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ABSTRACT

Ethics is an important element of most graduate professional training programs. In the field of Library and Information Science (LIS) the inclusion of ethics in the curriculum is supported by a position paper by library educators and is monitored in the accreditation of graduate programs. Despite the many LIS programs which claim to integrate ethics, few authors have examined how they are accomplishing this integration, and fewer still have explored the nature of the integration. The purpose of this research is to expand the descriptive literature on the current teaching of ethics in graduate LIS programs by investigating ethics integration across the curriculum. The research describes the views and experiences of administrators and teachers on institution-wide tactics for integration of ethics across the curriculum. The research also details the strategies that teachers used to integrate ethics into existing core courses in LIS curricula.

The conceptual framework, which grounds this study of the integration of ethics, is based on the taxonomy of the teaching of professional ethics. The research is based on a qualitative methodology that uses sequential data gathering, including document review, interviews and a focus group. The data analysis uses the constant comparative coding method for analyzing the documents, interviews, and the focus group.

The findings of the research serve to answer the study’s two research questions. Investigation of the first research question, “How did teachers and administrators describe institution-wide ethics efforts?”, resulted in three key
findings: the subjects recognized the importance of the teaching of ethics; the participants identified two types of challenges involved in promoting ethics, those across LIS schools and those effecting students; and the schools have devised processes to initiate, implement and evaluate the integration of ethics. Research required to answer the second research question that concerns the ways that teachers integrate ethics into their courses resulted in seven key findings: the importance of integrating ethics into core courses; that almost half of the core courses analyzed had ethics-specific learning objectives; that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into core courses; that teachers recognized the concept of community as central to the integration of ethics; that codes of ethics were the most consistently used learning resource; that teachers experienced challenges in the integration of ethics; and that the participants identified a missed opportunity, conceiving of training in ethical analysis as the teaching of skills.

The conclusion to the study provides a view of the implications of both the studies’ findings and the taxonomy. It also includes the major limitations of the study and the further research which the study implies. The study concludes with recommendations for the practice of teaching ethics and the Appendices include specific course descriptions and interview and focus group instruments.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

All true professions are rooted in an ethical concern for some fundamental good. Professions are described as having characteristics such as a mastery of esoteric skills and a substantial requirement for training. An individual and collective concern for the common good is often included in this list of professional attributes (Bayles, 1989, Bowie, 2006). The process of becoming a professional must, therefore, involve the development of ethical commitments specific to the profession. This dissertation is a study of how ethics is taught in professional schools, particularly in the field of Library and Information Science (LIS). Many professional development programs have adopted an integrated approach to the teaching of ethics. Indeed, the combination of words, integrating ethics across the curriculum, has become something of mantra. What does this curious phrase mean?

History

The current provision of ethics education in many professional training programs reflects the purposes for which higher education was founded in early America. U.S. colleges, designed from medieval European models, were initially established as centers of religious learning for theologians and clergymen (Kimball, 1992; Thelin, 2004). Ethics, defined as a study of the nature and structure of common morality (Cahn & Markie, 1998; LaFollette, 2007; Rachels, 2003; Sterba, 1998), was a foundational concern in higher education, and this
interest in ethics was carried into professional schools, including law and medicine that emerged in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Prior to this time universities were not offering programs for practical skills and students acquired skills through apprenticeship opportunities in fields such as law and medicine (Cremin, 1997). Similarly, the pioneer librarians lacked school-based training and often served as apprentices to practicing librarians (Davis, 1991). By the first half of the twentieth century, the new quantitative approach to science which was promoted by the German universities, combined with curricular movement toward specialization and skill-based education, shifted the emphasis in universities and particularly in professional programs (Kimball, 1992; Veatch, 2005). The goal of education changed from developing character to teaching technical skills (Cremin, 1997). As a result of this emphasis on the technical side of education, by the early 1900s, ethics education played a modest role within most university programs (Callahan & Bok, 1980; Davis, 1999; Veatch, 2005).

After a dormant period of almost fifty years, ethics began a steady re-emergence. Michael Davis (1999) and Robert Veatch (2005) reported that the revival of ethics education was especially pronounced in professional education. A profession is defined as “an occupation usually involving long and specialized education on the level of higher education and governed by its own code of ethics” (Good, 1973, p.440). The major fields generally considered as professions include architecture, dentistry, education, engineering, journalism, law, library science, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and social work (Stark, Lowther, Hagerty
& Orczyk, 1986). Business is often added to this list of professions (Bowie, 2006). In the second half of the twentieth century, professional education programs and practitioners in various fields began to address ethical issues within their professions in a systematic fashion. Increasing interest in ethics was fueled by the disclosure of atrocities during the Second World War and the involvement of professionals in planning and administering unethical programs. German physicians’ involvement in the genocide of Jews across Europe during World War II is one examples of such an atrocity (Veatch, 2005).

In the decade after World War II there were various events which focused the attention of professionals on the ethical dimensions of their work. In the field of medicine, the creation of new technologies, and the issue of allocating access to these new life-saving devices, was highlighted by the introduction of the prototype dialysis machine in one hospital in Seattle (Veatch, 2005). Initially, those controlling the few machines available were besieged by the pleas of terminal kidney disease patients. After a highly publicized, unsuccessful attempt at local control by the hospital committee, the issue of ethically allocating this life-saving treatment was addressed as a national issue (Alexander, 1963; Veatch, 2005). In the same period of time, when the U.S. was confronting ethical access to medical technology, ethical issues were percolating in other professional fields (Davis, 1999).

In the field of Library and Information Science (LIS), ethics came to the forefront because of the same moral crisis which ignited the medical field --
providing fair access to resources. The library resource denied was access to information. U.S. government officials of the 1950s tried to control what citizens could read. Sheila Kennedy (1999) reports that in an effort to protect America from communism, censorship of library materials was encouraged and library borrowing records were used as a tool for investigating suspicious persons. In 1953, the American Library Association issued the “Freedom to Read” manifesto, which stated that restricting reading was “a denial of the fundamental premise of democracy: that the ordinary citizen, by exercising his critical judgment, will accept the good and reject the bad” (Kennedy, 1999, p.139). This manifesto helped librarians and library supporters identify and resist unethical violations of privacy advocated by government officials of the 1950s.

In the early twenty-first century, ethical issues are more readily apparent and regularly addressed than they were half a century ago. For the field of medicine, access to medical care and implications of justice still dominate the current debate over government-provided healthcare (Beauchamp, 2008). In LIS, the internet, and equality of access are characterized as the “digital divide,” i.e., the inability of the poorest citizens to access on-line resources (Compaine, 2001). One prominent author in the field of information ethics proposes that all LIS ethical problems can be reduced to one persistent and critically important question “who should have access to what information?” (Fallis, 2007, p. 25).

Based on this growing interest in ethics, educators in professional programs continue to enhance pedagogical approaches to ethics. In many
professional domains, understanding and developing ethical skills and
dispositions have become an integral part of training for a profession. (Bowie,
2006; Callahan & Bok, 1980; Davis 1999).

In the field of Library and Information Science, research into ethics
education is both important and timely. The importance of ethics training is
recognized by the premiere library organization in the United States, the
American Library Association (ALA). The Accrediting Council of ALA includes
ethics in the curriculum as a criterion in accrediting masters-level educational
programs (McKinney, 2006). Based on self reporting and periodic checking of
websites, over eighty percent of schools offering masters’ programs in LIS claim
to integrate ethics into core courses (Ghikas, 2009; McKinney, 2006).

Developing concrete descriptions of LIS training in ethics is a timely concern. In
early 2008, the Association of Library and Information Science Education
(ALISE) ratified a Position Statement on Information Ethics in LIS Education,
which recommends “attention to information ethics (either through the
curriculum, instructor expertise, resources, or symposia) be considered for
development by library and information studies education programs…[and]
information ethics…should be infused throughout the curriculum” (para. 2,5).

Although research into ethics is timely and important, the topic of integrating
ethics into courses is not well represented in the LIS literature.
Existing Studies Addressing Integrating Ethics in LIS

LIS literature includes two studies which document practices in integrating ethics into core LIS courses. In the earlier study, Beth Paskoff (1995) reported very briefly on the integration of ethics into core and elective courses at Louisiana State University. LIS educators in general define core courses as a set of classes that are traditionally required for graduation. These usually include courses with titles such as Reference Services, Institution Management, and Cataloging/Classification. Elective courses are defined as optional courses not required for graduation (Chu, 2006). In a 2006 thesis, Kathleen Rickert interviewed four faculty members to determine their strategies and perceptions on integrating ethics into LIS core courses at a college in Minnesota. Both of these studies provide minimal descriptions, but they also furnish a glimmer of the potential usefulness of such research. In Chapter II, I will supplement the limited literature on integrated ethics by analyzing writings on the teaching of stand-alone ethics courses (examples are Buchanan, 2004; Fallis, 2007; Rockenbach, 1998). As well, I will examine related literature on integrated ethics in fields other than LIS. This study will briefly examine integrated ethics in business, engineering, law, and medicine.

Purpose of Study

Despite the many LIS programs which claim to integrate ethics, few authors have examined how the programs are accomplishing this integration.
The purpose of this research is to expand the descriptive literature on the current teaching of ethics in graduate LIS programs by investigating ethics integration across the curriculum. The research describes the strategies that teachers use to integrate ethics into existing core courses in LIS curricula. The research also portrays teachers’ and administrators’ views on school-wide initiatives on the integration of ethics.

**Rationale for Detailed Study on Integration of Ethics**

The prevalence of the integration of ethics (over eighty percent of LIS programs seem to be practicing it) and the dearth of published research on this topic, suggest that investigating the integration of ethics into standard, core courses would be useful to faculty and administrators within and outside of LIS education programs. In the current research project I used the methods of document review, individual interviews with teachers and a focus group with administrators to investigate the integration of ethics. The teachers were selected for interviews based on several criteria including knowledge of ethical content (by publishing or teaching activities or by recommendations of colleagues), recognition by national organizations for teaching excellence, and teaching of core courses at LIS programs which have been recognized nationally for both teaching and research. LIS faculty will benefit from the research: through their examination of the learning objectives, teaching techniques, learning resources, and strategies for evaluation of the teaching of ethics they will see how well-
qualified teachers incorporate ethics into standard classes. This portion of the study will assist teachers and administrators in identifying useful approaches to teaching ethical topics.

In addition to providing course-specific, detailed information, the current study serves another purpose. The teachers queried in interviews and the administrators participating in the focus group reflected on the environmental factors institution-wide that may affect the provision of ethics across the curriculum. Administrators in LIS programs often have a strong interest in encouraging ethics integration, since the ALA Accreditation Committee requires evidence of ethics inclusion in the curriculum. In a 1994 survey of LIS Deans, Shelly Rogers found that a large majority reported that their school integrated ethics throughout the curriculum. In a 2006 survey of LIS websites for schools in the U.S. and Canada, McKinney found that 87.5% of accredited institutions indicate that ethical teaching is integrated into LIS courses. This research will help LIS program administrators and teachers gain insight and knowledge from both specific teaching strategies recorded in interviews with teachers, and from focus group discussions of administrators and teachers on the overall provision of ethics education across LIS programs.

Interest in this study may extend beyond the LIS community. While a few journal articles and books describe ethics across the curriculum in non-LIS professional programs, little of the literature on this topic includes the qualitative approach for describing this phenomenon. The qualitative tradition is particularly
useful when the goal is to explore the “actors’ definitions of the situation” (Schwandt, 2003, p.298) and when there is little previous research on this phenomenon (Creswell, 2009). Teachers and administrators in other fields of professional education can learn from this methodology.

**Research Questions**

I have identified a gap in the LIS literature. Although many institutions claim to be integrating ethics into the LIS curricula, there is little documentation on how this is done. The overarching research questions for the study are:

- Based on the descriptions of teachers and administrators, in what ways are schools integrating ethics institution-wide? and
- How do teachers integrate ethics into their courses

Answering the first question combines the perspectives of teachers and administrators to address the successes and challenges in integrating ethics throughout their LIS programs. Answering the second question requires an examination of approaches and materials in specific courses. Exploring deeper, and moving beyond the specific, the question invites an investigation of the perceptions of teachers regarding the teaching of ethics.

**Limitations of Study**

The limitations of the study will be covered in Chapter three and then will be elaborated, in combination with recommendations for further research, in Chapter six.


Contents of Dissertation

The remainder of the study is organized into five chapters. Chapter two consists of a review of the literature on the teaching of LIS ethics. Chapter three describes the methodology and methods of the study, and details specific design and implementation plans. The conceptual framework for the study, the Taxonomy of the Teaching of Professional Ethics, is included as Chapter four. An in-depth analysis of findings based on research data is included in Chapter five. Chapter six provides a view of the implications of both the studies’ findings and the taxonomy. It also includes the major limitations of the study and the further research which the study implies. The chapter concludes with recommendations for the practice of teaching ethics. The final section of the study includes appendices and references.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

In reviewing the literature I have provided a survey of current opportunities for ethics education for U.S., masters-level students in the field of Library and Information Science (LIS). I found that graduate LIS schools that included ethics in their curricula generally adopt one or both of the following strategies: providing stand-alone courses in ethics and/or endorsing integration of ethics across the curriculum. LIS literature on incorporating ethics into standard, required courses seemed meager compared to the more extensive literature describing stand-alone ethics courses. Many LIS programs espoused integration, but few authors have published reports on how they accomplish this integration.

My examination and reporting of the literature in the LIS ethics arena serves to summarize and synthesize the previous writings on the topic of the teaching of ethics in LIS by: articulating vocabulary and describing phenomenon relevant to the topic; relating the topic to the history of the field of LIS; situating the topic in the broader literature of the field of professional ethics; (Boote & Biele, 2005) and addressing the gaps in the research to determine what needs to be done. The sequence of topics in this chapter includes: defining the terms ethics and information ethics, detailing the history of LIS schools and the place of ethics in LIS education, describing ethics as a stand-alone course in LIS, examining the integration of ethics in LIS, business, engineering, law, and medicine, and
presenting the questions which arise from the literature surrounding the integration of ethics in LIS.

In the section below I analyze the meaning of ethics and especially that of professional ethics. Then, I identify major components of information ethics.

**Definitions of Ethics and Information Ethics**

The term “ethics” has several meanings. The most widespread and primary meaning of “ethics” is common morality, a set of everyday ground-rules for living (Gert, 2004). These ground-rules are understood to apply to everyone, everywhere, at all times. ”Ethics” may also refer to the philosophical study of the concepts of common morality and the ethical frameworks specific to various philosophers. As a philosophical discipline, ethics aims to define the nature and structure of common or everyday morality (Sterba, 1998; Strike, 2006). A third sense of “ethics” refers to the ethical requirements of professional practice, which are requirements over and above those of common morality, applying specifically to professionals in the conduct of their professions. This distinction between duties of common morality and what is required of professionals is widely assumed by practical philosophers (see Beauchamp, 2008 and Strike, 2006 for examples).

The Codes of Ethics adopted by professional organizations were attempts to codify these ethical requirements. P. Shachaf (2005) examined librarians’
Codes of Ethics from twenty-eight countries and compared the frequency with which particular principles appear, including:

- Professional development (89%)
- Integrity (89%)
- Confidentiality and privacy (85%)
- Free and equal access to information (82%)
- Conflict of interest and personal gain (71%)
- Responsibilities toward the profession (67%)
- Responsibilities toward colleagues (64%)
- Censorship (64%)
- Collection development (53%)
- Competency (50%)
- High level of service (50%)
- Responsibilities toward the user (50%) (p. 526)

Some of the items listed described desired professional ideals or dispositions such as integrity. Some described responsibilities, such as participating in professional development, while others were more obviously action-guiding ethical principles. For example, the phrase, equal access to information, implied that every person should be provided with the same opportunity to obtain information.

LIS codes, the ideals they espouse, and the principles or values upon which the ideals are based, provide content for the specific field of Information Ethics. A course with this title is generally concerned with ethical issues associated with the production, storage, and dissemination of information (Weckert & Adeney, 1997). Courses often study the core ethical values of the library field: one book defines these as “providing service and access, avoiding philosophical and financial conflicts of interest, and protecting patron confidentiality” (Preer, 2008, p.xv).

**Establishment of LIS Schools, Standards and Priority of Ethics in LIS**

The field of LIS ethics as a teaching and research topic did not gain
popular until the late 1980s, and the first course in information ethics was taught by Diana Woodward at Drexel University in 1987 (Wildemuth, 2008). This timing was more than a decade after the emergence of ethics in the professions of medicine, engineering, and some other professional fields represented in universities (Davis, 1999; Veatch, 2005).

The teaching of ethics was neither a priority in the early years of the LIS profession nor was it a focus of early accreditation (Hauptman, 1990). In 1884 the first university-based library program opened at Columbia University when Melvil Dewey founded the Columbia School of Library Economy. In the next few years, as other library schools developed, groups of library educators expressed concern about the quality of education at the differing LIS programs. In 1915 the American Association of Library Schools assumed responsibility for “approving” the emerging schools for membership. Over time the responsibility for the accreditation process was assumed by the ALA’s Committee on Accreditation (Davis, 1974). This approval of membership, based on criteria, was an early form of accreditation (Davis, 1991).

In the twenty-first century, the standards by which the American Library Association (ALA) accredited graduate schools of Library and Information Science emphasized the importance of ethics in curricula. Although LIS school accreditation standards did not mandate separate ethics courses, they did require coverage of ethical issues in graduate LIS curricula. Professional ethics was
included as a core competency that ALA accredited Master-level programs in LIS must fulfill.

The ALA standards specified that a graduating student:

• Knows the ethics, values and foundational principles of the library and information professions, and
• Understands the role of library and information professionals in the promotion of democratic principles, intellectual freedom, and diversity of thought (McKinney, 2005, p.1).

Although the ALA did not provide curricular guidance in the area of ethics, a group of library educators appropriated this role. In 2008 the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) ratified the Position Statement on Information Ethics in LIS Education which was developed by the ALISE Information Ethics Special Interest Group. This official document contained the following recommendations with respect to adding or modifying courses in LIS curricula:

1. Develop a unit in a required, introductory LIS course (often called Foundations) with the following specified student objectives:
   • “to be able to recognize and articulate ethical conflicts in the information field;
   • to inculcate a sense of responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field;
   • to provide the foundations for intercultural dialogue through the recognition of different kinds of information cultures and values;
   • to provide basic knowledge about ethical theories and concepts and about their relevance to everyday information work; and,
   • to learn to reflect ethically and to think critically and to carry these abilities into their professional life.
2. Create one or more stand-alone courses on information ethics. This course should be offered on a periodic basis and taught by a qualified faculty member.
3. Embed information ethics into study and discussion across the curriculum and especially “in such areas as management, young adult services, information literacy training, and information-technology related courses.”
4. Maintain ongoing and culturally-sensitive engagement with information ethics as the need to revisit questions and issues arises” (ALISE, 2008, para.3-6).

**Ethics as a Stand-Alone Course**

To accomplish many of the ethical directives listed above, LIS schools have adopted strategies to teach ethics. Authors from many professional fields reported that ethical subject content was conveyed through a stand-alone course (Hastings Center, 1980). The majority of LIS authors describing ethics education viewed ethics as a separate, often elective course with fairly consistent teaching methods, a variety of content, and limited evaluation of outcomes. The section below includes the following characteristics of stand-alone ethics courses in LIS: their prevalence and status as an elective or a required course, content of courses, teaching methods used by educators, evaluative studies, and disadvantages of stand-alone courses.

Heting Chu, in a 2005 study of LIS curricula, designated courses in ethics and policy as an areas of growing interest for faculty and students wanting to address cultural (e.g., multicultural service) and societal (e.g., equity of access) issues (p. 332). The overall increase in the development of LIS ethics courses is demonstrated by numbers reported in the literature. In a Shelly Rogers 1994
survey of LIS Deans, six indicate that they have specific ethics courses. By 2004, Elizabeth Buchanan describes active stand-alone ethics courses in fifteen schools. These numbers were corroborated by Robert Vaagan; in 2003 he reported that twenty schools in the U.S. offer instruction or perform research in information ethics.

One important question is whether the ethics courses offered in LIS schools are required, core courses, or are offered as electives. In a 2007 article Don Fallis stated that only a few LIS schools required an ethics course. Faculty members, writing about teaching ethics, were not unanimous in advocating for a required stand-alone ethics course. Buchanan stressed that “instilling a sense of ethics and responsibility is a necessity, not an elective,” and she reported that 92% of students in her stand-alone ethics course believed that it should be required (2003, p. 3). But Toni Carbo disagreed by stating that ethics classes “cannot and should not be a required course…students must be ready to study ethics” (Rockenbach, 1998, p. 16). Carbo felt that information ethics was the most important course in the LIS program and for this reason she encouraged all students to take the course. But she strongly felt that students must be willing and open to participate in ethical reflection. In choosing to take the course, the student has made an initial commitment to inquiry.
Content of Stand-Alone Ethics Courses in LIS

Whether required or elective, the subject matter of stand-alone LIS ethics courses reflects a consistency in the teaching of core values and Codes, but variety in the coverage of theory and analysis. The courses generally endorse the same professional values, including protecting library users’ rights to privacy and confidentiality, supporting intellectual freedom, resisting censorship, valuing intellectual property, and providing equity of access to information (Carbo, 2003; Gorman, 2000; Hahn, 1992; Winston, 2007). Other less prevalent values are preservation of print materials (Carbo & Almagno, 2001), cultural solidarity/cultural diversity (Hahn, 1992), whistle-blowing (Woodward, 1989), social responsibilities (Woodward, 1989), free vs. fee (Blake, 1989).

One standard way to emphasize these values was to focus on various librarian Codes of Ethics. Through examination of codes students learned to employ a mode of inquiry that examined assumptions and considered various courses of action (Boylan & Donohue, 2003). Some of the Codes frequently covered in LIS ethics courses included the Code of Ethics of the American Library Association (2008) the Library Bill of Rights (2009), the Code of Ethics of the Medical Library Association (1995), and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) of the United Nations (Buchanan, 2004; Carbo, 2004). These codes generally provided canonical statements of the core values or principles. The Codes not only clarified the core values for librarians, but they also communicated to the general public that librarians were committed to values
which were important to society (Ball & Oppeheim, 2005; Fallis, 2007). Codes did not, however, explain how to apply these values to specific cases. Most teachers of ethics agreed that while the Codes provided useful boundaries, they were difficult to apply to actual situations and were not always applicable to diverse, modern situations (Fallis, 2007; White, 1991). For example, a study of 46 new LIS students measured their reaction to an ethical scenario both before and after reading an assigned Code of Ethics. The original reactions of students matched their reactions after reading the Code, but the students found some language of specific portions of the Code useful in justifying the selected course of action (Jefferson & Conteras, 2005). Given the limitations of the codes, some LIS educators endorsed the teaching of ethical theories and methods of decision analysis.

While faculty members generally endorsed teaching the same principles and various codes of ethics, they had different opinions on the importance of including specific ethical theories and ethical decision making models. Buchanan’s 2004 survey of LIS schools offering stand-alone ethics courses indicated that while the majority offered at least some coverage of theory and analytical techniques, there was considerable variation in the depth and breadth of this coverage. Similarly, interviews in 2006 with seven teachers of LIS ethics indicated that even though students were exposed to ethical theories and to frameworks for decision-making, some schools devoted more time to theoretical issues and others allocated more time to practical library issues (Rickert). The
variety of approaches to the teaching of stand-alone ethics may reflect different learning objectives for the courses. One such learning objective may concern the teaching of historical ethical theories.

Some LIS faculty members argue that an ethical theories approach provides important tools for librarians to employ in analyzing particular cases (Fallis, 2007; Woodward, 1989). The argument was that librarians, armed with a number of ethical theories, will be able to consider dilemmas from various points of view and accordingly make better professional judgments. Those advocating the inclusion of diverse ethical theories in professional ethics courses argued that the circumstances of an ethical dilemma were viewed differently depending on the ethical theory under study (Fallis, 2007; Hobson & Walsh, 1998; Woodward, 1989). For example, suppose an important library supporter wanted to suppress the availability of a contraceptive website because he felt it might be harmful to children. The utilitarian (Schneewind, 1965) would determine the overall damage to all of society if only children of a certain age were denied access. Those with a Kantian, duty-oriented ethical viewpoint (Kant, 1959) might suggest that the librarian was obligated to provide unrestricted access to all patrons or perhaps to protect children as members of a vulnerable subgroup. Those advocating a Rawlsian viewpoint (Rawls, 1971) might argue that all persons had an interest in access to information and that greater access for some should be tolerated only to the extent that this unequal access worked to the benefit of the least advantaged. And those focused on virtue-based theories (Oakley, 2001)
might focus on dispositions such as courage, which librarians needed to confront this situation. Historical details of the theories were not crucial; what was important was that duty, consequences, rights and virtue all matter and that each theory tended to focus the student’s attention on one particular dimension of the situation. But Gert (2004) warns that teachers can mishandle diverse theories by presenting them in a competitive light. In professional ethics the instructor often “puts them [the theories] forward as if students should choose between them…Even worse, students are told that they should choose the theory that seems to work best for the particular problem with which they are concerned…this is a trivialization not only of these theories but of moral theories in general” (p.vii).

A second approach is to embrace an ethical framework based on common morality. This approach relies on principles that are uncontroversial because they are part of common everyday morality (e.g., prohibitions of stealing and lying). Such an approach is more consistent with that advocated by moral philosophers including Beauchamp (2005), Curren (2004), and Gert (2004). The literature was unclear whether LIS ethics teachers included a common morality framework or included the coverage of diverse theories. Buchanan’s 2004 study includes a few reading lists from specific courses and states that a majority of the institutions include some coverage of theory. The third option, which, according to Buchanan (2004), was embraced by less than half of the teachers was to take a more pragmatic approach and teach no ethical theory at all.
Stand-alone LIS ethics courses in different institutions varied not only in how ethical theories were presented, but also in how the ethical cases were examined within a decision-making framework. One of the early LIS ethics courses in the U.S. provided an excellent model for the different kinds of analysis that could be included. Toni Carbo (2004) reported on the evolution of the stand-alone course at the University of Pittsburgh and the different methods of ethical analysis employed in the course. Students and teachers began by identifying and clarifying their personal attitudes and values, including their biases. Taking these proclivities into account, the students then studied the elements of ethical reasoning and applied these to cases from the field. Generally, the elements of ethical reasoning were identified by asking the following questions: What is the purpose of inquiry? What are the goals to be accomplished? What are the important ethical questions? What information would be relevant to answering these questions? What are the key ethical concepts and principles relevant to these questions? What are our assumptions? What are our points of view? What conclusions/implications/consequences might flow from our decisions (Paul & Elder, 2005)? Teachers employed different approaches to ethical decision-making. All who taught stand-alone courses in LIS ethics devoted a great proportion of the course to analyzing practical problems in the library field (Buchanan, 2004) with the goals of enhancing the students’ ability to perceive and distinguish ethical issues, and providing information to help students make ethical judgments (ALISE, 2008).
Teaching Methods in LIS Stand-Alone Ethics

Although LIS ethics faculty were divided on the importance of teaching in-depth ethical theory and in their choice of decision-making models, the methods used in teaching ethics courses remained consistently centered around lecture and group analysis of specific situations in LIS (Hannabuss, 1996). In fact, every course analyzed in Buchanan’s (2004) study of ethics stand-alone courses employed at least one session in case analysis of specific ethical scenarios. Not all LIS ethics instructors endorsed the use of pre-formulated case studies. Several speakers at a conference commented that the published case studies were out-dated and too simplistic. To alleviate this problem of datedness some classes used cases provided by students from their work setting (ALA, 2004). Similar to students in many professional graduate programs, LIS students often acquire work experience in the field before and/or while taking graduate courses. Some preferred using ethical situations which appear in very recent sources, such as reports in the ALA Intellectual Freedom List serve (Rickert, 2006).

Many teachers of ethics employed innovative formats to further the discussion. One course included a formal debate on the pros and cons of an issue. A unique teaching technique that resulted in students speaking more freely was to introduce fictional readings which depicted an information problem and then discuss the dilemmas of the different characters (Buchanan, 2004).
At an ALA conference in 2004 several instructors described the following teaching methods: One program used discrete groups of students, where each group was assigned a different ethical theory to use in analyzing the same ethical dilemma in information ethics. The point of this exercise was to demonstrate to students that considering the tenets of only one theory results in a limited analysis of a problem. Another course had a unique approach to Codes of Ethics that required each student to develop their own web-based code of ethics, complete with links to justifications, illustrations of conflicts, and an example of how principles applied to practice. One teacher assigned groups of students to prepare, present and lead class discussions. Another approach was to emphasize the universality of ethical problems by inviting speakers from allied areas, e.g., journalism ethics (ALA, 2004). Reviewing this ALA session gave me a glimpse of the value of first-hand accounts of teaching, since all of these varied approaches were presented by three teachers of stand-alone ethics.

**Evaluative Studies in Stand-Alone LIS Ethics Courses**

Although the literature was replete with a variety of teaching innovations, most of which were based around the lecture and case study formats, the literature of LIS ethics included very few evaluations of the impact of the courses. The teaching of professional ethics in LIS is characterized by weak and inconsistent evaluative studies. As in many domains of professional ethics most evaluation available for LIS ethics courses was anecdotal. An example was a student’s description of the teacher helping those in ethics class to “love the questions…to
appreciate the process of ethical decision-making as much as, if not more than, the decision itself” (Rokenbach, 1998, p. 17).

One study did directly address the efficacy of ethics education in library and information science. The study used the Defining Issues Test (DIT). The DIT was a widely used instrument which measured the extent of benefits of a certain educational intervention. In this case the intervention was a course in ethics in the Department of Library and Information Science in the School of Information Sciences at the University of Pittsburgh (Ingram, 1997). The DIT was used as a tool to compare the analysis of issues by students who took the ethics course to two control groups -- students in the LIS population who did not take the ethics course and professional, practicing librarians (Ingram, 1997). The study results obtained “p” scores that did not show a significant difference from pre to post-test among the three groups. The author warns against generalizing this small study. Another researcher in the field of professional ethics points out the Defining Issues Test only measured the judgment component of ethics teaching, it did not measure the alteration of the student’s sensitivity or the change in the student’s knowledge relevant to addressing an ethical issue (Davis, 2005). The evaluation of ethics teaching in LIS literature included anecdotal evidence as well as one small DIT study with non-significant results.
Disadvantages of Stand-Alone Ethics Courses

Beyond the negative implications of one evaluative study, there were other, perhaps more elusive reasons why schools might resist offering a stand-alone ethics course. While the literature in LIS ethics provided reasonable descriptions of stand-alone course content, most authors in this field do not discuss the disadvantages of an exclusive ethics course. My study of the literature from various fields suggested that the disadvantages included financial, collaborative, and practical concerns. Significant financial resources were required to develop, offer, and maintain a specific course devoted to ethics. Deans feeling economic pressure to support other initiatives were often reluctant to allocate resources to this stand-alone, elective course. Beyond the economic investment required, the LIS schools had other factors to seriously consider before implementing a stand-alone ethics course.

In examining professional ethics courses across many fields, Norman Bowie (2006) cited the uniqueness and sometimes exclusivity of ethics educators as a disadvantage of stand-alone ethics courses. In some institutions, faculty members viewed the teaching of ethics as the property of the single or few faculty members who are trained teachers of ethics. In some professional programs, ethics was delegated to those with academic training outside of the traditional professional path. For example, Bowie (2006) suggests that professors from the department of philosophy were often recruited to teach ethics in a professional school. This perception of the “ownership” of ethics by a small group within the
school can be detrimental to collaboration throughout the institution (Bowie, 2006). Conflicting evidence indicated that this disadvantage was not prevalent in LIS. One analysis of faculty in LIS indicated that those who both teach and research in ethics most often had standard LIS degrees, rather than training in the humanities. Specifically, as reported in the ALISE 2006 Directory of LIS Programs and Faculty in the U.S. and Canada, 88.9% of the teachers and researchers in ethics had Ph.D.s; of those with this degree, only 17% were in the humanities (Smith, 2007).

Beyond financial and collaborative disadvantages, there was the practical concern that the stand-alone courses muted the impact and perceived importance of ethics instruction since, in most schools, stand-alone ethics courses were electives. An analysis of all LIS courses found a trend towards more electives and a reduction of core requirements. Chu (2006) reported that most schools had created curricula with few required hours. As an advocate of ethics across the curriculum, the Dean at Louisiana State University (LSU) answers the question of why her school does not have a stand-alone ethics elective course by saying, “Professional ethics is not an ‘elective’ in the lives of librarians…but needs to be integrated fully into all aspects of the library education curriculum” (Paskoff, 1995, p.40-42).
Eighty-five percent of Deans questioned more than a decade ago, indicated that ethical issues were “regularly discussed in…graduate library/information science courses” (Rogers, 1994, p.53). The published literature in LIS ethics repeatedly endorses the concept of ethics throughout the curriculum (Hahn, 1992). As well, in a 2004 lecture one commentator stated that 59% of the schools deal with ethics in their required courses (ALA, 2004).

ALA analyses in 2006 of LIS websites in the U.S. and Canada demonstrated that the teaching of professional ethics was included in a required course description by 45 of the 56 accredited programs in the U.S. and Canada (McKinney, p. 3). While it was useful to know that over 80% of the programs used the word “ethics” in a course description for a required course, this did not indicate the extensiveness of coverage of ethics in the 45 accredited programs. Also, the ALA numbers gave no indication of how the schools integrated ethics throughout the curriculum. The question of how integration was done, both in individual courses and throughout the LIS school, was neglected not only in the ALA analysis but also in the library literature.

**Integrating Ethics at LSU and at St. Catherine**

The majority of LIS programs embraced the concept of “ethics across the curriculum,” but few sources detailed the actual implementation. LIS literature included two published accounts of the implementation of integrated ethics: Paskoff’s 1995 journal article describing the LIS program at Louisiana State
University (LSU) and a 2006 master’s thesis which included interviews with three library school professors at St. Catherine College in St. Paul, MN (Rickert). Both sources focused on the actual implementation of ethics into core, required courses in the LIS curriculum and I will detail the two sources in the paragraphs below.

The coverage of ethics at LSU began with an “ethical concerns” orientation for new students and then detailed ethical discussions in each of six required, core courses: In the “Foundations Course” ethical codes were addressed. The course entitled “Library and Information Agencies and their Resources” discussed cases of censorship and methods for resolving these cases. The “Information Services” course addressed the emphasis on confidentiality of user requests. The course in “Cataloging and Classification” stressed the importance of avoiding discriminatory words in subject headings and the “Principles of Management in Information Agencies Course” discussed the ethical responsibilities in financial situations. The experience of integrating ethics at LSU was that of a well established master's degree program which provides training for the majority of librarians in the state of Louisiana (LSU, 2008; Pascoff, 1995).

The College of St. Catherine is a new entrant to the LIS master's level training field, petitioning for ALA accreditation as an independent Master’s program in 2009 (Rickert, 2006). The College had studied extensively the options for ethics integration in order to determine which models could best enhance the
College’s emerging program of master's level study. In examining “ethics across the curriculum” a researcher interviewed three faculty members who described how they integrate ethics into the foundations, cataloging, and reference courses at St. Catherine College (Rickert, 2006).

Kathleen Rickert (2006) interviewed one professor at St. Catherine who described the ethics integration in “Foundations of Librarianship” course. Since this course is often the first course that students take in the LIS program, the course was designed to provide a strong grounding in the values of the profession. The professor used case studies from recent issues of *American Libraries* and divided students into small groups to discuss and identify ethical issues. For each meeting of the class the instructor assigned a pair of students who gave presentations on ethical issues. In the final class meeting for “Foundations” students read and discussed in small groups the Codes of Ethics of various library organizations (medicine, law, ALA, computer industry). The instructor’s goal in the course was to have her students study issues and apply principles.

In the cataloging course the teacher selected readings which provided conflicting points of view to help students to recognize bias or unethical practices. Students described how the specific subject headings supported or conflicted with the stated values in the ALA Code.

The core reference course at St. Catherine devoted one full session to the ethics of public service. The case studies were most often provided by the students from their work or personal experiences. The instructor felt that one
important outcome of the (sometimes heated) ethical discussions was that students
learned to work through their disagreements while remaining non-judgmental.
The report of interviews with three professors at St. Catherine College portrayed
ethics integration for three courses. This report, when combined with the briefer
descriptions of ethics in the six core courses at LSU, comprised the literature
available on the integration of ethics into LIS courses. Table 1 below provides a
summary of the content of the courses in both schools.
Table 1: Integrated Ethics in LIS Courses at L.S.U. and St. Catherine College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Louisiana State Univ.</th>
<th>St. Catherine College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Library Science</td>
<td>Review ethical Codes</td>
<td>Review Codes of various groups-final class uses case studies from current journals Review current issues (e.g., censorship) Students present ethical topic each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>Stress avoidance of discriminatory words</td>
<td>Teach students to recognize biased words Contrasts ALA code with LC subject headings (side by side images) Examine catalog record for inclusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services/ Reference</td>
<td>Stress confidentiality of user requests</td>
<td>One full session devoted to ethics Throughout course insert ethics Read ALA Code and selected authors Case studies provided by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and Information Agencies and their Resources</td>
<td>Distribute Intellectual Freedom Manual from LA Lib Assn Present &amp; discuss censorship case Handling of copyright compliance Discuss vendor relations Safeguarding borrowing records</td>
<td>Course not discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Management in Information Agencies</td>
<td>Discuss ethical responsibilities in financial situations</td>
<td>Course not discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Library and Information Science</td>
<td>Capstone course- student selected topic, often strong ethical content</td>
<td>Course not discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The description of the integration of ethics into the six required courses at LSU provided a brief, but broad view of the steps toward inserting ethics into the required curriculum of an LIS program (Paskoff, 1995). The report of three in-depth interviews with teachers at St. Catherine College gave more detail of the content and teaching methods (Rickert, 2006).
The descriptions of the curricula at LSU and at St. Catherine provided models of the content for two programs; these models were centered on ethics across the curriculum. The ideals, responsibilities, and principles covered in stand-alone ethics courses (privacy, intellectual freedom/censorship, valuing intellectual property, and equity of access) were well represented in these examples of integrating ethics with other LIS courses. Teachers employed the teaching methods of lecture, discussion, and the analysis of specific cases. While the principles and teaching methods were similar to those of stand-alone ethics courses, the two descriptions of ethics across the curriculum were limited. These accounts represented the strategies of two institutions and lacked important details about the integration.

_Ethics across the Curriculum in Business, Engineering, Law, and Medicine_

Examining literature outside of the LIS field provided me with a view of ethics integration strategies in other fields which could help in preparation for my data collection. My goal in exploring fields other than LIS was to provide a robust addendum to the meager LIS literature on ethics across the curriculum.

The practice of integrating ethics within existing, required courses is documented in the literature of business, engineering, law, and medicine. Researchers from these fields described the challenge of incorporating ethics into

---

1 Although Mark Winston (2008) wrote that medicine was not comparable to LIS (because of the greater number of credit hours required), I felt that medicine needed to be included here since medicine has the most extensive teaching programs in professional ethics.
their technology-oriented curricula. With their highly technical curricula LIS educators had a similar problem of merging ethics with curricula which was primarily focused on technology (Gorman, 2000; Hauptman, 1990). Examining literature from other professions helped me to identify approaches or opportunities for incorporating ethics into core courses. Specifically, the non-LIS literature described the integration and the actual teaching which accomplished the integration. Further, the allied literature pinpointed useful questions for determining how LIS programs can integrate ethics across the curriculum. This section will describe integration in each of the respective fields and then will conclude by listing relevant questions which can be addressed in subsequent chapters.

While there are individual articles on strategies such as inserting ethics into the teaching of specific fields of business (especially accounting and finance), there seems to be no overall endorsed integration plans for business schools. Sims and Brinkmann (2003) suggested the modular approach into the areas of research ethics, international business, marketing and public relations. They stressed the interdisciplinary approach and suggested the use of guest lecturers and team teaching. But they also described a typical business curriculum that seemed haphazard in its coverage of ethics, with no coordination between specific courses. This lack of coordination of content between courses could have resulted in undesirable situations. Business students could experience the exclusion of important ethical information because the instructor assumed that the
ethical segments were addressed in other courses. (McDonald, 1995). Articles in
the business literature emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary planning in
the teaching of integrated ethics.

In contrast to the business literature, the Director of the Center for
Professional Ethics at Illinois Institute of Technology provided a robust
description of integration strategies or what they called a “micro-insertion” of
ethics (Davis, 2006). This insertion of ethics was not synonymous with a course
in professional ethics; it interwove small amounts of ethics into technical cases.
The IIT instructors make no effort to teach moral theory or social ethics. Most
often, the micro-insertion involved identifying ethical concerns and introducing
their consideration as part of a case study. For example, having engineering
students consider the environmental/ethical impact of a product, as well as its
price, in developing a proposal for installation of air-conditioning. The goal was
to teach students how to add ethical considerations to typically straight-forward
technical decisions (Davis, 2005).

In the legal field the centrality of an integrated approach to ethics was
endorsed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who stated that it was an
“error to segregate ethics to any one course or any one part of the
curriculum…students [should be] sensitized to ethical issues as they arise in
various courses in substantive and procedural law” (Burger, 1980). Articles in
the legal education literature suggested that one good way to integrate ethics was
to incorporate a “clinical” class.(Burger, 1980; Venter, 1995). These classes,
often held in a Legal Aid Clinic, served to contextualize the traditional teaching on ethics through working with clients and teachers to take action. Another teacher recommended tackling ethics by expanding from cases into stories. The cases provided opportunities for teaching and analyzing rules; stories gave students examples which enriched their ethical imagination and encouraged the development of professional identity (Floyd & Gallaher, 2006).

In medical schools the extent and timing of the insertion of ethics into the curriculum was important (Parker & Harris, 1997). In a comparative study of three medical schools in Upstate and Western New York (Smith, 2006) found that while duration of interventions vary, timing of ethical interventions is similar across schools. The study reported that in the first two, non-clinical years of primarily academic studies, students from two schools are required to select short courses in ethics or in the humanities. Then in the last two years, when they are treating patients, students attend interactive, ethical sessions which are inserted into their regular classes. During these classes students report on their clinical cases and the instructor leads discussion around ethical issues in the care of that patient. In the first two years medical students take short courses to develop an awareness and appreciation of ethical or humanistic concerns. Then, in the final two years of medical school, students are expected to discuss and sometimes describe in writing the conceptual grounds for their own ethical decisions. The timing is specifically designed to provide instructive, ethical discussions at the time that students are beginning to interact with their patients. Also important in
medical settings are the ethical interventions throughout the medical school. The medical students have opportunities to attend ethics lectures, ethics committee meetings and can receive compensation for developing and teaching ethics-oriented short courses (Smith, 2006). Also, in situations where the care of patients is especially problematic, ethical consultations, usually from members of a formal ethics committee, can be requested by medical students, nurses, doctors, or patient and family (Heitman & Bulgar, 1998).

Descriptions of the extent and duration of ethical interventions include the following: a modular approach in business which often lacks coordination and pointed to the need for interdisciplinary cooperation; in engineering the micro-insertion of ethics into technical cases with consultation available to help re-design courses; in law a “clinical” insertion which involved students interacting with clients in a legal aid service, as well as an emphasis on moving from strict legal cases to stories which engage moral imagination; and a phased-in introduction of ethics in medicine with the first phase enhancing the sensitivity of students and the second phase requiring a discussion of the grounding of ethical choices. Some of these descriptions provide relevant information helpful in planning my strategies for exploring how LIS schools are teaching “ethics across the curriculum.”
New Questions

Studies featured above in business, engineering, law, and medicine provided insight on key factors in teaching ethics in an integrated fashion. Literature on the stand-alone LIS ethics courses and the two published articles on integrating ethics into LIS courses stimulated new questions which will aid me in determining how and to what extent ethics is integrated across the curriculum in LIS.

In preparing LIS faculty and in teaching and evaluating the ethics components of courses, some key questions which arose from the literature included:

- Are the ethical insertions coordinated across courses to assure even coverage and avoid duplication?
- How do students react to the ethical components of the course?
- Has any evaluative information been gathered on the effectiveness of the ethics segment of the course?
- What teaching techniques are included in the ethical component of the course?
  - Does the class discuss library Codes of Ethics?
  - Does the course incorporate any discussion of specific ethical theories or principles?
  - Does the class consider case studies which relate to ethical dilemmas and what are the characteristics of these case studies?
These questions provide a starting point for refining and tackling the research questions:

- How do LIS teachers and administrators describe program-wide ethics integration? And

- How do LIS faculty members report integrating ethics into courses?

**Summary**

The integration of professional ethics across the curriculum is a goal for all professions. In the field of Library and Information Science (LIS) the importance of ethics instruction is evident in the accreditation requirements of graduate LIS programs: specifically in the mandate that ethics teaching be present in core courses. My purpose in this research is to expand information about how ethics instruction is integrated into core courses and how ethics integration is accomplished school-wide. The goal of this chapter was to summarize and synthesize previous writings on the teaching of ethics in LIS. I began the literature review by defining ethics and information ethics. Then, I placed ethics within the history of the LIS schools and examined practices of teaching ethics as a stand-alone course in LIS. To address the integration of ethics I adopted two strategies: first, focusing on the two reported LIS programs that integrate ethics, and then examining basic characteristics of stand-alone ethics courses in the fields of business, engineering, law, and medicine. This view of the timing and extensiveness of integration provided a snapshot of integrated ethics courses in
various professional programs. By analyzing the literature from three sources, stand-alone LIS ethics courses, the LIS programs which do integrate ethics, and the integration of ethics in other fields, I was able to identify some initial questions. The list of questions which concluded this chapter will assist me in selecting and designing the methodology, conceptual framework, and methods which I will describe in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3: Research Methods

The opportunities for ethics education for U.S., masters-level students in the field of Library and Information Science (LIS) are varied. Graduate LIS schools that include ethics in their curricula generally have adopted one or both of the following strategies: providing stand-alone courses in ethics and/or endorsing the integration of “ethics across the curriculum.” Although there seemed to be an abundance of published literature on ethics as a stand-alone course, only fifteen institutions (twenty-nine percent of accredited LIS schools in the U.S.) offered a separate course in ethics and usually it is offered as a non-required, elective course (Buchanan, 2004). In surveys of institutional websites, the A.L.A. found that many of the institutions which do not have a stand-alone ethics course indicated that the teaching of ethics was integrated into LIS courses (McKinney, 2006). Despite these claims, few studies have examined how schools were accomplishing this integration in specific classes and fewer still have explored the integration on a school-wide basis.

The purpose of this research is to expand descriptive literature on current teaching of ethics in U.S. and Canadian universities; the research focuses on graduate programs in Library and Information Science (LIS) and specifically investigates ethics integration across the curriculum. This description of research methods begins and ends with the research questions for the study. These questions are intertwined with the sections of this chapter and the sections include descriptions of: the development of the conceptual framework (the taxonomy for
the teaching of professional ethics) and how the taxonomy guides the research methods; the methodology of qualitative research and an explanation of its appropriateness for this study; the three research methods used in the study, document review, interviews and a focus group; the data analysis process and employment of trustworthiness criteria; and limitations of the methods of the study.

Throughout the chapter, and summarized in the conclusion, are ongoing descriptions of the methodological limitations endemic to qualitative research – the role of the researcher in the investigative process. My role in this process is a compromised one: My background in libraries provides me with access to talented interviewees, but it also colors my view of their responses. I am aware of these biases and, wherever possible, have acknowledged them and have proposed ameliorative strategies.

**Research Questions**

I have identified a gap in the LIS literature. Although many institutions claimed to be integrating ethics into LIS curricula, there was little documentation on how this was done. Accounts of ethics teaching in LIS were primarily focused on stand-alone ethics courses, rather than descriptions of integrating ethics. The meager literature available did not detail the characteristics of the integration of ethics. Neither the integration of ethics into specific courses nor the school-wide integration of ethics has been adequately covered in the literature. The research
questions for this study pinpoint this void in the literature by posing two questions:

Question 1: Based on the descriptions of teachers and administrators, in what ways are schools integrating ethics institution-wide? and

Question 2: How do teachers integrate ethics into their courses?

These questions imply two types of answers by two sets of respondents. In answering question one, both teachers and administrators provided their respective viewpoints on program-wide approaches to teaching ethics. They itemized the challenges they encountered while integrating ethics and they reported the steps that their institutions took in an effort to provide every student with significant grounding in ethics. Teachers responding to question two provided course-specific descriptions of teaching activities and planning relevant to ethics, especially in terms of learning objectives, teaching techniques and assignments, learning resources, and evaluation. The questions in the study address practices to integrate ethics through institution-wide efforts and in specific courses.

Teachers and administrators occupy different positions in the LIS hierarchy and have different perspectives. Teachers could provide specific information on how ethics is integrated into their courses. Many administrators in LIS retain limited teaching duties, but in general, they could provide a more broad-based perspective on the integration of ethics into specific courses. Teachers, especially those with long-tenure at the institution, provided
descriptions of institution-wide ethics initiatives, but the administrators’ reflections on ethics integration represent the official view of the institution. These differing perspectives of teachers and administrators give valuable insight into formulating descriptions of the integration of ethics.

The research questions have provided guidance and a constant reference point for investigation. Answering these questions began with creating a conceptual framework. This framework, the taxonomy of teaching of ethics, influenced my choice of the particular qualitative methodology that used sequential data gathering. This methodology implied specific methods selected to investigate questions: document review, interviews and a focus group.

**Conceptual Framework: The Taxonomy of the Teaching of Professional Ethics**

Empirical study of the integration of ethical content into mainstream courses within LIS curricula requires a conceptual framework. The conceptual framework that I developed and which grounds this study of the integration of ethics is a taxonomy of the teaching of stand-alone professional ethics courses. Taxonomies serve several purposes including: summarizing a field, distinguishing its components, and providing a structure of categories that together form a consistent whole (Moseley et al., 2005). Structure (in the form of a conceptual framework) provides grounding and consistency for formulating a study’s design and for analyzing resulting data (Yin, 2003).
**Value of Conceptual Framework**

The Taxonomy of the Teaching of Professional Ethics is intended to provide a conceptual lens which added perspective to my research. Creswell (2009) described a theoretical lens or perspective “which provides an overall orienting lens for the study of questions” (p.62). In the case of the current research, this lens shaped the type of questions posed to subjects, how data was collected and analyzed, and how synthesized data informed the conclusions. Specifically, the taxonomy helped to inform and organize both the questions posed in interviews with teachers, as well as areas of discussion in the focus group of administrators. Having a rudimentary grasp of the literature was an important component for devising relevant questions, for understanding answers of participants, and for posing follow up questions to the interviewees and focus group participants.

In the analysis of the data from the participants, the taxonomy evolved as the dissertation research progressed. The dissertation research was influenced by the taxonomy since it provided a framework for analyzing participant responses. The taxonomic research did not predict the emerging categories, but the in-depth knowledge obtained in developing the taxonomy facilitated making distinctions between concepts as they arose in the coding. This process of distinguishing was compatible with and enhanced the employment of the constant comparison coding method described (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) later in this Chapter.
Finally, the taxonomy is important in its implications. The relationship between the findings from the research and the taxonomy will receive further analysis in Chapter 6, the conclusions and recommendations which result from the study. This final chapter details the implications that the taxonomy has for practice and research in professional ethics.

**Development of the Conceptual Framework**

This taxonomy of ethics instruction, which forms the conceptual framework for the study, was developed using three methods:

1. Conduct comprehensive searches of the literature. These initial searches, primarily of the LIS and philosophy literature served as research for the literature review of the dissertation. These searches served to identify the four most important components of the teaching of ethics including learning objectives, teaching methods, learning resources, and evaluation. The four components provided structure for the taxonomy. Later searches expanded the focus on these components into other professional fields.

   Timing: The searches of the LIS and philosophy literature were primarily performed prior to the data collection for the dissertation (interviews and the focus group), although searching of other fields including business, engineering, law and medicine, was expanded after the data collection.

2. Examine syllabi for profession-specific ethics courses in the fields of business, engineering, law, library and information science (LIS), and
medicine. LIS syllabi were solicited from interviewees and other contacts which I developed in the representative fields.

Timing: This step was performed during and after the time of data collection.

3. Expand the taxonomy through findings from the interviews and the focus group. These findings were especially relevant for expanding the teaching methods and evaluation sections of the taxonomy.

Timing: This third step occurred after the analysis of data from interviews and the focus group.

The literature formed the basis of the taxonomy and it was further enhanced through both the examination of syllabi and through insights gained in the dissertation research findings. First-hand accounts shared in interviews provided environmental flavor that could add to the “thick” description so important for valid qualitative research (Geertz, 1973).

The use of these three methods was often iterative (e.g., after examining engineering syllabi, I further searched the literature in the field of engineering). Charmaz (2006) terms this theoretical sampling. I went back to the source and collected more data about the properties of the phenomenon (e.g., teaching ethics in engineering) and then I theorized about the significance of this new data, and eventually made a decision about incorporating the new data into my findings.
The four components of the taxonomy of teaching professional ethics, which include learning objectives, teaching techniques and assignments, learning resources, and evaluation, reflect the methodological tension in this study between contextual and specific information. For the area of learning objectives, the taxonomy includes generalized, contextual discussions of each learning objective, e.g., forming professional identity. This broad discussion is in contrast to the specific details of a teaching technique, such as using case studies to illustrate situations with salient ethical content.

The taxonomy provides a view of how ethics is taught in five distinct professional areas: business, engineering, law, LIS, and medicine. Applying this framework provides a clearer picture of the components of integrated ethics instruction and helps to answer the second research question, “How do teachers integrate ethics into their courses?” Another fundamental reason for using the taxonomy is that its structure helps to pinpoint interrelationships and show how elements fit into a consistent whole. Specifically, the relationship between learning objectives and teaching techniques and their connection to the evaluation of curricular objectives gives insight into the challenges of integrating ethics. In this view of interconnected components, the taxonomy provides useful background for answering the first research question, “Based on the descriptions of teachers and administrators, in what ways are schools integrating ethics institution-wide?”
**Methodology**

A methodology is defined as “a way of thinking about and studying social reality” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.3). My research was based on a qualitative methodology. Using the word, qualitative, means that the research is based on examining qualities of phenomena and exploring their meanings in a non-experimental method of inquiry. Creswell (2009) argued that a qualitative approach is especially useful if the phenomena need to be understood better because there is little previous research. In this study, which is characterized by a dearth of previous research on the integration of ethics in LIS, qualitative research is a good vehicle for attaining an inside understanding of the phenomenon of interest.

Qualitative research involves research of the self because of the very real danger of bias. “Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality [and] emphasize the value-laden nature of inquiry” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p.8). In fact, differing qualitatively-oriented philosophical interpretations, including interpretivism, phenomenological analysis, and hermeneutics, all question the role of the researcher or interpreter in the process of understanding (Schwandt, 2003).

As a qualitative researcher, I must recognize my own role in designing, collecting, and especially in interpreting research. I must realize that in a qualitative study, the researcher can introduce elements of tension and I must realize my own culpability in this dimension. I have a long history in medical
library practice and had, in the past, favored research involving the collection of quantitative, discrete data. I realize that, like most practitioners, I favored a pragmatic, data oriented, approach (Hannigan, 1997). My initial inclination was to develop narrow, limited inquiries with the goal of attaining specific answers to the question of how ethics is taught. This approach, if implemented, could have diminished the strength of my qualitative methodology. I had to consciously insert contextual, as well as detailed, questions into the interviews and the focus group session. I proceeded cautiously to insure that I gave strong emphasis to contextual questions and was able to hear, record, and analyze the stories of the participants. Each participant was encouraged to provide thick descriptions throughout the interview and focus group process.

Beyond making sure that the interview and focus group guides included contextual questions, another qualitative corrective measure was to research myself in relation to the study participants. Milner (2005) recommended that researchers ask themselves, “How do I negotiate and balance my own interests and research agendas with those of my research participants, which may be inconsistent or diverge from mine?” (p.325). For me, research interest in LIS resulted from my passion for and familiarity with the field. As a librarian with solid connections within the medical library field, both through my professional association work and as a member of an LIS program’s Board of Visitors, I was well positioned to gain access to the wisdom of important LIS teachers. Moreover, I was comfortable in conducting interviews and the focus group since I
can speak the library language and am generally familiar with the courses and their components. This familiarity is a strength, but it also has a cost. Because of my comfort level with the area, I may have made some inappropriate assumptions about the courses or a teacher’s position on a subject.

Another factor that increased my risk of inaccuracy was the significant number of years since I received my Masters of Science in Library Science. I tried to ameliorate these risks by taking several measures. To update myself on the current situation in MLS programs today, I studied the websites, and particularly the curricular sections of LIS program websites. I also read articles on trends in LIS education (e.g., Chu, 2006). Especially in courses for which the technology was beyond my previous experience (e.g., online teaching techniques), I read articles on the use of technology in the classroom before I conducted the interviews (e.g., Bedford, 2007).

Beyond steeping myself in research about current LIS teaching, I took several measures to insure that the data collected represented the interviewee’s point of view, including: close listening to interviewees and focus group participants; adherence to the interview guide and moderator’s discussion guide; when appropriate; careful and timely transcription; member checking of the interviews and of the focus group, ensuring safety and accessibility of data by storage of transcription and recording into discrete files, and other techniques to insure trustworthiness in research (described later in this Chapter).
In this study, which used the methodology of qualitative research, I intentionally created instruments to investigate both the contextual data and the specific details for the integration of ethics. My interview and focus group questions reflected the necessary tension between the need for specific details of integration strategies and the qualitative imperative to uncover an inside understanding and explore the “actors’ definitions of the situation” (Schwandt, 2003, p.297). I selected participants based on several criteria, one being their interest in ethics. My strong interest and research agenda in ethics matched theirs and, with the precautionary measures I have put in place, my research effectively represented their interests and has fulfilled the qualitative mandate by allowing them to tell their stories in their own words.

**Methods and Their Sequence**

This research was based on a qualitative methodology and this methodology used sequential data gathering, including document review, interviews, and a focus group. These methods are depicted in Figure 1 below. The document review provided base-line information for subsequent research. The interviews, when supported by document review, provided a broad research strategy that is preferred when “how” questions are investigated within a contemporary context (Yin, 2003). The focus group provided a forum for stimulating discussion to investigate the context of a phenomenon. During the
course of the focus group, participants stimulated each other to share new insights (Kruger & Casey, 2000).

This methodology, of combining the specific methods in an intentional, sequential pattern, is especially appropriate for describing complex organizational phenomena, such as integrating ethical components into an existing course or curriculum (Yin, 2003). The sequence, that is, the timing of execution for each of the three methods, provides an important component of the study. Discussion of the sequencing will be interwoven with the details of each discrete method.

**Document Review**

I selected the systematic study of documents as the first method deployed in this study because the documents provided baseline information for the subsequent design of the second and third methods, interviews and the focus group (Denzin, 2007). In the section below I divide the documents into two categories, based on their usage: those documents that provide background information and those that are crucial to the research process. Further, I discuss the organization and analysis of both kinds of documents.

*Documents Providing Background Information*

Examples of documents that furnished background information included literature (articles, books, and websites) which served as the knowledge base for the taxonomy of the teaching of professional ethics and as data to prepare for writing the literature review portion of the dissertation. These sources were
obtained from searching databases available on the internet and those available through proprietary sources (e.g., WilsonWeb, Philosopher’s Index).

Boote and Beile (2005) suggested that the quality of the document review is determined by its coverage of resources and by its ability to synthesize the information. In my approach to developing the Taxonomy, which served as my conceptual framework, through initial searching of the literature I was able to determine that the four components of the taxonomy -- learning objectives, teaching techniques, types of teaching materials and evaluation strategies -- were the most crucial elements for describing the teaching of ethics. I was able to broaden the description of these components by expanding my coverage of databases to search literature in the respective fields included in the taxonomy: business, engineering, law, LIS and medicine. Similarly, the knowledge base that was created for the dissertation provided a broad coverage of the modest volume of literature in the teaching of LIS ethics. These articles generally centered on stand-alone ethics courses. Since there were very few articles on integrated ethics instruction in LIS, I expanded the coverage of the search to include sample articles describing the integration of ethics in four other fields: business, engineering, law, and medicine. Each of these four fields were selected for particular attention because they represented major professions for which I could access syllabi and literature relevant to the teaching of ethics. This group of professions could provide a diversity of approaches to integrating ethics: for business and engineering, the ethics courses were often directed at undergraduate
and had only occasional references in the literature to graduate students; for law and medicine, the courses were almost always post-graduate and the length of the graduate training exceeded that of the LIS masters degree. Document review was equally crucial to support the taxonomy and the dissertation itself. I created a synthesis of documents for both the dissertation’s literature review and for the taxonomy by combining the most relevant references into a summary which placed the topic and the research in historical context, explained its vocabulary, described what needed to be done, and provided a new perspective on the problem (Boote & Beile, 2005).

*Documents Essential for Research*

The second kind of documents includes those that play a crucial role in enabling the research. An example of these important documents are those essential for selecting interview candidates. Prior to selecting teachers for individual interviews, I examined various data sources to determine the suitability of the potential interviewee. The documents included copies of syllabi available online as well as websites, including those of library organizations such as ALA, ALISE, and American Society for Information Science and Technology (ASIS&T). To develop a pool of faculty members, I investigated institutional websites and teachers’ individual web pages. Web resources and the *ALISE Directory* (2006) were searched to identify teachers of ethics and teachers of LIS core courses who had been recognized nationally for teaching excellence. (The
selection and recruitment process for interviewees from various LIS courses across the U.S. and Canada is detailed in the Interviews section).

Further, documents were important for informing areas of discussion for individual interviews and the focus group. Papers which described the American Library Association Committee on Accreditation’s (CoA’s) examination of the integration of ethics were key for determining ALA’s latest investigative activities prior to accreditation. Descriptions, syllabi, and learning objectives for core courses into which ethics was integrated provided crucial details about specific courses that I could examine prior to each interview.

Organizing and Analyzing Documents

The systematic collection of documents was important since information from documents was used throughout the research process to verify and augment evidence from the findings. The key literature or published references that I used were annotated and saved in bibliographic software and were organized by the Chapters of the dissertation. For the unpublished documents, I recorded the most useful data from documents relevant to the study methods in memos (Charmaz, 2006). For example, I created memos to specify the rankings of teacher excellence and to record the algorithm (which includes each teacher’s interest in ethics as well as the reputation of the teacher’s school) that I created to select teachers based on a combination of these rankings. These methodologically oriented memos were coded using the constant comparative coding process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), so that the contents could be considered as I analyzed
the data from the findings. Some articles that were cited in the literature contained data that I recorded in memos. For example, articles which designated the best LIS schools appeared not only in my database, but the data from those articles appears in a memo. Systematically collecting and analyzing documents, both those providing background as well as those essential for research, was the first method employed in the investigation of integrating ethics across the curriculum.

**Interviews**

Personal interviews with LIS faculty served as the second of three sequenced methods to investigate the integration of ethics into LIS curricula. In this section I describe the processes of designing, executing, and analyzing qualitative interviews with fifteen teachers who integrate ethics into core courses in LIS. The planning included determining the number and type of participants and detailing the steps in selecting and recruiting participants. I follow by describing administration of the interviews, including characteristics of the interview design and safeguards put in place to maintain the qualitative character of the interviews. I end the section by describing the analysis of the resulting data using the constant comparative coding system.

**Interview Planning -- Number and Type of Participants**

I determined the desired number of participants by examining the literature for guidelines and recognized the stopping point when the categories of analysis were fully described. Kvale (1996), in describing the parameters of
research using qualitative interviews, recommended administering fifteen interviews (plus or minus ten). He specified continuing interviews until they reached the point of theoretical saturation, yielding little new information. In this study, I interviewed all of the interviewees available who were included in Tier 1 (the characteristics of the Tier system is explained in the next section on selection of interviewees). After these interviews, I knew that I needed to recruit interviewees for specific under-represented core courses (especially reference and cataloging). I began recruiting from Tier 2 and I also identified, through referrals, interviewees from Tier 3. While the last three interviewees shared a few new teaching techniques, the institutional information was mainly a repeat of other approaches previously described. While not totally depleted, I judged that a point of saturation had been achieved.

Next, I determined the overall qualifications of the participants I would recruit for the study. To establish a bounded study, I identified study participants based on an exemplary study strategy (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Exemplar individuals are those considered to be well-informed and are selected for interviews based on their expertise in the area of the research. The rationale for this approach was that LIS educators recognized for excellence in teaching or administrators who are leaders in their field have in-depth knowledge of best practices. Marshall and Rossman (1989) described the advantages and disadvantages of focusing on a specific type of interviewee who is an expert in the subject area of the study. I could obtain valuable information from these expert
interviewees because of their experience in the areas relevant to the research. Several of the interviewees had written articles, books or course materials relevant to the teaching of ethical content. They generally had a well-informed perspective on the research problem. The disadvantage of using experts as interviewees is that researchers may be challenged in trying to make contact with these often busy professionals. Also, Marshall and Rossman cited the potential problem that researchers may have in controlling the interview with expert participants. While the most knowledgeable interviewees were those that required one hour to interview, these interviews were also those which yielded the most useful information.

**Interview Planning -- Selecting and Recruiting Participants**

Arranging interviews with master teachers on their experience in integrating ethics required designing two separate processes -- that of selection and that of recruitment.

The selection process was based on several criteria which resulted in three tiers of interviewees. Potential participants within each tier were then ranked by the external reputation of the school (as determined by national rankings and research activity). The three tiers and their criteria included:

*Tier I:* Teachers who had won a national teaching award. This group included recipients of the ALISE and the ASIS&T annual awards, as well as the 61 teachers listed in Curran’s (1998) article on teaching excellence. This total list of approximately fifty teachers was narrowed to nine teachers by analyzing the
courses that they taught and by selecting those that 1) taught a core course and 2) either taught a course related to ethics or performed research in ethics. I successfully recruited seven interviewees from this group.

*Tier II:* Award-winning teachers who taught a core course and were not included in Tier I. These teachers’ writings and teaching did not indicate interest in the area of ethics. This group included around forty teachers. I successfully recruited five interviewees from this group.

*Tier III:* New interview subjects identified through the interviewees themselves or from other sources of referral. This was a useful way to identify interviewees who taught in important subject areas and who did not emerge from Tiers I or II. I successfully recruited three interviewees from this group.

I recruited interviewees based on their position in the tiers and their ranking within a particular tier. I contacted potential interviewees using e-mail, with phone follow-up, if required. Once the interviewee had accepted the invitation to participate in the interview, I suggested the courses most appropriate and I requested that the interviewee provide me with the latest course syllabi prior to the interview.

*Administering the Interviews*

In addition to selecting and recruiting the interviewees, I had to select the type of interview that I would conduct. The following section details my decision to choose semi-structured interviews and the features of this method. I further describe the mechanics of the interview. To close this section, I describe methods
I incorporated to insure that a qualitative frame of reference was maintained throughout the interviews.

I chose to administer the interviews for this study using open-ended questions in a semi-structured format (Krathwohl, 1998). I was generally able to pose questions in an established sequence, but in specific interviews I varied from the established format and asked follow-up questions as new areas of research emerged. Although I developed an interview guide to assure as much consistency as possible across interviews (see Appendix 2 for the interview guide), I was aware of the qualitative imperative and was prepared to follow the interviewee’s story.

Including a pilot interview, described later, I conducted fifteen individual interviews. Each interview lasted thirty to sixty minutes. The interview questions were organized into two areas -- the more general questions on ethics teaching practices school-wide (research question 1) and the very specific questions on the integration of ethics into one or more courses (research question 2). For the specific course questions, I limited the discussion with each teacher to issues relevant to a maximum of three identified core courses that the faculty member taught (e.g., Reference Services, Management of Libraries). I used the course syllabi and information obtained from the teacher’s online resume and school website to tailor questions specific to the interviewee’s teaching practices. Interview questions also concerned the school-wide approach to ethics. The goal of each interview was to address the two research questions: first to focus on the
description of institution-wide ethics efforts by investigating teachers’ perceptions of the context of their ethics instruction and, for the second research questions to determine teachers’ actual practices for integrating ethics into their courses by asking how ethics is integrated into specific courses. These questions, comprising contextual and detailed inquiries, reflect the duality and tension within this research: my responsibility as a researcher was to encourage and accurately represent the story that the interviewees wanted to tell; this duty was complicated by my need to obtain specific details.

To assure that I maintained the qualitative frame of reference throughout the research, I examined my own position in the process. My role, as the interviewer, was to listen and record what was important to the subject. I was not asking participants to remember an event or activity, but to reconstruct their experiences (Seidman, 1991). “Interviews are particularly suited for studying people’s understanding of the meanings in their lived world, describing their experiences…and elaborating their own perspective…” (Kvale, 1996, p. 105). I combined intense listening skills with established qualitative methods and developed an interview guide to assure as much consistency as possible across interviews (see Appendix 2 for the interview guide). Seidman (1991) warned that using an interview guide too stringently results in manipulating the participant. He suggested that the most effective questions in an interview were those which “follow from what the participant has just said” (p. 69-70). I used this technique repeatedly throughout the interviews, rearranging question order and inserting
new questions when warranted. This strategy could result in inconsistency between interviews. For example, when a new concept emerged in an interview, my changed insight about this concept may have colored subsequent interviews (Krathwohl, 1998). Kvale (1996) explained that successive interviews provided “conceptual…understanding of the phenomena to be investigated…[and] establish[ed] a base to which new knowledge [could] be added and integrated” (p.105). I minimized this risk of inconsistency by obtaining permission from interviewees to ask post-interview questions about major concepts for clarification. One example of this post-interview clarification was obtaining further information on the field experiences that teachers incorporated into their teaching techniques.

Each of the fifteen interviews lasting thirty to sixty minutes, was summarized, recorded and transcribed. To insure that data collected and resulting analysis well represented the interviewee’s point of view, I employed the following strategies, some of which have already been mentioned: close listening to the interviewee, adherence to the interview guide when appropriate, careful and timely transcription, member checking of interview, storage of the interview and transcription into discrete files, and other techniques to insure trustworthiness in the research (described later in this Chapter).

**Analysis of the Interview Data**

I coded the data using the constant comparative method. I enhanced the traditional approach of the constant comparative method by Glaser and Strauss
(1967) by following Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) interpretation of this process for categorizing. This method of data analysis employs repetitive comparison of coded information and combines coding by inductive categories with a simultaneous examination of all previously coded units. I began the process with a unitizing operation, which involved developing a list of units from the interview transcripts. Lincoln and Guba define a unit as information which can stand by itself and is interpretable without other information. For my research, examples of the initial units included concepts such as core courses, leadership, and student outcomes.

At the same time as I was performing the unitizing operation, I began categorizing by bringing units together that relate to the same content, e.g. evaluation and student outcomes. (or as Glaser and Strauss (1967) called it “look-alikeness or “feel-alikeness”). Once the documents were exhausted, I then examined the categories and their units, including units which did not fit into any category, for overlap. I examined and consolidated categories, performed purposive sampling to clear up anomalies or conflicts and further developed category properties. The resulting organization of data (when later combined with the focus group results) served as an outline for writing the Findings section of the dissertation. I used Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) description of Glaser and Strauss’ (1967)-method to devise, integrate, and delimit the categories for analysis of the interview transcripts. In summary the steps included: 1) Prepare data by transcribing and member checking extensive summary of the data 2) Review data
thoroughly prior to analysis 3) Unitize by developing units of information as broad codes 4) Compare units simultaneously while identifying units, bring alike units together. Continue until documents are exhausted. 5) Reduce units further and analyze those that don’t fit; may require purposive sampling to resolve conflicts 6) Cluster like units together to create themes and continually check themes against text for support and inconsistencies 7) Compose descriptive chapter around themes, include portraits of individual experiences and extensive quotes.

**Focus Group**

The final research method for this qualitative investigation of ethics across curricula was the focus group. Analyzing fourteen interviews (the fifteenth interview was conducted after the focus group meeting) provided me with important data which informed this last method of investigation, the focus group. I used multiple methods of inquiry to add “rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to… [my] inquiry … The use of multiple methods…reflects an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.4). To obtain the understanding afforded by multiple methods, I conducted a focus group which could provide data to compare and contrast with the findings from document review and the interviews. Choosing a focus group as a final method of data collection was a logical choice: Data from the interviews with teachers provided context for the discussion that took place later with administrators in the focus group (Johnson, 2008; Kurupp, 2006). In the section below I detail the definition and qualities of the focus group. Further, I portray
the focus group of LIS administrators and the necessary planning, including the implementation of the focus group and the selection and recruitment of participants. Finally, I describe the analysis of the focus group data.

**Definition and Qualities of Focus Group**

Focus groups differ significantly from group interviews. In the latter research method, researchers generally stress that all participants should answer the same questions (Thompson & Demerath, 1952). One result of successful focus groups is interactive discussion; questions are transformed as they are answered by different people. The moderator encourages participants to respond, not only based on what questions meant to them, but also considering the answers of other participants (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). The information shared in a focus group may change based on interactions of group members (Vaughn, 1996). Often the participants stimulate each other to discuss the topics in ways that do not happen in individual or group interviews. The participants provide a synergy which can expand the research inquiry.

As Charles Curran (1998) described them, “focus groups are directed conversations; not experiments, not even surveys. They produce opinion” (p.177). I designed this focus group to assess the viewpoint of LIS administrators on the role of ethics education, and particularly ethics across the curriculum, in LIS programs. Their administrative perspective provided both confirming and disconfirming evidence to compare to the perspective of teachers. This
administrator perspective provided me with valuable insight for formulating descriptions of the integration of ethics.

Planning and Implementation of the Focus Group

My protocol for administering the focus group was to ask broad, general questions first to establish rapport with the focus group members and to insure that I heard the information which the participant believed is most important. This approach, recommended by Stewart and Shamdashani (1990), was not recommended by Marilyn Litchtman. She developed the concept of the “guided focus group” which begins with specific, concrete questions and then moves to follow up questions (2006, p. 120). I decided to use the former approach because I wanted to know what interviewees thought was the most important aspect of a general question. For example, I began the core part of the focus group with a question that had provided interesting data in the interviews, “What problems/challenges have you experienced in integrating ethics?” Then I could follow up with on-going questions such as “How have you handled these problems?” Or when the response slowed down, I could suggest the categories of problems, such as those challenges of students or faculty, which had arisen in other interviews. I completed the interview with a more focused version of the initial question, “What do you think is the single biggest challenge in integrating ethics?”

As moderator, my primary role was listening. If the meaning was unclear I could re-phrase a question, but I expected the group participants to provide the
illustrative examples. My behavior as moderator was guided by the words of Stewart and Shamdashani (1990), “Focus groups are designed to determine how respondents structure the world, not how participants respond to the researcher’s view of how the world – or how a particular phenomenon – is structured” (p.65).

To accomplish this goal of determining the respondents’ perspectives on ethics integration I carefully planned the type of data gathered in the focus group to complement the data already gathered from the individual interviews with teachers. I designed the areas for discussion, which related to the open-ended questions asked of teacher interviewees concerning the institutional environment for ethics. Because of these open-ended questions I was faced with two contradictory tasks, making sure the most important questions were raised and the time used wisely, while encouraging the expansion of interactive dialog. The sequencing of focus group questions, similar to those in interviews, moved from introductory, open-ended questions to probing and more direct questions. In fact, the Moderator’s Guide (see Appendix 3) included the “points to check off” from the interviews, so that, if they did not emerge in the initial focus group discussion, I could specifically bring up important points for the focus group to consider.

For example, after a mention of ethical skills from the administrators, I followed up with the request for their opinions of teaching ethics as a skill set. Their rich discussion of this question is included in the final section of the Findings chapter.
Focus Group Selection and Recruitment

As well as structuring the data gathered in the focus group, I carefully selected its members. Those selected formed a convenience sample, which is a standard technique in focus group research (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). I selected the participants from those LIS administrators who were attending the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE). This meeting was a logical venue for the focus group since members of ALISE include administrators in the LIS field. Broad-based LIS school membership in ALISE, with sixty institutional members, insured that administrators from well respected LIS programs would attend the Annual Meeting (ALISE, 2007).

The focus group session included seven LIS administrators. I selected participants based on a strategy similar to that for selection of interviewees. The rationale for inclusion was that of selecting an exemplar group of administrators who were knowledgeable about the integration of ethics. Criteria for selection included: pre-registering for the ALISE conference, holding administrative positions at well recognized LIS organizations, and having teaching or publishing connections with ethics-related topics. Because of the paucity of research on the topic of integrating ethics into LIS curricula, views of administrators on the worth and feasibility of the integration of ethics provided an important perspective.
Analysis of Data from Focus Group

The focus group session was recorded and transcribed. Since it was important to capture all of the interactions, I hired a recorder as backup to the recording and to provide another perspective on the focus group session (Curran, et al, 1998; Kruger & Casey, 2000). Fortunately, the digital recording of the session was successful and I checked the digital recording against the human recording for discrepancies and found none. The notes of the human recorder were useful to determine if a point was addressed by several participants or by one or two focus group members repeatedly. I coded the transcription using the constant comparison method in a method similar to that of the interviews (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). As I expected, many categories were consistent with those from the interviews, but some new themes developed from the focus group. I selected themes based on frequency, specificity, emotion and extensiveness (in terms of length of time spent addressing a topic) (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). Findings of the focus group included quotes that capture the most important elements of the group interaction (Kruger & Casey, 2000). Culminating data collection with a focus group was a logical decision because data from the interviews with teachers provided grounding for the discussion that took place with administrators in the focus group (Johnson, 2008; Kuruppu, 2006).

Integration of Multiple Methods

I used three sequential research methods which comprise the qualitative methodology for this study of the integration of ethics across the LIS curriculum.
To provide a comparative picture of the phenomenon of integrating ethics, the information from interviews and the focus group were examined for similarities and differences. As detailed below and briefly diagramed in Figure 1, this system of qualitative sequential data gathering provided an appropriate research design for investigating the two research questions: “How did teachers and administrators describe program-wide ethics efforts?” and “How did LIS teachers integrate ethics into their courses?”

My overall design of the qualitative methodology used sequential data gathering including document review, interviews and a focus group. The document review provided me with data which informed the development of the conceptual framework (the taxonomy of the teaching of professional ethics). Further, document review was crucial to the design of interviews and focus group, and to the selection of subjects for both methods. I have noted the contributions of document review in my overview of qualitative methodology depicted in Figure 1.

Next, I initiated the interview process: This full process involved designing, conducting, transcribing, coding, analyzing and finally, composing the Chapter of findings from the interviews. The interview process began by using information obtained through document review. I selected teachers best suited to describe integrated ethics. Simultaneous with the selection process, I drafted the interview questions, data collection protocol and interview guide into preliminary form, which I revised based on the pilot interview. Following the pilot, I
conducted and recorded an additional fourteen interviews. Immediately following each interview, I produced a detailed summary. I sent the summary to each interviewee and I incorporated any resulting comments or changes into the documents. Also, within two days of each interview, I contacted the peer debriefer to obtain his critique of the process of the interview. Once the pilot and fourteen other interviews were completed, I began to code each interview. While each interview was individually coded, the overall analysis would proceed simultaneously with the coding, based on the constant comparative method. This method featured an accumulative process of combining all interviews in the coding/analysis operation. The result was an overall view of the interview results that I could use (once the focus group results were available) to organize the writing of the Findings chapter. Once the writing was in final form, any findings which seemed controversial were again member checked.

My next step in the sequence of qualitative methods was to initiate a process comparable to that of the interviews for the focus group. I created the interviews and the focus group as conceptually parallel processes. As in the interviews, document review played an important role in identifying administrators for participation in the focus groups and in designing the focus group process. I recruited focus group participants who met specific criteria which indicated that they were well suited to participate in the focus group on the topic of ethics integration. As the participants were recruited, I adapted the data collection protocol within the moderator’s guide. I also used the preliminary
coding developed from the fourteen interviews (the fifteenth interview was conducted after the focus group meeting) to pinpoint the general questions that I would ask the participants and to develop areas for follow up questions. The areas of discussion in the moderator’s guide were revised substantially based on advice from Ph.D. students and a professional qualitative researcher.

Immediately following the focus group meeting, I produced a detailed summary of the session and then produced a full transcript. I sent the summary to all members of the focus group and I incorporated any resulting comments or changes into the document. Also, within five days of the focus group meeting, I contacted the peer debriefer to obtain his critique of the process of the focus group. Then, I began coding the focus group. The initial coding will follow the constant comparative method, but the coding will be informed by the categories already developed in the coding of the interviews (since several questions are identical or very similar between the two methods of interviews and coding). Because of this previously collected data and the establishment of categories, actual analysis of the focus group data proceeded apace. I did exercise special precautions to keep track of any coding that was unique to the focus group and make sure that these viewpoints were included in the Findings chapter. In the final stage of data analysis I compared and contrasted the findings of the two research methods. Throughout the findings chapter, I specifically mentioned if the findings were endorsed by both teachers and administrators, by teachers only,
by administrators only, or if I perceived conflict between the statements of the teachers and the administrators.

Assuring the trustworthiness of a qualitative study is an important consideration which will be discussed in the next section. Only two methods of establishing credibility, the peer debriefing and the member checking, fit into the sequence of Figure 1. I used other elements throughout the research process to verify the trustworthiness of the research including: triangulation of sources and methods; my production of a reflective commentary; an audit trail for the study; providing details of insertion strategies to allow comparisons; admission of my beliefs and underlying assumptions, and recognition of limitations of the study’s methods.
- Process informed by document review

**Figure 1:** Overview of Qualitative Methodology
**Trustworthiness**

In keeping with the qualitative traditions of data gathering, I implemented methods to optimize trustworthiness, which is an evaluative concept developed for qualitative studies as an analog to quality measures in quantitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) introduced trustworthiness in *Naturalistic Inquiry*; it has subsequently been adopted by many researchers including Bradley (1993), Morrow (2005) and Shenton (2004). Elements or criteria of trustworthiness include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

**Credibility and Triangulation**

Credibility combines the notion of internal consistency with evidence of the quality of research communicated to others (Shenton, 2004). The concept of triangulation provides one component of credibility. Triangulation is “a process of repetitious data gathering and critical review of what is being said…to determine that the right information and interpretation have been obtained” (Stake, 2005, p.34-35). Another definition of triangulation is “using various data sources to clarify meaning by reporting multiple, refracted realities simultaneously…to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 5-6). In this study the phenomenon in question was the integration of ethics across the curriculum. I compared the perspectives of two sources of information (teachers and administrators) and I provided two different methods of analysis (interviews and a focus group, both of which were supported by document review). In non-academic parlance
triangulation is often invoked as evidence of credibility. Observers believe that information is true only after it has been verified by several people. The necessity for triangulation is echoed by the research community. For example, Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that triangulation is so crucial to credibility that “no single item of information should ever be given serious consideration unless it can be triangulated” (p. 283). Credibility is one measure of trustworthiness in a qualitative study and was an important component in this study.

Beyond the concept of triangulation, I employed four other forms of credibility support: peer debriefing, the researcher’s reflective commentary (Shenton, 2004), member checking, and negative case analysis. Other techniques for providing evidence of creditability were not compatible with the exemplar method of research: These techniques included prolonged engagement and persistent observation. The descriptions provided in the next paragraphs were derived from Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Shenton (2004).

Peer Debriefing

I recruited a colleague to serve as peer debriefer and to provide an external check on the quality of specific phases of the research activities. The peer debriefer was, Jason Blokhuis, a law school graduate and fellow Ph.D. candidate interested in the ethics of all fields of professional study.

I met on-line with the peer debriefer for an hour after each interview to test working hypotheses and to explore the next steps in the emerging design of
the inquiry. Questions addressed with the peer debriefer after each interview included:

- Which questions seemed most important?
- Did my assessment of the adequacy of the questions change as a result of the interview?
- Did I notice any instances of negative case analysis, where the views or reported activities of the interviewee differed greatly from the viewpoint of those previously interviewed?

The peer debriefer understood the subject area and the methodological issues of the research and he maintained notes of the interactions. These notes served as a data source for documenting hypotheses and modifications in research methods.

**Reflective Commentary**

The researcher’s reflective commentary (Shenton, 2004) was similar to the peer debriefing, but in this technique the note-taking was maintained by the researcher and the reflections focused on the effectiveness of the techniques that had been used in the study. I used the notes resulting from this dialog with self to inform the reporting of results in the formal write-up of the research. I regularly shared reflections in the commentary with my dissertation co-chairs and I reviewed the commentary to assist in writing the dissertation.

**Member Checking**

The fourth technique for credibility was that of member checking. I “member checked” the text of the interviews and the focus group to attain confirmation of the accuracy of the data. This step involved sharing the actual quotes of what the participant said with interviewees or focus group members to
identify any conceptual misunderstandings within the raw data. For this study on the integration of ethics in LIS, the member check consisted of three stages.

1) Within two days of the interview or the focus group, the researcher sent out a detailed summary, including quotes, of the transcript of the interview or focus group for review by the interviewee or focus group participants. 2) Once the findings were written, conclusions were sent to a select group of the interviewees for their review and comment for areas for which they were a major speaker that seemed either a unique observation (a negative case) or seemed to represent one side of a controversial issue (e.g., teachers’ evaluation of other teachers’ inability to integrate ethical issues). 3) The final stage for member checking will actually happen sixty days after the dissertation defense. At this time I will be presenting my dissertation findings at a conference at which I expect some of the interviewees and focus group participants will be present. The session will be an interactive one where I hope to expand the research findings for subsequently published articles.

**Negative Case Analysis**

The fifth component to increase credibility of the study was to engage in negative case analysis. I explicitly examined the original data for negative cases to see if there was any evidence which might have refuted or disconfirmed the major findings of the study. There are four instances of negative cases included in the discussion of the Findings chapter. These negative cases involve both institution-wide and teacher-specific activities and they include: two institutions’
ignoring ethical issues in faculty meetings; one teacher stating that his institution experiences no challenges with integrating ethics; and teachers stating that they do not find the use of Codes of Ethics or role playing as helpful teaching strategies.

**Transferability**

Another component of trustworthiness is the transferability of the research, i.e., the applicability of the findings from this particular study to research in another setting. Transferability is not generally regarded as a preeminent component of trustworthiness. Since research in the qualitative research tradition is defined by its individual setting or context, transferring or generalizing the results of a study could be an arduous, and often unsuccessful, task (Erlandson, 1993). Authors recommend limiting responsibility of the researcher to providing a thick description of context and boundaries of the study; other researchers can then decide if the research is transferrable to their setting (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marchionni & Teague, 1987). In this study of the integration of ethics, the researcher provided substantial quotes which gave a rich account of the interviewees’ and focus group participants’ experiences. Further, the researcher furnished contextual information within the bounds of confidentiality. Although environmental information was limited by the method of telephone interviews, contextual information was included whenever it was available and pertinent.
**Dependability and Confirmability**

The third and fourth criteria for trustworthiness are dependability and confirmability. Dependability has to do with the internal consistency of the study in its use of analytic techniques. Confirmability describes the adequacy of the findings, determining that they are supported by data and internally consistent, so that the final conclusions are acceptable. One technique satisfies both dependability and confirmability -- the inquiry audit. The audit trail is basically a collection of documents which not only provide evidence of confirmability and dependability, the audit trail helps to constantly systematize the plethora of documents generated by the study.

The audit trail is more easily navigated by using a file organization system. For this study the files were organized according to Halpern’s (1983) recommended procedure and were available to the three researchers with extensive qualitative skills who served as members of the dissertation committee. Halpern suggested six classes of records. The modification of the system for this study included the following classes of records: (1) raw data- electronically recorded interviews and focus group meetings and scanned documents; (2) data reduction and analysis products – transcripts and summaries of the interviews and the focus group; (3) data reconstruction and synthesis products – the data coding scheme and the resulting categories, as well as records of constant comparison; (4) process notes – including memos, strategies for sampling, and trustworthiness notes, including peer debriefer notes and audit trail notes; (5) materials relating to
my intentions and dispositions, personal notes, a reflective journal, motivational communications, expectations and predictions; and (6) instrument development information – interview questions and focus group topics, the protocol for interviews and focus groups, and notes from observation of interviews and focus groups.

The audit trail allows those observing the research process to trace its course by the choices made and descriptions of procedures implemented. As well as the use of the audit trail, confirmability was also reinforced by several factors: acknowledgement of the researcher’s assumptions and beliefs, the reflective commentary, triangulation technique (these two methods were already described above), and discussion of the specific limitations of the study, described at the end of this Chapter.

In summary, the four criteria of trustworthiness, credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, were included in the design for the qualitative study of the integration of ethics into LIS courses. The specific techniques used to address each criterion are listed in Table 2 below
Table 2  Techniques to Establish Trustworthiness in Study of Ethics Integration in LIS

(adapted from Lincoln and Guba, 1985 and Shenton, 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Criterion</th>
<th>Technique used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Triangulation (of sources and methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member checks (in process and at end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative case analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>Providing background institutional data to establish context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing details of insertion strategies to allow comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Audit trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>Audit trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledgement of researcher’s beliefs and underlying assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of limitations of study’s methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to using the trustworthiness criteria listed in the table, the researcher examined research in the field which provided models for conducting qualitative research.

**Exemplary Studies and Focus Groups in Library and Information Science**

The LIS literature provides two studies that are particularly useful models for this research. Analysis of their methods demonstrated that they would be useful for studying the integration of ethics.

Curran (1998) published the results of a study of teaching practices of sixty-one superior LIS teachers. Curran solicited the nominations of LIS Deans and then issued an open-ended request for a list of five strategies that the teachers
used that served as useful teaching behaviors. In this article he categorized and reported exemplary teachers’ responses. To further extend the dialogue, he initiated a listserv discussion of teaching excellence with six librarians whom he selected based on his personal preference. Curran admitted that this process resulted in the selection of superior LIS teachers who had been identified in a rather subjective manner.

Curran’s selection and use of exemplary teachers provided both data and insight on methods for selecting interviewees which assisted me in investigating the integration of ethics with teachers recognized for excellence. The sixty-one teachers in Curran’s study were added to those that had won teaching awards and helped greatly to expand the number of potential interviewees for this study of the integration of ethics.

Curran, in concert with Baijaly, Freehan, and O’Neill (1998), published an article detailing focus group methods. They depicted focus groups as “a structured way for people who share similar interests to talk about them” (p. 177). They used focus groups to converse with directors of information agencies about what they expect from new graduates of LIS programs. In the course of the article, et al. gave detailed descriptions of how focus groups are managed and he specifically detailed the role of the moderator and the recorder. The article provided me with a report of the successful implementation of focus groups in an LIS setting.
Pilot of Method

As final preparation for data collection the researcher conducted a pilot interview. The pilot was administered to a retired LIS faculty member who had taught a course in intellectual freedom. The pilot interview enhanced the subsequent data collection by testing the content of the questions and the effectiveness of the procedures to be followed. In qualitative research a pilot study serves a different purpose from the pretest which often precedes quantitative research, e.g., the administration of a survey. A pretest usually represents a test-run of the final strategies for data collection and question content and can result in minor changes in the protocol. The study pilot, when introduced at a formative stage of research and evaluated by a knowledgeable reviewer, can result in clarifying concepts for the research design (Yin, 2003). In the case of this study, the pilot served to introduce several new questions (suggested by the interviewee) to pinpoint the extent of ethics activity within the institution.

In conclusion, the qualitative methods in this study used sequential data gathering, including document review, individual interviews, and a focus group. They were reinforced by employing trustworthiness criteria, by studying similar research in the LIS field, and by administering a pilot study. Employing qualitative methodology and monitoring the research using trustworthiness criteria provided a coherent and quality oriented plan for investigating ethics across the curriculum.
Limitations of the Study Methods

The overall study design had several limitations. These limitations will be expanded in the dissertation’s conclusion in combination with recommendations for further research. I describe below the limitations which were most closely related to the methods employed in the study. These limitations include the following: the non-generalizability of exemplar studies, the self reporting nature of interviews and focus groups, my biases as a researcher, the small number of and interrelated relationships among study participants, and the limitations of participants’ perspectives -- contributed to limitations for this study of the integration of ethics into LIS curricula.

An exemplar strategy was chosen for this study as an effective way to identify best practices. The use of criteria for selecting exemplar teachers and administrators provided some assurance that the sample is representative of exemplary teachers (though not representative of LIS teachers and schools generally). Beyond the representativeness of the sample, another limitation of using exemplars was that those reading the report may be tempted to generalize the findings of the study, because of the significant knowledge-base of the subjects. The findings of this qualitative research are context-specific and are not generalizable. At best, the research findings may have some transferable elements, but this transferability must be judged by the reader who hopes to apply the findings.
Another serious limitation concerned the nature of document review, interviews and a focus group. Data obtained through these methods was primarily self-report and may not have been reliable in accurately depicting actual practice. This limitation was minimized by checking the teacher’s statements against the course syllabi, learning objectives, and course descriptions.

Denzin (2002) described researchers who “self-consciously make their own experience part of the research” (p. 350). Further, Marshall and Rossman (1989) recommended that researchers discuss their personal, professional and theoretical biases. I brought to the study two well-identified biases. I experienced undergraduate and graduate training in ethics and work-related experience in medical ethics. My ethical interest and training were combined with a masters’ degree and long professional experience in libraries. The dissertation allowed me to examine ethics through the lens of my profession – librarianship. I have a strong bias in favor of integrating ethics into LIS curricula and I chose to interview teachers who had taught and researched in the area and generally held my same affinity for the integration of ethics. My access to these talented teachers (because of my work in the field) and my passion for the subject area may have skewed my analysis of data. Because of my profound respect for the successful teachers and administrators that served as my subjects, I may not have been as critical as I could have been in the processes of interviewing and data analysis. Finally, given my previous experience in libraries, those that I interviewed may not have explained their teaching as clearly as they might have
to a researcher not familiar with libraries and library education: Assuming that I was a knowledgeable librarian, they may have talked to me in shorthand.

The second bias concerned my background as a medical librarian with a quantitative orientation toward research. With years of teaching and studying evidence-based medicine, I had strong inclinations to consider findings in terms of quantitative parameters. I was mindful of my orientation and I tried to avoid favoring this quantitative orientation in reporting the findings.

For both the interviews of faculty and the focus group of administrators, one major problem was the small size of the samples. According to Buchanan’s (2004) study, there were only 15 institutions which offered stand-alone ethics courses at that time. When this number was combined with the number of nationally recognized LIS teachers who seemed (from website analysis) to have an interest in the field of ethics, the number rose to approximately thirty potential interviewees. Recruiting fifteen professors who taught core courses at highly respected LIS programs was difficult; the researcher expanded beyond this small group by obtaining recommendations from interviewees for their colleagues who might have served as effective interviewees. The resulting total group of potential interviewees was still relatively small.

In selecting participants for the focus group, I also experienced limited options. The small and inter-related nature of the total population of LIS administrators was a study limitation for the focus group. Stewart and Shamdasani (1990) indicated that, if focus group participants were acquainted with each other,
this relationship could bias the research results. At the time of the study there were only fifty-seven ALA accredited schools of Library and Information Science, and because of this small number, it seemed realistic to expect that administrators would be familiar with each other. This problem of personal connections between focus group participants was a factor which I could not control, but I accounted for possible relationships between individuals when I analyzed the data.

This research was designed to record, analyze, and compare perceptions of teachers and administrators in the field of LIS concerning the process for and context of the integration of ethics into courses and the emphasis on ethics across their schools. The study did not directly assess the perspective of students enrolled in the courses, of practitioner librarians, or of those who employ librarians. The reactions and evaluations of individuals from these excluded groups to the question of how ethics is integrated through the LIS curricula remain important concerns and deserve a separate study in the future.

All of these concerns -- the non-generalizability of exemplar studies, the self reporting nature of interviews and focus groups, my biases as a researcher, the small number of and interrelated relationships among study participants, and the limitations of participants’ perspectives -- contributed to limitations for this study of the integration of ethics into LIS curricula.
**Conclusion**

This research study employed a conceptual framework, methodology, and specific research methods to obtain teachers’ and administrators’ reports of how ethics is integrated across LIS curricula. The components of the research included:

- A qualitative methodology that used sequential data gathering to detail ethics-related efforts institution-wide and to illustrate the integration of ethics components into existing courses

- Specific research methods including: document review to identify background information; interviews with seasoned and carefully selected teachers to determine their views on ethics integration institution-wide and how they integrated ethics into the courses that they teach; and a focus group of administrators to identify their views on the teaching of ethics across the curriculum,

- Data analysis using the constant comparative coding method for the document review, interviews and the focus group, and

- A conceptual framework, the taxonomy of the teaching of professional ethics, which was created to inform the design of questions and analysis of data.

The robust quality of the study was maintained through the widespread use of four criteria for trustworthiness and limitations of the study were detailed in this analysis.
Chapter 4
Towards a Taxonomy of the Teaching of Ethics in Graduate Level Professional Programs

Definition and History of Taxonomies

To understand how ethical content was integrated into core courses, I first needed to have a broad view of how professional ethics is taught. I wanted to know how teachers have designed learning interactions that they employ in stand-alone professional ethics courses. To grasp the range of learning experiences that can be incorporated into the teaching of ethics, I needed to create a taxonomy or a structure of categories. While each category has definitional boundaries, together the categories form a consistent whole. Taxonomies are often useful in summarizing a field and distinguishing its components. In their strongest form taxonomies are efficient, clarifying structures which can assist in guiding thought and action (Moseley, 2005).

Taxonomies were generally developed through observation and analysis. Carl Linnaeus, an eighteenth century Swedish botanist, is often regarded as the father of taxonomy-- the first scientist to develop an hierarchical structure based on observed characteristics (Blunt & Stearn, 1971). However, there is a much longer history of attempts to develop principles of classification in different domains. Aristotle first addressed the problem of how to select the defining traits in his work on the methods of biological classification, *The Parts of Animals* (Aristotle & McKenon, 1941) and his biology endured unchanged until the
modern period. He is also regarded as having founded political science and logic, both on the basis of systems of classification he invented (Mayr, 1982).

The type of taxonomy that I needed to observe and develop for this research was that relating to the practical design of learning experiences for students, or what is often called instructional design. Descriptions and evaluations for taxonomies of instructional design are well represented in the literature (Anderson, Sosniak, & Bloom, 1994; Hokanson & Hooper, 2004; Mosley, 2005). The creators of these taxonomies range from the behavioral objectivists, who saw education as a process of reinforcing developmental steps toward knowledge, to the constructivists, who envisioned a learner constructed system of meaning. Of particular interest are Bloom’s original taxonomy (1956) and Anderson and Krathwohl’s (2001) revision of Bloom’s taxonomy because they claimed to provide practical advice that teachers could use in the classroom (Mosley, 2005).

Benjamin Bloom worked as a graduate student for the Board of Examinations at the University of Chicago where he observed the interaction between courses taught and the measurement of students’ learning. Based on his keen observation, Bloom became interested in understanding how students think and whether their thinking processes could be reflected in the design of courses (Guskey, 2005). Through his *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956), Bloom provided a structure for classifying instructional objectives according to their cognitive complexity. His depictions of educational objectives, in what is
referred to as Bloom’s Taxonomy, provided a tool for organizing the objectives based on their cognitive complexity. Despite Bloom’s (1956) and Anderson and Krathwahl’s (2001) claims that their taxonomies provided practical advice to teachers, both taxonomies focused more on cognitive processes, rather than on practical elements of instructional design. The authors did not address how teachers teach, since they felt that these decisions were dependent on the course content and the creativity of teachers (Moseley, 2005).

Development of the Taxonomy

My goal in developing the taxonomy that supported this dissertation research was to address the practical, pedagogical concerns in ethics instruction. I began my research, as Bloom, Linnaeus, and Aristotle did, by collecting, analyzing, and observing: I started by examining sources on stand-alone LIS ethics courses as part of the literature review for this research. Then I examined text books in professional ethics from the fields of business, engineering, law, LIS, and medicine. I examined how the books’ contents were structured and especially examined the prefatory materials to determine authors’/editors’ intentions in creating the books. I next searched the philosophy and higher education literature to determine the proper categories for the taxonomy. Articles from the journals entitled Teaching Ethics and Teaching Philosophy were especially helpful. At this point, I expanded my search to Google books and to WorldCat to identify books which included discussions of the teaching of ethics
in higher education. I located several titles, most notably, the Hastings Center’s
*Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education* (1980), which not only provided
descriptions of the components of teaching ethics, but also gave recommendations
for practice. By this point I had determined, from the topics discussed in the
literature, four components that I would examine in the taxonomy: learning
objectives, teaching techniques and assignments, educational resources, and
evaluation. I chose these categories not only because of their frequency in the
literature, but also because I had determined that they represented the defining
traits in ethics education. Thus, I used both observation and analysis to
determine the primary components of the taxonomy. This provided me with a
skeletal understanding of the teaching of ethics which was essential for
developing the questions to use in interviews of teachers.

Next, I began searching the relevant literatures for each of the fields of
investigation. To identify the most salient articles in each field, I identified
review articles and I solicited the generous assistance of expert practitioners and
librarians from each field.² After I had read the literature, I was ready to
examine syllabi to determine the match between course content (syllabi) and
reports in the literature. At the same time that I requested sources of information
from expert practitioners, I also requested course syllabi for stand-alone ethics
courses in each of five professional areas. I was able to collect seventeen syllabi

---

² Many thanks to Elizabeth Bagley, James Elliott, Ken Harold, Elizabeth Kiss, Kelly Laas, Robert
Ladenson, Robert Lawry, Michael Loui, Laura Palucki-Black, Lisa Parker, Laura Purdy, and
Robert Simon for responding to my request for information.
from practitioners for all of the subject areas except for Medicine. For the field of Medicine, I was able to obtain three syllabi from the internet, specifically from the National Reference Center for Bioethics Literature (NRCBL). This corpus of syllabi is described in Table 3. My investigation of specific sources took place during and after the data collection from the interviews and focus group.

Table 3: Syllabi for stand-alone ethics courses included in the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of syllabi received from their authors</th>
<th>Number of syllabi identified on the Web</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, I began an on-going and iterative process of movement between the syllabi, the literature, and the data collected from the current research. Comparing the three sources helped me to comprehend new levels of complexity. I used published literature in structuring questions and preparing for interviews. As the interviews and focus groups were completed and findings began to emerge, these findings added new understanding to the information gained through prior research. I applied this further comprehension from the findings to my original source of research for the taxonomy, the literature from LIS and other fields. I also compared the information in the literature and in the data I had collected to the course syllabi I had collected. Using these three sources, the
syllabi, the literature and the data collected, I was able to decipher new meaning in the materials.

The resulting Taxonomy of the Teaching of Professional Ethics is a practical tool which addresses specific methods and materials used in teaching. Unlike the general taxonomies of Bloom and Krathwohl, this taxonomy is focused on the teaching of professional ethics and it addresses specific strategies in teaching. As the Hastings Center’s study (1980) points out, “the best source of potential information on the … teaching of ethics is the experience of other teachers” (p.71). This brief taxonomy, which identifies learning objectives, teaching techniques and assignments, learning resources, and evaluative strategies, is an initial, collective summary of experiences of teachers of ethics in various professional programs. Development of the taxonomy included three components: The literature formed the foundation of the taxonomy; this initial structure was further enhanced through the examination of syllabi from profession-specific ethics courses in the fields of business, engineering, law, library and information science (LIS), and medicine; and finally, insights gained from the dissertation research findings were integrated into the taxonomy.

Citations for the Taxonomy follow this protocol: Published literature was cited using standard APA format. Course syllabi were identified by the field for the courses including business, engineering, law, LIS, and medicine and the identification number assigned to the syllabus for the institution, e.g., (LIS 5). If examples were derived from the dissertation interviews (DIs), then the example
was followed by that acronym. Since the dissertation findings were protected by an Institutional Review Board (IRB) compact with participants, identifying information could not be provided for the institutions or for faculty members. As a convention, the body of the taxonomy includes only generalized statements on the applicability of the taxonomy; field specific examples of the taxonomy are provided in footnotes. And when speaking of the customer for the five fields, I refer to the client/patient, even though several fields have other names they prefer, e.g., libraries generally refer to their customers as patrons.

**Value of the Taxonomy**

The taxonomy provides a view of how ethics is taught in five distinct professional areas. This multidisciplinary viewpoint proved to be a valuable resource in three areas of the dissertation research: implementing data collection, analyzing the resulting data, and demonstrating important implications of the taxonomy. In each of these three areas, the taxonomy and the dissertation research supported and changed each other in an iterative process.

A provisional taxonomy was used during administration of the interviews and convening of the focus group, and it provided an underlying structure for collecting data. Especially in the areas of learning objectives and teaching techniques used in teaching ethics, having a rudimentary grasp of the literature was an important component for devising relevant questions, for understanding answers of participants, and for posing follow up questions to the interviewees and focus group participants. The taxonomy was an important tool to assist me
in implementing data collection. In turn, the data collected provided a context for the components of the taxonomy. The data provided examples, explained in detail by interviewees and focus group participants, which increased my understanding of similar components within the taxonomy. Further, this new understanding enhanced my administration of the remaining interviews and of the focus group.

Later in the process, as I began to analyze data, the taxonomy evolved as the dissertation research progressed. The dissertation research was influenced by the taxonomy since it provided a framework for analyzing participant responses. The taxonomy did not predict the categories for analysis, but helped me to distinguish categories as they arose in the transcripts of interviews and focus group discussion. For example, as the category of evaluation of the teaching of ethics expanded to include various components, I reviewed and expanded the literature cited in the taxonomy to clarify the difference between traditional evaluation, as provided by teachers, and evaluation from other sources. The new perspectives, beyond traditional evaluation, which arose from the data resulted in the addition of new references to the taxonomy.

The relationship between the findings and the taxonomy will receive further analysis in Chapter 6, the conclusions and recommendations which result from the study. This final chapter of the study details the implications that the taxonomy has for practice and research in professional ethics.
The above sections introduced this taxonomy by providing an historical context for the definition of taxonomy and then detailing the development of the taxonomy and its value. The taxonomy itself is a structure of categories that together form a summary of the teaching of professional ethics. Further, the individual categories, that included learning objectives, teaching techniques, learning resources, and evaluation, helped to distinguish the components of the field. The history of specific taxonomies, especially those representing instructional design, provided context for developing the taxonomy of the teaching of professional ethics. This development was an iterative process: beginning with the literature, following up with course syllabi, and then returning to the original literature for clarification and expanding to discipline specific literature. The taxonomy was expanded further by adding in relevant findings and understandings gained from the interviews and focus group research. The final section detailed the value of the taxonomy in three areas of the research: implementing data collection, analyzing the resulting data, and demonstrating important relationships to the findings.

**Components of the Taxonomy**

Extensive searching of the literature helped to establish the four most important components of the teaching of a stand-alone course in professional ethics. I constructed the four components in temporal order: the learning objectives precede the other elements since they predict what the student will
achieve in the course; the teaching techniques and assignments are methods that
teachers use to instill in students the relevant objectives; the learning resources
provide another tool directed at accomplishing the objectives; and finally,
evaluation systems are designed to determine the level of achievement of the
stated objectives by the students.

The first component, learning objectives, consists of goals or aims for
accomplishing certain activities as a result of exposure to a specific teaching unit
in a course. The articulation of an objective can serve as a guide to teaching
(Good, 1973). I selected the most important learning objectives for the teaching
of professional ethics by examining the literature and specific syllabi. The
objectives included in the taxonomy are divided into three groups. The first group
of objectives (see Table 4 below) addresses the knowledge that students
experience in stand-alone ethics courses. These four objectives include: enhance
students’ familiarity with codes of ethics; give students a deep understanding of
the most critical issues in the field; help students to clarify the relationship
between professionals and clients/patients; and teach students to achieve cultural
competency by developing empathy for clients. The next set of objectives is
focused on skill and perception based ethical reasoning skills. This set includes
four components: enable students to recognize ethical situations and to anticipate
ethical complications; use reasoning and perception to understand the situation,
articulate an ethical conflict and the alternatives for resolving it, and make
ethically sound decisions. The final learning objective, forming professional
identity, depends on students’ prior mastery of ethical knowledge, perceptions and skills.

The second element of the taxonomy, teaching methods and techniques, consists of the specific strategies that teachers use to achieve the learning objectives for the course. A teaching technique can refer to the specific way that a teacher presents instructional materials or conducts instructional activities (Good, 1973). The classroom oriented techniques that emerged from the literature and from the dissertation interviews included lectures, guest lectures, discussions, case studies, small group discussions, student-led discussions and presentations, and writing assignments. Further teaching methods include two components of experiential learning, field experiences and simulation strategies.

The third component of the taxonomy is the learning resources that the teacher selects to support the learning objectives. Learning resources are materials or devices with instructional content or function used for educational purposes (Good, 1973). For the teaching of ethics, I examined these materials in two categories: those materials that address ethical theory and methods of decision making and those that support the applied examination of ethics in professional practice. The representative materials I selected include books, journal articles, media and computer websites. (All of the materials used in the courses are listed within the course descriptions for each course which comprise Appendix 1).
The final element of the taxonomy is the evaluative systems that are selected to determine the student’s mastery of the material, specifically whether the student has achieved the stated learning objectives. There are two ways that these evaluation methods are organized: evaluation can be performed on a course-by-course basis or a student’s abilities in broad training areas, such as ethics, can be determined across all of the courses in the curriculum. The second group of evaluation methods are those which are particularly oriented to measuring the learning of ethics.

This summary of the four components of the Taxonomy, along with Table 4 below, provide background for the in depth discussion of each component.

Table 4: Components of the Taxonomy of the Teaching of Ethics in Graduate Level Professional Programs

Learning Objectives in Professional Ethics Courses
Learning Objectives that Address the Acquisition of Knowledge and the Sharing of Perceptions
- Increase familiarity with codes of ethics
- Understand the most critical issues in the field
- Clarify relationship between professionals and clients/patients
- Achieve cultural competency and develop empathy for clients

Learning Objectives that Are-Based on the Development of Skills and Perceptions
- Recognize ethical situations and anticipate ethical complications
- Use reasoning and perception to understand situation
- Articulate ethical conflict and alternatives to resolve it
- Make good decisions
- Forming Professional Identity
Methods or Techniques in Teaching Ethics
Lectures and Invited Speakers
Discussion, Presentations and Writing Assignments
  Discussions related to case studies
  Case studies-how teachers use them
  Case studies and learning strategy
  Media as adjunct to case studies
  Disadvantages of case studies
Small group discussions
Student-led discussions and presentations
Writing assignments
Teaching Methods Employed in Experiential Learning
  Fieldwork
  Simulation

Learning Resources in Professional Ethics Courses
Materials Addressing Ethical Theory and Methods of Decision Making
Resources Which Support the Applied Examination of Ethics in Professional Practice

Evaluation of the Teaching of Ethics
Traditional Evaluation of Students in Individual Classes and Program-Wide
Evaluation Techniques Appropriate for Measuring Learning of Ethics
  Testing knowledge of professional codes
  Defining Issues Test (DIT)
  Peer review and self-evaluation
  Evaluation of reflective activity

Learning Objectives in Professional Ethics Courses
The learning objectives are designed to represent the specific goals which undergirded the teaching of each course. They describe what students are hoped to accomplish as a result of their exposure to a specific component of the class (Good, 1973). On average, each course had five to eight learning objectives. One
course that was taught in eight modules had several specific learning objectives for each module of the course (Medicine 1). I obtained learning objectives from the literature and the course syllabi and introduce these objectives in three groups.

Learning Objectives That Address the Acquisition of Knowledge

In examining course syllabi and the literature, I determined that four objectives are oriented towards students’ learning of specific facts or gathering of information. As well, these objectives describe the understandings that students adopt as a result of this information. The first objective, increase familiarity with codes of ethics, is oriented towards the mastery of a particular body of information. The remaining three objectives also involve information mastery, but firmly address the understanding gained through familiarity with the material. These objectives include: understanding the most important ethical issues in the field, clarifying the relationship between professional and client/patient, and achieving cultural competency by developing empathy for clients/patients. Each of the four objectives is discussed here.

Increase Familiarity with Codes of Ethics

Professions establish standards and they codify these standards by creating codes of professional conduct. Ozar (20010 described the professional standards articulated in Codes as “specialized standards of conduct relevant to typical social roles” (p.10). Enhancing students’ familiarity with specific codes of ethics or professional standards is a stated or unstated objective for over half of the courses
in professional ethics that were reviewed. A few courses describe the code of ethics directly in the objectives section of the syllabi, e.g., “To acquaint students with the purpose of a professional code of ethics” (LIS 8). In most other courses one session was spent discussing and comparing codes or standards. These sessions provided positive, formal descriptions of the ideals and responsibilities of the profession. Some instructors move beyond the professional codes and include the study of historic documents such as the United Nation’s *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) to emphasize the relationship between human rights and the obligations of professionals (LIS 6). Several ethics educators do not embrace the goal of teaching students to employ codes or standards in a mechanistic fashion: they teach students to recognize the value and limitations of these tools (DI). Codes enunciate, for the general public, a concise description of the duties that professionals are ethically obligated to provide (Fallis, 2007). For the professionals themselves, codes provide useful boundaries and some are careful to specify the most important responsibilities of professionals (Preer, 2008). Codes and standards describe ideals and responsibilities for professionals in specific fields and their examination results in

---

3 For example, a journalist has responsibility for unbiased reporting and a librarian has responsibility for providing balanced information on various sides of an issue.

4 An example is the *American Dental Association Principles of Ethics and Code of Professional Conduct* (2009), this document includes under the “Principle of Patient Autonomy” a general statement of the dentist’s responsibility to protect the confidentiality of patient records, but also to provide copies of those records upon request from the patient. The ADA Code also includes an advisory opinion stating that it is the ethical responsibility of practitioners to provide the records, whether or not there is payment in full for services.

5 As an example from the field of education, Randall Curren (2004) pointed out that the Standards of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration identifies the unique professional responsibility of school administrators to serve as role models for their students.
principled discussions concerning the codes’ relevance to the most pressing moral
issues. (DI).

*Understand the Most Critical Issues in the Field*

Professional ethics courses are often organized around the most prominent
ethical issues in that field and more than half of the syllabi reflect this
organization. Beginning a course with the “hot issues” that arise in practice has
two advantages. These are issues that dominate the headlines and students are
immediately engaged in the material and can actually contribute to the
investigation by providing materials from the media (DI). Further, this
approach can be easily adapted as the issues to be discussed change (Fry &
Johnstone, 2002). The various issues can be taught as separate modules and in
some courses the specific teachers change for each module (Business 3, Medicine
2). Some issues permeate almost every field; these issues include:
privacy/confidentiality, ethical implications of technology, honesty/truth-telling,
conflicts of interest, and international ethical issues. Many courses employ the
same teaching methods for introducing students to ethical issues; they pair issue-
specific readings with case studies involving the issues covered in class.

*Clarify Relationship between Professionals and Clients/Patients*

One of the important responsibilities of a professional is to clarify the
relationship between his/her own professional role and that of a client/patient. As
indicated in the syllabi, in several professional fields, ethical instruction
systematically focuses on recognizing models for the relationship between the
client/patient and the professional\(^6\) (Engineering 1, Law 1-3, Medicine 2). Often these models recognize a potential conflict between the autonomy of the client/patient and the professional’s responsibility to promote the client’s/patient’s welfare, also called benevolence. In some fields this concept of promoting welfare is expanded to protect the patient from harm, also called beneficence (Beauchamp, 2008). In most professional ethics course syllabi studied, this relationship, between clients and professionals, is discussed as a distinct topic and then is reiterated in the examination of the codes of ethics.

_Achieve Cultural Competency and Develop Empathy for Clients_

Once students become involved in the personal details of case studies, they begin to relate to clients in a more culturally sensitive manner (Hastings Center, 1980). An important ingredient for cultural competency is to develop the student’s moral imagination by empowering the student to develop empathy for his or her client/patient. An empathetic student can develop an enhanced understanding of the most crucial issues in the field (Callahan, 1998). For example, in every field included in this study, confidentiality is an important value that the practitioner must grasp and understand (Beauchamp, Bowie, & Arnold, 2009; Beauchamp & Childress, 2009; Harris, Pritchard & Robins, 2008; Preer, 2008; Rhode & Luban, 2009). Another key issue is that of empathizing with a disabled client (Ho, 2007). The addition of cultural competency and

---

\(^6\) In a medical ethics course, the relationship was explored at length and was called the “clinical encounter.” Legal ethics courses, called “professional responsibility,” spent time discussing and exploring cases around “attorney-client privilege” (Law 2, Medicine 2).
empathy for the situation of the client or patient can help students to recognize and respect the importance of confidentiality, disability, and other key issues of the field. Teachers often have employed methods to increase this empathy, including role-playing and other simulation strategies. These strategies help students to understand the vulnerability of handicapped clients or the precarious position of patients whose confidentiality has been violated or a host of other important issues such as those of racial/ethnic group membership.

Learning Objectives That Are Based on the Development of Skills and Perceptions

Four learning objectives comprise the steps of the ethical reasoning process. This progression begins when students can recognize and even anticipate moral aspects of a professional situation. Students move into the second learning objective, using perception and reasoning to evaluate the ethical situation they have identified. As clarification of their reasoning students consider alternative solutions and articulate defensible positions. Finally, students practice making good decisions in hypothetical situations.

Recognize Ethical Situations and Anticipate Ethical Complications

Important objectives for the teaching of professional ethics revolve around skill development in recognizing ethical situations (Ozar, 2001). In ethics classes, as in other fields such as music, skills are developed in habitual fashion,  

7 While medicine is most dramatic in simulating interaction with patients, all fields studied (business, engineering, law, LIS, and medicine) use simulation to increase ethical imagination.
through extensive practice. Through case studies and other teaching techniques, students develop the sensitivity to recognize situations of ethical uncertainty (Callahan & Bok, 1980). This sensitivity can be described as a consciousness raising that helps students develop sensibilities similar to those described in cultural competence (Callahan, 1998). Through practice, students learn to identify the morally significant aspects of a set of circumstances. Students’ perceptions of the particulars of a situation are enhanced by their prior experience in other environments. In fact, students’ repeated experiences in recognizing ethical situations result in new perceptual skills that allow the anticipation of ethical complications. This experience creates a relevant base of knowledge which can serve students who recognize and act on the appropriate patterns (Fry & Johnstone, 2002). Past experience with similar situations invokes insight and intuition to anticipate ethical complications even before they happen. This recognition and even anticipation of ethical situations that prepares students for ethical situations in professional practice is a key objective for most professional ethics course syllabi studied.

Use Reasoning and Perception to Understand Situation

Once students gain skills to recognize a morally significant situation, their next educational step is to use their reasoning and perception to evaluate the ethically salient features of a case. Reasoning involves the reflection on and analysis of the situation to formulate ethically defensible options; students use logic to validly draw conclusions from articulated premises. Often experienced
students or practitioners move beyond the use of conscious reasoning to employ their perceptions. Students who understand a situation recognize and act upon appropriate patterns. Generally, this perception, which constitutes an intuitive understanding of the problem, stems from a deep involvement in the issue or problem (Fry & Johnstone, 2002). Curren (2008) described how this perceptual and reasoning process of understanding is facilitated by practice in ethical analysis using an inventory of ethical features (including consequences, rights, obligations, and virtues) and related ethical principles (including respecting client privacy, respecting patients’ decisions, and protecting the integrity of the institution). A further conceptual step towards understanding an ethical issue is the ability to translate these principles of the profession into action guiding tools (such as client confidentiality, patient autonomy and conflicts of interest). Bowie (2006) referred to these concepts as bridge or intermediary principles. Bowie proposed that, in professional ethics, “much of the heavy lifting of justification is done by the bridge concepts…for [their] use is central to acquiring good professional judgment” (p. 621).

**Articulate Ethical Conflict and Alternatives to Resolve It**

Through practice, students learn to explain to others, both orally and in writing, the ethical crisis, alternatives for solving the dilemma, and their favored resolution (DI). They describe the ethically salient features of a situation and the logic of their explanations support or fail to support each alternative. Teachers of ethics play an important role in this process by providing guidance for the
structure of the writing and evaluation including detailed, analytic feedback (Cholbi, 2007). One course syllabus included grading rubrics for written assignments and for discussions. The most important contents for the written paper were evidence and argument which were supported by an exhaustive review of the literature. For a successful oral presentation, the student identified and answered key issues (LIS 6). One course, which was described in the literature, included careful choice of words as a component of this learning objective. Precise vocabulary reduces discord and ambiguity, enhances civil discourse, and moves the discussion towards a resolution of the dilemma (Leever, 2001).

Make Good Decisions

Teachers noted that students are often reluctant to make this final commitment to a course of action in the hypothetical classroom environment (DI, Hastings, 1980). Expanding students’ awareness of many hypothetical solutions to a dilemma is an important goal. But in the teaching of professional (rather than theoretical) ethics, practice in the ability to make decisions is deemed a crucial skill (Ozar, 2001). Teaching techniques that move students toward selecting one ethical course of action include using case studies, not just as discussion tools, but as a vehicle for decision making. The Hastings Center report (1980) acknowledged this indecisiveness and reluctance of students to commit to a course of action and recommended strategies to encourage decision-making. These strategies are discussed in the section on teaching techniques below. In
addition to making the decision, students practice evaluation of their decisions in light of other alternatives.

**Forming Professional Identity**

Success at attaining this final objective is dependent on mastery of the previously covered objectives, including knowledge, perceptions, and skills. Teachers confirmed the importance of students gaining a better understanding of themselves and how their values and personalities correspond with the values of the profession⁸ (DI). Through discussions and assignments, students clarify their self-concept and anchor their self-perceptions to professional values. Further, investigation into the profession’s historical roots,⁹ the functions and responsibilities of the profession in society, and its assumptions concerning the social order all contribute to students’ personal connection to their new profession (Callahan & Bok, 1980). This identification with the profession expands students’ integrity and commitment to core values (Curren, 2008). Although these core values vary for specific fields, the syllabi studied include some values that overlapped across fields. These common values included a concern for clients’/patients’ privacy/confidentiality, honesty/truth-telling, and avoiding conflicts of interest (Beauchamp, Bowie, & Arnold, 2009; Beauchamp & Childress, 2008; Harris, Pritchard & Robins, 2008; Preer, 2008; Rhode &

---

⁸ Several LIS teacher interviewees required students in their courses to determine their score on Meyers-Briggs or other personality tests (DI) or tests of students’ moral orientation (LIS 3) as a component of the professional identity segment of the course.

⁹ Three LIS teachers assigned students to investigate and present short segments on historical luminaries in the field. One teacher called the segment “bio bits” (DI).
The values are accompanied by responsibilities of the profession towards serving the public (Bowie, 2006). While these values may have arisen in several courses throughout the curriculum, through achieving this learning objective, students address these values and responsibilities in a systematic way (Callahan & Bok, 1980).

This final objective, forming professional identity, adds a new component to the previous objectives – the formation of a professional identity grounded in ethical ideals provides a source of orientation to act ethically. Identity is “perceived as a link between moral knowledge and commitment to moral action.” (Nisan, 1996, p. 75). Augusto Blasi (1993) describes identity, a quality acquired in early adulthood, by saying “as we grow older our sense of self changes…[our] true self is no longer built on the sum of spontaneous feelings and thoughts that one experiences…but is built on those ideals and goals that one has for oneself” (p. 110-111). The role of the educator of professionals is to nurture a specific identity, one that includes commitment to the ideals of ethical professional practice. To nurture such an identity is to pursue a learning outcome that is dispositional in nature: Students who identify themselves as ethical professionals will be disposed to engage in ethical professional practice.

**Summary of Learning Objectives**

The nine learning objectives described above include several goals that were derived from course syllabi, discussed in the literature, or shared during the dissertation interviews. One set of objectives revolves around the knowledge
that is enhanced by the study of ethics. The second set of learning objectives were skills and perceptions that students acquire and that involve the process of ethical reasoning. These skills include using knowledge, perceptions and reasoning to recognize and evaluate the ethical situation, articulating defensible positions, and making a good decision. The final objective is for students to form their professional identity. Success at attaining this objective is dependent on mastery of the previously covered objectives which revolve around knowledge, perceptions, and skills.

**Linking Learning Objectives to Teaching Techniques**

All of objectives described above are part of the first component of the taxonomy of the teaching of ethics. The teaching objectives included several areas of knowledge, understanding, perceptions, skills, dispositions, and commitment which ethics educators want their students to acquire. These objectives are enhanced by specific teaching techniques and reading materials (discussed below). In this section, I connect each learning objective with its preeminent teaching methods. These connections are illustrated in Table 5. The techniques themselves will be discussed in the next section.
Table 5: Teaching Techniques Contributing Substantially to Learning Objectives in Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Small Group Discussion</th>
<th>Student-led Discussion, Debate &amp; Presentation</th>
<th>Field Experience</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>Writing Assigned</th>
<th>Resources Reading/Viewing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing knowledge of codes of ethics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding crucial issues in the field</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying relationship between client and professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving cultural competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing &amp; anticipating ethical situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using reasoning &amp; perception to understand ethical situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulating ethical conflict &amp; alternative solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sound decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming professional identity</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The techniques that are starred in this list are the specific teaching methods or resources which contribute substantially in achieving each specific learning objective.

The first four learning objectives are related to obtaining knowledge and understanding that shape the students’ perceptions of ethical issues. The two
learning objectives, enhancing familiarity with specific codes of ethics and understanding the most crucial issues in the field, are conveyed most often by lectures, reading the materials and writing assignments. In the more tightly structured environment of lectures, students listen, observe and record the highlights of the lecture; these activities all contribute to students’ ability to later recall the information shared (Guthrie, 2003). Reading assignments complemented the information gained from lecture and writing assignments. Assignments focused on analysis of an ethical dilemma or the application of codes of ethics especially helped the student to understand the complexity of ethical problems (Cholbi, 2007; DI). One other teaching technique that of student-led presentations, discussions, and debates, is crucial to conveying the learning objective, understanding the most crucial issues in the field. Almost three-fourths of the professional ethics courses studied included student-led presentations on research topics as a major component of the course (Business 2, Engineering 1-2, Law 2-3, LIS 2-3, 5, 7-8, and Medicine 1). Teachers reported that this engagement of students in specific topics resulted in spirited discussions (DI; Hastings, 1980).

The learning objective, clarifying the relationship between the professional and his client/patient, was demonstrated through case studies, field experiences and simulation. Since case studies require students to participate actively in the resolution of a problem, their active nature contributes to students’ awareness of the professionals’ position with respect to clients/patients (Good,
Field experiences and simulations result in even more active involvement of students in understanding the relationship of the professional to his client/patient (Guthrie, 2003; Hastings, 1980).

The learning objective, achieving cultural competency and developing empathy for clients/patients, is closely related to distinguishing the relationship between the client and the professional. The skill of cultural competency, which involves providing services respectfully in compliance with traditions and values accepted by those served (CDC, 2008), is enhanced by using the teaching techniques of case studies, simulation and field studies. Teachers reported that each of these techniques brings differing degrees of realism to the ethical situation being studied and helps the students to connect and empathize with their clients/patients, especially those from disadvantaged groups (DI).

The next group of four learning objectives describes four skills that revolve around the process of ethical reasoning. The first skill, recognition and anticipation of ethical situations, is first communicated by teachers’ lectures that provide students with the initial description of an ethical situation. The teacher also assigns case studies to get students accustomed to recognizing this particular kind of dilemma (Hastings Center, 1980). Some classes use simulation and field experiences and require that students clearly identify the ethical situations that may arise (Engineering 1, Law 2-3, LIS-8, DI). Recognizing ethical dilemmas is followed by the learning objective, using perception and reasoning to evaluate the ethical situation. This specific reasoning skill, which involves applying ethical
theories and decision-making systems, is generally taught through lectures and readings (Biondi, 2008). Reasoning and analyzing the situation also require much discussion, often facilitated by the teacher (Gregory, 2007). Classroom-wide, small group, and student-led discussions are crucial elements for learning the third skill, articulating the ethical conflict and alternative solutions. At this point in the reasoning process, the analysis of the case moves from discussions to an actual dialog (Gregory, 2007). Students often discuss or present the results of their written papers and the process of writing has deepened their thinking and is further enhanced by guidance and feedback from the teacher and other students (Cholbi, 2007). The last step in the reasoning process is making sound decisions. This commitment to one outcome is something that students often resist and teachers recommend the formation of small discussion groups with the assignment to produce a decision for the group (Hastings Center, 1980).

The final learning objective, “forming professional identity”, is dependent on students’ mastery of the previously covered objectives -- which revolve around knowledge, perception, and skills. Teachers’ lectures and students’ writing provide the most substantial help in achieving this learning objective. When effective teachers provide lectures, they demonstrate passion for the profession and serve as role models for professional identity (Honderich, 2005). As a result of writing assignments, especially essays explaining their own views, students clarify their understanding about the profession and their own identity as a member of that profession (Cholbi, 2007; DI). If presented by skilled teachers,
these assignments and lectures provide students with motivation and a commitment to the profession (Hastings Center, 1980).

Students’ progress towards accomplishing the nine learning objectives described above is facilitated by specific teaching techniques and reading materials. While most teaching techniques are appropriate for addressing each of the learning objectives, I have here identified a few techniques that provide substantial contributions towards achieving each specific learning objective. These connections between the learning objectives and teaching techniques are based on both research and on the dissertation interviews.

**Methods or Techniques Used in Teaching Ethics**

The second component of the taxonomy of teaching professional ethics provides descriptions of methods employed to accomplish the teaching objectives which were detailed above. Teachers of professional ethics select teaching methods which consist of instructional activities and are supported by learning resources (Good, 1973). This section reports on the predominant methods selected and how they are used in the teaching of ethics. The teaching methods that teachers use fall into three categories: those activities which require modest investment of students’ experience and interactivity – lectures and invited speakers; those which require moderate student engagement – discussions, presentations and writing assignments; and teaching techniques which actively engage the life experiences of students – experiential methods. The supporting citations in this section continue to employ all three sources used in developing
the taxonomy: the published literature (cited in APA format), syllabi from stand-alone professional ethics courses (cited with the subject area and the number of the syllabi, e.g., Med 1), and relevant sections of the dissertation interviews with teachers of integrated ethics courses (cited as DI).

**Lectures and Invited Speakers**

Through their lectures teachers impart information, largely through verbal messages, with a minimal amount of class participation (Good, 1973). In ethics education teachers’ lectures serve two purposes. The first already noted function of the lecture is to convey information, and this aids in achieving several learning objectives, most notably in understanding the crucial issues in the field. Lectures provide a foundation for understanding and articulating ethical concepts.

The teacher demonstrates the second purpose of the lecture when he or she models the analysis of an ethical argument. Teachers can serve as powerful exemplars for their students (Biondi, 2008). Through their lectures teachers demonstrate how to think through and critique an argument and thus they address the four skills-based learning objectives (recognizing the ethical situation, using reasoning to understand it, articulating the conflict, and making sound decisions). Teachers of ethics can debate their role in advocating a decision in ethical analysis. One recommended stance is that of critical neutrality where "it is permissible for instructors to indicate why they reject the alternatives and to present a reasoned case for their own view. What is impermissible is to load the
dice so that controversial material is presented as if it were unchallenged wisdom" (Simon, 1994, p. 27).

As well as providing an exemplar for ethical argumentation, the knowledge and enthusiasm that teachers convey through lectures provides an important element in conveying a passionate view of professional identity. Ozar (2001) mentioned the role of college faculty and staff in embodying the moral principles in their life and work as an influence outside of the ethics curriculum. This role supports the learning objective of forming professional identity.

Lectures for a course may be conducted by one teacher or by many. Teachers reported inviting guest lecturers, either colleagues from within the department to discuss ethical issues in their specialty areas or teachers from allied fields to expand students’ awareness of ethical issues in other disciplines (DI, Law 1, LIS 3, LIS6). An interesting format is a course cooperatively developed and taught by a variety of faculty members. Each meeting of the class has a unique topic and the lecture is given by a different teacher who has expertise in that topic (Medicine 2).

**Discussion, Presentations and Writing Assignments**

Active student participation in discussion has been reported as a common occurrence in professional ethics classes (Hastings Center, 1980). Teachers employ several strategies to encourage this widespread discussion. The preeminent method for inciting discussion is to employ case studies. Other
methods include small group discussions and student-led discussions or presentations that are often related to writing assignments.

Discussions Related to Case Studies

The major strategy to encourage participation is the use of the case study (Bowie, 2006; Hastings Center, 1980; Leever, 2001). The case studies are generally based on historical situations and are written to present conflicting values, often in great detail (Good, 1973). The classic Hastings Center (1980) research states that case studies are most effective “when they can readily be used to draw out broader ethical principles and moral rules” (p. 69).

Case studies – how teachers use them

Teachers described creating a consistency in using various cases over the different meetings of a course: They reflected on previous cases to give students a feeling of connection between cases (DI). Teachers vary in their use of the amount of class time spent on one case study: Some use extended case studies which may last a whole class (business 1), others use several shorter cases in a class (Engineering 2). Some instructors prefer to use examples of situations, rather than extended case studies (DI). To expand students’ involvement in the cases, some teachers require or request that students bring in case studies from the popular press or from a previous work situation to each class (LIS 1, 3, 6). Some teachers reported that they often begin classes with an example that a student has provided (DI). Syllabi for ethics courses showed class meetings
beginning with a pre-formulated case study that was read prior to class. The strategy insures beginning each class with an active discussion (Business 3).

**Case studies and learning strategy**

Widespread employment of case studies insures an active learning strategy for the teaching of ethics. This vigorous approach begins each course with the major issues in the field. These issues are those that dominate the professional literature and newspaper headlines. The teaching of these topics covers the history of the issue in the field and its legal and policy dimensions, and the discussion revolves around case studies. Another approach is to discuss theories of ethical decision making, in light of this particular field’s history and values (Fry & Johnstone, 2002). In this model, lectures during the first meetings of the course revolve around ethical theories and/or decision making models (Herkert, 2002, Fallis, 2007). The Hastings Center (1980) reported that those teaching ethics in higher education, and especially those in professional programs, are divided in the opinion of whether it is better to begin the courses by covering ethical theory, decision making systems, and values clarification or to begin the first meeting of the course with a case study and launch immediately into other issues of the field. In the sample of syllabi examined here, the overwhelming majority of courses begin with emphasis on the case studies and ethical issues. One course spends the first seven classes discussing ethical theories, while at the same time, incorporating case studies relevant to the field into the more theoretical discussion (LIS 7).
Media as adjunct to case studies

One aid for enhancing the case study is to incorporate films into the description of the case. The depiction of characters and their circumstances draws the interest of the students and makes the specific ethical issues vivid. In one ethical course that uses extended case studies often, each case is introduced with a film (Business 2).

Disadvantages of case studies

The Hastings Center (1980) identified two major shortcomings of the case study method. First, the students often want to pursue more facts (than those given in the written cases) in the belief that more facts might help to resolve the case. The teacher’s responsibility is to make the students understand that complex decisions at work must sometimes be made without all the facts. The second drawback is that, because the exercise was a fictional case rather than real life, students often avoid attempting a resolution. To resolve this reluctance, the Hastings Center report recommended having small groups struggle with the problem and requiring them to present their solution to the class.

Small Group Discussions

To encourage student engagement, some teachers divide the class into small groups which discuss a variety of scenarios or cases (Business 1, Engineering 2, Law 3, LIS 2-7, Medical 1). This, as described above in case

---

10 One business syllabus which assigned a major write-up on alternatives for detailed cases warned the students that in preparing their response they were not allowed to contact the company featured in the case study (Business 3)
studies, employs peer pressure to invite students to advocate a solution. Teachers in initial classes have students working in small groups to discuss their own values, mentors, and any personal beliefs that might hinder their professional development (Medical 1). Another discussion-enhancing strategy is to divide students into groups which debate different positions in a moral situation (LIS 7, law 3).  

*Student-led Discussions and Presentations*

Assigning to students responsibility for leading the class is another method to engage students in the course material. Syllabi included student-led discussions and presentations by a single student or by a group of students. Several syllabi reflected class meetings devoted to discussions or presentations chosen and presented by students on specific moral issues of relevance to the profession (LIS 3-4, LIS 7-8, Engineering 1). Students’ discussion responsibilities ranged from actually leading the discussion (LIS 4) to being designated experts or active contributors to support the discussion as led by the teacher (Law 2).

Short presentations, especially in introductory ethics courses, consist of brief biographies on pioneers who established the current ethical principles.

---

11 In a law course students were divided into firms of 10 students each and they were assigned to present 7 minute point/counterpoint presentations, reserving time for rebuttal, if so desired (Law 3).
12 The syllabus for one LIS course was a hybrid course (taught online with some face-to-face segments), specifying that each student was required to lead one online and one face-to-face discussion.
13 One law course uses clickers to facilitate class discussion on questions which address the rules/laws and have a right or wrong answer (Law 1).
important in the profession (LIS 6). These historical portraits play an important role in building students’ affiliation with the professional field. The historical perspective is designed to convey a sense of continuity to the professional-in-training (DI).

Presentations are often major in scope and are concerned with one significant ethical problem. In one class, when one student presents on one significant ethical problem, the other students are required to prepare questions from the readings (Law 2). Several syllabi provided a list of various appropriate topics for presentation. One course included a theme for the major focus of ethical investigations: examine ethical problems specific to the professional field which are related to Hurricane Katrina (Engineering 2).

**Writing Assignments**

The presentations are often reports of major research papers and many syllabi provided a list of appropriate topics (Engineering 2, LIS 2-4, LIS 6-8). Requirements for papers in one class included presenting both sides of a dilemma and using a decision-making model to suggest an ethically defensible alternative (LIS 6).

Another important concept in writing was the precision of language. The grading rubric on one syllabus (LIS 6) stressed the importance of the precise use of words. One author (Leever, 2001) forbade students to write or speak with overused ethical words and phrases, such as confidentiality or informed consent.
In their presentations students were to provide thorough explanations of the general ethical values, rather than using ethical catch phrases\textsuperscript{14} (Leever, 2001).

Beyond major research papers which resulted in oral presentations, there were other written assignments which were not presented in class. Students’ own writings play an important role in building their affiliation with the professional field. One technique, reflected in the syllabi, is to have students write personal ethical statements where they discuss beliefs, values, and ethics that will govern their practice (Engineering 1, Law 3, LIS 6). Another introspective technique used by one teacher is to require each student to produce a reflective journal that is sent to the teacher each week of the class (LIS 3).\textsuperscript{15} Often these journals help teachers to pinpoint and address the assumptions and bias of which students may be unaware. One final reasoning and writing technique that one teacher used to help students clarify their identities was to have each student describe an unresolved personal or professional problem which had an ethical dimension. Later in the course, the student applied the decision–making model covered in class to the problem and explored alternative resolutions of the problem in a written report (LIS6). Together these various techniques reported in the syllabi all serve to nurture the student’s professional identity.

\textsuperscript{14} For example, instead of using the words, “maintain confidentiality”, LIS students were encouraged to state that the professional must have safeguarded library users’ information requests, so that the user felt comfortable trusting the library staff in the future with other requests.

\textsuperscript{15} One teacher of an LIS ethics course stressed that some students have very private and personal reactions to the ethical issues and that this journal assignment was more appropriate for private communication, rather than for an online posting (DI). In contrast to this LIS perspective, the law ethics teacher selected the best of the reflective statements and asked those students to present the statement to the class (Law1).
Teachers often employ the strategy of having students write papers critiquing one code of ethics or comparing different codes of ethics (Engineering 1, LIS 3, LIS 8). Teachers find that comparing fields and codes gives students a good perspective on the codes in their field. One course begins with general codes such as the *U.N. Declaration of Human Rights* and moves to contrast these general codes with institution-specific codes. Further, the course contrasts the codes from different fields and asks questions, such as, who are the stakeholders in the codes and what did the codes demonstrate about an organization or field? (LIS 6) Students in some fields are expected to create their own codes of ethics; sometimes these involve web-based codes of ethics with links to specific cases, definitions and additional resources (Engineering 2, DI).

Their own writings also help students to understand important issues in the field and to articulate an ethical conflict and its solution. Writing about an issue helps the student understand that topic and also clarifies his or her thinking in preparation for a written and verbal articulation of a relevant argument (Cholbi, 2007).

All of these primarily classroom-based teaching techniques, including lecture, discussion of case studies, small group discussions, and student-led discussions, presentations and writings are widely used by those teaching professional ethics. By including these techniques in their syllabi, these teachers imply their belief that these teaching methods provide students with a foundation for understanding ethics.
Teaching Methods Employed in Experiential Learning

Some teaching techniques go beyond customary academic, classroom-based teaching to provide experiential, simulation or project-based approaches to the teaching of ethics. Experiential learning provides learners with a concrete, direct, and meaningful experience which often relates to the student on a personal level (Beard & Wilson, 2006; Silberman, 2007). The types of experiential teaching techniques employed in professional ethics courses include field experiences and simulation strategies.

Fieldwork

Perhaps the most direct experiential teaching technique is to involve students in ethics classes in fieldwork. One teacher of ethics described connecting professional responsibility with experience in the field. These externships help students to understand the importance of specific principles in concrete, real-life situations (Rhode, 2007). Students’ experiences in the field range from short- to long-term. One type of brief intervention is short interviews with a client or patient to understand his or her perspective (Engineering 1, Medical 1). One class requires that each student interview a professional in their field; during the interview students describe an ethical case study and ask the professional to describe resources in the workplace that ameliorate the problem (Engineering 1). More long-term interactions result from internships/externships in the professional field. Often these internships run parallel with a course in which class members work in diverse groups to brainstorm and debrief about
ethical issues that arise in the work setting, and students and teachers propose possible solutions (LIS 8, Engineering 2, Law 3). The ethically-intense fieldwork in a clinical situation often requires an individual or small group approach (Calman & Downie, 1987). As the students recount difficult situations, the instructor weaves in ethical questions using a teaching method that resembles a manner of coaching (Shaw, 2009). An important feature of service learning is to allocate structured time for students to reflect on the ethical components of the service experience. Having fieldwork as part of or in conjunction with a professional ethics course helps the students to pinpoint the ethical issues and to empathize with the situation of the patient/client (Silberman, 2007).

Simulation

When experiences in the field are not possible, then they may be simulated. Many of the professional ethics courses require students to role-play: the students act out roles to simulate an encounter with a client or patient (Business 1, Law 2, LIS 6). In another type of simulation, a demonstration by a master clinician details strategies for raising ethical issues within the patient encounter (Medical 2). One course uses literature to increase students’ sensitivity to the position of the patient/client. This course requires that students critique a play or a novel that raises ethical issues for the profession (Business 3). By including these experiential techniques of working in the field and of simulating experiences with clients/patients, teachers imply their belief that these strategies sharpen students’ understanding of ethical situations.
Teachers of ethics courses in professional graduate programs expose their students to many teaching techniques including lectures, small group discussions, student-led discussions and presentations, and written assignments. All of these methods are often supplemented by examinations of case studies. The professional ethics teachers also employ experiential teaching techniques including: field-work assignments which are organized to pinpoint ethical issues occurring in the workplace and simulations of professional interactions. By their assignments of these teaching techniques in a stand-alone course devoted to professional ethics, teachers have indicated their belief that these techniques further the students’ understanding of ethics in the profession.

Learning Resources in Professional Ethics Courses

This section of the taxonomy discusses resources in general terms. The materials were divided into two categories: materials that support the examination of theoretical and methodological approaches to ethics and resources focused on the applied ethics literature that examine ethics in the workplace.

Materials Addressing Ethical Theory and Methods of Decision Making

In the various fields of professional ethics teachers debate the necessity of incorporating traditional ethical theories into their courses (Bowie, 2006; Herkert, 2002). One textbook author spoke of “the death marches through moral philosophy—the functional equivalent of Cliff’s Notes on Kant” (Rhode, 2007), while another prolific author defended the importance of ethical theories as a tool to help the professional to analyze cases (Fallis, 2007). One topic related to
ethical theory that several of the professional ethics courses addressed is that of cultural relativism (Engineering 1, LIS 6, LIS 7). Most teachers include the topic to help students dispel the notion that customs are all that exist and to question the belief that there is no universal right or wrong (Rachels, 2003). The range of teaching practices for ethical theory in the syllabi surveyed show dramatic differences: one course spent the first seven meetings covering the ethical theories, using Rachels (2003), an accessible book of practical, ethical theory, and sprinkling in a few articles related to the field of study (LIS 7); another syllabus included no mention of ethical theory or decision making and assigned for every meeting of the class 1-2 case studies (Business 2). In between these two extremes were the majority of syllabi that include brief coverage of theory and major emphasis on cases. Several books, journal articles, and websites concerning ethical theories are listed in syllabi. Almost all courses have selected articles assigned for reading. For many courses the articles assigned are listed on an internal website, such as Blackboard, which was not available for inspection. For this reason, no articles are included in the syllabus. The materials mentioned most frequently include the Dali Lama (1999); Rachels (2003), and various readings from Gilligan, Kant, MacIntyre, Hume, and Mill.

Several courses which do not include ethical theory include in-class training on the use of decision-making models. The models most often resemble a multi-step method of decision-making including: “1) purpose (considering an individual’s rights and needs as well as those of others); 2) key ethical
question(s); 3) information needed to answer the question(s); 4) concepts and principles to guide thinking; 5) main assumptions used; 6) points of view of all stakeholders; 7) main inferences/conclusions (what are the alternatives, are all being considered, etc.); and 8) implications (for self and others, including consequences, questions of harm/good, etc.)” (Carbo, 2004, p.7) Two examples include these tools: Paul & Elder (2006) and Straker (2008).

Most of the syllabi examined from stand-alone courses in professional ethics include very few instances of extensive coverage of ethical theories. Their emphasis seems to be on the applied approach to teaching ethics.

**Resources That Support the Applied Examination of Ethics**

Most fields have several standard textbooks which serve to provide a summary of the field. The books represent original writings by authors or provide an edited anthology of articles by invited authors. The anthologies typically include a first chapter which briefly describes ethical theories or principles; the remainder of the book is generally devoted to specific ethical issues and often includes examples of specific cases to illustrate the ethical dilemma. Through the character of selected readings the anthologies are designed to help students to understand the range of issues by providing differing points of view on the most important issues.\(^{16}\) The syllabi for courses reflect the use of

\(^{16}\) One example of an anthology providing differing points of view on a topic is the textbook, *Contemporary Issues in Bioethics* (2008). For example, in a subchapter on ethical issues in animal research the author presents four articles which provided both sides of the issue, plus one article advocating a middle ground.
many different textbooks. Included here is a representative collection of one textbook from each specialty: From business, Beauchamp, Bowie, & Arnold (2009); From engineering, Harris, Pritchard, & Rabins (2008); From law, Rhode, & Luban (2009); From library & information science (LIS), Hauptman (2002); and From medicine, Beauchamp, & Childress (2009).

Codes of Ethics serve as a valued teaching resource for the applied examination of ethics in the professions. These codes, which are developed by committees within professional organizations, embody two kinds of functions. In the first instance, as suggested by Michael Davis (2000) the codes express agreement among professionals of the standards of professional work in the particular field. Practitioners can use their codes to clarify reasonable professional job expectations to employers. Another function of codes of ethics is to educate the general public. The codes define what it means to be a professional and what kind of goods are provided by this profession. Codes in this sense provide a summary of the role of this profession in society.

Codes of ethics are located in several types of publications. Codes appear in some textbooks and are generally published individually, but searching the internet for websites of specific organizations usually provides the most recent version of a code. One comprehensive collection on the internet is the Codes of Ethics Online which published by the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology (2008). For many teachers it is

---

17 Many thanks to Randall Curren for pointing out this distinction.
important to have access to a wide variety of codes. Teachers like to contrast the
codes from different fields (DI). One teacher begins the course by introducing the
*U.N. Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948).* This historic and more
general code serves to contrast with profession-specific codes.

Although codes of ethics appear in some textbooks and are generally
published individually, searching the internet for websites of specific
organizations usually provides the most recent version of a code. One
comprehensive collection on the internet is the *Codes of Ethics Online* which was
published by the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois
Institute of Technology (2008). For many teachers it is important to have access
to a wide variety of codes. Teachers like to contrast the codes from different fields
(DI). One teacher begins the course by introducing the *U.N. Universal
Declaration on Human Rights (1948).* This historic and more general code serves
to contrast with profession-specific codes.

Multimedia resources and websites also support the teaching of ethics.
Films and other media are assigned. Courses use videos of recent films and
documentaries to accentuate the messages of case studies. Films are reported to
evoke emotions and involve students in the ethical case. But some teachers have
minimized their use of films because they found that for some students the
emotional response interferes with the objective analysis of the case (Hastings,

---

18 For example, business courses used *Wall Street,* engineering courses used *The Truesteel Affair,*
law courses used *To Kill a Mockingbird,* LIS used *Storm Center,* and medicine used *The Elephant
Man.*
1980). Courses also recommend key websites for the field. One overview of online resources in engineering and science is a document produced by the Library at Illinois Institute of Technology (Laas, 2008). Another source of bibliographic citations to bioethics literature is Georgetown’s National Reference Center for Bioethics Literature (NRCBL, 2009). A final website used in LIS is the International Center for Information Ethics (ICIE, 2009).

The above section of the taxonomy examines the learning resources included in course syllabi for the teaching of professional ethics. The most common materials assigned in courses are those which contribute to an applied orientation of the course, rather than to a theoretical orientation. The materials include textbooks, codes of ethics, websites and media. These materials, in combination with teaching techniques, serve to transmit the learning objectives for the teaching of professional ethics.

**Evaluation of the Teaching of Ethics**

Previous sections of the taxonomy covered the learning objectives which define what students were expected to learn in courses and the teaching techniques and learning resources which worked together to convey these learning objectives to students. Evaluation is the final piece of the taxonomy puzzle. Evaluation of students’ performance displays the results of the teaching – evaluation reveals whether teachers have been successful in engaging students in productive learning. Evaluation of the teaching of ethics involves determining how well students mastered course material and how well students demonstrated...
specific skills and dispositions that the course/program has helped them to acquire and refine. Evaluation concerns one particular course or a series of courses that form an educational degree program: often this second kind of evaluation has been called outcomes assessment. This evaluation can be performed by teachers, peer students, or by the student him/her self.

For this taxonomy the discussion of evaluation centers around course and program measurements. The taxonomy describes and evaluates measurements specific to ethics education in two areas. The first area, of “traditional” evaluation, is that of teachers evaluating (grading) the work of students -- both in the individual course and program-wide. The second type of evaluation techniques are those especially appropriate for measuring ethics learning. My last component of the taxonomy proposes a relationship between these modes of evaluation and the learning objectives for the teaching of professional ethics. Some types of evaluation have proved more appropriate for measuring the accomplishment of specific learning objectives. The narrative below explores the advantages and disadvantages of the various modes of evaluation and recommends a combination of strategies.

*Traditional Evaluation in Individual Classes and Program-Wide*

This section describes teachers’ evaluation of students’ progress in specific classes and how schools judge the progress of students program-wide.

The standard method for educational evaluation of a specific course includes teachers’ formal evaluation and grading of students’ work. Teachers
determine the ethical content that students have mastered and the ethical skills that students have demonstrated by grading their papers, tests and presentations and by monitoring their class participation. The Hasting Center recommended that “the ordinary means of evaluating the progress made by students in courses of ethics…[should be] those traditional to the humanities: an assessment on the part of teachers about whether their students understand key concepts, are able to fashion coherent moral arguments both orally and in writing and can display an ability sensitively to recognize moral problems” (Callahan & Bok, 1980, p.301).

The teacher assesses a particular student’s competence in ethics by observing the student in classroom discussion and reading the student’s writings (Hastings, 1980). These recommendations give priority to the role of teachers’ assessment of students’ performance. Often teachers of ethics use case-based discussions and written assignments to assess students’ reasoning skills and assign grades (Ozar, 2001). These skills are evaluated in terms of competencies. As an example of a competency-based objective within a stand-alone ethics course, one course objective stated that the student would “demonstrate the ability to recognize and analyze ethical issues and dilemmas…and propose reasoned courses of action” (DI).

Many schools, especially those which train professionals, have expanded the unit of measure. The result has been a broad view which looks at student learning and connects this with the evaluation of students’ abilities in the overall program of study (APA, 2008; Ozar, 2001). When a particular professional
program identifies ethics as a curriculum-wide competency or educational objective, then the program is required to evaluate ethics throughout the entire course of study to determine if the objective has been achieved (e.g., an LIS specific example, “A graduate of ______ understands the role of library and information professionals and associations in the promotion of intellectual property, democratic principles, intellectual freedom and diversity of thought” (LIS 5).

The above statement describes the understanding that the graduates will have obtained from the program and lists four key values which LIS professionals, including graduates from this program, will support. To demonstrate that the outcome has been achieved, that graduates understand their professional role and the specific values listed, the school examines students’ work. To examine work for students curriculum-wide, schools use two strategies – comprehensive exams and student portfolios. Teachers report that comprehensive exams often include a question which tests students’ ability to recognize moral issues, to demonstrate familiarity with the codes of ethics, or to articulate ethical arguments (DI). The student portfolio includes a collection of a particular student’s work from various courses. The work collected in the portfolio reflects the curriculum-wide educational objective that the program had
selected to evaluate. This required evaluation is termed, embedded evaluation, since the curricular objectives for the program include the specific competencies or dispositions which must be evaluated. Having an embedded ethical outcome means that teachers have to cover ethical components and assign writings which can demonstrate awareness of ethics and ethics learning. The assignments are archived in a portfolio, including writings, websites, blogs and other materials that the student has developed to support the curriculum-wide goal of ethics (Klenowski, Askew & Carrell, 2006).

The evaluation of students, both in specific courses and in program-wide evaluations provides a traditional evaluation of the competency of students. Their competency is measured at the end of the course against the learning objectives of the course. Then, by the end of students’ graduate programs, their overall ethics competency is measured against the program-wide curricular objectives.

These traditional, teacher-mediated evaluations, including grading tests and papers and monitoring discussions and presentations, provide measures of achievement in most of the learning objectives for the teaching of professional ethics. The three learning objectives for which the traditional methods of evaluation are not generally appropriate are “clarifying the relationship between client and professional,” “achieving cultural competency,” “forming professional identity.”

19 Several teachers and administrators in LIS referred to the “embedded evaluations.” They asserted that these program-wide curricular objectives motivated faculty to include ethical writing assignments in their courses (DI ).
Evaluation Techniques Appropriate for Measuring Ethics Learning

The above section focused on a teacher-oriented evaluation of ethics in a particular course or for a student’s entire program of professional study. This perspective can be enhanced by examining additional evaluation techniques that are designed to measure ethics-specific activities or those that seem particularly suited to evaluating ethics learning. These techniques include two specifically designed for the evaluation of ethics, testing knowledge of a professional code and testing moral judgment through the Defining Issues Test (DIT). The creators of these systems consider them to be a more objective measure than that provided through the faculty grading of students or through the program-wide evaluation of competencies. Further, this section describes three other techniques that are especially appropriate for ethical skill evaluation including peer evaluation, self evaluation and students’ reflection on field work. All of these strategies add new considerations to the evaluation of students’ learning in ethics.

Testing Knowledge of Professional Codes

One strategy which aims at objectivity is testing students’ factual knowledge of a professional code. Students are given hypothetical cases and are tested on how closely their responses adhere to the standards described in the codes. Many teachers of ethics recognize that the codes are not perfect documents to be applied in all situations: Often these teachers require that their

---

20 This practice of testing against standards is most notably used in law and dentistry (Rhode & Luban, 2009).
students compare several codes and determine their most valuable components (Buchanan, 2004, Carbo, 2001). To many teachers the strict application of a specific code is antithetical to the measured judgment that is part of ethics training.

*Defining Issues Test*

Another ethics-specific mechanism was created by James Rest (1982) and is called the Defining Issues Test (DIT). This instrument was adapted from Kohlberg’s scheme of moral development (1981) and is considered to test a person’s moral judgment. Those taking the test are presented with several cases and are graded on the answer that they select. Philosophers have often questioned the value of Kohlberg’s work, and critics have suggested that the DIT has serious conceptual problems, especially in defining the “best” answer (Camenisch, 2001). Further, others have criticized the DIT, since a score on the DIT does not relate to mastery of the material in the class. The DIT provides one measure of ethical judgment, but it does not assess a student’s ethical knowledge or his or her ability to recognize moral problems: both of these skills are important components of an ethics education (Callahan & Bok, 1980; Davis, 2005). The two methods, testing students’ ethical judgment using the DIT and testing students’ ability to apply the tenets of a professional code, have conceptual problems which limit their usefulness in measuring educational outcomes, but they continue to be used as one measure of ethical skills.
**Peer Review and Self-Evaluation**

Beyond the ethics-specific evaluative measures just discussed, courses include the very relevant evaluation measures of peer review and self-evaluation. Two examples of students grading other students in the class include: the grading of other students’ presentations and the evaluation of students’ contributions to the classroom. In the first example, teachers divide students into presentation groups; each member of the group reacts to and evaluates the others’ presentations (DI). In the second example, teachers establish working groups which maintain the same membership throughout the course to develop and discuss class papers or projects. The members of the working group are asked to evaluate each other in terms of class participation, group participation, and overall importance of their contribution to the class (Law 3).²¹

Another evaluation strategy is that of self evaluation. Students’ self evaluations provided a unique type of evaluation. Some of the learning outcomes in ethics education are difficult to measure, for example, the attitudinal change required in cultural competence. The American Philosophical Association (APA, 2008) suggested that self-assessment, when combined with evidence from writings and examinations, can enhance the evaluation of attitudinal and dispositional learning.²²

---

²¹ This law course designated each group as a firm. Since 25% of students’ grades depended on class participation and since most work in the class was performed in the firms, the peer evaluation had an important impact on students’ ranking in the class (Law 3).

²² One medical course included each student meeting with the faculty member and having a self assessment interview (Medical 1).
Evaluation of Reflective Activity

The beginnings of attitudinal change, as suggested above, require reflection on the part of the student. One teacher includes as a learning objective that students should be “engaged in reflective thinking” (LIS-6). The measurement of this reflective activity and subsequent action has challenged and continues to challenge many teachers. Detecting an attitudinal or dispositional change is not included in measuring competencies or skills. The evidence, from literature, syllabi and interviews, indicates that teachers include components in their courses intended to stimulate this reflective activity. These components include service learning and reflective writing assignments.

Several professional programs use service-learning to make reflection on ethical issues immediately relevant to students by integrating practical or on-the-job review of ethical experience into graduate training (Engineering 2, Law 3, LIS 7, Medicine 2). Service-learning “combines service tasks with structured opportunities that link the task to self-reflection, self-discovery and the acquisition and comprehension of values, skills and knowledge content” (NSLC, 2005). Several ethics courses in the professions have segments which require students to work in community service agencies. The experience of service learning results in students relating to the community in a different way (Silberman, 2007). These courses incorporate the structured time required for students to reflect on the service through a combination of writing, reading, and speaking in small and large groups (Cooper, n.d.). Combining actual job
experience with guidance from teachers and classmates creates a realistic, but supportive, environment in which the student observes, reflects on and employs ethical skills. (LIS 8). This combination of classes teaching ethical concepts within a work environment is viewed by some researchers to have an impact on students’ ethical decision-making abilities (Hoyt, 2008).

In courses without service learning, several teachers incorporate writing assignments which reflect on ethical issues. In two classes, students are asked to reflect on their experience from a previous internship or field placement in the writing of a paper (Law 3, LIS 6). One other very specific measure, which evaluates students’ reflection across the curriculum, is to assign a repeated writing assignment. For example, students write a philosophical statement when they enter the professional program and revise it in a capstone course just before graduation. To demonstrate students’ reflective activity and growth in identity formation, teachers compare the two statements (DI). While not all of the above instances of stimulating reflective activity are strictly evaluative measures, this struggle towards evaluation is important since several teachers design assignments specifically with the goal of stimulating reflective activity. The above descriptions provide a direction for the evaluation of these attitudinal and dispositional learning experiences.

This section of the taxonomy has described different evaluation strategies which reveal whether students have been successful in achieving course objectives. The taxonomy describes measurements specific to ethics education in
the following areas. The first area, of traditionally-oriented evaluation, is that of teachers evaluating the work of students -- both in the individual course through grades and program-wide through comprehensive exams and student portfolios. The second type of evaluation techniques are those especially appropriate for measuring specific ethical competencies including applying codes of ethics, evaluating ethical judgment through the DIT, peer evaluation, self evaluation and evaluation of reflective activities.

*Relationship of Learning Objectives to Evaluation Techniques*

A useful way to conclude the evaluation section of this chapter is to propose a relationship between particular modes of evaluation and the learning objectives for the teaching of professional ethics. Some types of evaluation are more appropriate for measuring the accomplishment of specific learning objectives. This proposed application of the evaluation strategies to the learning objectives recommends a combination of strategies in the evaluation of ethical attitudes, knowledge and skills.

*Evaluating Acquisition of Knowledge and Shaping of Perceptions*

The first learning objectives included in the Taxonomy are the four objectives which address knowledge and the shaping of perceptions. These objectives include: enhancing knowledge of codes of ethics, understanding the most important ethical issues in the field, clarifying the relationship between professional and client/patient, and achieving cultural competency by
developing empathy for clients/patients. There are various options for choosing an evaluative system for measuring achievement of these objectives.

For the first two objectives, which center around the acquisition and understanding of specific facts and concepts, the teacher-oriented evaluation of students’ retention and understanding of this more factual information is best conducted by the traditional evaluations of grading tests, papers and presentations (Callahan & Bok, 1980). For testing of retention, teachers can also administer tests on application of the codes of ethics and standards (Rhode, 2007).

The other two objectives in this group of learning objectives -- clarifying the relationship between professional and client/patient and achieving cultural competency by developing empathy for clients/patients, and recognizing -- could derive benefit from using teacher graded assignments, especially the grading of oral presentations and small group sessions which can result in meaningful dialog. Teachers observing the discussion can grade the presenter on whether their response indicates that they are able to articulate the professional/client relationship or to show empathy for clients. In some situations (especially in online training) the teacher may not be able to observe the small group sessions. In these cases, peer grading may be appropriate for this group discussion portion of the class (Law 3, DI). Evaluation of these learning objectives can also benefit from another method of measurement. Clarification of the professional/client relationship and achievement of cultural
competency in some cases may require recognition of attitudinal qualities. This awareness of attitudes may be best evaluated by self-evaluation, with or without the teacher present as part of the experience (APA, 2008; Med 1).

_Evaluating Students’ Ethical Reasoning Skills_

The second set of objectives describe ethical reasoning skills, including recognizing and anticipating ethical circumstances, using perception and reasoning to evaluate the ethical situation, articulating defensible positions, and making a good decision. Students’ ability to perform these four reasoning skills is dependent on the knowledge that students have gained from fulfilling the first group of objectives. Attention to many of the evaluation modalities is crucial for successfully learning and using these skills. Through the traditional evaluation process of grading papers and presentations students demonstrate that they have learned the skills and are able to apply them to a theoretical case. Students’ ability to identify problems (ethical circumstances), evaluate the situation, articulate defensible positions, and most of all, to make good decisions, in a real world setting can at least be partially approached in a service learning setting or in a course which actively incorporates the problems students have encountered in previous employment in the field. When the ethics course incorporates the structured time required for students to reflect on the service activities through a combination of writing, reading, and speaking in small and large groups, then the students can begin to deal with a real ethical situation where the decision is pressing and crucial. In situations where the class cannot
incorporate service learning or students’ work experiences are not available, then perhaps the best option for judging students’ skill at the ethical reasoning process is to use the comprehensive exam, when one is required.\textsuperscript{23} This exam, which is given at the end of the program and covers all of the core courses, can include an ethical reasoning question that requires the student to clarify the situation, articulate positions of the major players and recommend a defensible alternative for solving, or at least ameliorating the problem. When a graduate program does not require a comprehensive exam, then mandating a graded portfolio which includes ethics-relevant writings, blogs and presentations is an option (DI). Further strategies can be employed including peer review, self evaluation, and administering the DIT.

\textit{Evaluating the Formation of Professional Identity}

The final objective is forming professional identity. For successful achievement of this objective, students must have mastered the knowledge, perception and skills covered in the previously discussed learning objectives. Knowledge of the professional role, its values, and the most crucial issues in the field all undergird students’ formation of professional identity. An in-depth understanding of the relationship of professionals to clients, especially understanding which is enhanced by cultural competence, is a crucial ingredient for identity formation. Further, the ability to recognize ethical situations and

\textsuperscript{23} In the field of LIS, the ALA Committee on Accreditation in the past has looked for ethical questions on the comprehensive examination as evidence that the program has prepared students to use ethical reasoning (Wildemuth, June 30, 2009).
navigate through the ethical reasoning process are important components to professional identity. As described above, all of the prerequisite objectives can be evaluated within the school environment. However, the motivation, conviction and predictable action that accompanies the forming of professional identity cannot be effectively evaluated during the period of graduate training. Professional identity can be most effectively evaluated when the student becomes a professional working in the field.

This summary of evaluation strategies provides a conclusion to the Taxonomy of the Teaching of Professional Ethics. The taxonomy was developed through an iterative process of moving from the literature to course syllabi and supplementing these with insights from the dissertation findings. The taxonomy provides a structure for viewing the most important educational components of the teaching of ethics. This begins with learning objectives, continues with teaching techniques and learning resources which convey the learning objectives, and ends with evaluation of achievement for these same learning objectives.
Chapter 5: Research Findings

My findings represent an attempt to answer the two specific research questions and their resulting sub-questions. The first question is:

How do teachers and administrators describe institution-wide ethics efforts? The resulting sub-questions include:

- What is their perception of the role of ethics in LIS education?
- What institution-wide challenges have they encountered while integrating ethics?
- What are their perceptions of students’ challenges with ethics?
- What steps have their institutions undertaken in an effort to provide every student with significant grounding in ethics?

The second research question is:

How do teachers integrate ethics into their courses? The resulting sub-questions include:

- What courses are most important for ethics integration?
- What are the most prevalent and important components across courses?
- What challenges are faced by teachers attempting to integrate?
- What opportunities have been missed in relation to ethics pedagogy?

To address these questions, I interviewed fifteen master teachers in Library and Information Science (LIS) and convened a focus group of seven LIS administrators.

Teachers and administrators addressed the first research question that is focused on institution-wide trends, by detailing their feelings about the role of
ethics in LIS education: They understand the importance of ethics in the LIS curricula and have passionate feelings about the role of ethics in their teaching. Their positive reactions to the role of ethics may have made them more cognizant of the challenges that the promotion of ethics brought to their institutions: challenges resulting from limited resources and restrictions on the curriculum, and challenges which the teachers and administrators perceived were felt by LIS students. Despite their expressed concerns about these recurring challenges, those who participated in interviews and the focus group provided descriptions of specific steps that their institutions had undertaken to provide every student with significant grounding in ethics. Three key findings resulted from this first section: that teachers and administrators recognized the importance of their teaching of ethics; that they identified two types of challenges which result from the promotion of ethics – those that exist across LIS schools and those that their students experience; and thirdly, that schools have devised processes to initiate, implement, and evaluate the integration of ethics on a school-wide basis.

To answer the second research question, teachers described the integration of ethics into specific courses. The section begins with the study participants’ identification of the core, required courses as most important for the integration of ethics. My analysis of these courses isolated the most prevalent components, including learning objectives, teaching techniques, learning resources, and evaluation. Further, in this second section, I return to the challenges resulting from the promotion of ethics, but this time, the problems are not those of the LIS
school or of its students, but of teachers attempting to understand and effectively integrate ethics into their courses. Finally, this course-specific section ends with what teachers and administrators have identified as a missed opportunity, the re-conceptualization of the teaching of ethics as a set of skills. Seven key findings emerged from this second section: that teachers indicated the importance and prevalence of integrating ethics into core courses in LIS curricula; that almost half of the core courses had learning objectives that specified ethics-specific knowledge or behaviors; that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses; that teachers recognized the concept of community as central to the integration of ethics; that the codes of ethics were the most consistently used learning resource in courses that integrated ethics; that teachers experienced challenges in the integration of ethics; and, finally, that teachers and administrators identified a missed opportunity, conceiving of training in ethical analysis as the teaching of skills.

**Institution-Wide Issues**

*Understanding the Importance of Ethics*

The first theme emerging from the data was related to the teachers’ and administrators’ perceptions of the importance of ethics for their students and for themselves as teachers. All teachers and administrators strongly endorsed the importance of ethics. One dimension of this theme was the connection of ethics to professionalism and diversity. Teachers, in particular, shared their feelings
about the role of ethics in their teaching and connected their understanding of ethics to the concepts of professionalism and diversity. Teacher interviewees and administrative focus group participants were agreed on their priorities of training students to be decisive professionals well grounded in ethics. They proposed that ethics was a crucial part of being a professional. They defined ethical responsibilities and explained that ethics had a close connection to diversity. And finally, teachers expressed strong feelings about the role that ethics plays in their teaching.

A majority of teachers and administrators spoke of ethics as a key to librarians’ professional identity; concern for the ethical obligations of the profession differentiated the librarian’s behavior from those who did not regard their work as a profession. The one teacher quoted below clearly tied ethics to the profession:

“Part of my approach to ethics is that it is a central element of professional identity and that what ethics serves to do is to define what a profession stands for… So it’s not really just a job, it really is more than just a job, and the ethical component I think is what makes it a profession…” ((12, 92-97, 105-107).24

A second teacher described the responsibility that librarians had as professionals to address and resolve difficult situations:

“The difference between the licensed clerk, the LTA, and the information professional is [that] you’re the one that makes the tough decisions” (112, 106-110).

---

24 All direct quotes in Findings Chapter were cited by indicating the interview number or focus group and the line numbers of the quotes in the transcripts.
Administrators’ agreed with the teachers’ view of the importance of professionalism and its role in helping librarians to confront hard decisions. A specific response was representative of the dialog within the focus group:

“teaching…what is a profession, what’s the difference between a profession and a job and the idea… that you go to the mat for your profession, you don’t go to the mat for a job” (FG, 645-648).

To confront these decisions, or “go to the mat,” the respondents reported that librarians’ education must address their ethical obligations. Teachers discussed the ethical issues most important to the field and one teacher summarized the discussions of all teachers by pinpointing four ethical responsibilities that define the field of LIS,

“Our service is the first ethical obligation [followed by] access to information, avoiding conflicts of interest, and protecting patron confidentiality … (I2, 138-140).

The portrait teachers painted was one of ethical responsibilities which grounded the information professions, particularly librarianship. Another dimension of the importance of ethical responsibility is the connection between ethics and diversity. In addressing ethics, almost half of the teachers tied concerns about diversity to their conversations about ethics. One teacher detailed this connection between ethics and diversity by saying:

“I also think that a lot of what we do with diversity really has a very, very strong ethical component although we don’t always say that out loud… the ethical concept of equity and also the concept of equality are very much driving what we do with diversity” (I9, 225-230).

One administrator in the focus group discussed the university-wide diversity program which included “a diversity statement that all the faculty and staff and
new people each year sign” (FG, 421-422) and this administrator indicated that ethics in the curriculum should receive similar emphasis. Because of the importance of diversity on university campuses and because of its close connection to ethics, teachers and administrators implied that this connection provided added weight to the importance of the teaching of ethics.

Beyond the relationship of ethics to professionalism and diversity, nearly all of the teachers explained why the teaching of ethics was important to their overall view of teaching. Four teachers exemplified the enthusiastic responses of many to the question, “How does the integration of ethics affect you and your teaching?”

“I would say that attending to ethics for me gives meaning and depth to what I teach and it gives me a real sense of purpose and meaning” (I8, 200-202).

“As a professional school we’re very conscious of training the next generation…and part of that professional role is ethical conduct and I think it’s absolutely inherent in what we do” (I2, 94-97).

“To me ethics and pedagogy are intertwined” (I6, 724).

“I just don’t see how you can leave ethics out of the story [and achieve] quality education, especially at the graduate level” (I7, 213-214).

Teachers expressed a strong belief in the importance of teaching ethics in their classes; further, they indicated that integrating ethics into courses was important to the quality of their school’s LIS program. The theme of the importance of teaching ethics appears above in the teachers’ and administrators’ discussions of professionalism and diversity, and in their impassioned descriptions of their commitments to teaching ethics.
Challenges Concerning the Teaching of Ethics for Institutions and Students

Their strongly positive statements on the role of ethics in their courses and their connection of ethics to professionalism and diversity indicated teacher and administrator awareness of ethics-specific issues. This awareness extended to pinpointing challenges that could result from a strong emphasis on ethics. Data from interviews and focus groups showed that ethics-related problems which were institution-wide revolved around two themes. The first theme centered on curriculum-specific challenges within the schools. The second theme concerned teachers’ and administrators’ perceptions of how their students value ethics. The next sections highlight key teacher and administrator views of each these two themes.

Challenges within the Curriculum

The challenge emerging from the data related to internal LIS program tensions and centered on the scarcity of time in a crowded curriculum. Teachers and administrators in the field of LIS reported their feelings about the current pressures on LIS curricula and the controversy over timing and extensiveness of ethical content. Further, a few teachers discussed their perceptions of the need for more coverage of ethical issues within applied technology courses.

Not surprisingly, all teachers and administrators identified the allocation of time for teaching ethical issues as a major challenge. One administrator described the constraints that many schools experience as a conflict between a
group of students’ demand for ethics coursework and the pressures of an overflowing curriculum:

“We … have a dedicated course on information ethics and students who take that will often write in their comments on evaluation this should be required of all students and so we have discussed that with the faculty. But then the other issue we have is that we have so many things we need to cover in the curriculum that we only have so much space for this, and yet it’s very important” (FG175-180).

Several of the teachers were similarly concerned about the time that was available for education in ethics in the LIS curriculum, especially in light of the demand for technology courses. Two teachers expressed this anxiety by saying:

“I fear sometimes that [ethics is] … what might get lost as … we move ahead so quickly with all the new technologies and the demands.” (I10, 227-229)

“One [challenge] is the tendency for our programs to move away from a service model and toward a technical model. That is, the idea of the user and the individual I think has faded from the curriculum…” (I5, 712-714).

Teachers expressed their concerns that in the rush towards mastering technological skills, the course content on the humanistic side of library work would be marginalized. The decision of some LIS schools to be called iSchools and removing “library” from the name of the school is cited by two teachers and by administrators in the focus group as possible evidence of this movement toward the technical model (I5, I10, FG, 873-74). Some teachers seemed to have tied the presence of ethics to concern for the individual user; they expressed concern that ethical issues were not generally included in applied technology courses. One teacher described the importance of including fundamental ethical questions in technology by saying:
“Well great, let’s gather all this data for a system and I say stop and ask why. Why are you gathering that information, who will have access to it, how will you protect people’s privacy, how are you going to audit to make sure that unauthorized users aren’t getting access?” (110, 270-274).

Several teachers described a model in which courses in applied technology were being enhanced by adding to technical skills, an examination of the impact that the proposed system had upon the individual. Nearly half of the interviewees broached the subject of digital/technology courses and the role they could play in including ethical content. While one teacher admitted that “I really don’t know how well our technology courses integrate ethics” (I2, 858), half of those mentioning digital libraries expressed concern that courses in technology had inadequate coverage of ethics.25 One teacher described an overall approach that teachers could use to communicate “ethics as … an opportunity for disruption.” This teacher elaborated by saying that “I don’t mean it in a really negative sense, I mean it in the most positive sense that it’s from disruption that things change” (I6, 105-108). One change that this teacher referred to was that of making the concern for the individual and the impact of the systems upon communities of individuals fundamental to the teaching of all courses in LIS, and especially courses in the area of applied technology.

In the focus group one administrator indirectly addressed the role of ethics in today’s technology-oriented curriculum by asking if “ethics is the soft female

---

25 None of the 15 interviewees taught applied technology courses. These interviewees who expressed the concern about technology courses were from three different institutions and were commenting on their perceptions of how colleagues were approaching ethics in applied technology courses.
side of our profession?” (FG, 853). This administrator was talking about the current school focus on technology-oriented “hard” topics, which have more definitive answers than the sections of courses that are “soft,” such as sections addressing ethical concerns.

Administrators also discussed their practical concerns about coordination of the insertion of ethics. They were concerned about the inability to control when the students take courses and they described it as:

“One of the problems…has been the order of sequence of courses…if they took our dedicated ethics course first and then took the collection development course, they’d say, ‘Oh, why are we doing all this stuff on ethics in the collection development course? We already had this’…so it’s hard to get them to build in the right order” (FG, 379-383).

Administrators were of two minds with respect to repeating ethical content. At another moment in the focus group, one administrator described the process for ethics education in her institution:

“Students hear it from me in our orientation, they hear it in the courses and then it gets reinforced in the exam and they know that this is coming so they really need to be paying attention to this…the students don’t tune out because they say, ‘Oh I heard this before’” (FG, 148-152).

In contrast with the concerns of administrators in the focus group, no teachers expressed concern about the duplication of effort in the area of ethics instruction. One teacher reported that her LIS program encouraged a multi-staged approach to content:

“Nobody ever has to feel like the bit they do is the only piece students are going to get, they’re going to hear it [ethics] over and over again from a dozen different perspectives and we all value that. We may worry sometimes about overlapping on where they learn their presentation skills, where they learn their web skills, but nobody ever worries if they overlap and get too much on ethics, it’s just … it’s too critical” (I13, 192-194, 198-200).
This section on the tensions created by an emphasis on ethics within the LIS schools addresses practical challenges. In describing these problems, teachers and administrators agreed about the difficulty of trying to create more time for ethics in curricula and the administrators expressed their concern about repeating ethical content in different courses. One fourth of the teachers clearly stated that students benefited from repetition of ethical content and that ethics required a multi-staged and sometimes repetitive approach. This consensus on the necessity of recurring ethical content matches with the opinion of all teachers and administrators that every core course was an appropriate venue for integrating ethics. A few of the teachers described their perception of the challenge of integrating ethics into courses focused on applied technology. They recommended that those teaching technology courses address, if they do not already, the impact of the systems on individuals. This recommendation was provided by teachers who did not teach technology courses but who indicated that the discussion of ethical issues was foundational to the application of technology. In the perceptions that they shared concerning the role of ethics in the curriculum, teachers and administrators supported the theme of LIS school-wide curricular challenges concerning time, coordination, and appropriateness of ethical content for technology courses.

*Students’ Challenges about the Value of Studies in Ethics*

As well as discussing the somewhat contentious role of ethics for their school, interviewees and focus group participants also expressed their opinions on
tensions that LIS students experience with respect to ethical content in courses. In this case, the participants in the study were articulating their perceptions of how students act and feel. This indirect evidence may not have represented how the students actually perceive the teaching of ethics. One of the teachers’ and administrators’ major concerns revolved around LIS students’ single-minded pursuit of courses which could serve them in securing a job and in running a library. One teacher described students’ motivation by saying,

“You get some students who are really seeing the LIS degree as simply a piece of paper that will let them get to a job. Luckily they’re very much in the minority, but if you have a student who’s focused on ‘I just want to know what I need to do to do my job’, sometimes some of those students are more challenging to engage in ethical questions” (I9, 784-788).

Another teacher described the typical response of the job oriented, narrow minded student by saying:

“The students’ biggest complaint about [the course] is that they haven’t learned anything about how to run a library ... and I tell them you’ve learned everything about how to run a library” (I12, 255-257).

The teachers stressed their belief in the importance of the ethical components of their courses. Recognizing and reasoning through ethical dilemmas had “everything” to do with running a library. One teacher described challenging students, those not receptive to inquiry focused on ethical issues, who attempted to direct the behavior of others:

“Some people are more dominant that others, they’re more insisting of their own view than others ... so that’s the time when we need to step in and say..., ‘We’re all here to learn and... one of the best skills of learning is to listen well and keep an open mind’” (I11, 948-952).
Another teacher indicated that some students may view ethics as a luxury course by saying:

“Sometimes topics like ethics and policy are seen as a bit like art classes; that’s lovely but we just don’t have time in the curriculum” (I10,698-701).

In contrast to those that were not open-minded enough to tackle ethics or those that viewed ethics as superfluous, teachers remarked that some students came to class especially well prepared for integrating ethics into their LIS courses. As an example, one teacher specified that:

“Some people, who come in already with well thought through ethical positions in their life, are hungry for that kind of feedback. I think it enriches them, it comes as a …surprise to them that they find people with whom they can share this and talk about it more” (I 14,290-293).

Administrators participating in the focus group indicated that for some students, exposure to decision-making based on ethical considerations can be problematic. One participant stated that ethics can be taught “but not without resistance, especially from students who find professional ethics in contradiction of their personal or previously received codes” (FG-quote in response to member checking). Another administrator addressed the difficulty of “get [ting] students ready for interdisciplinary work” such as ethics, but stated that “when students feel uncomfortable, they learn the most” (FG, 243-244). Teachers and administrators perceived that students approach the study of ethics from several viewpoints: they may find ethics enriching, but ethical course content challenges some students’ personal views and other students may feel that what they learn in ethical education is not as effective as other, more applied courses in attracting
the attention of employers. The theme repeated throughout the interviews and focus group was one of teachers and administrators perceiving that students held varying values of ethics education.

**Institutional Strategies for the Integration of Ethics**

Both administrators and teachers offered institution-wide strategies for implementing ethics across the curriculum. Despite the challenges of promoting the teaching of ethics, most of the interviewees and focus group participants were knowledgeable about and willing to share their institutional strategies for insuring that every student has adequate exposure to ethics. Representing contrasting opinions, a few of the teachers indicated that they were alone on the faculty in their support of ethics and that there was no institutional strategy. One teacher expressed the feelings of others by saying:

"I don’t think that there is what you would call an approach to ethics because we have never discussed it in a faculty meeting and we have never discussed it in a curriculum meeting "(I15, 28-30).

This portion of chapter 5 begins by describing the catalysts, key personnel and events that initiated the integration of ethics. Next, it highlights specific ethics implementation activities of teachers and administrators. It concludes with a discussion of the evaluation of ethics integration. All of these portions support the theme of institution-wide strategies for implementing ethics across the curriculum and are depicted below. Table 6 summarizes ethics integration activities including catalysts that served to initiate ethics integration, on-going ethics implementation activities and the varying processes for evaluating the
effectiveness of ethics education. In the table, the most important activities are asterisked.

**Table 6: Catalysts, Implementation Activities, and Evaluation of Ethics Integration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics Catalysts Events and Key Personnel</th>
<th>On-going Ethics Implementation Activities of Faculty</th>
<th>Evaluation of Ethics Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ALA accreditation visit *</td>
<td>• Regular dialog in faculty meetings *</td>
<td>• Ethical questions on comprehensive exams*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major reconfiguration of curriculum</td>
<td>• Presentations by lead instructors</td>
<td>• Capstone course final paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LIS surveys of other professional schools on campus</td>
<td>• Share skills with all faculty</td>
<td>• Writing on ethical issues at beginning and at end of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *Dean, Directors, Program Chairs in LIS</td>
<td>• Train adjunct or part-time teachers</td>
<td>• Responses to alumni surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty task forces</td>
<td>• Appoint mentor for new teachers</td>
<td>• Embed outcomes from ethical education in curricular objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school ethics experts</td>
<td>• Examine new &amp; related courses for ethical content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University administration</td>
<td>• Incorporate ethics into practical field experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students through course evaluations</td>
<td>• Regular meetings of core course teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review for ethics by curriculum committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses of teacher interviewees and the discussion of administrators participating in the focus group included descriptions of specific steps that their institutions took to insure that all students received a thorough grounding in ethics. Displaying their activities in three ways provided a framework for
examining organizational change. This organizational scheme was suggested by Brickley, Smith & Zimmerman (2009). The scheme fit the data and served to clarify the process of integrating ethics. These three components of organizational change for integrating ethics include: initiating the change – events and key personnel that served to initiate the integration of ethics; implementing the change – on-going integration activities of teachers; and evaluating the change – techniques and systems for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the teaching of ethics. This three part outline of how change happens across an institution is a useful model to conceptualize how study participants described their steps toward integrating ethics into student learning.

*Initiation – Events and Key Personnel*

In discussing the initiation of ethics, the teachers and administrators identified events and key personnel in their institutions. These events and people served as catalysts for the integration of ethics.

School-wide events that involved many faculty members prompted an examination of ethics integration. The premiere event which teachers and administrators identified as having spurred the examination of the teaching of ethics was the ALA accreditation process site review. Two-thirds of the teachers interviewed revealed that the impending visit was a major prompt for examining ethics coursework. Preparation for this visit resulted in the review of each course, by either the curriculum committee or by a small appointed group. Ethics was an identified core value for ALA and its presence was documented for all
One teacher described that in their school the ALA site visit was the “only” motivating factor.

“The only way that I ever see faculty move on curricular issues is if the Committee on Accreditation…takes hold of it. If they think that the Committee on Accreditation is going to be looking at a particular pedagogy or a kind of approach to curriculum then they’re slightly motivated to do it, much more likely to do it because of the pressure that would be put on them by the university to do it” (I 15, 80-85).

Other teachers regarded ALA accreditation, and especially the priority which the ALA assigned to ethics, as an opportunity to build the ethics program at their school. One teacher explained:

“As we were coming up for accreditation [I thought] about how do we really, if we say that it [ethics] is a core value, how do we stop giving it lip service and really make core values and the tenets to the profession…and ethics a real living part of the curriculum” (I12,82-85).

Another event, less widespread than the ALA site visit, which fostered the initiation of ethics activity, was a curriculum-wide reorganization. One-fourth of the teachers reported participating in major reconfigurations of the curriculum during which the ethical components of each course were examined. One teacher described how ethics could be included in the curricular reconfiguration process:

“In reviewing that curriculum we went through and just brainstormed about competencies and skills and knowledge, attitudes, and tore, deconstructed it, put them all back together and examined how they would fit in these different courses and, of course, there was always that … ethics component. “ (I8, 64-68)

This teacher implied that for each course, the faculty examined and evaluated the ethics content.

One study participant also briefly mentioned one other initiating factor, that of studying ethics teaching activities across the campus. This interviewee described:
“The next step was …to go campus-wide and …look at the practices in other schools and departments. There are quite a few professional schools on campus and we’re interested of course in that particular sort of spin on ethical behavior, you know, the kind that particularly is attached to people with professional credentials going out into the world to do professional work” (114, 109-114).

This activity, studying what other professional schools have accomplished in ethics, served as a strategy for initiating ethics programming in LIS. These institution-wide fact findings, as well as the two activities of reconfiguring the curriculum, and preparing for ALA reaccreditation were all events that constituted steps toward initiating ethics. With three-fourths of the interviewees and the focus group discussing reaccreditation as an important event, the ALA accreditation process site review served as the most crucial catalyst for the promotion of coursework relating to the teaching of ethics.

Individuals and groups, as well as events, had a role in initiating ethics teaching. The following section highlights the participation of the groups and individuals which were important catalysts for the integration of ethics across the curriculum.

Major groups which played an initiating role in their institution’s approach to ethics include the leadership of the LIS School, faculty task forces, in-school ethics experts, university administration, and the LIS students. The Deans, Directors or Program Chairs of the LIS programs often took leadership roles in initiating ethics instruction. Just less than half of the teachers reflected on how these LIS administrators played or could play the most important role. The role of the administration was not always positively reported, e.g., two teachers
discussed the opportunity lost when the administration was not actively involved in promoting ethics. Leaders of the LIS program played powerful roles in promoting areas of the curriculum that they felt were important. One teacher reported that,

“The role of the leader in any program, and how much each of those leaders value ethics and the teaching of ethics and …value what message is sent from the top … can make a huge difference” (I10, 714-717).

To illustrate, one teacher shared the story of a Program Director who created a faculty ethics taskforce to initiate and recommend options for expanding ethics throughout the curriculum:

“We just last year started a task force on this topic….There’s a push at the university to deal with issues of cheating and academic integrity in general, but at our school we wanted to expand it into the idea of…professional ethics…. One of the things that we’ve come up with is this notion that there isn’t anything that you can do with information that doesn’t have an ethical component to it… the production, the selling, the buying, the keeping away, the providing access to, the manipulation, you know, everything you can think of as having an ethical component. So we feel very strongly that it’s our role to not only… instill ethical behavior while the students are here but… a lifelong approach, a lifelong attitude towards it” (I14, 35-36, 78-85).

Another group important in initiating ethics instruction was in-house ethics experts. These were usually teachers who felt comfortable with integrating ethics content into their courses. Often these experts served as catalysts to encourage the teaching of ethics. One teacher cited her influence in tutoring faculty for the teaching of ethics:

“I’m now considered the resident ethics expert for our faculty and when somebody else is teaching the intro class instead of me… I spend a good bit of time, first of all, I give them all my notes, and I spend a good bit of time with them about how, what I have found that works and doesn’t work and they feel a whole lot better” (I12, 15-20).
Another teacher spoke of her role in promoting the initiation of ethics instruction by achieving “greater awareness …and part because they probably got sick of me talking about it all the time” (I10, 281-282).

Another crucial group for promoting ethics was the administrators in the university. One LIS administrator described the example of the university requiring the school to have a faculty meeting on diversity, as a motivation for initiating a faculty meeting on integrating ethics (FG). The university often took an active role in promoting ethics throughout the professional schools (I7, I9, I14). The institutional directive was that the schools should address research ethics (i.e., responsible conduct of research) and this obligation spurred interest in expanding the integration of professional ethics. One teacher reported that they participate in an administration-mandated campus-wide departmental review which examines ethics in the curriculum (I8).

The final group cited as a source for initiating an interest in ethics integration was the LIS students. Teachers noted that student course evaluations served as an effective indicator that professional ethics needed to be addressed in a course.

“So in terms of the course evaluations those go to the dean and to the program chair and so, if students themselves raise something, then that is called to the instructor’s attention” (I10, 155-157).

These examples showed how interviewees and focus group participants reported initiating ethics in the curriculum. The group that was most often discussed by teachers and also addressed by the focus group was the LIS
administration, especially Deans, Directors, and Program Chairs and their preeminent role in targeting the expansion of ethics instruction. The interviewees and focus group participants agreed that the crucial event which served as an ethics catalyst was the ALA accreditation visit. Initiating ethics instruction serves as the first step in conceptualizing how study participants described the integration of ethics into the curriculum.

**Implementation of the Integration of Ethics**

Teachers and administrators reported several organizational strategies that result in moving beyond initiation to the on-going implementation of ethics across the curriculum. Perhaps the most widespread activity for implementing and maintaining ethics across the curriculum was to have regular discussions of ethics pedagogy in faculty meetings (I8, I9, I13, and FG). As an exception, two seasoned teachers stated that the topic of ethical content in courses had never been mentioned at faculty meetings during tenure at their institutions (I1, I3). As one administrator said, “First, you’ve got to talk about it” (FG, 417). This LIS administrator was implying that the crucial first step towards integrating ethics throughout the school was to have a cross-section of the faculty involved in an ongoing discussion. These, usually monthly, faculty meetings served as venues for discussions on how to engage students in ethics (I13).

One teacher related that those most skilled in introducing ethics to students were asked to lead ongoing discussions in faculty meetings about teaching strategies. Also, a few of the teachers interviewed related that these
“ethics experts” on the faculty worked with colleagues one-on-one to help them prepare for classes (I6, I10, I12). One teacher and the seven administrators participating in the focus group discussed that this preparation may have been especially important for adjunct and part-time faculty who were teaching core courses (FG, I12). A similar preparatory role was that of the mentor for the new faculty member. Two teachers described how new faculty have a formally assigned “faculty mentor to discuss how they cover ethics, professionalism, research, critical thinking and …several other topics that were factors that need to be incorporated” (I13, 131-133). In the mentoring relationship, the experienced colleague observed teaching and helped the newly hired faculty member to effectively integrate ethics into their courses. Another method cited for regularly incorporating ethics, was to examine all new courses proposed and related courses for the inclusion of ethics in the syllabi. One teacher described the process as:

“Every time we have a course proposal we have to go back and see how that will fit into the existing curriculum. So we don’t look at courses in isolation, we look at them as a component of the curriculum.” (I8 72-74)

While looking at these proposed new courses and other courses related to them, faculty members suggested opportunities for integrating ethics. Another area for the incorporation of ethics is in practical field experience and in outreach projects. Administrators reported introducing ethical components into these real-world educational experiences (FG). One teacher explained that all of the faculty teaching core courses held regular meetings to discuss their coordination of content and that this group often discussed ethics (I14).
For most of the strategies that involved integrating ethics into the curricula on an on-going basis a key player was the curriculum committee. Directors who promoted ethics charged the curriculum committee with their vision. In this case the charge assigned by the Director was an initiative and the curriculum committee served to implement the initiative. A few of teachers reported that, while the entire faculty has responsibility for the curriculum, the curriculum committee was often in charge of the on-going detailed review of courses, including examining courses for the integration of ethics (I1, I2, I5, I8). As one teacher explained, generally “the curriculum committee needs to review the curriculum and make recommendations to the overall faculty for integration” (I8, 25-26).

These various strategies included: dialog in faculty meetings, presentations by lead instructors, sharing skills between all faculty, training adjunct or part-time teachers of core courses, appointing a mentor for new teachers, examining new and related courses for ethical content, ethics incorporation into field work, regular meetings of core-course instructors, and review for ethics by curriculum committee. Each of these strategies demonstrated ways that the organization of an LIS school is adapted to insure that all students receive grounding in ethical issues in the professional field of librarianship as part of their masters-level training. The above examples, which were reported by teachers and administrators, showed how schools choose measures to initiate ethics and to perform on-going ethics implementation. In earlier sections of this
Chapter, teachers and administrators clearly indicated that teaching ethics was an important component of their teaching and one teacher specifically described the importance of ethics to the quality of the graduate school of LIS. If ethics is an important part of quality education, then it makes sense that schools would implement systems to insure the integration of ethics. In this section the study participants share the steps that their schools have undertaken to initiate and implement ethics across the curriculum.

The most effective initiators or catalysts for ethics integration were the Deans, Directors and Program Chairs of the LIS program and the premiere event for initiation of activity was the ALA Accreditation visit. For on-going implementation activities, the most crucial strategy was to encourage regular dialog in faculty meetings. One administrator in the focus group identified the faculty meeting discussions as the first step. Perhaps she was implying that, until the faculty could regularly and comfortably talk about ethics, it could not begin to be integrated across the curriculum. Based on the priority expressed by several teachers, the discussion of ethics during faculty meetings seems to be the most important factor.

*Evaluation of the Integration of Ethics*

Beyond the various strategies to initiate and perform on-going implementation activities, the data from the interviews and focus group revealed that the evaluation of ethics across the curriculum served as an important measure of the effectiveness of its implementation. Examining the three areas of initiation,
implementation and evaluation provided insight into the process of change at an institution with respect to the integration of ethics.

Teachers and administrators described various methods to evaluate the integration of ethics. These evaluative strategies were focused on the demonstration of students’ cumulative knowledge of ethics, rather than investigating students’ knowledge on a course-by-course basis. (Course-based evaluations of teaching will be described in the second section of this chapter, entitled *Integration of Ethics into Specific Courses*). The data presented here supports the key finding that schools have devised processes to initiate, implement, and evaluate the integration of ethics on a school-wide basis. Evaluation, along with initiation and implementation, were measures of organizational change which emerged from the data.

One important component which is often missing from literature discussing the teaching of ethics is the evaluation of its effectiveness. While one administrator expressed the frustration of many by saying that “Assessment\(^{26}\) is like a game, how am I going to get over this hurdle?” (FG, 306-307), both administrators and teachers cited several methods which provide a measure of the student’s grasp of the skills covered in ethics education. The study participants indicated that these evaluations demonstrated students’ cumulative knowledge of ethics.

\(^{26}\) In evaluation parlance in the U.S., evaluation and assessment are often used interchangeably (Harris, 1976). In this study, for clarity, the word evaluation will be used exclusively, excepting direct quotes.
Teachers and administrators identified several specific strategies including questions on comprehensive exams, alumni surveys, capstone courses, and repeating writing assignments focused on ethics. Further, the study participants described the comprehensive strategy of embedded outcomes. The participants indicated that together, these multiple methods of evaluation provide another valuable picture of ethics across the curriculum.

Teachers and administrators described the placement of ethical questions on the comprehensive examination that the student must pass as a final requirement for graduation. One teacher detailed the evaluative role of the comprehensive exam by saying:

“In our final comprehension exam, not every time, but usually there’s a question that certainly incites a discussion of ethics and this time I think it was very, very clear to pick the three ethical principles and explain how value conflicts might arise from those. Another one that was in that same comprehensive exam was, explain how under the current copyright law and with digitization and licensing we can protect the rights of both the copyright owner and … the reader’s right to read.” (I8, 40-48)

Teachers were explicit in expecting graduating students to explain ethical principles and apply them to specific laws such as copyright. Several teachers and administrators indicated that this was a prevalent method of evaluation. Through the essays on the exam, teachers evaluated students’ ethical reasoning abilities. For example, in the copyright/licensing question, students must show that they had accounted for all sources of evidence and had considered different points of view. The presence of questions centering around ethics on comprehensive exams was considered by the ALA accreditation team as
important evidence of compliance with the ethics standards (Wildemuth, 2009). Because of this endorsement by ALA, having ethics questions on the comprehensive exam may be considered by many the most important measure of the success of integrated ethics.

A few of the teachers and administrators mentioned the capstone course, a final culminating course for graduating students, as a place to consolidate knowledge that students had acquired throughout the program. Generally, students in capstone courses produced a final paper and often these papers addressed ethical issues (FG). One administrator explained that her school was considering adding the capstone experience:

“[I know of] other places where there is a capstone experience. We don’t have one, but we are thinking of making changes so that that could happen… We could revisit things to see whether what they [students] got in the first course they’ve now internalized by the last course” (FG, 156-159).

The administrator’s description of the capstone course demonstrated the necessity of repeating ethical content and the evaluative quality of the capstone course gave the school the ability “to see whether what they got in the first course they’ve now internalized by the last course” (FG, 157-159).

Specific writing assignments centered on ethical issues were another venue for evaluation. Administrators suggested that their institutions were exploring having an ethical writing assignment as an evaluative measure. A similar writing assignment would be given at the beginning of the program and just before the student graduated. The writing would be graded based on the growth of the student’s ethical reasoning abilities (FG). Two teachers also
described this technique of repeating ethical writing assignments. Students wrote a personal philosophical statement in the introductory course and later revised and enhanced the statement in the capstone course. Teachers cited the personal philosophy statement as useful “when we do their midpoint of their program and ending assessments we can look at…that philosophy statement that they write in their intro class; they also write one in their capstone course” (I12, 711-713). Usually, these assignments were graded on a pass/fail basis and this grade was averaged with many other facets of the introductory and capstone courses.

The above quote and the practice of repeating writing assignments focusing on ethics hinted at the assessment of ethics throughout the program. For integrated topics, such as ethics, teachers and administrators indicated that it is important to have an extended evaluation process. As one administrator described, ethics needs to be “threaded throughout the curriculum… [The schools should determine] what do…students need to know and what do they [students] need to do” (FG, 132-134).

In the focus group administrators discussed other measures of evaluation. One such measure was to analyze the responses to an alumni survey. One administrator explained their efforts to collect information by saying, “We’ve been collecting from the alums their stories hoping to feed that back into the … course content, but I love it where they come back and say, ‘Oh, if I hadn’t had [ethics], I was really in a pickle’ (FG, 438-440).
this administrator indicated that specific responses to these surveys provided good examples of former students’ dexterity in applying ethical skills (FG).

Administrators and over one-fourth of the teachers described one comprehensive process for evaluation which provided a measure of student learning in ethics throughout the curriculum (FG, I2, I9, I12, and I14). In this process, that is called embedded outcomes, the measurement of a student’s ability in ethics was embedded in the goals for the curriculum (Other curricular outcomes included areas such as organization of information, reference, and user services) (ALA, 2006). These curricular goals were usually published on an institution’s website. The ethics-specific components were sometimes included under more general objectives or they may have been identified as a specific competency. Some statements of ethics-related goals were more general in nature, such as, “instill [in students] a commitment to professional ethics” or “demonstrate professional attitudes regarding… professional ethics.” Other objectives were more specific and addressed the competency of students, such as, “demonstrate an understanding of …ethical issues, trends, and problems facing the profession” or “demonstrate the ability to recognize and analyze ethical issues and dilemmas… and propose reasoned courses of action.” In the process of documenting achievement of embedded outcomes, the student was required to archive his own work using software provided by the institution. Students’ work came from the capstone course or could be represented by various assignments that students had already produced in previous courses. These products included
essays, formal papers, self-reflections, self-assessments, student journals, poster presentations, or on-line discussions (I2, I9, I12, FG) in courses which included field experience. Students had options for documenting ethical situations; an administrator explained that:

“Students can choose to cover ethics in their journal or poster presentation or in on-line discussion group... In our professional field experience [course] it's hard to know just where the students will encounter ethical dilemmas, so I am trying to give them a range of opportunities to document their response” (FG, member checking).

The students’ advisors worked with them to select the most appropriate work that students had produced to archive in their portfolios. Then students were graded on the quality of the work, generally on a Pass/Fail basis (I9). This grading took place just before graduation, but some institutions also had competency checks at the beginning and middle of students’ LIS masters program (FG8).

This practice of measuring embedded outcomes resulted in giving the administration and faculty more control over the content of teaching and an ability to measure the impact of the teaching on students. Teachers described goals that their schools hoped to accomplish by analyzing outcomes. Ideally, the resulting data would provide teachers and administrators with information on how well students were meeting all competencies. Teachers would examine the work produced for each competency to see where the school needed to strengthen the curriculum (I9). These embedded outcomes also helped administrators to monitor the teaching of specific courses. Two teachers explained that, while their schools
did not always mandate that teachers use the identical syllabus to teach the same
course, the schools did require that the students must achieve the outcomes stated
in the objectives of the schools’ curriculum. This embedded assessment meant
that teachers must have covered the ethics material, since students must have
produced documents demonstrating their skills in the area of ethics and these
materials go into the portfolio (I9, I12).

This embedded assessment, aided by the electronic portfolio management
package, provided schools with a way to monitor each student’s achievement in
core areas. One teacher described it by saying:

The electronic curriculum management package enables us to electronically
have records of how all our students have done on required modules. But for
each outcome, including the ethics outcome, every student will have mounted on
the website the exercise that we’re using to demonstrate, that specifically relates
to that outcome, in this case ethics… Then the faculty member in the course
where they did that also grades that… and we can evaluate how well they’re
doing on each of the required outcomes so we can see where we need to
strengthen.” (I9, 100-113)

Measuring its effectiveness was a key component of integrating ethics.
The comprehensive method of embedding outcomes was a particularly important
part of measuring effectiveness: It tracked students’ achievements in ethics
across the curriculum of LIS, beginning with the core required courses and ending
in a capstone course. Through their knowledge and use of evaluative activities
including placement of ethical questions on comprehensive exams, alumni
surveys, capstone courses, repeated writing assignments concerning ethical topics
and embedded outcomes, teachers and administrators indicated their support of
assessment activities that attempt to measure ethics across the curriculum.
Program-wide evaluative activities provided the final component of a three part look at the steps toward implementation of ethics across the curriculum. When combined with on-going implementation activities and with events and groups which serve as catalysts for integration, these three activities provided an institution-wide view of the integration of ethics.

Summary of Section

This section of the Chapter reported teachers’ and administrators’ responses to several questions concerning the overall institutional approach to integrating ethics within the school’s curriculum. The first theme covered how teachers and administrators understood the importance of ethics and had strong feelings about their role in transmitting skills in ethics to their students. Teachers reported that ethics is a “central element of professional identity” (I2, 374). Their favorable reactions to the role of ethics made teachers and administrators more cognizant of a second theme which concerns problems that the promotion of ethics brought to their institutions. They discussed challenges which served as obstacles to the integration of ethics and their discussions evolved into two minor themes from two viewpoints: that of the school and its many time and curricular constraints and that of the students and their course expectations. Despite their awareness of the challenges, study participants shared their institutional strategies for the integration of ethics. Teachers and administrators’ responses to a question concerning institution-wide strategies for integrating ethics were organized by the
components of change including initiation, implementation and evaluation of the integration of ethics.

**Integration of Ethics into Specific Courses**

The preceding section of Chapter 5 detailed the school-wide view of ethics teaching in LIS. This second section of the chapter focuses on the integration of ethics into specific LIS courses. Specifically, this section will explore integration of ethics into core, required courses and will answer the research question: “How did teachers integrate ethics into their courses? The resulting sub-questions included: What courses were most important for ethics integration? What were the most prevalent and important components across courses? What were challenges for teachers attempting to integrate? What missed opportunities were discussed concerning ethics pedagogy?

The data for this section of the findings was obtained from interviews with teachers about specific courses which could serve as examples of the integration of ethics. The selection of teachers aimed at hearing the experiences of interviewees who are knowledgeable concerning best practices in the teaching of ethics. Fifteen teachers, each from different institutions, detailed twenty-one courses that they taught. Nine of these courses were on unique topics (i.e., topics well differentiated from each other in subject areas such as cataloging vs. reference). Appendix 1 includes in-depth descriptions of the course content relevant to ethics in the nine unique courses.
This section provides the course-specific component of the story of the integration of ethics into LIS curricula. Teachers detailed their opinions on the courses most appropriate for integration of ethics. Their focus was on the core, often required, courses and they also gave examples of the appropriate level of integration for specific courses. This first theme concerns the extent of courses appropriate for the integration of ethics, especially core, required courses. The second portion of this section describes the findings across the core courses and provides an overview of the key themes that teachers shared in their course syllabi and in their descriptions of how they integrated ethics into specific courses. The themes revolve around the course components including the learning objectives, the teaching techniques, the learning resources and the course evaluations.

Further, this section continues the theme of the challenges of teaching ethics in LIS; this time teachers recount causes of problems that faculty encounter integrating ethics -- including deficits in the training of LIS faculty and in the pedagogical alternatives available. Finally, considering this dearth of teaching approaches, the teachers identified a missed opportunity that could be employed in the future.

Seven propositions comprise the key findings from this second section: that teachers indicated the importance and prevalence of integrating ethics into core courses in LIS curricula; that less than half of the integrated core course syllabi examined had ethics-specific learning objectives; that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses; that teachers
recognized the concept of community as central to the integration of ethics; that the codes of ethics were the most consistently used learning resource in courses that integrated ethics; that teachers experienced challenges in the integration of ethics; and, finally, that teachers and administrators identified a missed opportunity, conceiving of training in ethical analysis as the teaching of skills.

**Courses Appropriate for Integration and Focus on Core Courses**

In analyzing teachers’ opinions of courses suitable for the integration of ethics, two common themes emerged from the data: all courses in the LIS curriculum have ethical components, but the teachers agreed that the most important activity was to integrate ethics into core, required courses.

When asked, which courses are most appropriate for integration, all of the interviewees stated categorically that important ethical elements existed for all courses. They also pinpointed some courses that deserve more extensive ethics coverage than others. One teacher expressed the feelings of many by stating:

“Well, I can’t think of a place where it’s not [ethics is not present], I can certainly think of places where it takes substantially more emphasis… if you look at a 15 week course in copyright it’s going to come up every single day. If you look at a 15 week course in digitization of audio files it’s going to come up once, maybe twice” (I13, 233-235).

Teachers indicated that, while all subject areas in the LIS curricula have relevant ethical issues that can be addressed; some courses require extensive ethical coverage.
Most teacher interviewees and administrators in the focus group specifically mentioned the importance of ethical components in all required, core courses. For example, one teacher and one administrator stated:

“The entire core courses deal with ethical issues” (I4, 76)

“We need to be covering ethics for our professions in all of the core courses; we’re supposed to do that.” (FG, 118-119)

By definition, each student that graduates from an LIS program must have completed all required courses. Schools of LIS varied in the number of core courses/credit hours that a student must have taken as part of their total course requirement for graduation: the schools range from two required courses which provide six out of forty credits required to graduate (University of Illinois) to nine courses which complete 34 out of 63 quarter credits required for graduation (University of Washington) (Chu, 2006, p.331).

Several of the core courses which were detailed in this study were specifically designed to provide extensive ethical content (I1-I2, I6-I7, I10, I12). For example, the faculty at one institution, while reorganizing the curriculum, made a conscious decision to keep a course in collection development as a required course, based on the strong ethical content in the course. The interviewee described this saying:

“Part of it [the decision to keep the course as required] was because it includes these basic professional values and the way I teach collection management … also includes intellectual freedom and the Library Bill of Rights” (I2, 446-448).

Often, the vehicle for providing the initial ethical content to students in LIS was the first course that students took. Typically this course is called “Library
Foundations” or “Library Perspectives” and is a required course. In some situations (as illustrated in the above quote) schools may have picked a course other than “Library Foundations” as the required course to carry the major teaching of ethics. The evidence for the integration of ethics is strongest in the core courses, even though the vast majority of the teachers agreed that all courses have ethical components. The key finding of this section is that teachers indicated the importance and prevalence of integrating ethics into core courses in LIS curricula; because of this indicated priority of core courses, descriptions of integrated ethics analyzed in this chapter are those of core, required courses.

**Findings across Core Courses**

As noted above, teachers and administrators designated required courses as the most important locations for integration of ethics. This section outlines the findings in core, required courses and provides an overview of key themes that teachers shared in their descriptions of how they integrated ethics into specific courses. (Details of required and elective courses are included in the individual course descriptions in Appendix 1.) The core courses summarized in this section included six unique courses and represent seventeen different interviews. The subjects of the six courses and the number of interviews conducted for each course were: Foundations (4), Management (4), Collection Development (3), Reference (3), Cataloging and Classification (2), and Research Methods (1).
The following portion of the section is organized by four components of the teaching of ethics: learning objectives, teaching techniques, resources assigned, and evaluation of specific courses.

*Findings Concerning Course Learning Objectives*

Learning objectives refer to the written objectives in which teachers stated what knowledge and behavior students should gain from the course (Ozar, 2001). Learning objectives for the six unique specific courses fell into two categories. The first, and slightly larger group of learning objectives, was characterized by lack of definitive, ethics-specific considerations. One teacher, in describing the course objectives for a course in library management, indicated that many learning objectives contained implied ethical elements:

“So the word ethic…is probably not going to show up here, you know, how can you do a personnel or a budget or a vision without doing it ethically… how can you function well as a team if you’re not behaving ethically … they’re just too fundamental, they’re just in there, they’re assumed all the way through it” (113,499-505).

This teacher proposed that this course would have ethical components “assumed all the way through.” Other teachers, when explaining how their learning objectives related to teaching ethics, pointed out terms in the learning objectives such as reflective or critical thinking or communities of users or understanding users or paying attention to people (I1, I4, I10, I11). The teachers considered these concepts as components of the teaching of ethics.

Just less than one-half of descriptions for the seventeen versions of the six core courses had learning objectives which contained ethics-specific language.
depicting knowledge and behavior. These learning objectives contained concepts such as core values, ethical aspects, ethical issues, ethical standards, personal philosophy, and philosophical contexts. The learning objectives for all four versions of the Foundations courses which were covered in the interviews had specific descriptions. In most schools, these courses served to carry strong ethical content. Foundations courses were often the first course that new masters-level students took and they were generally organized around the core values of the profession. In the other core courses (cataloging/classification, collection development, management, reference, and research methods) there was at least one version of the course that had an ethics-specific learning objective. These learning objectives specific to the teaching of ethics are listed by their specific course in table 7 below.

Table 7: Ethics-Relevant Learning Objectives in Core Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Course</th>
<th>Learning Objectives Relevant to Ethics. Students will be able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging/Classification</td>
<td>• Identify, critically analyze, and discuss the social and ethical aspects of classification (I14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Development</td>
<td>• Recognize and respond to challenges of intellectual freedom (I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>• Explore library institutions and professionals through perspectives of history, public policy, ethics, and law. (I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a sense of professional identity and awareness of ethical standards of professional conduct (I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be introduced to importance of historical…and philosophical contexts (I7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop understanding and appreciation of core values of profession. (I10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop personal philosophy (I12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop knowledge, skills and dispositions including: (I12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Define and discuss core values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Describe and discuss the concept of ethics and ethical practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop reasoned opinions and decisions

| Management                      | • Strategically resolve practical problems, critical and ethical issues and policy matters (I9) |
| Reference                       | • Explain major ethical issues in reference work (I15) |
| Research Methods                | • None* |

*Although the course had no ethics specific objective, the teacher expressed her unwritten objective of “embed ethical awareness of research.” (I6, 394). She explained that this syllabus served several teachers of the core course and not all used an ethics-oriented approach to teaching.

These learning objectives, which were taken directly from syllabi and interviews, summarize the ethics-specific knowledge (e.g., awareness of ethical standards of professional conduct) and behaviors (e.g., develop reasoned opinions and decisions) that teachers expected to result from the integration of ethics. The table illustrates the finding that almost half of the core courses had learning objectives that specified ethics-specific knowledge or behaviors.

**Findings Concerning Teaching Techniques**

The next section discusses a variety of the teaching methods that LIS teachers reported using to incorporate ethical content into their courses. These methods included lectures, student-led presentations, assignment of papers, discussion, case studies, and experiential methods. The techniques discussed throughout this segment are further defined in the Table 8 below.
Table 8: Brief definitions of Teaching Techniques & Assignments  
(Good, 1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Technique</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>Active participation, student receives report, analyzes data &amp; recommends solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>People talk together to share information on specified topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>Learning that relates to students on personal level. Can include field experience, simulation strategies, and identity clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field experience</td>
<td>Practice away from college campus; less formal, more limited than internship; can include project-based or problem-based instruction for field experience which has driving problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Teacher using verbal message with minimum of class participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Short, written assignments with a specific purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research papers</td>
<td>Major writing assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Making practice and materials as near as possible to the situation; related to role playing (spontaneous portrayal of situation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student led discussion, debate &amp; presentation</td>
<td>Student organized sharing of information either orally and/or visually (presentation); Formal presentation of arguments on both sides of a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values clarification techniques</td>
<td>Exercise to explore orientation of student; can involve studying historical mentors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in this segment on teaching techniques supports the theme that teachers used many strategies for integrating ethical content into core courses in LIS.

Lectures, Student-led Presentations, and Assignment of Papers

Throughout descriptions of the six unique courses the teaching techniques cited most often were lecture, student-led presentations, assignment of papers, discussion, and case studies. The lecture usually was a one-way sharing of information by the course instructor or by a guest lecturer. One teacher of a “Foundations” course explained the value of having outside experts address her class:

“I have a number of guest speakers that come in and really flesh out ethics in particular context. So copyright for example, I always have a speaker come in with very up-to-date in the moment examples about what’s happening with
Guest speakers served to add credibility to the teacher’s presentation of information and they were prevalent in core LIS courses, especially in the overview foundations course.

Another type of lecture was student presentations. One teacher of cataloging and classification systems relates her experience of using student presentations on a specific ethical topic as a method for introducing ethics to the class:

“you have a student [with]more in-depth research in information ethics give a presentation and then the instructor uses that occasion to lead into a discussion of ethical issues” (I11, 261-264).

This teacher reported that, after she shared this way of introducing ethics, several other teachers at her school had adopted this practice. Usually, as a basis for the presentations, students wrote papers that were assigned to them. These papers varied from short reports to extensively researched papers. Teachers approached the papers by either allowing students to select their own topics or by suggesting a set of topics from which students can choose. Some of the topics suggested indicate the breadth of the ethics-related research. These topics included: implications of corporate sponsorships or partnerships for libraries; free vs. fee-can public libraries charge; relationship between intellectual freedom and social responsibility; how do digital technologies affect fair use; what position should librarians take in internet filtering; and library services to one or more marginalized populations (I7). Teachers also assigned reports or brief writings,
such as letters to the editor of the local newspaper supporting libraries in ethical situations in the community. Teachers expressed their opinions that these presentations, writings, and discussions helped to engage students in ethical issues. The evidence presented above concerning lectures, student presentations, and assignments of papers supports the theme that teachers used a variety of teaching techniques to integrate ethical content into courses.

**Discussions and Case Studies**

One important goal of many teaching techniques is to spur student discussion and their sharing of information. A majority of the teachers reported that they used case presentations to encourage student discussion. Case studies were designed to get students actively participating in reasoning through the examination of hypothetical or fact-based situations. The case studies employed by most LIS teachers interviewed were shorter and less involved than the extensive case presentations used in other fields. In formal case studies, students read an extensive case report, analyze data, study the nature of the problem, and try to formulate a solution, usually using principles from the field (Good, 1973). All of the LIS teachers used case studies in their teaching, but most of them devised their own shortened version of this classic tool. One teacher of library management explained why he used briefer descriptions of situations:

“Where you have case studies of management, some of those have to do with ethics and they’re fine... it’s that they’re technically limited. There are just hundreds and hundreds of situational examples ...and you may be able to investigate 25 others ...just talking and moving from one to the next” (I1, 230-232).
LIS teachers chose to use the shorter “situational examples” rather than extended case studies. But this focus on many shorter cases had some disadvantages which one teacher described:

“One of the problems that I have found in trying to use case studies is there’s usually not sufficient time and there isn’t sufficient information provided in case studies; they tend to be rather superficial. I generally bring in several different ones across the term and then link them together. I think that helps the students gain a better and deeper understanding” (I10, 402-406).

This teacher preferred shorter cases, but recognized the need for continuity between the situations covered in the cases: teachers could provide the “glue” which tied together the various cases. Further, almost one-third of the teachers encouraged students to bring in cases from the media or from their work experience. One teacher describes how this strategy encouraged the provision of timely and relevant cases:

“All my students bring to class (whenever they see something in the popular literature related to our class) something that’s going on right now and those are often really wonderful hypothetical’s. A student brought an example of a book store in Maryland that had ordered a book as a result of a phone request and when the patron showed up to pick it up they looked and it was a teenager and they said, ‘Oh we’re sorry, we’re not going to sell this to you’” (I2, 222-227).

Several teachers described students actively engaged in discussing cases that their classmates had provided from the current media. Teachers in LIS indicated that they use these current situational examples, which are often provided by the students themselves, throughout their class meetings. Further, teachers occasionally used films to extend the impact of the case study. For example, in teaching censorship in the Foundations course students had readings and viewed a vintage film, *Storm Center* (1956), depicting a librarian’s strong
response to a book challenge (I7). Case studies and films moved students towards experiential learning. These reports of teachers support the theme that case studies are an important tool to spur discussion. The data suggests the extension of this theme to specify that teachers often used shortened versions of traditional case studies, enhanced by films, and that they encouraged students to provide relevant cases from their experience or from the literature. This overall discussion of case studies supports the major theme of this segment -- that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethics into courses.

*Experiential Methods*

Teachers used case studies and these cases helped students to begin to understand a situation beyond their experience. They also used experiential teaching techniques; often these methods were direct, concrete and related to students on a more personal level than the standard lecture, discussion, or case study (Beard & Wilson, 2006; Silberman, 2007). These direct teaching methods helped students to identify and realize the importance of the needs of the community served. Two-thirds of the teachers interviewed used experiential methods (12, 15, 17-8, 112-15). Experiential techniques that teachers reported using in their LIS courses fall into three overall areas: field experiences, simulation strategies, and identity clarification for students.

*Field experiences.*

Just over one-fourth of the interviewees assigned field experiences, also called community studies, to provide students with first-hand experience to
enhance their recognition and understanding of the community (I2, I7, I13-I15).

One teacher in collection development described this assignment by saying:

“The major project is around community study, and you know, don’t go running around building collections until you know who your community is, and every community is different, and I really push for diversity” (I7, 867-870).

This teacher stressed the theme of community as an important component of ethical behavior.

One teacher who included the field assignment of working on a consulting project with non-governmental agencies and libraries reported that students gained a better understanding of ethical issues of staffing. Students also began to comprehend, through community projects, the importance of tailoring their work to the needs of the specific community they served. Students actively addressed these staffing and community issues in regular meetings of their class. Teachers reported that they “debrief on the projects at least three times during the course. If anything in the area of ethics comes up, then they talk about it there” (I13, member checking). The classroom served as a supportive environment where students could discuss their observations and practice their skills in identifying and reasoning in ethically charged real-life situations. In class students had the support of their teacher and of other students in helping them to reason through situations in the field.

A similar example occurred in a program with more extended community involvement than that in the previous description. One teacher discussed the extended field experience of school media specialists who were required to work
in a school for almost 200 hours prior to their graduation. While performing field work, students also took core courses. This teacher described how a management course, taken concurrently with the field experience, provided a forum for discussing ethical dilemmas which arose in practice. “They talk about their field experience a lot and I would say that’s probably a really good source of ethical material” (I15, 616-617). In this case, as in the one previously described, the teacher helped students to reflect, discuss, and begin to resolve the situations with ethical implications that they confronted in the field.

On the other end of the duration spectrum were the short community insertions. Teachers assigned students to attend and report on library board meetings (I2) or to observe and evaluate the execution of reference services (I8) or to develop a classification system that “resonates with a variety of perspectives” for a community they were studying. (I14, 659) These activities of short duration, while not providing long term exposure to ethically charged situations, did help students to grasp the importance of understanding communities and the impact that this understanding could have on the provision of services.

Teachers indicated that both the long and short field experiences contributed to students’ appreciation of the community for which they were working. Throughout their interviews, when asked about the integration of ethics, teachers described field assignments and stressed the importance of students’ ability to understand and interact with the community. Teachers indicated that
field assignments fostered students’ awareness of the community. The above evidence supports the theme that many teachers considered community awareness as a component of ethics.

The experience of being in the work environment helped students to recognize ethical situations; further, the course that was concurrent with the field experience provided the student with a sounding board for the discussion of challenging ethical dilemmas those students experienced or observed.

Simulation.

Field study was not always possible or appropriate for every course; in these instances, several teachers reported that they used strategies to simulate the experiences in the field. Just under half of the teachers interviewed reported using role playing. Students act out roles to simulate an encounter with a client.

An application of role-playing in a collection development course is detailed below. Students, who had just drafted their own intellectual freedom policy and complaint procedure, tested their procedure in a role-playing situation

“We do role playing in class and so every student gets to be an irate patron complaining about something in the library, and then the other student shows them their intellectual freedom policy and briefly explains it and gives the [complaint] form to fill out”(I2, 548-553).

This teacher reported that students benefit from the experience and often adjusted their policies and complaint forms based on the feedback that they received in the role-playing exercise.

Two teachers in library management courses also used role-playing to help students experience various situations such as “evaluating other people,
committees making decisions, and people making hiring decisions” (I4, 258-260).

One teacher described an additional type of simulation experience, one which involved using the literature. In a reference course students examined each reference resource against the interests and information needs of their assigned fictional character. He described the experience:

“That person would become theirs and for all of the encyclopedias we would look at or all of the directories we would look at, the information that they were looking for was always key to the needs of that particular person” (I5, 593-604).

In this reference course students learned to consider the needs of one type of community member as they examined resources. As a teacher-designed strategy students used literature to gain empathy for library users.

These examples of simulation or role playing reinforce the major theme that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses. The simulation examples also support the theme that the teachers interviewed considered community awareness to be a component of ethics.

As an exception to the endorsement of the value of role-playing, two teachers (I12, I13) explained that they do not like to use role-playing or other forms of simulation. One teacher reported, “I don’t use role playing. I haven’t found that to be helpful for students, haven’t found them very comfortable with it” (I13, 434-435). These teachers reported that the technique was ineffective and generally disliked by students.
Values clarification.

Another key experiential ingredient, and one that teachers described as crucial to learning ethics, is to help students better define their own identity and values. Several teachers stated that before students can evaluate professional ethical principles, they must know themselves. To accomplish this goal, these LIS teachers employed several strategies, including personality testing along with writing and research assignments focusing on historical characters and students’ values. Three courses described in the interviews included discussions of students’ scores on the Myers-Briggs personality inventory during the first class meeting (This standard inventory is available at various locations on the internet). One teacher explained the link of this test to professional ethics by saying, “A lot of ethics… requires having some sense of yourself” (I13, 453-455). This teacher indicated that self-learning, through personality profiles, could be an important prerequisite for understanding ethical situations and dilemmas.

Just over one-fourth of teachers assigned students to research and report on pioneers in the LIS field who had addressed the values and ethical concerns of the profession. Teachers indicated that historical perspective conveyed a sense of continuity to the professional-in-training (I3, I7, I10, I12). The historical perspective helped to connect their students to the development of the profession and often provided them with professional role models which could begin to cement their professional identity. Another technique that one-third of the teachers used was assigning the writing of personal ethical statements where
students discussed ethical underpinnings that governed their practice. Teachers stressed that some students have very private and personal reactions to the ethical issues and that this journal assignment is appropriate for private communication, rather than an online posting. Another teacher reported that their students “write one journal a week reflecting on what they choose … it could be the guest lecture, it could be my lecture, it could be something in a newspaper or something they saw in a book… they have to integrate it with what they’re learning in the course” (I7, 389-392). Teachers reported that the biographical research provided students with role models and the writing and personality profile exercises helped students to identify their own underlying assumptions. Teachers indicated that these strategies contributed towards helping students define their values and grounding students in their profession. These approaches to values clarification served not only as an experiential teaching technique, but also as a personal development strategy that was an important ingredient for ethics learning. The above discussion of the three experiential teaching techniques, field experiences, simulation and values clarification, all serve to support the major theme that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses.

Summary of Teaching Techniques

The varied teaching techniques covered in this segment of the chapter include lectures, students’ presentations, assignment of papers, discussions, case studies, and experiential methods. Teachers’ descriptions of the teaching techniques support two major findings of the study: first, that teachers used many
teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses; second, that teachers interviewed considered their courses’ focus on community as a component of teaching ethics.

**Learning Resources for Ethical Information**

In combination with teaching techniques, an additional strategy for providing students with an introduction to professional ethics is through the resources assigned in the different courses. This segment of the chapter highlights these ethics-related resources. The major resources used consistently across most of the courses are the library codes of ethics. The discussion here enumerates these codes and includes teachers’ discussions of how they are used. The theme for this area is that codes of ethics comprise the most consistently used resource in core courses which integrate ethics. Beyond the various codes, this segment provides a representative listing of key materials from each course, including textbooks, journal articles, websites and films. The finding from this listing is that, beyond the codes, each core course uses a variety of resources.

**Codes of Ethics**

The various professional codes of ethics were generally formulated by professional associations and represented the result of group deliberation on the most important values of the profession. In libraries the overriding value was that of insuring access to information and this value was articulated throughout the codes of many library associations (Fallis, 2007). The ALA Code of Ethics
(2008) states the standards of service and several of the teachers interviewed presented the ALA Code along with the ALA Library Bill of Rights (2006) which described a library’s role in the face of dilemmas and the values that the library must preserve (Preer, 2008).

Three teachers used the technique of contrasting the codes from different types of library and non-library groups to demonstrate the diversity and similarity of content both within and outside of the library field. The teachers explained:

“We start by looking closely at the many different library codes of ethics and I have them identify what values cut across those codes and also how those codes reflect what different groups of librarians do, because special collections librarians have a different take on this than public librarians do” (I2, 166-170).

“We have one session where we talked about what makes up a code and different structures and are there things that all codes have in common and what you can tell about an association or a profession from its code” (I12, 348-352).

“I [give students] many different codes of ethics and compare the Society of American Archivists, ALA, Association for Computing Machinery, Society for Professional Journalists and develop what they think should be in their own code of ethics” (I10, 104-108).

While all three teachers presented many differing codes, only the third teacher required that students look introspectively to develop their own code.

Another teacher, rather than recommending several codes to contrast had the students pick a few codes and answer several questions. She had students “look at the codes of their particular professional associations and analyze what it would take to implement them …whether or not they find them effective, do they think they’re current …(I13, 381-384). In this course the teacher was asking students to analyze practical questions about the codes’ effectiveness and currency.
One teacher addressed the applications of the codes and presented the codes in conjunction with the policies they supported. The teacher explains:

“I teach them in context with the related policy statements to not stand alone but to show how they work together, and so how the code of ethics is really underpinning the other policy statements” (I7, 337-341).

This teacher paired the codes with a related policy. For example, the teacher presented the relevant section of the ALA Code of Ethics (2008) in conjunction with the ALA Intellectual Freedom Manual (2006), and students explored the interconnectedness between the two.

Some teachers warned that, if including the codes in a course were handled in a pro-forma manner, a forced and uneasy connection to ethical content might result. One teacher described an ill-advised strategy to say to other teachers, “here’s how you put the code of ethics into your course syllabus.” This teacher suggested that forcing the use of the codes created “artificial moments, [and that] we need authentic moments of talking about ethics” (I6, 684-687). This teacher felt that integrating ethics requires more than just including codes of ethics. The conversation about ethical concerns and the value of the codes must evolve naturally within class discussions.

The evidence above supports the theme that codes of ethics comprise the most consistently used resource in core courses which integrate ethics. All of the teachers included some form of codes of ethics in their courses, with one exception. This teacher may have been reacting against what was viewed as the forced nature of introducing the codes. The teacher explained,
“In cataloging, classification, indexing and so forth, we don’t talk about any particular Code, but rather the individual sort of take on things…It’s more like a consciousness raising or critical thinking, than it is a particular code” (114,478-481).

The teacher of cataloging preferred that the students critically evaluate situations without reference to standardized codes. This represents a negative case and contradicts the predominant theme that codes of ethics are the most consistently used learning resource in the integration of ethics.

Other Learning Resources

Beyond the codes of ethics other learning resources were varied. There were a few ALA publications that were used across several of the Foundations and Collection Development courses: ALA. (1996)Library bill of rights; ALA. (1999). Libraries: An American value; ALA. (2004).Core values statement; ALA. (2008). Frequently banned books. Each core course had an interesting collection of reading focused on ethical issues in that specialty area. A few titles from each area are listed in Table 9 below (for a complete listing see the narrative on each course which is included in Appendix 1). A limited number of journal articles are included in this list. For some courses journal articles were unavailable for my research, since they were listed on the school’s internal databases, such as Blackboard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Materials included</th>
<th>Significance of material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Foundations</td>
<td>Dority (2006); Gorman (2000), Rubin (2004); ICIE website</td>
<td>International Center for Information Ethics website was highly recommended to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging &amp; Classification</td>
<td>Bowker &amp; Starr (2000)</td>
<td>Book helps students see flows in legacy classification systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Development Resources</td>
<td>Asheim (1953); Kiddder (1999)</td>
<td>Asheim article was assigned in every CD course; Kidder book emphasized roles and needs of communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Libraries and</td>
<td>LIS news online; Lennick (2006)</td>
<td>Lennick article focuses on leadership and moral intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Hammer (1992); Milgram (1962)</td>
<td>Hammer article concerns misconduct in science; Milgram DVD describes the infamous experiment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above brief table of materials supports the finding that beyond the codes, each core course uses a variety of resources.
All of the teachers interviewed had positive feelings about the impact of integrative ethics components of their courses. For all of the courses described in this study, teachers stated that these materials, in combination with their teaching techniques, helped to prepare students to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field” (ALISE, 2008).

**Evaluation of Courses**

Although the teachers interviewed had positive feelings about the impact of the ethics content of their courses, its evaluation was generally characterized by the traditional and the anecdotal. This segment of the chapter will address the evaluation of individual courses. The theme of the segment is that teachers and schools have collected evidence to evaluate the ethics content within core courses in a non-systematic manner.

All of the teachers performed traditional evaluation of students’ work on the assignments related to ethics by awarding grades based on the quality of written work and student contributions to the class. Teachers commented on the anecdotal remarks that students made concerning the ethical components of the classes, even long after they had finished the course. An example that one teacher shared:

“I will have students write to me and say, after they’ve graduated, maybe about one a year, ‘This is what’s going on in my library. Does this seem right to you? Help me think about the ethics of this’” (I8, 475-477).
Many teachers shared this kind of personal reflection as an indication of the impact that the course had on the students. This type of non-systematic, anecdotal story seemed to dominate the evaluation of the integrated ethical content in core courses.

The course syllabi and the interviews with the teachers revealed two non-traditional, but also non-systematic, approaches to evaluation of components of the course. One teacher of a Foundations class assigned students to peer review other students’ final, major presentations. The peer review took place in a group of ten students without the instructor present. The teacher explained that:

“It’s completely non-threatening because you know when you peer review you’re going to give each other A’s unless you’re a complete disaster…coming unprepared…I think it’s a great culminating activity because they always come out of there saying, ‘Wow. I never even thought about that’…or ‘I’ve got four more ideas I didn’t even think of’” (I12, 503-519).

The Evaluation checklist for peer review included some of the following questions: Is there a clear focus on a particular dilemma? Are both sides of the dilemma examined? Is there evidence of reflective thought on how the issue might be resolved? Did student use a decision-making model?

Another interesting approach that a teacher discussed regarded the beliefs/values/philosophy statement. In this statement, which the student wrote at the beginning of the course, students identified assumptions that they hold. The statement was examined again at the end of the course and students indicated whether their assumptions remained the same or changed during the course (I12). If changes in assumptions were tracked, it could provide a self-reported measure of the impact of the course. All of the examples provided above, of evaluation of
the ethics components of core courses support the theme that teachers and schools have collected evidence to evaluate the ethics content within core courses in a non-systematic manner.

The above section added a new segment to the story about the integration of ethics in LIS courses. Teachers and administrators who understood the importance of ethics, both to students and to their own teaching, provided descriptions of the key ethical components of core courses in LIS.

**Challenges of Teaching Integrated Ethics**

One important theme in section one was the challenge that LIS schools and students faced regarding the integration of ethics. In this section both teachers and administrators address challenges of teaching a course with integrated ethics. They supported this theme by recounting causes of problems that faculty encounter integrating ethics, including deficits both in the pedagogical alternatives and in the training and in the education of LIS faculty. Further challenges included an institution-wide negative view of ethics by some faculty researchers.

One fourth of the teachers remarked that in the LIS field there was a dearth of literature on pedagogical approaches for integrating ethics. Teachers articulated their difficulty in designing effective teaching strategies which incorporated ethical components. One teacher described the challenge of “finding effective teaching methods. It’s a huge subject and it has no tidy edges to it” (I13, 568-569). Another teacher elaborated that ethics must evolve naturally in class
discussions: “It doesn’t have to be this hit them on the head explicit ethics, it…has to be authentic and it has to be seamless” (I6, 767-768,772). The difficulty of achieving a seamless integration of ethics into an LIS course was exacerbated by the complex, and sometimes indeterminate, nature of the instruction required in the teaching of ethics. One teacher described this by saying:

“Ethical issues, when we start to look at them, become extremely complex and it’s very difficult to be hard lined on everything. So in a sense what you’re introducing is an area of discourse that’s …philosophical and it …requires someone with training in discourse and philosophy to undertake….We can teach when to recognize an ethical issue, but to recognize how to behave, to recognize how to respond to it, that’s difficult” (I5, 716-722).

Teachers identified that teaching ethics may require faculty with special experience and training. Also, they pinpointed the complexity and difficulty of examining the issues and of calibrating a response to them. One teacher tied the complexity of ethical issues to their indeterminate nature by saying, “The trick of teaching the ethics stuff is in the gray zone, ‘cause you’re never giving them a right or wrong answer” (I7, 830-831). One of the characteristics of the methods of ethical inquiry -- the lack of a quick, concrete solution -- makes it difficult to teach.

As well as complex pedagogical issues, teachers and administrators described the lack of training and experience in ethics that characterized many LIS teachers. One third of teachers interviewed discussed this characteristic of their fellow teachers. One teacher identified that those teaching in LIS may not have previously worked in a library; this work experience could have provided
valuable background for discussing ethical situations in class. He explained that, “if … you haven’t been out there working with it on a day to day basis, you don’t really see it [ethics] as being all that important” (I1, 720-721). Another teacher noted that the problem of “not seeing ethics” was not just related to the lack of library work experience, it could have resulted from deficits in the education of faculty. LIS faculty members may not have received training in ethics as part of their graduate education. The teacher described this situation by saying:

“We also have many faculty members in school who …not only don’t have professional experience, but they don’t have masters degrees in library science, so there’s absolutely no reason why they should’ve been acquainted with the ALA Code of Ethics or any other library code of ethics, because they’ve never gone to library [graduate] school” (I2, 888-891).

Administrators participating in the focus group identified the problem that faculty may not have the “professional experience from which to develop case studies.” But they implied that teachers should be able to recognize ethical situations and they proposed that the inexperienced faculty “would need to use pre-formulated cases” (FG, 341-343).

A few of the teachers interviewed indicated that even LIS faculty who were integrating ethics into courses did so in a superficial manner. An abrupt and mechanical handling of ethics did not achieve seamless and natural discussion of ethical topics. One teacher pointed out the abbreviated nature of some ethical insertions:

“I think it’s a lack of understanding of what it actually is and how complicated it is. Saying it for 10 minutes in a lecture is not sufficient” (I10, 694-696).
One administrator contributing to the focus group provided disconfirming evidence of the theme that teachers experienced challenges in the integration of ethics, by disagreeing with the importance of time in teaching ethics. The administrator indicated that the approach to a topic is paramount and that the quality of coverage of a topic was not always equated with the length of time devoted to teaching:

“I don’t think time alone matters. If those 10 minutes were really powerful it might resonate more with the students than in fact the half of the course that went before. So I think it depends on the gifts of the teacher” (FG, 370-373).

This administrator was emphasizing that an inspired teacher can compensate when minimal time is available.

Beyond identifying the challenges associated with complex pedagogical issues, with the training and educational limitations of LIS faculty and with the superficial nature of some integrations, interviewees shared a personal element in the challenges surrounding the issue of ethics. Two teachers indicated that they found it difficult to inoffensively critique colleagues’ teaching or work as lacking ethical considerations. One teacher described it by saying, “I’ve been perceived as kind of … [negative] because I’ll raise these questions about ethics. You know, people think that I’m putting them down because they don’t do ethics” [I6, 800-803]. Interviewees found that their peers treated them in a defensive manner when they suggested that the peer consider expanding their research or teaching to cover specific areas that raised ethical issues. Ethics-related tensions were significant enough between colleagues for one teacher to suggest a strategy for
diffusing the personal element in the tension surrounding the issue of ethics for LIS faculty by giving “attention to ethics without alienating well-intentioned people” (I8, 151-152). The teachers implied that making suggestions which concern the coverage of ethical issues must be handled in a delicate manner.

One teacher articulated a final challenge: a negative view of ethics created by research ethics programs governed by a university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The teacher indicated that many of the LIS faculty who do extensive research may transfer a negative view of ethics from their IRB experiences to their teaching role. These researchers may view ethics as negative instances -- or as examples of what you cannot do. This teacher described a situation that within universities many view “ethics as a restriction or ethics as the negative...ethics is still very much perceived or conceived as what you can’t do” (I6, 627-629). She stated that this negative view is in great part due to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) which regulates research on human subjects. She described the standard view of “ethics as… applying it after the fact…You design your research and then you worry about the IRB” (I6, 109-110). This teacher stressed that some in the university may have a negative view of ethics, and that the restrictions of human subject related research ethics, may have clouded LIS faculty members’ perceptions of professional ethics as part of students’ learning.
Absence of Challenges to Ethics Integration

The situations reported thus far described challenges for teachers which resulted from the integration of ethics. When asked the question, “What are the biggest challenges to integrating ethics?” one teacher reported an exception to this theme of resistance to the integration of ethics. This teacher shared a situation that had no reported challenges to the integration of ethics. The teacher reported that:

“[Ethics integration] is something that has been more than willingly accepted…everybody just accepts as necessary, as vital, [and] agrees to put it into the required courses. [They do] so not just willingly, but really wanting to put it in there” (I4, 423-428).

The fact that this teacher could think of no challenges or tensions for teachers integrating ethics was unique among the interviewees and represented disconfirming evidence for the theme of the several tensions that teachers face when integrating ethics into their courses.

Missed Opportunity in Teaching LIS Ethics

This final major finding describes the suggestion of a few teachers of one way to ameliorate some of the challenges in the teaching of ethics: they suggested a new approach to teaching ethics, based on the pedagogy of teaching a skill. There appeared to be a difference between teachers and administrators concerning their views on the teaching of ethics. A few teachers proposed viewing ethics as a skill set, whereas the administrators debated whether ethics is a skill that could be taught.
One teacher described the need for enhanced training for students in ethics. This teacher, who had worked previously as a masters-trained librarian, reflected on her previous graduate training that did not address the ethical problems they encountered when they worked in libraries:

“I always felt like when it came to the ALA code in intellectual freedom and all the core values, that we were told you will do this, but never how do you do this. You know, like what does this look like in practice? It looks really pretty on paper” (I12, 46-49).

These teachers recognized the deficit in their own masters LIS training: the LIS education they received merely gave lip service to various codes of ethics and vaguely told them what to do, but did not equip them with the tools to know how to address ethical issues. Their realization of on-the-job need for ethical skills motivated several teachers to promote ethics within their courses and throughout the LIS teaching community. But they realized that, despite their efforts to further ethics teaching, challenges of schools, students, and teachers hampered their efforts. One teacher described how ethics education in LIS was weaker than that in other professions:

“We would never prepare lawyers or physicians without a very clear component of the curriculum that addresses the ethics of jurisprudence or healthcare, [but in LIS] we only address certain aspects… censorship…equity and access” (I5, 135-137).

This teacher recommended that the preparation in ethics for librarians be expanded to cover courses and topics beyond the obvious access-related topics. In fact, one-fourth of teachers interviewed amplified this request for changes by suggesting that ethics could be viewed in terms of abilities and skills.
One teacher described the LIS environment and the advantages of looking at ethics as a skill set by saying:

“LIS programs… they’re professional degrees, you come out with the skill set. Ethics is not conceptualized as a skill set, so that’s a big problem. If you re-conceptualize ethics as a skill set, you see more people interested in actually taking an ethics course or in having it… throughout the curriculum. So until we get to that point where it’s seen as something useful, it’s not going to get there. It’s going to continue to be kind of pushed aside as a soft elective that isn’t going to be that useful” (I6, 825-831).

This teacher suggested that viewing ethics as a skill may make it seem more acceptable as a desirable and teachable subject. Faculty who were accustomed to teaching other skills may adapt more readily to a skill-based view of ethics. Students, who are acquiring skills to help them in getting jobs, may be more receptive to honing their skills in ethics. One comparison that teachers made was to examine the development of other skills in LIS and use these skills as an example for LIS ethics development. One teacher recommended looking at the teaching of communication/presentation skills by saying,

“When you teach skills everybody, every student, understands a skill, and our students for example, now understand the value of communication skills, we teach a course on information presentation where they learn how to put together a report nicely and make it coherent” (I14, 147-150).

The teachers described ethical skills development as similar to communication skills. These skills in ethical reasoning and behaviors, which could serve professionals throughout their careers, were described as based,

“not so much dogma or rules, but like a tool kit… we don’t even know what’s down the line in terms of the technology, but the skills you learn, the underlying skills, … you’re going to need to know just so that you can keep on developing” (I14, 158-159, 165-168).
These teachers encouraged re-conceptualizing ethics as abilities or talents in which professional librarians could develop skill through practice (similar to web design or public speaking). Teachers interviewed indicated that, by implementing this view of practical, skill-based ethics, they were striving to make ethics a “real living part of the curriculum” (I12, 76).

While a quarter of the teachers interviewed advocated for a new conception of ethics which stressed the development of skills and abilities, LIS administrators held distinct viewpoints on the teaching of ethics. Administrators were committed to incorporating ethics into their schools’ courses, but they demonstrated a nuanced approach to the concept of ethics as skill development. Within the interactive focus group environment, administrators had the following thoughtful interchange when discussing the idea of teaching ethics as a skill:

One administrator stated:

“I don’t think you can teach it as a skill… I am convinced that first you … show people and demonstrate through what you have them read and what you talk about how to think in a certain way, then you give them clues so that they can operate with that form of thinking. And so first it’s about how to think about something then it’s about providing certain kinds of tools that then…” (FG, 718-23, 728-29).

Another participant interrupted with a thought about the centrality of ethics training: “In a sense [it’s] the theory and practice that we’re balancing in our programs all the time.”

The initial speaker added: “But it’s through case studies and things like that they get some tools they can bring up when they need it.”
An additional respondent introduced the student’s viewpoint and summarized the dilemma:

“But what bothers some of the students, is that you’re asking them to think about something that their gut tells them is part of their identity in a way that doesn’t fit with their identity…most of us resist thinking of ethics as a skill because we intuitively regard it as a trait – something innate – integral to our identities, rather than something we could pick up. But … our identities are really shaped by interaction with others or by the discourse…We learn our first ethics unconsciously, as we learn our language, and both ethics and language feel like parts of us, but are in fact skills” (FG, 717-740 and member checking).

Through their discussions administrators changed their initial position that ethics cannot be taught as a skill. They moved to the view that ethics, which was closely related to identity, could be regarded as a skill which could be taught since identities were shaped through discourse. But at the same time, the administrators admitted that, “students who were never part of such a discourse” (FG, 713-714) could resist this kind of teaching. This extended conversation between administrators, combined with the new approach proposed by the teachers, support the theme that teachers and administrators have identified a missed opportunity – to re-conceptualize ethics as a skill.

**Summary of Key Findings**

The first research question, “How did teachers and administrators describe institution-wide ethics efforts?” was answered by narrowing the question to four areas of inquiry concerning teachers’ perceptions of the role of ethics, institution-wide challenges they encountered, perceptions of students’ challenges, and institutional steps to provide students with grounding in ethics. Three key findings emerged from the data in this first section of the chapter.
The first key finding was that teachers and administrators recognized the importance of the teaching of ethics for their students and for themselves as teachers. Teachers and administrators connected ethics to the concepts of professionalism and diversity. And the teachers provided impassioned descriptions of their commitments to teaching ethics.

The second key finding was that the study participants identified two types of challenges which result from the promotion of ethics – those that exist across LIS schools and those that their students experience. The challenge emerging from the data related to internal LIS program tensions centered around the scarcity of time in a crowded curriculum. Further, a few teachers discussed their perception of the need for more coverage of ethical issues within applied technology courses. This recommendation was provided by teachers who did not teach technology courses but who indicated that the discussion of ethical issues was foundational to the application of technology. Teachers and administrators perceived that students approach the study of ethics from several viewpoints: they may find ethics enriching, but ethical content challenges some students’ personal views, and other students may feel that ethical content is not as effective as other, more applied courses in attracting the attention of employers. In this case, the participants in the study were articulating their perceptions of how students act and feel.

The third key finding was that schools have devised processes to initiate, implement, and evaluate the integration of ethics on a school-wide basis. These
three steps are essential for achieving institution-wide change, such as the integration of ethics. The teachers and administrators detailed the evidence of these processes: they provided eight catalysts—events and key personnel which served to initiate ethics activities. The most crucial event for initiating the integration of ethics was the ALA reaccreditation visit. The most important initiators of the integration of ethics were the Deans, Directors and Program Chairs who administer the LIS programs. Further evidence of the processes were the nine on-going ethics implementation activities that were detailed by the study participants. The most widely used of the implementation strategies was the regular dialog in faculty meetings describing the methods for integrating ethics into courses. The final evidence of the change towards the increased integration of ethics is in its evaluation. Teachers and administrators discussed five evaluative exercises or systems which provide measures of the success of the integration of ethics. One often used evaluative measure was the placement of questions relating to ethical issues on comprehensive exams.

In answering the second research question, concerning the ways that teachers integrate ethics into their courses, I narrowed the inquiry to four areas: courses most important for integration; the most prevalent ethical components across courses; the challenges for teachers attempting to integrate; and a missed opportunity in ethics pedagogy. As a result of inquiry into these four areas, seven key findings emerged from the data presented.
The first key finding was that teachers indicated the importance and prevalence of integrating ethics into core courses in LIS curricula. Although all teachers interviewed stated that all courses in the LIS curriculum have ethical elements, they recommended the major integration of ethics into the core, required courses. Teachers described how “substantially more emphasis” should be placed on the core courses and one teacher gave an example of a school retaining the required status for a collection development course, because it served as a vehicle for conveying ethical content.

The second key finding was that almost half of the core courses had learning objectives which specified ethics-specific knowledge or behaviors. To verify this finding, I examined the seventeen syllabi for the core courses and discussed the learning objectives with the teachers. I found that that just less than half of the courses provided learning objectives which contained definitive, ethics-specific concepts. As evidence, I provided a table of the ethics-specific learning objectives that were listed in core courses. These examples provided models of the ethics-specific knowledge and behaviors that teachers expected to result from the integration of ethics.

The finding that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses served as the study’s third key finding. The evidence for this finding comes from the robust descriptions that the teachers provided of using lectures, student-led presentations, assignment of papers, discussion, case studies, and experiential methods, including field studies, simulation and values
clarification exercises. Two teachers had perceptions that differed from the majority of teachers about the value of role playing. They did not find it to be a comfortable exercise for students.

The fourth key finding was that teachers recognized that the concept of community was central to the integration of ethics. Repeatedly, when the teachers were asked to discuss the teaching of ethics in various courses, they invoked techniques centered around identifying and serving the needs of the community. Throughout many of the course descriptions, community was a recurring theme: collection development teachers stressed creating a collection suitable to the community; one cataloging/classification course taught students to develop systems that reflected the relevant perspectives of the community; concerns for the community in reference courses moved students beyond simple analysis of tools to question the adequacy of service to the public; the research methods course stressed the ethical considerations regarding the community being studied; and management courses stressed adequacy of service to the community as part of employee performance appraisal.

The fifth key finding was that the codes of ethics were the most consistently used learning resource in courses that integrated ethics. The teachers described their various methods of using versions of codes for comparison, to examine their application to policies, and to combine with “authentic moments for talking about ethics.” One teacher provided a negative case against this predominant theme of teaching codes of ethics: this teacher preferred students to
critically evaluate situations without reference to standardized codes. Beyond the
codes of ethics, other learning resources varied greatly among the courses. I
developed a table which included representative titles from each of the courses to
display the disparity.

The finding that teachers experienced challenges in the integration of
ethics served as the sixth key finding. The comments of teachers about the
causes of the challenges provide the evidence for this key finding. These causes
include deficits both in the pedagogical alternatives and in the training and
education of LIS faculty. Further challenges included an institution-wide
negative view of ethics by some faculty researchers. One administrator provided
disconfirming evidence to one small part of the theme by downplaying the
challenge of time allocated to teaching ethics. A teacher provided a negative
case to the entire theme by stating that, at his institution, the teachers did not
experience challenges with the teaching of ethics.

The seventh and final finding was that teachers and administrators
identified a missed opportunity, conceiving of training in ethical analysis as the
teaching of skills. Several teachers provided evidence by suggesting that viewing
ethics as a skill may make it seem more acceptable as a desirable and teachable
subject. Faculty who were accustomed to teaching other skills may adapt more
readily to a skill-based view of ethics. Students who are acquiring skills to help
them in getting jobs, may be more receptive to honing their skills in ethics. One
teacher used the analogy between the development of skills in ethics and the
enhancement of communication skills. Another teacher described teaching ethics as “not so much dogma or rules, but like a tool kit … [with] underlying skills.” In contrast to the teachers’ re-conceptualization of ethics as a skill, administrators demonstrated a more nuanced viewpoint on the teaching of ethics.

The ten key findings described above were created from the reported experiences of teachers who were interviewed and from the discussions of administrators who participated in the focus group. The key findings were derived from the themes identified in this Chapter.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

This chapter concludes the story of the integration of ethics into LIS curricula. I begin this chapter with a summary of the study. I then address the implications of the study’s conceptual structure, the Taxonomy of the Teaching of Ethics in Professional Graduate Programs. Next, I detail the implications for the LIS profession of the study’s major findings. I follow by addressing the limitations of the study and make suggestions for future research and conclude the Chapter with recommendations, guided by the dissertation findings, for practical strategies of integrating ethics across the curriculum in masters-level studies in Library and Information Science.

Summary of Dissertation

Many LIS programs claim to integrate ethics but few authors have examined how the programs are accomplishing this integration. The purpose of this research is to expand the descriptive literature on the current teaching of ethics in graduate LIS programs by investigating ethics integration across the curriculum. The research portrays teachers’ and administrators’ views on school-wide initiatives on the integration of ethics. The research also describes strategies that teachers use to integrate ethics into existing core courses in LIS curricula. The two research questions are:
Based on the descriptions of teachers and administrators, in what ways are schools integrating ethics institution-wide? and

How do teachers integrate ethics into their courses?

The methodology for the study is qualitative research with the sequenced methods of document review, interviews with award winning teachers, and a focus group of distinguished LIS administrators. Data is analyzed by the constant comparative method and verified by using trustworthiness criteria.

**Key Findings from the Taxonomy**

In this segment I summarize the key findings from the taxonomy that I created as the conceptual framework for this study. Chapter 4, which is entitled, “Towards a Taxonomy of the Teaching of Professional Ethics,” distinguished the most important components of the teaching of stand-alone ethics courses, including learning objectives, teaching techniques and assignments, learning resources and evaluative tools and systems. The two key findings concern the usefulness of the taxonomy in terms of its clarification of the components of the field of teaching applied ethics and the insight that the taxonomy provides into the state of ethics in the field of LIS.

The first key finding is that the taxonomy provides useful distinctions between the major components of the field. Beyond a mere list of the components, the taxonomy provides a conceptual organization of the findings. While the parts are distinct, they are interrelated. These distinct but
interconnected components can help to guide thought and action. For example, in devising the course syllabus for a reference course with an integrated ethics component, a teacher can create an ethics-specific learning objective, e.g., “Explain major ethical issues in reference work.” Then the teacher can use teaching techniques and learning resources, such as observational analysis of reference interviews and reading the ethics chapter in a major textbook (e.g., Bopp & Smith, 2001), to help accomplish the learning objective. The teacher can evaluate whether the student has accomplished the learning objective, both orally through class discussions and in writing on class exams and papers. As in the example above, the components of the taxonomy can be viewed as a whole and this view enhances the understanding of the phenomenon of integrating ethics. The practical goal of the taxonomy is in line with that of Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956): Namely, to provide useful advice that teachers can use in the classroom. Because the scope of this taxonomy is restricted in its structural domain, the teaching of ethics in professional fields, the taxonomy can address more practical, pedagogical concerns than those addressed by the taxonomies of Bloom and others (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Gagne, 1985).

The second key finding is the evaluation of the state of ethics instruction in the field of LIS. The goal of creating the taxonomy, as covered in Chapters 3 and 4, was to provide a lens or perspective which shaped the type of questions posed to subjects, how data was collected and analyzed, and how synthesized data informed the conclusions. The development of the taxonomy was not undertaken
with the goal of comparing the teaching of stand-alone ethics courses across the five fields studied. But an examination of the tool did lead me to make some contrastive conclusions concerning the courses taught and the teaching materials used. Further I have been able to identify two opportunities where teachers of LIS ethics could benefit from the teaching and evaluation methods used in courses from other fields. The generalizability of these conclusions is limited by the small number of syllabi examined (twenty) and my research design, which was limited to the study of syllabi (it did not include teacher interviews to determine details of the courses that are not clearly stated in the syllabi).

The examination of syllabi for the taxonomy indicated that those teaching LIS ethics have as widespread an array of learning objectives, teaching techniques and assignments as those from the other fields. The most innovative courses in each field used case studies and a variety of experiential techniques. Further, the teachers interviewed for the integrative study (some of whom also taught their school’s stand-alone ethics course) clearly understood evaluation methods for ethics teaching, and especially the importance of “embedded outcomes” in their programs’ evaluation processes. Finally, I found that the LIS field had reached a convergence with the other fields on developing appropriate teaching materials. While I did not have access to internal databases of required reading, I was able to review the major course texts and some other types of materials used, such as films and websites. In the syllabi examined, the fields of business, law, engineering, and medicine used films more often than teachers in LIS. In the
library field the teachers were unique in providing students with a wide array of blogs and websites. The LIS ethics courses also assigned a rich array of ethics readings. The sample textbooks from the syllabi, as represented in the taxonomy, can be updated to include a book published in 2008 entitled *Library Ethics* by Jean Preer. This book, awarded the 2009 ALA Greenwood Award for the best book of the year in library literature, provides a current but historically-based view of the most important issues in the field of library ethics and relates these issues to current librarian codes of ethics. It is noteworthy that stand-alone LIS ethics courses are much more focused on covering a variety of codes of ethics and performing comparisons, than courses in the other four fields.

The time sequence reported in the literature review indicates that early stand-alone courses in ethics were established in the fields of medicine, law, engineering and business (Davis, 1999) beginning in the 1970s and moved to full implementation in the 1980s. LIS ethics was a few years behind the other fields: The first LIS ethics course was taught in the fall of 1984 at Drexel University by Diana Woodward (Wildemuth, 2008). LIS was, relatively speaking, a late-comer to the teaching of ethics. Despite the lag of a few years by LIS in offering stand-alone courses in ethics, the field made significant strides in developing learning objectives and evaluating their fulfillment, in using a wide range of teaching techniques and in developing learning resources which assist in the teaching of ethics.
In a more speculative view, from my examination of the twenty syllabi from five fields of professional education, I have identified two areas in which the LIS teachers of stand-alone and integrated ethics could learn from ethics courses in other fields: in the expansion of conflicts of interest to include loyalty to an employer and in the use of non-traditional evaluation such as peer-review and self-evaluation.

While the stand-alone ethics courses from all fields addressed conflicts of interest as an important topic in the teaching of ethics, I noticed a more nuanced approach when I closely examined syllabi from the different fields. The three fields of LIS, law and medicine all placed a major focus on the crucial link between the professional and the client/patient. In LIS this connection is made by covering the concepts of intellectual freedom and confidentiality; in law the bond is the legally enforced lawyer/client privilege; and in medicine the patient-doctor relationship and confidentiality are paramount. The fields of engineering and business are focused on this relationship with clients, but they are also focused on the relationship with the employer. Most courses in engineering and business devoted time to discuss loyalty to employer and to address the employees’ role in whistle-blowing. It seems that ethical issues in LIS fall into a middle ground with the strongest emphasis on the relationship with clients, but another key area is the librarians’ loyalty to employers. LIS ethics classes could more extensively discuss what loyalty requires and whether this loyalty might have important ethical elements. For example, medical librarians working in a managed care
organization may be expected to report on activities of other managers and employees in the organization (especially union-related activities). Questions arise about what duties does the librarian have to safeguard client information? What are their duties as employees and their duties as librarians? Engineering and business students focus on this corporate conflict. LIS students taking stand-alone ethics, many of whom soon will be employed in information centers existing within a larger structure, might also benefit from a significant discussion of their responsibilities as loyal employees. In the integration of ethics into LIS courses this loyalty discussion could also be raised in management and special library courses along with the discussion of issues of privacy of information.

The second area which might benefit the LIS ethics student is to expand the methods of evaluation. Both engineering and law ethics courses depended heavily on team structures and on the peer evaluation of the team members. In these courses the evaluation of the other members of the team could count for five to twenty percent of the student’s grade. In one law class each team member was rated by peers on their contribution to the team, their contribution to the class, and the importance of their contributions. In on-going team oriented activities, which are used often in ethics classes, fellow team members can provide valuable input. The other evaluation measure is that of self-evaluation. This method is used primarily in medical ethics classes. The American Philosophical Association (APA) recommends using this method, along with evidence from performance in written assignments, when the evaluation is of an attitudinal change. Since
several LIS courses address values clarification, using self-evaluation might be an effective strategy for both stand-alone and integrated ethics courses.

**Implications of the Key Findings of the Dissertation**

The key findings emerged after I had synthesized data obtained through three carefully sequenced research methods: First, I examined course syllabi and reviewed other documents in preparation for the second method, interviews with fifteen award-winning LIS teachers, which was followed by the final method, a focus group of distinguished LIS administrators. The ten key findings revolve around the two areas of inquiry – the general introduction of ethics across the LIS school and the integration of ethics into specific core LIS courses.

The first finding was that teachers and administrators recognized the importance of the teaching of ethics for their students and for themselves as teachers. The implication for the teaching profession in LIS is that the faculty benefitting from teaching ethics will want to share skills with their colleagues by being available and cooperative in helping them to integrate ethics. Teachers with ethics expertise should take advice from one of the teachers interviewed in this study who suggested a strategy for promoting “attention to ethics without alienating well-intentioned people” (I8, 151-152).

This first finding is related to the ninth finding, that teachers experienced challenges in the integration of ethics. Teachers explained that the challenge was connected to the lack of training and education of some LIS faculty and their
discomfort with adding ethical issues to their courses. In the interviews teachers more often brought up these barriers than did the administrators in the focus group. When asked about the lack of training and job experience that might limit a teacher’s ability to integrate ethics, one administrator stated that “They don’t have a professional memory that brings examples to bear …, so they might need prewritten cases to discuss” (FG). Teachers repeatedly commented on the need for the integration to evolve naturally from the course material and not represent a superficial adjunct. The difference in perceptions suggests that teachers can see the barriers more clearly than their administrative colleagues. This finding implies the important role that ethics advocates can play in helping their colleagues to integrate ethical components into their courses. But the interviewees clearly stated that comments regarding the coverage of ethics must be handled in a delicate manner. One teacher perceptively stated that “people think I’m putting them down because they don’t do ethics” (I6, 800-803). Several teachers suggested that this kind of intervention works best when ethical issues are explored on a one-on-one basis between colleagues.

The second finding, that study participants identified two types of challenges, those that exist across LIS courses and those that their students experience, has widespread implications for attitudes toward the teaching of ethics. This finding can be considered in combination with the final and tenth finding, that of a missed opportunity of re-conceiving training in ethical analysis as the teaching of skills. The implications of these two findings are that the way
ethics is viewed has an impact on the students and on the curricula. Considering ethics as skills that can be learned, as activities with tangible benefits, can influence the way that students (and faculty) view the value of ethics education.

Several teachers and administrators reported that students might not value ethical training as much as the training provided in technologically based courses. Some teachers endorsed the conception of teaching ethical analysis as a skill. Administrators in the focus group debated whether ethics could be taught as a skill: They discussed the challenge of building ethical skills while also addressing attitudes that students had acquired from their upbringing. Their argument was similar to that of Socrates and Plato (Curren, 2000). Socrates believed that ethical virtue is a skill or form of knowledge, while Plato stressed that it is important to assure the proper execution of skills by complementing the skills with dispositions, attitudes, and inclinations.

A first step towards developing this view of ethics could be to examine the learning objectives which undergird what one teacher calls an “ethical toolkit.” Several learning objectives included in the Taxonomy focused on sorting out a situation ethically and coming to a decision. These learning objectives pinpointed important skills for students including: recognizing, and with practice, anticipating ethical complications that may arise in the course of their careers; using reasoning and enhanced perception to understand the situation; articulating, in speech and in writing, the ethical conflict and alternatives for resolving it; and making good decisions. The first two learning objectives prescribed perceiving
situations in certain ways -- to recognize ethical complications and to understand the situation. The third objective underscores the importance of effective communication of an argument. In the interviews one teacher spoke of using communication skills as a model for teaching ethics as a skill. While the complexity involved with mastering the four ethical skills greatly outweighs the difficulty of learning presentation skills, these skills are certainly an important part of the ethical toolkit. The fourth learning objective in the skill oriented set, making good decisions, involves students’ ability to evaluate their own decisions and select the best option. An additional and final learning objective, forming professional identity, provides the disposition-forming piece of the ethics pedagogy which predicts students’ inclination to act using the ethical skills and knowledge depicted in the prior learning objectives. As Plato stressed, this potential action is moderated by attitudes and inclinations. While these dispositions could be related to a student’s upbringing, learning the professional requirements and seeing them in practice can also influence a student to adopt new attitudes or adapt former inclinations (Hoyt, 2008).

Evaluating learning objectives provides an important first step towards examining the conception of teaching ethical analysis as a skill. The learning objectives undergird teaching techniques which help to convey ethical analysis as a skill set. Evaluation of outcomes is relevant to considering ethical reasoning as a skill, since the outcomes require and embed the skill-based approach.
Another component of these challenges described in the second finding is the challenge to LIS curricula: specifically, the time that is required to integrate ethics into an already crowded curriculum. One implication is to view the claim of lack of time in the curriculum as an excuse, rather than a reason. Teachers’ and administrators’ beliefs provide underlying reasons for the excuse of no time in the curriculum. These beliefs about ethics include the following views: ethics is self-evident to all and need not be taught; ethics is innate and cannot be taught; or ethical behavior is assured by observing standards (Marks, 2004). This curricular tension also has implications for the most persistent question concerning ethics teaching asked by LIS decision makers, “Should there be a separate course in Information Ethics or should the topic be incorporated into many other courses, especially foundations courses?” (Carbo, 2008, p.12). This question creates an unwarranted dichotomy between stand-alone ethics and the integrated instruction in ethics that has been the major topic of this research. One administrator participating in the focus group was concerned about the sequence of courses and the fact that students who had taken stand-alone ethics might repeat some content in the ethics component of a core course. Several teachers and one administrator provided a contrasting viewpoint by emphasizing that students hearing several ethics examples for the same area of LIS is beneficial. One teacher explained that: “nobody ever worries if they overlap and get too much on ethics, it’s just … it’s too critical” (I13, 198-200). The ALISE Position Paper (2007) recommends both a stand-alone ethics course and ethics integration
into core courses: together, they complement each other and form important
elements of a complete LIS education.

The third finding, that schools have devised processes to initiate,
implement, and evaluate the integration of ethics on a school-wide basis, implies
that practical strategies are available for schools that want to enhance the teaching
of ethics within courses. These strategies will be expanded in the final section of
this chapter.

Findings four through eight all relate to the teaching of specific courses
and many of the implications for these findings are closely related. The fourth
finding relates to the importance of the integration of ethics into core courses.
One administrator participating in the focus group stated that “we’re supposed to
do this,” referring to American Library Association (ALA) and Association for
Library and Information Science Educators (ALISE) recommendations. The
institution-wide attitude expressed by a teacher was more positive:

“[Ethics integration] is something that has been more than willingly
accepted…everybody just accepts as necessary, as vital, [and] agrees to put it
into the required courses. [They do] so not just willingly, but really wanting to
put it in there” (14, 423-428).

The fact that this teacher reported no challenges by teachers or within the
institution to integrating ethics perhaps indicates that teaching based on this
positive orientation (an attitude towards problem solving that begins with
considering ethical concerns) can move an institution towards strategies for
resolving the challenges. Britz and Buchanan (2009) propose this kind of approach, which they call “ethics from the bottom up.”

The fifth finding, that almost half of the core courses had learning objectives which described ethics-specific knowledge or behaviors, implies the widespread practice by teachers of informing students of the ethical components of the course. The learning objectives not only provide focus for the teacher and the course, but they also alert students to the most important concepts upon which they will be evaluated for competency.

The sixth finding, that teachers used many teaching strategies for integrating ethical content into courses, implies a recommendation from these talented teachers. While LIS teachers often use a wide array of sophisticated teaching techniques in their courses, a few of the strategies included in the courses reviewed here may spark ideas for teaching. One example concerns the most commonly used teaching strategy in ethics education, the case study. Teachers demonstrated a nuanced approach to case studies which other teachers may want to emulate by using shorter, more informal cases, the content of which is often contributed by the students themselves. One teacher linked cases together throughout the course to give students continuity in approaching ethical components of the course.

The seventh finding is that teachers recognized the concept of community as central to the integration of ethics. These teachers implied that, when students assess the needs of a community and determine how to respond to these needs,
through their behavior (in courses in reference, management, or research methods) or through their building of collections or systems (in courses in collection development or organization of information), that they are learning skills crucial to ethical decision making. Similar ethical issues apply to both real communities (Morrisey, 2008) and virtual communities (Bruckman, 2006).

The eighth finding was that the codes of ethics were the most consistently used learning resource in courses that integrated ethics. Their reported use implies an endorsement by the teachers that the codes are useful for conveying ethics and principles of the profession. Also, other teachers may want to emulate the methods by which the study participants employed the codes including: to compare and contrast; to introduce codes from other professions (e.g., journalism); to relate codes to policies; and to have students create their own codes.

I conclude this section by summarizing below the key findings and their implications. Further, I examine the challenges and the opportunities that they create.

These findings paint a portrait of teachers who realize the importance of integrating ethics into their courses: This activity is crucial to their own identity as teachers, as one interviewee said, “attending to ethics for me gives meaning and depth to what I teach and it gives me a real sense of purpose and meaning” (I8, 200-202). Several of the teachers identified the hesitancy in some of their colleagues to broach the ethical components for the subjects they taught or
Teachers acknowledged their responsibility to help colleagues integrate ethics into their courses, but they emphasized that this opportunity must be handled in a delicate manner. One teacher suggested exploring one-on-one with a colleague the ethical issues relevant to their courses or research.

Teachers and administrators identified challenges in the integration of ethics for students and for the LIS curricula: several teachers proposed that these challenges could, in part, be answered by re-conceptualizing the training in ethical analysis as the teaching of skills. This opportunity to envision ethics as acquiring skills and ethical skills as having tangible benefits could influence the way that students view the value of ethics. The challenge to the LIS curricula concerns the time that is required to teach ethics. Administrators and teachers have the opportunity to examine excuses, as well as reasons that may motivate action on two curricular issues, integrating ethics in all core courses and creating a stand-alone course in information ethics.

The teachers shared specific integration strategies for core courses thus providing an opportunity for those wishing to integrate ethics. Findings concerning the implications of crafting learning objectives, of employing many teaching strategies, and of designing several approaches to presenting the codes of ethics, all can contribute to a teacher’s knowledge base for the integration of ethics.

The participants in the study shared opportunities for school-wide initiation, implementation, and evaluation of ethics, based on their own
institutional activities. Their experience provides an opportunity for institutions to benefit from the success of others.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

The next segment discusses major limitations and recommendations for future research. I first mention the limitations that have been described in Chapter 3, and then I elaborate on additional limitations, including those that can evolve into recommendations for future research.

Some limitations of this study have been previously discussed and include the limits of using an exemplar study, of determining the reliability of self-reported data, of the researcher’s personal bias’, of the small size of the study population, and the perspective which is limited to those of teachers and administrators. I have tried to account for each of these limitations by taking extra precautions, such as checking the interview data against printed sources of information, especially syllabi. Also, as explained in Chapter 3, I am cautious in the interpretation of data; I have examined the transcripts after the coding and have noted disconfirming data.

One major limitation of the study has to do with the way the conceptual framework was constructed. To prepare myself to address the topic of integrated ethics, I included in the literature review six accounts which gave details of the teaching of stand-alone ethics courses in LIS (ALA, 2004; Buchanan, 2004; Carbo & Almagno, 2001; Carbo, 2004; Fallis, 2007; Rockenbach, 1998). I also received
the course syllabus for one stand-alone ethics course retrieved as part of the pilot interview. Further, as the interviews on integrated ethics progressed, I received six additional stand-alone ethics syllabi from teachers who taught this course, in addition to teaching courses in which they integrated the ethics content. In Chapter 4, I stated that, “having a rudimentary grasp of the literature was an important component for devising relevant questions, for understanding answers of participants, and for posing follow up questions to the interviewees and focus group participants.” This statement may contradict the advice of Creswell (2009) that “Qualitative researchers build their patterns, categories, and themes from the bottom up, organizing data into increasingly more abstract units of information” (p.175). The disadvantage of my use of a mixed epistemological stance (rather than creating a pure interpretive study where all findings are induced from the data), is that the portion of my research prior to or contemporary with the data collection, may have influenced the data collection itself. I could have heard what I expected to hear, rather than what the participant actually said. Describing Creswell’s concerns, I could have gotten my categories and abstract units of information from the Taxonomy resources (literature and syllabi) rather than from the words of the interviewees.

To counteract this bias, I primarily collected, rather than studied, the syllabi before and during the interviews and focus group. Further, I had all participants approve of my extensive summary write-up of the interview that I produced within two days of the interview. I also asked all participants to be
available for subsequent data checks. When the interview (or the focus group) upon analysis resulted in especially contentious or unclear data, then I sent the participant(s) a few paragraphs from the relevant section of Chapter 5 for their approval or revision. Through both types of member checking, I received much valuable information which helped me to reflect in my writing the precise information shared by the interviewee. The peer debriefer may have added another level to the trustworthiness of the data. The person filling this role was not exposed to the results of the syllabus analysis and his particular background, as a law and education scholar, did not provide biases towards the data in this study. He served the role as an objective observer, providing a reflection on the findings from the focus group and from each interview.

The second and third limitations of the study imply a path forward to future research that could ameliorate particular weaknesses of the present study. The second limitation concerns the lack of an observation of teaching practices. Observation of master teachers integrating ethical content could have allowed me to provide “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973) of the actual classroom setting. These textural details could have given readers a contextual feel for teachers’ and students’ reactions to the content of ethics instruction. While it seems unlikely that a researcher could conduct observations at multiple schools, one possibility might be to obtain videotapes of particular class sessions. Also, it should be relatively easy (with proper permission) to observe an online class, especially the interactions in class and those on the blog.
The third limitation (which was mentioned briefly in Chapter 3) was the sole focus on the views of teachers and administrators in LIS on the value of ethics instruction and the exclusion of the perspective of the LIS students, practicing librarians or those that employ librarians. Clearly, these are important pieces of the puzzle of understanding ethics integration and they need to be investigated in the future. One suggested tactic is to address both of these limitations at one time by designing an observational study which uses mixed methods and combines the qualitative observation with a survey of students for the quantitative part of the study. Other survey-type studies could be designed to address practitioners’ and employers’ views on the value of ethics education in LIS.

Another related area for further research relates to expanding the taxonomy. The quantity of and interrelationships between the differing learning objectives could be expanded by analyzing additional syllabi. Also, teaching techniques in the taxonomy could be expanded through additional interviews and syllabi analysis and by the addition of teacher observation to the research. The area of online teaching of ethics could be an especially fruitful one for the observation of teaching techniques and a catalog of these techniques would be a welcome addition and innovative to the taxonomy and to the literature of the teaching of ethics.

Finally, one of the research components of this study, contrasting information provided by teachers with that provided by administrators, may be a
misleading comparison. Several of the teachers of integrated ethics currently hold administrative positions or have held them in the past. Further, the administrators participating in the focus group all were engaged in limited teaching activities. The fact that, in the field of LIS in general, administrators are teachers and teachers serve in administrative capacities may have blurred possible comparisons. Interestingly, I did find a few areas in which the administrators expressed a unique viewpoint: These opinions were not necessarily divergent from those of teachers, but they were quite different in that administrators viewed the question of time, evaluation, and student receptiveness from the program-wide viewpoint. These three unique areas of emphasis for administrators include: (1) the already mentioned concern for the addition of ethics in courses and the time required for this teaching; one administrator emphasized the communication abilities of the teacher as more important than the time spent in class on the ethics; (2) the concern for evaluation and a discussion of how to measure reflective thinking by students at the end of the program; this discussion resulted in recommendations for capstone courses and assigning writing on same ethical topics at beginning and at end of the program, to demonstrate students’ increased competency; (3) administrators’ assessment of the students’ viewpoint on ethics, concern about the influence of their upbringing, and also concern about the receptiveness to ethics for younger versus older students. All of these study limitations are important considerations in evaluating the validity of the research methods in this dissertation.
Recommendations for Practice Guided by Dissertation Findings

I will conclude this research with my recommendations for future practice of teaching integrated ethics as informed by the findings of this dissertation. I have developed the recommendations to provide practical suggestions for implementing the integration of ethics. Teachers can devise teaching strategies for specific courses and administrators or teachers can systematically encourage the implementation of ethics integration throughout programs at LIS schools. In both situations, the individual or group that is promoting change in the approach to teaching ethics can be considered catalysts of ethics instruction diffusion. A few of these catalysts, as well as pivotal events are included in Table 6. My specific advice to these agents of change depends upon the position of their school in the ethics continuum -- how far along their program is in emphasizing ethics. The paragraphs below will provide counsel to those in schools at the beginning and to those at more advanced stages of this continuum. Finally, I will provide recommendations to teachers of individual courses who wish to enhance their approach to ethics.

Schools that are at the beginning of the process of encouraging their faculty to consider adding ethical components to the curriculum will want to consider the findings section entitled “Initiation and Implementation of Ethics Integration” and the accompanying Table 6. The three events that participants report spurred the emphasis on ethics were the ALA reaccreditation visit, a major reconfiguration of the curriculum, and their LIS program surveying other
professional programs to determine the ethics programming on campus. These ideas from study participants could serve as a springboard for expanding a program’s emphasis on ethics.

Institutions that are at a more advanced stage in developing an institution-wide approach to ethics can study the implementation strategies described in the text and outlined in Table 6. The most frequently mentioned of the nine strategies listed in the table is the regular dialog about ethics teaching in faculty meetings. Promoters of ethics instruction at these institutions which have achieved success in advancing ethics, may want to examine the teaching strategies used across specific LIS courses, as well as those listed in the taxonomy for courses in professional ethics. These ethics-vested teachers and administrators can compare their current practices to those listed in the taxonomy and in the dissertation findings. I describe below a case where a lead teacher for a course entitled, Collection Development, might suggest that her colleagues perform this analysis because she was concerned about the consistency of introducing ethical considerations into this core course by the four different instructors teaching the course. They could use the information contained in this dissertation in three ways: 1) To enhance the consistency of the introduction of ethics they could expand the ethics-specific teaching techniques and learning objectives for their courses by examining those included in the section of Chapter 5 entitled, Findings Across Courses. In the specific case of assuring consistent ethical coverage for all versions of the course, Collection Development, one learning objective included
in Table 7 seems relevant, “Recognize and respond to challenges of intellectual freedom.” Those interested can also examine the discussion of teaching techniques, ranging from lecture to experiential methods, and consider which methods might best help students to achieve the ability to recognize and respond to intellectual freedom challenges. To drill deeper into the collection development course they can 2) examine and compare their current course syllabi to the individual course objectives and teaching techniques included in the specific course descriptions listed in Appendix 1. Here they will find that the teachers specifically included guest lecturers to help students recognize the challenges to intellectual freedom and they used role playing to help students to respond to the challenges; and finally, 3) these teachers may want to examine the learning objectives included in the Taxonomy, Chapter 4, to determine if any of these learning objectives from stand-alone ethics courses can be adapted to fit their courses featuring the integration of ethics. They may determine that the learning objective, recognize and anticipate ethical situations, allows the instructors to expand the objectives for the course to the concept of developing an early warning system that can allow students to anticipate challenges of intellectual freedom. Further, teachers of Collection Development may want to make sure that the students understand and can articulate the ethical issues and may want to add these as additional course learning objectives.

In this study I have focused on activities at the forefront of integrating ethics into the teaching of masters’ level students in LIS. I have recorded and
analyzed extensive descriptions of how master teachers and administrators view the teaching of ethics. In their words I have shared the story of the integration of ethics in LIS teaching, including the challenges confronted and strategies employed for success, both in the classroom and throughout the LIS School. My hope is that this study will serve as a foundation for future investigations and that the story of the integration of ethics will continue.
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Appendix 1:

Descriptions of Ethics Integration into Specific Courses

Interview Protocol & Questions

Interviews with master teachers in LIS conducted between October 2008 and February 2009 are detailed in this Appendix. The protocol for interviews was designed to elicit information about the overall ethics program at the school and course-specific information about the particular specialty area of the teacher. (An interpretive analysis of answers to these research questions was summarized in Chapter 5) This Appendix displays answers to questions for each specific course and provides generalized and specific information about the course.27 (See Appendix 3 for specific interview questions)

I began by asking teachers about the best way to integrate ethics into their specific course. This question was intentionally open-ended and non-suggestive and I expected that teachers would indicate their first thought concerning a successful strategy. Then I followed up with specific questions about the use of case studies, codes of ethics, ethical theories, decision-making models, and other teaching techniques. Further, I encouraged the teacher to include specific ethical issues they addressed in class and through reading and writing assignments. Then I requested the teacher to single out any of the course learning objectives which especially related to ethics. I concluded the course-specific segment of the

27 The citations provided for learning resources used in the courses are given in full bibliographic form and are not generally repeated in the reference list.
interview with questions about the evaluation of the ethics component of the course and the specific question from the ALISE position paper of whether the teacher felt that this course prepared students to “take responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interaction in the information field?” (2008) The answer to this final question resulted in a strong affirmative by all of the teachers interviewed. I include below detailed descriptions of the teaching methods, materials assigned, learning objectives, and evaluation for the 6 core courses and 3 elective courses.
1. **Cataloging and Classification Courses**

These courses were designed to provide students with a foundation in information organization, including the process of classification and the use of subject headings to catalog materials.

a. **Teaching Techniques**

Each of the two teachers interviewed for the course in cataloging and classification, demonstrated diverse teaching strategies.

One teacher (I11), who taught the course face-to-face, used traditional teaching methods including:

- Lecture on the tools and their particular bias (e.g., Dewey system bias toward Christianity),
- Focus on the importance of considering other viewpoints, which this teacher stressed as an ethical consideration in cataloging and indexing systems,
- Invocation of the ALA Code of Ethics and review of the sections stressing equal access and the need for objectivity.
- Assignment of research paper to students on issues, encouragement to students to choose topics on ethics (e.g., user privacy, data integrity, transitory nature of Web resources and user access)
- Discussion of ethical issues in depth, as students presented papers.

The second teacher interviewed concerning ethics integration chose a less traditional approach as part of a totally online, distance-education course in cataloging and classification. (I14) In this course the teacher assigned the following experiential activities (the third activity is less relevant to ethics than the first two):
- Require each student to choose a classification system that had theoretical or policy implications, and to develop and present a PowerPoint presentation which covered the following aspects: who devised it, what good/bad did it do; how was it manipulated; who were the stakeholders (e.g., classification of mental disorders DSMIII) The purpose of exercise is to display the flaws in legacy systems that are readily accepted by most of society and to teach students to question the authority of such systems.

- Use case studies that are fresh each semester (e.g., database manipulation at Johns Hopkins University to remove “abortion” from Popline database). Encourage students to bring in cases.

- Require project in which students performed ethnographic interviews and used the information gained to present either existing classificatory schemes in a “community of discourse” or to develop and present a classification scheme for a client using the principles of domain analysis. This project used an experiential method with the goal of teaching students to recognize the difficulty in developing a classification system that “resonates with a variety of perspectives.”(114,649)

b. Learning Resources

In the first, more traditionally oriented course, the teacher assigned no reading assignments related to ethics. The readings related to the ethics component of the second course were:


c. Learning Objectives

The ethics-related learning objectives that the teacher identified for the traditionally oriented course included “understand approaches for obtaining information on users’ information needs” and “exhibit critical thinking and problem solving abilities” (111, 761-769). The learning objective that related to
ethics for the second, more experientially-oriented course, was to “identify, critically analyze and discuss the social and ethical aspects of classification”.

d. **Evaluation**

While students are not given an opportunity to formally evaluate the ethics component of either class, both teachers agreed that the classes, as they had designed them, fulfilled the challenge stated in the ALISE position statement, which is to help students take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2) Relating anecdotal evidence, one teacher said “my students tell me ‘I don’t look at things the same way anymore,’ and that’s, I think, the core of ethics education” (I14, 624-25).
2. Collection Development Courses

A broad description of a course in basic collection development is to learn to identify, provide and evaluate information tools and resources for communities of users. Three LIS teachers were interviewed and each taught a different variation of the course (I2, I5, I7). Two of the courses were required for graduation and one course was an elective. All three of the courses were taught face-to-face, but one course also used live interactive television, so that students across the state could take the course. During the interviews the teachers discussed the teaching techniques, readings assigned, learning objectives and evaluation which addresses the ethical components of the course.

a. Teaching Techniques

The teaching methods that the three teachers employed to convey the ethics-related portion of the course included lecture/discussion, case studies, guest speakers, role playing, and classroom-based or community projects. One teacher described their course as “a good mixture of principles and also some very practical exercises” (I2, 590-91).

While all the teachers organized much of their teaching around the concept of censorship, their lectures and discussions also explored issues of privacy, copyright and resource sharing. Further, they stressed the importance of developing a collection that relates to the local community. The teachers put special emphasis on ensuring that the collections that librarians developed met
the needs of community members who were disabled or from under-represented
groups such as minorities or the gay-lesbian and bi-sexual population.

The teachers each included relevant case studies for discussion with students; some specific cases mentioned were outsourcing of the state library in Hawaii, filtering of internet websites in Rochester, N.Y. public libraries, and censorship challenges in North Carolina. All teachers encouraged or required students to provide cases for class discussion, either from the literature or from a work situation. One teacher began each class with examining the clippings that students had obtained from the popular media: These current incidents provided relevant discussion topics which in some cases required the entire class period to discuss.

One teacher used several outside speakers from the university and local library community to address the following topics: fiscal management, open access and scholarly publishing, copyright, electronic licensing, distributors and vendors, multicultural materials and de-selection. This teacher felt that each of these speakers provided “very up-to-date, in the moment, examples about what’s happening” and gave first hand accounts of ethically-laden situations (17,897).

Role playing and class and community projects furthered the goal of making the ethical issues in collection development realistic to the student. The one teacher who used role-playing felt that the class was successful in getting the students engaged in the censorship issue. The students in this class were required to complete several projects prior to the role playing. First, they
developed an annotated bibliography on an ethical topic, such as censorship, resource sharing, or collection planning. Next, the students wrote a collection development plan for a small library in a specialized subject area. Then, the students designed challenge forms for handling challenges to material in this particular library’s collection. The role playing involved students acting out the actual challenges for specific materials in each type of collection represented in the projects. The students took turns playing the librarian and playing the irate library user. (I2).

One class in collection development used an alternative to role playing, by simulating the situation through literature. The teacher assigned as course reading a book which provided a rich description of a community (Kidder, 1999). As a project, the students were required to design and produce a poster presenting several essential qualities of community, as observed from readings and from observation, and to detail the library collection development implications which result from these qualities. In a final project for this course, students produced a paper which described the values of libraries and how to address them through a collection. (I5).

Just as the above course used the literature to emphasize the needs of diverse components of a population, another teacher used community projects to get students engaged in populations with special needs. Students worked with non-governmental organizations (NGO’s) or with smaller libraries in their local community to recommend a collection which met their information needs.
During the projects students had regular in-class discussions about the projects and addressed any ethical situations that arose during their observation in the field. (17). One teacher of collection development commented that the classroom only provides “concepts and ideas for themes they will encounter in practice.” It seems that the three courses, by adding the community projects, observations or readings may have, in a small way, brought practice to the course. Through the use of all of these teaching methods including lecture/discussion, case studies, guest speakers, role playing, and classroom based or community projects, the three teachers felt that were able to engage students in the ethical aspects of collection development.

b. **Learning Resources**

The reading assignments related directly to the teaching techniques. Across the three classes the sources included codes, guidelines, books, journals, and miscellaneous resources. The students in all of these classes read the ALA Code of Ethics (2008), and other ALA publications including: *Intellectual Freedom Manual*(2006), *Library Bill of Rights* (1996), *Libraries: An American Value* (1999), and *Frequently banned books* (2008). The teachers assigned several books and journal articles related to the ethics components of the courses. There is one notable article which all teachers assigned:

Asheim, L. (1953). The librarian's responsibility: Not censorship, but selection

One teacher also assigned articles related to the above classic:


Other ethics-related books and journal articles included:


Miscellaneous materials and assignments were also required. One teacher made available to students their own collection of collection development policies that different libraries had developed. The course also required that students regularly monitor several blogs that address ethical issues, e.g. Office of Intellectual Freedom blog http://www.oif.ala.org/oif.

c. **Learning Objectives**

The readings and teaching techniques all supported the learning objectives for each course. These objectives included both general and specific statements. The general statements that imply ethics state that students will:

- Understand cultures, individuals, groups and communities as information users
- Employ concepts of reflective practice (by keeping track of thoughts and processes)
- Formulate collection development plans

Specifically, that students:
- Assess the needs of a community in relation to a particular collection
- Recognize and respond to challenges and opportunities of special interest to collection developers: intellectual freedom, new information formats, copyright and resource sharing

d. Evaluation

The ethics-specific portion of the classes were never formally evaluated. But the three teachers did agree that the collection development courses which they had designed all reaffirmed the ALISE position statement (2008) by helping students take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (p.2).

The above descriptions provided by three teachers of collection development give rich detail to these diverse elements of teaching techniques, materials assigned, learning objectives and evaluation of the courses.
3. Courses covering the Foundations of Library and Information Science

Ethics is frequently a major topic in courses entitled “Foundations” or “Introduction to Library and Information Science.” The ALISE Position Statement on Information Ethics in LIS Education (2008) designated this course as the most logical first step towards the integration of ethics by declaring that “The curriculum should be informed by information ethics through a unit in the required foundations (or equivalent) course”. These introductory courses are almost always required. (One of the Foundations courses that is reviewed here is not a required course). and they generally included the following kinds of topics: history of libraries and librarian pioneers, exposure to the various fields of practice and research in librarianship, Of the four courses detailed in this study two were taught face-to-face and two were taught in a hybrid format that involved two or more face-to-face meetings. The four Foundations courses, taught by master teachers, encompassed a variety of ethical components; including teaching techniques and class projects/assignments, readings assigned, learning objectives and course evaluation.

a. Teaching Techniques

The teaching techniques/class projects/assignments in the Foundations courses fell into several categories: lecture/discussion topics, case studies employed, class assignments, and more active learning methods including role playing.

The creativity of the teaching techniques was evinced by examining the starting lectures for the different courses. Teachers thought it important to begin
the fundamentals course with the examination of students in the class and their identity. One teacher required that all students arrive to the first class armed with their test scores on the Myers-Briggs personality inventory.28 This professor commented that "you can't do ethics unless you know yourself first" (I12, p.637). The teacher later introduced decision making models to help students recognize assumptions that are underpinning their decisions. Another teacher also began the course by covering the identity issue, but this teacher discussed identity from an historical perspective and had students research “library luminaries,” historical pioneers who had a role in establishing library principles. (Other teachers interviewed for this course also required the students to research historical library leaders, but this assignment was made later in the course.) One teacher began their course by focusing directly on the values implicit in the library profession, including discussion of the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the unique position of those in the field of librarianship. The fourth teacher began her course with a focus on library specific values by looking at the ALISE Position Statement on Information Ethics in LIS Education (2008) and then began a discussion of public library filtering and ethical implications.

Internet filtering is just one example of case studies that teachers employed. All teachers interviewed used case studies, but teachers complained that cases are too simplistic and they suggest “linking them together to [help students] reach deeper understanding” (I10, 406). Some of the cases cited were

---

28 One teacher of the Foundations course also recommended the test authentichappiness.com
the Kreimer case (Geiszler, 1998) concerning a homeless man evicted from a New Jersey public library, the case of a reference librarian questioning the motives of a tattooed teenager looking for pictures of marijuana plants, and the discussion of a librarian’s proper response to a library user’s inquiry for the name of a good car mechanic. Teachers encouraged students to bring in examples for cases: One teacher required that students bring in clippings from the popular media to spur discussion.

As well as case studies, the teachers use other teaching techniques and assignments including:

- dilemma papers, where students had to present both sides of an issue and must have used a decision-making model to resolve
- in-class discussions where the students, after reading the Patriot Act and explanatory documents from the department of justice, had to find two positive things about the Act.
- in-depth analyses of the key values and code of ethics for one professional association
- student-written letters to the editors of publications concerning ethical issues
- book reviews on a title related to an issue of access

Teachers also employed introspective learning methods. One technique was the student’s reflective journal that was shared with the teacher on a weekly basis. Students who may have been uncomfortable sharing their fears and uncertainties with the class, addressed these concerns to the teacher. The second technique was requiring students to write as the capstone of the course, a statement of their professional beliefs/values, ethics, and philosophy that will
govern their practice as a library and information professional. They also included their views of professional values and described whether these views had changed during the course.

The more active, experiential teaching strategies were intended to move students out of the classroom, either figuratively or physically. One teacher employed role-playing to demonstrate the ethical concerns and viewpoints of the various stakeholders, e.g., Case compared Google books to OCA/Open Content Alliance and students assumed the identity of a fiction writer, President of a university, and a librarian. In another foundations class LIS students were required to attend and report on a library board or a city council meeting in which one topic was library access or funding. Another teacher assigned students an interlibrary loan exercise which provided first-hand experience with library censorship. Students were required to borrow one of two children’s books, *Sissy Duckling* or *Daddy’s Roommate* from the public library. These books are unavailable in conservative communities because they include gay characters. Students shared their experiences when some libraries refused to get these materials on interlibrary loan. All of these teaching techniques including using case studies, various assignments and experiential methods provided diverse opportunities for integrating ethics into a Foundations course.
b. **Learning Resources**

Resource materials which supported the teaching strategies served an important role in furthering the integration of ethics. These materials consisted of Codes of ethics, position statements, articles, books, films and websites.

Teachers spoke of teaching codes of ethics along with policy, so that students could see that the codes serve as underpinning for these policy statements. Often teachers lead students to discuss what codes have in common and what you could learn about an association from its code. All teachers used a large number of codes from diverse areas, some course syllabi include over 50 codes. Beyond the standard codes of the ALA and the CLA (Canadian Library Association) a few of the representative codes were:

American Society for Information Science and Technology. Professional guidelines

Association for Computing Machinery. Code of ethics and professional conduct.
   Retrieved April 14, 2009, from Http://www.acm.org/constitution/code.html

Society of American Archivists. Code of ethics for archivists with commentary

Courses also included several ALA publications:


Many of the assigned readings in Foundations courses related to ethical concerns. The list included here include only a few representative titles from each course. These titles included:


A few important websites:


c. **Learning Objectives and Evaluation**

As well as assigning a robust collection of materials, teachers of foundations courses formulated a broad array of learning objectives for their
Since foundations is an introductory course and often the first course that students take, one primary purpose of the course was to inform students of the qualifications and the values needed to become a professional in the field of library and information science and to develop a sense of professional identity which may initiate the personal changes required to acquire these qualifications and values. Several objectives/competencies address this goal:

- Develop student's knowledge, skills and dispositions in LIS including: core values of professionals;
- Describe and discuss the practice of ethics and ethical practice.
- Develop an understanding…of the core values of the profession and an understanding of professional issues and practices
- Develop a sense of professional identity

Some of the objectives for the foundations courses described specific tools and strategies that teachers used or students developed to achieve this understanding of issues and changes in disposition. These objectives included:

- Understand core values of field of LIS (I10, I12)
- Develop a personal philosophy as a profession including: articulate viable philosophy of professional behaviors, ethics and responsibilities (I10)
- Develop reasoned opinions; plan for professional development based on self-awareness (I12, I10)
- Be aware of human factors. and how they shape attitudes and perceptions (I10)
- Be engaged in reflective reading and critical thinking (I10, I12)
- Explore ethical standards of professional conduct (I2)
- Through historical, social, and ethical context and through the study of contemporary issues provide a framework for understanding trends which affect roles of information professionals (I2, I10, I 7)
One teacher puts together many of these strategies into one statement:

- Introduce students to the importance of historical, social, political, economic, cultural, legal, technological, ideological, and philosophical contexts in their foundational study of the field. (I7)

For each of the courses in this study, and especially for their ethical segment, the remaining question is have these course objectives been accomplished? For this particular course, the teachers admitted that the standard course evaluation form did not include any questions relating to the ethical components of the course. In fact, the course evaluations don’t really include questions about course content. Teachers stated that the course did make a step (as one teacher said “a giant step” (I10, 252) towards achieving one of the objectives included in the ALISE position statement, which is to help students take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field” (2008, p.2).

Teachers shared comments about students’ informal evaluation of their courses. The biggest student complaint was that “they haven’t learned anything about how to run a library.”(I12, 234) Teachers were uniform in their view that ethical information and skills have everything to do with the running of a library.

One teacher paraphrased Richard Budd, the former Dean at Rutgers, in advocating the long term view in terms of the outcomes of ethics education: “Educators should not only give students skills to use technologies and information available today, these teachers in LIS should be educating students for the final job they will undertake in their career. “(I10)
4. **Management of Libraries and Information Agencies Courses**

Four seasoned teachers shared their syllabi and insights concerning integrating ethics into courses in the area of LIS management. The courses represented a gamut of teaching modalities including face-to-face, totally online, and a hybrid course that is mostly on-line, but with a few face-to-face segments.

a. **Teaching Methods**

Teachers had distinct teaching methods for incorporating ethics into a management course: these techniques included the traditional such as lecture, discussion and case study to the more experiential methods.

Teachers used the ethics-specific method of case study to stimulate student discussions, but they resisted using formal case studies because they required too much time to cover completely. They used examples gained from their own library experience (I1) as well as encouraging students to bring in cases from media sources. Teachers found that ethical issues discussed related to personnel issues, communication skills and considerations of ethical behavior within a bureaucracy. Personnel conflicts, especially discussion of clashes between librarians and library aides were favorite topics for case studies. (I15) One strategy to help to move the discussion is to use a 12 step process which provided a structured inquiry of who’s harmed, who’s helped (I13). Teachers also presented codes of ethics; they noted that ALA Code of Ethics and ASIS &T

---

29 As an exception one teacher did not use the codes, since they did not have examples.; he felt that the class should discuss behavior instead of spending time on the codes. (I1)
Code of Ethics are especially useful in providing guidelines for organizing services. After examining the codes students engaged in a discussion of what they needed to do to implement the codes of particular organizations (e.g., ALA, archivists, web designer, and preservationists).

Some teachers added experiential and identity enhancing components to the management courses. For fieldwork students were assigned to serve clients in local libraries and non-governmental agencies; students performed management analysis for these organizations. In class they debriefed about the work and discussed problem-solving strategies for any ethical situations that had arisen. The experience with “real world clients”, followed by class discussions of ethical dilemmas faced in the workplace added to the relevance of the ethical teaching (I13). To simulate real situations teachers used role-playing; favorite topics were employee evaluation, hiring and presenting budgets. To enhance students’ values formation two teachers began the course by having students bring to the first class their rating on the Myers Briggs Personality Inventory (I13, I15). The rationale was that students must first know themselves to “get past your own prejudices and expectations.” (I13, 406-407)30 Another values/identity enhancing activity is to require that students prepare a one-page document outlining their personal philosophy of librarianship (I1).

30 An LIS educator who teaches a Foundations course also uses Myers Briggs as an introductory exercise. There are many free sources for this test on the internet.
b. **Learning Resources**

Codes of ethics referenced in the courses include:


American Society for Information Science and Technology. Professional guidelines

Association for Computing Machinery. Code of ethics and professional conduct.

Society of American Archivists. Code of ethics for archivists with commentary


One teacher encouraged students to read LIS News online in preparation for class each week. They also assigned a variety of ethics-related readings including:

c. Learning Objectives

Teachers identified specific learning objectives which they indicated were relevant to the ethics content of the course including:

- Paying attention to people involved in library operations (I4)
- Looking at characteristics and function of manager, understanding basic human elements (I4, I1)
- Allowing reflective thinking, developing concepts, raising questions on issues (I13)
- Considering principles that currently affect library management. (I13)
- Strategically resolve practical problems, critical and ethical issues, and policy matters (I15)

In addition to the above objectives, one teacher specified that all of the course objectives are relevant to ethical behavior (e.g., preparing a budget in an ethical manner).

d. Evaluation

Teachers agreed that their students in the Management courses on libraries would be able to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2) Teachers felt that as a result students will begin to understand the ethical
level of service that this profession requires and think clearly about human interactions (I 1, I 15).
5. **Reference Courses**

Most reference courses in LIS masters training serve as basic introductions to reference tools in both print and electronic formats. Further, these courses introduce librarians to the skills and attitudes they needed to meet the information requirements of a diverse group of library users. One teacher suggested that those teaching reference often allowed this tool-related goal to dominate the course content; he portrayed the typical reference course as a mechanical enterprise in which students were focused solely on using specific online and print reference tools. (15)

Interviews with three reference teachers spotlighted their teaching methods, readings assigned, learning objectives, and the evaluation of the course. These master teachers described how they gave priority to the library user viewpoint and successfully integrated ethics into this often tool-dominated course. Two of the teachers taught the course face-to-face and one teacher used a hybrid format including compressed video and online.

a. **Teaching Techniques**

Teaching techniques, which included discussions, case studies, and experiential techniques, helped students to recognize the human needs of a diverse group of library users. Topics covered included examining information seeking behavior models and discussing the library anxiety that users may encounter. Teachers also led discussions on reference librarians’ responsibilities
to promote equity of access and confidentiality. (I8) They helped students to understand the difference between privacy and confidentiality and to respect the awesome responsibility that librarians have when users shared information with them. They stressed the ethics involved when providing legal and consumer health/medical information.

Rather than using traditional and sometimes lengthy case studies, these teachers provided examples and anecdotal stories to their students. Teachers expanded these examples into the experiential realm through two techniques. First, in one course each student examined specific reference resources while considering the needs of one fictional character. This exercise used characters from the book *Working* and required students to examine each resource and consider the interests and information needs of their assigned fictional character. In this case the teacher used literature to help students to gain empathy for specific library users (I5). Another teacher employed an unobtrusive measure, observations of reference librarians’ interactions with requestors of information. The activity required students to examine and evaluate an actual librarian’s interactions, both in face-to-face and in online reference. The students reported on the interactions that they witnessed in terms of the skills that the librarians uses and, as relevant to ethics, the empathy that librarians demonstrated with users. (I5, I8)
b. Learning Resources

Teachers assigned readings from texts and from institutional codes and guidelines which addressed the importance of the user’s perspective in providing effective reference service. The codes of ethics and guidelines which were discussed included:


One reading strategy was to assign the same ethical readings on the first day of class and the last day of class; this was an intentional strategy which had students reflect on what they learned throughout the course about important ethical considerations in providing reference services. The repeated reading is starred in the listing below of books and articles which the reference teachers assigned:


c. **Learning Objectives**

The courses generally did not specify “ethics” in the learning objectives. As an exception, one teacher provided an ethics-specific learning objective that students should

- Explain major ethical issues in reference work.

Other teachers indicated that general learning objectives for his course applied indirectly to the teaching of ethical concepts.

The courses’ learning objectives stated that the course served to introduce students to:

- Roles and responsibilities of reference librarians,

- Diverse user needs and information seeking behavior

- Techniques and strategies for providing information services

- Explaining factors influencing the choice of information source and format

- Discussing and applying criteria and methods for the evaluation of reference services.
d. **Evaluation**

All three teachers agreed that students taking these reference courses would be better equipped to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2) One teacher stated that the course increased students’ awareness “that…their decisions all have consequences…and that ethics involves personal decision making, not just applying a checklist.” (I8 505-512)

The teachers indicated that the students in their classes were responsive to the ethical content of the course and that, although no formal course evaluation was administered on the ethics portion, the course helped students to take responsibility for their actions in the arena of reference services. Three master teachers of reference all employed considerable skill in designing learning objectives, selecting reading assignments, and employing teaching techniques which helped to orient this course towards the ethical issues involved in providing reference services for a diverse group of library users.
6. **Research Methods Course**\(^{31}\)

The one teacher interviewed described an online, required course which was often one of the first courses masters-level students take. The teacher explained that her approach was to use ethics as a “framework for the foundation from which all else proceeds…most people if they even think about ethics is an afterthought.” (I6, 88-90) The teacher declared to students that

> “Anytime we make a methodological decision about research, whether it’s how we define our research question or what type of instruments we’re going to use,…we’re making ethical decisions” (I6,59-61).

**a. Teaching Techniques**

The teaching techniques involved the use of case studies, the discussion of ethical theories, considering cross cultural perspectives, and role playing. For the case studies this teacher had students research and then view a video on the Milgram experiments\(^{32}\) and discussed the experiments’ violations of consent and autonomy. The class also discussed the ethical issues involved in using online surveys and blogs as data sources. Further, students viewed a video in which Robert Hauptman discussed authorial ethics. To clarify the issues, the teacher introduced several ethical theories including the consequentialist approach in the U.S. and the rights-based approach popular in Scandinavian countries. Despite the online nature of the course, the students were able to engage in role playing

---

\(^{31}\) There seemed to be a growing acceptance of the area of research methods as appropriate for a core, required course for masters-level LIS students. 2009 research found that “about half of the ALA-accredited programs require such a course” (Mcknight & Hagy,p.136).

\(^{32}\) These experiments which were conducted by Yale psychologist Stanley Milgram tested the willingness of subjects to follow their own conscience vs. following the instructions of someone that they viewed as being in authority (Milgram, 1963).
concerning ethical measures for recruiting subjects and obtaining consent. The class also actively commented using online discussion boards.

In preparation for the major research proposal for the course, the students began by writing a description of what they thought would be the ethical issues in their research and what the IRB would identify as problematic. Then, after they finished their proposal, they again evaluated the ethical issues that had arisen.

b. Learning Resources

The reading for the course included standard methodology papers which addressed a bit about ethics and the following papers which focused role of ethics in the LIS curriculum:


c. Learning Objectives and Evaluation

The course had several traditional learning objectives which imply ethical operations including “articulate the importance of research, assess appropriate use of research methods, interpret data analysis results and design a research project.” This teacher suggested adding “embed an ethical awareness of research” (I6, 394).
For evaluation of students’ abilities in research ethics, the mid-term exam for the course included one question on ethics. Several students commented to the teacher that they had never thought to question research findings and methods. The teacher indicated that the course did prepare students to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2).
7. **Searching Courses**

Two teachers described their elective face-to-face courses in which students learned to search proprietary and free online resources to answer information requests.

a. **Teaching Techniques**

Teachers used lecture, demonstration, and design to illustrate the following ethical issues to students: practices of database producers (e.g., not notifying users of the producers’ removing journals from coverage or of their dropping articles which were proven false and not providing an official record of the deletion); ethical issues in interaction with people; ethics of creating and judging websites; and equal access discussion in terms of usability of websites. The demonstration components of the course especially emphasized determining trustworthiness and inaccuracy through the examination of a number of websites. The design section of the course stressed the importance of enforcing copyright and avoiding plagiarism in the websites that the students created. One subtle way that the teachers emphasize ethics in the course was to assign the students searches to perform that emphasized ethical topics, e.g. euthanasia.

b. **Learning Resources and Evaluation**

The one book assigned relevant to the ethics component of the course was

The courses did not involve any formal evaluation of the ethical components. Teachers agreed that their courses did prepare LIS students to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2) Teachers specified that students learned in the course to consider the ethics involved in choosing databases to access, in interacting with clients, in evaluating information and in maintaining confidentiality.

c. **Learning Objectives**

While neither of the courses had learning objectives which specifically mentioned the concept of ethics, the teachers indicated that two learning objectives were closely related:

- Help students understand challenges posed by the changing information environment of information professionals (I11) and
- Students will be able to explain the complexities of the searcher/client relationship (I9)
8. **Library Fundraising Course.**

One teacher described a face-to-face elective course on Fundraising in Libraries. The course employed lecture, discussion, case studies and experiential teaching techniques.

a. **Teaching Techniques**

Lecture was an important part of the library fundraising course. The instructor recruited many outside speakers including library directors, historians of philanthropy, trustees, and friends of the library. These speakers helped students to understand the role of different players in library fundraising. The teacher had a collection of cases from fundraising and library literature and these cases were often longer and more extensive than traditional case studies that this teacher used in her other LIS courses. Most cases involved conflict of interest and often concerned the clash of the mission of the donating body with the library’s values, e.g. donations from tobacco companies or from entities which would deny access to information.

Beyond the regular and guest lectures and discussion of cases, the teaching moved into experiential learning for the student. Each student, for the duration of the course, assumed the identity of a library seeking funding. Each student was assigned a specific prospective donor and the student presented a brief mock meeting with the donor to present the library’s case. Part of donor research was to determine the appropriateness of the donor for the library. Another experiential part of the course is the student’s actual interview with a library
director or a library fundraiser to talk about the issues of accepting donations from
individuals, corporations and foundations.

b. **Learning Resources**

The learning resources included codes of ethics, model standards and
other reading. The ALA code of ethics was contrasted with that of the
Association of Fundraising Executives. Students learned to question whether a
donor had values which were at odds with the ethical practices of librarianship.
The codes and guidelines are listed below:

February 16, 2009, from, from
http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/statementspols/codeofethics/codeethics.cfm
Association of Fundraising Professionals. Code of ethical principles and
standards. Retrieved April 14, 2009, from
http://www.afpnet.org/ethics/guidelines_code_standards
National Committee on Planned Giving. 1999. Model standards of practice for the
charitable gift planner.
http://www.ncpg.org/ethics_standards/modelstandards.pdf

Other readings included:

but doubts persist about think tank. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 27
March, A4.*

Dec.), 4, 6.

Myers, B. (2004). Safekeeping the public trust: Librarians and fundraisers in

Times, 11 March.*
c. **Learning objectives**

The learning objectives for the course were oriented towards fundraising. One learning objective hints at the strong connection of the course to ethics: challenge students to consider philanthropic giving in changing economic, philanthropic, and institutional environments.

d. **Evaluation**

The ethics component of the Library fundraising course was not formally evaluated. The teacher “absolutely” agreed that students taking this course are better prepared to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2) The teacher explained that students like the course “because it’s so grounded in real experience [and] they really like hearing the outside speakers” (I2, 792-794).
9. **Children’s Literature Course**

One teacher described this elective on-line course.

**a. Teaching Techniques and Learning Resources**

Typically, literature courses cover and criticize the literature which is written for children. This course not only talks about teaching children through their literature, but the course covers respect for children and their rights to ethical treatment. The major teaching techniques were case studies described in situations found in the children’s literature. The literature was examined to determine how children make ethical decisions. Further, examples from the literature demonstrated issues of privacy and confidentiality.

The teachers compared and contrasted the ALA Code, the Library Bill of Rights and the NAEYC Code of Ethical conduct. The full documents are cited as follows:

- National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment [http://www.naeyc.org/about/positions/PSETH05.asp](http://www.naeyc.org/about/positions/PSETH05.asp)

**b. Learning Objectives & Evaluation**

The teacher indicated that two learning objectives touch on the ethical content of the course. The students will:
• Be able to select and evaluate the literature of children by using specific criteria for each genre and

• Be aware of the issues surrounding the selection and use of children’s materials, such as fair use, copyright and controversial materials.

While there was no formal evaluation of the course, the teacher enthusiastically endorsed that students have achieved the recommendations of the ALISE statement. This course helped the students to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field.” (ALISE, 2008, p.2)
Appendix 2: Interview Guide and Questions

When conducting an in-depth, semi-structured interview, the order of the questions can change and questions can be added based on the interaction between the interviewer and subject.

**Purpose of the Interviews**

The purpose of conducting the interviews is to determine how exemplary LIS faculty integrate ethics into existing core courses in LIS curricula. The research will also investigate the teachers’ feelings about the integration of ethics and the teacher’s perception of the environment for ethics integration in his/her institution.

**Usefulness of information**

This research will expand the descriptive literature on the current teaching of ethics in graduate LIS programs by investigating ethics integration across the curriculum.

**Preparation, Follow-up & Most Important Questions**

**Preparation before the interview:**

- e-mail invitation and attach IRB information letter.
- search for information from institution’s LIS website about ethics programming or about specific core courses, if available.
- develop a list of courses that the instructor teaches and obtain the specific syllabi, course description and learning objectives for each course. In some cases researcher will need to contact the faculty member prior to the interview for access to syllabi.
• set duration of interview for 30 minutes; duration of all interview questions should equal 30 min.
• before interview give assurances of confidentiality
• Use data collection tool (below).

Follow up questions:
• Were important * questions answered? If not, why not?
• Do I have a different view of relative importance of questions? Will this change the instrument?
• What were the unexpected findings? Should they be incorporated into future interviews?
• What are researcher’s and peer debriefer’s assessment of the interview?

Most important questions:
(Important questions are starred in text below) institutional attitudes toward integrating ethics (Q I.1, I.2); any information relating to taxonomy-learning objectives, techniques, resources, evaluation (Q III.2-III.10); role of ethics in preparing students (Q III.13), biggest challenges in integrating ethics (Q IV.1.)
**Interview Data Collection Tool**

Before interview remind of confidentiality and ability to stop interview at any time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A – Introductory Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Try to limit discussion here to 7 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contextual Question:*
*I.1* Tell me about the overall approach at your institution to ethics within the curriculum.

*Probing Questions for Follow-up (ask only if appropriate):*
*I.2* How would you characterize the emphasis on ethics is throughout the teaching of courses at your institution?

*I.3* Are you aware if your institution has ever looked at curriculum in a systematic manner to see if ethics is offered within specific courses?

*I.4* What are or would be the steps to integrating ethics into the curriculum?

*I.5* How are faculty encouraged to integrate ethics into existing courses?

*I.6* If faculty are encouraged, what is the nature of the encouragement and who is initiating?

*Contextual Question:*
*I.1* If it’s not clear already - How do you feel about the integration of ethics into core courses?

*Probing Questions for Follow-up (ask only if appropriate):*
*I.2* Do you think that ethics integration is important to the quality of your school’s LIS program?
II.3 How does integrating ethics affect you and your teaching?

II.4. In general, which courses do you feel are most appropriate for the integration of ethics?

II.5. What makes these courses the most appropriate?

Part B – Direct questions about the teaching of ethics in class(es) entitled:

| Interviewer will attempt to limit discussion to a maximum of 2 identified courses, for which she has already examined the syllabus, learning objectives, and course description. |
| Try to limit Part B (13 questions) to 18 min. Encourage expansion on questions |

Contextual Question:
III.1. What is the best way to incorporate ethics into this course? Can you describe any instructional approach?

*III.2. Does this class consider any case studies which relate to ethical dilemmas?

(Defined as situations where there is a conflict of accepted library principles -- e.g., intellectual freedom vs. rights of intellectual property)

*III.3. If yes, which specific issues does the course address?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dilemmas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*III.4. Does class discuss any specific Codes of Ethics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>teaching methods &amp; specific codes (if mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*III.5. Does course incorporate any discussion of specific ethical theories or decision making models?
Yes | No | Ethical Theory or Decision Making Models (circle one)
--- | --- | ---

*III.6. How would you describe the various techniques used to teach the ethics portion of the course?*

possible alternatives to record:
- [ ] case studies
- [ ] lecture
- [ ] role play
- [ ] class discussion
- [ ] debates
- [ ] Other: specify:

*III.7. Do the students in this class have any reading or written assignments which specifically relate to the ethical components of the course? Can you suggest some?*

If yes, could you specify the sources used in the assignment?

Yes | No | Indicate text assigned
--- | --- | ---

*III.8. When you look at the learning objectives for this course, do you think that they at all relate to the coverage of ethical topics?*

review (briefly) the specific teaching objectives (examined before interview) See if any relate to coverage in course. List them here:

*III.9. How does the course evaluation address the ethics segment?*

III.10. Do you remember any examples of students reacting to the ethics content?
III.11. In your judgment, do you feel that this course prepares students to take “responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field?” (from ALISE position paper)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course prepares students to make ethical decisions?</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Some positive preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No preparation at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Interviewee has no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Ending Contextual Questions
Limit to 5 min.

*IV.1. What are the biggest challenges of integrating ethics into courses in LIS?

IV.2. How should our discussion be expanded to include other questions or issues on the integration of ethics into LIS courses?

Questions to answer immediately after pilot and interviews with peer debriefer:

- Were important * questions answered? If not, why not?
- Do I have a different view of relative importance of questions? Will this change the instrument? Which questions most important for study
- What were the unexpected findings? Should they be incorporated into future interviews?
- What are researcher’s and peer debriefer’s assessment of the interview?
Appendix 3: Moderator’s Guide for Focus Group*

(adapted from Vaughn, 1996, p.43 and from Curran, 1998)

This general outline is version that was actually used in January 2009 for Focus Group and includes tables from interview findings. Moderator used information from these tables to spur discussion.

I. Introduction Welcome and hospitality 0:00-0:03 3 min.

1. Thanks for coming…
2. Describe why we are here:
   Investigating “Ethics Across the Curriculum” using two strategies:
   • Interviews with master teachers in LIS for institutional and course specific examples.
   • This focus group to hear your experience

3. Guidelines to follow during focus group:
   a. Role of moderator
   b. Timing
   c. Recorder’s role
   d. Confidentiality
4. Brief introductions

II. Clarification of terms and an overall view of research 0:04-0:06 3 min.
I want to briefly expand on my research and why you’re here today.

A. Definitions of ethics
B. Goal: to hear your perceptions of the integration of ethics at your own institution or at other places where you’ve been involved.
   Specifically:
   1. What problems have you experienced and how have you handled them?
   2. On the success side we will try to specifically pinpoint the processes your institution follows to make sure that all students have a grounding in ethics?

C. Throughout our discussion I may add in, or ask you about, points that the teachers I’ve interviewed have mentioned. First does anyone have any IMPORTANT QUESTIONS or concerns at this point?
III. Question 1: 0:07 - 0:25 18 min.
What problems have you experienced in integrating ethics and how have you handled these problems? First focus on problems or hindrances to integrating ethics – what do you see as the biggest problem?

Points to check off:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems for Students, they may:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Want a skill set; tools helpful in the real world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See ethics or intellectual freedom courses as luxury;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack ethics preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not be sufficiently open minded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be out of touch with their core values and their alignment with LIS profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems for Faculty, they may:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack skills to recognize an ethical dilemma when they see one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have inadequate training; come from graduate programs with no emphasis on ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short of work experience in libraries; no idea of ethical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack interest in teaching; research is primary interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use academic freedom defense; no one can tell me how to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Underestimate difficulty of material; think 10 min. approach will cover ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have experienced success in academia without practical ethics knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack effective teaching methods for ethical insertions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of stand-alone course or very strong introductory course segment in ethics may allow other faculty to minimize their coverage of ethics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. 0:26-0:44 18 min. can expand to 0.55 11 min., if necessary
Question 2 In thinking about stories of success in integrating ethics, what are practical steps a school can take?

What are some of the steps that an institution might follow to insure every student has significant grounding in ethics?
A few of these ideas have already come up including:

**Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What activities may result in the implementation of change in ethics provision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examine curricula</strong> every 8-10 years for ALA accreditation or at intervals ranging from 1 to 5 years (usually by small appointed group or by curriculum committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine ethics content for <strong>new, proposed courses</strong>; at same time look back at related courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administer questionnaire</strong> to faculty about their teaching of ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to all of faculty on how <strong>lead instructors</strong> incorporate ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage regular <strong>dialog in faculty meetings</strong> giving examples of discussion of ethics in classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appoint mentor</strong> to encourage inclusion of ethics as part of peer evaluation of new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Require course with significant ethics content</strong>, e.g., Foundations, Collection Development with almost 50% of course devoted to ethical issues and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Require stand-alone ethics course</strong>; occurs at least at 2 institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Train adjunct</strong> faculty; they may not be as familiar with how ethics is included in core courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incorporate</strong> an integrated ethics segment <strong>into community learning activities</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage overlapping of content</strong> between classes in teaching of ethics skills (usually repeat of course content is avoided, e.g. in web and presentation skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share skills between faculty</strong> to identify ethical issues in areas such as digital libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat training in <strong>ethics as skill development</strong> (like public speaking); learning way of thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initiation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What groups have initiated change in approach to ethics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University administration -- may require campus-wide departmental review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong> -- may be inspired to fight for inclusion because of students lack of preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task force --established by faculty to examine ethics teaching and also civic behavior of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Advisory Committee</strong> -- brainstormed with Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching core courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students -- through their evaluations they can recommend changes to course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee—look for ethics in regular review of curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What activities may result in the monitoring/evaluation of outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Require demonstration</strong> of knowledge of ethics prior to graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imbed evaluation</strong> of student’s progress in core competencies (including ethics) through display of work on e-portfoli (blackboard software) or on true outcomes software; This analysis can also show school areas in which they need to strengthen curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use student’s course evaluation</strong> to address ethics segment of course-no interviewees report doing this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If extra time and seems important: summarize some of the most often cited or most important processes:

V. Question 3 10 min. if have time 0:45-0:55
Based on the stories of successes in integrating ethics that we’ve just heard, can you identify the positive environmental factors which contributed to this success?

A few we’ve already brought up include:

A few ideas the teachers brought up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Environmental Factors for success in integrating ethics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Heightened <strong>awareness</strong> in society today;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anticipation of <strong>ALA initiatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>University-wide initiatives:</strong> required training for all graduate students; symposia; outcomes measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Common subject area</strong> for LIS schools with diverse components (IT, Telecommunications, journalism, education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Skill sharing</strong> between faculty working to identify ethical issues in areas such as digital libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training in ethics as <strong>skill development</strong> (like public speaking); learning way of thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Wrap-Up  0:55-0:60

A. First and most importantly, Thank you
B. If you have any other topics you’d like to talk about, please feel free to stay afterwards
C. I will be sending you my summary of the session for you to Member Check - a chance for you to add additional ideas, as well as to clarify what we’ve discussed today.

VII. After dismissal moderator and recorder debrief each other, review questions and check impressions each has gathered

Other points:
- Some useful phrases:
  - To encourage participation: I see heads shaking in agreement, does anyone want to add something to this idea? Who has a different take on this to add to the discussion?
  - (in general stay away from the why question – use Do you suppose? Help me to understand? What do you think the reason is? Under what circumstances?
  - I also hear from interviewees…..what’s your experience?
  - I want to hear about that, but not yet. We will get there eventually.