” may be *successfully* taught within higher education 5) to ascertain collective views on primary pedagogical issues within ethics, and 6) to compile statistical data on these and related questions.

After forty interviews with forty selected ethics faculty were recorded, coded, analyzed and amalgamated to determine patterns, then two further purposes of the study could be completed: 6) to share the study with other instructors, administrators, and educators to better publicize findings about the teaching of ethics and 7) ideally to add tools and recommendations for improvement to a larger inventory. This report not only includes current (2015-6) *full* findings from Pacific region institutions (Part II) and refers to previous *primary* findings from the Atlantic region (Part I), but also contains comparisons between the two studies, and the *aggregate* findings in which Parts I and II are treated as one larger research project.

Summary of Primary Findings

In some cases the findings from the first (Atlantic) and second (Pacific) studies were sufficiently similar to be listed as both aggregate findings and similarities at the end of this essay. Such findings are confirmed by the results of *both* studies and thus *might* prove true for English-speaking institutions as a whole if this research proves valid, representative, and replicable both over time and within other regions.

Other findings pertain to only one study and thus are not confirmed by the other. These are thus referred to toward the end of this article as *comparative* findings of *difference*. Primary findings are listed in headline form immediately below and

discussed in greater detail toward the end of this essay. More secondary findings are embedded throughout the text within specific sections identified by subheadings.

Here are the “headlines” about findings of the 2015-6 study of the Pacific region listed in bullet point format only. More detailed elaboration of each finding with supporting statistics are reported further below.

A) Findings of the Pacific study (bullet point headlines)

- Short papers, classroom discussion, the teaching of *applied* ethics. bringing new ideas from the field into the classroom, discussing “hot” issues (e.g. hatespeech, racism, genetic manipulation, sexual morals, etc.) are all trending *upward* since the 2008 study.
- * A strict adherence to canonical texts, case studies, assigning self-authored texts, and formal debates are all trending *slightly downward* since 2008.
- * Faculty think that both ethics students and teachers now face the same greatest obstacle within the educational process – a perceived lack of time.
- Far more women and a somewhat more racially diverse faculty are increasingly potent contributors to teaching ethics than in 2008.
- * Faculty remain divided about whether ethics teachers should be “neutral” referees in the classroom or should “take a stand” and reveal their “biases”.
- Although faculty also remain divided about whether the ethics of “moral improvement” (i.e. “being a better person”) may be taught in schools, the majority now feel it should not or cannot be taught at the university level. One third disagree.
- * The most frequently mentioned reason ethics faculty now teach pertains to “service to society” rather than other reasons often reported such as enjoyment, passion for learning, fulfillment, love of students, etc.
- There is currently a push back against PowerPoint type technologies by many ethics professors for both philosophical and pedagogical reasons. The minority defending PowerPoint were fewer than in 2008.
- * More faculty are now minimizing or banning the use of cellphones and laptops

by students in their classrooms.

- More participants are taking teacher training workshops from CITL (CTL) type university programs than in 2008 and most of those are finding these to be effective.
- Over time newer faculty move from a single (course content) to a dual (student-driven and personal research influenced) emphasis as with the previous study.
- * As in 2008 most ethics faculty typically and Socratically **consistently** challenge students' assumptions, opinions, beliefs, and the status quo.
- As in 2008 while students frequently find the **mode** of ethical and philosophical thinking challenging and unsettling to their desire for closure and moral simplicity, often they later find this approach to thinking rewarding and relevant.
- As in 2008 graduate ethics courses tend to be 1) smaller 2) less formal and 3) more student-driven. Graduate pedagogies more frequently include 4) student presentations, 5) textbooks/articles written by the professor 6) allusions to the professor's research and 7) more expansive discussion supplanting the media projections, debates, cases, and lectures prominent within undergraduate classes.
- Just as the Oxford/Cambridge traditional tutorial system had a **minor** influence upon the overall 2008 study outcomes, even so the Confucianist/Taoist Eastern tradition has a **minor** influence overall in the teaching of ethics in English-speaking institutions in the Pacific. However, the **primary** curricula in both studies is similar.
- While for some participants ethics is only subject matter or a mental process, for many it is also a potential means for both students and faculty to raise the bar in public discussion if not to bring pro-social change in civic moral decision-making.

Other key findings for Part II (Pacific), together with details and data, are embedded within the report below.

B) Findings of the 2008 Atlantic Study

All findings for Part I (Atlantic) may be found in the original *Teaching Ethics* (2009, volume 10, number 1) report. More important ones are also referenced within the question-by-question report and analysis below.

The Participants and Their Selection

The participants from Harvard, Oxford, Cambridge, Yale, Princeton, etc. and their selection process for the first study (Part I –Atlantic) were previously listed in *Teaching Ethics* and *Ethical Space*. For the 2015-6 companion study 60 potential participants were chosen by reputation and referral by advisors within germane leading professional organizations and institutions and by selected ethics “elders”, then compared for frequency of mention, location, and for balanced demographics. This process narrowed the group to 54 who then self-selected for participation according to availability and choice.

Major advisors to the selection process consisted of appropriate American Philosophy Association (APA) officers and selected academic leaders in the field. Initially 43 of the 54 at leading Pacific institutions (Stanford, Berkeley, UCLA, the Australian National University, etc.), responded that they were available to participate. When six of these dropped out or could not meet a deadline, alternates were invited to fill vacancies until the group totaled forty.

More professors from sizable high echelon universities were selected for the study whereas one or two were typically chosen from smaller and lower ranked universities including those within small nations. Thus factors of scale, reputation, ranking, advisory input, representation, demographics, sub-discipline, and “quota” were all taken into account when both institutions and individuals were selected.

Those interviewed deliberately included a wide spectrum of roles and experience including (former) deans; (former) department, center or program heads; recently retired faculty; and professionals currently teaching ethics including journalists, lawyers, and health professionals. A few relatively new faculty who had taught ethics for fewer than ten years were included to add generational scope, representativeness, and “new blood.” Slightly more than half (52%) of the participants were *full* (cf. senior) professors, over one quarter (28%) were *associate* (middle level), and one fifth (20%) were either *assistant* (usually relatively new) professors (15%) or instructors (5%) if one uses U.S. nomenclature. Almost one fourth (23%) were or had been academic administrators.

Invitations to a large numbers of women and those from a spectrum of races and cultures were extended. Although only eight women (20% of participant total) accepted the invitation for the Atlantic study in 2008, twice as many or sixteen (40%) participated in the recent Pacific study. In 2008 only one (2%) diversity participant proved available while in 2015-6 this number had grown to seven (18%) diversity (including disability) faculty members.. These increases seemed roughly proportional to the increasing numbers of women and individuals from diverse cultures within this sector of higher education.

In the 2008 Atlantic study just over half of the participants (52%) taught in the United States and just less than half (48%) in Great Britain. In part II over seven tenths (72%) of those interviewed taught in the United States and almost three tenths (28%) at other English speaking countries in the Pacific, although several have taught in both environments, and a few have taught in at least three countries. As of 2015 twenty nine

had taught within institutions in the U.S. Pacific region; four in Australia; two in New Zealand, Canada (Pacific coast) and Hong Kong; and one in Singapore.

All numbers and proportions took into consideration the international and local rankings of institutions and programs, the population of nations, the advice of multiple advisors (see methods), and the reputations of institutions both within and beyond their national boundaries. Larger numbers of participants came from more highly populated countries with larger, relatively older, top ranked institutions and programs. For example, there were seven participants from Oxford in 2008 and eight from Stanford in 2015-6.

A list of those participating in the Pacific region below is alphabetized by last name with current or most recent affiliation(s) in parentheses . These participants averaged over twenty-three years of teaching experience in higher education and over fourteen years teaching at their current or most recent institution. As of 2015 they had taught *ethics* an average of twenty-two years and the more senior half of all participants had taught an average of thirty-one years.

In part II on average the participants had taught an average of fifty-one ethics and moral philosophy classes per person yielding an estimated two thousand and forty total classes taught prior to and during 2015. Of these, on average 58% percent were undergraduate classes, 27% graduate, and 15% mixed classes, almost the same as in 2008.

Approximately 42% of these courses were taught in philosophy departments, 40% in professional (e.g. medicine, law, journalism, and business) colleges and (ethics) institutes, while 18% were taught in other departments or mixed (e.g. interdisciplinary institutes, cross-listed courses, humanities programs, etc.) venues.

One administrative head, Joan Berry, and one former director, Deborah Rhode, were interviewed as (former) administrators to add overview information about additional programs at Stanford. Five experts on comparative higher education and comparative (East-West) philosophy, Roger Ames, David Grossman, Peter Hershock, Barry Keenan, and Deane Neubauer from the East-West Center and University of Hawaii, were also consulted for background understanding. One participant, Deborah Rhode, was interviewed twice, once as a professor/participant and once as former director of Stanford's McCoy Ethics Center.

In each part (Part I in 2008 and Part II in 2015-6) forty participants were asked forty standardized questions about teaching. All statistics reported below pertain only to replies to that standard forty question interview.

Part II participants (2015-6 Pacific Region study) were:

ANANNY, Mike (University of Southern California)
ANDERSON, Scott (University of British Columbia)
AUMAN, Ann (University of Hawaii)
BARRY, Christian (Australian National University)
BIVINS, Tom (University of Oregon, Eugene)
BRINK, David (UC, San Diego)
BRISLIN, Tom (University of Hawaii)
BROWNE, Tamara (Australian National University)
CHO, Mildred (Stanford University)
DAL BO, Ernesto (UC, Berkeley)
DAMON, William (Stanford University)
FINLAY, Stephen (University of Southern California)
FRASER, Chris (University of Hong Kong)
GLASSER, Theodore L. (Stanford University)
GOLDSTEIN, Tom (UC, Berkeley)
GOERING, Sara (University of Washington)
HANSON, Kirk O. (Santa Clara University)
HENDRICKS, Christina (University of British Columbia)
HERMAN, Barbara (UCLA)

HIERONYMI, Pamela (UCLA)
JENNINGS, Pete (Santa Clara University)
KUTZ, Christopher (UC, Berkeley)
LEE, Seow Ting (National University of Singapore)
LEUNG, (Grace) Lai Kuen (Chinese University of Hong Kong)
MAGNUS, David (Stanford University)
MCLEAN, Margaret (Santa Clara University)
OSHANA, Marina (UC, Davis)
PETTIGROVE, Glen (University of Auckland)
REICH, Robert (Stanford University)
RHODE, Deborah (Stanford University; two interviews)*
RICHARDS, Ian (University of South Australia)
RULLI, Tina (UC, Davis)
SATZ, Debra (Stanford University)
SCHAPIRO, Tamar (Stanford University and MIT)
SCHROEDER, Mark (University of Southern California)
SILVERS, Anita (San Francisco State University)
STRONG, Catherine (Massey University, New Zealand)
THOMAS, Pradip (University of Queensland, Australia)
WALLACE, Jay (UC, Berkeley)
WASSERMAN, Ed (UC, Berkeley)

*interviewed twice; once as participant; once as former director of ethics center

Approach and Methods

Adapting questions used by Kenneth Bain in his Harvard University Press award-winning book, *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Harvard, 2004), the researcher created a forty-question interview that was uniformly administered to all eighty participants whether in person (35%), on-line (60%) or by phone (5%) according to their preference, geographic distance including during travel, and availability. In both phases of research almost one third of all participants also provided additional materials such as

relevant syllabi or hand-outs. Twenty-two were also observed during lecture or seminar teaching whether live or via recordings.

Of the forty questions, ten focused upon general teaching (e.g. “what are your teaching methods?” “how do you prepare to teach?”) as developed by Bain while thirty were created for this study by the researcher to focus upon 1) how teaching effectiveness is enhanced and evolves over time (10 questions) 2) how *ethics and moral philosophy* courses are specifically taught by these faculty (10 questions), and 3) empirical data about teaching experience (e.g. “how many years have you taught ethics courses?”).

Concurrently, germane course catalogs, program websites, and related materials were reviewed. A rich literature (see Works Cited and Additional Resources), about the role of ethics in professional education, ethics pedagogies such as case studies, and ethical issues that arise in the employment of grades and evaluations, and related subjects, was inspected. Classroom observation of participants included undergraduate and graduate ethics, moral philosophy and next-of-kin courses offered within philosophy departments and professional colleges based upon availability, logistics, and permission.

All in-person and phone interviews were conducted between June and November in 2008 and again between April and December 2015 in offices or public settings on or near campuses. On-line interviews employed an attachment questionnaire also appended to this article (Appendix II) which was read aloud during phone and in-person interviews to insure consistency.

Data (e.g. total number of courses taught, years teaching) provided by participants was subject to human error since it was sometimes based upon memory and estimates. Percentages did not always total 100 % because several participants gave

multiple answers to questions (e.g. a person might have taught in BOTH a philosophy department AND an institute or might list up to six reasons in response to “why do you teach?”). Some categories could not be precisely defined such as “courses taught”, since independent studies, graduate theses, and workshops are shades of gray sometimes decided case by case. Moreover, it was not always easy to categorize a course in ethics or moral philosophy since some “next-of-kin” courses might contain roughly 30-70 % ethics content. Where does one draw the line? This researcher erred in the direction of inclusiveness with such borderline cases.

The coding of interviews also left room for error. If one respondent mentioned that she used books that she had authored “off and on” in class over the years, this response, like one in which another professor said “periodically” rather than “off and on”, might both be coded as “sometimes” rather than “frequently” or “rarely” or “never”. Thus in the figures (charts) below, the words “or similar language” are frequently used. Judgment calls had to be used in cases like this and when other shades of gray emerged. Thus percentages quoted below are deemed approximate.

Definitions and Language

The participant interpreted terms such as “ethics” and “moral philosophy”, which were often used interchangeably, according to her or his individual or sometimes institutional usage within cultural context. Other terms such as “leading institutions” were determined by many criteria such as international and regional ranking systems;

advisory input from the APA, from senior (including Emeritus) philosophy and applied discipline scholars; and by worldwide *consistency* of reputation.

At no point were teachers at these leading English-speaking institutions assumed to be better than teachers within other universities or nations. There is insufficient consensus about what constitutes “great” teaching, whether such may be empirically verified, and by which cultural standards and whose “ethics”, to so determine. Instead institutional ranking systems and long-term consistency of reputation were used to determine “leading” programs and institutions. Moreover, in the interest of inclusiveness and the honoring of cultural standards, “leading institutions” were determined by local and regional rankings, not just by world standards. For example, if a country was too small, young, or poor for its institutions to be ranked within the top 5% of all higher education institutions, then the top ranked institution within that country was selected.

To be consistent the initial rankings systems consulted, such as *Times* and Philosophical Gourmet (Leiter, University of Chicago), were used in both Part I and Part II. However, due to the “larger international footprint” of the 2015-6 study, additional ratings systems such as QS World Rankings (both the general rankings and the Arts and Humanities rankings), Shanghai Jiao Tong, Oceania, and MacLeans (Canada) ranking systems were also consulted.

It was vital that each “leading” English-speaking institution for each country or region (e.g. Australian National University in Australia, Stanford in Pacific U.S., University of British Columbia in Pacific Canada, etc.) was determined by *more than two* ranking instruments and confirmed by advisors and insider experts within relevant

regions. Also of importance was knowing how to allow for the “weighting biases” of each ranking venue. As Nain Cai Liu’s analysis of World University Ranking systems (Liu, 2011) points out, it is knowing “how to wisely use” each system and take into account its preferences or biases which points toward the meaningful understanding and application of the word “leading”.

It was also crucial to include institutions with highly ranked programs and institutes (e.g. Markkula Center of Applied Ethics at Santa Clara U. and Stanford’s McCoy Center for Ethics In Society), not just highly ranked institutions. In most cases the two areas, highly ranked programs or centers, and highly ranked institutions, overlapped.

Only English-speaking institutions were selected due to

- 1) limitations of time, budget, and the researcher’s minimal language fluency beyond English,
- 2) the researcher’s previous authoring and co-authoring of research books about international and indigenous ethics to which this research provided expansion and balance,
- 3) specific invitations from academic institutions (Stanford, Berkeley, U. of Hawaii, and the East-West Center) in the United States were extended to the researcher, and
- 4) the Atlantic region research featured English-speaking institutions so it was important to consider similar Pacific region institutions rather than compare apples with oranges.

Summary of Findings and Analysis by Topic and Question

Each section below summarizes data from the Pacific study grouped by specific questions. All questions are available in Appendix II and are designated there by numbers which correspond to the numbers found in the subheadings below.

Teaching Ethics (Question 31)

Clearly one cannot ask if ethics instruction can be improved without considering whether ethics can and should be taught in the first place. One long-standing debate within the educational domain and indeed within society orbits the question “*Can* ethics be taught?”

According to the participants the answer may depend upon what is meant by “ethics” and within which culture, age group, or context. When asked “What have you to say to those who feel that ethics can *not* be taught?” (question #31), the majority of participants in the recent 2015-6 Pacific study responded that

- 1) it depends upon what is meant by ethics and may depend upon age and culture
- 2) if ethics means thinking more clearly, systematically, or knowledgably about moral decision-making, then most (88%) say ethics *can* be taught and
- 3) if ethics means the improvement of moral character or becoming a “better” person, then only one third (33%) believe that “moral growth” should be

“taught” within a *university-level* ethics classroom. Over half (53%) feel that such educators cannot or should not attempt to teach students to be “better” people while a few (14%) are not sure.

The first two findings immediately above were similar to the previous 2008 study. However, finding #3 showed a marked difference from the Atlantic region research in which participants were evenly divided (40% positive; 40% negative, 15% unsure, 5% other) about whether moral improvement could or should be taught in universities.

In both studies most thought that ethics instruction can and should effect improvements in moral *reasoning*. Yet 2015-6 participants did not feel that changes in moral *action* should be taught (53% negative; 33 % positive), thus indicating an increase or difference of 13% in the negative response since 2008.

In the recent Pacific study Debra Satz, Senior Associate Dean of Humanities and Arts at Stanford, commented “ethics can certainly be taught; it’s a discipline like many others. But teaching ethics as a way of making people ethical is not the best route.” Dr. Sara Goering at the University of Washington explained, “I’m not teaching them an ethical view, but ...how to evaluate a wide variety of ethical arguments”. Professor Mark Schroeder at the University of Southern California stated “students can come to be better at recognizing when a situation is morally fraught ... what can’t be taught is a method or way of solving moral problems”.

Many felt that classroom ethics is not a moral fix-it kit: one participant said “if people are not already inclined to be ethical, studying ethics will probably not persuade

them.”; Dr. Scott Anderson of the University of British Columbia in Canada added “I don’t expect an ethical skeptic or the ethically indifferent to change their minds.”

Professor David Magnus, Director of Stanford’s Center for Biomedical Ethics, used this analogy:

learning physics can help you understand how to ride a bike... but just because you don’t ride a bike better doesn’t mean that physics is worthless. Ethics is very important to life and gives you useful tools... even if you don’t do better on a Kohlbergian scale. My goal is not to make them better people but more thoughtful... if that also happens to make them better people, then great ...

Some participants pointed out that the matter is not one of opinion and that solid studies may be consulted. Professor Deborah Rhode, Founding Director of Stanford’s Ethics Center, observed that “there’s a fair amount of research literature that concludes that young adults do develop in their ethical reasoning ... well designed courses can have a positive effect.” Others noted the value of ethics pedagogy whether or not it can “make people better.” Professor Glen Pettigrove at the University of Auckland wrote that college instruction “will not turn a sociopath into a philanthropist ... but it will provide people who already care about certain values with tools they might use to deliberate ... “

Not everyone agrees. Both in the previous (2008) and current studies, there are also those who think that moral development can or should be initiated, advanced, or enhanced within the classroom. Is this thinking more pronounced in parts of the Pacific region due to the legacy of Asian philosophy? Professor Grace (Lai Kuen) Leung at the Chinese University of Hong Kong), imparted that “it is easier to teach ethical behavior in Asian societies because the Confucius culture backs up the importance of being moral

and ethical”. However, many institutions in the North American part of the Pacific region have not been *primarily* impacted by Asian philosophies. It is hard to know how much weight to give this factor say in Oregon, Washington, or in the Canadian province of British Columbia.

To those who would claim that “ethics can’t be taught” Association Dean / Professor Tom Brislin at the University of Hawaii disagreed and replied “Isn’t that what a university education is for –to give students opportunities for expansion and positive change.” Dean Ed Wasserman at Berkeley agreed and noted that it is not “either ...or” but rather “ethics can be a force for *both* moral and intellectual improvement... I have seen people struggling with genuinely vexing dilemmas ... and ethics has helped them... So it can be a tool toward living a more just life and people can improve in *both* ways ... intellectually and morally ... through ethics instruction.” Professor William Damon at Stanford wisely observes “if you don’t teach ethics, you are still teaching it by giving a lot of messages you wish you were not giving.” In other words, by not teaching ethics one is saying that ethical behavior and the study of moral-decision making are not important – and that statement of itself can be viewed as a moral if not immoral statement.

In both studies participants overwhelmingly affirmed the importance of teaching ethics as reflection, moral reasoning, the application of key philosophers’ principles, and a lens for better understanding moral dilemmas.

Where they differed was that in 2015-6 a majority (53%) took the position that teaching moral **behavioral** growth at the university level should not be undertaken while only 40% took this position in 2008. Both “sides” featured articulate spokespersons in both studies. On the one hand David Smith, Margaret Farley, and Elizabeth Anderson argued in 2008: “you may not change students’ overall behavior, but you can give them corrective lenses” (David Smith, Yale); “you can’t make every student a good person but increasing students’ moral insight is helpful (Margaret Farley, Yale)”; and “Does (classroom ethics) make people more virtuous? I doubt it. But it may make them more responsible, thoughtful decision-makers when hard decisions arise.” (Elizabeth Anderson, University of Michigan)

Those voicing support for normative and corrective ethics in the Atlantic study included appeals to Kant --“since ethics is not inbred, it must be taught” (Stephen Latham, Yale); or to modeling “ when showing is better than telling, thinking about ethics is best taught and displayed by who you are in students’ presence” (Nick Adams, Cambridge); or to social necessity – “given the state of the world, ethics must be taught.” (Julian Savulescu, Oxford, 2008). Thus there were strong voices on both “sides” in both decades.

Toward What End? (Questions 12, 13)

Supposing ethics, at least by some definitions of that word, can be taught? What then? What might a student learn in such a course in a leading institution? What would

successful teaching of an ethics course look like? All participants were asked two questions (#12 and #13) about such “success”.

When asked “What do you expect students will be able to do perceptually and conceptually upon completion of your class which they could not do upon entry?”, they answered as rank-ordered below (top nine response clusters only):

- 53% know how to make complex moral decisions
- 48% understand major ethical approaches, principles, philosophers, and theories
- 48% critically evaluate ethical arguments and issues
- 45% question assumptions and ideas more deeply including their own
- 38% reflect more insightfully upon personal and professional ethical dilemmas
- 35% identify ethical issues
- 28% develop and refine cogent writing
- 28% respect, understand, and refute counter-arguments

A large range of less frequently mentioned teaching aspirations were also articulated including speaking persuasively (8%), moving beyond opinion (8%), reading slowly and thoughtfully (8%), and more. A little more than one quarter (27%) of all participants also listed goals that might be unique to their own classroom such as “learn how to counsel executives about ethics” (2%) and “take these ethics theories from the textbook into their science labs.” (2%).

An overview of the statistics above suggests that while a large majority see themselves as primarily teaching critical thinking and moral theory, some go further into

more specialized areas. Professor Margaret McLean, who teaches within a historically religious institution (Santa Clara University), added to her list of goals “to recognize the role that religion and faith play in ethical decision-making historically and currently”. Professor Ann Auman at the University of Hawaii, who is teaching future journalists, proffered:

Students are faced with many ethical issues in the world of social media and on-line information. ... I want them to learn that they need a set of standards to follow because they are **BOTH** consumers **AND** producers of news and information. It is their responsibility to create and maintain a moral compass.

Ann Auman

When asked “What do you expect of your students’ learning if you are to regard it as successful?”, the Pacific region participants replied that their students should be able to:

- 53% identify ethical issues and explain them
- 45% make better ethical decisions
- 38% apply tools for ethical decision-making to their lives and careers
- 35% engage in more sophisticated thinking/reasoning
- 35% know the major ideas of the course content
- 35% articulate moral views more clearly
- 33% converse more intelligently and respectfully with those with whom they *disagree*
- 25% develop ethical sensitivity and courage
- 18% become more self-critical/aware

Participants also listed a number of secondary criteria for determining “successful” learning such as “enrolling in other ethics courses” (8%), “openness to new thinking (8%) and “debating and discussing positions without defensiveness”. (5%).

Many of the teachers also hoped that their students would not just learn methods but also engage in a transformative *experience*. Professor Barbara Herman at UCLA felt students should “get excited about something philosophical. Years later they can remember a text or even an example as revelatory. The aim is for them to discover the fun and power of having a mind.” At the University of Queensland in Australia, Professor Pradip Thomas stressed the “importance of their being open to include *new* thinking in making sense of persistent issues.” Moved by some student evaluations that she had received Grace Leung at the Chinese University of Hong Kong quoted from one:

“Dr. Leung has really challenged students to think outside the box. What was originally perceived by me as a boring fluff model turned out to be ... truly intriguing and helped me to grow as an individual.” (anonymous student)

Not surprisingly the previous 2008 study expressed similar goals and tone for successful learning in spirit if not in exact letter and number. Taken as a whole, the vast majority of participants in both studies used the classroom as an intellectual fitness center, with a significant minority also employing it as a civic and self-improvement lab.

How to Teach Ethics? (Questions 11, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 32, 33, 37)

I want to give my students the tools and the confidence to reason out their own answers to my questions and not parrot my answers.

Debra Satz, Stanford

In the Pacific study on the surface faculty seemed to use standard teaching tools. For example, although 18% opposed the use of final exams, almost two fifths (38%) gave finals. Nine tenths (90%) assigned and graded long (53%) or short (75%) papers. Almost one quarter (23%) assigned both. Other common forms of grading included discussion/participation (35%), responses to readings (33%), quizzes (28%), mid-term exams (18%), group projects (18%), class presentations (18%), graded homework (18%), case study analysis (15%) and rewriting assignments (15%). Many used tools less typical of other disciplines such as 1) innovative, individually created tools (30%) – (see Appendix I), 2) debates (10%) and 3) case studies (30%). Such cases were of all types including current—43%; hypothetical –15%; classical -15%; personally experienced – 15%; legal-13%; published/purchased-- 13%; scientific—10%; mixed—10%; and other 8%

When answering the question of whether professors should use and sometimes profit from the sale of texts and articles they themselves have written, Pacific region participants revealed that they have always (13%) frequently (10%), sometimes (24%), rarely (25%), or never (28%) used publications they have (co-) authored themselves. Most (85%) also used new ideas and literature in the field, whether frequently (63%), sometimes (20%) or only in graduate courses (10%).

This new material was often (70%) balanced with an emphasis upon traditional “canon” texts by seminal moral philosophers such as Aristotle, Kant, and Mill, and sometimes included more modern thinkers (e.g. Rawls, Parfit, and Korsgaard) or in some cases more traditional Eastern (e.g. Confucius, Lao-Tzu) or feminist (e.g. Gilligan, Noddings) voices. Sample syllabi from many courses are available (see Appendix I). Some (20%) opposed the use of textbooks, anthologies, thumbnails, and commentaries as primary resources. But others use topical texts (15%), philosophical excerpts (15%), diversity anthologies with under-represented voices (10%), standard textbooks (10%), on-line and other commentaries (10%), traditional anthologies (10%), and mixed (case study, philosophy, commentary – 8%) volumes.

Ernesto Dal Bó at University of California, Berkeley spoke in favor of concurrently using two types of sources – traditional primary sources and texts: “I use both kinds....text books are sometimes wrong or reductive so it can be best to use the original. But primary texts can be hard to penetrate for new readers so one should not be absolute either way.” For some faculty it also makes a difference whether the course is graduate or undergraduate and whether it is a philosophy or applied class as noted in the italicized portion of Dr. Tom Brislin’s words: “I would say that the principles are more important than the philosophers in a *basic applied* class... (You should) guide them in how the principles might be applied to professional issues they are likely to, face.” On the whole the preference for primary sources has slightly decreased since 2008.

While a majority of participants most valued person-to-person pedagogy, some preferred a wide spectrum of media. In the current study two fifths (40%) mentioned using university teaching websites such as Canvas, Web CT, Blackboard, and

Whiteboard and most of these found them helpful. Other technologies included PowerPoint (20%); films (including DVDs, You Tube clips, etc. --30%); websites (18%); interactive (group e-mail, chat room, and variations -- 20%); traditional black or white board (13%); clicker technologies (10%); and a mixture of new technologies such as blog zones, wikis, and podcasts (10%). As expected all of those who used overhead transparencies and half of those who distributed hard copy hand-outs have retired these in class.

The data indicates a steady increase in adoption of technologies since 2008. However, what is surprising is a reverse trend with two technologies: 1) a sharp increase (from 25% to 45%) in the objection to laptop and hand-held devices in the classroom. 2) increased concerns about PowerPoint (see below). These latter faculty, over half (55%) of those who once used PowerPoint, state that they are either phasing out PowerPoint type technologies or they have already retired them.

These trends do not appear to be only technology adoption and retirement phases, but also pertain to both strong philosophical and pedagogical objections as reported below. At Berkeley Professor R. Jay Wallace wrote "I have used Power Point, which is not a terribly good technology, in lower level classes because it provides a visual focus. But it is too 'dumbed down' for upper level courses." The "dumbing down" effect seems part of a larger concern about "reducing interactivity", "spoon-feeding ideas", "pre-scripting rather than modeling actual thinking in the moment", "diminishing eye contact", and "rendering them intellectually impotent".

The objection to personal technologies in the classroom (which has almost doubled since the first study) is typified by Dean Ed Wasserman at Berkeley who stated

that “I forbid use of the internet in class unless we have to check a fact for accuracy.”

Many participants who submitted syllabi stated that the classroom is “a no smartzone” or/and “no laptop” zone. As one participant at Stanford cleverly explains in his syllabus, “using these devices during lecture is like second- hand smoke: it not only harms you, it harms others too.”

To be sure half (50%) of the 20% who use PowerPoint type technologies defend them as “student friendly”, an “eyeball focus”, “organizationally superior”, “easier and cheaper for students than buying Cliff Notes”, “no less interactive than using film and videos”, and “good creative pressure upon us faculty to really outline and clarify our thinking ... which in turn helps students.” Those who welcome laptops and cell phones are also persuasive: “the laptop and smart phone bring almost all available knowledge right into the classroom”; “we can’t live in the past; thinking is no longer primarily silent reflection”, and “I bring mine to work; this is their work zone--how can I forbid them from bringing theirs?”

Still others have adopted a PowerPoint policy or adjustment (“I still use it ..only a lot less”; “it’s for the first part of class only.. but then we turn up the lights and have great discussions”. Some also use a lap top policy such as “they can use it only if they sit in the back row so no one else is distracted” and “their wi-fi access must be turned off so then cannot zoom in on baseball scores, e-mail, and porn during class... they know in advance my penalty for their losing focus.”

It is not surprising that these issues also arose in 2008 albeit not as substantially. A few 2008 participants complained that a PowerPoint type takeover would “reduce

complex philosophical arguments to a shopping list” and that “students would no longer learn to think for themselves”. Yet the reaction to laptops and smaller technologies was all but absent in the first study. The *global* increase in the adoption, penetration, and variety of newer “smart” devices since 2008 seems accompanied by an increased attention to what is meant by “smart” and to such technologies’ impact upon the “smartness” of students.

When asked “How do you prepare to teach?”, the most frequent replies were 1) rereading class reading assignments (55%), 2) reviewing notes (53%), 3) thinking about and searching for new examples, questions, and topics (38%), 4) writing a fresh outline or plan (38%), 5) reading widely from related texts and journals (38%), 6) preparing media clips, PowerPoint, and other technologies (23%), 7) finding topical ties to class readings (20%), 8) collecting and updating materials (20%), 9) writing the entire lecture afresh (15%), and 10) originating and adapting key questions (13%). Less frequently mentioned forms of preparation were unique to individuals such as “preparing spatial organization on blackboard”, “seeking input from senior professionals”, “following up on student questions”, and “getting enough sleep”.

Many take the subject of preparation quite seriously. Professor Pete Jennings at Santa Clara University commented

Preparation prevents poor performance. I prepare as I used to prepare as an athlete for game time. Class time is game time. You’ve got to bring your ‘A game’.... I am responsible for setting the conditions for student learning and creating a climate in each and every class that inspires student interest and engagement. (Jennings, 2015)

The unsung catalyst to ethics instruction is named “caffeine”. Professor Theodore Glasser at Stanford conveyed: "Prior to class I drop by Starbucks and do some serious

daydreaming until I have a good sense of what I'm going to say and how I'm going to say it--the key questions for that day's lecture-discussion." Dean Tom Brislin at The University of Hawaii affirmed that "the key is coffee ... lots and lots."

Many instructors (40%) mentioned using the Socratic method of repetitive questioning as a primary mode during class discussion. Of these many use it whether they are teaching in larger lecture classes (67%), seminars (35%), case studies (30%), or small groups (30%). Although not unique to philosophy, such questioning seems at its core. At UCLA, Professor Pamela Hieronymi wrote:

If you assign a history book and students read it, they may have gained some knowledge of history. But no one would expect a student to read a calculus book and thereby learn calculus. To learn calculus ... you need to think the problems through on your own, and in that way come to comprehend the subject matter. Philosophy is more like calculus than like history. Students need to work through the problems on their own, either orally, in class, or in writing.

Although changes in 1) format (e.g. the flipped classroom with homework brought into class and "lecturing" seen at home via videos, etc.), 2) new technology (clickers and wikis) and 3) incentives (prizes, postings, etc.) may change each decade, the philosophical emphasis upon engaging deep questions, working through independent thought problems, and applying these through both actual case studies and hypothetical problems seems unchanged and at the foundation of ethics studies.

Nor is the questioning strictly rhetorical. Questioning is a state of mind which cross-examines much or all that seems "given", "real", or "normal." When asked "What do you aim to teach students to question or believe?", over two thirds (70%) replied

“question everything” or some large subset thereof such as “the status quo”, “the conventional wisdom”, “all professional practices”, or “all of your own personal premises.” Ann Auman at University of Hawaii advised: “Question evidence .. ask ‘How do you know that?’ At Stanford William Damon agreed: “Question expertise.”

Despite the endless questioning, participants made clear that they are not teaching nihilism. Thus for some there are *some* beliefs worth holding such as “neither student nor teacher is infallible”; “ethics is important to your careers and lives”; “critical thinking works and is essential”; “truth does exist” and “ethics is hard but ultimately morally profitable”.

In one way or another many participants also conveyed a sense of optimism asking that students also believe in *themselves*. As Professor Christina Hendricks at University of British Columbia wrote “I want them to believe that its not just the canonical or professional philosophers who have useful things to say ... but the students themselves ... “

Obviously the 2015-6 participants also believe in *themselves* when it is observed that all but six (85%) have at some time or another placed their own publications on their class reading list. Since such practices have sometimes been attacked as “narcissism”, “profiteering off of students”, and “grand-standing”, it is important to hear insider points of view. At Stanford Professor Glasser offered “Of course I am going to have them read my work. I want them to know where I stand... I’m not a by-stander. I’m part of the argument”. Dean Ed Wasserman at Berkeley noted that “in my case and in many cases there is no money being made. I’d much rather that they read what I’ve written than hear me parrot it in lectures.”

Some authors only use their work when it is considered the definitive or only expertise on a subject. As one Stanford participant explained “I use my work occasionally, but it is when I have authority on the subject and, as a balancing factor I provide it in the context of other perspectives.” Another Stanford professor, David Magnus, affirmed this approach. “Sometimes I use my work when it is the first article on a new subject and no one has yet thought it through ... overall it depends upon the primacy, potency, and context of the article.” It is hard to doubt the authority of Professor Kirk Hanson at Santa Clara University who is Director of the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics:

My center has produced 250 videos (roughly 80% are my creation) available on YOUTUBE...now dozens if not hundreds of other universities use these materials...I assign videos I appear in or am the host for. All of this is positive for the students who feel you are engaged fully with the topic.

Clearly many participants believe not only in themselves but in the work of at least some of their colleagues. Over four fifths (85%) introduce the new thinking and research of others, including fresh materials from conferences, publications, and workshops, into the classroom. Ted Glasser at Stanford relayed that “the writing and thinking of others has tremendously influenced the content of my classes which changes from year to year.” In the words of R. Jay Wallace at Berkeley, “New materials influence my thinking about issues and thus my teaching. At the grad level I bring new materials into the classroom and a lot percolates into the syllabus.”

At Massey University in New Zealand, Catherine Strong has used other sources as well: “I get new material from the news, from the industry, and also from

several professional internet forums I belong to.” Professor Marina Oshana at the University of California, Davis, affirmed the advantage of top recent materials:

I teach moral philosophy, political philosophy, philosophy of law and feminist ethics. These areas are always developing so of course I am bound to test new ideas all the time. I don't teach ethics as a fossilized realm of study.

A Stanford participant concurred with such dynamism: “a syllabus should be a living document so I am frequently making changes and introducing materials to make improvements.”

Even when using a teaching tool often considered “frozen into history”, the case study, several teachers seek to be fresh and imaginative: At Massey University in New Zealand, Professor Catherine Strong wrote “I collect and design new case studies constantly ...based on current issues in our country or culture.” Professor Anita Silvers at San Francisco State University conveyed that “I make up case studies based on real cases. In the directions for writing up the case, students are assigned a decision-maker participant's role to play, such as the Hospital CEO, the Attending, and the Surrogate for the patient. Writing with the responsibility of the assigned role, the student cannot waffle but must face a challenging dilemma, think it through, and make a decision on the spot.” Several others confirmed the dynamism and creativity of role-playing within a fictional case such that the student may not make an appeal to history – instead she must be “on the hot seat” and think ethically realistically while facing a pending deadline.

Although the numbers within the 2008 study slightly differ from those above, the participants agreed that “how” a moral philosopher teaches is not primarily about course content and tools. The professor's approach to thinking, questioning, and probing may

well engage a student as much if not more than a book or technology. For example, when interviewed in 2008, Professor John Cooper at Princeton stated that he challenged “all of their moral beliefs including those from parents, media, political leaders, and other sources of values.” At Harvard, Professor Frances Kamm stated “I teach them to question all pat answers, their own and others – indeed they must question their entire mindset”. (2008).

Ultimately these values pronounced in both studies were well articulated in the first:

I want (students) to think Socratically, questioning everything.
I want them to believe that the questions are important and that
a life without facing those big questions is incomplete.

Martha Nussbaum, University of Chicago (2008)

Primary Teaching Problems (Questions 15, 16, 34, 35)

Faculty in the current 2015-6 study discussed both the problems they face in the classroom and also the problems they perceive that students face. When asked “What problems do you face working with students?”, faculty replied as below:

50% their limited time or over-commitment to other activities

- 25% their unfamiliarity with philosophy or moral reasoning
- 20% convincing them that ethics is valuable (in compulsory courses)
- 18% “my” ignorance about or distance from their mindset or culture
- 18% class size
- 15% student writing skills
- 13% distraction by their electronic devices
- 13% student difficulty with or resistance to making complex moral judgments
- 10% insufficient resources such as teaching assistants

When asked the same question only from a *student* perspective (i.e. “what problems do you perceive that students face in learning from you?”) , faculty replied as below:

- 53% keeping up due to time limitations
- 28% facing courses involving demanding theory or sophistication
- 18% generation gap
- 18% adjusting expectations regarding grading and approach
- 18% reading academically rigorous materials
- 15% teacher’s expectations or workload demands
- 15% information overload
- 13% English as a second language
- 10% class size
- 10% professor doesn’t seem to understand or care about their lives

These two charts, in which faculty and students share overlapping problems, are just a few of the challenges. Depending upon geography other problems faculty and students may face include close-mindedness, dependency upon drugs and alcohol, preference for skills (rather than cognitive) training, grade inflation, blind acceptance of “relativism”, a factory approach to teaching, mono-cultural bias, dogmatic religious or political beliefs by either party, the teacher’s hand-writing, class conversational “bullies”, speed-driven lecturing, and many others.

Much was reported about four major challenges: 1) cognitive/mental speedbumps 2) resource limitations 3) generational distance and 4) time shortage/multi-tasking/over-commitment.

The cognitive/mental challenges have many subsets including students unaccustomed to 1) philosophy, 2) moral reasoning, 3) ethics nomenclature, 4) critical thinking, 5) sophisticated writing, and 6) dense readings. In several classes there are students who speak and read English as a second or third language. One participant at the University of Southern California wrote:

I sometimes find it hard to move students beyond surface-level short-term inquiries...they seem to want to only grasp a few details of a case or phenomenon before giving their opinion ... My aim is to help them develop *arguments*, but they often seem to want to just share their *opinions*... I often have a hard time convincing students to read texts that may not seem immediately relevant to their interests, but are part of developing a conceptual foundation useful for their future. They want to read short texts, blog posts, or watch videos. I’m not sure they ever read the harder pieces I assign ...

Resource limitations take many forms as well - poor facilities, over-crowded

classes, insufficient number of teaching assistants, poorly maintained or staffed IT or AV support, minimal office hours for large numbers of students, inadequate budgets, etc. Since quality teaching depends upon one-on-one faculty mentoring of students, class size has important pedagogical implications. Professor Pamela Hieronymi at UCLA lamented:

Learning requires individualized attention – teaching is coaching for the mind. The ideal class size for the kind of teaching we do in philosophy is somewhere between six and twelve. At that size students can express themselves, repeatedly, receive feedback from the instructor, repeatedly, and learning can take place. But I am given thirty-five students when I do not have teaching assistants and at least eighty when I do...it is an absurd number.

With the spread of social media culture, generational distances sometimes seem enlarged and several faculty expressed an angst or confusion about knowing what their students are really like and how to fully reach them. Dr. Christopher Kutz, said that the real problem is “*understanding* what it is *not to understand something*”, a key not only to bridging generations but also subcultures, educational levels, and the teacher-student gap at large. Kutz’s Berkeley colleague, Ernesto Dal Bó, noted that “trying to figure things out from their perspective” is one of the largest challenges of teaching in general no matter what the generation or culture.

While many of these difficulties also appeared in the 2008 study, a major shift appeared in another area -- the ascendancy of “time starvation.” While “lack of time” was tied for fifth at 15% as a problem facing teachers in 2008 and tied for ninth at 8% as a problem facing students, “time starvation” has catapulted to the top of both lists in 2015-6 as a noose around both faculty (50%) and students (53%), at least in the perception of participants.

The matter is complicated. Time deprivation seems linked to the larger phenomena of increased multi-tasking, numerous avenues of mini-messages (texts, tweets, blogs, clips, sound-bites, etc.), multiple pre-career activities, media saturation and addiction, economic pressures, and many “speed-up” trends in the wireless yet wired world.

An important question then is whether or not students actually have less time for classes, homework, thinking, and projects? Or whether 1) they prioritize distractions they did not previously have or 2) they *seem* to have less time since reading an essay can take longer than watching three videos or “googling” summaries of the essay . Thus “old school” reading seems like an excessive time-guzzler. For increasing numbers reading an entire book seems wasteful and unprofitable if not impossible. In the age of Wikipedia, bite size excerpts and omni-present on-line reductive trots seem time-friendly and thus more suitable to many but not all students. Such a world challenges if not frustrates the understandably text-driven, standard-bearing professor.

On the other hand students have real time challenges within the current economy: many hold full-time or multiple jobs. Many have far more types of on-line relationships, organizations, media, cultural opportunities, internships, etc., from which to choose than ever before. In this context the aggregate picture formed by interviews outlines both the *reality* of less time per class and the *perception* of less time for each (relatively) long assignment, especially for students enmeshed with or addicted to social media.

One student-faculty difficulty was given special attention via questions about the impact of a professor’s declared political, religious, or other beliefs in class, and about whether faculty must guard against (the appearance of) personal “bias” regarding issues.

The question of “stating one’s position” has been controversial in ethics pedagogy such that it was not surprising that participants in the first (2008) study were almost evenly divided about whether professors should give the appearance of belief neutrality (35%) or should “take a stand” and “reveal personal positions” (33%). Those arguing for neutrality stated it was “pedagogically and morally obligatory” to “suspend one’s own views”. Some were apprehensive about teacher intimidation of students who held other beliefs and about the appearance of subjective grading, whether deliberate or subconscious, based upon professed teacher or student ideology.

In the current Pacific study the division of thought changed slightly with those favoring “the professor should be unmasked” (35%) as a slightly larger group than those stating “the professor should be a neutral referee (33%). Related views which were frequently voiced were “one must be clear that it is safe to disagree with the professor” (30%), “stating but not imposing your own positions is important in an *ethics* class” (28%), “values are important and should be modeled” (20%), and “even-handedness is needed –each school of thought fairly represented” (18%).

In response to this debate, when asked “How does your ethics instruction impart a free and rational inquiry without bias?”, Pacific region participants replied as within figure 6 below:

55% important to show both or multiple sides of issues

33% it is impossible to be unbiased

- 30% modeling neutral, free and rational inquiry essential
- 25% must make community safe for respectful disagreement
- 23% transparency an important value so must be up front about personal preferences
- 23% essential to encourage students to develop their own positions and critiques
- 20% professor should never reveal personal views
- 18% must model taking a stand and disclose rationale for it
- 13% neutrality can go too far; some views are harmful to society
- 10% compromise: reveal your views only at the end of the term

While the field is still divided about whether modeling one's positions constitutes "bias", there is near unity around the importance of engaging in honorable disagreement, and respecting student's diverse views. In the debate about "neutrality" vs. "advocacy", those leaning toward being an "even-tempered referee" had much to say. Mark Schroeder at USC explained:

I don't reveal any of my own views when I teach. I'm pretty successful with this as evidenced by the fact that I take open questions about what I think during the last day of classes. Students are always obviously surprised by many things ... there is no implication that students must come to think anything in particular.

From another angle Stanford Professor and Dean Debra Satz also works toward openness to multiple positions:

I work very hard to ensure a community of co-learners. I sometimes defend unpopular opinions or read controversial views to help students learn the value of toleration and rationale dialog. ...I think the students often cannot detect my beliefs....

Others hold to the view that transparency, if not advocacy or proselytizing, is advantageous and even inherent to ethics. At Santa Clara, Kirk Hanson imparted “I think having a set of values is essential to the students believing you think the course is important.” For Professor Tom Bivins at the University of Oregon students benefit since “they can see that I’m a human being, and that my beliefs are mine alone. And, if I have biases, then I’m just like they are only I recognize them and am not afraid to let them know what they are.” Professor Ian Richards at the University of South Australia added “expressing your views is generally positive. If students like and respect you, then they like and respect your values and beliefs.”

Many have had the experience shared by Ernesto Dal Bó at Berkeley:

While some students appreciate being put on the driver’s seat, others demand to know what my views are—perhaps to get a shortcut to the recommended action from an authority figure—and complain when I tell them I’d rather have them work out what the right view should be..

Stanford’s Glasser, who views teaching as a mode of advocacy, reported that avoiding “bias” is impossible and that all teaching imparts an intellectual/conceptual perspective or framework: “I don’t buy the “bias” vs. “non-bias” premise – you can’t be independent of your interest nor separate that out. ...no art is apolitical and no journalist is impartial.” Another Stanford professor also pointed out that teachers cannot escape their *cultural* “bias” or programming.

It is difficult not to have some kind of bias. What is important is to identify where the biases came from and how the cases might be dealt with in other cultures and countries. Often the people I work with come from different backgrounds so it is in a sense a U.S. bias that they are encountering.

Yet another Stanford colleague concurred that “bias is inevitable... but one can be aware

.. and one can make the deliberate attempt to think one set of thoughts and not another....”, an important thinking skill to *model* for students.

Whether or not participants advocated or believed in “neutrality”, almost all concurred that building community where members may “respectfully disagree” was important. Professor David Brink at the University of California San Diego advocated for a “safe forum for reasonable disagreement ... it is a forum where these biases and different views may be sorted through.” Berkeley’s R. Jay Wallace characterized such a forum as “one where there is openness to legitimate criticism including views which challenge one’s own... ..” At Stanford, Deborah Rhode described such an arena as “an open atmosphere within a safe space”.

Calling for a civil discourse atmosphere is common to both the 2008 and 2015-6 groups. Indeed the proponents of visible “commitment” in both groups were sensitive to the case made by “neutrality” advocates. Thus both “sides” recommended counterbalancing safeguards whether to teacher disclosure or feigned impartiality. Such balancing techniques included 1) insuring that the teacher’s views are publicly questioned and examined, 2) playing Devil’s advocate toward more than one position, 3) tolerating moral ambiguity, pluralism, and uncertainty in some cases 4) guaranteeing that students will not be punished for expressing views antithetical to those of the professor and 5) giving multiple examples, perspectives, and choices regarding moral options.

Outstanding Teaching and *Educare* (Questions 30, 40)

“Apex” questions 30 and 40 seemed most important to many teachers because they were asked if there are keys or secrets to both excellent teaching at large (30) and to drawing forth “the best ethical thinking, passion for learning, and growth” (40) from ethics students. Only two faculty bypassed these questions and most spoke or wrote passionately or at great length.

In the recent 2015-6 study when asked “are there any keys and secrets to outstanding teaching? ”, participants responded as in figure 7:

- 53% respect, love, or empathy for students
- 43% passion, love, or enjoyment of teaching or the subject matter
- 20% ability to create engagement or interactivity
- 20% passion for improving one’s teaching
- 20% communication skills including listening, speaking, and facilitation
- 15% self-discipline and hard work
- 10% community building / team skills / protecting safe environment for group
- 10% humility, self-disclosure
- 10% devotion of time / commitment
- 10% risk-taking

When asked the similar, but more ethics-specific, question about “what draws forth the best ethical thinking, passion for learning and growth?”, respondents replied as below:

- 33% engaging student participation
- 25% respect, appreciation, and love for students and/or subject matter
- 23% materials and an approach that seems relevant to their lives
- 20% listening and really hearing students
- 18% creating a safe space for all voices
- 15% teacher's passion for learning, course, or teaching
- 15% quality one-on-one interaction
- 13% inspiring student self-discovery
- 10% employing cases or questions in which students must take a stand
- 8% small classes

There are many aspects to what participants considered excellent teaching. One involves modeling: “the more relaxed *you* are, the more relaxed *they* can be which helps with your first job – building community” Stanford/MIT Professor Tamar Schapiro explained. At Australian National University Tamara Browne agreed: “When *you* enjoy it, the *students* enjoy it too. You must have a passion for the subject ... and enjoy the performance aspect.”

One professor in the Asian Pacific emphasized these important traits:

The first secret is time and commitment....other key points are communication ability and charisma. To teach well we need to be able to anticipate students' needs, what will seem interesting to them, and what will be too difficult or too easy. We need to read their faces during class and adjust ...

Berkeley Professor Tom Goldstein identified three keys -- “enthusiasm, deep familiarity with the material, and the ability to listen to what’s happening *in the classroom*”

(emphasis added – ed.) Dr. Glasser also underscored the importance of enthusiasm adding “if you do it as a burden, it will be a burden”.... Instead the top-notch teacher should impart “optimism ... the hope for a better tomorrow”.

For Ian Richards at the University of South Australia two door-openers are “generosity and humility....remember that you were once a student – and what it was like to be in their position.” According to a participant at Stanford such an attitude includes “understanding a student’s reason for taking the course, their needs, and any resources each student will require”. Another participant agreed:

empathy for the students ...for their concerns outside the classroom... is a basic foundation for good teaching. It reminds you to slow down and...take their questions and concerns seriously.

Although a few participants thought that people can be born with an aptitude for outstanding teaching, most felt that one must develop or further enhance such effectiveness. At Stanford one professor responded “one can certainly get better. You can improve over time. Teaching emphasizes a dialog and one can learn from it ..”

Again and again the veteran faculty emphasized the importance of full-spectrum listening. Deborah Rhode communicated “in addition to being well prepared, having a sense of humor and looking for ways to engage students, being a responsive listener is critical.” Her colleague at Stanford, Bill Damon, agreed

you must be a good listener since teaching is two way... be an open receiver, not just a talker. Indeed being interactive means that you are watching for cues and realizing that less is more. I have learned to

let there be pauses and silences as with Miles Davis and Charlie Parker in jazz. After all learning is a slow process so I must give them time to digest, to dig in, and then to respond.

For some there is also a somewhat subconscious but important aspect to teaching which involves carrying a particular spirit of assurance and steadiness. Ernesto Dal Bó called it “a type of Zen peace. On your best days you carry a plasticity and peace of mind. You expect things to go well and that confidence allows you to be a better communicator who connects well and fields audience response in a flowing way ...”

For some at the heart of the matter is the matter of the heart. As Professor Margaret McLean at Santa Clara University summarized, “you need to love it ... you need to have a heart for teaching ...and you need to care about your students, not as consumers but as people. Teaching technique and talent are helpful, but they’re nothing without heart.”

Regarding the more specific question about teaching *ethics*, several ideas were voiced:

...the best technique for aiding students to employ ethical decision-making is to use the self-discovery style of learning. The teacher may set the environment, boundaries, questions and codes of ethics. The students then use these to find their approach to real life scenarios. (Catherine Strong, 2015)

One professor at Stanford emphasized that it is important for ethics students to be “open and well motivated ... it is hard to defend sleep-walking through life.”

A question debated in the field is whether ethics instructors should be held to a higher standard of moral behavior than others. Would it be an oxymoron to talk about a “dishonest ethicist” or a “corrupt moral philosopher”? Pradip Thomas felt that “honesty

in one's exploration of ethical issues" is the most important quality of *educare* or "drawing forth." Similarly, Grace Leung called for "authenticity.. if you demonstrate that in your conduct, students sense it and are more open to learning."

For those who held that ethics is not just subject matter but also pertains to the way the professor teaches, it makes sense that an approach to teaching ethics also be "ethical" in the sense of being "other inclusive", "alter-directed", or accountable to others and to moral ideals. For those who share this view it makes sense that teaching ethics is also about teaching *ethically* in keeping with Emerson's dictum that "who you are thunders over you so loudly that I can't hear a word you're saying."

In such a theory of value the student emerges as a primary center of one's responsibility if not accountability. In that light Ted Glasser at Stanford felt that "they need to know that they are taken seriously and their arguments matter....everyone has something important to say." In Hawaii Tom Brislin expressed that this also meant "getting to know each one personally and finding collaborative ways for them to know each other." Another participant affirmed that it is essential to "engage with them conversationally... let them make conjectures and then engage with them..." At Oregon Tom Bivins elaborated "I try to make them *feel* in my classes. If they don't feel something, they don't care. My job is to excite them both rationally and emotionally."

Pete Jennings tied many of these themes together with what might summarize much of the majority view:

Educare –to bring out, lead forth. Education, properly understood, is broadly and deeply formative, not narrowly and technically informative.... You've got to get away from pro forma ... teaching template... textbooks ... narrow emphasis on technical/analytical/ knowledge/skills. All this is too impersonal, sterile, clinical, and has little "educare" value. You've got to get up close and personal.

Engage hearts and the minds will follow. We are ... preparing them for life and work in a difficult/challenging but rewarding and noble profession.

The data for these two questions matched closely with that of the previous 2008 study. Hence the two groups spoke in largely one voice. In 2008 Professor Onora O'Neill (Cambridge) said great teaching involves enabling "students to be active rather than feeling that they are being lectured at" (2008). At Princeton Dr. Gideon Rosen elaborated: "You can't just read boring notes or give dreamy lectures. Students must be thinking actively about the issues themselves rather than trying to decode dry speeches." (2008)

As Janet Radcliffe Richards (Oxford) offered "I take seriously what students have to say. It's important to first see where they are and then give them a reason for moving" (2008). When a teacher is considering this different student culture or vocabulary, it is important to carefully translate: "great teachers take seriously the obligation to explain what is difficult or distant in clear and interesting fashion" (Kagan, Yale, 2008)

The final question on the survey asked:

"Given that the Latin root of education, *educare*, means to rear or draw forth, what have you discovered draws forth the best ethical thinking, passion for learning, and growth from your students?"

Although it was the longest question, in 2008 it drew the shortest, and possibly most important reply. At Cambridge, Professor Simon Blackburn replied with only one word, "Honesty".

.

Enhancing Pedagogical Effectiveness (Questions 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27)

I've learned the humility to recognize that being a good teacher requires continued effort, reflection, and balance. The smallest changes in teaching method can have dramatic effect, for good and bad.

Stephen Findley, University of Southern California (2015)

One of the most important areas of research pertained to how teachers *improve* their teaching over time whether through trial and error, feedback from students and peers, or more formal mechanisms such as workshops, mentors, teaching centers, video playback, and assessment. Faculty in both surveys relied more upon student feedback and personal reflection than from other approaches.

In the recent Pacific study most participants (90%) reported making temporary or long-term changes in their approach to teaching. Almost two thirds (65%) of all changes were made to accommodate student (including graduate assistant 15%) feedback.

Most student-directed changes (70% of all changes made) pertained to adjusting to the students' 1) self-reported thinking capacity, 2) media preferences, 3) learning pace, 4) homework saturation point, and other forms of feedback. Faculty respondents disclosed becoming "more relaxed", "more varied in approach", "less didactic", "more aware of students as individuals", "more conversational", and "less ambitious" and thus many professors often reduced the amount, speed, or level of course presentation, reading

material, homework, or lecturing. Often participants *increased* the amount of 1) discussion (28%), 2) spontaneity (20%), 3) newer media (20%) , 4) reading and homework incentives (15%), 5) on-line presence (15%) and 6) updated material (15%). They also *decreased* the length of lectures (15%), essays/papers (15%) and readings (13%) in response to student feedback.

Changes made less frequently and by fewer participants included reducing redundancy (10%), adding more interdisciplinary content (10%), increasing diversity/gender balance materials (10%), taking positions (8%), decreasing PowerPoint (8%), and reducing testing (8%). Many made the usual “maturing” or “learning” changes after assessing trial and error, experimenting with new materials, and accruing years of classroom experience. A few (10%) reported that they only minimally “fine-tuned” their course over the years and fewer still (5%) said they have made no changes.

One fifth (20%) reported implementing more media (slides, art, music, clickers, PowerPoint, DVD) as a form of change or growth. Half (50%) of those later changed their minds (see above) and withdrew or decreased use of one or more tools.

Student written (formal) and spoken (informal) feedback effected instructor changes “frequently” (65%) or “sometimes” (33%) although one instructor (2%) felt that feedback was unnecessary and unimportant. Seven (18%) deliberately initiated additional student input by creating their own feedback forms and processes or by using college wide mid-term evaluation forms.

Student feedback coupled with the passing of time seems to have had a tempering effect on many rigidities and possibly unrealistic expectations of some younger faculty. Bill Damon at Stanford revealed “I’ve become a better improviser and more fluid ... and I require less reading.” Berkeley’s Tom Goldstein has become a “little looser about the lesson plan ... and a little less doctrinaire about when the plan gets covered”. Christina Hendricks at the University of British Columbia has replaced what was once lecture time with more active learning. Thus she wrote “I have covered less material but I hope that the students are more engaged and learn more.” A participant in the Asian Pacific concurred: “Less is more. As a young new professor, I hoped to include a wider range of material...my first syllabi were much too ambitious. I learned to pare things down.”

Despite a pattern of substantial respect for student feedback, not all evaluations from students were given equal weight. As Professor Bivins at the University of Oregon differentiated: “I look for the good ideas and try to adopt those, and ignore the whining.” . Dr. Schroeder at USC shared a similarly balanced view:

I read all of my student evaluations and take notes ...However, there is good research which confirms the sense that students do not generally know what creates the best learning environment. I think responding to student feedback is as much about helping students feel empowered ...as it is about figuring out what is not working.”

A second means for potentially enhancing pedagogical effectiveness is the input of other faculty. While one tenth (10%) felt that their courses were “not influenced” by faculty colleagues and twice as many (20%) felt they had “only rarely learned” from their peers, almost three fourths (73%) felt they had either “frequently” (30%) or “sometimes” (43%) accrued teaching insights from colleagues. Many of those felt they had learned

1) informally, by observing their own teachers, guest lecturers, and other faculty (40%)
2) from collaborative or team-teaching processes (20%), 3) by sitting in on each other's
classes (15%), and 4) by more formal peer evaluation (10%). To a lesser extent
participants also learned by other formats such as teacher surveys, conference panels,
correspondence, and teacher supervision.

At one end of the spectrum faculty such as Christina Hendricks have substantially
learned from multiple colleagues at 1) workshops 2) peer evaluations *of* others 3) peer
evaluations *by* others 4) following other teachers on Twitter and 5) blogs about
teaching. Margaret McLean, Associate Director at Markkula Center for Applied Ethics
(SCU), who uses some of these same opportunities for growth, also attends regular
department conversations and campus seminars about teaching. She wrote "I also will
ask advice from more experienced faculty – even now. I try to incorporate one new idea
into a course every year."

Participants were asked not only how they evaluated their teaching via student
and faculty input, but also via their own reflection and independent analysis. Almost all
(98%) reported some mode of self-inspection whether they described it as "self-criticism"
(38%), "thinking about my teaching" (35%) or "continual assessment" (25%).
Almost one fourth (23%) took the practical approach of quickly discarding what had not
been working in class, but others (13%) first utilized either grad assistant feedback,
informal student feedback such as after class or during office hours, or requested a
meeting with CITL (a campus program for teacher training) personnel. Still others
(10%) said that they welcomed peer classroom visitation.

One fifth (20%) reported some additional means of evaluating their work. A participant at the University of Southern California relayed that “Every class ... I hand out a sheet that asks them to ‘name two things about the class you would change ... and two things you would NOT change’. I then aggregate these results, share the trends with the class, and make relevant adjustments.”

Several narrated holding themselves to high standards when making upgrades. Chris Kutz said “I must teach as if my own child were taking this class and would learn well.” Only one (2%) of those surveyed reported that he did not engage in any manner of self-inspection.

Exactly half (50%) had never enrolled in any institutional faculty development processes such as prescribed workshops, video playback, or assigned mentoring. Of the others (50%) who had done so, two fifths (40%) had reservations regarding the value of such work while more (48%) felt they had learned from such training. Comments ranged from those who were enthusiastic about their workshops and mentoring such as Professor Hendricks (UBC) who reported "multiple workshops per year and who has had several successful mentoring relationships" to those with mixed feelings and yet others who felt the workshops or mentors in their lives had been “a mismatch”, “impotent”, or “a waste of time.”

The availability of campus learning centers and their programs such as those hosted by CITL or CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) seem to have increased since 2008. Seven (18%) participants found such centers effective while four (10%) reported mixed experience and two (5%) were disappointed. Half (50%) declared that they had not used most of the “supplementary” teacher training options such as CITL

workshops, video-playback, mentoring and peer evaluations, and of those ‘abstainers’ three fifths (60% or 30% overall) said they had never taken *any* form of teacher training.

Thus the leading form of instructor learning remained trial and error while the second most widely used tool was teacher/course evaluations by students. Many acknowledged that they had been inspired by their own teachers whom they emulated whether consciously or subconsciously.

When asked to review the most substantial changes they had made after years of *aggregate* (student, peer, self, CITL, mentor) evaluation, the largest number realized that they had made many types of changes including 1) increasing the ratio of student-to-teacher participation (28%), decreasing the amount or/and length of reading and assignments (23%), increasing technology use (20%), making a “variety of ongoing adjustments” (18%), covering less material in class (18%), soliciting additional feedback (15%), introducing more hands-on or experiential exercises (15%), discarding ineffective technologies and tools (13%), and deliberately fostering more discussion and thinking periods (13%) . Three (8%) observed that they had “not made much change at all”.

All in all major teacher breakthroughs in the classroom were often inspired by two paradoxically opposing observations: 1) “These are human beings *just* like me” and, in the words of Christopher Kutz at Berkeley 2) “I need to teach students who are *not* like me.” An empathy for both similarity (e.g. “they have many other hidden pressures *just like me*”) and difference (“their cultural background demands that they not make eye contact with the professor *unlike me*”) seems to awaken the professor to deeper understanding and greater connectivity.

One sub-pattern seemed to be that over time several faculty disclosed more information about their research, lives, or ethical positions during class. Dr. Rhode reflected “I find that over time I have become more willing to take a position in the classroom. I think whether or not that improves the class depends upon the individual student.”

A larger pattern seems to be that over time, despite contrary examples, most faculty tend to lose a stiff and erect posture and figuratively lean forward in the direction of their students. In the words of Dean Wasserman at Berkeley “My classes have become less material- driven and more student-driven. I think this has made me a more engaging teacher and the classes have become looser and more fun.”

On the whole participants feel that their classroom adjustments have paid dividends “substantially” (63%), “partially” (20%), or “marginally” (8%) with only one person reporting “no change” (2%), another “unsure” (2%), two others (5%) stressing humility by saying “there’s much more to do.” This data is not substantially different than in Part I although more faculty have taken CTL/CITL type teaching training and a higher percentage of those benefitted from such training. From the overview perspective, however, most faculty have continued to learn by “trial by fire” without training, by the subconscious emulation of their own best teachers, by experimentation, and especially by student written and oral feedback.

In both studies some participants spontaneously voiced “asides” when answering questions about effectiveness. These included “perhaps we *should* undergo some teacher training after all?”; “I’m usually too busy to think about teaching but this interview makes me wonder if I shouldn’t address it more conscientiously?”, and “so what are other

interviewees saying about teacher workshops ... I'm wondering if I should take one or not?" Such questions raise larger ones about whether some teachers might best utilize additional venues and choices for enhancing effectiveness; whether students are fully served; whether formal, informal, or mixed teacher development instruction works best; and whether to trust the current laissez-faire attitude favoring informal evaluation methods and "learning by osmosis" ?

Why Teach? (Questions 14, 17)

"I fall out of bed teaching. It's who I am and what I do in the classroom and elsewhere."

Margaret McLean, Santa Clara University (2015)

The graph below shows not only how current participants (Part 2) answered the question "Why do you teach?" but also shows how this question was answered in 2008 and the averaged answer when the two surveys are treated as one.

1) "Service to society"/"noble profession":	40 %
2) "Enjoyable"/"fun"/"fulfilling"	35 %
3=) "Accompanies research"/"allows me to do research"	30 %
3=) "Love of learning"/"love of university life"	30 %
5) "Important for people to think about issues/ethics"	25 %
6) "Students contribute to a more informed society"	23 %
7) "Its my job"/"required to teach"	20 %
8=) "Love of students"/"assistance to students"	15 %
8=) "For the money"/"my livelihood"/"to support family"	15 %

Many other reasons were articulated in both parts of the study such as “relating theory to practice”, “I’m good at it”, and “it is important for its own sake.”

In the 2008 study Dr. Christine Korsgaard (Harvard) elaborated on the valued linkage of teaching to personal research:

Your teaching and your research – that is, your own philosophizing— can remain very closely linked. You can share your thoughts with the students – and they find it exciting. In fact I find routinely that if I lecture on a topic I am currently working on, most of the better students write their paper on that topic—they pick up on my own interest and excitement, even if I don’t tell them that is the topic I am working on right now.

Within the Pacific study several participants felt that teaching has substantial civic importance: Pamela Hieronymi wrote “it is vital for the future of humanity” while Ted Glasser said “teaching is a form of activism ... an effort to make the world better.” As Glen Pettigrove at the University of Auckland pointed out “Learning to think clearly about significant and complicated questions is important. I want to help people do that.”

Many teachers teach (ethics) for the gratification of engaging in an effective or rewarding job. When asked “How do you know when you’ve done a good job teaching?”, the largest number of Part 2 participants advanced “the degree of student engagement with the material” (43%), whether in class, assignments, e-communication, or during office hours. Positive feedback about the course and teacher, whether informally (40%) such as students rushing the podium at the end of class, ovations, thank you notes, and spontaneous comments, or more formally (28%) such as through mandatory written evaluations, were also key indicators.

Other important “signs” of perceived effective teaching included the increased comprehension of material (23%), greater quality of student contributions (20%), unexpected positive feedback such as via holiday cards, requests for recommendations, and invitations to student events (20%); increased retention of ideas (15%), greater sophistication of discussion (15%), depth and refinement of final papers (15%), and more independent thinking (10%).

To be sure almost one quarter of the participants (23%) stated that they were not certain when they had been successful in their teaching. Nevertheless the majority experienced positive perceptions which they translated as momentary if not sustained success. As Bill Damon at Stanford indicated “You can really tell ... they have those visible ‘Eureka’ moments.”

Ed Wasserman at Berkeley observed that there are two seemingly contradictory roles involved within successful teaching. One requires being “so transparent that the material comes through unfettered and unbiased in a brilliant manner.” The other involves “being the agent provocateur who inspires great thinking.” Wasserman concluded “When I find the balance between those two roles, I hit the ‘sweet spot’ and that’s how I know I’ve been successful that day.”

In both studies many answers to the “successful teaching” question revolved around increased dynamism: both the professor and the student become “energized” or “animated” in new ways. In 2008 Robert Gurland (NYU) expressed the value of enthusiasm:

My enthusiasm for my work has never waned, fifty-three years in the classroom, better than 25,000 students...If I lived forever, I would never experience boredom if I were permitted to occupy the classroom platform ...new faces, new ideas... teaching is ... an invigorating activity which not only enhances

the life experiences of my students but it provides the means of continual self-renewal ... to quote Dylan .. it allows one to remain 'forever young' (2008).

In the current Pacific study many voiced that teaching is a great responsibility. In the words of Dr. David Magnus "taking bright young people into the process of discovery is a tremendous privilege I take very seriously". Stanford colleague Tamar Schapiro noted "by being a teacher I can talk to the most mature part of the person." Several see teaching as an invaluable, if not apex profession within society. such as Mark Schroeder (USC) **who** concludes "Both of my parents were teachers, and I don't know what a more valuable way of contributing to other human beings would be."

Creative Inventory of Tools and Topics (Questions 36, 38, 39)

In both studies the researcher gathered a list of creative classroom tools and resources used or recommended by participants. These included both ideas instructors had developed themselves and those they had collected from other faculty.

In the 2008 study this "creative inventory" of techniques and resources was listed with the published findings in *Teaching Ethics* (volume 10, No. 1, fall 2009). An abridged version is listed below. The current 2015-6 creative inventory of pedagogical ideas and tools constitutes a special appendix (I) to this paper. Ideas and teaching practices are broken out by classroom technique, process, and technology. Additionally, the "Works Cited and Additional Resources" section below includes many publications and media recommended by participants including books, essays, journals, columns, podcasts, films, videos, and websites.

Many standard tools such as syllabi from ethics and related classes, exams, and on-line lectures (URLs are provided) are complemented by more inventive creations such as on-line ethics comics, class-room thinking games, and papers listing and discussing key films/videos featuring ethical issues and case studies (See Appendix I).

Participants were also asked which ethical issues most engage their students. While the answers are too lengthy to list, the following issues were all mentioned by at least three respondents: diversity/racism/hate speech (20%), breaking ethics news stories (18%), gender equality (13%), death/euthanasia/assisted suicide (13%), justice/law (13%), genetic manipulation (10%), sexual morality (10%), deception/truth-telling (10%), animal experimentation (8%), privacy (8%), organ transplant equity (8%), resource distribution (8%), global health/medical resources (8%), and birth (surrogacy/abortion/stem cell/embryology) issues (8%).

In 2008 participants submitted many similar issues. They also contributed thirty-five unique teaching tools they had developed for ethics and moral philosophy classes.

These tools included

- 1) variant debate formats such as
 - a) adaptation of Lincoln-Douglas format and
 - b) spontaneous mid-discussion debates
- 2) research about each student's cultural/religious values pertaining to specific ethics issues
- 3) philosophical analysis of news articles with ethical themes
- 4) development of pedagogical guide hand-outs for graduate assistants
- 5) production of (a) film(s) about specific philosophers
- 6) creation of specific relevant hypothetical stories for classroom debate
- 7) construction of compendia of charts, graphs, and commentary
- 8) authoring of special topic-driven websites (e.g. racial discrimination, animal rights, history of ethics)
- 9) locating and excerpting special media examples such as

- a) Gilbert and Sullivan excerpt (C.D.)
 - b) BBC radio comedy
 - c) Feature film sequences about arresting moral dilemmas
 - d) Illustrative music and art
 - e) Editorial cartoons
- 11) adding optional special sessions, “movie nights”, or additional workshops
 - 12) integrating special pedagogies (e.g. Collingwood questioning approach)
 - 13) importing multiple disciplines (e.g. economics, math, sociology, theology)
 - 14) analysis of lawyer obituaries to determine underlying values/life priorities
 - 15) technical innovation (e.g. blog groups, pre-class e-questions; web lectures)
 - 16) group dynamics (e.g. warm-up dyads, small group question reports, etc.)
 - 17) developing case studies from well known literary and dramatic scenes
 - 18) ending each class with a question which must be discussed to begin the next class
 - 19-35) Many others (see *Teaching Ethics*, 2009, Vol. 10, Number 1).

Both groups noted key scholarly on-line reference guides (*Oxford Companion; Stanford and Routledge Encyclopedia(s) of Philosophy; Philosophical Index*, numerous on-line journals, ethical theory websites, ethics news listservs; college and university teaching websites; and much more (See “Works Cited and Resources”). One tenth (10%) made note of particular film/DVD and video/television documentaries (listed in Appendix I) that well illustrated particular ethical issues.

Summarily, although six (15%) participants in 2008 and 4 (10%) in 2015-6 felt that innovation was unnecessary or laborious, most (85% in 2008, 90% in 2015-6) identified or invented creative tools, helpful resources, arresting topics, and/or enticing examples/cases to engage students.

Several seemed sensitive to the dangers of relying upon gimmicks. Hence individual faculty creativity was often, although not always, embedded within or rotated with more traditional teaching methods.

Standard Tools of the Trade

In 2008 two fifths (40%) provided examples of their standard teaching tools such as handouts, syllabi, DVDs, and policies. One of the most elaborate and practical tools proved to be the fifteen page “Teaching Sections in Philosophy” hand-out which Professor Thomas Scanlon at Harvard developed for his teaching assistants in the early 1990s. His guidance to teaching assistants included:

When a student asks a question, and you are deciding how to answer it, try not to think about what The Answer is (the one that would show your complete mastery of the subject). Your main thought should rather be what answer would be most helpful to the student. You are like a medical doctor, who should give the answer that is most comprehensible and helpful to the patient, not the one that shows the greatest command or cutting edge medical literature on the topic.... Don't be too critical, or allow yourself just to refute their suggestions or objections, like a tennis instructor who slams the ball back at the beginning player. This not only discourages them but also sets a bad example (1992).

Scanlon's thorough hand-out in effect created an informal code of communication ethics.

In the Atlantic region study some faculty said it was important to “put one's self in the student's dorm”. Hence some provided “extras” in their syllabi such as lists of libraries and book store locations, highly detailed grading policies, a statement of the professor's expectations, a class roster, a comprehensive assignment outline, explicit lists of course aims and assessment, class difficulty level, professor's philosophy, “for further reading” lists, and answers to student FAQs.

In both studies a few faculty reported being involved in the production of CDs, DVDs, films, websites, etc., about ethics. Many more had used such documentaries,

instructional DVDs, and similar visual tools created by educational companies. Still others had been involved as consultants or contributors.

About half who submitted materials had developed specific classroom policies governing grading, academic misconduct, and attendance. In 2008 a few were grappling with more current policies such as student classroom use of cell phones, laptops, text messaging, headsets, and other distractions. By 2015-6 more of these technology policies (see above) had become absolute.

Patterns and Insights

Summary #1: Comparison of Part I and Part II – Differences

The eighteen points immediately below list comparative *differences* between important outcomes of Part I (2008) and Part II (2015-6). Possible interpretations of those differences will be discussed beneath that list. In the following segment findings of *similarity* will be listed.

The analysis and interpretation of these differences occurs further below. It should be noted that the differences (e.g. “student attendance dropped from 70% to 60%”) are not to be literally interpreted. A “drop” or “rise” in numbers is a comparison of the two studies, not necessarily of changes in practices or perspectives since there are different participants in other institutions. (See “Analysis and Interpretation” below).

The primary differences include:

- 1) Although Atlantic region participants were evenly divided (40% pro; 40 % con) about whether ethics as “moral improvement” should be taught in universities, fewer (33%) in the recent study felt that this type of ethics can or should be imparted in college. More (53%) felt that ethics as moral reasoning *only* should be taught, not the ethics of “character development” or “being a better person.” However, as in 2008 there are strong proponents for both approaches.
- 2) Even though 2015-6 faculty are roughly divided on whether to appear value neutral in the classroom, the percentage of those favoring taking a stand has risen *slightly* (2%) to 35% while those opposed has decreased *slightly* (2%) to 33%. This is a very subtle and thus probably insignificant difference. Participants remain almost equally divided. Another third (32%) are either unsure (15%) or have a mixed (12%) or other (5%) response.
- 3) While many participants in both studies teach ethics 1) “because it is fulfilling” or enjoyable (35%), 2) due to the love of students (30%), and 3) because it supports research/writing (18%), the greatest number of teachers now report that they teach because it is of service to society (40%) or use similar language.
- 4) Although many of the challenges facing ethics *faculty* remain the same (i.e. student difficulty with philosophical/ethical thinking, age gap, insufficient basic skills, etc.) the *primary* problem – *inadequate time* – has more than tripled (from 15% to 50%) since 2008.
- 5) While major perceived problems facing *students* remain cognitive challenges and differences in age, culture, and language, the *primary* problem facing students ALSO seems to be *time limitations* (53%) augmented by information overload (15%), a major shift since 2008.
- 6) Far more women (from 20% to 40%) and diversity and disability faculty (from 2% to 18%) participated in the Part 2 study. Such changes seem in proportion to increased growth in both areas within the field.
- 7) While the overall proportion of classroom technology time remains about the same, slightly more (from 23% to 30%) faculty use film/video, 20% more have experimented with new interactive on-line technologies, and 10% overall are testing or adopting clickers and brand new devices not reported in the previous study.
- 8) Stronger reaction to some technologies has appeared including those unfavorable (40%) about PowerPoint type presentations and 45% who object to student laptop and cell use in the classroom. Of those who have used PPT, 55% have retired or reduced use, a major shift since 2008.

9) As primary grading tools 1) the “short” paper has more than doubled from 30% to 70%, and 2) the evaluation and marking of participation/discussion grew from 20-35%. However, final exams, case studies, and debates have all dropped by 10-20% in use.

10) The number of participants teaching *applied* (such as medical, journalism, business, legal or media) ethics has grown from 28% to 40% in professional schools and from 10% to 18% in departments and institutes other than philosophy.

11) The percentage of those who frequently assign publications that they have authored themselves has dropped by half (from 50% to 23%) and the number of those who *never* assign them has grown from 5% to 22%.

12) Those “frequently influenced by new ideas” in their field which they import into the classroom has sharply increased from 35% to 63 %.

13) Slightly fewer (80% in 2008, 70% in 2015) use original canonical ethics writings as their primary reading documents while fewer still (37% in 2008, 20% in 2015) now oppose the use of textbooks, anthologies, etc.

14) Although the primary keys to outstanding teaching are still reported as 1) empathy/love/support for students (53%) and 2) enthusiasm/passion for subject matter/issues/ideas (43%), nevertheless a previous emphasis upon the teachers’ skills (organization, listening, eye contact, clarity) has *decreased* by 15% and focus upon the instructor’s character (honesty, humility, authenticity, fairness) by 20%. This is not to say that participants deem these inconsequential, only lower on the scale.

15) Almost all (90%) self-inspect their own teaching and over two thirds (70%), set aside a deliberate time for self-evaluation of their classes. The latter number reveals a sharp increase of 20%

16) Even though half have not taken teaching workshops, recorded themselves, or worked with mentors, those taking CITL (also called CTL – a “Center of Teaching and Learning”) type workshops report a much higher (from 50% to 85%) rate of effectiveness and satisfaction.

17) Despite ongoing interest in “perennial” ethics topics such as justice, equal rights, fairness, and deception, students currently are *most* interested by these “trending” topics in the classroom: free speech/hatespeech/racism (20%), gender / sexual preference equity (13%), death/assisted suicide/euthanasia (13%) genetic manipulation (13%) and sexual morality (10%)

18) Fewer participants (30%) than in 2008 (40%) use case studies although the variety of case types (20% hypothetical, 18% topical, 15% classic, 15% personal, 13% legal, 10% scientific/medical, etc) has expanded.

Analysis and Interpretation:

The influential Canadian social scientist Harold Innis coined a dual bias theory in which both the impact of *time* and *space* constituted unique “biases”. In conjunction these could be seen as two blades of the scissors shaping history (Innis, 1951). When analyzing the two companion studies seven years and several thousand miles apart, there are clearly factors of both time (seven years) and space (several thousand miles) which separate the two studies. In some cases it is hard to be certain which differences might be caused by time, space, a mixture of the two, and other factors both known --such as the participants and their backgrounds-- and unknown --including hidden influences upon each participant and institution.

Clearly both factors –time and space – among many others –have come into play. So to compare Part I (Atlantic) with Part II (Pacific) is not only to compare 2008 and 2015, but also to compare extracts from “East” and “West” as well as both latent and obvious contextual factors.

The introduction of specific new technologies in the classroom might well be partially explained by “time” since some technologies were unavailable in 2008. On the other hand a greater emphasis upon Taoist, Buddhist, and Confucianist ethics in the curriculum of some Pacific institutions might seem more due to a “bias” of “space” or geography. Yet other differences such as the number of faculty who, for

example, now prefer Aristotle to Kant or vice versa, who did not before, *might* have little to do with time or space and *might* be explained by yet other factors or remain unknown.

The ongoing expansion (from 28% to 40%) of ethics taught within the professional schools, and other expansion within programs, institutes, and departments other than philosophy, might be seen as a product of time if that growth pattern may be shown to be part of a national or international trend. However, such “growth” might not be a trend at all but rather an accidental over-representation of participants from such applied programs. They might constitute a sample not likely to be replicated by the demographics of other samples. More and different research is needed to fine out. Moreover, one must be very careful about the interpretation of data based upon only eighty participants.

“Time” refers to far more than a literal eight year interval and also includes movement into an age of “super-speed-up”. Does this sort of “time change” help explain why both students and faculty report for the first time that the number one limitation to their learning is a perceived or real “lack” of time? Might this “time starvation” also have bearing upon the trend toward “short” papers, faster technologies, and smaller content “dosages?” Or not? Common sense and research alike suggest that technology and socio-cultural trends “link” to the psychology of time and its perceived quantification and speed.

The reaction to PowerPoint, laptop use by students, and cell phones in the class room seems more driven by time than space since many faculty welcomed these technologies initially, then reacted to their impact upon students over *time*. Such a

pattern happened across many regions and cultures and the impulse to react seemed largely based upon first-hand experience rather than geographic accent. More faculty than not who phased out PowerPoint or banned laptop and cell phone use did so *following* an initial trial phase, that is, over time. And their objections were based more upon over-arching general philosophical and pedagogical concerns, not derived from national or cultural belief systems which were location-specific.

Another dimension of time pertains to the age of the participants' institutions. When one considers the history, standards, and traditions of universities in the Atlantic region, and remembers that the average age of Oxbridge and Ivy institutions taken together is over four hundred years old, then the other Pacific institutions – which average *a little more than* one hundred years each – look quite young by comparison.

In examining Asian institutions of the far Pacific, Neubauer, Shin, and Hawkins (2013) note the degree that these younger institutions on the one hand feel the pressure to emulate elite Western institutions to succeed within the dominant paradigms of globalization and economic development. Yet on the other hand they are still somewhat nourished by the values of Taoism and Confucianism. Such younger “hybrid” institutions are driven to obtain higher international rankings and may teach ethics (and much more) accordingly. They may be caught between the “eternal” time zone of ancient tradition and the “speed-up” time warp of corporate globalization.

Although Stanford and Berkeley, among others, stand somewhere in between the “older” and “younger” institutions, throughout their development and those of the surrounding schools in California, western Canada, Oregon, Washington, and Hawaii, such universities also felt the need to emulate if not compete with the prototypical

Oxbridge and Ivy cultures. Many of these “parent” Atlantic institutions sought to define and to some degree transplant curricular templates not only for higher education writ large but also for the ethics classroom. Nevertheless the degree of influence varies from institution to institution and department to department and cannot be seen as homogenous or conclusive.

What about “space”? One participant in Asia wrote directly about the decades of influence of Buddhist, Hindu, Confucianist, Taoist and even Maoist ethics upon Asian Pacific institutions and their curriculums. One is more likely to find a higher percentage of courses about Confucianist or Taoist ethics taught in Hawaii and California (not just Singapore or Hong Kong) than in Rhode Island or Scotland. Geography matters.

Moreover, evidence seems to suggest that, despite exceptions, teaching styles, student requirements, and even university dress codes are somewhat more relaxed and “pacific” in the Pacific. Overall the 2015-6 participants, despite notable exceptions, do seem *somewhat but not substantially* less formal, demanding, and competitive. But how much of that may be accounted for by “space”?

Higher education institutions do not exist in a political and cultural vacuum. As Ka Mok (2015) explained about Hong Kong:

“the Honk Kong government has tried to encourage its universities to engage with industry and business to promote innovation and R&D, knowledge transfer, and research capacities of universities in the city state.” (p. 116, 2015).

Such universities cannot always control their own destinies. As in Hong Kong often the standards for academic “success” are not driven exclusively from *inside* the academy.

Hence the socio-economic and political “space” in which a university resides can have as much or more impact than regional topography, natural resources, and climate.

Space of all kinds matters.

. Many other factors, not just time, space, culture, and their mixture, are often more subtle or undetected. For example, the selection, training, and predispositions of each participant, the time that each allotted the interview (some were laconic, others comprehensive), what they ate and drank the night before, and a host of other factors, had unmeasured impact upon the outcome of both studies. All researchers must stay humble in the light of uncertainty, the likely misinterpretation of culture, and many types of possible human error. Moreover, it is impossible to calculate the interplay of seen but misunderstood influences, not to mention invisible factors not perceived until years later.

Would forty different participants from the same institutions answer the forty questions identically to those in 2008 or 2015-6? That seems unlikely. Would forty participants from neighboring institutions or fields answer identically? That too is unlikely. Would these same forty or eighty answer identically one year later or earlier? Also unlikely. But in general would most if not all of the *over-arching* patterns of difference and similarity emerge despite variations? That seems *more* likely.

So the comparisons seem noteworthy, but neither absolute nor permanent. Nor has their reliability and validity been tested by other researchers choosing different samples.

Summary #2: Patterns of Similarity between the Two Studies

Great teaching requires full-spectrum interest in everything, especially in learning. The teacher's passion for the material and issues, respect for the student, and ability to help them open up a book in a new way means a love for the entire education process.

Margaret Farley, Yale (2008)

It is important not only to be a good public speaker with communication skills, and to be a master of simplicity who can deconstruct complex material into comprehensible molecules for students, but also to be a narrator of significant human stories which connect with students' lives.

Julian Savulescu, Oxford (2008)

Quotes such as two above from the first study might have emerged in either.

Both are representative of common values and views shared by many findings summarized below.

Some findings in the "similarities" category were unexpected. For example, two findings which *might* have been expected did *not* materialize. First there seemed to be no prominent differences in the aggregate views reported by men and women in both studies. Secondly, there seemed to little difference by those teaching in U.S., British, Asian, Canadian, and Australasian institutions . Hence, despite the uniqueness of the tutorial teaching system used at Oxford and Cambridge, and of the Confucian, Taoist and other traditions in the Pacific, this study did not reveal *appreciable* national and cultural differences in attitudes toward the teaching of ethics.

So, paradoxically, one form of *unity* of thought was in the way that *division*

occurred. Despite exceptions, if participants were divided about an issue, they were typically divided within each gender and within each group from a particular country or institution, not divided according to reported demographics.

Below is a list of nineteen “common ground findings” all of which express areas of similarity if not unity, including those where the two studies are “*united*” about issues in which professors are “*divided*”, shared by participants in Part I and Part II. Although some findings may seem identical to those above, they are different in so much as the percentages below reflect an *average and aggregation of the two studies*, not the percentages reported above from either the first or second study alone.

With notable exceptions, participants in both studies agreed that

- 1) Ethics as a discipline of moral reasoning should be taught *consistently* in colleges and universities.
- 2) Student formal and informal feedback is a powerful force in altering course structure, pace, workload, tone, and content. Roughly two thirds (65%) of the reported changes teachers made were in response to student feedback. Changes resulting from workshops, peer evaluation, and mentor influence combined (30%) were less than half as influential.
- 3) Both studies showed ongoing division (34% to 34% overall) about whether faculty should be transparent about political, philosophical, and religious views or pose as “belief neutral” to avoid imposing “bias” upon students.
- 4) On the whole faculty were somewhat divided (46% opposed to 37% in favor) and unsure (17%) about whether ethics as “moral improvement” or “character development” should be taught in higher education ethics courses.
- 5) As teachers mature, they typically move from a content-centered approach toward a mixed (student-driven and content-enriched) approach. (See below).
- 6) Despite exceptions more cautious teachers move away from being a “neutral” referee in their initial teaching years to taking more stands in the classroom. A few move in the opposite direction and some find a means of compromise.

- 7) Nine tenths (90%) report making numerous pedagogical changes over the years and most (80%) report these adjustments resulting in substantial (60%) or partial (20%) improvement.
- 8) In both groups there was a strong emphasis upon questioning both students' personal assumptions/opinions (80%) and the status quo (70%).
- 9) In the aggregate *most* teachers taught because it was fulfilling, enjoyable, and stimulating (35%) and a service to society, or "noble profession" (33%)
- 10) Although ethics faculty seemed aligned with other faculty by giving exams, typically two or more papers, and other conventional methods of evaluation, they *appeared* to rely more upon Socratic questioning, debating, hypothetical and actual situations and case studies, role-playing, and reflection exercises than many other disciplines.
- 11) Almost two thirds (65%) assigned works they have (co-) authored either frequently (37%) or sometimes (28%).
- 12) Most (75%) used or required (60%) traditional canonical readings and over one quarter (28%) opposed the use of textbooks, anthologies, and similar "reductive" publications.
- 13) Half (50%) favored the use of some classroom technologies such as university class websites (45%) and film/DVD/video clips (27%) while over one third (35%) objected to student use of lap tops and cell phones, and 37% expressed philosophical or pedagogical objections to PowerPoint type technologies.
- 14) Overall the greatest problems faculty faced were some level of student resistance to philosophical or ethical methods/reasoning (47%), inadequate time (33%), age or/and culture gap (18%), and the erosion of basic student skills (18%).
- 15) The largest challenges students seemed (to these participants) to face were cognitive/reasoning challenges (43%), time limitations (28%) and age, culture, and language differences (28%).
- 16) The participants felt the greatest keys to outstanding teaching were respect/support/empathy/ love for students (47%), passion/enthusiasm for the subject matter and teaching (39%), and specific classroom skills (listening, clarity, facilitation, eye contact, etc. (28%).
- 17) While half (50%) have not taken teacher development workshops, two thirds (67%) of those who have done so found them effective or somewhat effective.
- 18) On the whole almost nine tenths (88%) invented, discovered or borrowed

creative teaching tools and topics which enhanced their pedagogical effectiveness (See Appendix I)

- 19) Many felt that they successfully imparted important thinking if not applied skills to their students such as rigorous moral reasoning (38%), critically informed decision-making (38%), deeper perspective on important issues (37%) and a more philosophical or transcendent approach to life and personal dilemmas (33%).

How An Ethics Professor Grows

Another interesting finding from the combined studies painted a portrait of how the ethics professor typically matures over *time*. Despite exceptions, the longer a professor teaches, the more s/he will typically prefer to:

- 1) teach smaller groups of students.
- 2) include and assign her own research, teaching inventions, and publications.
- 3) value if not solicit student feedback
- 4) downsize peer or/and mentor feedback
- 5) decrease adoption of newer classroom technologies
- 6) teach a higher percentage of graduate students
- 7) reuse favorite teaching tools such as film/video excerpts, hand-outs, field trips, etc.
- 8) work with, train, and welcome feedback from teaching assistants
- 9) teach “niche” and “boutique” courses
- 10) avoid excessive workload such as extra courses and summer teaching
- 11) assist and draw forth rather than seek to impress and dominate
- 12) relax attempts to police students and tightly manage timetables
- 13) lecture less and invite more discussion / debate
- 14) minimize participation in teacher training such as CITL workshops, conference trainings sessions, and video-recording performance
- 15) reduce length and simplify structure of evaluative tools such as exams, papers, and homework
- 16) welcome increased classroom spontaneity, humor, fun, and discovery
- 17) value and model the nature of thinking itself as much or more than course content

Conclusions

It is important to express enthusiasm, provide students with resources to reframe and re-envisage the world, to create an environment where they can flourish and help others, and to offer invigorating role models which may inspire them to go beyond what they thought would be possible.

Jolyon Mitchell, University of Edinburgh (2008)

Teaching is sometimes where I figure out what I think about issues; teaching is also the most important part of my job –training students to be reflective citizens. Many of these students will go on to have important roles in society...

Debra Satz, Stanford (2015)

These findings, interviews, and quotations cannot be taken to fully represent moral philosophy writ large, nor the participant institutions, nor ethics instruction in the Pacific U.S., Singapore, Hong Kong, Western Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the U.K. Nevertheless in the absence of greater evidence and samples, it seems safe to conclude that moral philosophy, to the extent it *is* represented by this faculty group, still champions the flowering of younger minds within the influential presence of older, rigorously trained brains that can both accurately “channel” and critique great kindred minds past and present.

Trends and technologies to the side, the centerpiece of ethics instruction in such leading English-speaking institutions has featured mind-to-mind engagement within a

figurative séance in which other seminal spirits have vividly entered and left the room. Striking exceptions to and variations upon this rule included the use of case studies, debates, the occasional embracing of technology, frequent Socratic cross-examination, and the creation, adaptation and implementation of teaching inventions.

In the teaching of moral philosophy and ethics, there may not be a “one size fits all” model. But there is a central assumption that any size should be a catalyst to intellectual growth and to deeper understanding about moral choice. Although it is debatable to these eighty participants on the whole whether moral behavior may be improved in the university classroom, it is not debatable whether instruction *about* moral behavior and decision-making may be improved.

Indeed one goal of this research is that such improvement may occur as readers or this essay potentially learn from these eighty participants. After all, as a body they have studied and taught ethics and moral philosophy with ongoing success for almost *two thousand years* and have done so at extremely influential institutions which are collectively over *five thousand years* old.

While split in perspective about whether they should reveal their own beliefs and cultural alliances (to religions, “isms”, political groups, etc.), they are all but united in aspiring to teach elevated moral reasoning and the ability to wisely argue and counter-argue about ethical choice and justification.

Both groups wish to improve their teaching and almost all think they have made improvements based not only upon trial and error, and self-inspection, but also in considered response to student feedback, and to a lesser degree to peer, mentor, and other expert input. A previous all but rigid reliance upon the classical canon of revered

philosophers is increasingly supplemented by the infusion of voices from 1) women, 2) a variety of cultures, 3) the 20th and 21st centuries, and 4) the authors of anthologies, case studies, readers, critical analysis, and other “secondary” texts.

Topicality and current affairs have played an enlarged role in the ways teachers have attempted to reach students through lecture examples and readings. “Breaking news” ethics has also figured more prominently in the mediated and written narratives, documentaries, class debates, papers, and projects used by many faculty. The topical is hardly supplanting the eternal, but is giving the latter better traction and attraction within a new generation.

Recommendations

Obviously no one size teaching recommendation fits all. So the first recommendation must be that each reader come to his or her own conclusions about which tools, thinking, approach, and resources might be most helpful and adaptable to her own thinking, teaching, and situation.

Moreover humility is a necessary requirement for all researchers so there is no assumption that these findings are universally valid, reliable, and replicable. Nevertheless the overall findings above support these recommendations below for a) other researchers, b) administrations within higher education, c) teachers, and d) society.

A. Recommendations to *researchers*

1. **Replication:** Other researchers are invited to try to replicate this work to determine if there are similar findings in other English-speaking regions such as Southern Africa, Eastern and central Canada, Ireland, and the U.S. South and Midwest.
2. **Cultural comparison:** Comparative studies with universities from other cultures and countries can be undertaken to see if the findings hold true under the influence of other longitudes, languages, and latitudes.
3. **Longitudinal sequel:** A follow-up study in 2022 in the same regions might test for issues of “time” following the impact of another seven year interval.

B. Recommendations to *administrations* within higher education:

1. **Facilities:** Again and again faculty raised the question of resources and suitable facilities. While it may be assumed that ethics is not a clinical science and thus does not need unusual space or special facilities, on the contrary many ethicists state the need for suitable environments for role-playing, debates, case presentations, small groups, and the sense of expansiveness important to a subject based upon reflection.
2. **Class size:** Many faculty commented about the inappropriateness of teaching a subject of this nature to larger groups. When students need one-on-one opportunities to test their arguments with the instructor and must demonstrate thinking on their feet in the moment, it seems crucial that ethics be taught frequently if not primarily in seminar size groupings.
3. **Curriculum:** In semiological terms “ethics” is code for far more than subject matter. When institutions try to marginalize, minimize, or exclude the teaching of ethics within their curriculum, they are making social and political statements about their own hierarchy of values. Those administrators who call for an increase in both the quality and quantity of ethics instruction in academic institutions seem in step with 1) the overall tone of the participants in both studies and 2) the evident needs of society.

C. Recommendations to *teachers* ...

1. **Learning from colleagues:** No doubt each ethics teacher who wishes can make choices about the possible use of creative tools (see Appendix 1) and resources (See “Works Cited and Additional Resources”) as well as data and findings above to potentially learn from these colleagues.
2. **Newer faculty:** Seeing some of the patterns above about the learning

curves that faculty often encounter might be especially helpful to less experienced faculty. Possibly they might learn more quickly and earlier in their careers the value of sincere student feedback, relaxation about being themselves in the classroom, the wealth of tools developed by other faculty (Appendix I), and the lessons such as “less is more”, community learning, and instructor disclosure much earlier in their careers.

3. **Dialog and development:** Multiple associations such as AEJMC, APPE, and APA, and journals such as *Teaching Ethics*, *Ethical Space*, *The Journal of Media Ethics*, and many listed below provide opportunity for colleagues to share ideas, data, resources, lessons learned, and proposals within the refinement or ethics pedagogy. This author (twcooper@comcast.net) encourages, supports and is happy to be part of that dialogue and welcomes feedback and suggestions regarding this and related research. It seems important that the dialog be multidisciplinary, multi-generational, and multi-cultural with a large welcome to all who wish to contribute and learn.

D. Recommendations to *society*:

1. **Ethics education:** The public, including alumni, parents, education boards and government leaders all have a stake in what is taught at every level of education. Although the development of curriculum ultimately rests with each institution’s faculty, nevertheless citizens have every right to demand more and better ethics education especially in state-owned institutions funded by their tax dollars. Citizens may also become involved with awards, fund-raising, organizations, and campaigns which reward improvements in ethics education and call for new or improved programs wherever ethics instruction is missing or mediocre.
2. **Public conference:** A summit gathering or conference should be held focusing upon the questions “Who should teach the ethics of moral improvement in society?” and “How may such teaching take place effectively?” If many participants feel teaching “character ethics” at the higher education level is too late in a student’s development, then should “character ethics” be taught in elementary or secondary schools? While most have argued that “character education” should occur primarily in the *home*, unfortunately parenting is characterized by increased child abuse, alcoholism, single parents with two jobs, neglect, high-conflict divorces and separations, drug abuse, etc., and many children do not have care-givers. There is no consensus about whether religious instruction *successfully* teaches moral improvement and, if so, which faith(s), if any, provide(s) the best model(s). Many young people do not receive or accept ethics training from anyone. The questions regarding “character ethics” begin with “who?” and “how?”
3. **Employ ethics:** In what has been called the “age of Enron” (which also

includes the age of Madoff, Wall St. meltdown, two party gridlock, sports drug enhancement, stem cell debate, gun control controversy, the “big short”, “spotlight” upon priest abuse, environmental resource depletion, and far more it seems especially timely for an informed citizenry to join the public forum and to employ ethics a) in a literal sense (hire ethicists for institutions, add ethics faculty to schools, identify ethics advisors for boards and leaders) and b) in a figurative sense by refining our personal best practices and mindsets. Citizens should discuss ethics in more depth within the family, civic institutions, corporations, non-profits, and beyond. In an age when many institutions require mandatory sexual harassment and diversity training, should there not also be far more ethics instruction in all sectors of society, not just within education. Why not employ ethics, ethicists, and educators?

Toward A More Ethics-Driven Future

“There are three keys to great teaching -- love what you do, impart why you love it, and meet your students where they are.”

David Brink, University of California, San Diego (2015)

The root of the word “education” derives from the Latin “educio” meaning to “draw forth”. The majority of faculty affirmed that the best “drawing forth” from ethics students comes by 1) fully engaging them in the thinking process; 2) a passion for learning, thinking, students, and teaching; 3) clean communication skills such as full-spectrum listening, clarity, and organization; and 4) modeling important traits such as fairness, humor, humility, empathy, and honesty.

It was not the purpose of this study to inspect the lives and ethical choices of the participants. Nor has it been conclusively proven that ethicists are “better” moral citizens or ethical leaders than other groups.

Nevertheless many faculty conveyed that ethical life outside the classroom is also

important and that ideally ethicists, like their students, should make a specific contribution to a more informed society. For several participants ethical action is as valuable as the process of wise decision-making.

Some participants mentioned that it was important for them to be ethical themselves not only to set an example but also to aspire toward, and encourage their students to aspire toward, a more just and morally intelligent society. If this study contributes in some small measure to that large aspiration, and to refinements in education, it is hoped that this torch may be passed to other educators, ethicists, students, and generations.

Works Cited and Additional Resources

Books and Articles (published)

Aiken, Henry D. *Philosophy and Educational Development*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*. Edited and translated by Roger Crisp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Arthur, John and Scalet, Steven, *Morality and Moral Controversies: Readings in Moral, Social and Political Philosophy*. (9th Edition) Boston: Pearson Publishing, 2012.

Ashmore, Robert B. and Starr, William C. *Ethics Across The Curriculum -- The Marquette Experience*. Milwaukee, WI.: Marquette University Press, 1991.

Ashmore, Robert B. and Starr, William C. *Teaching Ethics: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Milwaukee, WI.: Marquette University Press, 1994.

Bain, Kenneth, *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Baumgarten, Elias. "Ethics in the Academic Profession: A Socratic View.", *Journal of Higher Education*. 53, no. 3 (1982); 282-95.

Beauchamp, Tom L. and James F. Childress, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Bok, Derek C. "Can Ethics be Taught?" *Change*, October 1976, 26-30.

Bok, Sissela and Callahan, Dan, eds. *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education*. Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: Hastings Center, 1980.

Bond, Florence W., *Chief Seattle: Man of Vision*. Bloomington, Indiana: Authorhouse, 2001.

Bowie, Norman, "The Role of Ethics in Professional Education." *Companion to the Philosophy of Education*. Randall Curren, editor. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Bowman, James and Menzel, "Teaching Ethics and Values", *Teaching Business Ethics*. 3, No. 2, (1999); 204-5.

Bresnan, Patrick S. *Awakening*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 2009.

Bugeja, Michael. *Living Ethics*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Cahn, Steven. *Education and the Democratic Ideal*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Pub., 1979.

Christians, Clifford, Fackler, Mark et al. *Media Ethics: Cases and Moral Reasoning*. NY: Addison-Wesley, 2016.

Churchill, Larry R. "The Teaching of Ethics and Moral Values in Teaching: Some Contemporary Confusions." *Journal of Higher Education*, 53, no. 3 (1982): 296-306.

Collingwood, R. G. *An Autobiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978 (1939).

Cooper, Tom. "Learning from Ethicists: How Ethics is Taught in Leading Institutions", *Teaching Ethics*. 10, No. 1, Fall 2009 (published spring 2010), 11-42.

Curren, Randall, "Academic Standards and Constitutive Luck." *Teacher's Life: Essays for Steven M. Cahn*. Maureen Eckert and Robert Talisse, editors. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books, 2008.

Damon, William, and Colby, Ann. *The Power of Ideals: The Real Story of Moral Choice*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Damon, William *The Path to Purpose: How Young People Find their Calling in Life*. NY: The Free Press, 2008.

Damon, William, and Colby, Anne. *Some Do Care: Contemporary Lives of Moral Commitment*. NY: The Free Press, 1992.

Davis, Michael. *Ethics and the University*. NY: Routledge, 1999.

Frankena, William K. "Toward a Philosophy of Moral Education." *Harvard Educational Review*. 28, no. 4 (1958): 300-13.

Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., and Damon, W. *Good Work: When Excellence and Ethics Meet*. NY: Basic Books, 2001.

Gampel, Eric. "A Method for Teaching Ethics", *Teaching Philosophy*. 19, no 4 (1996): 371-383.

Gilligan, Carol. *In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Glasser, Theodore L. "Ethics and Eloquence in Journalism". *Journalism Studies*. 9, no 4 (2008), 512-534.

Glasser, Theodore L., "Journalism Studies and the Education of Journalists." *Journalism Studies*. (February 2006): 146-9.

Goldman, Michael. "On Moral Relativism, Advocacy, and Teaching Normative Ethics." *Teaching Philosophy* 4, no. 1 (January 1981): 1-11.

Gouinlock, James. "The Moral Value of Philosophic Education." *Teaching Philosophy* 3, no. 1, (1979): 37-49.

Groake, Leo and Scholz, Sally J. "Seven Principles for Better Practical Ethics." *Teaching Philosophy* 19, no. 4 (1996): 337-355.

Hardiman, Mariale. *Brain Targeted Teaching for 21st Century Schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA, 2012.

Hardiman, Mariale. *Connecting Brain Research with Effective Teaching*. New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.

Hawkins, John N and Mok, Ka Ho. *Research, Development, and Innovation in Asia Pacific Higher Education*. New York, N.Y., MacMillan, 2015.

Haywood, Elizabeth M. "Using Games to Enhance Student Understanding of Professional and Ethical Responsibilities." *Issues in Accounting Education*. 19:1 (Feb. 2004), 85-99.

Hearn, Thomas. "Moralism and the Teaching of Moral Philosophy." *Teaching Philosophy* 3, no. 1, (1979): 51-63.

Hou, Yung-Chi, "Rankings: Help or Hindrance to Quality Assurance? From a Perspective of Asian Accrediting Agencies", in *Quality in Higher Education*. Deane E. Neubauer and John N. Hawkins, eds. Singapore: APEC Secretariat, 2011. Retrieved at http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/Quality_in_Higher_Education:_Identifying,_Developing,_and_Sust

[aining Best Practices in the APEC Region](#) on Dec. 10, 2015.

Innis, Harold, *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951.

Jennings, Bruce; Nelson, James Lingerhann, and Parens, Erik, *Values on Campus: Ethics and Values Programs in the Undergraduate Curriculum (Report)*. Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.; The Hastings Center, 1994.

Kant, Immanuel, *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals and What Is Enlightenment?* Saddlebrook, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1989.

Korsgaard, Christine, *The Sources of Normativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Leamson, Robert. *Thinking about Teaching and Learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 1999.

Lisman, C. David. *The Curricular Integration of Ethics: Theory and Practice*. Westport, CT.: Praeger Publishers, 1996.

Liu, Nian Cai, "The Phenomenon of Academic Ranking of World Universities Model: Future Directions", in *Quality in Higher Education*. Deane E. Neubauer and John N. Hawkins, eds. Singapore: APEC Secretariat, 2011. Retrieved at http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/Quality_in_Higher_Education:_Identifying,_Developing,_and_Sustaining_Best_Practices_in_the_APEC_Region on Dec. 10, 2015.

Lynn, Laurance E. JR. *Teaching and Learning With Cases: A Guidebook*. NY: Chatham House Publishers, 1999.

McKinnon, Barbara. *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*. Belmont, CA: Thompson/Wadsworth, 2013.

Mill John S. *Utilitarianism*. Edited by George Sher. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing, 2002.

Miller, Richard I. *Education in a Changing Society*. Washington: National Education Association, Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools, 1963. (ERIC: ED024656)

Neubauer, Deane; Shin, Jung Cheol, and Hawkins, John N., eds. *The Dynamics of Higher Education Development in East Asia*. NY: MacMillan, 2013.

Nell (O'Neill), Onora, *Acting on Principle*. New York, NY: Columbia. 1975.

Noddings, Nell, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003.

Parfit, Derek, *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Purkey, William Watson. *What Students Say to Themselves; Internal Dialogue and School Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2000.

Purpel, David, and Kevin Ryan. "It Comes with the Territory: The Inevitability of Moral Education in the Schools" in *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*. Edited by Henry A. Giroux and David Purpel, Berkeley: McCutchen Publishers, 1983.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Rock, David. *Your Brain At Work*. New York, NY: Harper Collins. 2009.

Rosen, Bernard, and Arthur Caplan. *Ethics in the Undergraduate Curriculum*. Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: Hastings Center, 1980.

Rosen, Gideon et al, eds. *The Norton Introduction to Philosophy*. New York: Norton, 2015.

Rosenberg, Jay. *The Practice of Philosophy: A Handbook for Beginners*. Upper Saddlebrook, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1996, 2004.

Scanlon, Tim. "Teaching Sections in Philosophy." (hand-out), n.p., n.p., c. 1992.

Schorr, Philip. "Learning Ethics: The Search for an Ideal Model." *Public Administration Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (1983): 323-45.

Sloan, Douglas. "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum." *Hastings Center Report*, December 1979, 21-41.

Tsze-sze, *Confucius: The Doctrine of the Mean*. Broadbridge, UK: Clarendon Press, 1893.

Tysinger, James W., Klonis, Leah, Sadler, John Z., and Wagner, James M. "Teaching Ethics Using Small-group, Problem-based Learning." *Journal of Medical Ethics*. (1997): 315-318.

Weimer, Maryellen, "Focus on Learning, Transform Teaching." *Change*. v. 35, no. 5, pp.48-54, Sept.-Oct. 2003.

Weston, Anthony. *A 21st Century Ethical Toolbox*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Winston, Kenneth. "Teaching Ethics by the Case Method." *Curriculum and Case Notes*. 153:159, 2003, 12-19.

Related Journals (Selected)

American Journal of Bioethics

Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy

Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy

De Philosophia

Dualist
Episteme - A Journal of Undergraduate Philosophy
Essays in Philosophy: A Biannual Journal
Ethical Space
Fu Jen International Journal of Philosophy
Geist: Uncommon Sense
Harvard Review of Philosophy
Hypatia
International Studies in Philosophy
Journal of Indian Philosophy and Religion
Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies
Journal of Media Ethics (formerly Journal of Mass Media Ethics)
Journal of Moral Philosophy
Journal of Philosophy (at JSTOR)
Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods (at JSTOR)
Journal of Philosophy, Science & Law
Journal of Social Philosophy
Journal of the History of Philosophy
Labyrinth: The International Journal for Philosophy, Feminist Theory & Cultural Hermeneutics
Manusya: Journal of Humanities
Media Ethics
Midwest Studies in Philosophy
Mind (at JSTOR)
Monist, The
Philo: The Journal of the Society of Humanist Philosophers
Philosopher's Imprint, The
Philosophical Perspectives (at JSTOR)
Philosophical Review, The (at JSTOR)
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research (at JSTOR)
Philosophy Now
Polemika
Poznan Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities
Sorites - Electronic Magazine of Analytical Philosophy
STOA: International Undergraduate Journal of Philosophy
Teaching Ethics
Teaching Philosophy
TEOREMA
The Philosopher
Thinking

Interviews

Part #1 – 2008 – Atlantic region

Adams, Nick; Andersen, Elizabeth; Appiah, Kwami; and 37 others (see Participants in TEACHING ETHICS, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2009); in person at Cambridge, MA.; New Haven, CT.; Princeton, NJ; Oxford, U.K.; Edinburgh, U.K., and Cambridge, U.K. April 14 – Oct. 23, 2008; by telephone, June 4, 2008 (Boston-to-New York); and on-line correspondence to Nashville, TN; Urbana-Champaign, IL; Chicago, IL, Ann Arbor, MI, and to locations listed above, April 25 - Nov. 30, 2008.

Part #2 – 2015-6 – Pacific region

Ananny, Michael; Anderson, Scott; Ann Auman, and 37 others (see Participants in this article); in person at Palo Alto, CA; Berkeley, CA, San Diego, CA; Honolulu, HI, and Boston, MA; March 7 – Dec. 19, 2015; by telephone, Sept. 11, 2015, Boston – San Francisco; and on-line correspondence to Auckland, Honk Kong, Singapore, Macau, four cities in Australia, Palo Alto, Davis, Santa Clara, Los Angeles, Eugene, Bellingham, and Vancouver (B.C., Canada).

In part #2 additional contextual interviews were conducted with administrators such as 1) representatives (Joan Berry, Anne Newman, and Alanna Reyes) of the Stanford Center for Ethics in Society Oct. 2015 and with 2) Deborah Rhode, Professor and Founder of Center for Ethics in Society at Stanford University. Background interviews about Asian philosophy, culture, and higher education were conducted from Dec. 2015-February 2016 with East-West Center and University of Hawaii experts Roger Ames, David Grossman, Peter Hershock, Barry Keenan, and Deane Neubauer.

On-line Resources, Panels, and References (selected)

Brink, David. Special lecture, UCSD Summer Program for Women in Philosophy, Aug. 5, 2014, Retrieved on March 9, 2015 at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VEe0kh15Ug4>.

Craig, Edward, editor, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online*. London: Routledge, retrieved Nov. 19, 2008 at www.rep.routledge.com.

Ethical Systems, “Teaching Ethics”. Ethical Systems.org; Business Integrity Through Research, 2015, retrieved Sept. 18, 2015 at <http://www.ethicalsystems.org/content/teaching-ethics>.

Harvard Business School, *Case Studies* (about 350 new ones are added each year).

http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/research/Documents/Case%20Studies%20for%20Harvard%20Business%20School_Brochure.pdf

Hendricks, Christina. "Plato's Republic, Politics, and Ethics", and other lectures; University of British Columbia, October 13, 2015, retrieved on July 28, 2015 at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7FwF7-06egw&list=PLaSGognTdxBDcxCdf6isUFLSkcNfljnA> and <https://www.youtube.com/user/artsonedigital/videos>.

Honderich, Ted, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (E-book). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Retrieved Nov.19 as eBook at www.netlibrary.com/Details.aspx.

Satz, Debra (moderator), with panelists Barbara H. Fried (law), Benoît Monin (psychology, organizational behavior), and Tamar Schapiro (philosophy), "Does Teaching Ethics Do Any Good?" Stanford University; May 6, 2014, retrieved on August 8, 2015 at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Gxxtuy1cRY and <https://ethicsinsociety.stanford.edu/events/lectures/special-lectures/does-teaching-ethics-do-any-good>

Wallace, Jay. "Introducing Philosophy and Moral Normativity", Academic year 2003-4, retrieved Nov. 7, 2015 at <http://ls1.berkeley.edu/video>.

Zalta, Edward N., editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford, California: Center for the Study of Language and Information, retrieved Nov. 19, 2008 at www.plato.stanford.edu

_____, *Philosophical Index*. Reno, Nevada: Erratic Impact. Retrieved Nov. 19, 2008 at www.erraticimpact.com/site_index.htm

Classroom Observations: Part II – Pacific Region

In Person

William Damon, at Stanford University, October 19, 2015 (on location with Damon while he delivered teleconference class from his office with Howard Gardner's School of Education Class at Harvard).

Theodore L. Glasser, at Stanford University, Oct. 13, 2015 (in classroom)

Christopher Kutz, at UC Berkeley, Nov.19, 2015 (in classroom)

Robert Reich, at Stanford University, Oct. 8, 2015 (in classroom)

On-line (via Youtube, university websites, etc. with date observed)

David Brink, University of California San Diego, March 13, 2015

Theodore L. Glasser, Stanford University, Oct. 14, 2015

Kirk Hanson, University of Santa Clara, August 10, 2015

Christina Hendricks, University of British Columbia, August 5, 2015

Jay Wallace, Berkeley, Nov. 7, 2015

Videos/Films/DVDs Produced On Campus:

Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University. Over 250 ethics instructional and related videos (e.g. “What is Ethics? What is Business Ethics” hosted by Kirk Hanson), retrieved August 10 at

<https://www.youtube.com/user/appliedethicscenter> and

<http://www.jesuitdigitalnetwork.org/courses/what-is-ethics-what-is-business-ethics-markkula-center-for-applied-ethics>

Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics (David Magnus) has created eight videos for Internal (Stanford students and employee) use only. These are:

- *Adolescent Medicine
- *Confidentiality
- *Ethical Theory
- *POM Error
- *POM Futility
- *POM Informed Consent
- *POM Lacks Capacity
- *Social Media and Confidentiality

See also

- On-line Resources (above)
- On-line Classroom Observations (above)

APPENDIX I: INVENTORY OF CREATIVE TEACHING TOOLS

ATLANTIC REGION (2008) STUDY

Creative Teaching tools list from Atlantic Region (2008) Study is available within the article “Learning from Ethicists: How Ethics is Taught in Leading Institutions”, by Tom Cooper, *Teaching Ethics*. Vol. 10, No. 1, Fall 2009 (published spring 2010), pp. 11-42.

PACIFIC REGION (2015-6) STUDY (Selected)

- **APPE-TEASERS** from David Magnus (Stanford): opening class with short video clip or engaging question to instantly activate class.

- * **BLOGS** from William Damon (Stanford) who recommends:
 - 1) “Room For Debate” *The New York Times*
 - 2) “The Philosopher’s Stone” *The New York Times*

See also NEWSPAPERS

- * **CASE STUDIES** from
 - 1) Markkula Center for Applied Ethics (Santa Clara University)
<https://www.youtube.com/user/appliedethicscenter> and
<http://www.jesuitdigitalnetwork.org/search/?f.search=short+cases>
 - 2) Deborah Rhode (Stanford) : created casebook (rhode@stanford.edu)
 - 3) Ed Wasserman (Berkeley) : private collection (ed.wasserman@berkeley.edu)
 - 4) Catherine Strong (Massey University): designs and creates “mini-text” case book (c.r.strong@massey.ac.nz)
 - 5) Margaret McLean (Santa Clara University): students begin case studies *before* class begins and write case details on whiteboard; McLean designs case study *worksheets*
 - 6) Anita Silvers (San Francisco State University): creates case studies
 - 7) Ann Auman (University of Hawaii): recommends cases from the Poynter Center collection

- * **CLICKERS** (“Learning Catalytics” similar to clicker technology) to test homework and SpunkI Rubric Technology from Christina Hendricks (University of British Columbia) <https://learningcatalytics.com/> and <http://oncourseworkshop.com/life-long-learning/spunki-reading-rubric-engages-students-course-content/>

- * **CODES OF ETHICS:**
 - 1) Ann Auman requires that students create a code of ethics which includes traditional Hawaiian values
 - 2) Auman also recommends the Society of Professional Journalists’ Code of Ethics
 - 3) Ed Wasserman informs students at the beginning of class that their final exam will include a full critique of the code of ethics of *The New York Times*.

- **COMICS CREATED TO ILLUSTRATE ETHICAL DILEMMAS:** designed for ethics classes by Tom Bivins (University of Oregon)
397mediaethics.weebly.com/ethics-comicslecture-notes.html

- **COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING** from Margaret McLean (Santa Clara U.) e.g. learning about ethics cases on location in Alzheimer’s Day Care Center and at Rehabilitation Center.

- * **COURSE DESIGN GUIDE:** Integrated Course Design (by Dee Fink) from Christina Hendricks (University of British Columbia) <http://www.deefinkandassociates.com/GuidetoCourseDesignAug05.pdf>

- * **DEBATES (formal/timed):** from Christopher Kutz (Berkeley), ckutz@berkeley.edu

- **EXAMS:**
 - 1) SAMPLE midterm and final exams are available from the classes in bio-medical ethics of David Magnus at Stanford University's Center for Bio-medical ethics by writing twcooper@comcast.net
 - 2) PRE-ANNOUNCED EXAM:
 - A) Ed Wasserman (Berkeley) narrates final exam question at beginning of semester allowing class to work on it for months.
 - B) Scott Anderson (University of British Columbia) announces questions in advance.

- **EXPERIMENTAL GAMES:**
 - 1) Ernesto Dal Bó (Berkeley) engages his MBA ethics students in games in which they role play a classical (often Harvard Business School) case, then discern the key abstract principles, then apply those principles concretely to the case.
 - 2) Tamara Browne (Australian National University) uses physical games in which, for example, students throw crumpled papers at a can to illustrate a gene pattern or she passes chocolate covered coffee beans around the room to start a discussion about cognitive enhancement.

- **FIELD TRIPS:** David Magnus (Stanford) has taken his students to stem cell labs; 23 AND ME, etc.

- **FLIPPED CLASSROOM:**
 - 1) a “flipped classroom” is one in which the usual “homework” is brought into the classroom and the “instructional material” such as media and on-line lectures are observed at home. Thus content and take-home are “flipped” to some degree. David Magnus (Stanford) and Jay Wallace (Berkeley) have employed aspects of this approach.

- **FILMS, DVDs, YOUTUBE CLIPS**
 - 1) **PRODUCED ON CAMPUS:**
 - A) Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University. Over 250 ethics instructional and related videos (e.g. “What is Ethics? What is Business Ethics” hosted by Kirk Hanson), retrieved August 10 at

<http://www.jesuitdigitalnetwork.org/courses/what-is-ethics-what-is-business-ethics-markkula-center-for-applied-ethics>

B) Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics (David Magnus) has created eight videos for Internal (Stanford students and employee) use only. These include:

- *Adolescent Medicine
- *Confidentiality
- *Ethical Theory

C) Lecture videos of Christina Hendricks at University of British Columbia include

- * “Plato, Republic, Public, and Ethics” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7FwF7-o6egw&list=PLaSGognTdxBDcxCdf6isUFILSkcNfjinA>
- and
- *“The Trolley Problem” at <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLaSGognTdxBBGIET-i-vJ39HmiWG6OqnV>

2) COMMERCIAL AND DOCUMENTARY FILMS, DVDs, CLIPS, etc.

- 1) Debra Satz (Stanford) writes “I use many documentaries, films, and even MONTY PYTHON.”
- 2) Ed Wasserman (Berkeley) recommends analyzing the moral dilemmas in EMPEROR’S CLUB, RETURN TO PARADISE, and SAVING PRIVATE RYAN.
- 3) Bill Damon (Stanford) recommends the “7 UP” (also called “UP”) documentary series about 14 British children filmed every seven years as a longitudinal study.
- 4) Marina Oshana (UC-Davis) writes that she uses MOMENTO and SOPHIE SCHOLL: THE FINAL DAYS feature films.
- 5) Grace Leung (Chinese University of Hong Kong) has created a list of films depicting ethical issues.
- 6) Margaret McLean (Santa Clara University) uses the documentary HOLD YOUR BREATH (*not* the horror film of the same name) to discuss issues of diversity and bio-ethics.
- 7) Tamara Browne (Australian National University), uses many documentaries such as GENERATION RX, IN THE FAMILY, CAN GM FOOD SAVE THE WORLD, and CYBORGS, as well as classic features such as GONE WITH THE WIND.
- 8) Sara Goering (University of Washington) recommends films such as DAX’S CASE, FIXED, THE SOUND AND THE FURY, and HOW TO DIE IN OREGON.

• GRADING RUBRIC DESIGN

- 1) Pamela Hieronymi (UCLA) hieronymi@ucla.edu
- 2) Margaret McLean (Santa Clara University) mmclean@scu.edu
- 3) Christopher Kutz (Berkeley); employs *peer* grading, ckutz@berkeley.edu

- **HAND-OUTS WITH OVERVIEW** from Christian (Australian National University); examples
 - 1) A map of the entire academic field
 - 2) Deconstructing Kant's ethics

* **LITERATURE USED IN CLASSES** from Robert Reich

- EXAMPLES 1) "The Ones Who Walk Away from Omelas" (short story) by Ursula Le Guin
- 2) *The Night in Question* (book) by Tobias Wolff

- **MOOCS** –Makkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University from Kirk Hanson

Examples:

- 1) Business Ethics in the Real World AND
 - 2) Building a Corporate Culture
- <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/focusareas/business/moocs.html>

- **NEW COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

- 1) Scott Anderson (University of British Columbia)
- 2) Pete Jennings (University of Santa Clara)
- 3)

- **NEWSPAPERS –**

See also Blogs

- 1) Multiple clippings about same case from Ed Wasserman (Berkeley)
- 2) Analysis of *New York Times* on-line from Anita Silvers (San Francisco State University)

* **PAPERS LISTING FILMS/VIDEOS FOR CLASSROOM USE:**

- 1) Brislin, Tom (University of Hawaii) *Lights! Camera! Ethics!* (includes many examples of feature films/videos used in classroom. See "Works Cited and Resources" for *unpublished* papers above), tbrislin@hawaii.edu, 2015.
- 2) Tucker, Allison. *Teaching Ethics: Materials for Practitioner Education*. London: Educational Media, Imperial College, and the European Commission, 2001.

- **PEER-GRADED MIDTERM** from Christopher Kutz (Berkeley); anonymous and ungraded; used for feedback and improvement; professor inspects and may give further feedback; ckutz@berkeley.edu

- **PRIZE FOR BEST STUDENT PAPER(s)** given by Stanford U. for freshmen taking required courses. David Magnus' students have been among those who "won or been recognized" annually for ethics essays.
- **READERS** (compilation of assigned reading) created for students
 - 1) by Debra Satz (Stanford)
 - 2) by Jay Wallace (Berkeley)
- **REFLECTION PAPERS-SMALL GROUPS** from Deborah Rhode (Stanford)
Members within small groups have specific roles such as to give feedback.
Contact rhode@stanford.edu
- **REFLECTIVE THINKING EXERCISES** from Grace Leung (Chinese University of Hong Kong)
- **ROLE-PLAYING** Ann Auman (University of Hawaii) has created skits that accompany case studies in which students enact important components and characters within the case.
Anita Silvers (San Francisco State University) uses a similar model.
- **SYLLABI** Over twenty ethics syllabi were provided by, for example, Ananny, Anderson, Bivins, Brink, Browne, Dal Bó, Glasser, Goldstein, Hendricks, Kutz, Leung, Magnus, Reich, Shapiro, Wallace, and Wasserman in the 2015 Pacific region study. These are available upon request from twcooper@comcast.net.
- **TEAM-TEACHING** from Tom Brislin (University of Hawaii) and Tom Cooper (Emerson); co-taught ethics course from Boston-Honolulu on-line. See www2.hawaii.edu/~jour/dominion
- **TECHNOLOGY POLICY**
 - 1) Over half who discussed laptops and hand held devices do not permit them to be used in the classroom.
 - 2) Jay Wallace (Berkeley) hands out class notes *in advance* of each class so that students do not need laptops or other devices to take notes.
- **THINKING TABLES** from Robert Reich (Stanford) Students sit in small groups around tables and concurrently brainstorm/debate answers to engaging questions presented to class, some spontaneous and others based upon homework. Then professor interacts with entire group while calling for answers and justifications from tables. reich@stanford.edu
- **THREE PART QUESTION** from Tamar Schapiro (Stanford/MIT). In class students must be ready to discuss "1) something you understand 2) something you do not understand and 3) a question about the reading".
Schapiro@stanford.edu

- **THREE-STEP APPROACH** from Glen Pettigrove, University of Auckland. Students must 1) reconstruct an ethicist's argument; 2) formulate a substantial counter-argument; 3) reply persuasively from the ethicist's perspective to the counter-argument) For further details contact: g.pettigrove@auckland.ac.nz
- **TRANSLATIONS** from Chris Fraser, University of Hong Kong. The professor translates documents used in class HIMSELF to insure accuracy.
- **VOTING ELECTRONICALLY ON CASES** with clicker technology from Deborah Rhode (Stanford)– students vote at key moments within case requiring role-playing by students; teacher invites students to defend their votes drawing in otherwise silent students. (write Rhode@stanford.edu for more information).

Christina Hendricks (University of British Columbia) uses similar technology (see “Clickers” above)

- **WEBSITES** (selected)
 - 1) TheGoodProject.org by Howard Gardner – see especially “The Professional Ethicist” at that site.
 - 3) Ethics teaching omnibus website:
 - A) From Tom Brislin (University of Hawaii) Repository for key resources including syllabi, grading standards, and media ethics tools. <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~tbrislin/ethics/>
 - B) From Tom Bivins (University of Oregon) <http://397mediaethics.weebly.com/ethics>
 - C) Romp Ethics <https://rompethics.iths.org> (ROMP = Research On Medical Practices; discusses ethical issues and uses cartoons for easy comprehension) from David Magnus (Stanford)

APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW FORM

(the researcher developed this form using some of Kenneth Bain's (2004) questions for the first part (questions 11-21) of the interview and developed other questions – 22-40 -

for the latter part. Questions 1-10 are strictly informational (name, address, e-mail address, etc.) The same interview form was used for/by all 40 participants in each study.)

ENHANCING PEDAGOGICAL EFFECTIVENESS

- 1) Name _____
- 2) Address _____
- 3) Phone (office) _____
- 4) E-mail _____
- 5) Title/institution _____
- 6) Years teaching
 - a) in higher education _____
 - b) at this institution _____
- 7) Years teaching ethics or/and moral philosophy _____
- 8) Total number of ethics courses/sections taught _____
- 9) a) Total graduate courses (%) _____
b) Total undergraduate courses (%) _____
c) Total mixed (%) _____
- 10) Total courses taught in (fill in bottom two and other which apply)
 - a) philosophy department _____ (%)
 - b) professional school/program _____ (%) _____ type
 - c) divinity school _____ (%)
 - d) institute _____ (%) _____ type
 - e) other _____ (%) _____ type

A. PEDAGOGY

- 11) What are your teaching methods? *
- 12) What do you hope students will be able to do conceptually and perceptually after completing your class, which they could not do upon entry? *
- 13) What do you expect of their learning if you are to regard it as successful? *
- 14) Why do you teach?
- 15) What if any problems do you face in helping students to learn? *
- 16) What if any problems do students face in learning from you? *

17) How do you know when you have done a good job of teaching? *

18) What are your key assignments and other means of evaluating student work? *

19) What do you aim to teach your students to question or believe? *

20) How do you prepare to teach? *

B. GROWTH AND REFINEMENT OF COURSES

21) How have your courses and teaching evolved over the years? *

22) How, if at all, have you incorporated feedback and evaluations from students in adjustments you have made in your teaching?

23) How, if at all, have you utilized techniques, ideas, and input from other faculty in your classroom?

24) How, if at all, have you evaluated your own teaching?

25) Have you ever deliberately taken workshops, classes, or worked with a mentor to enhance your effectiveness?

26) What changes in your teaching approach, attitude, or methods have you made in light of this aggregate input and self-examination?

27) If you have made changes, what is your evaluation of these changes?

28) How, if at all, have new ideas and materials in the field influenced your teaching?

29) What technologies have you introduced and retired and with what impact?

30) After all you have learned, do you think there are any secrets or keys to outstanding teaching?

C. TEACHING ETHICS

- 31) What have you to say to those who believe that ethics cannot be taught?
- 32) What are the most effective ways to include primary sources by leading philosophers, moral philosophers, and other thinkers?
- 33) If you employ case studies, which studies and approaches do you find most useful and engaging?
- 34) How do you insure that ethics instruction encourages free and rational inquiry without imparting a political, theological, or other bias, if you think that is possible?
- 35) If you think that students can detect your own beliefs, whether religious, political or other, what type of positive, negative, or neutral impact, if any, do you sense that has on students?
- 36) Which ethics-related written and electronic (video/DVD/on-line) teaching materials have you found the most valuable to students?
- 37) To what extent do you draw upon and assign publications which you have authored or co-authored and with what impact?
- 38) Which topics, ideas, debates, or questions most engage your students?
- 39) What unique tools, topics, materials, or techniques, if any, have you personally created or adapted for your classes?
- 40) Given that the Latin root of education, educare, means to rear or draw forth, what have you discovered draws forth the best ethical thinking, passion for learning, and growth from your students?

*questions so denoted are part of Kenneth Bain's original teaching studies reported in *WHAT THE BEST COLLEGE TEACHERS TEACH* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004). All other questions were devised by the researcher.