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**ABSTRACT**

This portfolio and the project described therein, focus on applied professional ethics for early childhood education settings, particularly during fieldwork, for students and practising professionals. It contains the results of a four-year project of research, its synthesis and its dissemination as articles, book chapters, conference presentations and papers, and teaching resource materials. Specifically, the materials presented here focus on the resolution of dilemmas using the Ethical Response Cycle, a new model for responding ethically to problematic situations. The model is represented as a cyclical diagram depicting the ongoing, fluid and non-hierarchical nature of ethical judgement that is needed by professionals in any problematic situation. The model includes phases which are underpinned and supported by reflective thinking and negotiation, and are based on Western ethical positions. Suggestions for further research are made.
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STATEMENT OF PORTFOLIO PURPOSE, RATIONALE AND THEORETICAL SUPPORT

*You can't right the world in one day. But you can begin to right it any day at all* (Eleanor Dark, 1934) (Dark, 1999, P.58).

Synopsis

This document contains a portfolio of work consisting of published and submitted writing and multi-media teaching resource materials focusing on applied professional ethics, as well as description of the theoretical and conceptual foundations underpinning the development of the writing and products. The primary aim of the project that is described and presented in this portfolio, is to improve the ethical judgement of early childhood educators, in the belief that this will lessen the number of dilemmas encountered in the field and increase ethical behaviour. There is little empirical evidence as yet, to show that ethics education results in more ethical practitioners, however, the work presented here fulfills a need identified in the literature and anecdotally, and provides a sound base upon which further empirical research can be based.

Ethics can be defined as doing what is right or good, rather than what is expedient or pragmatic. The desired outcome therefore, of professional preparation in, and knowledge about ethics is sound ethical judgement. Ethical judgement involves the ability to apply sound, sensitive and reflective ethical reasoning to the process of seeking resolution to problematic situations or dilemmas. Concepts about, and the study of, ethics is critically relevant to early childhood educators as ethics is integrally embedded in professionalism,
professional practice, and thus, the manner in which educators develop and maintain relationships with children, families, colleagues and others. Relationships are a critical component of the excellence of practice that early childhood educators aspire to. This is reflected in the draft of a new state-wide curriculum framework developed through the NSW Department of Community Services and distributed for consultation in April, 2000, (not yet available for citation). Ethics is about relationships, knowing, and doing, what it right, and ethics does have personal costs. As yet there is little written about how to base relationships on notions of ethical practice. There is even less research on this topic.

Ethics is a subset of morality that pertains to fairness and justice. Morality itself, is a subset of values that pertains to right and wrong (Kirschenbaum, 1995), and my concerns with values, morality and ethics as they relate to my role as a teacher educator, are the motivation for this work that I am presenting. The primary focus of the portfolio is a body of work that has culminated in the development of a new process based model, the "Ethical Response Cycle" (ERC), for the development of professional ethical judgement. Development and presentation of the model is based on a gap in the literature and on the belief that ethical judgement can be "developed through ethical thinking and problem solving". Further, it is a competency needed by early childhood education students and practitioners which is "generally recognised [as needing to be] explicitly taught as part of ...[professional development] coursework" (Jacob-Tim & Hartshorne, 1994, p.5). The rationale for the decision to develop a new model of ethical response is explicated in greater detail later in this statement and is predicated on the belief of many ethicists that

...mastery of an explicit decision-making model or procedure may help the practitioner make informed, well-reasoned, ethical choices in professional practice. Tymchuk (1986) has also noted that, in difficult situations, the course of action chosen [to resolve a dilemma] may be questioned and challenged. Use of a systematic problem-solving strategy will allow the practitioner to describe how a decision was made. This may afford some protection when difficult decisions come under the scrutiny of others (Jacob-Tim & Hartshorne, 1994, p.19).

More specifically, the work represented here has been undertaken to facilitate the work of post-secondary educators, particularly those working with students of early childhood education in universities and Technical and Further Education (TAFE) colleges. Such educators can use the concepts, knowledge, processes and materials developed in the
course of the project described in this portfolio to help their pre-service teachers and child care workers to construct the desirable knowledge, skills and attitudes that are needed for ethical judgement during fieldwork programs. Fieldwork programs involve a range of stakeholders, whose roles and interactions are complex. Much of the work described, therefore, relates to the relationship between these people and necessarily encompasses the work of practicing professionals and other stakeholders in fieldwork programs who, as well as students, express the need for support in the ongoing development of ethical judgement abilities for, and in the workplace. This is applied ethics. Applied ethics involves development and application of the skills needed to think and behave ethically and to respond ethically in situations of professional dilemma.

This portfolio and the project described therein, therefore, focus on applied ethics for early childhood education settings, particularly during fieldwork. It contains the results of a four-year project of research, its synthesis and its dissemination as articles, book chapters, conference presentations and papers, and teaching resource materials. This statement both introduces and supports the purpose, rationale and theoretical underpinnings of the work completed during the project presented here. It explains how the project was conceived, how it evolved, and what the outcomes of the ongoing project have been. Specifically, the materials developed focus on the resolution of dilemmas using the "Ethical Response Cycle", a model for responding ethically to problematic situations. The model is represented as a cyclical diagram depicting the ongoing, fluid and non-hierarchical nature of ethical judgement that is needed by professionals in any problematic situation. The model includes phases that are explained in detail in Chapter 4, which are underpinned and supported by reflective thinking and negotiation, and are based on Western ethical positions. It allows users the scope to focus more comprehensively on certain phases, according to the particular situation under
consideration. It also allows users to return to, and reflect on, a judgement. The historical and theoretical ethical underpinnings for the model are described in Chapter 2.

The portfolio contains two main sections. Section 1 contains conceptual, theoretical and contextual information as rationale for, and support of, the prepared and published writing and materials presented in Section 2. Section 2 contains published and submitted writing, multi-media teaching resources, and details of dissemination of the work.

In Section 1, the “Ethical Response Cycle” is introduced and a theoretically based rationale is given to support its development. In order to most usefully summarise the conceptual and theoretical base of the “Ethical Response Cycle” the following broad themes are used:

- The need for, and use of, formal preparation for ethical judgement in professional courses
- The historical and theoretical concepts of ethics that underpin the teaching of professional ethics
- The relationship between professionalism and ethics
- Professional ethics as an area of study
- Professional ethics within early childhood education
- The use of tools to facilitate the development of ethical judgement
- Development of a new model of ethical response for early childhood educators
- Concluding statements and suggestions for future directions.

Section 2 contains the body of published and submitted work that has been produced leading up to and during the development process that has occurred and which has culminated in the production of the “Ethical Response Cycle”. The work presented is
multi-media in nature, to address the range of learning styles, teaching approaches and practical needs of those for whom the body of work is intended, primarily early childhood pre-service teachers, their post-secondary instructors and supervisors, practicing teachers and ultimately the families and children with whom they work. This section contains eleven written papers, two book chapters, two videos (a pilot and a completed final product), a CD-ROM and an Instructor’s Manual. A short statement to indicate the developmental sequence of the work and the links between pieces of work accompanies each piece of work.

The work presented in this portfolio began with a project in which I was involved, that originated under the auspices of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales. Some of the work in the portfolio has been completed with other members of that Council. Table 1 shows details of journal articles and book chapters, and my contribution to their development. Full list of the activities completed as part of the project described is shown in Appendix 1.
Table 1

Contribution to Published Chapters, Refereed Articles and Conference Paper Completed as Part of “Understanding and Applying Professional Ethics...” Portfolio for Educational Doctorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Title of Article</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>codes aren’t enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>First draft, contributing new material and original ideas – Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final submission of chapter - Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article - Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write method and results – Newman.</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit – Newman &amp; Coombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit to Journal – Newman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>Incorporate reviewer comments and finalise submission for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Review and edit - Newman & Coombe |
|---|---|---|---|
• Review and edit - Coombe & Newman.  
• Submit to journal and address reviewers' comments for final submission - Newman. |
Not drawn from any other shared work. |
• Edit and suggestions - Newman & Pollnitz.  
• Edit, incorporate changes and submit to Journal  
• Address referee comments - Newman. |
• Edit and suggestions - Newman, Pollnitz and Goodfellow.  
• Edit, incorporate |
SECTION 1
CHAPTER 1

Traditionally, it has been considered the responsibility of religion to prescribe what behaviours are wholesome and what are not. However, in today's society, religion has lost its prestige and influence to some degree. And at the same time, no alternative, such as secular ethics has come up to replace it....It is because of this that I think we need to make some special effort and consciously work towards gaining that kind of knowledge. His Holiness the Dalai Lama (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 1999).

INTRODUCTION

The context

The project described in this portfolio, focussing on applied professional ethics, is based on the notion that professionalism and ethics are inextricably linked. The goal of "acting professionally" is widely adopted in work, sport and many life situations. All workers, are exhorted to "act professionally" in their interactions with the public, for example.
However, I contend that, one can act professionally, but not be a professional. For example, a garbage collector can act professionally by having concern, care and diligence about the work she or he performs, always being punctual for work, interacting positively with colleagues and the public, protecting the environment, and being loyal to his or her employer. This does not mean however, that the person’s role as a garbage collector, however essential, is a professional role. All workers are not “professionals” in the traditionally accepted way (which is discussed further in Chapter 3). There are many more factors to consider than appearing to act professionally to an observer. I contend that early childhood educators, who work in positions of critical responsibility with young children and their families, must not only act professionally at all times, but must be, and are, professionals of then highest calibre. Professionals usually work autonomously and have the responsibility of making important decisions, often complex, involving clients, many of who are vulnerable. Professionals therefore, have power. Lebacqz (1985) goes as far as to suggest that professional power can define reality (this is how it “is”), but cautions us to remember that professionals’ understandings and actions will be limited by their own cultural bias and professional training. She asserts that although professionals should undoubtedly exhibit virtues, individual virtue is not enough for a professional – norms for professional behaviour (or professional ethics) are needed to balance personal ideologies (discussion of the professional virtues underpinning early childhood education is continued in Chapter 3). A professional, exhibits “professionalism” and an integral element of professionalism is ethical behaviour. Professionalism is more complex, than simply acting professionally. Professionalism, undoubtedly involves ethics, and ethics is a critical component of professionalism. In this portfolio, ethics and professionalism are explored, and links between the two concepts are made. Early childhood educator professionalism is the focus. In any study of ethics, humans, and human character must be considered. As
Lebacqz (1985) points out, each time a professional makes a decision, it is not simply a single, isolated act. Each decision has a "spreading" effect and influences the decision-maker's character, and can effect the person's integrity. Professionals make complex decisions, so in considering ethics, and ethical decision-making, the professional her or himself must be considered:

The language of being accounts for something that is all together missing from the language of doing: the impact of our actions on ourselves. As James McClendon suggests, a focus solely on decision-making or ethical quandaries tends to restrict morality into a kind of case law. It ignores the moral qualities of the people involved. Yet equally important with the act itself is the moral agent who performs it (Lebacqz, 1985, p.83).

The moral agent, in this case the early childhood professional, is central to the study of ethics. The moral agent has a choice about how to behave, and how to develop relationships. One model of professionalism suggests that professionals enter into a "covenant" with their clients which does not presume that the professional and the client necessarily share common goals and values, but permits them to negotiate mutually acceptable limits based on complementary aims and purposes. The covenant model of professionalism:

Implies at a minimum basic norms of truth telling and keeping promises. Thus the professional would neither eschew all ethical decisions nor, impose a decision on the client, but would negotiate about the best course of action on the basis of sharing honestly the values and goals on both sides (Lebacqz, 1985, p.50).

The covenant model of professionalism fits well with early childhood education philosophies and is advocated as the model of professionalism underpinning the work in
this portfolio. For these reasons, ethics, and professionalism, are considered together in this portfolio.

Ethics as a concept, and area of study is complex and extensive, including such elements as the agent, or person involved; values; theories and ethical approaches; ways of reasoning and methods of decision making, for example. The work in this portfolio focuses on one aspect of Western ethics, that is, decision-making, and in particular, tools for ethical analysis and decision-making, while acknowledging that there are many other elements that are important, but beyond the scope of this project. A case is made for improving the professionalism of early childhood educators, in particular, by improving their ethical judgement as an important component of their ethics education. The work behind the development of this portfolio is for people preparing to become professionals, professionals already in practice, and for those who teach them in professional preparation courses. It is particularly for early childhood professionals.

The work in this portfolio is timely as in Western society there is talk of a general moral decline, accompanied by a technological revolution, symptomatic of “a major ethical vacuum in government and business” (Kirschenbaum, 1995, p.7). The project developed in response to perceived societal needs reflected in the micro world of early childhood education which is undergoing a “revolution of childhood studies” (Kincheloe, 1997, p.viii). As early childhood care and education services are increasingly related to conditions for urban and rural development, and seen as part of the social capital for healthy and wealthy local communities (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999), the work of the early childhood educator increasingly gains complexity as we move into an era, noted for rapid technological change. Ironically though,
They [those using the dominant language of early childhood educators] seek techniques that will ensure standardisation, predictability and control. They aspire to methods that can reduce the world to a set of objective statements of fact, independent of statements of value and the need to make judgements. They avoid the ethical dimension arising from what Rorty (1980) refers to as "the burden of choice", the responsibility for making judgements, instead reducing choice to an issue of managerial rationality in which questions of value are systematically transformed into technical questions (Gergen, 1992). They are not questioning questions, which ask about value, acknowledge the probability of multiple perspectives and meanings, diversity and uncertainty, and which open up for democratic participation, dialogue and further questioning. In short, they express a desire for a clean and orderly world, devoid of messiness and complexity (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999, p.2).

The work represented in this portfolio is about preparing students for those aspects of early childhood education and professional life that require judgement and demand the burden of choice. It is about the "hard stuff", the multiple perspectives, the diversity, the messiness, and the complexities. It is about the elements of professional life that cannot be easily prepared for, the non-technical aspects of teaching and learning in the work that early childhood professionals do with children and families. In short, it is about the ethical issues that make our professional lives interesting, demanding and rewarding in the long run. More importantly, development of ethical judgement for early childhood professionals is critical for the integrity of the profession, the quality of programs in early childhood settings and the wellbeing of children and families.

Some beginning work has been done in Australia in relation to early childhood professional ethics, but none of this work has yet been about formal ethics education or included processes and methods for the development of ethical judgement and resolution of dilemmas. The area of values education and the component skill of decision-making, have hardly been addressed. Values education can be described in
broad terms as “The conscious attempt to help others acquire the knowledge, skills attitudes and values that contribute to more personally satisfying and socially constructive lives” (Kirschenbaum, 1995, p.14). Early childhood educators do encounter complex dilemmas (Newman & Coombe, 1999), that involve choices involving values. As professionals who work with vulnerable young children, their families and the communities in which they live, any response by an early childhood educator, to a problematic situation, should come as the result of sound and sensitive ethical reasoning based on the core values of their profession. Decisions should be made “in a structured, sequential process designed to increase the likelihood of achieving a good decision”, so that the “skilled and thoughtful decision-maker is more likely to realise …[her or his own] values than the person who chooses thoughtlessly, irrationally and inconsistently. In groups [such as early childhood teaching teams], the participant or leader, with good decision-making skills is also more likely to help the group make effective decisions” (Kirschenbaum, 1995, pp.18-19). Members of the early childhood profession in Australia do have a profession-generated code of ethics, based on the core values of the profession, to refer to (AECA, 1991), and some resources have been developed to support use of the code (for example, Fasoli & Woodrow, 1991). Research related to the development of ethical judgement is almost non-existent however. Furthermore, pertinent research about professional ethics and the development of ethical judgement in professions other than education is also scant. Relevant models, methods, or strategies that can help professionals to learn about, and develop ethical judgement that can be applied during professional preparation, and in the workplace, are consequently relatively rare. Literature reviews reveal examples of very general models for professions (Preston, 1996) and for Counselling Psychologists (Jacob-Timm & Hartshorne, 1994; Kitchener, 1986). These models are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, but do not contain the specificity or flexibility, or embedded reflection and
negotiation that is needed by early childhood students and professionals working in "ethic of care-driven", yet complex and changing socio-political contexts in the twenty first century. At the University of Minnesota, Dr Muriel Bebeau and her colleagues have been evaluating various outcomes of their ethics education program for dental students (to be further described in Chapter 3), but as yet have not studied the relationship between ethics education and later professional practice (Bebeau, Rest & Navarez, 1999; Bebeau, 1995; Bebeau, 1994; Bebeau & Thoma, 1994; Bebeau, Rest & Yamoor, 1985). These researchers contend that outward moral (ethical) behaviour is reliant on four inner psychological processes: moral sensitivity, moral judgement, moral motivation, and moral character (Rest, Navarez, Bebeau & Thoma, 1999). Their work has focused on moral sensitivity and moral judgement and they point out that the components co-determine behaviour and have some evidence to indicate that when more than one component is measured, behaviour may be predicted. The work in this portfolio concentrates on moral (ethical) judgement.

For these reasons, a major outcome of the project described has been the development of the "Ethical Response Cycle", and a strong base for future research has been established. It is timely for more work in this area to be published specifically for early childhood educators.

**Significance of the Project**

The following section outlines my journey towards the completion of this Educational Doctorate portfolio which has been exciting, challenging, intellectually stimulating, practically useful and professionally rewarding. I began work in this area independently
and then began a professional collaboration with Lois Pollnitz, from the University of Newcastle, who has shared professional interests and expertise. Our collaboration has been invaluable, as we have discussed complex ideas and come up with advances in our thinking and writing together. This portfolio would not be the same without her contribution and I acknowledge and thank her for her generosity and wisdom. As I have, in conjunction with Lois Pollnitz, researched, written, developed materials, and presented the results of the work, the model for developing the ethical judgement abilities of early childhood students and practitioners evolved from the motivation to provide a framework that will be useful, usable and used. This process has moved through several stages that began with an early mapping of the elements that constitute student teacher development of ethical judgement (Figure 1) and then a taxonomy of ethical judgement (Figure 2) that was presented at the conference for the Association of Professional and Applied Ethics (AAPAE) in 1998. The taxonomy reflects the levels of cognitive learning outlined by Bloom (Barry & King, 1989), of acquisition and recall of facts, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. The taxonomy was later modified in a published chapter (Hayden, 2000). These two early attempts led into the development of the conceptual framework shown in Figure 3 that depicts the knowledge skills and dispositions required for ethical judgement as early childhood students move through a developmental process from novice to experienced professional. These three attempts to provide a framework for ethical judgement culminated in, and were replaced by the simplified, and user friendly model, as I later collaborated with Lois Pollnitz to develop the “Ethical Response Cycle” that will be fully described in Chapter 4.

Figure 1 shows the first attempt to define the contextual and pragmatic scope of elements involved in the development of ethical judgement for early childhood student
teachers as they move from individual agent, through developing professional to novice and later, more experienced professional. It can be noted that many changes have occurred, particularly in the “Current Context”, since that time. For example, the place of working families in relation to their use of childcare settings, has shifted several times in the last few years in response to government policy changes. Similarly, there is a much greater focus on diversity in early childhood education than there was when this “map” was originally conceived.

Figure 2 shows the initial attempt to provide a practical framework to guide teacher educators in ethics program preparation.

Following further examination of the literature, I concluded that the study of early childhood ethics revolves around three major themes: knowledge, skills and dispositions. Figure 3 classifies the elements of ethical judgement according to the knowledge, skills and dispositions that students, and later professionals, need to acquire to become sound and sensitive ethical practitioners and decision-makers.
Towards professional ethical judgement

Further professional experience

Debriefing, reflecting with others

Field experience - opportunity to exercise ethical judgement

Experimentation with dilemma resolution possibilities

Analysis of dilemma situations

Specialist professional knowledge of dilemma classification

Personal reflection on ethical issues and resolution options

Development of personal, professional philosophy

Further practice with problem solving of ethical issues

Specialist professional knowledge of ethical issues

Ability to recognise issues and generate problem solving options

Development of ethical reflection abilities

Knowledge of professional core values, legal requirements and codes

Introduction to ethical theories

Awareness of concepts of ethics

Awareness of personal values and morals

Figure 2. Towards Ethical Judgement - A Taxonomy
Figure 3: A Framework of Dispositions, Knowledge, Skills and Judgment for Ethical Knowledge, Skills and Judgment.
A notable feature of my own professional journey has been the reactions of friends and colleagues who learn that I am working in the arena of ethics. People always react. Some disapprove – a person who devotes their time to the study of ethics must be a high handed moralist who would be boring to work or play with; some are confused – but why would you take on work that is so HARD? Thankfully, most approve and are grateful that someone is tackling the “hard issues” and is prepared to offer strategies to the profession that will enhance the wise practice and professionalism of students and colleagues. As I talk to more people in many professions, I encounter more examples of the dilemmas that so engage and worry professionals. Most agree that anything that can help them to make the hard ethical decisions that are needed in early childhood education and other professions beyond the 1990s and into the twenty-first century, is timely and necessary.

I am an early childhood educator, not a philosopher. I have not had an educational background in philosophy or ethics. I have endeavored to learn, understand, synthesise and apply the most essential historical and contemporary knowledge about ethics as it applies to professionalism and early childhood education. My major purpose is to improve my own ability to prepare student teachers and support colleagues in the processes of responding ethically to the many issues that arise in the complex field of early childhood education. My collaboration with Lois Pollnitz, has been valuable for shared reflection and professional discourse. The work contained in this portfolio therefore, is primarily concerned with the practical application of ethics, in day to day situations in all aspects of early childhood education, and most specifically, in fieldwork programs for students and their supervisors.
The contexts in which the work developed

Early childhood educators are, on the whole "good people", who make their best attempts to act ethically. People entering the field of early childhood education often do so for altruistic reasons, or because they have had some background, for example, in caring for children, as mothers, baby-sitters or Sunday School teachers.

Choices may involve those between the values of families and professionals; of appropriate early childhood pedagogy, generally misunderstood beyond the immediate microcosm of early childhood education; curriculum development; management; child protection; and work with families, the law, multi-disciplinary professional teams, and the community. In Australia, a highly diverse nation, with a multicultural population, many issues arise in relation to religion, ethnicity, and our indigenous populations. It is beyond the scope of this portfolio to examine specific ethical issues, but all of these shape the rationale for the development of the work in this portfolio to facilitate the judgement and resolution processes employed by professionals faced with problematic issues. Judgement is needed in many dilemmas, and tough ethically based decisions are frequently needed. As Hayden (2000) points out, the more that child care is perceived to make "gains in terms of policies, numbers, dollars and other aspects of a well-developed system of public child care", the more ardent the opposition [by some], becomes. She attributes this paradox to embedded ideologies of motherhood and encourages early childhood professionals to

seek out and develop long term constitutional improvements which can transcend embedded notions and which will move towards the development of a new discourse, a new vision, a new era for early childhood education in Australia and elsewhere (p. 63).
This new vision which includes the need for constitutional improvements in ethical judgement and action for early childhood professionals, forms the basis for my work (Newman, 2000a)(Appendix 4a), and led to the development of the “Ethical Response Cycle”, and my desire to embed sound and sensitive ethical reasoning into every aspect of early childhood professional practice. The development of materials for ethics education does not imply that that those to be trained are unethical, but supports the notion that training and education will equip personnel so that they are professionally ethical as well as technically competent. I concur with Jacob-Tim and Hartshorne’s suggestion that “the educated practitioner is the best safeguard against ethical –legal problems. [Professionals] with a broad knowledge base of ethics and law are likely to anticipate and prevent problems from arising” (1994, Preface). A lack of understanding of ethical concepts and principles, and a lack of skill in analysis of ethical issues can result in poor decision making on ethical issues, difficulty in justification of decisions, over-reliance on regulations or procedures which may not be appropriate to all situations, and non-action through fear of the unknown (Royal Institute of Public Administration Australia, 1994).

Significance to my personal professional development

I became a teacher educator, after years “in the field”, teaching early childhood and special education, managing children’s services, dealing with staff, budgets, management committees, bureaucracies, funding bodies, politicians and families. I naively thought that my “tough” times were over. As a teacher educator, I would be able to relax and share the benefit of my accumulated wisdom in an academic context and with student teachers. After all, I had developed excellent skills in working with student
teachers in my early childhood centres. I had helped students who were struggling to progress; I was tough enough to counsel students out of the profession who were unsuitable for the field. I had even learned how to award failing grades to students whose performance was unsatisfactory. Teaching student teachers would present me with no problems, or so I thought.

As I entered teacher education, in the Western Sydney region, the number of child care centres was burgeoning. The number of private for profit centres, particularly, was growing rapidly. The demand for university qualified early childhood teachers was high; critically high, in fact, with centres not being able to find graduates to fill positions. The employment rate for student teachers graduating from the course in the university in which I work, was one hundred percent. Any graduate who wanted to work found a position quickly, frequently before they had completed course requirements. Newly graduated beginning teachers were being appointed as service Directors, responsible for staff and management as well as teaching. Many took on great levels of responsibility, without any previous teaching or other work experience. They were often the most qualified staff member in the service, and had no-one supervising them directly, or even indirectly. Services were not demanding our best graduates, they were taking whomever they could get, and fast. At the same time, early childhood centres were experiencing rapid staff turnover. Our student teachers were entering fieldwork programs for professional learning and experience, in centres where the staff was sometimes inexperienced, minimally qualified or even unqualified, rapidly changing, and sometimes motivated by non-altruistic commercial principles, such as profit making. The early childhood fieldwork context was complex, rapidly changing and not altogether positive. Not all fieldwork settings demonstrated the excellence that we advocated to our students.
As my professional interests gained focus I began to specialise in the area of student teacher fieldwork programs. More and more frequently, it seemed to me, a small number of student teachers were returning to university from fieldwork sessions, overwhelmed by problematic situations that they had encountered. Fieldwork sessions where theory could be related to practice, should be the locus for student teachers’ development of the “art of teaching”, including ethical identity. It seemed critical that this should happen in a positive way, rather than in a negative, stressful way.

Students’ dilemmas were sometimes about pedagogy: “You told us to do it this way, but they said in the real world this won’t work”, or, “I saw something that you told us was inappropriate”. Sometimes the dilemmas involved legal issues such as the student teacher being asked to contravene NSW state regulations by being solely responsible for groups of children. Sometimes the dilemmas involved a student teacher’s perception, or the actuality, of physical or emotional abuse of children. The range of dilemmas was wide, but the range of emotions involved for the student teachers was not. They were experiencing confusion, doubt, anxiety and sometimes great anger. Some had wanted to become early childhood educators for many years and now wanted to leave the profession, before they had even formally joined it. They wanted to know what they could, and should do. Some students were experiencing severe stress and some were questioning their decision to enter the field of early childhood education. These “nice ladies” (who, I should mention, were occasionally male, in a female dominated profession, involving an additional layer of dilemma not discussed here), were in what philosopher Ken Kipnis refers to as “ethical pain” (Feeney & Freeman, 1999, p.17). I began to feel that our teacher preparation courses were not adequately preparing students for the dilemmas they might encounter in the field, teaching them how to deal
with the dilemmas if they did occur, or de-briefing them positively after a dilemma had occurred. Professional ethics seemed more and more to me to be the key to resolving my own subsequent teaching quandaries and ultimately, those of my student teachers. I needed to better understand professional ethics, and how to help students understand ethical practice and avoid or deal with ethical dilemmas.

With others, I began to raise such issues at meetings of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales and discovered that the issues were by no means unique to our university. The Council consists of representatives of universities, TAFE, employers and other preparation institutions concerned with early childhood fieldwork. With slight variations on the theme, the same stories were emerging from all of the TAFE Colleges and universities represented on the Council. Employer representatives who were encountering dilemmas in their work with students and institutions also raised parallel dilemmas. Students were not always the victims of dilemmas, sometimes they were the perpetrators of actions that resulted in dilemmas. Clearly, fieldwork is a complex process and there was work to be done to improve the experience for all of the stakeholders involved.

Following some initial work with members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW (Practicum Council) to gather examples of typical dilemmas, dilemmas based scenarios were written, refined and classified according to stakeholder and are now used by tertiary educators for workshop purposes. Concurrently the “Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience” were developed, piloted and published (Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales, 1998; Newman, 1998)(Appendix 5b). Professional reflection and further search for knowledge and academic support then led me to further depth of study in the literature on professional
ethics. I became aware of the “Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics” (AAPAE) and gained great benefit from attendance at their conferences and association with people studying and working in ethics in disciplines and professions other than education. There was little literature about ethics in early childhood education, or education in general from Australia, or overseas. Literature about ethics in student teacher fieldwork was even more minimal. I found no literature at that time about the teaching of ethics in early childhood education courses. There was limited literature in general about professional ethics. I suggested to the Council that we conduct some research into student experiences of ethical dilemmas. Initially, four universities were to participate in the work, but ultimately the research was based at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean (UWS Nepean) and also included a small group of students from Charles Sturt University (CSU) at Wagga Wagga.

Research to define the problem

Maybe there are only two kinds of question in the world. The kind they ask in school, where the answer is known in advance; not asked so anyone will be any the wiser, but for other reasons. And then the others, those in the laboratory. Where one does not know the answers, and often not even the question, before one has asked it. Peter, aged 13. (Hoeg, 1993, p.17)

With Kennece Coombe from CSU, I conducted a survey of undergraduate students (Coombe & Newman, 1997a; Coombe & Newman, 1997b; Newman & Coombe, 1999)(Appendices 3a, 3b & 3e) to elicit their knowledge about ethics and determine
whether they had encountered experiences of dilemma during fieldwork. This research project was given ethics clearance by the UWS Ethics Committee. The results showed that students knew about the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) Code of Ethics, but were unclear about the true nature of an ethical dilemma. Students reported that they had been involved in many dilemmas (Coombe & Newman, 1997b)(Appendix 3b). More detail of this research follows in Chapter 3.

Following the research, and with support from the Practicum Council, I decided to produce the first of the teaching resource materials that form part of this portfolio. This project, focusing on various aspects of early childhood professional ethics has continued until now, and is ongoing. It was decided that a useful format for the first task, would be a video to be used by tertiary educators for fieldwork preparation and debriefing, depicting some of the dilemma scenarios that had been gathered through the research and a Practicum Council working group project. I successfully applied for an Initiatives in “Teaching and Learning” grant from UWS, Nepean and with assistance from Lois Pollnitz, who is a member of the Practicum Council, produced what eventually became a pilot video called “What Should I Do? Issues in Early Childhood Field Experience” (Newman, 1996)(see Appendix 7a). Ethical clearance for this project included the ethics processes of the early childhood centre and school that were included in the filming and parents gave permission for children to be involved. As early childhood educators we also, had ethical concerns about the project and were always present for script writing consultations and filming. Although not required, we always gained permission from children for their own involvement. Members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW reviewed this video and asked for the removal of a scene where a child was depicted in great distress at the child care centre gates. In the scenario involved, the child was required to look unhappy about her attendance, and this was managed through
a great deal of excellent "acting" on her part, and cutting of footage. For example, in one scene, where she looks distressed, in actuality, she was reacting to a very "silly" thing that I had said to her. The child's mother was present at all times and was participating in the video production. Although the scene in question was not "staged" and filming was done when the incident naturally occurred, members felt that questions may arise about how the child had come to be in such a distressed state. We did not want there to be any doubt as to the origins of the child's distress, or the possibility that we had encouraged or caused the distress for filming purposes. The scene was removed.

The video depicts three re-enactments of dilemma based scenarios in early childhood fieldwork programs. These typical dilemmas are presented from the point of view of students. The dilemmas were chosen as those most representative of student concerns, as revealed in the initial research (Coombe & Newman, 1997a)(see Appendix 3a). The dilemmas show a student teacher being asked to take sole responsibility for children in a child care centre (counter to New South Wales state regulations); honesty with families; and a health and hygiene incident. The video focused solely on the perspective of the student, and depending on viewpoint, this may be seen as a limitation, or strength. For students, it is a strength, as they can more strongly identify with the characters, but on the other hand, it does not encourage them to look at issues from the perspective of others. For stakeholders other than students, depiction of dilemmas from perspectives other than that of the student would broaden the scope of the video. A following video, incorporated evaluation information and broadened the scope.

As I began to present the results of the first study, and show the video at conferences in Australia and internationally, I came to understand the extent of the need and desire in
the field for a greater body of research and resource development in the area of ethical decision making. Participants in workshops and presentations always urged me to further the work. Participants in the U.S.A. and Europe were as interested in the work as were those in Australia. My initial contact with Dr. Stephanie Feeney, whose work on early childhood ethics had already been a major influence, was when she attended my presentation at the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in Dallas, Texas in 1996 (Activity 22, Appendix 1). Dr. Feeney praised my work at this time and invited future contact. With this professional encouragement, with Lois Pollnitz, I successfully applied for a national Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA) Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) grant which later led to further contact with Dr Feeney. This is a national and highly competitive grant for which we received $48,000. This allowed us to embark on the next stage of the project that involved the preparation of a package of teaching resources for tertiary educators. The teaching resource kit contains an instructor’s manual; a video that is an extension of the pilot video; and a CD-ROM. The material used was mainly extension of that used in previous stages of the project that had already undergone ethical clearance processes, but again ethical consideration was given to the use of children in filming. Many ethical issues arose during filming for us, and are detailed in Appendix 3g. The kit is titled “Will my response be ethical? A reflective process to guide the practice of early childhood students and professionals”. A central component of the process outlined in the kit became the “Ethical Response Cycle” (ERC).

During the development of this kit, I was successful in applying to the UWS Nepean Academic Study Leave program and spent time at the University of Hawaii, with Dr. Feeney and the philosopher Dr. Kenneth Kipnis, whose work on professional ethics has
also been very influential in the development of my professional knowledge and understanding of ethics. Together, they developed the “Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment” for the United States based NAEYC in 1989. Dr Feeney has continued to work and write about early childhood ethics and has just published a new book about the use of the code called “Ethics and the Early Childhood Educator. Using the NAEYC Code” (Feeney & Freeman, 1999). I was able to review this book, prior to publication, and my contribution has been acknowledged in the book. The Australian early childhood “Code of Ethics” (AECA, 1991), was developed from the base of the American code and Dr. Feeney is very familiar with the Australian work in this area. Following my liaison with Dr Feeney I was prompted to broaden my writing into the area of leadership, as it relates to the ethical agenda (Newman, 2000b)(see Appendix 3f). The collaboration during this time was invaluable to me, helping me to gain new knowledge and consolidate ideas. Dr. Feeney also read the draft writing at this time and offered very valuable advice. I also had the opportunity to preview our work at this time, with a range of stakeholders in early childhood leadership, teacher education and child care centres in Hawaii, through a series of workshops and presentations (see activities 31-35, Appendix 1).
### Table 2

**Workshops and Presentations to Disseminate and Seek Feedback on Work Carried Out to Develop the Teaching Resource Kit “Will My Response be Ethical?...”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Presentation</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Presentation Details</td>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Type</td>
<td>Presentation Title</td>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Staff Development Presentation for NSW Department of Community Service Advisers</td>
<td>Newman, L. (1998). <em>Professional Ethics in Focus</em>. Invited to present workshop to Children's Services Advisers, Department of Community Services, Campbelltown, September, 1998</td>
<td>Newman – Sole Presenter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows presentations that have been undertaken to disseminate and gain feedback on the work as it has evolved and progressed.
Development of the knowledge base and theoretical framework

To acquire and present a knowledge base for the development of ethical judgement for student teachers undertaking early childhood fieldwork, it is necessary to access and synthesise the literature in ethics in a range of areas. A sound understanding of professional ethics is needed, and to underpin this, students preparing to enter a profession, must understand professionalism. For students of early childhood education, this must be applied to the unique considerations of the early childhood profession.

The knowledge required for sound and sensitive ethical judgement must be based initially on traditional ethics and its related components: professionalism in general, and specifically as it relates to early childhood education; professional ethics; and issues relating to the development of ethical judgement through use of tools such as codes and frameworks. Further to background information relating to professional ethics, students need to examine the notion of ethical dilemmas and their resolution. Background information on the historical and philosophical foundations of contemporary ethics is required as well as information about recognised notions of values, morality and ethical principles. An examination of the differences between personal morality and professional ethics is essential for the development of sound professional ethical judgement. This background is necessary to learn how to work through the steps in most decision-making curricula (Kirschenbaum, 1995) of defining the problem, setting goals, gathering information, generating alternatives, considering consequences, making decisions, and evaluating outcomes. More specifically, as part of the information gathering aspect of decision-making, for individual professions, it is necessary to be familiar with the relevant regulations and professional aspects of that profession.
including guidelines for ethical behaviour, represented in codes of ethics and conduct. Students need to understand what kinds of codes there are, how they are useful, and what their limitations are. To supplement this knowledge, students also need to be familiar with approaches that can be drawn on when the use of codes and guidelines is insufficient. This includes the use of decision-making tools. These aspects of ethics and professionalism are discussed in this statement, overarching the portfolio, in relation to the seven broad themes presented at the beginning of this chapter.

Literature about ethics and professionalism is presented in Chapters 2 and 3. Chapter 2 provides an overview of ethics in general and more specifically, the components of ethics that are most important to this study: traditional Western ethical approaches; and ethical principles. In Chapter 3, the application of ethics for professionals is discussed, including, professional ethics; current issues in professional ethics; the teaching of professional ethics; and ethical preparation for field experience and professional preparation courses, with a focus on the teaching profession. To contextualise the discussion to early childhood education, a brief historical account is offered of the development of professional ethics in early childhood education, and particularly as it applies in Australia.

Further, for students of early childhood education, questions of early childhood education's place within the teaching profession and current issues in professional ethics are addressed as part of the problem definition, or information gathering process. To understand and address needs in the early childhood field, it would be remiss to ignore other levels of education. An historical perspective, relating the contemporary development of ethical practice in early childhood education, is also necessary to ground the work in previous professional endeavours. As well as the knowledge base to be
acquired, students need to understand and be able to demonstrate personal and professional dispositions. Skills, therefore, need to be developed by students, in using and demonstrating the ethical knowledge and dispositions of an ethical professional. These skills can be learnt and facilitated through the application of decision-making tools.

Following the outline of the knowledge base in Chapters 2 and 3, a description is given of some tools to assist ethical judgement, including a new tool that has been developed during this project to facilitate the development of the skills and dispositions of ethical judgement of early childhood professionals. In Chapter 4, the “Ethical Response Cycle” (ERC) is presented. This is a new and unique model that shows early childhood educators, and those preparing to be so, how to apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions of ethical professionalism as they strive to move beyond being “nice ladies” who love children to becoming ethical professionals exercising sound judgement that involves analysis, synthesis and evaluation reflecting the highest levels of Bloom’s taxonomy (Barry & King, 1989). In Chapter 5, a summary and overview is presented, along with suggestions for future work and research directions.
CHAPTER 2

Today the Western mind appears to be undergoing an epochal transformation, of a magnitude perhaps comparable to any in our civilisation’s history. I believe that we can participate intelligently in that transformation only to the extent that we are historically informed. Every age must remember its history anew. Each generation must examine and think through again, from its own distinctive vantage point. The ideas that have shaped its understanding of the world. Our task is to do so from the richly complex perspective of the late twentieth century [and into the new millennium] Tarnas, 1991, xii).

UNDERSTANDING ETHICS

In the previous chapter, it was established that early childhood educators have a particular responsibility to base their relationships, actions and behaviour on the highest level of ethical standards. Their work is with very young children, who are in many respects, vulnerable, and often too young to speak for, or protect themselves (Feeney & Freeman, 1999). They also work closely, and intimately at times, with the families of these children. To work ethically requires cognisance of basic ethical theory. In this
chapter, a selected and briefly summarised outline of the essential and relevant aspects of Western ethics, as a branch of the discipline of philosophy, is presented. The study of ethical theories and principles provides an essential base for the study of professional ethics. Clarification of the concepts of ethics and morality along with knowledge of the historical development of ethical theory as a branch of Western philosophy allows tertiary early childhood educators, and therefore their students to understand the ethical complexities of their work and frame and justify their actions. This knowledge is then gradually dispersed into the working world of professionals to enhance and update practice. Factors that influence the perceived current societal trend towards moral ambivalence and loss of ethical standards can then be considered, within a framework of knowledge and ethics.

The information presented in this chapter, along with Chapters 3 and 4, accompanied by the teaching resource materials developed, could be used as the basis of a program in professional ethics for early childhood educators, in preparation, or in service.

**What is Ethics?**

Ethics can be defined in many ways including the behaviour of individuals or groups which is thought to be right, fair, good or just. Ethical thinking is about addressing “tough choices through energetic self reflection” (Kidder, 1995, p.13). The perceived level of rightness, fairness, goodness or justice of people’s behaviour determines whether their behaviour is described as being either ethical or unethical. The term “morality” has a similar meaning to the term “ethics”. People’s behaviour, depending on its perceived level of rightness, fairness, goodness or justice, is described as being either
moral or immoral. In conversation, the terms ethics and morality are often used interchangeably. Reference to their origins explains why this is a common and acceptable practice (Preston, 1996; Strom, 1989). The word ethics is derived from the Greek word, "ethos" which means "character" or "custom". The word morality is derived from the Latin word "moralis" which means "manners" or "customs". Both terms relate to the character, customs and traditions that underpin society, what its members do, and how they do it (Sottle, 1994; White, 1988). A common application of the respective terms is to use morals to apply to personal issues, and ethics to apply to the formal study of morals, or to the work-related aspects of morality. This is how the terms are used in this portfolio.

In practice, ethics and morality refer to the human ability to make choices among values (Preston, 1996), and to the human conduct which differentiates between what is thought to be right and what is thought to be wrong. Individually and in groups, people make daily decisions about how to conduct themselves in ways they believe to be either right or wrong. This is the ethical or moral dimension of our lives. The decisions people make are based on their values and specifically on the principles they hold about what is a right thing to do and what is a wrong thing to do. For example, if someone believes that it is wrong to lie, she or he will always tell the truth. Sometimes, however, people know that telling the truth will cause great distress to someone they deeply care about. In these circumstances, telling the truth becomes more difficult and the person may choose to either withhold information or to lie. Whether a choice is made to tell the truth, withhold information or to lie, peoples' characters will be affected by the decision and so will the other person be (Boerstler, Carlson, Gac & Swanson, 1997); so being ethical and moral has a personal and social aspect as characters are shaped and re-shaped (Preston, 1996). Another way to look at ethics may be to view ethics as
“obedience to the unenforceable” (Kidder, 1995, p.66). A law, it can be argued, must be obeyed or you will be punished, or fear being punished. So therefore, obeying a law is “obedience to the enforceable”. In opposition to this notion is “obedience to the unenforceable”, where people choose to “do the right thing”, when there is no law binding them to do so, in other words, obedience to self-imposed law. Kidder suggests that the level of obedience to the unenforceable (or ethics) is the true measure of success across communities or nations. And Boerstler et. al, would surely argue that this is partly based on character building of the individuals involved. The difference between law and ethics is seen as the difference between enforceability and unenforceability.

Though it is common and acceptable to use the terms ethics and morality interchangeably, in this work, the concept of ethics as a major branch of the discipline of Philosophy is adopted. Ethics in the philosophical sense is defined as “the study of standards of conduct and moral judgement, a summary of the basic beliefs people have by which they make judgements of what is right and what is wrong” (Boerstler et al., 1997, p. 22). In this sense, ethics “has traditionally come to mean the formal study of morality” (Mitchell & Lovat, 1991, p. 19). It goes beyond asking “what ought I to do here and now?” and requires a higher level of reflection (Haynes, 1998). Ethics as a formal study of morality seeks to provide theories to guide human conduct, and frameworks for the consideration of specific issues. Another commonly used differentiation between morals and ethics is to apply morals to the personal aspects of life, whereas ethics is used to pertain to aspects of a person’s working life. This differentiation is also adopted in this work. Like the study of any discipline, the study of ethics requires learning definitions, discussing ground rules and applying strategies to help reach resolutions.
Ethics takes practice and

requires two distinctive virtues: A willingness to entertain views in opposition to our own, and a commitment to try to form the most responsible judgement. On the matter at hand...both virtues are in good supply in early childhood education (Kipnis, 1987, p.27).

It is evident that ethics is not confined to abstract and idealistic thought. It has an integral practical component. Ethics is about objective moral reasoning and the application of moral principles to specific situations in everyday life. Reaching ethical judgements in specific situations is a complex process usually requiring justification of the application of principles and the ability to decide between conflicting principles (Strike, Haller, & Soltis, 1988). Reaching an ethical judgement may, for example, involve deciding between the ethic of intention and the ethic of responsibility. That is, deciding between upholding a principle despite the severity of the consequences and making a decision which diminishes the impact of the consequences but still aims towards the principle (Hostetler, 1997). This kind of decision making is illustrated in the example described earlier where the alternatives are to tell the truth regardless of the consequences or to either withhold information or to lie in order to diminish the impact of the consequences. Early childhood educators often have to choose between conflicting values in the course of their work. What is considered right for a child may not be right for their family; what is best for one child, may not be best for the group of children, for example.
Preston (1996) describes ethical behaviour as engaging in “ethical reflection ... [which] involves stepping back from a situation and considering obligations and consequences and not simply responding to one’s own personal interest or feelings in a particular case” (p. 19). During the process of reflection, there are points at which judgements are made. These formative judgements serve to filter information and guide the direction of reasoning so that the outcome of the reflective process is a sound ethical judgement. Of course, behaving ethically involves more than ethical judgements alone. Judgement must be followed by appropriate ethical action.

Hostetler (1997) identifies three ways judgement is involved in the reflective process. These are:

- determining what is relevant and important in the situation in terms of people, values, or other facts about the case;

- determining how we should serve or respond to those; and

- determining what to do when those concerns or the responses they demand conflict (p. 7).

The final outcome of the reflective process is a judgement which has practical implications for all those involved in the situation. This understanding of ethics is referred to as ‘applied ethics’ and it is this aspect of ‘ethics’ that is particularly relevant to this work.
Approaches to Ethics

Current thinking about ethics has evolved from ancient beginnings. Western cultural history has evolved from the three major eras or world-views: the classical, the medieval and the modern (Tarnas, 1991). Many argue that we are now in the post-modern era. The history of ethical thinking in the Western world can be traced to Pythagoras in c. 530 BC. The historical roots of ethics are often associated with Socrates who is quoted as saying, “The unexamined life is not worth living” (Haynes, 1998, p.1). Socrates advocated discussion and debate as ways of developing morality. In the ensuing centuries there has been much debate as philosophers, those seekers of wisdom, have wrestled with notions of what is right, good or proper but Tarnas reminds current day Western thinkers that

Our way of thinking is still profoundly Greek in its underlying logic, so much so that before we can begin to grasp the character of our own thought, we must first look closely at that of the Greeks. They remain fundamental for us in other ways as well: Curious, innovative, critical, intensely engaged with life and death, searching for order and meaning, yet skeptical of conventional verities, the Greeks were originators of intellectual values as relevant today as they were in the fifth century B.C. (Tarnas, 1991, p.2).

From this history many positions emerge and are debated. Mitchell and Lovat (1991) have identified the historical emergence of three major ethical positions or movements - absolutism, situationalism and proportionalism. The earliest movement, the historical absolutist position, was based on religious beliefs that rightness and goodness were qualities bestowed by God. Ethical behaviour meant obeying the teachings of the church. The second movement, the historical situationalist position, was based on the
belief that external forces did not dictate nor did God reveal what is right, good or proper. People had to decide standards for themselves and, in consultation with others, resolve upon accepted conventions of behaviour. Ethical behaviour meant conforming to the agreed conventions. The third movement, the historical proportionalist position, was based on a moderating view that people must interpret and apply external, imposed or recommended standards as appropriate to particular situations (Mitchell & Lovat, 1991).

In contemporary Western ethical debate, modern versions of these three positions can be identified (Mitchell & Lovat, 1991, pp. 7-10). The Absolutists or Principalists adhere to universally binding principles about which there can be no debate. At the other end of the range are the Relativists who believe that morality is a matter of opinion, that one opinion is as good as another. The relativist view, though, is generally rejected on the grounds that relativism does not encourage people to make responsible choices (Coady, 1991; Kipnis, 1987; Preston, 1996; Strike & Soltis, 1985; Strike et al., 1988) and critics view the current trend towards postmodernism as an extreme form of relativism. In between these extremes are the Proportionalists who believe in some general standards but also take account of specific circumstances.

Mitchell and Lovat (1991) also report the emergence of another position, that of Prudential Personalism. This position holds that morality is a matter of “intelligent and systematic seeking for ways to achieve human personal and communal goals” (p. 16). Both the Proportionalists and Prudential Personalists aspire to making informed, responsible ethical judgements. Though the philosopher Kipnis (1987) does not declare his allegiance to either of these two positions, he aligns himself with them by claiming that ethical thinking requires a “willingness to entertain views in opposition to our own, and a commitment to try to form the most responsible judgement on the matter at hand”
These positions are supported by Strike et al., (1988) who point out that reaching a decision about an ethical issue often requires that “hard choices be made under complex and ambiguous circumstances” (p.3) and that being able to reason ethically is crucial when an individual has power or influence over the life of another. This position on ethical thinking is particularly relevant to professional ethics.

The Consequentialist and Non-Consequentialist positions are often described as contrasting positions in texts about ethics. Consequentialists hold that the consequences of a decision determine the quality of the decision. That is, the end justifies the means. For Consequentialists, in any situation, the right judgement is the one which achieves the greatest balance of good over evil for the greatest number of people involved (Hostetler, 1997). Non-Consequentialists on the other hand, hold that decisions must be based on duty or principle regardless of the consequences of the decision. That is, the decision is prescribed by the sense of duty or by the principle involved. Preston (1996) uses the example of the abortion debate to illustrate these two positions. Non-Consequentialists would always argue against abortion on the grounds of the principle of the sanctity of human life whereas Consequentialists would argue either for or against abortion depending on the circumstances in each situation.

Kidder (1995), condenses the traditions of moral philosophy into three principle ways of thinking for resolving dilemmas: “Rules-based Thinking”, “Ends-Based Thinking”, and “Care-based Thinking”. If rules-based thinking is employed, one will follow the highest sense of principle and despite any consequence (non-consequentialism) base actions on maxims that could be universalised. It asks us to only follow principles that we think everyone should follow, resulting in actions that could become standards that others ought to obey. What you decide to do, could become a universal law from now on. On
the other hand, using ends-based thinking, decisions are made based on what will be best for the greatest number of people (consequentialism). It requires us to predict the possible consequences of our decision. With care-based thinking, one cares about others and puts him or herself into their shoes. It embodies “The Golden Rule” of “do unto others as you would have them do unto you”. Care based thinking has been emphasised by feminist ethicists and is aimed at nurturing and protecting relationships. It is advocated by many early childhood educators as being the most appropriate model for the profession. These ways of thinking however, are underpinning approaches rather than dilemma paradigms. To “resolve” dilemmas, more specific tools are needed because “resolution requires us to choose which is the nearest right for the circumstances” (Kidder, 1995, p. 23).

In an attempt to apply the concepts of ethics to the working world of professionals Lebacqz (1985), advocates the use of “situation ethics”, (which she uses in a similar manner to Mitchell and Lovat’s prudential personalism) to deal with the conflicting obligations professionals sometimes have. Professionals may have conflicting obligations to clients and others; may consider that they can do more good by breaking a rule than by keeping it; or may consider that a previously accepted rule now needs to be broken, for example. It depends on the situation, with the over-riding consideration being that maximisation of good consequences. The situational approach reveals much of what a person thinks when confronting a problem: rules are generally binding, but do we need to make an exception? Will the consequences of breaking the rule be generally good? Or will keeping it produce more harm than good? Lebacqz argues that this situational approach comes close to a “commonsense, experiential, intuitive, approach to moral decision-making” (1985, p.21). She cautions however, that focusing on consequences alone, can be dangerous in human communities where there is an
understanding that certain “duties”, such as keeping promises, are central to healthy functioning. Duties, as well as good or bad consequences should be considered. A balance therefore, of deontological (duty-based) and teleological (end-based) ethics, seems most appropriate. Duties (or duty-based ethics) requisite for human communities then, to function effectively, could be seen as:

- Making reparation for wrongs done
- Keeping promises
- Gratitude
- Doing good (beneficence)
- Avoiding harm (non-maleficence)
- Justice (equitable distribution of good and harm)
- Self improvement (in virtue and intelligence)
- Respect for the liberty and self-determination of others (autonomy)
- Truth telling (adapted from Lebacqz, 1985, p.25).

Preston (1996) claims that the most recent worrying social ethical position to emerge is what he calls a “post-modern pluralistic ethical environment” (p. 6) which is typified by moral ambivalence and a loss of ethical standards. He attributes this emergence to the breaking down of traditional moral authority systems, for example, the teachings of the church and the structure of the family, and to the rise of the 1980s ‘greed is good’ (p. 6) syndrome. This syndrome was particularly evident within business (the ‘corporate cowboys’), banking, public service and some professions. Bartlett and Olgilby (1996) report that there has been a prevailing view in the business world that “two sets of ethics exist in the evaluation of corporate behaviour - that activities which would be unacceptable in a person's life could be acceptable in the pursuit of occupational goals”
Ethics as such has been regarded as being simply commonsense business practice. Any media search conducted in the late 1990s would quickly substantiate these authors’ claims, and any discussion of professional ethics needs to acknowledge the current recent history and context.

Nationwide police investigations and commissions of inquiry, including investigations of police forces themselves, have now exposed the unethical practice and criminal acts of the 1980s and 1990s, where individual and group behaviour was determined by the attitude of “if you can get away with it, do it” which is often sanctioned by law. Good solicitors or accountants for example, are often perceived as those who can manipulate laws to serve the interests of their clients.

On this view of lawyering, sophisticated and subtle restructuring of clients’ finances in order to minimise liability to taxation or to child maintenance is wholly legitimate. Indeed such conduct may justifiably be perceived as obligatory upon any lawyer who takes seriously the implications of the professional duty of conscientious and committed pursuit of clients’ interests (Tur, 1994, p. 58).

An alternative and decidedly more positive view of ethics in our postmodern age deserves consideration here. Advocates of postmodern ways of thinking strongly refute the notion that “anything goes”, and view the fact that universal rules and absolute facts are no longer accepted, as a positive. The implications are that the responsibility of the individual is, in fact, greater and more profound than in the past. Individuals need to make very difficult decisions, without being able to fall back on rules and codes.
purporting to be universal and unshakeable founded, which tell what choices to make. We must instead repersonalize morality, become our own moral agents, recognizing that we bear responsibility for making moral choices for which there are no foolproof guidelines offering unambiguously good solutions. Far from finding this a cause for pessimism, Bauman argues that ‘personal responsibility is morality’s last hold and hope’ (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999, p.38).

The ethic of care, which many early childhood teachers practice, in contrast to business ethics and the ethics of law, emphasises responsible behaviour which is empathetic to others; sensitive and responsive to the feelings, wishes and needs of others; and which is responsive to the situation at hand. The ethic of care is founded on social relationships and is typically associated with women who tend, more than men, to value relationships and to be more cognisant of the interdependence of individuals within relationships (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984; 1993). Gilligan (1982 cited in Haynes, 1998) argues that women “often choose to react to a situation by trying to assess what action would cause least harm to all within the web of proximal relations, such as a family or a known community” (p. 22).

Gilligan, among others, contends that the differences between the way men and women reason about ethical issues are the result of social conditioning. She argues that men and women’s formative experiences of nurturing and socialisation including the development of social roles determines these differences.

Though more typical of women, and allied to the feminist perspective of ethics, the ethic of care does not need to be restricted to women. The ethic of care does not exclude men and if the ethic of care is valued by the community, it should not be gender specific but be inclusive of women and men (Noddings, 1993). Though the ethic of care emphasises
responsibility in relationships, it does not ignore individual rights, acting for the common good or maintaining community traditions. The ethic of care complements these and the more analytical and objective approaches to deciding what is right and what is wrong human conduct.

For students of early childhood education, in-depth study of ethics is unlikely to form a core component of coursework. Their lecturers too, may never have studied philosophy or ethics. Ethics needs to be (and should be) addressed in an inclusive way, by all teachers, as well as ideally, a discreet block of concentrated study time. An overview of the ethical positions previously discussed is given in Table 4 (Appendix 2). It gives a brief summary of the most commonly discussed ethical positions, gives pointers for further reading and is useful for students or tertiary educators to clarify ethical theories and adopt positions.

**Ethics in current times**

Thinking and debate about ethical issues is further influenced by the complexities and uncertainties of living in a technological age. Bradley, in 1948, was moved to observe that "The world has achieved brilliance without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants" (cited in Bartlett, 1980, p. 825).

It can be argued that fifty years on, and fifty years since the nuclear bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, Bradley's observation remains relevant. There are many examples that can be cited to illustrate Bradley's comment. An explosion in world population combined with rapid industrialisation has reduced Earth's resources and
increased global pollution to an alarming extent (Robinson & Garratt, 1996). The
discovery of a “black hole” in the Earth's atmosphere confirms the urgency of nations
reaching agreement about the relationship between humans and their planet. Though
there is much rhetoric about protecting the planet, and world summits devoted to
discussion of the environment have been held, there is little evidence of global
commitment to preserving Earth for future populations. Individual governments, it
seems, are torn between taking measures that will protect the environment and making
decisions which promote material wealth and employment. Robinson and Garratt warn:

We are members of a complex biosphere whose stability, health and
integrity it is in our interest to preserve and not threaten. An environmental
ethic will have to stress how we must see ourselves as products and perhaps
partners of this planet, and not controllers and exploiters of it (1996, p. 145).

We now live in the age of the computer which has in many ways made daily life easier,
but also, has provided new avenues for crime and opportunism. Computer hacking as a
pastime, for example, has achieved some level of respectability. It appears to be okay to
try to “beat the system”. Ready access to the Internet opens up new opportunities for
those who wish to use technology for their own purposes and self-interest. We applaud
advances in technology that have sent space-craft travelling the universe, and that have
enabled humans to walk on the moon and live in orbiting space stations for months at a
time. Meanwhile, we seem to accept that millions of people here on Earth are left
unprotected from their persecutors; or live in poverty, constant poor health and despair.
The World Health Organisation reports that 12.2 million children under five die every
year, many of them as a result of failing to receive basic health treatment (Preston, 1996,
p. 9). How many of us argue that the time, energy and money spent on space research
would be better spent on improving quality of life on Earth. How many of us are prepared to give up our comfort and security to help improve the situation of others?

Throughout history, there have been shining examples of individuals who have demonstrated the ability to put their beliefs about what is right and wrong ahead of serving their own interests. Their advocacy and action for the purpose of improving the quality of life on Earth has been undertaken at the risk of personal suffering and even death. Some notable examples of these individuals include Socrates, Jesus Christ, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi (Preston, 1996). As individuals, they have led ethical lives and have provided leadership for others. While their influence has been widespread, it has not been strong enough to embrace the global community. The global community is still to demonstrate its social responsibility. It is still to act ethically by responding appropriately to the amount of pain and suffering in the world as evidenced by recent wars involving ethnic cleansing. The global community consistently fails to devote effort to the benefit of the common good.

The constant and often rapid changes that typify the technological age give rise too, to social change in expectations and to feelings of uncertainty about established beliefs and practices (Bayles, 1981; Mitchell & Lovat, 1991). Bayles (1981) argued that current emphasis on consumer rights has led to more intense questioning of traditional ideas about what is right or wrong, and to increasing criticism of the professions. For example, patients who in past years would have accepted their Doctor's advice without question, are now more likely to expect a detailed description of their ailment and an explanation for the recommended treatment. They are more likely too, to hold the Doctor accountable and seek redress for any misdiagnosis or mismanagement of care. It
has been a traditional view that doctors should always save lives when possible. Does this mean that technological advances in medicine should always be used by doctors to prolong the life of a patient even though the quality of life experienced may be extremely poor? Conversely, technological advances in medicine enable doctors to hasten death and to make it physically easy for the patient, but should doctors take advantage of this kind of technology?

Dahlberg, Moss and Pence (1999) go so far as to suggest a revolution. They introduce the notion that we have moved beyond the industrial era to the post-industrial or knowledge era in which “diversity, differentiation and fragmentation replace homogeneity, standardisation and the economies and organisation of scale” (pp.8-9). They suggest that the current revolution is information-based (rather than energy-based), extremely complex and requires new competencies including the “burden of choice” (p.2), and high levels of creativity. These competencies are in the field of the philosopher, ethicist or ethical thinker.

These examples, selected from a range of other relevant ones confirm Bradley’s observation and more recently, Preston’s statement “that the human capacity to determine what we can do, has outstripped our ability to decide what we ought to do” (1996, p. 6). Given this situation, what do we tend to do? It is claimed that, when confronted with ethical issues, individuals or groups tend towards a particular ethical position depending on the influences that have shaped their lives (Kipnis, 1987; Mitchell & Lovat, 1991; Sockett, 1990). This pattern of behaviour helps to explain why there continues to be disagreement about what is right, good or proper (Mitchell & Lovat, 1991).
While current interest and debate in the community about what is right, good or proper can be regarded as a healthy sign for the ethical life of the community, particularly in the light of events of the past twenty years, we need to be aware that dissatisfaction gives rise to a range of views for dealing with moral and ethical standards. Some of these can be regarded as reactions which bring to prominence the views of those who take extreme positions in regard to moral and ethical behaviour. The range of views includes,

to dream of a return to a past that never was; seek a better life through adherence to xenophobic beliefs; escape into the fantasy world of fundamentalist religious beliefs or of the pabulum of the media and hucksters of technology (Hamberger & Moore, 1997, p. 301).

There are the voices, for example, of individuals and groups who advocate for, among other extreme societal measures, the return of corporal punishment in schools and capital punishment for murder. We need to be sure that renewed interest in ethics focuses on a commitment to social policy that promotes democratic and participatory processes. We need to be sure that social policy includes social justice so that members of the community who are disadvantaged for whatever reason and therefore, are the most vulnerable to exploitation, are protected. Among many others, young children can fall into this category of vulnerability. Early childhood educators, in their work with young children and their families must be informed about current world views, issues of social policy and engage in the debates that will inform their everyday ethically based choices for action.
Clarifying ethical principles

Application of ethical theories can be seen in the use of ethical principles to resolve dilemmas and guide actions. When ethical principles are used as the basis for judgements, prioritisation of principles will inevitably be needed as right-versus-right dilemmas arise, and is further discussed later in this section. Five commonly applied traditional ethical principles are now discussed.

Autonomy

Autonomy refers to individuals’ rights to determine their own course of action and includes being free to decide and being free to act, but also, autonomy requires the individual to be respectful of the dignity and autonomy of others. The privilege of autonomy is based on the assumption that the individual is competent to make an informed and rational decision. Autonomy does not give individuals the right to infringe on the rights of others and it also requires them to give special protection to those with diminished autonomy or capacity.

Consider the principle of autonomy as it relates to a researcher who is interviewing families about their child’s experiences at school entry. Her hypothesis is that those children who undergo involvement in a certain transition program, will have families who are more satisfied with their child’s transition into school. This finding may result in the researcher attracting funding to continue running and extending the program. In one interview, the participant is a mother with a mild intellectual disability whose child who also has an intellectual disability commenced school, with no involvement in any transition support program. The interviewer is only aware of the mother’s disability because of her own teaching experience in this area. The research assistant does not
recognise the disability. The participant gives responses that do not support the researcher's hypothesis, but the researcher has the distinct feeling that the participant is wanting to say what she feels the researcher wants to hear. The respondent recounts being satisfied with her treatment and experiences, but the researcher knows that this is because she is not aware of her rights or what assistance is available, and has been given to others in similar situations. On several occasions the respondent looks to the researcher to guide her and gain approval for her responses. The respondent has agreed to participate in the study, which has gained university ethics clearance. The researcher's autonomy in the study may lead her to include, or not include the interview, which has been conducted ethically. However, the respondent's information will be used to plan future programs for her and her child, as well as many others. The researcher's autonomous choice about inclusion of the data may impact on the respondent's future autonomy as a parent. The researcher may decide to forego the use of the information as she feels that the position of the child and the family may be compromised if she does not have a choice of programs. On the other hand, the researcher feels that her findings could result in benefits for many families, if they prove her hypothesis.

In some situations, the principle of autonomy may not be upheld, for example, when it comes into conflict with the principle of nonmaleficence.

**Nonmaleficence**

Nonmaleficence is about not causing harm to others, either intentionally or unintentionally and about not taking action that puts others at risk of harm. What constitutes harm is not always clear but relates to physical injury and emotional trauma, and includes levels of physical or emotional discomfort and stress. The principle of
nonmaleficence is an important one to uphold in the early childhood education profession as the primary clients are so young, can be vulnerable and are often unable to speak for themselves.

Adherence to or non-adherence to the principle of nonmaleficence is often based on the anticipated gravity of potential harm compared with the potential positive outcomes of decisions and actions. Many examples drawn from medical practice can be used to illustrate this point. For example, a child cancer patient may endure great physical suffering over an extended period of time as the result of treatment for the cancer, but the harm done is deemed worthwhile given the potential of the treatment to bring about the anticipated good of long-term remission from the cancer, and an overall increased quality of life for the child.

Balancing nonmaleficence is the principle of beneficence.

**Beneficence**

Beneficence is about making decisions and taking actions that make a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of others.

While it may appear to be straightforward that the principle of doing good should always prevail over causing harm, there are situations where this approach becomes problematic. For example, an elderly patient has severe heart problems and is hospitalised with chronic emphysema (severe restriction of respiratory function), is very weak and constantly using an oxygen mask. Despite his situation, the patient is mentally alert and generally in good spirits. He becomes unable to pass urine and a
catheter is inserted to relieve his discomfort. The retention of urine could be symptomatic of prostate cancer. Males are more likely to die with prostate cancer rather than of prostrate cancer but an operation under general anaesthetic can generally rectify things. The doctor decides to carry out the operation on the elderly patient who dies of heart failure within the following two weeks. In this case, it might be argued that the emotional stress and physical effects associated with the operation did not outweigh its benefits. Without the operation, the patient would have been comfortable to the end and not borne the additional trauma of the operation. Though the intention of the operation was to achieve some good for the patient, it is doubtful that there were any benefits for the patient, and in fact it is more likely that the outcome of the operation was to reduce the quality of the time left to him.

Other situations where adhering to the principle of beneficence becomes problematic include those where there are obligations and responsibilities to more than one client. Adherence to the principle of beneficence may sometimes lead to a decision which benefits one client and disadvantages another.

**Justice**

Justice is about being fair to others and about making decisions that promote common interests. It requires that the benefits and disadvantages of particular decisions and actions be distributed equitably on the basis of effort or merit.

In decisions about what is just, issues of diversity and disadvantage need to be taken into account. For example, it can be argued that the ratio of health funding for indigenous Australians should be greater than that provided for other Australians on the basis of the
documented health statistics and living conditions of indigenous Australians. In early childhood education, adherence to the principle of justice may require balancing fairness to one client, say the child, against fairness to another, say the child’s family, or balancing fairness to the individual child against what is perceived to be fair for the larger group of children.

Fidelity

Fidelity is about keeping promises, keeping faith with others and maintaining loyalty to others.

Adherence to the principle of fidelity builds trust between individuals and groups and underpins the development of worthwhile human relationships. Fidelity involves being honest, avoiding deception and maintaining confidentiality, but these must be balanced against other principles. For example, being honest with a client might result in causing themselves or another considerable harm. For example, an early childhood professional may choose not to tell a family that she is aware of their history of physical and emotional abuse of their child as she has been advised by an agency working with family that they are likely to leave her service if they become aware that she knows this history. She considers that there is potential good for the child involved in regular attendance at the service, where she will receive care and education and staff can monitor her progress.

As revealed by the previous discussion, prioritising and choosing between principles to resolve ethical dilemmas is a complex process. When principles are in conflict, it becomes difficult to decide which principles should take priority over others.
Specific Order of Principles

In order to simplify the selection of principles on which to base decisions, a specific order of principles can be adhered to, based on the extent to which some principles are thought to be more important than others. The establishment of a specific ordering of principles for similar situations ensures that similar situations are dealt with in the same way. Nash argues that the prioritisation of principles is associated with the person's role. In some professions, confidentiality is paramount, in others non-maleficence may take precedence. He does warn however, about setting up dilemmas by being too rigid in adherence to an order of principles (Nash, 1996).

In most situations, there is good argument for establishing that doing good (beneficence) should always take precedence. This ordering of principles is of particular relevance to situations involving disadvantaged members of society, including young children, who can be vulnerable and lack power to protect themselves. In situations where there is an issue of confidentiality, it can be argued that the principle of not doing harm (nonmaleficence) should take precedence over maintaining the privacy of an individual (fidelity). This ordering of principles too, has particular relevance to situations involving young vulnerable and powerless children. It might become known, for example, that a young mother of a premature baby is using illegal drugs, spending a great deal of time in smoke filled environments, and not fitting the monitor that has been prescribed by her doctor to alert her to the possibility of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. If the ordering of principles (nonmaleficence takes precedence over fidelity where there is an issue of confidentiality) is applied in this situation, the professional involved would notify the relevant authorities, breaking the confidentiality of the informant and the mother to protect the child from potential harm.
The problem with establishing a specific ordering of principles for similar situations, however, is that the unique circumstances of each situation are not taken into account and so unjust decisions or decisions which are difficult to defend, are sometimes made. If a teacher, for example, applies this approach, and does not report accidental incidents, (in the belief that she is doing what is best for the parents), that she knows would concern parents, this could have serious consequences legally, and for the development of relationships built on mutual trust if consequences later arise. For example, the teacher may feel that it is not worth upsetting a newly divorced mother by telling her about what seemed like a minor incident in the playground. However, her child may suffer psychological or physical repercussions and the implications of the mother not knowing may mean that there is further potential harm to the child.

Another way of approaching the problem of deciding between conflicting principles is to adhere to the principle which will bring about the greatest balance of good over harm. Lebacqz (1985) argues that the first priority of professional ethics should be the restoration of autonomy to clients and the liberation of clients from professional power situations. Most professional dilemmas involve prioritising beneficence with another principle such as confidentiality or honesty, however Lebacqz (1985) argues for a higher overall prioritisation of justice.

The greatest balance of good over harm

Adopting the approach of creating the greatest balance of good over harm requires the decision maker to balance the possible harms against the possible benefits of
judgements, and to choose a judgement where the benefits outweigh the all-round harms.

This approach has the benefit that it is often easier to predict possible harm than it is to anticipate the beneficial outcomes. The judgement arrived at, however, may not be the one that is most beneficial but the judgement which causes least harm to all concerned. Prioritisation of principles can be assisted by the use of models of ethical response such as Kitchener’s (1984), Preston’s (1996) and Newman and Pollnitz’s (in preparation). Development of models for the use of reasoning draws on ethical theory. In his model, Preston advocates giving consideration to the concepts of universalism and to social good when deciding which values should prevail over others. Kitchener establishes an order of principles. Newman and Pollnitz advocate ordering of principles based on reflection, negotiation and informed professional inclination. Nash firmly believes that students must know how to talk about morality in the technical terms of ethics as it helps them to structure how they think about morality and gives us all a common language to talk about morality (Nash, 1996).

In this chapter, selected, relevant concepts and theories of Western ethics have been presented as a foundation for the teaching of professional ethics. In the next chapter, the relationship of these concepts and theories to applied professional ethics is explored.
CHAPTER 3

The exercise of ethical decision making is often seen as the highest fulfillment of the human condition (Kidder, 1995, p.186).

PROFESSIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Professional Ethics

In Chapter 2, theoretical concepts of ethics and current ethical issues were explored. Theoretical understanding of ethics in isolation however, is of little use to professionals if they do not know how to apply the knowledge in their daily practice. In the previous chapter, concepts of ethics were explained and in this chapter, ethics, as it applies to professionals in general; to teachers as a group; and to early childhood teachers in particular, is examined. Further, teaching about professional ethics to teachers in preparation, in their tertiary level programs, is argued for. Initially, to clarify understanding and context, a brief description of characteristics of a profession is relevant to precede discussion that elaborates the characteristic of ethical behaviour as it relates to professionals. Professional ethics is defined as professionals' responsibility to behave in ways that are consistent with each profession's agreed core values and
standards of conduct and in ways that uphold the trust conferred on them by members of the community.

When a person chooses to become a professional, they adopt a “role”, as a teacher, dentist or doctor, for example. In this role, the person now needs to consider more than their own personal values, or virtues. The must consider role-specific values and virtues. Each profession has particular values and virtues. Lebacqz (1985) suggests that there are virtues common to all professionals such as competence, honesty, beneficence etc., and that further, individual professions have their own set of virtues such as cheerfulness for nurses, piety for ministers and gentleness for paediatricians etc. As previously mentioned, early childhood professionals are expected to be “nice ladies”. However, the individual professional must be reflective and self-aware to ensure that professional virtues, though demonstrated, are held for the right reason. Members of the “helping professions”, for example, can be prone to demonstrating the right virtues (such as trustworthiness, caring), for the wrong reasons, such as the need for personal praise or reassurance. Lebacqz suggests that professionals operate in a “trusteeship” role, where power is given over something valuable. She points out that physicians are entrusted with knowledge and power for our health, ministers for our soul, and lawyers for social and interpersonal relations. Early childhood professionals certainly act in a critical trusteeship role, as they are entrusted with the care and education of families’ young children. Professionals then, in their trusteeship role, need to be sure that the virtues they demonstrate, are for the good of the community, not simply for personal gain.

It can be argued, that to a great extent, the functioning of a community is dependent on the effectiveness of services provided within it. The quality of services provided by professionals in the community has an overall impact on quality of community life.
Members of the community who provide human services for others are expected to be knowledgeable, skilled, and behave according to rules of conduct and community moral principles. Members of professions, for example, doctors and lawyers, constitute a particular group of service providers. They are commonly understood to have higher levels of qualification, greater depths of knowledge and higher levels of expertise than many other service providers.
Descriptors of what constitutes ‘a profession’ vary, but elements commonly described are that professionals:

- Fulfill a social necessity
- Possess specialised knowledge based on research, gained over a long period of preparation
- Have a specialised skill that allows a specialised service to be offered
- Are considered to be experts in the field
- Have a willingness to go beyond the call of duty without necessarily expecting payment
- Show autonomy in actions
- Can identify a distinctive culture
- Show altruism
- Are committed to the interests of clients
- Have a relationship with clients based on confidence, faith and trust
- Provide service with compassion
- Maintain a distance from clients
- Self regulate the profession
- Adopt standards of practice
- Abide by a code of ethics
- Advocate for their professional core values
- Are relatively well paid for making the judgements that autonomy requires
- Resolve complex issues
- Avoid certain manners of attracting business
A profession has been described as:

an occupation requiring advanced study in the liberal arts and sciences and specialised training. But this is not the whole story; profession is an honorific title, a term of approval that is a highly valued collective symbol (Feeney, cited in Fleet and Clyde, 1993, p. 201).

Professionals must at all times place the responsibility for the welfare, health and safety of the community before their responsibility to the profession, to sectional or private interests, or to other members of the profession according to Brock (1999) who uses an Australian Council of Professions report to support his contention that a profession can be distinguished from a more commercially minded occupation.

Another common community understanding is that professionals are obliged to behave with autonomous ethical behaviour in their relationships with clients rather than to only adhere to formal and specific rules of conduct. To understand how to behave ethically, professionals need some formal study of concepts of ethics (Jacob-Tim and Hartshorne, 1994). Formal study of professional ethics usually incorporates introduction to that profession’s code of ethics.

**Codes of Ethics**

Most descriptors of “a profession” include the fact that the group has a code of ethics to guide ethical action. Codes of ethics are aspirational, indicating the users’ ability to apply the code with autonomy, as opposed to codes of conduct that are prescriptive (Forster, 1999).
Codes of ethics usually contain a smaller number of general or fundamental principles [than codes of conduct], which will be of particular importance in instances where a code of conduct is silent or unclear. A code of ethics is better than a code of conduct for ensuring long term commitment to important values because it demands something more than compliance. It calls for people to exercise judgement and take responsibility for decisions they make (Forster, 1999, p. 1-2).

Baumgart (1996) too, contends that ethics cannot be imposed, but that users of a code need commitment to its use, or in other words, a disposition to be ethical. Behaving ethically therefore involves professionals making informed, responsible decisions and acting with discretion. They act honestly, are just, obtain the consent of their clients (those individuals and groups who are the recipients of the service), and maintain the confidentiality of clients. Such decisions and actions are for the good of the clients and protect their rights. Any decision made by an individual professional should be a decision that all ethical members of a particular profession would make (Bayles, 1981; Mitchell & Lovat, 1991; Rich, 1984). In recognition of these characteristics, the community usually places trust in members of the professions and treats them with respect. Codes of ethics however, do have shortcomings and cannot be expected to be the only base for ethical practice.

Why codes of ethics and guidelines aren't always enough.

It is clear that professionals need to do more than adhere to high personal moral standards to be ethical. Usually they will also have a code of ethics to guide their professional decisions. Codes of ethics are based on the core values of a profession and
examination of principles in them will usually reveal a concern for values such as fairness, competence, honesty, the good of the client and society and not taking advantage of the client. Ethical principles, or professional duties such as justice, beneficence, non-maleficence, fidelity and honesty, lie behind codes of ethics (Lebacqz, 1985). The concept of “being a professional” is embodied in the implementation of these values and principles, through application of the code. It is a common assumption that ethical dilemmas can be resolved simply by adhering to codes of ethics, although professionals do sometimes see their codes as “window-dressing”, or for protection of the profession itself, rather than as a guide to the behaviour of members. Perhaps professionals who view their codes this way are expecting them to do more than they are designed for. As Nash says though, codes are “not meant to be precise ethical action guides, and they should rarely be applied [this] way. Codified principles and practices can never cover every situation, because circumstances vary and discretionary professional judgement is always necessary” (Nash, 1996, p.95-96). Lebacqz (1985) extends the notion of professional judgement to include the character of the professional person. She points out that codes establish expectations for professional character. Rather than giving specific direction for behaviour, codes are geared towards “patterns of behaviour and the embodiment of general principles... that say something about the kinds of character traits necessary for someone to be a professional” (p.70). She suggests that codes should be used not so much to answer the question “what should I do?” as “what sort of person should I be?”

Codes are best for portraying the image of the profession and the professional and establishing moral expectations for the demonstration of professional moral values such as orientation to service, competence, commitment, trust, confidentiality, collegiality, respect for clients, fairness, honesty, fidelity and goodwill (Nash, 1996).
In some situations it may be possible to find a solution to a dilemma by referring to statements in the relevant code and by adhering to them, but more often than not, the dilemma exists precisely because a situation arises where the professional is torn between complying with code statements that are in conflict. If one statement is adhered to the professional may be in breach of another (Newman & Pollnitz, in press).

Codes of ethics may give minimal guidance when practitioners are faced with decisions of ethical consequence. Ethical principles may conflict, or there may be no specific guideline to give direction in some situations. For example, use of the AECA Code of Ethics (AECA, 1991) may conceivably lead to perplexities. Early childhood educators can be faced with difficult decisions such as weighing up two competing points from the code of ethics such as, 1.11. “Work to ensure that young children are not discriminated against on the basis of gender, age, race, religion, language, ability, culture or national origin”, against, 2.3. “Engage in shared decision making with families”. Situations do arise where ethical statements compete, opinions differ, and educators must act (sometimes quickly) in a situation of dilemma. For example, it is conceivable that an early childhood teacher may institute policies in her/his centre to ensure that all children, regardless of gender, say, or religion, take part in activities or routines together. An example of a scenario that may lead to differing opinions between families is when role plays include boys and girls being given the same opportunities to dress up in many types of clothing, including clothes traditionally worn by the opposite sex. The educator firmly believes that he or she is being fair, and doing what is in the best interests of all children. All children should be offered equal opportunities. At the same time, the educator is firmly committed to involving parents in decision making and may encounter a dilemma when different families have widely differing views from each
other about what is appropriate or desirable for their children. For example, some gender
specific clothes may be deemed inappropriate by some parents for their children.
Educators too, will have views based on their education and personal value system and
will need to decide which code statement takes precedence. The decision making
process is complex. It has been pointed out that codes of ethics do not take into account
the ethical obligations of justice and liberation, so important in professional ethics where
professionals are in positions of power in relation to clients. Codes traditionally focus on
the autonomy of the professional and the relationships of professional-client without
addressing the institutional aspects of professional care that can lead to large gaps in
power between professional and client (Lebacqz, 1985).

The following case illustrates how an Australian early childhood teacher could find that
use of the AECA Code of Ethics (AECA, 1991) was only a beginning point in her
reflections about a current dilemma. On a busy party day in her early childhood centre, a
volunteer parent failed to notice that a young Muslim boy was eating ham, which his
parents had explicitly explained was strictly forbidden within their religion. What does
the AECA Code of Ethics say that is relevant to this situation? Specifically, what does
it say that will help the teacher to decide whether or not to stop the child from eating the
sandwich? For guidance, the teacher can draw on these statements from the Code which
are however, very general:

In relation to children, I will:
• Engage only in practices that are respectful and provide security for
children and in no way degrade, endanger, exploit, intimidate, or harm them
psychologically or physically;
• Ensure that my practices reflect consideration of the child’s perspective.

In relation to families, I will:
• Acknowledge the uniqueness of each family and the significance of its culture, customs, language and beliefs; (AECA, 1991).

Trying to adhere to all these statements presents the teacher with a problem. If she takes the unfinished food away, the teacher is clearly meeting her obligation to the family but in the process, may not meet her obligations to the child. By intervening, she may upset the child in front of the other children. As a member of a minority group on this occasion, he may feel embarrassed about what he has done. He may feel distressed about his differences being noted, and even feel like an “outsider”. He may feel very guilty about what he has done and be worried about the punishment, which may follow. He may no longer be able to enjoy the party. So, by intervening, the teacher exposes the child to potential emotional and perhaps even to physical harm if his parents punish him.

By not intervening though, the teacher knowingly allows the child to be deceived and knowingly allows him to break a central tenet of his religion. Attempting to adhere to all the relevant code statements doesn’t help the teacher decide what she should do.

What does the code say that will help the teacher decide whether or not to tell the child’s parents that he has eaten some ham. For guidance, the teacher can draw on these statements from the Code, in addition to the previously cited ones:

In relation to children, I will:
• Ensure that my practices reflect consideration of the child’s perspective.

In relation to families, I will:
• Consider situations from each family’s perspective, especially if differences or tensions arise;
• Strive to develop positive relationships with families that are based on mutual trust and open communication.
Again, trying to adhere to all these statements presents the teacher with a problem. If she adheres to the code statements that relate to the family, she will tell the child’s parents about his eating ham. She cannot know, however, what their reaction will be. Their reaction may put the child at risk of punishment for something the teacher feels was not his fault. Her obligations to the child include protecting him from potential psychological or physical harm; so in her attempt to adhere to the statements which relate to families, the teacher may not be able to meet her obligations to the child.

If the teacher attempts to adhere to the statements relating to children, she may or may not decide to tell the child’s parents about him eating ham. On the one hand she is obligated to protect the child from harmful practices; on the other hand, she is obliged to be respectful of the child within the constitution of his family; so may decide to tell his parents. This would enable them to act in accordance with their religious procedures and practices. Again, it is clear that attempting to adhere to all the relevant code statements doesn’t help the teacher decide what she should do (Newman & Pollnitz, in press).

Reference to the code reveals too, that in relation to the case study, there are obligations the teacher has to herself ("work to complement and support the child rearing function of the family"); her colleagues ("work with my colleagues to maintain and improve the standard of service provided in my workplace"); and to the community and society ("provide programs which are responsive to community needs"). These obligations may further complicate the dilemma for the teacher because the outcome of choosing
between the conflicting obligations can lead to the early childhood service being pulled in different directions (Henry, 1994).

Though not all alternative and potential outcomes relating to the case study have been explored, enough have been addressed to demonstrate that reliance on the code alone is not sufficient to resolve these and other ethical dilemmas that arise in early childhood staff's daily work with children and families. Similar quandaries can arise for other professionals. As illustrated by the discussion, what the code can do is help staff identify what their obligations and responsibilities are, where obligations and responsibilities conflict, and what the issues are. According to Henry (1994), identification of these obligations is crucial to the resolution of ethical dilemmas. Staff who use the code to identify obligations and responsibilities can feel more certain that colleagues will support them in situations where they have taken a "risky or courageous" stand in order to resolve an ethical dilemma (Katz, 1988). Codes will not solve ethical dilemmas but will facilitate raising levels of ethical awareness and hopefully encourage ethical practice (Clyde, 1989a; Henry, 1994). What is needed to complement and supplement codes as a tool for resolving ethical dilemmas are procedures and strategies which enable staff to evaluate competing obligations and responsibilities and arrive at ethically defensible decisions. Forster (1999), also shows that teachers need an awareness of what lies behind ethical choices.

Ethical conduct requires decision making and, accordingly, judgement especially in those situations where it seems to be a matter of choosing between competing or conflicting values. For example, judgement is required in a case where attending to the well-being of one child (e.g. a child with a disability) may appear to require less attention to the wellbeing of all other children in the class (p.3).
Forster supports the notion that reference to ethical theories and principles can facilitate the complex process of professional ethical judgement. The application of ethical principles is explored in the next section.

**Applying ethical principles and theories to facilitate thinking beyond the code.**

There is a critical need for professionals to understand the ethical dimensions of their work and a necessary starting point is to define and/or ascribe to agreed underpinning principles or values for the profession. These are based on ethical positions and underpin codes of ethics. Some principles for early childhood professionals are listed below.

Professionals should:

- be clear about their goals
- be confident without certainty (healthy skepticism)
- accept and respect their clients
- avoid tricks, gimmicks, bribes and white lies
- use power and resources appropriately (adapted from Stonehouse, 1991)

The principles are useful for any professionals. Like ethical principles, ethical indicators underpin codes and can be used to assist professionals to make ethical judgements in problematic situations. According to Stonehouse, professionals should consider:

- what is right rather than easy, purely pragmatically based or expedient
- what is good rather than simply practical
- what members must not do or condone even if it works or they could get away with it.
what they must never be accomplices, bystanders, or contributors to (adapted from & Ward, 1978, in Stonehouse, 1991).

Professional core values, developed over time within professions, underpin codes and guidelines, and guide practice. They can be shown to arise from historically based and traditional theoretical positions such as rule-based thinking, ends-based thinking, proportionalist-based thinking and care-based thinking, as described in Chapter 2.

These four (as well as other) ethical approaches inform ethical principles such as autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, justice, and fidelity, as described in Chapter 2. Knowledge of the aforementioned ethical approaches and ethical principles can help early childhood (and other) professionals to understand ethics, the purposes of ethical action and can facilitate decision making in problematic situations. Isolated knowledge alone however, is insufficient. Knowledge needs to be applied to real life situations and problems and embedded into everyday practice. This can be achieved through the use of frameworks for dilemma resolution (to be further described in Chapter 4), that incorporate, and are based on, traditional ethical approaches and principles.

Differentiating Personal and Professional Values

It is clear from the identification of professional characteristics that ethical behaviour is different from decision-making based on personal preference. It extends beyond personal or “private” norms of behaviour (Strike, Haller & Soltis, 1988, p. 38), that is, those values and standards which govern individuals’ judgements about how they should behave. Furthermore, ethical behaviour can be distinguished from behaviour that adheres to “ordinary norms” (Bayles, 1981, p. 16) or public moral principles that serve
to "regulate the interactions among human beings" (Strike, Haller & Soltis, 1988, p. 41) as more than personal considerations are involved in the decision about which actions to pursue. A person acting in a private, or personal capacity, is free to decide their actions according to personal moral principles, likely to be based on family, community or religious values. The same person, acting in a professional capacity, while influenced by their personal values, must base their decisions on the values of their profession. Professional ethics builds on the values people already hold and applies this to their work. Conflicts between personal values and professional ethics can occur and can cause profound tension when dilemmas arise (Royal Institute of Public Administration Australia, 1994). Within a framework of professional ethics, professionals need to demonstrate two types of virtues: dispositional virtues and action virtues. Dispositional virtues allow professionals to see what is required, a way of seeing and feeling about the world that motivates them to have a disposition towards the good. Action virtues, on the other hand, allow professionals to not only see what is good, but to actually do it (Lebacqz, 1985). Professional virtues are implemented by acting with professional responsibility. Professionalism entails the professional taking responsibility for:

3. "Using one's knowledge, skill and technical expertise to support democratic functions;"
2. Using one's position, power and authority to uphold society's values, beliefs and practices;
3. Using one's public resources to maximise the benefits to society from their use.

Professionalism can be equated with ethical practice as it enables the [professional group] to function as a proficient entity, which reinforces trust and respect for those working in it (Royal Institute of Public Administration Australia, 1994, p.15).
For example, for any of a number of reasons, a doctor may be tempted to have an affair outside marriage with someone she plays tennis with socially at the local tennis club. The doctor's decision to have or not to have the affair may be made on the basis of her personal norms of behaviour. Alternatively, the doctor's decision to have or not to have the affair may be made on the basis of social group norms of behaviour in which case she will decide whether or not to conform with the public moral principle or ordinary norm, "We should not commit adultery". The doctor's decision is made as an individual in a private capacity and is quite separate from her professional life.

If however, the fellow player is also her patient, the doctor is not able to separate her private from her professional life. In her professional life, the doctor's reasoning is guided by the principle that her professional relationship with a patient must not be compromised or endangered by the development of an intimate personal relationship. As long as the person is her patient, the core values of her profession tell her that it would be unethical for the doctor to make the decision to proceed with the affair. For the doctor to act ethically, she must make her decision, based on the core values of her profession. She must choose not to have the affair, or cease to treat the patient.

Professionals need to do what is right, fair and just for all their clients; so they must act impartially. Professional impartiality is achieved by using objective reasoning that incorporates moral principle and a sense of obligation to others as bases for decision-making. Professionals need to know that, on the whole, the decisions they make as individual professionals are the decisions other ethical members of their profession would make in similar circumstances.
Professional ethics are not imposed on the profession but are generated by its members from an agreed understanding of what constitutes the profession's purposes and characteristic activities or procedures. The ethics of the profession should become internalised as part of the profession's consciousness and identifiable culture and as part of the individual professional's consciousness. Of course, there are always individual professionals who are perceived to act unethically. It is possible that such professionals have consciously chosen to prioritise ethical principles differently to the majority of their colleagues. An example of this could be the American, so called, “Dr Death, and Australian Dr Phillip Nitsche, who actively engage in assisting euthanasia. They may argue that their decisions to help terminally ill people die more quickly, are based on a principle of beneficence – doing what is good for the patient and family. Their colleagues however, on the whole, base their decisions on the professional core value of preserving life at any cost. On the other hand, some professionals will always act unprofessionally due to personal needs and desires, laziness or lack of commitment to their profession.

Professional ethics, then, should not be about satisfying the individual professional's sense of what is right or wrong, or about acceding to a client's wishes or demands, but is about the individual professional “acting in ways that are consistent with the duties entrusted to [that professional] in a public or professional role” (Preston, 1996, p.158). This means that professionals should at all times demonstrate competence, integrity and fair conduct (Thompson, 1997), and apply sensitive and humane reasoning to the issue at hand. The client's trust should be maintained in circumstances which are often complex and multi-faceted (White, 1988). In this way, professionals meet the expectations of their community responsibility.
To sum up, professional ethics should include both a clarification of the roles and
behaviour of professionals, and the establishment of norms or “professional core values”
(Kipnis, 1987, p. 28). What might these core values be? For public officials
representing the Australian Government, for example, they include fairness, integrity,
honesty and caring (Royal Institute of Public Administration Australia, 1994). Core
values for teachers in New South Wales are documented as:

1. Trust and trustworthiness
2. A commitment to truth and honesty
3. Tolerance and respect for the rights of others
4. Integrity
5. Courage
6. Equity and fairness
7. Excellence
8. Diligence
9. Care and support of colleagues

Core values for early childhood personnel include:

- Recognition of each individual as a unique human being
- Realisation of the full potential of children and adults
- Environments that foster well-being and positive self-esteem in children, staff and families
- Autonomy and self-reliance in children, staff and families
- Appreciation of the special vulnerability of children and their need for
  safe and healthy environments
- Recognition that each child is an individual with unique needs and abilities
- Respect for confidentiality and the right of the child and family to privacy
- Development of children: socially, emotionally, intellectually, and physically
- Use of developmentally appropriate instructional techniques for children
- Appreciation for childhood as a unique and valuable stage in the life cycle
Professional practice based on the best current knowledge of child growth and development
Recognition for the support and interconnectedness of the child and family
Support for families in their task of nurturing their children
Effective protection and advocacy for the rights of children
Support for the right of all children, regardless of income, or other circumstances, to have access to quality early childhood programs
Unity among people who work in child care settings and cooperation with other professional groups concerned with the welfare of young children
Continuing growth as professionals in early childhood education (Kipnis, 1987, p. 29)
Appreciation of the diversity of cultures within our society and protection of the cultural identity of children in each minority group
Acknowledgment and use of the power of the media in the promotion of early childhood issues
Rights of parents to pertinent information about their child (Stonehouse, 1991a, p. 9).

Once documented for professions, these norms or core values provide the basis for discussion of appropriate behaviour, and so help the members of professions to resolve ethical issues that arise in their relationships with clients. In particular, this process enables professionals to be more confident that their decisions as individuals will be the same as other colleagues’ in similar circumstances.

**Current issues in professional ethics.**

There has been criticism of professionals and a decline of public confidence in the professions in recent years. In New South Wales, a Royal Commission has tarnished the image of police, judges and teachers. Lawyers are perceived by the public to be
primarily interested in moneymaking. The public is demanding greater accountability from doctors. This has lead to renewed public interest in professional ethics and the development of many new or revised professional codes of ethics.

There is agreement (Bayles, 1981; Mitchell & Lovat, 1991) that a direct result of the current technological revolution is that those service providers in the community who are recognised as professionals are increasingly active in making decisions that impact on daily public life. The intricacy of modern technology has caused societal structures, for example the financial, legal, education and health systems, to become more complex in order to deal with the new technology. Medical procedures increasingly are based on computer-based analyses of evidence, teaching is moving into an era where courses can be delivered “on-line”, without direct teacher-student contact, and banking and financial dealings are now often transacted without going near a bank. The public is now more dependent on professionals with understanding of these complexities to guide community thinking and action. Nevertheless, people are not willing to allow the professions to forgo their obligations to them as clients and increasingly demand their rights as consumers.

Increasingly, the power and privileges once enjoyed freely by professionals are challenged. Professionals' inclination to arrogance, to making decisions on behalf of clients rather than in consultation with them, and to acting in a condescending manner towards their clients is perceived as a subtle form of harm, and is less tolerated than it previously was (Prilleltensky, Rossiter & Walsh-Bowers, 1996). People are now much more likely to “shop around” to find a doctor, solicitor or financial adviser with whom they can build a relationship based on mutual respect. University students increasingly
demand accountability from their lecturers in return for the payment of fees. Changes within the professions themselves, have further eroded their status in the community.

At the same time, well-publicised scandals have resulted in a decline of public confidence in professionals and criticism of the behaviour of professionals has intensified over the past twenty-five years (Bayles, 1981; Coady, 1991; Honey, 1991; Rich, 1984; Thompson, 1997). Social and community movements such as better educated and media-informed populations, increasing litigation, and growing demands for civil rights are linked to changing perceptions of professionals. Early in the twentieth century, peoples’ knowledge of the wider world relied on minimal reporting by the few who were privileged enough to travel, newsreels in cinemas, artworks and amusements such as “penny arcade” games depicting exotic and distant lands. Early in the twenty-first century, there are few mysteries in the world as many people have daily access to television and internet reporting of events. Greater access to information has meant that clients no longer unquestioningly accept the opinions of professionals. Coady (1991) notes:

As public confidence in the professions has declined, there have been moves to replace the relationship of trust between client and professional with a relationship in which the obligations are closely defined by law (p. 17).

As a result of this change in public perception of the professions, professional ethics has become the “object of considerable attention” (Rich, 1984, p.6) and a “popular and important topic in recent years” (Bayles, 1981, p. 3). Honey (1991) dates this growth of interest in professional ethics as beginning within the medical profession at the end of the 1960s. Medicine is gradually becoming demystified and more community oriented. The outcome of interest and concern about medical ethical practice has been the
emergence of the new field of bio-ethics. Some of the issues of current concern to bio-ethicists include abortion, euthanasia and genetic engineering.

Professional ethics has been defined by Feeney and Kipnis (1985) as a "shared process of critical reflection upon our obligations as professionals" and by Rich (1984) as concerned with public acts by persons in their professional roles that raise ethical issues. And ... concerned with acts that at some time may have been private or secret and have now either taken on public characteristics or relate directly to one's professional role (p. 6).

Abortion is an example of an act which was once private and secret, but is now undertaken publicly by the medical profession even though the ethical issues are still hotly debated in some community quarters. There is much public debate too, about the ethical issues surrounding the concept of medically assisted voluntary euthanasia.

While lawyers are examining the legal implications of medically assisted voluntary euthanasia and doctors are reassessing their obligations to the terminally ill, social scientists are reflecting on the broader social implications.

The ethical implications of genetic engineering, and in particular, cloning are gradually surfacing. Discussion is increasing about genetically modified food, cloning of human body tissue, and genetic mapping for the purpose of identifying disability or disease in-utero. While the idea of there being two "Dolly the sheep" might be somewhat amusing, the ability to clone is a recent and recognised great leap forward in science. The ethical issues in relation to human cloning for beneficial outcomes and "designer babies" are now being debated. As well as being used for beneficial outcomes, cloning and genetic manipulation could be used for harmful purposes. Those numerous and frightening
science fiction tales of destruction in which humans are cloned or genetically reconstructed don't seem quite so far-fetched anymore.

**Current issues in professional ethics for teachers**

Though there has been much public discussion of ethics related to the professions of medicine, law and business during the past twenty to twenty-five years, little public attention had been directed to ethics in education (Rich, 1984), but is now increasing (Lovat, 1999). Australia still has no recognised nationwide code of ethics that applies to all teachers, however, the Australian College of Education has adopted a code (revised in November, 1987) for teachers which refers to the responsibilities of teachers to themselves, to students, to their profession and to society (Haynes, 1998). Recently, Groundwater-Smith, Cusworth and Dobbins have developed and published a code of ethics for teaching, modelled on the AECA code for early childhood educators, which reflects teachers’ responsibilities to children, families, colleagues, community and society (Groundwater-Smith, Cusworth & Dobbins, 1998). More recently, Brock (1999), has proposed a “Code of Ethical Principles”, that he says answers the question of “what ought the teacher, as professional, do?” (p.2). Forster has also argued for the “ethical school” (Forster, 1999, p.3), and Hare (1999, p.14) recently reminded teachers in New South Wales in their union journal of the importance of acting ethically as a teacher “as the role of the teacher changes, and assumes a role that, for some, the church and the family would have played in the past”. Ideally, these drafts would be adopted by the profession, circulated, commented on, and adopted for all teachers in NSW at least, or Australia.
While teachers in New South Wales government schools, where the majority of children attend, do not yet have a universal code of ethics, they are bound by their employer generated core values. The values which relate to education, to self and others, and to civic responsibilities are to be “promoted through the curriculum and throughout the total life of the school” (NSW DSE, 1991, p.6). The values stated in the document are those perceived as reflecting values which are shared by the great majority of Australians (NSW DSE, 1991, Forward). Teachers in New South Wales are expected to adhere to their employer generated Code of Conduct (revised 1995) which purports to assist teachers faced with ethical challenges. The Code deals with: personal and professional behaviour; performance of duties; public comment by staff; notification of corrupt conduct; use of official facilities and equipment; financial and other private interests; outside employment and private practice; and acceptance of gifts. In addition, teachers are bound by the New South Wales Teachers' Federation Code of Ethics that espouses principles related to union membership. This code takes on a different emphasis to employer generated, or profession generated principles. Further, recently developed child protection policies, are mandated within NSW Department of Education and Training (DET)(previously Department of School Education) schools.

Though the ethical dimensions of teaching have been incorporated into documents such as the “NSW Desirable Attributes for Beginning Teachers” (1993), the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration “Code of Ethics for Queensland Teachers” (1996) and the “National Competency Framework for Beginning Teaching” (1996), the most recent interest in professional ethics in teaching has been generated by the findings of the New South Wales Wood's “Royal Commission into Corruption” (1998). The outcomes of its findings about teachers' sexual abuse of students in New South Wales schools have led to the publication of a protective behaviours document which includes mandatory
reporting of suspected or alleged abuse, and the initiation of discussions should hopefully lead to the development of a code of ethics for teachers in New South Wales schools. The Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), formed as a result of the Wood’s Commission, has an education arm and is developing educational materials for school students such as a CD-ROM called “Talk of Topsville” (ICAC, 1997) and a kit for secondary teachers of Design and Technology called “Valuing our Work” (ICAC, 1996). These materials are concerned largely with values and ethics education. The NSW DET hosted a Professional Development day in 1998 from which a set of published Occasional Papers papers called “The Professional Ethics of Teaching” (1999) was developed and widely disseminated.

It can be seen that interest in professional ethics for teachers in New South Wales has been developing, and is now highly placed on the education agenda. On the whole though, Australia has been slow to include discussion of ethics as a core issue for education within the school system. In the early childhood field, however, interest in professional ethics has been on the agenda since the 1960s.

Commitment to professional ethics by early childhood personnel has led to the development of codes of ethics for early childhood personnel. In the United States of America, and in Australia, codes of ethics have been developed for early childhood personnel by early childhood personnel under the auspices of early childhood professional associations. Another associated recent development in the early childhood field in Australia is the publication of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales’ “Principles of Field Experience in Early Childhood Professional Preparation Programs” (Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales,
2000) and "Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience" (Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales, 1998). A copy of these documents is included in this document in Newman and Pollnitz (in press)(Appendix 7b). The Principles and Guidelines were developed in response to concerns expressed about situations that arose during field experience for students undertaking professional preparation courses at tertiary institutions. The documents were developed to complement the AECA Code of Ethics, for the specific context of professional fieldwork programs.

The current level of interest in professional ethics puts professionals on notice. Professionals are becoming increasingly aware that community confidence and community trust in them needs to be earned rather than bestowed. As a discipline, professional ethics includes "aspects of social, political, and legal philosophy as well as individual ethics" (Bayles, 1981, p. 13). Professional ethics encompasses "all issues of ethics and values in professional roles and the conduct of professionals in society" (Rich, 1984, p. 41). Evolution and changes in society present professionals with new issues that challenge their beliefs about where their obligations to clients lie and cause them to review and reassess their ethical conduct.
Teaching Professional Ethics

Socrates is reported to have said ‘Athens is like a sluggish horse and I am the gadfly trying to sting it into life’ (Gaarder, 1995, p.52).

It is said that Socrates, whose mother was a midwife, liked his art of teaching philosophy and ethics through discourse, and likened it to the art of the midwife. Though the midwife does not give birth herself to the child, she is there to help it into the world. Socrates saw his role as helping people to “give birth” to insight, since real understanding must come from within. It cannot be imparted by someone else. Only the understanding that comes from within can lead to real truth (Gaarder, 1995). The ideas of Socrates can easily and usefully be incorporated into modern teaching about professional ethics in the form of Socratic Dialogues as students search for “moral exemplars” who:

are committed to high ideals; ...act in accordance with these ideals;...take risks on behalf of these ideals;...are inspiring;...are humble, dedicated and responsive to the needs of others... [and] instantiate those standards of moral excellence ...students want to exemplify in their own lives (Nash, 1996, p.79).

The role of moral exemplar can fall to the professionals who are preparing students for their future professional careers. There is considerable debate about whether ethics can be taught. Arguments focus on the ability of educators to change the personal morals
and values of adult learners. If ethics teaching is seen as being about equipping “individuals to make more informed, more educated, and more considered judgements on ethical issues” rather than “teaching people morals”, concerns about the teaching of ethics can be allayed. Teaching ethics then, is about “empowering the participants to exercise self-regulation on ethics issues rather than relying solely on external regulations to determine their course of action”. It employs adult learning techniques of the participants “drawing on their own experiences during the learning process; and being able to identify their learning needs and isolate the learning which has relevancy to their work” (Royal Institute of Public Administration Australia, 1994, pp.8-10).

White’s (1988) proposal for the ethical training of counselling psychologists can be generalised to other professions including teaching and other early childhood preparation programs. White’s approach to ethical training, favoured by most theorists because it goes beyond abstract courses to include exploration of ethical issues which arise in daily work, is usually referred to as applied ethics. White asserts that training in applied ethics should:

- ensure that students have knowledge of professional ethical guidelines, relevant legal guidelines, and the cultural and philosophical traditions that gave rise to the guidelines and requirements; and

- teach students how to conceptualise ethical problems, how to reason ethically, and how to apply ethical standards, as well as why they should want to reason and act ethically.
In teacher preparation courses, Campbell (1997) argues for ethical training to be incorporated into existing traditional subjects. Foundation subjects, for example educational philosophy, should be reconceptualised to include ethical inquiry into the practical aspects of teaching. An understanding of historically recognised ethical positions would enable students to learn 'how-to-interpret [this author's emphasis] - what-is-and-should-be-done' (Campbell, 1997, p. 257). This would enable students to locate their ethical decision making in a theoretical framework, for example, on utilitarian, virtue, absolutist, relativist, feminist, religious or humanist principles. Curriculum and method subjects should be reconceptualised to include reflective ethical inquiry into the practice of teaching. Campbell argues that students need to explore the values underpinning decisions they will make about what is taught and about how it is taught. For example, texts selected for learners, and classroom management strategies need to be examined for the value messages they convey to learners. The incorporation of ethical inquiry into foundation, curriculum and method subjects would better prepare students, as teachers, to anticipate ethical dilemmas in their daily work and make informed ethical judgements. As Aristotle pointed out, virtue is of two kinds: moral and intellectual. While moral virtue is learned informally in families and communities, intellectual virtue is developed through systematic instruction (Nash, 1996).

Campbell, among others, advocates that case studies be used to teach applied ethics in teacher preparation courses because case studies:

present students with realistic classroom or school-based scenarios and engage them in a level of reflection that forces them to connect practical dilemmas with theoretical moral and ethical principles (1997, p. 258).
Initially, in her classes Campbell takes a central role in structuring students' conceptual learning about ethics by providing information about historical and current ethical philosophical positions, for example, utilitarianism and relativism. She then challenges students to explain and justify their own moral positions, always with reference to the literature. Case studies are then introduced for discussion by students in small groups. Campbell provides some case studies, the students provide others. Case studies are drawn from personal history or from fieldwork experience. Campbell's role gradually changes from instructor through facilitator to collaborator as the students begin to apply philosophical theory and principles and debate issues. Campbell's description of how she asks her teacher education students to approach applied ethics utilises Vygotsky's theory of the zone of proximal development. In the learning process, Vygotsky theorises that learners can be guided from one stage of development to the next by interacting with others, with parents initially, then with peers and teachers. By interacting with others who "scaffold" learning by posing questions, making comments and providing demonstrations, learners gain new knowledge, reach new understandings and attain new skills. Those who provide the scaffolding at first give a high level of support and then gradually withdraw their support as the learner becomes more competent and confident in their new learning. Learning is thus "applied" and allows for:

the implementation of general ethical theories, principles, rules, virtues, structures, moral ideals and background beliefs to problems of professional practice, including professional-client relationships, delivery of services and policy construction and enactment (Nash, 1996, p.22).

This allows students to "apply moral beliefs to professional behaviour" (Nash, 1996, p.6), rather than becoming "ethical technocrats" or "ethical logicians" who can "clarify,
sharpen and analyse their moral presuppositions, but who still may not know how to do the right thing in morally ambiguous situations" (Nash, 1996, p.9). Hamberger and Moore (1997) advocate this approach too. They claim that when students become teachers who are confronted with the demands of learners, parents, early childhood services, schools and the community on a daily basis, they will reflect as a matter of course on:

- What are my values and how do these values guide my action?
- Who am I?
- How do I resolve the value conflicts within myself and with others as I perform the role of teacher? (Hamberger & Moore, 1997, p. 303).

As students come to understand more about their own personal and professional values, and how to differentiate between them, they learn to discuss situations in which core values come into conflict. For example, dilemmas may involve conflicting principles in which judgements must be made about telling the truth versus remaining loyal to someone; deciding for the individual as opposed to deciding for the community; making a decision based on the short term, rather than the long term; and making a decision based on justice, rather than mercy. Kidder (1995) refers to right versus right ethical judgements based on these four opposing sets of values as the four ethical dilemma paradigms.

Including Ethics in all Professional Preparation Courses

In recent years there have been increasing calls for tertiary professional preparation programs to identify and emphasise a level of professional practice that goes beyond the acquisition of knowledge and skills. For example, it is proposed by Higgs and Titchen
(1995) who are specifically concerned with the professional preparation of physiotherapists, that professionals' knowledge base consists of "three overlapping and interactive types of knowledge" (p. 526).

**Figure 4.** Types of knowledge and internal influences on knowledge generation (Higgs & Titchen, 1995, p. 526)

Figure 4 illustrates that in Higgs and Titchen's view, professionals need to acquire:

- knowledge that comes from research and scholarship (propositional knowledge);
• practical expertise and skills, knowledge that comes from experience, and a measure of artistry that encompasses wisdom, talent, and intuition (professional craft knowledge); and

• knowledge of themselves - their existing system of beliefs and values (personal knowledge).

Higgs and Titchen contend that it is the development of personal knowledge that enables professionals to understand and accommodate the values and beliefs of their clients, to deal with their needs appropriately, and to deal with ethical dilemmas. Their proposal, which extends the traditional non-propositional type of knowledge and adds personal knowledge as a third type of knowledge, satisfies those who now call for professional preparation courses to include the teaching of ethics so that graduates are more cognisant of the ethical dimensions of professional practice, and are better equipped to deal with ethical dilemmas they will face in their daily work. Hostetler, (1997), would agree in relation to teacher education, as he believes that far too much emphasis has been put in the past on the 'technical' aspects of teaching. Nash too, reflects that his experience with students in professional preparation programs, has led him to understand that he cannot assume any previous knowledge or understanding of philosophical concepts and he needs to regularly clarify with students the relationship between moral beliefs and actual professional behaviours. Students need guidance in real ethical issues involving confidentiality, punishment, whistleblowing and fairness (Nash, 1996).

Calls for including the teaching of ethics in professional preparation programs have arisen from concern about the trend in professions towards a commercial and entrepreneurial approach to practice which appears to be replacing the traditional view of professionals as helpers in the community. In “the good old days”, for example,
lawyers were perceived as having "compassion for the client's entire predicament, tempered by detachment and also a measure of concern for the public good" (Kronman, 1993 cited in Kirby, 1996, p. 172). Nowadays, the practice of lawyers in Australia is seen by the community as increasingly commercial. Evidence of this is apparent in the number of "anti-lawyer" jokes that are rife and perceived as hilarious by most, who view lawyers as a group, as being money-hungry rather than altruistically professional in their search for justice.

It is argued that the trend towards a commercial and entrepreneurial approach to practice in law is undermining the profession and needs to be arrested (Kronman, 1993, cited in Kirby, 1996). One suggestion for arresting the trend is for law schools to intensify interest in the teaching of legal ethics.

It is a matter of infusing all law teaching with a consideration of the ethical quandaries that can be presented to lawyers in the course of their professional lives. Only in this way will law schools provide students with guidance on the professional responsibility and on the ethical issues they will face as they enter the profession (Kirby, 1996, p. 180).

Parker, Price and Harris (1997) argue just as forcefully for a commitment to the inclusion of teaching about ethics in medical courses.

Ethics should be deliberately taught, and a formal commitment to do this should be made when establishing course goals and objectives. ... Students need a theoretical framework within which ethical issues can be considered (p. 185).

Kirby's (1996) concern about the lack of emphasis on ethics and about how it is taught is echoed by Parker et al. (1997) who argue that students tend to judge the importance of
an area of study by the amount of time allocated to it, "its position in a timetable, its
timing in a course and the extent of its assessment, more than by its appearance in a list
of course goals" (p. 181). The teaching of ethics in medical courses, often offered on an
ad hoc basis or as an elective subject only, has contributed to students' perceptions that
other areas of study, for example, the study of science, take precedence over the ethical
dimensions of the knowledge base required for professional practice.

The exclusion of the ethical dimension of professional practice can indeed be seen to
have dangerous implications. Kidder (1995) recounts the horrors of the Chernobyl
accident in the Ukraine, that has left one and a half million people with medical
complications. Two electrical engineers conducted an experiment in which they disabled
all of the "fail-safe" alarms and controls in the nuclear power plant. The results are well
known and far-reaching. Kidder visited the scene shortly after the accident as a
journalist and shares his chilling reflection on the role of the engineers involved as:

the story of a moral meltdown... a lapse in conscience so profound as to compel us to rethink the role of ethics in contemporary society (p. 31). [The
two men involved were clearly very intelligent], but what was missing – not only within those two individuals, but in the entire structure of command
and control that either encouraged or permitted such an unconscionable experiment to go forward that night- was a framework for discerning right
from wrong. What was absent was what most people around the world would describe, quite simply, as conscience, morality, or ethics... Had the
finely tuned scientific education of these men left no space for such considerations? Had the complexities of present day technology demanded
so much time and attention from its students that the grand humanistic issues... could find no niche in their curriculum? Was there no room for a
moral philosophy equal to the sophistication of their scientific and technical
understanding? Or did the system simply drive it out of them, compelling them to swallow their scruples for the sake of loyalty to their superiors?
(p.33).
The business/corporate sector is not usually regarded as one of the traditional professions, nevertheless, members of the business world are expected to act in a professional manner, and some are members of traditional professions. Community respect, however, for those who work in “white collar” occupations and as managers and directors, has declined in response to the frequency of reports that appear in newspapers about corporate crime and unethical behaviour. The reports include accounts of deceit, lying, theft, insider information, bribery, piracy, tax-evasion and even murder. To offset this trend towards unethical and criminal behaviour in the business world, Bartlett and Olgilby (1996) report that “universities are receiving major donations to establish or expand educational programs in ethical decision making aimed at business students” (p. 37).

It is to be assumed that the donations are being made by corporations themselves in order to regain public respect lost in recent years, and also to prevent business failures due to withdrawal of stakeholder support or litigation. Research has shown that withdrawal of stakeholder support can cause firms to collapse. It is in the interests of corporations then, to maintain the support of stakeholders who include members of the public as members of the local community as well as financial communities, shareholders, suppliers, and employees of government bodies (Polonsky & Ryan, 1996). Self and Ellison (1998) report that engineering courses at universities are now including the teaching of ethics, and so are “catching up” with other courses such as medicine, veterinary science, nursing, dentistry, business, and agriculture. Robert Nash, describing his experience of teaching ethics in professional preparation programs for a range of professions asserts that students value moving beyond the question of “is this the right thing to do?” towards “which decision has the most integrity in terms of the kind of
person I either perceive myself to be or am striving to become?" He reports students communicating with him years later to affirm the value of this question as they sort through complex ethical dilemmas (Nash, 1996, p.63).

The establishment of the St James Ethics Centre in Sydney is a further example of a trend towards a greater focus on the ethical dimensions of work.

Empirical data about the effects of ethics education on later ethical practice is limited. A small number of studies show formal ethics training to develop better abilities to recognise ethical issues and higher quality decision-making, but some studies have shown gaps between knowledge of the appropriate course of action and willingness to carry it out (Jacob-Tim & Hartshorne, 1994). Some ongoing data has been collected by Dr Muriel Bebeau and colleagues at the University of Minnesota in the Centre for the Study of Ethical Development. Bebeau works with dentistry students and has studied their development of "ethical sensitivity", and other ethical competencies. She asserts that the [ethics] curriculum is clearly needed. Students are tested for the abilities and attitudes that are used to evaluate the program. This is based on the belief that the morally responsible professional can: recognise moral problems as they arise; formulate a course of action that considers moral responsibilities and each person’s rights; does not allow moral values to be preempted by other values; and possesses the ego strength and social skills needed to implement his or her good intentions (1985). Bebeau (1994) argues that carefully constructed educational experiences can strengthen abilities related to moral failings. She explains, based on empirical findings, that ethical sensitivity can be assessed and enhanced through instruction; dramatic changes in problem-solving abilities are evident, even with older students; changes and reconceptualisations do transfer to new situations; college education is powerfully associated with development of moral judgement; moral perception and moral judgement are linked with actual
behaviour; and that differences across results are consistent between knowledge and attitudes. In summary, she asserts that “engaging in carefully planned educational activities promotes abilities-related behaviour (p.57). More research of this nature is clearly needed, across a range of professions, to examine a range of competencies, and to establish the benefits (or lack thereof) of formal ethics education programs in the transfer of knowledge and attitudes to long-term behaviour in professional practice.

Ethical Preparation for the Field Experience Component of Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs

*If no code of practice exists for determining whether something is good or bad, why do people talk as though it does? How could they be so sure when they awarded stars and points and wrote notes in the record and decided who was gifted in mathematics and art and referred Humlum to the Central Mission Home for the retarded on Gersonsvej, and committed me, for an indefinite period, to Himmelbjerg House because the fact that I was of average intelligence amounted to exacerbating circumstances? If there is no code of practice, why is everyone so very, very sure?*

Peter, aged 13 (Hoeg, 1993).

Students can’t learn to become teachers from books, or their own teachers, only. They can’t become good teachers either, by learning only about the technical aspects of teaching (Hostetler, 1997). To introduce and allow for experience with the more practical aspects of professional preparation, and to allow students to apply and integrate
their learnings, many professional programs include fieldwork components in professional settings. Valuable learning, and many students contend, the most valuable learning occurs in the “real world”. However, in early childhood education (as well as in other professions), tertiary teachers are heard to express concern about the quality of some experiences “in the field”. In some placements, and on some occasions, highest quality practices are not observed. A sound ethical preparation is essential therefore, to prepare for these less tangible and less technical aspects of teaching. The inclusion of professional ethics in teacher education and early childhood preparation programs is not only for the benefit of students as graduates but also for them during their time as students. During their courses, student teachers are often confronted with the demands of others, specifically, fellow students, tertiary staff, learners, staff in early childhood services and schools, to some extent parents, and to a lesser extent, the community. The demands are sometimes conflicting and education in professional ethics enables students to deal more effectively with problematic situations when they arise. The component of teacher education and other early childhood preparation programs which perhaps more than any other, exposes students to the competing demands of and obligations to others, is field experience. Field experience is regarded as any type of professional practice undertaken in an early childhood or school setting.

Field experience can take many forms. It can cover professional practice commonly referred to as field visits, field placements, practicum and internship. Whatever field experience is called and however it is organised, it “is seen by most students, most people in the field and most lecturers concerned with [field experience], as the most important part of the course” (Clyde & MacNaughton, 1993, p.47), and an immensely rewarding time. Most educators, student teachers, early childhood students, early
childhood practitioners and teachers would agree with Clyde and MacNaughton that field experience:

has a two-fold purpose, namely to socialise students in training into their chosen profession and to provide first hand experience of the "real world" in which the student can acquire the relevant skills under the supervision of an experienced expert in the field, together with support from lecturing staff at the institution at which the student is undertaking the course (p. 47).

Field experience is regarded as an opportunity for students to put into practice what they have learned in their study, to integrate theory with practice, and to acquire new knowledge and skills best learnt in the workplace. Field experience allows students to practice and enhance the technical skills of helping learners learn and develop, and to manage learners in a group setting. In addition, field experience enables students to work actively towards enhancing personal skills and interpersonal relationships, and ensures that they learn teaching as an art (Clyde & MacNaughton, 1993). Some ethical competencies that fieldwork programs can incorporate into requirements (and hope to see demonstrated by fieldwork staff) are:

4. Sensitivity to the ethical components of their work and an awareness that their actions have real ethical consequences and can potentially harm as well as help others

5. A sound working knowledge of the content of ethical codes, professional standards, and law, pertinent to the delivery of services

6. A commitment to a proactive rather than a reactive stance in ethical thinking and conduct that uses knowledge of codes, standards and law, along with ethical reasoning to anticipate and prevent problems from arising
7. An ability to analyse the ethical dimensions of a situation and demonstrate a well-developed ability to reason about ethical issues

8. A mastery and use of a problem-solving (decision-making) model

9. An awareness of personal feelings and values and the role of these in their ethical decision-making

10. An appreciation of the complexity of ethical decisions and a tolerance of uncertainty and ambiguity. An acknowledgement that there may be more than one course of action

11. The personal strength to act on decisions made and to accept responsibility for actions (adapted from Jacob-Tim & Hartshorne, 1994, p.6).

In most field experience programs, the requirements for students are set either entirely or mainly, by the tertiary institutions. Often, and regrettably, the requirement for students to develop personal and interpersonal relationship knowledge and skills, and to learn about teaching as an art (what it is like being a teacher) has been neglected or has been perceived as being less important than the more technical aspects of their work. In research about the nature of professional experience, conducted with four early childhood teachers who were supervising early childhood student teachers during a block of field experience, Goodfellow (1994) found that one of the teachers' concerns was that learning the artistry of teaching was not incorporated into the tertiary institution's curriculum or requirements even though they perceived that helping students to learn the art of teaching was a significant part of their role. Working with ethical finesse is undoubtedly part of this art and has been scarcely addressed in professional experience related programs. Any work to do with professional ethics for teachers, must benefit from consideration of the notion of “teaching as an art”.
In a study conducted with early childhood students, Edwards (1993) found that one of the concerns about field experience which caused great anxiety for early childhood student teachers was being asked to conform with practices they either knew to be wrong or believed to be wrong. The students reported that they felt ill-prepared to deal with these situations. As a result of these findings, Edwards recommended that early childhood students and tertiary staff work together in building confidence and competence in coping with this aspect of professional practice. Similar concerns were noted in more recent Australian work (Coombe and Newman 1997a; Coombe & Newman, 1997b; Newman & Coombe, 1999) (Appendices 3a, 3b & 3e).

Preparation for the ethical dimension of professional field experience is an emerging area. There is not yet empirical evidence in teacher education to show whether this will result in better, more reflective, or more ethical teachers. Nevertheless, students do perceive fieldwork to be a time when dilemmas arise (Newman & Coombe, 1999) and this needs to be addressed. Accompanying this knowledge is the aforementioned public demand for more ethical professionals. Tertiary educators are surely ethically bound themselves to demonstrate beneficence by improving their preparation courses to better prepare their students for professional ethical issues, judgements and actions. Their challenge is to find the best way of incorporating the ethical dimension of professional practice into courses so that student teachers can understand and articulate what proper ethical reflection and action require, and so that as teachers, they will fulfill their professional obligations to themselves, to learners, to their colleagues, and to the community. Perhaps Nash's code of ethics for his class discussions aimed at fostering moral conversations, could usefully be adopted in all teacher education classes:
Do not force premature closure on the moral conversation. Genuine philosophical discourse rarely speaks in clear and unambiguous messages. Rather it speaks in subtleties, sometimes in riddles, occasionally in circles and haltingly at that, and always in ambiguities, paradoxes, and unfinished business. Beware of the tyranny of quick-fix moral directives and impatient "final" calls to action.

Find the truth in what you oppose. Find the error in what you espouse. Then and only then declare the truth in what you espouse, and the error in what you oppose.

Read as you would be read. Listen as you would be listened to. Question as you would be questioned. Pontificate only if you would be pontificated to.

Speak with, not at or separate to each other. T.S. Elliott once said that Hell is where nothing connects. Conversational Heaven must be where every comment is a link in an unbroken chain.

If you don’t stand for something, you’ll fall for anything. But know how to stand up for what you believe without standing over, or on, others (Nash, 1996, pp. 25-26).

eter inclusion of the ethical dimension of teaching into fieldwork programs should accompanied by research to gather important empirical data about the efficacy of an approach.
The Argument for Ethics into all Aspects of Teacher Preparation Courses

Everything flows said Heraclitus (c. 540-480 B.C.). Everything is in constant flux and movement. Nothing is abiding. Therefore we “cannot step twice into the same river”. When I step into the river for the second time, neither I nor the river are the same. (Gaarder, 1995, p.28).

Like Heraclitus, student teachers, and those in practice need to be able to see the impact of their decisions and actions, and how these have created change. As an educator it is notable to me that the literature on the ethical preparation of teachers is scarce. Nevertheless, designers of teacher preparation programs, have been under increasing pressure to include in their courses a reflective and ethical dimension to the concept of teacher education so that student teachers are able to:

1. understand what proper ethical reflection and action require; and
2. are able to articulate the requirements to others.

Consequently, as graduate teachers, they will be able to:

- do right by their clients, their colleagues and themselves; and
- play a meaningful part in the political debate about ethics in education
- be an experimentalist, who doesn’t aim to settle things once and for all (Hostetler, 1997).
Among others, Noddings asserts that teacher preparation programs:

should produce reflective thinkers and ethical decision makers who understand the importance of displaying dignity, care and justice toward their students (Noddings, 1986 cited in Yost, 1997, p. 283).

For far too long, it is argued, teaching has been conceived as being decontextualised, apolitical, and values-neutral, and with undue emphasis on the technical (Beyer, 1991; Campbell, 1997; Hamberger & Moore, 1997; Luckowski, 1997; Yost, 1997). It is argued that teaching is now a far more complex process which goes beyond the technical and cannot afford to ignore political and social issues (Hamberger & Moore, 1997). Teachers need to be educated to meet the new demands of teaching which Beyer (1997) regards as "a field of reflective moral action" (p. 248). A growing body of literature claims that teaching should be regarded as a moral enterprise because all teacher behaviour affects others. In response to the values-neutral, or relativistic teaching focus of the eighties, there is now a resurgence of calls for value based teaching and character education (Kirschenbaum, 1995).

Because what is done in teaching affects others, teachers should use knowledge, including values, and skill for the welfare of learners and society. Failure to explicate and clarify this responsibility has both personal and social consequences (Strom, 1989, p. 268).

The messages above clearly state that teachers present as moral exemplars for students because whatever they do or say, either consciously or unconsciously, influences learners. What for example, do students learn from a teacher who rigidly enforces school rules for students but is seen to disregard them for herself? What is learnt about morality from teachers' unconscious behaviour that falls into what is known as the
hidden curriculum, that part of curriculum which is not consciously planned and is often ignored by teachers. Campbell (1997) adds honesty, justice and care to the list. Hare asserts that teachers who exhibit qualities of humility, courage, impartiality, empathy, open-mindedness, enthusiasm, judgement, and imagination, best convey meaningful moral education (cited in Campbell, 1997).

Strom (1989) identifies three key areas which contribute to the notion of teaching as a moral enterprise. Firstly, teachers need to understand the many ways in which they can and do exercise power in the teaching/learning situation. They need to explore the ethical implications of the different forms and uses of the power they possess as teachers. Much of the power held by teachers is in their interpersonal relationships with learners, and they can choose to use the power appropriately or inappropriately. Inappropriate use of power in these relationships includes, for example, devising punishment which humiliates students or exceeds the seriousness of the misdemeanour; and manipulating students for the benefit of the teacher. An appropriate use of teachers’ power is recorded by Luckowski (1997) from her own personal memory. She recalls a teacher whose openness and warmth made her feel welcome and capable in a large and often impersonal institution. Student teachers as well as learners, are strongly influenced by the conscious and unconscious messages given by practicing teachers.

Secondly, Strom (1989) asserts that teachers need to reflect on their personal values and beliefs in order to understand the influence their values and beliefs have on decisions about what they teach. A teacher who is a fundamentalist Christian, for example, may choose to omit an elective curriculum topic dealing with competing theories about the origin of the universe. Some teachers might think it is important to address current
social issues, for example, drug taking amongst adolescents, while others might want to avoid a topic which is bound to create controversy in the school community.

Thirdly, according to Strom, teachers need to think about the kinds of values the school and the community expect them to uphold and teach. Is it, for example, appropriate to teach white middle class values in schools populated by children from diverse ethnic backgrounds, or by children who live in areas of high unemployment? What messages are given to children when, on the one hand, they are told that they live in a democracy, while on the other hand, they experience a school life which operates in a strictly authoritarian manner. It has been suggested by Sergiovanni (1996) that regardless of the diversity of the school community, “at root we share a basic morality that includes such virtues as responsibility, respect, trustworthiness, fairness, caring, and civic virtue” (cited in Campbell, 1997, p. 255). Kirschenbaum (1995) agrees noting that pluralistic societies can raise the concern that there are no commonly held coherent values, but cites modern day American evidence of social disarray as strong evidence for a return to direct teaching about commonly held, socially positive, human values such as respect, responsibility, compassion, self-discipline, loyalty, courage, tolerance, fair and open-mindedness, work ethic, the public good, individual rights, justice, equality, diversity, truth and patriotism.

Teachers need to be educated in the following three dimensions of professionalism which incorporate the ethical dimension of their work:

- the **articulative dimension** (able to articulate their philosophies of teaching and learning);
- the **operational dimension** (to have the competence and skills and knowledge to put the philosophy and theory into practice);
• the political dimension (the ability to critically analyse social and cultural contexts and curriculum content and to be capable of inspiring and influencing [and persuading] others to respect their ethically grounded set of beliefs and practices) (cited in Beattie, 1997, p. 118).

These three dimensions and the types of knowledge identified by Higgs and Titchen (1995) can be underpinned by a set of beliefs about the preparation of student teachers for teaching. These beliefs are articulated by Beattie (1997) who declares that teacher preparation courses should be based on beliefs that:

• teacher education involves the whole person - the personal and the professional are interconnected in the construction and reconstruction of professional knowledge;
• learning to teach involves beginning with ourselves, learning to be responsive to others and reconstructing what is known in the light of new experiences;
• a professional knowledge of teaching has many dimensions - cognitive, social, organisational, practical, moral, aesthetic, personal, political and interpersonal. The theory and the practice are inseparable;
• learning to teach and teaching to learn require experiences and settings which support reflection, collaboration, relational learning and the creation of communities of inquiry;
• the construction and reconstruction of professional knowledge is a career-long process not a single event. It is always a work in progress (Beattie, 1997, p. 126).

For many teacher educators, incorporating a reflective and ethical dimension into teacher preparation courses has been a struggle (Beyer, 1997) but Yost (1997) claims when this dimension has been included, it has had a positive influence on student teachers' moral dispositions. In a study conducted with student teachers in the United States of America, Yost found that students graduating from a teacher education program incorporating a reflective and ethical dimension:
• were aware of the impact of social issues on schools;
• recognised teachers' responsibility to facilitate students' ability to become positive contributors to society;
• understood societal and reform issues;
• had a theoretical knowledge of the technical aspects as well as the art of teaching;
• understood the multi-dimensional role of teachers; and
• critically reflected on their experiences.

Yost's reference to the art of teaching is elaborated by others including Goodfellow (1994); and Krueger (1997) who explain the artistry or "soul" of teaching as he sees it. He reports observation of youth workers using "their experiences, self awareness, knowledge and skills to form empowering interactions and help children learn new skills and ways of interacting with each other" (p. 412). The emphasis, during each interaction is on, notes Krueger, being with the child rather than doing something to the child. There is greater interest shown by youth workers in the process than the product of the interaction and their thinking is largely based on intuition rather than on prescription.

The artistry of teaching then, is about being a teacher. It's about bringing together a sound knowledge base with planning, practice and improvisation. Teachers as artists, use their senses and intuition as well as their intellect as they support and resource learners. They engage themselves in a cycle of: involvement in interactions with learners; stepping back from learners; reflecting on interactions, recording their findings; and becoming involved again. All of these attributes are critical for sound ethical judgement. The artistry of teaching has been defined by Schon (1987, cited in Goodfellow, 1994) as:
the kinds of competence practitioners displayed ... in their unusually adept handling of situations of uncertainty, uniqueness and conflict ... [which occur in practice] (p. 29).

It is believed that teacher graduates from teacher preparation programs designed to incorporate a reflective and ethical dimension are much better placed to display such artistry in dealing with and resolving ethical dilemmas which occur in teachers' daily work (Campbell, 1997). Such teachers will not shy away from the burden of choice, discussed in Chapter 1 as essential in current contexts. Nevertheless, specific ethical training is advocated to prepare student teachers for dealing with ethical issues and for resolving ethical dilemmas which arise in their daily work as teachers (Campbell, 1997; Sottile, 1994). A survey of 30 teachers conducted by Sottile (1994) revealed that as students, they had not had any specific education in teacher ethics, and most were unable to answer his question, about the most common ethical issues they faced as a teachers. When prompted, the teachers were able to give examples of ethical issues they had to deal with in the classroom. The most common issues they reported related to emotional abuse, physical abuse, and confidentiality. Sottile's findings support the view that the professional ethics of teaching has been largely neglected until recently (Strike & Ternasky, 1993).

Though there is little consensus about whether topics in ethical knowledge and reasoning should be included in existing subjects or whether a separate ethics subject should be offered in professional preparation programs (White, 1988), there is agreement that a serious commitment to the teaching of ethics must be made despite the fact that it takes time, a commodity which is in short supply in most professional preparation programs. Strom (1989) argues that:
rather than viewing ethical concerns in teaching as constraints, conscientious
teacher educators can and should help candidates appreciate the challenge
that an ethical perspective has both for realizing their own highest ideals and
for making a positive difference in their pupils' lives, thereby contributing to
formative processes in society (p. 272).

To paraphrase Heraclitus, an early natural philosopher, Gaarder postulates that you can't
step into the same dilemma twice (1995). Experiencing, and being involved in a
dilemma, changes the participant, and thereby, their response to the next dilemma.
Exposure to concepts of professional ethics and practice in ethical decision making
cannot inoculate students against the complexities of ethical issues, but can only help to
improve the skills and artistry of students who will be exposed to the necessity to
exercise sound ethical judgement and to resolve ethical dilemmas in their professional
lives.
Early childhood professional ethics

...it is worth noting that he [Plato] believed women could govern just as effectively as men for the simple reason that the rulers govern by the virtue of their reason. Women, he asserted, have exactly the same powers of reasoning as men, provided they get the same training and are exempt from childrearing and housekeeping. In Plato's ideal state, rulers and warriors are not allowed family life or private property. The rearing of children is considered too important to be left to the individual and should be the responsibility of the state (Gaarder, 1991, p.73).

The nature of work in early childhood education is both similar to, and different from that of teachers in primary and secondary schools. The issue of professionalism is now discussed as it relates to early childhood personnel. For this discussion the term early childhood practitioner is used to describe all those working directly with children, as roles and responsibilities are not strictly governed by qualifications in most early childhood services. A comparison of the characteristics of early childhood practitioners with those attributed to professionals and teachers in school settings precedes discussion of the extent to which early childhood personnel meet the criteria for recognition as professionals. Discussion includes the proposition that the traditional definition of professionalism be redefined to better reflect the work and relationship practices of women.

Rich (1984) suggests that secondary teachers have gained recognition as professionals in recent decades. While this claim is debatable in the Australian context, it is generally agreed that secondary teachers are more highly regarded by most members of the
community, and hence more likely to be recognised as professionals, than teachers of younger children, and in particular, early childhood practitioners (those personnel who work directly with children in services for children aged from birth to five years). Despite their university or Technical and Further Education (TAFE) qualifications, some identify early childhood practitioners as having low status in the community (Elliott & Irvine, 1984; Farragher & MacNaughton, 1990; Finkelstein, 1988; Lyons, 1997; Petrie, 1992; Scutt, 1992). There are indications, though, that early childhood personnel, that is, all those who work either directly or indirectly with children aged from birth to eight, are not prepared to wait passively for a process of improved public image of professionalism to occur. Early childhood practitioners have begun to identify characteristics they share, to varying degrees, with other teachers and professionals in the community. For example, Katz (1988) describes eight criteria that are generally agreed as being essential for occupations to be classified as professions, and discusses them in relation to characteristics displayed by early childhood personnel. Katz urges early childhood personnel to consider which of these identified characteristics - social necessity; altruism; autonomy; code of ethics; distance from the client; standards of practice; prolonged training; and specialised knowledge - are appropriate to their work with children and families.

To some extent, early childhood practitioners are more able to demonstrate the characteristics of traditional professions than teachers in schools. For example, early childhood practitioners have greater autonomy than teachers in schools in curriculum and policy matters. Like teachers in schools, early childhood practitioners are bound by Government rules and regulations. In early childhood services, regulations relate to staff numbers and qualifications; numbers of child places; standards of health and safety; and child protection. In their daily role, however, early childhood practitioners have much
greater autonomy than teachers in schools where the curriculum is governed by syllabus
documents which underpin teachers' planning. Early childhood practitioners are able to,
and have the responsibility for, developing curriculum and planning experiences which
best meet the individual and group's needs and interests. There are more opportunities
for early childhood practitioners to self-regulate their practice. Teachers' work in
schools is bound by the hierarchical constraints of large systems whereas most early
childhood practitioners are actively and directly involved in service-based policy
development.

Through their close relationship with children and families, early childhood practitioners
are more able than teachers in schools, to display their specialised knowledge and
altruism. The knowledge base, gained by practitioners over three or four years in TAFE
and university courses, is composed of knowledge of child development, sociology,
curriculum and pedagogy. The range and depth of specialised knowledge gained
through these courses far exceeds everyday knowledge (Hart & Marshall, 1992) and
underpins early childhood practitioner practice. Children and their families are the prime
focus of early childhood practitioners' work. Children's and families' interests and needs,
regardless of their situation, be it related to socio-economic status, ethnicity or
disability, are the principle concern of early childhood practitioners and subject to the
need for specialised knowledge.

To fulfill more of the recognised criteria of professionalism, early childhood
practitioners must look beyond best practice to developing expertise in reflective and
“wise” practice with an ethical foundation in order to work in partnership with each
family; to plan, implement and evaluate child-centred and child-initiated curriculum
appropriate for individuals and groups; to work autonomously, and sometimes in
isolation; and to self-regulate their practice. Wise practice is "always situated in ... context" (Davis, 1997, p. 2). Wise practice "by its very nature, is idiosyncratic, contextual, and probably inconsistent. It seems not standardised, not off-the-shelf, not one-size fits all" (1997, p. 4). Wise practice can be readily observed in many early childhood services. Though what happens in early childhood services is sometimes described as chaotic by observers not tuned in to the philosophy and practice of early childhood education, it is clearly interpretable to an observer with the specialised body of knowledge that is remarkably recognisable to early childhood educators globally. In high quality early childhood programs, high levels of professionalism, and ethical judgement, supported by wise practice, are evident. Wise practice, though not absent, is less called for in school settings where practice is more regulated by hierarchical systems, syllabus documents and testing programs.

Being able to demonstrate professional characteristics, though, has not earned early childhood practitioners the status afforded to teachers in schools, perhaps because early childhood practitioners also display characteristics that are unique and appropriate to their occupation, but that are neither valued by the community nor recognised as professional characteristics. For example, early childhood practitioners demonstrate a commitment to the care and interests of children and their families rather than maintaining distance from them, and they base their working relationships on networks rather than on hierarchies of power (Dresden & Kimes Myers, 1989; Farragher & MacNaughton, 1990; Finkelstein, 1988; Petrie, 1992; Scutt, 1992; Peters, 1988; Stonehouse, 1992). Early childhood practitioners are likely to base practice on an ethic of care.
Though they may not be recognised as professionals, it can be demonstrated that many early childhood practitioners are professional in terms of their daily work and the quality of their practice. In their daily work, early childhood practitioners undertake a variety of roles characteristic of professionals. These include engaging in research and further professional development; advocating for their clients, both children and families; managing and counselling people; and managing property and finance. In their practice, they “integrate their obligations with their knowledge and skill in a context of collegiality and contractual and ethical relations with clients” (Sockett, 1992, p. 226). What they now seek is public recognition as professionals. Their focus is on the process of professionalisation “by which an occupation becomes a profession and the changes in status that are implicit in that process” (Sockett, p. 226) are affected.

The dialogue among early childhood personnel about pursuing the pathway towards recognition as a profession acknowledges that the way is long and strewn with obstacles. In his review of Australian literature published between 1960 and 1990, Ashby (1991) identified the emergence of two marked trends and a third emerging trend in professional issues related to early childhood education. Firstly, he identified the gradual breaking down of the distinction between the teaching and caring aspects of early childhood education. There is now greater recognition and understanding that early childhood education incorporates care and that early childhood care incorporates education (Stonehouse, 1992). Stonehouse (1991b) and Lyons (1997) report, however, that the debate about the education/care dichotomy in early childhood education still flourishes and the division between teachers and carers remains to a great extent.

Current employment policy in some early childhood services perpetuates the division between care and education, and between teachers and carers. For example, in some
services staff with early childhood teacher qualifications are barred from working in baby/toddler rooms. Though it is not standard practice, employers in some services have argued that staff with early childhood teacher qualifications should be paid at the same level as staff with lower qualifications. In support of the lower than entitled pay structure for early childhood teachers, it has been argued in a recent Queensland arbitration case that:

degree qualified staff are likely to be using their knowledge and skills in long day care yet we’re only paying them for what we’re requiring them to use which is the same skills that we’re paying and requiring a [two-year trained] group leader to use (QIRC Transcript cited in Lyons, 1997, p. 4).

It is ironic that furthering one’s qualifications can be seen as a disadvantage in some sectors of our current early childhood field, whereas in professions such as medicine, further study leads to greater recognition, role specialisation and increased remuneration in most cases. Some early childhood services even restrict the number of children enrolled to avoid having to employ an early childhood teacher, in accordance with current NSW state regulations. In most services unqualified as well as qualified staff are employed. These practices are usually driven by financial considerations, but nevertheless, reflect the view held by some that early childhood teachers are not required in long day care services, and by many that it is acceptable to leave babies, toddlers and young children in the care of unqualified people for up to eight hours a day five days a week. The continued practice of employing unqualified staff, some 60% of long day care staff (National Community Services and Health and Industry Training Advisory Board, 1996 cited in Lyons, 1997), sustains community perception that long day care centres are child minding centres. This community perception is perpetuated
by media reports which refer to long day care centres as child minding centres (Lyons, 1997), and contributes to the ongoing debate about the education/care dichotomy.

Despite it being a slow and sometimes painful process, the breaking down of the distinction between the teaching and caring aspects of early childhood education is taking place. When teaching and care are recognised as being synonymous in early childhood education, early childhood practitioners will not only be good at facilitating and nurturing development, they will be effective teachers. Rodd (1997) calls for early childhood professionals to be warm and responsive but also “demanders” of learning and competence. As “warm demanders”, early childhood practitioners will be able to present a more unified position in relation to their quest for professional status. When parents who would not be prepared to leave their child in the care of an unqualified medical practitioner, or at school with an unqualified “teacher”, demand similar levels of qualifications when leaving their children in a long day centre for care and education, early childhood education will have an elevated position in the eyes of the community.

Secondly, Ashby notes “the gradual identification of the early childhood profession as having a unique focus which releases it from travelling on the coat tails of other groups” (1991, p. 15). The third emerging trend is the shift among early childhood personnel to arguing their case for professionalism from a feminist theoretical position. Having identified the trends and issues, Ashby recommends that, to enhance their argument for recognition as professionals, early childhood personnel need to resolve outstanding internal issues and reach agreement about their professional obligations and responsibilities. Ashby's findings are confirmed by others who have examined developments in early childhood in the United States of America, and by contemporary

One of the major outstanding internal issues for early childhood personnel has been the need to strengthen their collective and unified voice. Early childhood practitioners and early childhood teachers do not belong to the same union and the national early childhood association is primarily constituted to advocate for children and families, not professionals. It may be easier for them to present a more unified position in their quest for recognition as professionals, if there were a strong professional body, to speak for the needs of its members and self-regulate practice. Relevant unions and professional associations vary from state to state, and within each state in Australia. In New South Wales, for example, early childhood teachers in schools belong to the New South Wales Teachers Federation. Early childhood teachers in early childhood services might not belong to any union but can belong to the Independent Education Union, and if they are employed by a local government council they belong to the Municipal Employees Union. TAFE trained and unqualified staff can belong to the Liquor and Hospitality Miscellaneous Workers Union.

The peak federal association for early childhood personnel, the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA), is based in the Australian Capital Territory and has branches in each state and territory. Membership is open to all early childhood personnel including unqualified staff in early childhood services and membership is not compulsory. In a survey of 225 early childhood practitioners working in New South Wales early childhood services, it was found that only 40% of them were members of the AECA (Pollnitz, 1993). The range of unions and professional associations, and lack
of compulsory membership for unions and professional associations, leaves the early childhood field fragmented in body and voice.

An Ethic of Care as a Basis of Early Childhood Professionalism

Finkelstein (1988) argues that lack of community recognition for the professional status of early childhood personnel is the legacy of the historical development of early childhood education. Work in early childhood services has been perceived by the community, and by some who work in the field, as being a substitute for mothering in the home. Since mothering and working in the home (particularly by women) have always been regarded as low status occupations it is not surprising that work in early childhood services is also regarded as a low status occupation (Lyons, 1997). Having researched the relationship between the concept of professionalism in early childhood education and the work of women in the development and definition of early childhood education, from 1600 to 1980, Finkelstein concludes that:

early childhood educators are the recipients of a problematic professional legacy mired in a historical tradition of child advocacy; economic unselfishness; political powerlessness; commitment to interdisciplinary research; and narrow concepts of moral, cultural, political, and economic possibility for women (p. 24).

Though this century's tradition of early childhood being made up of “do-gooders” (Fleet & Clyde, 1993) is gradually being cast off, Petrie (1992) claims that early childhood is still dominated by personnel who exhibit these dispositions. She describes them as
"maternal feminists" (p. 14) who "seek to perpetuate the nurturing role, more specifically, the middle class conception of the nurturing role of women" (p. 15). She is supportive of Finkelstein's belief that early childhood personnel need to "find a way to demand economic and political status for children and their caretakers and to view themselves as intellectuals as well as nurturers" (p. 25), if they are to raise their professional status in the community.

Dresden and Kimes Myer (1989), Fleet (1989) and Scutt (1992) also address the issue of the professional status of early childhood personnel from a feminist perspective, claiming that professional status is traditionally equated with a male-dominated view of career, success and power. They argue that early childhood personnel need to work towards a definition of themselves as professionals that promotes attributes that are more characteristic of a female view of the world and of the way early childhood personnel work. Dresden and Kimes Myers include the attributes of: authority based on a web model of working relationships rather than an hierarchical model; the measure of career success based on a path rather than a ladder model; and a lifestyle that includes other demanding commitments. Scutt (1992) and Fleet (1989) identify women's relational skills as positive attributes that should be reinforced. In particular, Scutt claims co-operative and consultative approaches to problem solving that are typically adopted by women should be recognised as qualities of leadership.

These qualities are connected with the feminist perspective of ethics, aptly labelled the 'ethic of care' (Preston, 1996, p. 53). Feminist theorists claim that men and women tend to differ in their approach to ethical issues that arise in their work. Research conducted by Gilligan (1982) (cited in Haynes, 1998), confirms the claim. Gilligan found that women and men reason about moral dilemmas differently. She found that:
Men are more likely to:
- think in abstract principles and,
- see moral problems as arising from conflicts between individuals, and
- appeal to the rights of individuals to resolve conflicts.

Whereas women are more likely to:
- focus on particular situations rather than to think abstractly;
- see moral problems as arising from the needs of our ongoing relationships, and
- appeal to the needs of others and mutual obligations towards them to resolve problems (1982, cited in Preston, 1996, p. 54).

The male perspective of ethics tends to focus on principles, rights and justice, and is oriented towards the individual. This perspective fits comfortably with the male oriented professional status attributes of career, success and power. The feminist perspective of ethics tends to focus on care, compassion and relationships, and is situation based. This perspective is consistent with the feminist perspective of professionalism. Discussion about the professional qualities and professional status of early childhood personnel, therefore, needs to include discussion about finding ways to resolve these differing ethical perspectives.

Radomski (1986), Ebbeck and Clyde (1988) and Stonehouse (1992) embrace the feminist perspective of professionalism in their identification of three fronts on which early childhood personnel should be active. Firstly, they contend that early childhood personnel need to reach agreement about self-definition so that a unified position can be presented to the community; secondly, they need to gain respect for those characteristics which set the predominantly female occupation of early childhood education apart from the male-dominated professions; and finally, they need to demonstrate to a greater extent characteristics that are traditionally recognised as those of a profession.
Something that early childhood practitioners can do to become “more like” members of the traditional and male dominated professions is to be more actively engaged in advocacy for children and families and themselves as a profession. This involves early childhood practitioners becoming more qualified and having greater control over the qualifications of those entering the profession, developing new skills, becoming more politically aware, more politically active and becoming agents of change (Rodd, 1997). Meade, (1995 cited in Rodd, 1997) urges early childhood practitioners to seek positions in:

- the political web where policies are influenced;
- the professional web where values and professionalisation can be influenced;
- the web of scholars where practice can be informed and guided at the grass roots level (p. 4).

To be effective in these positions, early childhood practitioners need to develop some new skills, for example, in conference presentation, public speaking, lobbying, public relations, talking to the media, writing for different audiences, undertaking research and professional publication (Rodd, 1997). Systematically addressing issues identified by a range of supporters will provide the opportunity for early childhood personnel to be perceived as “more like” members of the traditional professions but also to challenge and change the traditional view of professionalism so that it better reflects the perspective early childhood personnel have of their role in the community.

**A brief history of early childhood professional ethics**

The development of interest in professional ethics in early childhood education can be traced back to the 1960s and sets current codes of ethics, principles, issues and trends
into their historical location. Issues discussed in this section include: developing the disposition to consider problematic situations from a professional ethics perspective; developing an exemplary code of ethics; using strategies to assist systematic ethical analysis; and the current trend for external pressures rather than ideals to influence early childhood practitioners' interest in redefining their role, obligations and conduct.

In Australia during the period from 1960 to the 1990s, there was a significant shift in thinking about the specific responsibilities and obligations of early childhood personnel. Ashby (1991) documented them as:

- a gradual breaking down of the distinction between the teaching and caring aspects of early childhood;
- a developing recognition of the features of early childhood which distinguish it from other occupations; and
- the emerging trend of early childhood personnel to argue their case for professionalism from a feminist theoretical position.

Ashby's documentation of these shifts provides insight into the development of professional ethics in the early childhood field. The shifting concerns of early childhood personnel during this period laid the foundations for the development of a set of core professional values, and ultimately for the development of a code of ethics for early childhood education.

Over thirty years ago, current beliefs about the obligations of early childhood personnel were being expressed. Tapp (1964), for example, identified four areas of responsibility of early childhood personnel - to children, parents, colleagues and the community - and advocated that early childhood personnel and parents should work in partnership. Twenty years ago, Connelly (1979) took up the issue of what he termed "cooperative
accountability" among early childhood personnel, other professionals and families, in relation to the rights of young children. Clyde (1980) also addressed the issue of accountability, arguing that, ultimately, accountability to children and family clients of children's services was the responsibility of early childhood personnel. One of the manifestations of the concept of accountability has been the development, in Australia and in the United States of America, of an accreditation program for early childhood services that offer long day care for children aged from birth to five years. In the same spirit, calls for early childhood personnel to reaffirm values in early childhood education, to influence policies, and to unify as a specialist group continued through the 1980s (Fleet 1989; Langham, 1981; Rodd, 1988; Stamp, 1980) and have extended into the 1990s.

Initially driven mainly by ideals, more recent calls in Australia for early childhood personnel to advocate on behalf of children, families, services and themselves, have been driven by political and economic change. The removal of the operational subsidy from federally funded early childhood services, for example, has forced licensees to increase fees and to introduce cost cutting strategies. These measures have increased the financial burden on parents which has caused many to either withdraw their children from services or reduce the number of days children attend. The cost cutting measures have prompted concern by many early childhood staff about the impact on the quality of programs offered by services. So extreme has the impact on services been that some have been forced to reduce staff, reduce child places, and even close. The fear of early childhood personnel is that increasing numbers of children will be placed in the cheaper alternative of "backyard care" with someone who may or may not be a nice lady who loves children (Stonehouse, 1994), and with someone who has no qualifications or education in child development, curriculum or pedagogy. As specialised knowledge has
already been established as an identified element of a profession, perceptions of the professionalism of early childhood educators will inevitably suffer. Now, more than ever, it is crucial for early childhood personnel to heed the calls for reaffirmation of early childhood values, to unify and to advocate actively for their clients and to know how to advocate and make decisions on the basis of sound and sensitive ethical reasoning.

Ashby's (1991) historical record described the emerging principles of professional ethics which culminated in the development by the AECA of core professional values that were based on the NAEYC's list of core values. Those core professional values expressed as principles were embodied in the AECA Code of Ethics adopted in 1991. The adoption of this Code of Ethics by early childhood personnel is a significant step towards the fulfillment of the characteristics attributed to the traditional professions. Though based on the same core values, the AECA Code of Ethics has differences to the NAEYC Code, which has been criticised for its negativity (Clyde, 1989b). The NAEYC Code attempts to deal with all areas in detail to give specific guidance to a workforce with inconsistent training and sponsorship of centres in the under five sector (1999b) and this has been seen in Australia as giving the NAEYC Code a restrictive tone; the inclusion of rules of conduct as well as a set of core values conveys a sense of prescription unfamiliar in the Australian context, but developed purposefully for the U.S. context. U.S. developers of the code see a specific code as being much more useful than an aspirational code (1999b).

It is encouraging that the early childhood field in Australia has its own code which is aspirational, positively stated and includes guiding principles. The AECA Code explicates the responsibilities of early childhood personnel to each client group, that is,
to children, families and the community, as well as to themselves and colleagues. Since the adoption of the AECA Code, a document setting out guidelines for ethical practice in early childhood field experience has been developed by the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales to complement it in the specific context of fieldwork programs. The Council guidelines are modelled on the AECA Code of Ethics and designed to be used in conjunction with the Code. The Code and guidelines are of no benefit, though, unless they are used effectively by those for whom they have been developed. In these recent troubled times for early childhood education, the AECA Code could be used as a focus for reaffirming early childhood values, for unifying early childhood personnel, and for advocating for children, families and themselves. Importantly too, early childhood personnel need to be able to translate the principles expounded in the Code into practice.

Applying Ethical Principles to the Development of Ethical Judgement

The process of translating early childhood values into sound ethical practice should begin in early childhood services with the formulation of philosophy and development of curricula that reflect and embed the Code of Ethics, but in reality, most often begins when problematic situations are first encountered. Feeney and Kipnis (1985) suggest that problematic situations that have an ethical dimension can be approached from different perspectives, including viewing situations as relating to personal, legal, employment, or social theory problems. Feeney and Kipnis argue however that, on the whole, these four approaches, used on their own or in combination, usually produce less than satisfactory results when dealing with questions of ethics. Feeney and Kipnis assert
that more appropriate resolutions are likely to be achieved when problematic situations are approached from the perspective of professional ethics. Hence, they encourage early childhood personnel to engage in ethical analysis of problematic situations, that is, to critically reflect upon their obligations, as professionals, to clients and colleagues.

- When approached from a **personal perspective**, problem solving is based on deeply held personal values. Decision making on the basis of personal values enables individuals to feel comfortable about their solution to the problem, but doesn't inform them about what early childhood teachers or practitioners should do.

- When viewed from a **legal perspective**, problem solving is based on knowing what has been mandated as government law or by service or school policy. Rules, regulations and procedures relating to law and endorsed policy must be followed; so a problem can be resolved decisively. If there are no laws or policies which can be applied to a problem, as is often the case, or the law or policy is ambiguous, then early childhood teachers and practitioners need access to some other form of guidance to assist their decision making.

- When viewed from an **employment perspective**, problem solving is based on what is required by the employer. Adherence to the contract of employment means that decision making is straightforward, but what do early childhood teachers and practitioners do when there are no rules, regulations, policies or procedures, set by their employer, to fall back on? What do they do if they disagree with employer requirements? In these
situations, early childhood teachers and practitioners need access to strategies beyond those determined by their employer.

- When viewed from a social theory perspective, problem solving is based on individuals' perceptions about what is an ideal society, and about what behaviour will facilitate the creation of that ideal society. This kind of global long-term thinking offers a sense of direction for decision making but tends not to assist resolution of specific work related problems. Early childhood teachers and practitioners need access to more tangible strategies that have immediate relevance to problems encountered in their daily practice. (from Feeney & Kipnis, 1985, pp. 54-56)

Kipnis (1987) further cautions that ethical analysis does not involve applying "cookbook instructions" (p. 29) to the resolution of ethical dilemmas associated with problematic situations, but involves deciding what responsibilities to assume. Early childhood personnel should identify the appropriate principles of obligation to stakeholders, for example, obligation to the child and to the caregiver/parent, and then decide between conflicting principles, the justification being that any decision made is one that all responsible early childhood practitioners would make (Fasoli & Woodrow, 1991; Feeney & Kipnis, 1985). In the process of generating and testing principles, there are, Kipnis (1987) suggests, a number of useful strategies that can be employed to facilitate productive discussion. These include: generalising, that is, wondering what would happen if all personnel did that; restating the problem in terms of what is owed to the child, parent, colleague, employer and personnel themselves; guarding against illicit topic changing, that is, becoming diverted from the main issue; considering the role of
the profession, that is, asking if the professional association can assist in any way; and nurturing disagreement, that is, actively listening to other points of view.

Considering problematic situations from a professional ethics perspective enables early childhood teachers and practitioners to take into account any relevant personal, legal, employment or social theory issues. It also provides them with strategies to exercise judgement which is not self-serving; that is fair; that avoids where possible, causing clients harm; and that reduces the risk of losing clients' trust. Tackling problems from a professional ethics perspective ensures that early childhood teachers and practitioners identify obligations to their clients, peers and themselves, and make decisions which are in the best interests of their clients. Viewing a problem from a professional ethics perspective provides individual early childhood teachers and practitioners with the confidence that the decision they make would be upheld by all other responsible early childhood teachers and practitioners. It is to be hoped that the trend which began in the 1960s towards recognition of the importance of professional ethics in early childhood continues unabated, and strengthens well into the 21st century. A more detailed discussion of methods for ethical decision-making follows in Chapter 4.

**Australian early childhood personnels’ development of ethical judgement**

Recent Australian research has begun to examine the area of ethical judgement in early childhood education. Studies include those that preceded and post-date the adoption of the AECA Code of Ethics in 1991. The studies, conducted with practitioners in early
childhood services and with students enrolled in early childhood teacher education courses, are described in this section and the findings are reported.

Australian research in the area of ethics in early childhood education has a recent history. Research conducted in the late 1980s provided a foundation for the development of the AECA Code whereas more recent research has investigated the impact of the Code. There is as yet, extremely little empirical research about the impact of ethics education on the ethical behaviour of professionals.

The first study described was conducted by Rodd and Clyde in 1988, who surveyed paid staff in 170 early childhood services across the state of Victoria, and served as a pilot for the second study (Rodd & Clyde, 1991) which was a national survey of paid staff in 300 early childhood services in all mainland states of Australia and the Northern Territory. Their studies were based on research conducted in the United States of America by Stephanie Feeney and Kenneth Kipnis (Feeney & Sysko, 1986). Feeney and Kipnis investigated the need for the development of a code of ethics for early childhood personnel, and their findings underpinned the development of the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment for early childhood personnel in the United States of America. The influence of Feeney and Kipnis's study on the development of a code of ethics for Australian early childhood personnel cannot be underestimated. Feeney and Kipnis's 1986 study was the second step in a two-part plan to develop a code of ethics. The first step involved early childhood educators and philosophers working collaboratively to explore standards for early childhood personnel. The study set out to investigate what kinds of ethical issues arose in daily interactions in the workplace, how often they arose, which ones caused greatest concern, and how they
were resolved. Feeney and Kipnis used the journal, "Young Children" as a vehicle to survey NAEYC's 45,000 members. They received 600 responses to their questionnaire.

With some minor modifications, Rodd and Clyde replicated Feeney and Kipnis' study in the mid 1980s. The purpose of the Victorian and Australian national studies was to determine:

the kinds of ethical dilemmas which early childhood workers face, and the source of those dilemmas; whether these dilemmas were "situation-specific", that is, whether conflicts reported by centre-based child care workers were similar or different from those of people working in kindergartens or other areas of children's services; whether there were more ethical dilemmas present in some relationship dimensions than others, for example, do parent/staff interactions generate more dilemmas than staff/staff interactions; the ways in which early childhood workers typically resolve their ethical dilemmas, and what are the bases for those solutions (Clyde, 1989a, pp. 36-37).

Each questionnaire consisted of ten questions. The response to the national survey was disappointing with only 99 responses from the 300 services invited to respond, but this level of response still provided a sufficiently large sample to validate the study. The pattern of responses to the questionnaire in both studies was similar, and the results were also generally consistent with those found in Feeney and Sysko's 1986 American study. The descriptions of the respondents' background in the national study (gender, age, qualifications, job description, time fraction employed, and work experience in the field) were similar to the respondents' profile in the Victorian study. Analysis of the data from both surveys revealed no significant differences in the findings that could be attributed to respondents' type of employment, job description, age, qualification or years of experience (Clyde, 1989a; Rodd & Clyde, 1991). Though there were some variations in
frequency ratings between the respondents in each study, there was a similar pattern of response in both the Australian studies. For the sake of clarity, only the ratings from the national study, reported in 1991, are recounted here.

Almost 90% of the respondents rated the issue of ethics in early childhood as either important or very important and over 65% reported that they sometimes encountered ethical dilemmas in their daily work. The major areas of ethical concerns identified by the respondents were with staff/parent relationships and the professional conduct of colleagues. In response to the question about the need to prioritise the development of a code of ethics for early childhood, 83% of respondents agreed that it was either of essential or major importance and one third nominated a code of ethics as a basis for helping them to resolve ethical issues. The results confirmed the growing concern among early childhood practitioners about professional ethics as it had been reported in the literature. They not only confirmed the focus on ethical awareness but also moved the discussion forward significantly by: substantiating the occurrence of encounters with ethical dilemmas; identifying which relationships were the most frequent cause of ethical dilemmas; and establishing the importance of developing a code of ethics for early childhood education.

Though in general, the results of the surveys were very encouraging in terms of the desire to further ethical practice through the development of a code, Rodd and Clyde (1989) identified three areas that gave rise to concerns. Firstly, analysis of the data about ethical issues and professional concerns caused Rodd and Clyde to doubt practitioners' commitment to on-going professional development. For example, when they matched respondents' length of experience in the field with their responses to the questions and compared that with the characteristics of Katz's stages of professional
development, Rodd and Clyde (Clyde, 1989a), suggested that a disturbing feature was evident. Responses to questions about professional concerns by staff who had worked in the field for more than eleven years (45.4%) were not significantly different from staff who had worked in the field for less than six years (35.3%). Rodd and Clyde suggested that, on the whole, Australian practitioners with eleven or more years of experience were still operating at the "survival" and "consolidation" stages of professional development as described by Katz (Katz, 1977 cited in Clyde, 1989a, p. 43). That finding, among others, prompted Rodd and Clyde to advocate that early childhood practitioners should focus more on general professional concerns, and adopt a more assertive position in an effort to gain professional status in the community.

The second area of disquiet that Rodd and Clyde discussed was the low response rate to the survey (16.2%) of staff with between six and ten years work experience in the early childhood field. Rodd and Clyde proposed several possible reasons for this low response, for example, staff leave for child rearing and the "burn out" phenomenon (Rodd & Clyde, 1991). They concluded that staff with six to ten years of experience were and would continue to be represented disproportionately in the field until they had greater access to, and increased motivation to attend, in-service courses. The authors hypothesised that this would help them to develop professional maturity beyond the "survival" and "consolidation" stages (Katz, 1977 cited in Rodd & Clyde, 1991, p. 33).

The third area reported was that the major ethical concern shared by respondents was about disagreements with parents. Rodd and Clyde suggested that, since there would always be disagreements over policies and parent requests due to social, familial and educational changes, early childhood practitioners needed to develop "a sophisticated competence in interpersonal skills" (Rodd, 1987, cited in Rodd & Clyde, 1991, pp. 33-
34). Concerns and issues arising from the discussion of these three areas prompted Rodd and Clyde's strong recommendation that ethics, as a philosophical and practical study, be included in pre-service and graduate courses for early childhood students, and in-service courses for early childhood practitioners.

In 1992, Vanaglia used a questionnaire to survey the paid staff of seven long day care centres in one geographical region in Australia. The purpose of this study was to: ascertain levels of staff awareness of ethical issues; explore the level of staff awareness of the existence of the AECA code; and to find out what staff thought about its contribution to early childhood education. Fifty two percent (52%) of the 29 respondents from seven long day care centres reported that they were aware of the AECA Code of Ethics. This was a reassuring response, given that at the time the Code was being circulated in draft form only. Eighty three percent (83%) of respondents agreed that a code of ethics would help them to deal with ethical dilemmas, a significant increase on the one-third finding in the Rodd and Clyde study. Ninety three percent (93%) of respondents reported that a code of ethics would assist in ensuring high quality early childhood programs.

The majority (90%) of Vanaglia's respondents indicated that they were interested in finding out more about the area of ethics and would attend in-service sessions specifically about ethics. This is an interesting finding given that Clyde's pilot survey of kindergarten teachers in the Melbourne area in 1989 (Clyde, 1989 cited in Rodd & Clyde, 1991) indicated that all had attended in-service programs during the two years before the survey, yet only 20% had participated in programs relating to "professionalism" per se. More often they attended programs focussed on behaviour management or "subjects", for example, music and science. Whereas a high proportion
of the practitioners indicated support and interest in response to the questions about ethical issues which required a yes or no answer, only 59% responded to the open ended question asking them to list ethical concerns. Rodd and Clyde’s displacement phenomenon theory in which they contended that practitioners believed ethical issues were of concern to the field in general but had little impact on them personally, and Rodd and Clyde’s concerns about practitioners’ level of professional maturity, appear to be relevant to Vanaglia’s study too.

Vanaglia’s findings indicated that, in her regional sample, there was a general awareness of the existence of the Code of Ethics, a substantial recognition that a code could assist staff to deal with ethical issues, and that a code could contribute to the quality of early childhood education. In addition, respondents reported a strong interest in individual professional development through in-servicing programs beyond those that relate to skills enabling survival and consolidation. Though Vanaglia’s findings echo those of Rodd and Clyde, they also indicate some positive shifting of thought about professionalism and professional responsibility. We need to be cautious about putting too much emphasis on this finding given the small regional sample of respondents. The difference in findings could be explained, for example, by the networking of a particularly committed group of practitioners, or by some specific in-service being conducted in the region. Nevertheless, the findings are encouraging.

Further research that directly examined use of the AECA Code of Ethics was conducted by Pollnitz at this time. Between two and three years after the adoption of the AECA Code, Pollnitz (1993) conducted a survey of paid staff in 200 early childhood services in the state of New South Wales. The purpose of her study was: to ascertain staff’s level of knowledge of the Code; to find out the extent to which staff found the Code helpful in their daily work; and to establish staff’s perceptions of the Code’s contribution to raising
their status as professionals. Two hundred and twenty five responses to the questionnaire were received from 109 services. Responses were received from teachers, assistants, nurses, and clerical assistants in preschools, long day care centres, occasional care centres, early intervention centres and mobile vans. Forty three percent of the respondents were qualified early childhood teachers and the majority of respondents (69%) had been working in the field for between one and 10 years.

There were two parts to the questionnaire. The first part focussed on theoretical issues related to having a code for early childhood personnel and was not dependent on respondents having any knowledge of the existence of the AECA Code. The results for this part of the questionnaire revealed a similar pattern of response to the findings reported by Rodd and Clyde and by Vanaglia. For example, 83% of respondents supported the notion of having a code of ethics for early childhood. In this part, the issue of formal enforcement of a code was investigated for the first time. The responses of practitioners tended to reflect the AECA National Working Party's position on the issue of enforcement of a code for early childhood personnel, with 64% supporting voluntary adherence. Nevertheless, there was strong support for compulsory adherence (47%). There was strong support too (69%), for a code to be upheld by law. This is interesting, considering the lack of an appropriate national professional body that could undertake this regulatory role.

Though 64% of practitioners rejected the notion of a code with compulsory adherence, 65% agreed that some action should be taken for violation of a code of ethics. It is clear from this finding that practitioners were not rejecting compulsory adherence on the pretext that voluntary adherence would allow them to “get away” with unethical behaviour, but that they regarded unethical behaviour as a serious matter to be dealt with
appropriately. When asked about who should be responsible for taking action against those who violate a code, 71% of practitioners expressed a preference for action to be taken by an employer, though there was considerable support (59%) for action to be taken by a professional association.

Practitioners strongly supported the view that the type of action to be taken for code violation should be related to the severity of the breach (86%), and even more strongly (97%) supported the notion that action for code violation should be individualised and depend on the circumstances of each situation. The most appropriate action for code violation was deemed to be counselling (93%) followed by reprimand (84%). As the severity of the action increased, the level of practitioner support decreased so that only 47% agreed that suspension, and only 44% agreed that dismissal, were appropriate actions. Clearly, practitioners preferred helping practices to punitive action for code violation further reinforcing an ethic of care underpinning early childhood professionals' philosophies. It was Pollnitz's recommendation that given these practitioners' views about the issue of voluntary versus compulsory adherence to a code, the notion of compulsory adherence should be revisited and considered seriously in any future review of the AECA Code. This would also involve addressing the format of the current aspirational, voluntary code as regulated adherence to a code is more suited to a code of conduct than an aspirational code of ethics.

The second part of the questionnaire focussed on practitioners' knowledge of and beliefs about the AECA Code of Ethics. The finding that only 43% of practitioners reported knowledge of the AECA's Code's existence was regarded by Pollnitz as somewhat disappointing given that: the Code had already been adopted for more than two years; it was a public statement of standards and accountability; and it had the potential to help
raise the professional status of early childhood personnel. On the other hand, Pollnitz noted with optimism that in only two years, nearly half of the practitioners were aware of the Code’s existence. What was clear from the findings, however, was that continued efforts were needed to inform all practitioners about the Code.

Pollnitz’s results indicated that a range of early childhood practitioners believed that the Code:

➢ helped the community to identify early childhood education as a profession (94%);
➢ boosted their confidence (80%);
➢ helped them to recognise ethical issues (93%);
➢ helped them resolve ethical dilemmas (71%);
➢ helped them resolve ethical dilemmas that arose in their relationship with parents (90%), other staff (88%), their employer (87%), others outside the service (86%), the director/ordinator (85%) and the children (81%).

Practitioners were familiar with the content of the Code (85%). From these findings, Pollnitz concluded that the Code was a user friendly document and was meeting the needs of those practitioners who knew about it. They were using it to confirm and to guide their practice.

Despite these overall positive findings, Pollnitz found that there were often contradictions, inconsistencies and “mixed messages” in practitioner responses. For example, while many practitioners agreed that they used the Code as a set of rules for action, they also claimed that their decision-making was not restricted by the Code. Whereas they declared that the Code helped them to resolve ethical issues which arose in their working relationships, relatively few recorded examples of ethical issues they
had confronted. Examples of “ethical” dilemmas provided by practitioners were often not ethical dilemmas but rather related to employment problems, legal problems, and to social theory problems. Issues of concern relating to the examples of ethical dilemmas included: dealing with requests to treat children in harmful or inappropriate ways (to do with sleep, food and discipline); and dealing with others’ unprofessional behaviour (other staff, management committees, employers, families, students and the government licensing agency).

Pollnitz proposed that the “mixed messages” were indicative that to some extent, practitioners were still in the process of clarifying their knowledge and understanding about what the Code meant to themselves, and to their relationships with their clients and colleagues. Since there was no significant difference in response to the survey between staff in positions of responsibility, with higher qualifications, with more years of experience, and in full-time employment, and other staff, she concluded that practitioners’ thinking about ethics and its contribution to the early childhood field was to be an evolving process among all practitioners regardless of their situation or experience. Her strongest recommendation was for effective strategies to be put in place to support and hasten the process.

Research reported so far, has focussed on practitioners in the field. The concentration on them was appropriate given their everyday direct involvement with children and families. They are much more likely to encounter ethical issues than early childhood personnel who have indirect involvement with children and families, for example, tertiary early childhood educators who work within the profession, but not with children. The next most likely group of early childhood personnel to whom ethical issues are important are early childhood students, particularly during their field experience. In a
new area of investigation I, with a colleague from Charles Sturt University, began to look at issues for student teachers. We were interested in finding out about students' level of knowledge and understanding about professionalism, codes of ethics and what constitutes an ethical dilemma, not only for the purpose of supporting them during field experience, but also to establish whether there was a need for early childhood students to undertake specific instruction about ethics in their coursework (Coombe & Newman, 1997a). We used a questionnaire consisting of 12 items to conduct a survey of 179 first to third year students enrolled in early childhood teacher education courses at The University of Western Sydney, Nepean (UWS, Nepean) and at Charles Sturt University, Wagga, Wagga (CSU). Almost half (42%) of the students were in the third year of their course. The number of first (30%) and second year students (28%) was approximately equal. Questions probed students' knowledge about the existence of codes of ethics and their understanding about codes of ethics; elicited information about their awareness of the AECA Code; elicited examples of dilemmas they had experienced during fieldwork, that they perceived to be of an ethical nature; and sought information about their knowledge of, and confidence in dealing with ethical dilemmas.

Ninety five percent (95%) of the students were able to provide a satisfactory explanation of what a code of ethics is. Their explanations included references to professionalism, guidelines, standards and structures; beliefs, values and attitudes, and behaviours and practices. The students named 10 professions they thought of that have a code of ethics. Teaching and medicine were most mentioned by the students as professions which have codes of ethics despite the fact that teachers, as a whole group, do not have an overall code of ethics in Australia or New South Wales. Students who were aware of the AECA Code of Ethics, may have had this in mind as it refers to their own teaching group. Interestingly, the occupations of hairdressing and real estate were included by some
students in the list, indicating some confusions about what constitutes a profession, as opposed to a commercial enterprise. The level of awareness of the AECA Code was the same for students across all years of the course.

More than two-thirds of the students reported that they had witnessed three or more situations of dilemma during fieldwork experience, though analysis of the students' examples found that the dilemmas did not always involve ethical issues and is consistent with Pollnitz's (1993) finding that early childhood practitioners' examples of "ethical" dilemmas did not always, in fact, involve ethical issues. Only six percent of the students' dilemmas could be categorised as ethical in nature. Rather, the examples were about dilemmas students experienced when they observed or were drawn into practices that were wrong, poor or that breached regulations. For example, one student reported that she had been expected to change a baby without wearing gloves, breaching commonly recognised health and hygiene procedures. Another reported that staff in her centre did not keep developmental records for individual children, as regulated by the licensing department. Undeniably, these students were faced with a dilemma about what they should do – "Should I say something or say nothing?" "Who should I speak to about this, my service supervisor or my tertiary adviser?" but there is not an ethical component. Where there is a breach of regulations, there is a right action which should be taken, and a wrong one, which was taken. The dilemma for the student, is about the appropriate way to take action, and the difficulty of doing so, as a student. In an ethical dilemma, there is no clearly defined right or wrong way to proceed, as there is in the previous examples. An ethical dilemma involves a choice between competing values, or "rights". These students clearly needed to learn to differentiate between right-wrong issues and right-versus-right dilemmas, and the ethical dimensions of confronting issues as a student.
In further analysis of the data, we sorted and re-sorted the students' examples of perceived dilemmas into categories (Newman & Coombe, 1999). The major categories were: individual personal difficulties in knowing how to deal with the actions of a child; students being requested to implement practices they judged to be inappropriate; and students observing staff implementing practices that they (the students) judged to be inappropriate. Within these categories, we differentiated between “critical incidents” and events “open to interpretation”. An example of a critical incident given by a student was, the “teacher in the nursery yanked a child by the arm out of the high chair and carried him like that into the other room because he hadn't been eating his food nicely.” An example of an open to interpretation event was, “when I was on one of my field visits a Director threw a pair of shoes to a child instead of giving them to the child or telling the child to pick up the shoes”. It is quite conceivable that this teacher had developed a relationship with this child, where the throwing of shoes was not a negative or inappropriate act, but was judged to be so by the observing student (Newman & Coombe, 1999).

In addition, the examples were categorised according to perspectives suggested by Feeney and Kipnis (1985) that were designed to help users to avoid facing ethical dilemmas (1999b). Thirty four percent (34%) of dilemmas reported by students involved personal problems; 28% involved legal problems; 16% involved employment problems; six percent involved professional ethics problems; and five percent involved social theory problems. Eleven percent (11%) of the dilemmas did not fit into any of the categories. The conclusions we reached were firstly, that students need instruction about determining what constitutes an ethical dilemma and secondly, that students need to
develop strategies that enable them to deal with problematic situations whether or not the situations are technically ethical dilemmas.

Published research conducted to date reveals that early childhood personnel have a strong commitment to ethical practice and to a code of ethics for early childhood. It reveals too, that despite encouraging signs about the positive impact of the AECA Code, there is much to be learned, clarified and understood about professional practice; ethics; ethical practice and codes of ethics; and dilemma recognition and resolution, if early childhood personnel are to feel confident about themselves as professionals and are to be recognised as professionals by the community. Further clarification and study of the traditional discipline of ethics, as a branch of philosophy is needed by students and practicing professionals. This should include study of methods of decision-making and dilemma resolution. This will be further discussed in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

Well, dealing with others is a very complex issue. There is no way that you can come up with one formula that could solve all problems. It’s a bit like cooking. If you are cooking a special meal, then there are various stages in the cooking. You may first have to boil the vegetables separately and then you have to fry them and then you combine them in a special way, mixing in spices and so on. And finally, the end result would be this delicious product. Similarly here, in order to be skillful in dealing with others, you need many factors. You can’t just say “This is the method” or “This is the technique”. His Holiness the Dalai Lama (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 1999).

EXTENDING THINKING ABOUT PROFESSIONAL ETHICS:

NEW TOOLS FOR ETHICAL ANALYSIS

There is clearly a lot more to professional ethics than the existence of codes and guidelines. In the previous chapters I have shown the links between professionalism and ethics, and argued that ethical early childhood professionals need better preparation and support to make sound, sensitive and well reasoned judgements. The ethical professional making complex judgements needs a combination of professional dispositions, virtues, knowledge and skills. The ability to exercise sound ethical judgement requires a deeper level of understanding of ethics than simply knowing that a code exists. Codes, when they do exist, have shortcomings as discussed in Chapter 3. Ethical judgement can be supported by knowledge of ethics, and use of tools, techniques, or models of decision-making. Often, techniques for ethical
judgement are based on the use of ethical principles, however, early childhood educators and many others in the caring professions are not usually involved in formal studies of traditional philosophy or ethics in their preparation courses. A case has been made earlier for the inclusion of increased levels of professional preparation for ethical judgement and practice, but at this time, there is still little available. One critical aspect of ethical practice is the resolution of problematic issues. Jacob-Tim and Hartshorne (1994, p.6) include “mastery and use of a problem-solving model” as an important competency of ethical professionalism. I will now describe some tools and techniques that are already available for this purpose, that would be useful for students of early childhood education but also have limitations for this profession. In an attempt to address the need for early childhood teacher educators to learn quickly and successfully how to resolve the problematic issues they encounter, a new tool has been developed during this project to support and complement all other aspects of professionals’ development of ethical practice. This tool, known as the “Ethical Response Cycle” is presented in this chapter, following initial discussion about the need for such a tool, and description of tools and models that have preceded and informed its development and helped to consolidate thinking about the contents and structure of this new model of ethical response.

Initial examination of the literature on ethics in early childhood education led to discovery of the work of Feeney and Kipnis (1985) that was helpful as it directly addressed concerns about early childhood educators and ethical dilemmas. The Feeney and Kipnis Perspectives relating to dilemma types (Feeney & Kipnis, 1985) that were outlined in Chapter 3, were useful for students to understand that not all dilemmas are the same. I assumed that this knowledge may help students to decide what actions they should pursue when faced with problematic issue. Feeney and Kipnis never however, intended these perspectives to be used to classify ethical dilemmas or be used as a resolution methodology (Feeney, 1999a). Though useful,
the perspectives are not a dilemma resolution tool or method. Beyond this work, there is little information or empirical research in the education literature that advocates, or shows results of application of, direct processes or methods for dilemma resolution. A wider search reveals strategies for decision making or dilemma resolution that are being used within professions other than early childhood education. There still however, is not an abundance of useful information. The work of Noel Preston (1996), Rushworth Kidder (1995) and Karen Kitchener (1984) are useful as these authors each provide a process for examining and resolving problematic issues. They propose models that could be used as a framework for ethical decision making, Preston's and Kidder's for professions in general, and Kitchener's for counselling psychology.

Following examination and analysis of the literature and use of the Kitchener and Preston models with students, in the form of critical evaluation of the CD-ROM on which these models then appeared, and encouraged by feedback I received from Feeney and Kipnis, as well as many other practitioners, the scope and originality of the project described in this portfolio was extended. Lois Pollnitz and I developed a new and specific model for ethical response (see Figure 6). The structure of the manual and CD-ROM in the “Will my response be ethical…” kit (Appendix 7b) subsequently became based on the new model, replacing use of the Kitchener and Preston models. Following more specific detail about existing models, detail of the new model is given.

**Using tools for ethical analysis**

The rationale for a new model of dilemma resolution was based on shortcomings that we could see for early childhood educators in both the Preston and the Kitchener models that we had piloted, accompanied by a deeper understanding of the literature
we had studied, and the feeling that all responses in early childhood education should be ethically based. We had harbored an ongoing concern that the Intuitive Level advocated in Kitchener's model for quick decisions, did not incorporate all of the necessary processes for legally and theoretically sound ethical responses. Underlying our concerns was an ongoing quandary of our own about the ways of, and necessity for, defining the difference between an ethical dilemma and dilemmas of a different nature. Our resultant proposition is that all responses in early childhood education should have an ethical base, irrespective of their nature. Hence the "Ethical Response Cycle" that we have developed prompts users to, however quickly, move through all the necessary levels that will ground their decision on sound ethical reasoning. Every decision therefore, will be defendable on sound ethical grounds. We further postulate that, as users of the Cycle practice and extend their skills in the use of the model, they will begin to automatically incorporate the steps in the process, no matter how quickly their decision is made. What follows gives more detail of the justification for the development of the "Ethical Response Cycle". The two main conceptual components underpinning the Cycle are Professionalism and Ethics, as described in Chapters 2 and 3.

Frameworks of dilemma resolution for the professions

It has been argued that the resolution of ethical dilemmas requires more than knowledge of theories or of a code of ethics. As discussed earlier, codes are useful for identifying where problems of obligation and responsibility occur, but have limitations. Codes may not address issues of concern, or statements within codes may conflict when applied to a particular issue. To address the limitations professionals can learn to use the thinking processes, language and theoretical underpinnings of
ethics with greater finesse, and consequently their ethical behaviour, resolution of dilemmas and justification of actions will be greatly facilitated. Frameworks or models of dilemma resolution can help professionals to do this. They incorporate traditional ethical theories and principles and can be used as tools by students to prepare for their professional lives and by practicing and experienced professionals to reinforce and support sound ethical behaviour and dilemma resolution. Models can show how a step by step process, incorporating reference to codes of ethics, can be used to assist the resolution of ethical dilemmas. When the outlined processes are learnt and used, the professional becomes immersed into the language of ethics and processes of dilemma resolution which then become integral to daily practice. After all, there is no benefit to be gained from recognising a dilemma, without making some attempt to resolve it satisfactorily. When the resolution of dilemmas is difficult, people may blame the decision-maker for a perceived poor decision, or blame someone for the fact that there is not a clear-cut resolution. Ethics is complex, and largely an intellectual and verbal issue. By learning the concepts and language of ethics, professionals become better equipped to use it for their own purposes of ethical reasoning and sound justification for actions. Kidder (1995) explains that there is no magic formula for churning out the answer, but that

in the act of coming to terms with the tough choices, we find answers that not only clarify the issues and satisfy our need for meaning but strike us as satisfactory resolutions...that as we practice resolving dilemmas, we find ethics to be less a goal than a pathway, less a destination than a trip, less an inoculation than a process (p. 176).

Approaches designed to assist with the resolution of ethical dilemmas are often presented as models to demonstrate a step-by-step process of finding concrete and justifiable solutions to ethical dilemmas. Three such models will now be described and a new model, specifically developed for early childhood educators, but applicable to other professions is be presented.
The Preston Model

Noel Preston's "Ethical Decision-Making Model" is advocated for the professions in general (Preston, 1996). The features of the model include information gathering, reflection, analysis, synthesis, assessment and communication. The steps taken in applying the model include assessing the situation; considering core values and dispositions; making a comprehensive assessment of the situation; and finally, arriving at a decision. The process is based on Preston's argument that an "ethic of response", upon which the model is based, synthesises other theories and will assist us to "attempt to live the ethical life within the complex, dilemma ridden technological age which has expanded our ethical options and confused ethical discourse as we confront these options" (Preston, 1996, p.75).
Figure 5. The Preston ethical decision-making model

By working through this step by step critical-evaluative model, staff can resolve dilemmas and ensure that their decisions are based on sound ethical reasoning and hence, can be defended. Staff's accountability is maintained by their adherence to this transparent process. Working through such a model though, can be time consuming and early childhood practitioners, like other professionals, do not always have the luxury of making a reflective and well considered decision over a period of
time. Often, ethical decisions need to be made immediately. This model, though a useful base for early childhood educators, could be adapted to make it more specific and applicable to early childhood education contexts. The model too, stops at the point of decision-making and does not address the subsequent action, professional documentation or any follow-up reflection after the event. Preston’s notion of an ethic of response is useful for early childhood educators.

**The Kitchener model**

A second model, designed by Karen Kitchener (1984) for clinical psychologists, recognises the need for immediate decisions to be made, on some occasions. Her model consists of two levels: the intuitive and the critical-evaluative. Unlike Preston’s model, Kitchener differentiates on-the-spot decisions, where Kitchener asserts that professionals need to draw on their intuitive level of ethical response, from decisions where more time can be taken for consideration.

The model is designed for use when “a problem [exists] for which no course of action seems satisfactory. The dilemma exists because there are good, but contradictory ethical reasons to take conflicting and incompatible courses of action” (Kitchener, 1984, p. 43). The model is useful for professions such as counselling psychology and early childhood education, for example, which are both seen as helping professions in which “there is an explicit charge to help and not to harm people, [and therefore] individuals involved in the helping professions have an obligation over and above that of the lay person to act in an ethically consistent and thoughtful manner” (Kitchener, 1984, p. 43). Professionals in other helping professions such as teaching and nursing can be assisted by the use of the model as “acting ethically involves professionals in difficult decision making for which they are poorly prepared [and]
frequently they even lack the tools to identify what issues are at stake”… (Kitchener, 1984, p. 43). Research has suggested that facilitation with decision making is needed by early childhood students and practitioners (Coombe & Newman, 1997a; Newman, Pollnitz & Goodfellow, 1997; Pollnitz, 1993) who could use this model, by applying it to their own code of ethics.

**The Intuitive Level**

At the “Intuitive Level” of reasoning or decision making, professionals use the ethical beliefs that they have developed, based on what they “should” or “should not” do, formed through their professional preparation programs, the core values of their profession and their experience and expertise. People sometimes need to respond immediately, or intuitively, in ethical situations, based on this knowledge. Often, there is not the time for reflection with “everyday moral decisions” being made (Kitchener, 1984, p.44). Despite ethical preparation and education:

> some ethical dilemmas or issues will arise which we cannot possibly have foreseen. In these cases when we have not previously considered the ethical implications, when an immediate decision is necessary, and when there are no convenient professional rules on which to rely, our “moral good sense” or conscience is critical (Kitchener, 1984, p. 44).

Although there is certainly the need for recognition and understanding of the intuitive level of moral reasoning, Kitchener explains why this level of reasoning alone is not enough. In some dilemma situations people may have no ordinary sense of which direction to take. Furthermore, intuitive decision making cannot always be trusted. Examples of professionals being sued for malpractice provide sufficient evidence of this. Hence, Kitchener argues that a higher order of moral reasoning is called for to guide, refine and evaluate ordinary moral judgment. A critical evaluative level of reasoning has therefore been proposed to “illuminate our ordinary moral judgment
and to redefine the bases for our actions in similar situations” (Kitchener, 1984, p. 45).

**The Critical-Evaluative Level**

Kitchener advocates use of the “Critical-Evaluative Level” of reasoning when people are called to evaluate or justify their ordinary moral judgments. Within the “Critical-Evaluative Level”, Kitchener has proposed a three-tiered hierarchy. As each tier is used unsuccessfully to provide an effective basis for action, the decision-maker moves to consideration of the next tier. That is, if level one fails to provide sufficient justification for a decision, move up to level two, and so forth.

The previously discussed case example of a Muslim child eating a forbidden food provides a good example of a predicament in which Kitchener’s model is useful. Resolution requires both immediate action and a follow-up response.

Since the parents will not be arriving to pick the child up for several hours, the teacher has the opportunity to work through an evaluative process as advocated by Kitchener and Preston (1996). She has time to take all factors into account, and to arrive at a decision based on sound ethical reasoning. By the time she has worked through the steps proposed in the model she can feel confident about the validity of her decision and will be clear about how to implement it. Her decision about whether or not to stop the child from eating the ham sandwich portion however must be made immediately. She doesn’t have time to engage in the step-by-step ethical analysis described in the Preston model. She must make an on-the-spot decision and carry it out at once. The strength of Kitchener’s model is that it recognises professionals’ need to make on-the-spot decisions and so includes an intuitive as well as a critical-evaluative level of ethical response.
Professionals' intuitive responses are the outcome of what they have learned about what they ought to do and what they ought not to do as individuals and as professionals. If they act in accord with their internalised ethical beliefs or virtues in any given situation where an immediate response is required, professionals can be fairly certain that they have acted with conscience, with good sense, and how other ethical members of their profession would behave in similar circumstances. The critical factor for making intuitive judgements that can be ethically defensible is that an established firm set of personal and professional ethical beliefs has been developed.

If the teacher's intuitive response in the case is to stop the child from eating any more ham her decision may be based on: her knowledge that in the child's religion, eating ham is forbidden; her knowledge that the centre has a policy which states that staff will cater to the diverse needs of families, including those which relate to cultural and religious practice; and her personal commitment as a professional to honouring any undertaking she makes. She is not deterred by the realisation that there is only a little bit of ham left in the sandwich, the child's seeming ignorance of what he is doing, or by her thought that the family may not adhere strictly to all their religious beliefs; so won't be worried about their child eating the ham.

Analysis at the critical-evaluative level might confirm the intuitive decision or might reveal that a more appropriate judgement could have been made. Critical-evaluative analysis, then, can guide, refine and evaluate the intuitive judgement. The outcome of the critical-evaluative analysis is then assimilated into the individual's existing body of ethical knowledge and experience and can contribute to intuitive judgements that need to be made in future situations.
Figure 6. A model of ethical justification (Kitchener, 1984, p. 45)

A shortcoming in Kitchener's model is the possibility that the two-tiered system can suggest that not all judgements require critical reflection. This has been addressed in the Newman and Pollnitz model to be presented.
The Kidder Model

In a third model of ethical analysis, Kidder has devised a framework to help people when “potentially deadly blows [come along] before we’ve even begun to grasp their significance” (p.181). Without a full understanding of cause, only a little hint of possible consequences, and with little room for reflection, professionals must make well-reasoned, ethical decisions. Kidder suggests a logical and sequential process that helps to fuse intelligence with intuition, and internalises the process in order to make decisions quickly, authoritatively and naturally. Like an athlete or musician, an ethical decision-maker needs training, practice and maintenance of skills to become and remain “ethically fit” (Kidder, 1995).

Kidder suggests that decision-makers should:

- Recognise that there is a moral issue
- Determine the actors
- Gather the relevant facts
- Test for right-versus-wrong issues

And then apply:

- “the stench test” - does it have an odour of corruption that makes others look askance? Does it go against the grain of moral principles?
- “the front-page test” - how would you feel if what you were about to do was in the headlines of tomorrow’s morning newspaper?; and
- “the Mum test” - if I were my mother (or any other moral exemplar) would I do this?

If any of these tests makes you feel uneasy about what you are about to do, it may be the wrong decision.
The three tests conform to basic moral reasoning:

“The stench test” is a form of rule based reasoning, which asks about moral principles rather than consequences. “The front-page test” is ends based reasoning that looks to outcomes – if people know what I’m doing, will there be negative outcomes? “The Mum test” involves care based reasoning, putting yourself in the shoes of others and following the Golden Rule. If the issue fails the tests, there is no point in going any further as you are dealing with a right versus wrong issue. Any further elaboration of the process will only be to justify an unconscionable act.

If a choice is made to proceed:

- **Test for Right-versus-Right paradigms** (ethical principles are applied). If the issue gets through the right-versus-wrong test, the next question is “what sort of dilemma is this – truth versus loyalty; self versus community; short term versus long term; or justice versus mercy?” This establishes that it is indeed an ethical dilemma that pits two deeply held core values against each other.

- **Apply the resolution principles** (ethical theories are applied). When the choice between the two values is clear, apply the three resolution principles – the rule-based or non-consequentialist principle (do it because it is right and don’t consider the consequences); the ends-based or utilitarian principle (what would bring the greatest good to the greatest number of people); and the care-based principle (based on the Golden Rule). Arrive at a resolution based on the line of reasoning that seems most relevant and persuasive to the issue at hand.

- **Investigate the “trilemma” options** (can be implemented at any stage in this process). Is there a third way through the dilemma? Can there be compromise between the two rights, or is there a creative and unforeseen action that has come
to light? [This process is referred to as “Ethical Finesse” by Ken Kipnis] (Kipnis, 1987).

- **Make the decision.** Using the moral courage that is required of leaders, decide.
- **Revisit and reflect on the decision.** At a later time, go back over the decision and reflect on its lessons. “This process builds expertise, helps adjust the moral compass, and provides new examples for moral discourse and discussion” (Kidder, 1995, p. 186).

Kidder’s model is useful and “user friendly”. It could be supplemented by the inclusion of consideration of professional professional rules and considerations and the need for documentation for accountability that is so important for professionals.

**The need for a new model of ethical response for early childhood education**

The three models described so far have been developed for the professions in general, and in the case of Kitchener’s model, for the specific profession of counselling psychology. In our respective positions as early childhood teacher educators Lois Pollnitz and I have conducted research (e.g. Newman & Coombe, 1999; Pollnitz, 1993), gathered copious anecdotal evidence and considered and applied these models extensively. The models are all useful for early childhood educators, but limited in their application in early childhood contexts. We now propose a new model that addresses our concerns about Kitchener’s two levels of reasoning, extends on Preston’s “ethic of response” model, and adds elements of negotiation, action and informed inclination to Kidder’s model. The Newman and Pollnitz model rethinks decision-making in the postmodern age by putting the responsibility on the individual to use reflection, negotiation and informed inclination to prioritise law, professional
considerations, ethical principles and theories according to the particular temporal and contextual features of the situation. The model allows for, and indeed encourages uncertainty and return of thinking to a problem and

undecidability, therefore, is not a moment to be traversed or overcome; I can never be satisfied that I have made a good choice since a decision in favour of one alternative is always to the detriment of another...[and] this is at once a risk and a chance, since continual stability would mean the end of politics and ethics (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999, p.40).

The new Newman and Pollnitz model is useful and useable for early childhood educators and considers the contexts and complexities of their work. For example, an underpinning supposition to precede the use of this model is that it can be used to consider any problematic situation as early childhood professionals have an added responsibility to many professionals, to act in the highest ethical manner because of the vulnerability and powerlessness of their primary clients, very young children. Hence, all actions should have an ethical base. Further to this responsibility, in Australia at present, the only national early childhood body is primarily constituted for advocacy for children and families. There is no professional association or organisation that performs a “watchdog” function for the profession, and no ethics board or committee to guide ethical practice or to which breaches of ethical action can be reported and judged. There are therefore, no sanctions in place for unethical behaviour. Early childhood educators therefore, have a great professional responsibility to self regulate and respond reflectively and ethically in any problematic situation. For this reason the Cycle moves beyond Kitchener’s where some responses can be intuitive. It is our proposition that all judgements need to include critical reflection, however brief, leading to responsibility of the decision-maker. This allows for a “double-check”, that the intuitive response at first considered, is indeed ethical. The Cycle has this checking facility embedded as all phases should be considered, however briefly, each time an ethical response is called
for. Each use of the Cycle embeds critical evaluation, reflection and negotiation during the consideration of law, professional considerations, ethical principles and ethical theories. The Cycle fulfills the need of busy early childhood educators for tools and guidelines to help them to formulate and consolidate their thinking that are clear, simple, easy to use, and can be made specific to their profession. As all professional responses should be ethical, in the “Ethical Response Cycle”, emphasis is not placed on labelling or classifying dilemmas as ethically based or not. All problematic situations can be considered through use of the Cycle. It is possible that application of the Cycle will determine that the issue in question is a clearcut “right/wrong” situation, and therefore no dilemma exists. Users may then proceed without the Cycle, to apply the “right” action. Alternatively, if the problem does not have a clearcut right or wrong solution, the Cycle can be applied.

We anticipate that our new model will also be useful for many other professionals, particularly those working in the helping professions. As previously detailed in Chapters 1, 2 and 3, the three main areas that informed the search of the literature and subsequent development of the cycle were: professional considerations and the implications for early childhood education; ethics including ethical principles that were considered the most relevant to early childhood education; and ethical theories and their influence on decision making in early childhood education.

The Newman and Pollnitz “Ethical Response Cycle”

The Newman and Pollnitz “Ethical Response Cycle” was developed in response to perceived and stated needs within the early childhood profession. The Cycle diagram represents a process that helps professionals to apply and justify sensitive and intelligent reasoning to problematic situations. It can be used by tertiary educators
and students working in professional preparation programs and by professionals already in the workplace at times when they find themselves in problematic situations where there are no rules or policies in place to guide their decisions or when the rules and policies already in place seem to be counter to core professional values. Further, there are sometimes clear-cut rules or policies in place but finding the best way to do the right thing still presents a dilemma.

The Cycle is represented in Figure 7 by a diagram that outlines a process of ethical analysis. Ethical analysis is always complex and so it is recommended that the "Ethical Response Cycle" be used as a framework to support and validate systematic and sensitive reasoning to resolve problematic situations. It is presented as a tool to assist the reflection and purposeful decision making that will lead students and professionals to reach sound ethical judgements, and to determine and justify subsequent actions.

Consider the example of an early childhood student teacher who is asked to assume responsibility for a group of young children, knowing that it is illegal in her state for someone, as yet unqualified, to take on that responsibility. Her initial intuition may be to refuse, or to comply, depending on her reasoning. With the benefit of further information, the student learns that the only temporary teacher who could possibly fill in treats the children in a disrespectful manner that could be considered to border on emotional abuse. Her dilemma is complex involving decisions about what is good for the children; possible harm to them; her personal desire to demonstrate her abilities and please her supervisors to gain a good grade; and issues of legality. Her profession's code of ethics (the AECA Code), gives general guidance about her responsibilities to children, but does not specifically tell her what to do in this situation, so she will need further guidance quickly. Use of the Cycle, provides a framework, or tool, to structure her thinking and decision-making, towards eventual judgement and action. She needs to consider and prioritise ethical principles and call
on ethical theories to make her decision about what to do and how to do it. Knowledge of the “Ethical Response Cycle” will provide the student with the intellectual content and language of professional ethics to provide a framework for making her decision and explaining it. It will help her to resolve “right versus right” issues. It is right to protect children, and it is right to obey the law that has been developed with their best interests in mind. Early childhood educators face many such right versus right dilemmas.

By working through the “Ethical Response Cycle”, students and professionals can apply systematic, sensitive ethical reasoning to the resolution of problematic situations including those that present them with ethical dilemmas. The outcome of this process will be a decision or judgement, which is most likely to achieve a wise solution, even though there may be varying degrees of benefit or disadvantage for some of the individuals involved. Furthermore, as an outcome of the process students and professionals can feel confident that the judgement they have made would be the judgement all good members of their profession would make in similar circumstances. An added benefit of use of the Cycle is the embedded use of documentation of the process, judgement and action as a written basis of justification, professional accountability and future reflections.

The Cycle represents a continuous process that professionals can work through every time they need to make a decision to take action. After initially learning to use the Cycle, implementation will become automatic and the phases quickly thought through. All responses in professional life can therefore be based on ethical action. The cycle is entered at the point where a dilemma is identified. The Cycle can be used by individuals or teams attempting to resolve a dilemma together. Each stage in the cycle should be considered for every judgement, even if resolution appears to be obvious after considering one or two stages. More specific detail about use of the phases follows.
Figure 7. The Newman and Pollnitz “Ethical Response Cycle”
Judgement
Make judgements that:
♦ are the outcome of a well-
  considered reasoning process
♦ can be justified
♦ form the basis for a sound
  ethical response

Action
Take appropriate action:
♦ as determined by the
  judgement.

Documentation
Record and date detailed
information about:
♦ the process of arriving at the
  judgement
♦ the judgement
♦ the proposed and actual action
♦ any implications for further
  action
♦ developments arising in the
  aftermath of the judgement

Negotiation
Negotiate:
♦ within each phase of the cycle
♦ alternative options for
  resolution and action
♦ the action that is considered
♦ follow up actions and
  strategies

Informed inclination
Draw on professional:
♦ dispositions
♦ knowledge and expertise
♦ extended experience

Ethical theories
Draw on philosophical positions
such as:
♦ the absolute moral obligation to
  adhere to religious and societal
  regulations (rule based);
♦ the obligation to make
  judgements that result in the
  greatest good for the greatest
  number of people (ends based);
♦ the obligation to make
  judgements that are
  underpinned by systematic and
  intelligent/rational thought
  processes and take the specific
  circumstances into account
  (proportion based);
♦ the obligation to make
  judgements that are situation
  sensitive and are underpinned
  by consideration of the
  maintenance of nurturing and
caring human relationships
  (care-based).

Ethical principles
Draw on historically recognised
principles such as:
♦ autonomy
♦ beneficence
♦ nonmaleficence
♦ justice
♦ fidelity

Figure 8. Elaboration of the “Ethical Response Cycle”
How does the “Ethical Response Cycle” work?

Because ethical analysis is a complex process, it would be unwise to advise strict adherence to a specific step-by-step process for the resolution of all problematic situations. Rather, what is recommended is that the “Ethical Response Cycle” is used as a framework to support and validate systematic and sensitive reasoning, by considering each of its phases, for every situation under consideration.

There will be some situations where each phase of the Cycle will be fully addressed. In these situations, use of the phase of informed inclination might either support the judgement to be made or be used as the last determining factor when reference to all other phases has exhausted wise options. In some situations, not all phases will need to be comprehensively addressed, but will always be taken into account (for example, there may be no relevant legal factors involved, but this needs to be determined before leaving consideration of this phase).

Reflection is an embedded concept within the Cycle and occurs throughout the process towards judgement, and after the judgement has been made as a means of determining appropriate strategies for implementing the action, and for providing information for future judgements. Like reflection, negotiation is integral to sound and sensitive use of the Cycle. Documentation may be recorded during the process or at the end.

What follows should be considered a general guide for using the “Ethical Response Cycle”. It attempts to illustrate how the Cycle may be applied.
Use of the Cycle begins with recognition of a problematic situation. Users determine the facts of the dilemma and embedding reflection and negotiation, consider all phases of the Cycle:

**Reflection**

Reflection involves the critical evaluation of the process and outcome of the judgement and action to determine if the resolution is complete or requires further consideration; the implementation of the Ethical Response Cycle for future reference; and, the development of a sense of personal competence to resolve dilemmas. Reflection can be done alone, or with colleagues. Reflection involves an a disposition for openness to permit the truth to emerge, to examine what might be happening, and what is in error, to decide what the appropriate response is. Reflection could be seen as the lay approach to prayer, as advocated by Lebacqz (1985) as an approach to dilemma resolution for ministers. In reflective learning, participants examine past experiences and personal beliefs in the context of new information and skills (Royal Institute of Public Administration Australia, 1994).

Users critically evaluate.
- the outcome of the judgement and action to determine if the resolution is complete or requires further consideration
- the implementation of the Ethical Response Cycle for future reference
- the development of own competence to resolve dilemmas

**Negotiation**

Negotiation occurs when professionals (including those in preparation) engage with others in ethical conversations, brainstorming, or use other strategies to come to an agreement or settle upon a position. Negotiation supports the notion of teamwork that is important in many professions and is entered into when more than one person is
involved in making a judgement. Negotiation may involve a team member reconsidering initial inclinations, or may be used to find out what others think and to confirm ideas.

Users negotiate:

- within each phase of the cycle
- alternative options for resolution and action
- the action that is considered
- follow up actions and strategies

**Legal Aspects**

Legal aspects may or may not exist. The professional initially needs to determine whether there are any laws or regulations to consider or abide by including:

- national laws
- state laws/regulations
- system regulations/codes
- employer regulations/codes

The user should:

➢ Check to see if there are any enforceable legal factors to be taken into account. If there are, and the decision is made to adhere to them, then the analysis process moves forward, considering the other phases through to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement, including the reasons for making it.

➢ Alternatively, if the situation or dilemma appears to warrant exemption from a rule or regulation or inclination suggests a good reason for “bending” a rule or regulation, the process of analysis moves forward to more comprehensively consider the phases of ethical principles and theories and to draw on the professional's
informed inclination. If the decision is made to breech the legal aspect, and move forward to consider other phases, the decision with reasons is documented.

**Professional Considerations**

Professional considerations are employed when users refer to the core values of their profession, codes of ethics, principles of professional practice, policies & guidelines pertinent to their profession or employment and frameworks such as quality assurance systems.

Users should refer to:
- core values
- codes of ethics
- principles of professional practice
- policies & guidelines
- quality assurance system

➢ If there are professional considerations relevant to the situation or dilemma, and the decision is made to adhere to them, then the analysis process moves forward, considering all phases, to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement, including the reasons for making it.

➢ Alternatively, if professional considerations do not inform the decision because the specific professional considerations lack relevance, are only partially helpful, or appear to be in conflict with each other, accepted ethical principles and theories should be considered. Further, this grounds decisions in traditional ethical theory. Reflections may be documented at this point. Examples of application of the Cycle are outlined in Newman & Pollnitiz, (in press).
Ethical Principles

Ethical principles draw on historically recognised ethical beliefs. For the purpose of clarity and precision the Cycle incorporates five well accepted principles. The principles selected as most useful for early childhood professionals are autonomy, beneficence (doing what is good), nonmaleficence (avoiding harm or the risk of harm), justice (fairness) and fidelity (honesty). The incorporation of ethical principles is based on several traditional and well-recognised Western philosophical frameworks. Again, a selection has been made based on early childhood educators needs, beliefs, values and understandings.

Draw on historically recognised principles such as:

- autonomy
- beneficence
- nonmaleficence
- justice
- fidelity

Any one of the ethical principles may be used to assist the decision. The professional may decide for example, professional autonomy is sufficient to make a wise judgement. Alternatively, the professional may rely on informed inclination to decide which principle to draw on. Arriving at a decision about which principle to draw on may require some prioritising of the principles. For example, in a specific situation, it may be decided that keeping the trust (fidelity) of some of the individuals involved, should outweigh the anticipated level of harm (nonmaleficence) that may be caused to others involved. If drawing on a principle resolves the problem or dilemma, reflection and decisions are documented and the analysis moves forward, considering all phases, to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement.
> Alternatively, if ethical principles do not inform the decision, or prioritisation is still difficult, ethical theories should be considered.

**Ethical Theories**

Ethical theories draw on philosophical positions such as: rule-based thinking that dictates the absolute obligation to adhere to religious and societal rules; ends-based thinking that incorporates the obligation to make judgements that result in the greatest good for the greatest number of people; care-based thinking where the obligation to make judgements that are situation sensitive and are underpinned by consideration of the maintenance of nurturing and caring human relationships is paramount; and proportionalism that includes obligation to make judgements that are underpinned by systematic and rational thought processes and take the specific circumstances into account.

In summary, ethical theories draw on philosophical positions such as:

- the absolute moral obligation to adhere to religious and societal dictates (rule-based)
- the obligation to make judgements that result in the greatest good for the greatest number of people (ends-based)
- the obligation to make judgements that are situation sensitive and are underpinned by consideration of the maintenance of nurturing and caring human relationships (care-based)
- the obligation to make judgements that are underpinned by systematic and rational thought processes and take the specific circumstances into account (proportion-based)

> When using the ethical theories phase of the Cycle, the professional draws on a range of theories. Autonomy or informed inclination as a professional may be used to decide which theory best suits the professional's philosophy and practice or which
theory best fits the situation, and to prioritise the theories. Reflections and any decisions should be documented. If the problem or dilemma is now resolved, the analysis moves forward, considering all phases, to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement.

- Alternatively, if resolution is still difficult, informed inclination may be considered.

**Informed Inclination**

Informed inclination draws on professional dispositions; knowledge and expertise; and extended experience. Accumulated experience can develop attentiveness and is related to the professional virtue of prudence. Reliance on experience must be used wisely however, as if misused, can be frustrating for clients as it implies that only the professional can make the decision (Lebacqz, 1985). To be used wisely, and to be seen as demonstrating the virtue of prudence, informed inclination as advocated in the Cycle is supported by consideration of all other phases of the Cycle. After reflective deliberations have been made across the first five steps in the cycle, the time arrives for a judgement to be made. Incorporating what was decided in the first four phases the user draws on professional:
- dispositions
- values and virtues
- knowledge and expertise
- extended experience

- If analysis has already taken into account legal and professional aspects, ethical principles and ethical theories, and still the professional is not sure about what should be done in the situation, informed inclination may be used to make the judgement. Informed inclination is cumulative. It is based on professional
dispositions, depth of knowledge, level of expertise, extended experience, and the process of ethical analysis just undertaken. All of these contribute to the sense of what must be done and to the sense of what the wise judgement will be.

**Judgement**

Judgements are the outcome of a well-considered reasoning process; can be justified (based on the legal aspects, professional considerations, ethical principles and ethical theories that have been considered) and form the basis for a sound ethical response. The judgement however is not an end in itself, but a means to ethical action that can be well justified.

Professionals should make judgements that:
- are the outcome of a well-considered reasoning process
- can be justified
- form the basis for a sound ethical response

Reflections and the judgement are documented, and the process moves forward to the action.

**Action**

Action as determined by the judgement now needs to be taken. Following the action, for the purpose of justification and accountability, all the reasoning involved that leads up to the judgement, the judgement itself, and the action should be documented for future reference.

**Documentation**

For professional and accountable documentation, dated and detailed information should be recorded about: the process of arriving at the judgement; the judgement itself; the
proposed and actual action; any implications for further action; and developments arising in the aftermath of the judgement. Action and documentation should not necessarily be seen as a definitive completion point in the cycle. Often, it will be necessary and useful to reflect on, and critically evaluate the judgement and action. The judgement and action may need further consideration and review, and future judgement processes will be enhanced if reflection on a recent judgement is undertaken. Detailed information about:

- the process of arriving at the judgement
- the judgement
- the proposed and actual action
- any implications for further action
- developments arising in the aftermath of the judgement

should be recorded.

The Cycle as described, can be used by students, their tertiary educators, and professionals in the field. It is available for use in the form of an Instructor's Manual, or a CD-ROM (as presented in Appendix 8b) and is supported by the video presented in the kit Will my response be ethical? (Appendix 8b).
CHAPTER 5

By the time we reached Delhi, I realized that the Dalai Lama’s advice to “understand the background of people” was not as elementary or superficial as it first appeared. Yes, it was simple, perhaps, but not simplistic. Sometimes it is the most basic and straightforward of advice, the kind we tend to dismiss as naïve, that can be the most effective means of enhancing communication (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 1999).

CONCLUSION

In this portfolio I have outlined the processes that I undertook, with Lois Pollnitz, to develop a body of work that led to the development of the “Ethical Response Cycle” which subsequently became the core process to facilitate the development of ethical judgement, around which the teaching resource kit “Will my response be ethical?...” is based. This work is timely, as western communities place much greater scrutiny on the work of professionals than they have in the past. The work is groundbreaking in early
childhood education, but acknowledges, incorporates and extends a strong history of ethical awareness and action in the early childhood profession in Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America.

The work presented in this portfolio presupposes that professionals are expected to act ethically by communities. Ethics is a critical aspect of professionalism and professionals are expected to know about, understand and implement ethical practice. Ethics and professionalism go hand-in-hand. Knowing how to go about making sound ethical judgements is a critical element of ethical practice but is not easy, is complex and justifying judgements clearly is an essential competency for professionals. Professionals need preparation, guidance and practice to facilitate their knowledge, skills and attitudes with regard to ethical judgement. It takes more than a sound moral preparation for life in general. To date, teacher preparation courses have not addressed the ethical preparation of students to any great degree, and the time has come for teacher educators to improve their practice in this critical area.

One element of addressing ethical issues, that is commonly undertaken (and often seen to constitute the only ethics component of courses) is to introduce students to relevant codes of ethics (if they exist). Codes of ethics however, provide one tool only to assist professionals but are not enough on their own. Codes can be limited, as they provide general guidelines only, may not address all issues, and may include principles that conflict when applied to some issues. Models of ethical resolution provide a further supportive tool for preparation for ethical professionalism. The premise underpinning the work in this portfolio is that students who are taught to incorporate the use of decision-making models into their ethical repertoire will have a greater chance of making sound, sensitive ethical judgements that they can clearly justify. No one model
on its own provides a recipe for success but models can provide guidelines and procedures that can assist with the finding of solutions for ethical dilemmas. The strength of models lies in their transparency. Procedures laid out are logical, clear and include accountability measures. They are particularly apt for professionals such as early childhood teachers. As students and professionals learn about and use the outlined models they will enhance their abilities to make sound and sensitive ethical judgements as well as being able to justify their judgements in a clearly articulated manner. Use of a model such as the "Ethical Response Cycle" facilitates use of the concepts and language of ethics, as the basis of decision making, and this will become integral to daily practice and ultimately enhance the professionalism and the profession in which users are employed.

Although several models have been presented in this portfolio, that could be useful to early childhood educators, all are seen as having some shortcomings in relation to the specific contexts and issues of early childhood education. The Newman and Pollnitz "Ethical Response Cycle" has been developed and presented to address these shortcomings. Accompanying materials have been produced to assist tertiary educators who themselves, have not been trained in the concepts, language and processes of philosophy or ethics. Using the materials tertiary educators can now better prepare their students for ethical judgement and to become ethical professionals better able to resolve problematic situations they may encounter during the fieldwork (professional preparation) components of their courses. Further, the practicing professionals who support students during fieldwork, can improve their own ethical judgement abilities through use of the materials. A strength of the materials presented is that they recognise and build on work already done in the area of ethics, by members of the early childhood profession.
If the next generation of teachers is to enter the workforce equipped to take on the challenges of our complex society, preparation for the ethical dimension of their work must begin early. For teacher educators, the challenge of how, and when to incorporate teaching and learning about ethics is not to be taken lightly as according to Nash, Aristotle is quoted as saying, "people do not become virtuous by nature or through spontaneity. [Nash adds], He believed that excellence of character occurs, if at all, only as a consequence of a systematic and devoted community effort wherein everyone is a moral teacher" (Nash, 1996, p.60).

It is the responsibility of those who design professional preparation courses, as a critical part of the moral communities that students encounter, to ensure that graduates entering the professions are equipped with a knowledge base which will enable them to reason and make appropriate decisions in their daily work. Traditionally, the knowledge base of professional preparation courses has been composed of propositional knowledge "knowing what", and non-propositional knowledge "knowing how" (Higgs & Titchen, 1995). Hostetler (1997, p.12) however, believes that the domain of technical knowledge has received undue emphasis in teaching. Emphasis has been on the acquisition of research, and theory-based knowledge, and on the attainment of skills.

The intention of developing the materials and resources that have been the outcome of the work presented in this portfolio, is the hope that teachers and other professionals will be encouraged to reflect more on the (non-technical) ethical dimension of their teaching in a much more overt, systematic, and sensitive manner. Hopefully, they will be able to articulate their thinking and action processes more clearly, and justify their judgements and actions in a more comprehensive manner. A desired outcome is that early childhood
professionals will feel better able to satisfactorily deal with the dilemmas that continue to arise in their working lives. Use of the "Ethical Response Cycle", which is a new model for ethical analysis that consolidates and extends the work of previous authors to incorporate recognition of professionals' specialised knowledge, expertise and experience forms the core of this process. It helps teachers to overtly articulate a theoretical foundation for their judgements that is drawn from traditional Western philosophical positions. Use of this Cycle will help professionals to more easily resolve dilemmas, behave in an ethically justifiable manner and clearly articulate their ethical reasoning to their own profession, clients, and the wider community.

Currently, there is little empirical evidence to support the formalised teaching of ethics in teacher education courses, or to support the use of models of decision making. The "Ethical Response Cycle" was only developed towards the end of this project, and as yet, has not been formally applied and evaluated. Student pilot use however, has provided very positive feedback, and comments were incorporated into the re-design of the CD-ROM presented in this portfolio. The materials have been presented at many conferences (see Table 2), to early childhood educators, social workers, physiotherapists, ethicists and philosophers. Feedback has been uniformly and consistently positive. Suggestions to improve the materials have been incorporated. The materials produced in this portfolio form a solid base upon which to develop a research project to gather empirical evidence about early childhood (and other) professionals' personal and professional values, ethical behaviour, ethics related knowledge, skills and attitudes, and more specifically, ethical judgement using decision making models. Much more research in this area is needed, in a time where change is rapid, working lives and expectations have changed, and dilemmas are complex. I see the work in this portfolio as still only in an infancy of ethics related work, but as an extension on the considerable
efforts made by early childhood professionals in Australia, New Zealand and the United States. There are many possibilities for furthering the work. In the future, I, and others, need to continue to develop a solid body of research, and teaching and learning related work, that will continue and extend the reputation of early childhood professionals as concerned and caring, but also informed and active ethical professionals at the forefront of the education field.
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- Conference Presentation - CP
- International conference presentation – ICP
- Staff/Student Development – SD
- Teaching Resource Development - TRD

Organisation of Activities by number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Individual or Shared</th>
<th>Appendix No.</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. G</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Newman, L. &amp; Pollnitz, L. (1997). Awarded a $48,008 Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) grant by Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs to develop resources to facilitate the ethical decision making abilities of stakeholders in early childhood field experience.</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Newman took leading role in developing application. Pollnitz reviewed and offered suggestions. Major centre of project has always been UWS Nepean, under my coordination. The University of Newcastle, has not contributed other than Lois Pollnitz's own work.</td>
<td>7b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity Nos. 7, 8, & 9
Presentation: No. 18 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. POS</th>
<th>5. CPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Newman responded to call for papers and liaised with Editor. Newman principle for the Professional Precept Hall. Newman liaised and followed up with editor. Pollitt reviewed material and original ideas. Pollitt reviewed and made suggestions that were incorporated. | Published 2000 Conference Presentation Activity No. 17 | Conference Presentation Activity No. 20 | Publishing by AECA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Journal/Type</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Newman, L. &amp; Pollnitz, L.</td>
<td>Researcher reflections on the ethical dilemmas of ethics research: the making of a video about early childhood fieldwork dilemmas.</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Published in Journal for Australian Research in Early Childhood Education.</td>
<td>3g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Newman, L.</td>
<td>Review of Ethical judgment in Teaching by Karl Hostetler, in Educational Philosophy and Theory. 30(3), 318-320. ISSN 0013-1857.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Newman, L.</td>
<td>Professional Ethics: Confronting the hard issues for student teachers. Every Child. 4 (1), 16.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Authors and Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presentation Type</td>
<td>Title and Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Conference Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Presentation Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Conference Type</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location/Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source/Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location/Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Staff Development presentation for Department Of Community Service Advisers</td>
<td>Newman, L. (1998).</td>
<td>Professional Ethics in Focus. Invited to present workshop to Children’s Services Advisers, Department of Community Services, Campbelltown, September, 1998</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Presenter &amp; Publication Details</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity No. 12  
Appendix 3f |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newman contracted with film company, liaised on script development, advised on casting and shooting of video. Arranged shooting locations. Consulted on editing. Pollnitz gave review comments on script.</td>
<td>8a Pilot Video produced Appendix 8a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manual, shared work. CD-Rom initially developed by Newman with design company staff. Newman devised original storyboard and wrote necessary new material for script. Some material drawn from draft text. Pollnitz reviewed and consulted on version 2. Video shared work. Newman mainly liaised with film company.</td>
<td>8b To be distributed to Australian Universities under the terms of CUTSD Grant. Publication currently being sought by Linkwest, UWS Nepean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text Book</td>
<td>Newman, L &amp; Pollnitz, P. Draft text prepared for early childhood students in professional ethics.</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for structure - shared. Newman searched data bases and supplied new literature. Pollnitz drew on her previous thesis work and wrote first draft. Newman reviewed, and extended, then later re-structured. Newman incorporated feedback from Feeney, Clyde and EdD supervisors. Newman submitted proposal for publication to U.S. publisher following meeting suggested and arranged by Dr. Feeney. Newman wrote second draft.</td>
<td>Publication will be sought after publication of kit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE OF ETHICAL APPROACHES
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Table 4

A Comparison of Ethical Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Approach</th>
<th>Advocated by</th>
<th>Main Principles</th>
<th>For further reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socratic Ethics: Know thyself</td>
<td>Socrates (c469-399BC)</td>
<td>“The unexamined life is not worth living”. Humans have a purpose or function (teleological view). Morality is more than just obeying the law. Once we know who we are we will always know how to behave. Moral knowledge can not be taught, you have to discover it for yourself. The teachings of Socrates were not written down until his student, Plato, did so. The foundation of knowledge lies in the reason of human beings (rational). Socrates was a “philosopher” (one who loves wisdom). He did not take money for teaching, but believed that he knew very little. He was troubled by this and constantly strove to achieve true insight. He did not instruct people but gave the impression of desiring to learn from them by discussing and asking questions to show people the weakness in their arguments (discourse or Socratic dialogue).</td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Garret (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaarder, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Approach</td>
<td>Advocated by</td>
<td>Main Principles</td>
<td>For further reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Absolutism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Universal moral rules that are always true. Can legitimise one powerful culture imposing its own moral values on all others.</td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Garratt (1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is right or good is always relative to the particular circumstances and beliefs of a person. No objective or absolute standards. Don’t interfere with others’ cultures</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communitarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td>A principle always applies across cultures and generations. Ethics goes beyond local interests or cultural constraints to a standpoint that is paternal or universally valid.</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleological ethics</td>
<td>Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) Peter Singer</td>
<td>Calculate possible consequences of actions. Realising a particular goal (telos, end or purpose). Utilitarianism - maximise utility or happiness. “The greatest good for the greatest number”. May be used to exclude minorities. The highest pleasure lies in the desire for unity with others. Focuses on the results of the action rather than the motivation. Most modern day policy making is founded on this principle-what will do the greatest good for the greatest number. Critics argue that humans can’t accurately assess consequences and that this principle condones the sacrifice of the few for the advantage of the many. Seeing the narrative of one’s life as a continuing and connected series of events and people is to find order and purpose. Life is better when it is shaped by certain purposes and directed towards certain ends. A teleologist is one who is an active agent in designing and implementing a life-course.</td>
<td>Preston (1996) Robinson &amp; Garratt (1996) Kidder, (1995) Nash, (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue Theory</td>
<td>Aristotle MacIntyre</td>
<td>Centres on character or moral qualities of a person. Foster living well so that good and right behaviour becomes a habit. Doesn’t provide answers for dilemmas when virtues (honest, loyalty) conflict.</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontological Non-consequentialism</td>
<td>Imanuel Kant (1721-1804)</td>
<td>Decisions based on clear intrinsic view of what is right or duty rather than considering, or despite the consequences (deon-duty). Duty is absolute. Creating the standard that we want all others to obey from now on. Universal law of morality based on practical reason. Right is right intrinsically - no extrinsic justification needed. Often associated with religion. Base an action on a maxim that could be universalised (The Categorical Imperative - “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you”). Humans are rational beings. Good will is the motive that produces our determination to be good people, and our practical reason helps us get there. Not about outcomes of action, but obligations in performing it. Critics say it is too rigid and doesn’t allow for individuality or creativity.</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Approach</td>
<td>Advocated by</td>
<td>Main Principles</td>
<td>For further reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Contract Ethics,</td>
<td>Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679),</td>
<td>Society and ethics rest upon an implicit social contract - to live in society we must trade off some freedoms for social benefits. Agree to follow certain rules (don’t steal, don’t murder). Right to citizenship. Right to security. Little to say on the protection of the vulnerable. What social and legal agreements are necessary to produce a just society.</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractarianism, Justice</td>
<td>John Locke (1632-1704)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Garratt (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Rights</td>
<td>John Rawls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentialism</td>
<td>John Paul Sartre</td>
<td>People not born pre-determined, but make themselves into what they are. Personal bears sole responsibility for own actions. Choices directed by own free will.</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Care</td>
<td>Gilligan, Noddings, mainly</td>
<td>Maintain human connectedness, stress the importance of context and situational demands. Responses emphasise the moral sentiments of nuture and care. Women reason differently about moral dilemmas. Care about the others involved and put ourselves in their shoes. The “golden rule” – do unto others…Reversibility-put yourself in another’s shoes. Critics say it is too simplistic to be a supreme moral principle.</td>
<td>Preston (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-Based Thinking</td>
<td>feminist writers. Martha Nussbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Garratt (1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Post Modernism | Jean Freud  
|               | Francois Lyotard  
|               | Jaques Derrida | Post war disillusion and uncertainty. Change from the problems of knowledge to the problems of meaning. Increased ethical scepticism and uncertainty. Celebration of "relativism". Postmodern intellectuals should now adopt a playful distrust of large scale moral truths and Utopian visions and cultivate an ironically detached attitude towards all human beliefs, including their own. Should be wary of philosophers and politicians who claim that grand moral truths exist and that they personally have some kind of access to them. Linked with existentialism, poststructuralism, and deconstructionism. Unchecked, can lead to extreme relativism and subjectivism. | Preston  
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ABSTRACT

The place of ethics in the professions is often unquestioned. What is not so clear is the awareness of early childhood students about ethical issues and their contribution to ethical practice. The New South Wales Early Childhood Practicum Council has developed 'Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience' on the premise that there is insufficient awareness amongst early childhood education stakeholders about how to deal with ethical concerns. This paper reports on a survey of students that examines student experiences and perceptions of ethical dilemmas in the practicum. The survey sought to establish a level of student awareness of the existence of the Australian Early Childhood Association's Code of Ethics, what constitutes ethics, some examples of the students' perceptions of ethical dilemmas they encountered in the practicum and their ability to respond. The paper suggests action and strategies which can be taken within teacher preparation courses for the development of strategies to facilitate ethical practice in the practicum.

INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses four aspects of discussion about ethics and the practicum. First, it contextualises the discussion about ethics within the realms of the professional. Second, it considers ethics within the narrower field of education and the practicum. Third, it will present the results of a survey of early childhood education students undertaken during 1995 before considering the final aspect of suggesting action and strategies to facilitate ethical practice in the practicum in light of practicum stakeholders.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Ethics or ethical behaviour encompasses a range of values relating to morality and 'proper' conduct. Although the general idea of ethical practice is acknowledged within a range of professions, the same Code of Ethics would not be appropriate for medics, legal professionals, architects, accountants and teachers. The constitution of ethical conduct is a construction of morality based on the cultural and professional biases of those in positions of power. These biases then become the accepted norms of behaviour—ethical standards.

The notion of ethics is never unproblematic. Because what constitutes ethical behaviour is context-specific, it is difficult to define. For example, it would be considered to be unethical behaviour if medical practitioners were to advertise as medical practitioners. On the other hand, they are quite at liberty to advertise their services as lay marriage celebrants or tutors for HSC students in maths or physics. Thus, to advertise is not in itself regarded as unethical behaviour, except within particular constraints, and it is within the purview of professional
organisations to determine which constraints, and what ethical principles, apply within a particular profession.

Given the number of professions and trades which have actively pursued the development and implementation of codes of ethics, it seems reasonable to assume that such codes are seen as important symbols that indicate: externally, for public consumption, that the association or group to which the workers belong is one that values morality and integrity; and, internally, that the association has a prescribed standard of acceptable behaviour which also serves as a validation for disciplinary action against non-conformity. Coady (1994), presents some degree of cynicism in pointing out that the past record of many professions in enforcing their codes of ethics is not reassuring, leading many to believe that such codes provide a veneer of professional commitment to hide incompetence and malpractice behind a collective wall of secrecy justified by the principle of confidentiality (Coady, 1994:5).

It is not the purpose of this paper to problematise ethics to any grand extent, rather the discussion thus far serves as a caveat to that which follows — a reminder that each of the groups of stakeholders within education will have a slightly different view of ethics from each other. And each view will be determined by the biases each group has about what is important, moral and right.

ETHICS IN EDUCATION

The role, application and evaluation of ethics and ethical standards in education have received a deal of attention in the literature (Bredekamp & Willer, 1993; Katz, 1993; Strike & Temasky, 1993; Poplin & Ebert, 1993; Smith, 1994; Sottile, 1994; Hatch, 1995). Katz (1993) indicates that a code of ethics is one of eight characteristics of a profession and uses these characteristics to consider the professionalism of early childhood education.

Sottile (1994), for example, points to the lack of preparation of teachers to deal with situations involving ethical decision-making. He found that the teachers he surveyed indicated that the three most common types of ethical dilemmas they experienced related to psychological (emotional) abuse, confidentiality, and physical abuse. On the other hand, Poplin and Ebert (1993) discuss the perceptions of parents that the moral and ethical stand taken by teachers might well undermine that which is part of the family culture.

The almost inevitable concomitant of teachers dealing with the subjective nature of morals and ethics in the classroom is the moral dilemma. Katz (1992) defines the dilemma as a predicament wherein there is a choice between alternative courses of action and the selection of one of the alternatives sacrifices the advantages that might accrue from a different selection. She continues:

*It is assumed further, that each of the two ‘horns’ of the dilemma, A and B, carry with them their own errors; alternative A involves certain errors as does alternative B; error-free alternatives are not really available. In principle, each of the available alternatives involves ‘a choice of error’. Thus part of our task is to determine which error is preferred in each predicament.* (Katz, 1992:165)

Such choices confront students during their practicum sessions. To facilitate early childhood teacher’s preparation, information is needed about students’ experiences of decision-making in situations of ethical dilemma. Thus, the survey that is reported on here sought to consider students’ views about their recent practicum sessions.

THE SURVEY

In July/August 1995, 179 students enrolled in early childhood teacher education programs at Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga and University of Western Sydney, Nepean were surveyed by means of a written questionnaire. Fifty-four (30%) of the respondents were first year students, 50 (28%) were in their second year, and 75 (42%) were third year students.
Eighteen of the students (10%) were studying at CSU. The survey instrument comprised 12 questions intended to elicit information in relation to the students’ knowledge about the existence of codes of ethics, their understandings about such codes and their experiences with ethical dilemmas during their practicum sessions. The purpose of the survey at this time was as a ‘pilot’ to provide some foundation data from which the determination could be made to proceed with a more extensive piece of research. The inherent difficulties of relying on one-shot, question and response surveys were recognised. There was some attempt to offset these difficulties by encouraging short, written responses as well as including Likert-type rankings. Quantitative responses were analysed according to students’ year of study using Chi Square and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques.

Briefly, 171 of the students were able to provide a response to the question, ‘What is a code of ethics?’ Chi Square analyses indicated no relationship between year of course and knowledge of the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) Code of Ethics, possibly indicating that students are introduced to the Code of Ethics at the beginning of their respective course in the universities studied. Students’ responses to what constituted a code of ethics were categorised into four areas: professionalism; guidelines, standards and structures; beliefs, values and attitudes; and, behaviours and practices. These categorisations arose from the data and were not predetermined. Ten ‘professions’ were nominated by students as having codes of ethics, with the most predominant one being teaching (56%) followed by medicine (29%). Hairdressing and real estate were included. Examples of the responses from the students which were included in each of the categorisations were:

**Professionalism:**

Statements which bind a profession together. Ethics are sort of a law by which you should abide, believe and understand.

A list of the expectations of a professional in their field. Thus, what is expected of them, the roles they have and their responsibilities.

A set of norms, values, protocols etc. that members of a profession subscribe to.

Our professional responsibility towards the children, parents, colleagues and the community.

A summary of information relevant to a particular profession that outlines suitable or acceptable practice while working within that profession on a daily basis, based on professional community beliefs.

**Guidelines, standards and structures:**

A set of rules to protect the rights of others.

A code of ethics is a ‘code’ which we follow. It provides a standard or guideline—may or may not be signed.

A set of statements of ‘advice’ that a certain profession may use as a guideline to issues relating to work.

A set of guidelines owned and designed by professionals to ensure continuity and quality in all areas of their work. Beliefs, values and attitudes.

**Beliefs, values and attitudes**

Beliefs and moral compromises.

A code of ethics is not really a philosophy but a set of beliefs shared by a group.
Personal beliefs and values that influence your behaviour in daily interactions.

It is a set of comments about appropriate behaviour relating to self and others.

A set of morals, beliefs and values that people in a certain profession should adhere to.

Behaviours and practices

A list of ethical practices and behaviours which must be used and practised by the early childhood professional at all times.

A statement of the expected behaviours that will occur within a centre. The centre usually devises the ethics themselves.

As the responses above might indicate, there were overlaps into two or more of the categorisations, so it was not possible to specify the number of responses exclusive to each category, nor even those which might be generally included in the category. It was noted, however, that a majority of responses alluded to the notion of ‘Guidelines, standards and structures’. There was only the occasional reference to issues of moral conduct though this concept might well have been an implicit understanding within the students’ conceptions about beliefs and values or behaviours and practices.

There seemed to be the general expectation that codes of ethics were imposed from beyond the day-to-day lives of the practitioners and that there was little sense of ownership of what was contained within such codes and limited consideration of the students’ own moral and ethical stance. Similarly, there appeared to be scant understanding that codes might allow for autonomous action and critically reflective practice. Eleven students either could not, or chose not to, nominate a profession that had a code of ethics, although only two students were unaware of the existence of the AECA Code of Ethics.

More than two-thirds of the students reported that they had witnessed three or more situations of ethical dilemma while on practicum placements. (See Figure 1)

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 1:** Responses to the question, ‘How many situations involving ethical dilemmas have you been in since you commenced this course?’

The dilemmas that were described indicated some confusion in understanding the difference between ethical dilemmas and the observation of poor practice though some did suggest that the choices that confronted them when being drawn into, or observing, poor practice was the source of the dilemma. Examples of observations of poor practice rather than ethical dilemmas, *per se*, included:

* On prac I was asked to change a baby without wearing gloves.
* Staff not keeping developmental records.
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Comments which 'created' dilemmas from observations of such practice were exemplified in the following terms:

* When I was an assistant in a 0–3's room and the materials given to the babies were developmentally inappropriate. My dilemma was, should I mention this to the teacher or not.

Several of the stories provided by the students seemed to include an implicit, if unarticulated, query of 'Should I mention it?'; 'Should I intervene?'; 'Should I report it to someone else?'. And where this can be read into their reports, the dilemmas as they saw them became quite clear. The short descriptions of the professional ethical dilemmas the students had faced were coded into three categories: interactions and practices; abuse; and supervision of students. Again, it was difficult to code responses into discreet categories. It is arguable that those descriptions relating to abuse could similarly have been coded for interactions and practices and so on. Examples of the coded data for each of the categories included:

Interactions and practices

This category of data included those issues relating to confidentiality, staff interactions and staff relationships with parents.

An assistant roughly manhandled (sic) a child who was suffering from separation anxiety. The assistant was abusive both physically and verbally. The mother of the child happened to have observed the incident and withdrew her child from care. The assistant declared she had done nothing wrong and had the support of the rest of the staff. But I was in a situation of being the middle man. I saw what the mother saw, but was expected to take the defence of the assistant.

The Director of a centre told a boy that home corner was only for girls and that he should do something else.

A carer who was comparing two children and their skills to do puzzles.

A parent wanted to know about another child's progress and as a student, also as a professional, it was not my position to speak or reveal any confidential information.

A parent told me to hit his children when they are misbehaving and since I wouldn't, he questioned what kind of caregiver I was for not hitting the children to make them do the right thing.

Staff bitching about other staff in front of me and asking my opinion about them.

Abuse

The category of 'abuse' included those incidents which related to the perceived physical or emotional abuse of children.

In a small group situation, a child was singled out, pulled up by his arm and made to stand in the corner while the teacher yelled at him in front of the other children.

I did not believe in the way the children were criticised or put down by the teachers. These children that were from different cultures or backgrounds were particular targets. The teachers continued the judgments, jokes and their comments to me and expected me to feel the same and to treat the children in the same way.
At a day care centre one staff member told off a child in a way that was quite unpleasant in front of other staff members and all other children and then locked him in a baby chair. But the child wasn’t a baby, he was nearly three. Everyone there was told not to communicate with him.

A child being grabbed, dragged by the arm and sat on a ‘naughty chair’.

Situation such as when a child has done something inappropriate for their age, for example wet pants. Teacher scolds child and says they should know better and tells them that they are behaving like a baby.

Insisting that a distressed child (under 2) wait 40 minutes for her bottle. She was constantly crying and asking for it, but had to wait for morning tea.

Supervision of students

In terms of the supervision of students, there were examples reported where the students felt that they were put in an invidious position because they were left to cope on their own.

Being left alone by teachers in the nappy room with two babies on first year prac. I did not feel happy about this or trained enough to handle this situation.

Being left alone in the classroom with children.

I was asked to sit with a group of children during morning tea. This was my first visit and I was not sure of what they expected of me. I asked the children to sit down and one child wasn’t doing what I said. I asked nicely and then told him. He had a piece of fruit in his mouth and spat it at me. Another teacher came over and took him away.

A group of 3–4-year-old boys kept on swearing at me and other children. At first I was shocked as I didn’t know how to deal with it. I felt all I could say was that ‘that sort of language isn’t used here at daycare’. However, they kept on saying, ‘You stupid, fucking slut!’

From this brief selection of responses, it is clear that students are exposed to a range of situations which cause them to be concerned while they are undertaking professional experience in schools and centres. The final four questions on the survey were used to garner some information about the students’ self-rankings of how confident they felt in the situations they described, how well they felt they had handled it, how confident they would now feel about handling the situation and finally how well-prepared they feel to handle such ethical dilemmas in the work situation when they are teachers. These results are summarised in figures 2–4 below. The ranking codes for each of the tables are: 1=not at all; 2=limited; 3=developing; 4=quite; and, 5=very.

![Figure 2: How confident did you feel about knowing what to do in this situation? (*32 cases missing)](image)
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques indicated that students’ perception of their knowledge of what to do was correlated with the year of their course (0.06, p<0.07), suggesting that students’ perceptions of their own ability to handle dilemmas appropriately increases as they progress through their course.

![Figure 3:](image)

How prepared do you now feel about your ability to handle difficult ethical situations when you are out on field experience?

(*14 cases missing)

ANOVA techniques again revealed that students’ perceptions of their current ability to handle dilemmas in field experiences was highly correlated with the year of their course (0.002, p<0.005). Similar to the students’ perception of knowledge of what to do, students felt that their ability to apply the knowledge to appropriate action increased as they progressed through their course.

![Figure 4:](image)

How prepared do you now feel about your ability to handle difficult ethical situations when you commence work?

(*15 cases missing)

Similar to the previous analyses, students felt more confident about their future ability to handle dilemmas after graduation, as they proceeded through their early childhood courses.

Data analysis indicated a firm ambivalence on the part of the students regarding their confidence in relation to situations involving ethical dilemmas. However, analyses revealed that the level of confidence amongst the students increased according to their succeeding years of study.

**STRATEGIES**

It is not possible to ensure that students are placed only in ‘sanitised’ practicum situations, thus it becomes the responsibility of the teacher preparation institution to advise students
about some of the dilemmas they might experience and to assist them with strategies to cope, and perhaps, to institute change. This final section of the paper attempts to offer some strategies in this vein.

Currently, there are several projects underway to facilitate students’ and other stakeholders’ understanding and practice of ethical behaviours during early childhood fieldwork experiences.

At this point it is necessary to differentiate between those guidelines which relate to general codes of conduct such as the AECA Code of Ethics and the Code of Ethical Conduct of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and those which relate specifically to ethics in the practicum: Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience developed by the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales.

The ‘Guidelines’ developed by the Practicum Council did not evolve in isolation from the AECA code but rather as an adjunct to it with a specific focus on the particular situations which present themselves in the practicum. The ‘Guidelines’ consider the responsibilities for ethical practice that are applicable to the tertiary institution, the student, the professional colleague and the centre/school and inform each about the expectations held for them and what they might expect of other stakeholders. The strategies which can be employed to introduce the ‘Guidelines’ to each of the stakeholder groups include information seminars within the university setting and inservice sessions for staff either in individual settings or group inservices which include a number of settings at a time. In developing such strategies, care must be taken to avoid a metropolitan model of information dissemination to ensure the involvement of staff and students in rural and remote locations. The production of a video-recording of examples and discussion topics which is presently in production by members of the Practicum Council will assist in overcoming a little of the tyranny of distance and will also assist as a teaching tool in the preparation of students for the practicum. The ‘Guidelines’ and video will assist in individual or group preparation of students for field experiences.

Further strategies could involve the encouragement of universities to include the ‘Guidelines’ within practicum handbooks to ensure dissemination to all cooperating colleagues involved in any given practicum session. This strategy would allow the ‘Guidelines’ to be available for quick reference during the practicum and provide a focus for debriefing by both staff and students following the practicum session.

CONCLUSION

The results of the survey that was reported on here indicated that students appear to need some direction in firstly determining what constitutes an ethical decision-making situation and secondly, knowing how to deal with it. It is the responsibility of the institution that is preparing students for the early childhood work force to ensure this preparation is as thorough as possible. This would mean inclusion of the study of ethics within professional education subjects. The Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience provides one source for such professional development. Others to be included would be the AECA Code of Ethics as well as consideration of various resource publications which direct attention to the understanding and implementation of ethical guidelines (Fasoli & Woodrow; NAEYC, 1994)
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Learning in Early Childhood Centres

3 "Would you like to pack away now?": Improving the Quality of Talk in Early Childhood Programs
Laurie Makin
The way teachers talk to children can influence their learning. This paper explores features of quality talk in early childhood centres, and discusses how quality can be documented.

9 Persistence when it's difficult: A disposition to learn for early childhood
Margaret Carr
Being ready, willing, and able to learn are important attributes for four-year-olds. Can early childhood centres encourage persistence?

13 Emergent Literacy in Kindergartens
Claire J. McLachlan-Smith and Alison St. George
Many centres use valuable display space for notices to parents, rather than displaying children's writing. This study of New Zealand kindergartens gives insight into the kinds of environments which help children get ready for literacy.

Parents and Families

19 Quality childcare: Do parents choose it?
Anne B. Smith and Shamer I. Barnaclough
A study of 100 childcare centres shows that many parents make passive choices of centres rather than actively choosing between alternatives. Parent choice is not currently a viable means of controlling quality and policy makers need to look at other mechanisms.

23 The technical language children use at home
Marilyn Fleer
Technology education is a key learning area, yet very little is known about how young children should be involved in a technology curriculum. This paper reports on the mismatch between curriculum planning and young children's home experiences.

29 Anaau Ako Pasifika: A home-based early childhood project for Pacific Islands families in Aotearoa/New Zealand
Diane Mara
This innovative programme for Pacific Islands families in New Zealand shows that parents are offering more than they realise to their children. When encouraged to use their first language while playing, singing, and reading with their children, parents are not only passing on their language, but also affirming its cultural relevance.

Policy and Practice Issues

33 Good practice to best practice: extending policies and children's minds
Anne Moate
The positive changes in early childhood education policy in New Zealand in the late 1980s occurred largely as a result of enough people coming together to speak with one voice for the sector. When the webs created by policy makers join with the webs of scholars and webs of thinking teachers, the children's learning will be supported and improved.

41 Te kohanga reo: More than a language nest
Anapera Royal Tangare
Kohanga reo is a movement which can and has moved government into a legitimisation crisis. It is a movement of Maori people who believe in the rightness of the culture, the language, traditions, and values.

48 Ethical quandaries for neophyte early childhood practitioners
Kenese Coombe and Linda Newman
How are professional ethics considered when preparing early childhood teacher education students for their practicum? Are students aware of the difference between an ethical dilemma and poor teaching practice? And do they know how to deal with either?

Transition to School

53 Factors impacting on children's adjustment to the first year of school
Key Margrett
Starting school is a period of transition and adjustment as children move from early childhood centres or home to the school environment. How well children make this transition can be a critical factor for children's adjustment to the demands of the school environment and in determining future school success.
INTRODUCTION

Neophyte practitioners or “trainee teachers” in early childhood education are faced with a myriad of concerns and issues in relation to the practice of the profession when they attend practicum placements or sections. This paper considers the role of professional ethics and ethical standards in the conduct of professions and reports on a survey of students which examines student experiences and perceptions of ethical dilemmas in the practicum. Some examples of the students’ perceptions of ethical dilemmas they encountered in the practicum and their ability to respond are presented. The paper also suggests actions that may be taken within teacher preparation courses for the development of strategies to assist neophytes to resolve the quandaries they face.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

The authors have pointed out elsewhere that the constitution of ethical conduct is a construction of morality based on the cultural and professional biases of those in positions of power. Such biases are then taken to be the accepted norms of behaviour, the ethical standards. The notion of ethics is never unproblematic. Because what constitutes ethical behaviour is context-specific, it is difficult to define. Thus when authors such as Annis (1989) attempt to define ethics, there remains the need to contextualise the definition in terms of who decides what is “good” or “bad” and by whose values and criteria. Annis suggests that:

Ethics deals with what acts are morally right or wrong, what our moral obligations are, what the conditions are under which we are morally responsible for our acts, what moral rules or principles are justified, what traits or dispositions are morally good or bad, that is, virtues or vices, what things are desirable from a moral point of view, and related issues. Professional ethics deals with the same issues only it examines them in terms of one’s professional role or the role of a profession in society, for example, what acts are right or wrong given one’s professional role, what are one’s professional obligations etc.

Liang, Schuen and Neher (1996) point out that the concept of professional ethics:

... represents the impact of spiritual power such as values, mindset and morals on the practitioner’s operations. It is the criteria [sic] to which the practitioners refer when they wish to justify a decision. Professional ethics are objectively regulated by system rules such as laws, formal guidelines and societal norms, and are subjectively bounded by personal values.

The notion of professional ethics being “objectively regulated” is itself debatable. Instead the interpretation of what is considered to be ethical conduct needs to be contextualised to a specific group or even a specific situation at a particular point in time. It is expressly the inability of ethics to be objectively regulated which gives rise to “ethical dilemmas”.

ETHICAL DILEMMAS

Katz (1992) defines the dilemma as a predicament wherein there is a choice between alternative courses of action and the selection of one of the alternatives sacrifices the advantages that offered by a different selection. She continues:

It is assumed further, that each of the two “horns” of the dilemma, A and B, carry with them their own errors; alternative A involves certain errors as does alternative B; error-free alternatives are not really available. In principle, each of the available alternatives involves “a choice of error”. Thus part of our task is to determine which error is preferred in each predicament.

Such dilemmas arise frequently for those who are drawn into teaching although Sottile (1994) points out that teachers generally have little preparation for dealing with these issues. For students who do not have the benefit of several years of teaching experience the choices may appear more like traps for the unwary. The survey reported here sought information about early childhood education students’ experiences of decision making in situations of dilemma while they were on practicum placements. The purpose of the survey at this time was as a “pilot” to provide some foundation data from which a determination could be made to proceed with a more extensive piece of research.

THE SURVEY

In July and August 1995, 179 students enrolled in early childhood teacher education programs through Charles Sturt University (CSU), at Wagga Wagga in New South Wales and the University of Western Sydney, Nepean (UWS) were surveyed by means of a written questionnaire. Fifty-four of the respondents were first-year students, 50 were in their second year, and 75 were third-year-students, 18 of whom were studying at CSU. The survey instrument comprised 12 questions intended to elicit information in relation to the students’ knowledge about the existence of codes of ethics, their understandings about such codes, and their experiences with ethical dilemmas during their practicum sessions.

Student responses revealed that the understandings students had of what
A code of ethics is not really a philosophy but a set of beliefs shared by a group. Personal beliefs and values that influence your behaviour in daily interactions. A set of morals, beliefs, and values that people in a certain profession should adhere to.

BEHAVIOURS AND PRACTICES
A code of ethics is a set of statements about appropriate and expected behaviours of members of a professional group. Conduct, a summary of correct things to do.
A list of ethical practices and behaviours which must be used and practised by the early childhood professional at all times. A statement of the expected behaviours that will occur within a centre. The centre usually devises the ethics themselves.
As the responses above might indicate, the responses provided overlapped into two or more of the categorisations, so it was not possible to specify the number of responses exclusive to each category nor even those that might be generally included in the category.

It was noted however that a majority of responses alluded to the notion of "Guidelines, standards, and structures". There was only the occasional reference to issues of moral conduct though this concept might well have been an implicit understanding within the students' conceptions about beliefs and values or behaviours and practices. As the authors have noted elsewhere there seemed to be the general expectation that codes of ethics were imposed from beyond the day-to-day lives of the practitioners and that there was little sense of ownership of what was contained within such codes and limited consideration of the students' own moral and ethical stance. Similarly, there appeared to be scant understanding that codes might allow for autonomous action and critically reflective practice.

More than two-thirds of the students reported that they had witnessed three or more situations of ethical dilemma while on practicum placements with the largest group, 25 percent, reporting that they had observed six ethical dilemmas since they had begun their course of study at their tertiary institution. The dilemmas that were described, however, indicated some confusion in understanding the difference between ethical dilemmas and the observation of poor practice though some did suggest that the choices that confronted them when being drawn into, or observing, poor practice was the source of the dilemma.

Examples of observations of poor practice rather than ethical dilemmas per se included:
On prac I was asked to change a baby without wearing gloves.

Staff not keeping developmental records.

An example of a comment which "created" a dilemma from observations of such practice was reported thus:

When I was an assistant in a 0-3; room and the materials given to the babies were developmentally inappropriate. My dilemma was, should I mention this to the teacher or not?

Several of the stories provided by the students seemed to include an implicit, if unarticulated, query of "Should I mention it?"; "Should I intervene?"; "Should I report it to someone else?"

The short descriptions of the professional ethical dilemmas the students had faced were loosely coded into three categories of indicators: interactions and practices, abuse, and supervision of students.

Again, it was difficult to code responses into discrete categories. It is arguable that those descriptions relating to abuse could similarly have been coded for interactions and practices and so on. Examples of the coded data for each of the categories included:

INTERACTIONS AND PRACTICES
This category of data included those issues relating to confidentiality, staff interactions, and staff relationships with parents.

A parent told me to hit his children when they are misbehaving and since I wouldn't, he questioned what kind of caregiver I was for not hitting the children to make them do the right thing.

At my prac-school, I had first class (six-year-olds) and I was teaching and a girl
had written something in her book (I think we were doing story-writing) and she showed the teacher. The teacher said her writing was terrible, ripped the page out of the book and told her to rewrite it again. I did not agree with what was done.

An assistant roughly manhandled [sic] a child who was suffering from separation anxiety. The assistant was abusive both physically and verbally. The mother of the child happened to have observed the incident and withdrew her child from care. The assistant declared she had done nothing wrong and had the support of the rest of the staff. But I was in a situation of being the middle man. I saw what the mother saw, but was expected to take the defence of the assistant.

The director of a centre told a boy that the home corner was only for girls and that he should do something else.

A parent wanted to know about another child’s progress and as a student, also as a professional, it was not my position to reveal any confidential information.

Staff bitching about other staff in front of me and asking my opinion about them.

ABUSE

The category of “abuse” included those incidents which related to the perceived physical or emotional abuse of children.

In a small group situation, a child was singled out, pulled up by his arm and made to stand in the corner while the teacher yelled at him in front of the other children.

During rest time, one of the relief staff held a child upside down by his leg until he said he would sleep.

I did not believe in the way the children were criticized or put down by the teachers. Those children who were from different cultures or backgrounds were particular targets. The teachers continued the judgments, jokes, and their comments to me and expected me to feel the same and to treat the children in the same way.

At a daycare centre one staff member told off a child in a way that was quite unpleasant in front of other staff members and all other children and then locked him in a baby chair. But the child wasn’t a baby, he was nearly three. Everyone there was told not to communicate with him.

Insisting that a distressed child (under two years of age) wait 40 minutes for her bottle. She was constantly crying and asking for it, but had to wait for morning tea.

SUPERVISION OF STUDENTS

In terms of the supervision of students, there were examples reported where the students felt that they were put in an invidious position because they were left to cope on their own.

Being left alone by teachers in the nappy room with two babies on first year prac. I did not feel happy about this or trained enough to handle this situation.

Being left alone in the classroom with children.

I was asked to sit with a group of children during morning tea. This was my first visit and I was not sure of what they expected of me. I asked the children to sit down and one child wasn’t doing what I said. I asked nicely and then told him. He had a piece of fruit in his mouth and spat it at me. Another teacher came over and took him away.

A group of three- and four-year-old boys kept on swearing at me and other children. At first I was shocked as I didn’t know how to deal with it. I felt all I could say was that “that sort of language isn’t used here at daycare”. However, they kept on saying, “You stupid, fucking slut!”

It is clear that students are exposed to a range of situations which cause them to be concerned while they are undertaking professional experience in schools and centres. The final questions on the survey were used to garner some information about the students’ self-rankings of how confident they felt about knowing what to do in the situations they described, how confident they would now feel about handling the situation, and finally how well-prepared they feel to deal with such ethical dilemmas in the work situation when they are teachers.

When asked how confident they felt about knowing what to do when they were faced with a quandary, or practical dilemma, the largest group of respondents (35.4 percent) indicated that their confidence was limited. When these students were combined with those who felt no confidence at all in dealing with the situations, the size of the “lacking in confidence group” grew to 47 percent. The remainder of the responses to this question were spread across those who felt their confidence was developing (34 percent) and those who felt quite confident or very confident (19 percent).

The perceptions of confidence grew over the two subsequent questions. The first of these sought to discover how confident the students felt “now” about how to deal with ethical situations during field experiences. Here, 27 percent responded that they were quite confident or very confident and 45 percent felt that their confidence was continuing to develop.

Finally, there seemed to be much more confidence across the group in response to the question, “How prepared do you feel about your ability to handle difficult ethical situations when you commence work?” Only 16 percent of students still felt that their confidence level was limited or below, while 47 percent reported that their confidence was developing and 36 percent believed that they would be quite or very confident in their ability to handle the situation.

The raw appearance of this data indicates a firm ambivalence on the part of the students regarding their confidence in relation to situations involving dilemmas. However a preliminary statistical analysis revealed that the level of confidence amongst the students increased according to their succeeding years of study and their exposure to what was regarded as acceptable forms of professional practice.
STRAATEGIES

Codes of ethics or codes of practice are often seen as valuable attributes of professions or trades groups because they encourage positive public perceptions or because they mandate conformity to one form of behaviour. Similarly the concern remains that such codes may be ideologically driven and effectively undermine the rights and responsibilities of professional practitioners to act autonomously in response to a particular situational context.

Unlike some other professional groups like medics and architects, for instance, the right to practise as a professional in early childhood education is dictated by levels of formal qualifications held rather than by sworn adherence to a code of ethics. This situation seems to hold little disadvantage when Coady's rejoinder is considered. Coady (1994) points out that:

The past record of many professions in enforcing their codes of ethics is not reassuring, leading many to believe that such codes provide a veneer of professional commitment to hide incompetence and malpractice behind a collective wall of secrecy justified by the principle of confidentiality.

It is thus incumbent upon the institutions preparing practitioners for the early childhood sector to ensure that their graduates have a clear understanding of ethical practices rather than shifting responsibility to the application of such codes.

There needs to be some differentiation between those guidelines which relate to general codes of practice in early childhood settings (such as the Australian Early Childhood Association's (AECA) Code of Ethics and the Code of Ethical Conduct of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)) and those which relate specifically to ethics in the practicum, Guidelines for Ethical Practice in the Practicum developed by the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales.

The Guidelines were developed by the Practicum Council with a specific focus on the particular responsibilities and situations which present themselves in the practicum and evolved as an adjunct to the AECA Code of Ethics. As with the AECA Code, the Guidelines are not enforceable through sanctions, however, they clearly address those responsibilities for ethical practice that are applicable to the tertiary institution, the student, the professional colleague, and the centre or school and inform each about the expectations held for them and what they might expect of other stakeholders.

Nichols and Owens (1995) are mindful of three basic motivations which draw people into teaching. They summarise these underlying orientations as: "a sense of calling, a service ethic, and a perceived legitimacy of teaching responsibilities". In the practicum, then, the centrality of the safety and well-being of the child in the setting remains unchallenged, but the vulnerable figure of the neophyte practitioner is added. The sense of calling, integrity, and developing skills of these "trainees" also need to be nurtured and protected.

A primary concern in preparing students to meet the challenges of the practicum should be ensuring that students and co-operating staff are aware of what the profession as a whole regards as acceptable practice. This could be addressed by encouraging tertiary institutions to include the Guidelines for Ethical Practice within practicum handbooks to ensure dissemination to all co-operating colleagues involved in any given practicum session. This strategy would allow the Guidelines to be available as part of any pre-practicum conference that occurred between the student, co-operating staff, and tertiary institution liaison personnel as well as for quick reference during the practicum. It would also provide a focus for debriefing by both staff and students following the practicum session.

The Guidelines largely reflect what Strike (1995) refers to as the "public language ... of a morally pluralistic society". He points out that such a language would have three sublanguages which educators use to communicate in terms of public education:

- a rights language—"talk competently about due process, equal opportunity, privacy, and democracy";
- a language of caring or nurturance—because learners "have needs and projects that must be respected, [the learners] need to grow and mature"; and
- a language of integrity about subject matter—"teachers need to respect evidence and argument, they need to respect values internal to their subject matters, they need an ethic appropriate to the life of the mind and the pursuit of truth".

Strike also suggests that thinking about relating notions of ethics to learners in terms of a language "also allows us to connect instruction in ethics to important points about how people learn to see and interpret their worlds". When this is overlaid on the day-to-day work experiences of practitioners, instruction incorporating the need to consider ethical outcomes in their practice assists practitioners to be more reflective about their own needs and/or any preconceptions which they hold.

The strategies which can be employed to introduce the Guidelines to each of the stakeholder groups include information seminars within the tertiary setting and inservice sessions for staff either in individual settings or group inservices which include staff from a number of settings at a time. Such strategies could be supported by consideration of various resource publications which direct attention to the understanding and implementation of ethical guidelines.

In developing and implementing inservice strategies, care must be taken to avoid a wholly metropolitan model of...
CONCLUSION

The social and moral contexts of teaching are never stagnant. For this reason codes of ethics and guidelines for ethical practice should remain as guidelines. Primary responsibility to prepare graduates who will practise ethically in early childhood education is firmly within the purview of tertiary institutions. The secondary responsibility for ensuring continuing ethical practice rests with the profession of early childhood educators at large.

Those who have been well-prepared in early childhood education should feel confident to make autonomous ethical decisions in response to the particular temporal and social contexts of the moment. They need to be sure in the knowledge that they are able to act in the best interests of the child or children in their care. A set of hard and fast rules cannot cover every contingency faced by the practitioner and thus is more likely to create confusion and consternation. On the other hand, a set of guidelines to ethical practice can prove to be an invaluable aid.
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Abstract

In Australia in recent years, as in other countries, there has been media attention to, and public interest in, the ethical and proper behavior of people considered to be leaders in society. Some have been “caught out” for acting unethically - harming children, engaging in corruption, disregarding human rights and dignity. The time is right for educators, researchers and authors to demonstrate leadership in ethics by focusing on morals and ethics more strongly and overtly.

The teaching profession has not escaped scrutiny and criticism of their ethical practice. Members of the early childhood sector of the profession however, have demonstrated proactive leadership in ethics. In Australia, for example, a code of ethics and supporting materials were developed and leaders continue to develop supporting resources. This paper focuses on the professional preparation of the next generation of early childhood teachers. It has two primary purposes. Firstly, I raise questions about current notions of student teacher preparation for ethical practice in complex, changing contexts. Secondly I propose some ideas aimed at better preparing student teachers for ethical judgment.
Introduction

In Australia, early childhood student teachers become qualified to work in schools and in early childhood services for children 0-5 years old. Professionalism, of the highest standard, is a critical consideration in their teacher preparation courses and later practice. In this article, one important aspect of professional preparation, the notion of ethical professionalism, is discussed. I contend that ethical professionalism involves the development of a sound ethical identity, that is, a sense of the professional self that includes the confidence and the competence to make sound and sensitive ethical judgements. Ethical judgement is complex, involving greater reflection and prioritisation of conflicting values than decision-making which involves a clear choice between alternatives. Issues surrounding preparation for, and the practice of, ethical judgement are multidimensional, particularly in the rapidly changing socio-political climates we currently experience. The concerns that I raise here relate primarily to ethical issues for student teachers undertaking fieldwork in early childhood services, but certainly have relevance to all early childhood settings, including schools. Further, students undertaking other professional preparation programs, not only those who will become teachers, face similar issues. Early childhood professionals can also learn from, and contribute to, the development of ethical professionalism in other professions. I contend that the educators of new generations of professionals need to address two aspects of professional ethics preparation in their courses. Firstly, they should be aware of issues arising from social and political changes in the current professional contexts where fieldwork takes place, and the ensuing ethical implications. Arising from this awareness springs the need to be proactive about updating courses to better prepare students, (who will later become the practicing professionals), to respond ethically in problematic situations.

Understanding the context of professional preparation fieldwork

Most people would imagine early childhood fieldwork programs to take place in safe, nurturing, positive environments where student teachers are somewhat protected from
the “harsh daily realities” of daily teaching and management. With a supportive and experienced cooperating teacher, students, one would imagine, should be in the ideal environment to feel secure, learn, experiment and develop their attitudes, skills and abilities. Why then, do student teachers encounter many dilemmas during fieldwork (see Newman & Coombe, 1999), and how can university and college instructors better assist them to avoid or deal with such dilemmas? This is a question that has engaged my colleagues, my students, and me in recent years. I am suggesting in this paper that student teachers undertaking early childhood fieldwork programs in New South Wales (NSW) Australia, are currently faced with many general, but at least two specific and critical issues that impact considerably on their construction of ethical self-identity and their subsequent ability to exercise sound ethical judgement. It can be argued that the concerns arise in part from regulations and practices relating to employment patterns in early childhood services at present, but also to current teacher preparation practices.

The first specific concern relates to the current economic climate in which government funding to non-profit early childhood services has been decreased, while administration responsibilities have been increased. The second specific concern impacting on student teachers’ development of ethical judgement that I discuss here, is related to the qualifications and educational levels of staff in early childhood services (for 0-5 year olds) in NSW. The levels of qualification held by staff in services, can be directly influenced by levels of government funding, as I will further discuss later.

**Student teachers partaking in fieldwork in centers under increasing pressure**

Currently, early childhood administrators, managers and staff are working, in a socio political climate where there is ever increasing economic rationalism that has added significant economic pressures to the already complex role of the early childhood educator. This situation is now likely to be exacerbated in Australia if national government cuts to early childhood funding are an indication of future trends. In early childhood services in NSW, many qualified teachers are not even entering the field for
which they prepared, or, as they gain experience, they increasingly, leave to work in schools, or pursue other career paths. One reason may be that working conditions in other settings show greater scope for staff development support and career paths than child care settings do. Consequently, the numbers of highly qualified and experienced staff are low. Cooperating staff are working with student teachers in this climate. There is an increasing possibility that more student teachers will be placed in early childhood settings where financial stringencies have effected practice. Models of excellence are not always demonstrated. The interests of the children, and issues of quality, are not always paramount. Competing stakeholder interests can result in tensions and cooperating staff may create or exacerbate dilemmas as they attempt to please everyone. Their facilitation of student teachers in their growth as ethical decision-makers can be compromised. For example, an issue could arise where a staff member is torn between complete honesty with a parent about their child’s happiness at the center and their need to keep the center full in order to be able to pay all staff. Under such circumstances an observing student teacher may be concerned for the child and will increasingly report dilemmas during fieldwork placements. Student teachers can be unsure of how to deal with dilemmas (Newman & Coombe, 1999) and need to be more comprehensively prepared to for the complex environments they will enter.

**The position for cooperating staff in fieldwork settings**

In NSW, there has recently been a great deal of media attention directed towards issues of professional ethics. A code of conduct has been introduced for national and state politicians. The ethical practice of teachers in the public school system has been under scrutiny following a Royal Commission into corruption. The Australian community has again judged schoolteachers as less ethical than nurses, pharmacists and doctors (Milne, 1997; The Bulletin, 1999). The image of the teaching profession as a whole needs to improve. Early childhood teachers, though not singled out for media scrutiny, must engage in the public debate and concern, as members of the teaching profession. They
must address the implications of public concern and be proactive in raising ethical awareness and practice.

Concurrent with media attention to teachers’ ethics, children’s services in Australia, as mentioned, are in a time of flux. The number of places available for young children had burgeoned in recent years, but now the national government’s financial support for community based long day care centers has been slashed, resulting in substantial fee increases. For the first time in recent memory children’s services are experiencing vacancies as parents withdraw children for financial reasons. Restrictions have been placed on the number of hours that children of non-working parents can attend long day care programs. Some mothers have found that it is no longer financially viable to work outside the home and pay for licensed long day care. Anecdotal evidence suggests that many more children may be spending time with grandparents or in unlicensed (illegal) childcare settings for financial (as well as other) reasons. Some grandparents are reporting an unwillingness to take on long hours of care for young children. Early childhood professionals working in services are experiencing insecurity and uncertainty about the future. At the same time, there are complex issues of qualification differences, articulation between courses and professional status to be addressed. Early childhood staff preparation is changing and qualification levels are shifting. In Western Sydney, where most of the student teachers with whom I work, will undertake fieldwork programs, there is a proliferation of new children’s services. Student teachers are likely to be undertaking fieldwork in settings where staff are young and inexperienced, staff changes are common, and management (commercial and community) are coming to terms with increasing administrative requirements and government policy changes. At the day to day level, university educated student teachers are often supervised by cooperating staff members with a lower level of qualifications than than the one they are working towards (e.g. two year TAFE Associate Diploma) or from another discipline (e.g. Mothercraft Nurse). The inherent difficulties are apparent. Indeed Lyons (1997) argues that the barriers to professionalism are substantial, with a sense of
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collective identity being the missing element. At the same time, the elected (national) government is portraying a message to families that indicates their disapproval of formalized care for young children. The well-researched benefits are scarcely mentioned in media discussions. When cooperating staff are undergoing so many challenges their own ethical practice may be dilemma ridden. Where do student teachers fit into this complex arena and is it any wonder that they encounter dilemmas during fieldwork in this current context of negative public opinion, and professional uncertainty?

The relationship between student teachers and their less qualified cooperating fieldwork staff

Whilst there is no question that many different qualifications are appropriate, and indeed desirable in early childhood services, and that most are sound, relevant and appropriate for some early childhood practitioners, there are important implications to consider for student teachers undertaking degree level courses. Children in schools have teachers with degree (or similar) level qualifications. It seems unthinkable that children and student teachers in schools would be placed under the direct supervision of unqualified staff, or staff without degree level (or similar) qualifications. This regularly happens in services for children under legal school age however (Lyons, 1997), in the United States and Australia. Whilst I recognize that school budgets are constantly under threat of “trimming”, I have never heard suggestions that children in Year 1, or Year 6, should no longer have qualified teachers in their classrooms. However our society sanctions (or ignores) the placement of younger children, in their most formative learning years, under the responsibility of people who have minimal, or no formal preparation to teach them. Currently in NSW, regulations are under review, and there is strong pressure (from some) to remove the requirement for teachers from the new regulations. One implication for future teachers is that they often do not experience the mentorship of a similarly prepared and experienced teacher, and this situation is
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increasing. The number of teachers in early childhood services is also currently decreasing, rather than increasing. Even services that opt to employ teacher qualified staff are finding it extremely difficult to attract them. It seems unthinkable that the community at large would tolerate the major funding and policy changes witnessed in early childhood services in Australia of late, for school aged children. Some community members in fact, see the cuts as a good thing, encouraging more mothers to stay at home with their children. The reality of these major funding cuts however, is that there is now more pressure on services to employ staff who are less highly paid, because they have had fewer years of study and lower levels of study in preparation to teach young children. Fewer children under five years of age, are now spending their days with university qualified early childhood teachers. Consequently, the students' mentors, trained at minimal levels, lack the depth of theoretical knowledge needed to inform and underpin practice at the level required by universities, and those with the qualifications and experience are often so over-burdened by administration that they do not have the time to offer quality mentorship to students. A result can be over-generous assessment of students, as mentors are observing appropriate practice, in their opinions, but not recognizing shortcomings that more highly educated supervisors, or those with more time, would identify. Similarly, as the mentor, who is often trained to Associate Diploma level (as required by regulations), is often also the room leader, the type of programming demonstrated in the room is often not at the level expected by university supervisors. Student teachers encounter dilemmas when the practice they are witnessing is different to that they have been taught to expect and implement themselves. Similarly, cooperating staff may not reinforce university requirements when the methods and content are different to those they are familiar with from their own training. Despite the best intent, their assessment of the quality of a university student’s planning may be superficial. A new challenge has arisen for tertiary educators who now need to better prepare student teachers to enter the work world and to be more prepared to exercise excellence in their ethical judgment. One aspect of ethical judgement includes the preparation and assessment of the next generation of teachers. We (teacher
educators) are offered a unique opportunity to use difficult times to raise the quality of student teacher preparation. I think we can do this through ethics education.

**Improving the Practice**

**How can teacher education institutions support students?**

Ethics, and sound, sensitive ethical decision-making are critical competencies in uncertain times. I agree with Hostetler, who advocates the use of the term "ethical judgment" in preference to ethical "decision making" when referring to the complex choices that arise for teachers. He points out that judgment is more than decision making, i.e. when good judgment is exercised, one decision is not arbitrarily chosen over another. "Judgment implies a non capricious process....not simple, mechanical application of rules...There is no algorithm or formula for judgment...there is more at stake in ethical matters...regarding justice, honesty, kindness, courage and so on" (1997, p.9-10). Ethical judgement is increasingly called for in early childhood education as the certainties of the past rapidly disappear.
Ethical judgment can be further defined as:

those value choices concerning actions and attitudes that affect more than one person or which affect one's own character, thereby affecting others. These choices are moral or ethical when they involve consideration of precepts and regulate human conduct such as rights and obligations, and principles such as respect for persons, justice and reciprocity (Strom, 1989, p.268).

Professional preparation institutions need to overtly address the development of ethical judgement and teachers educators cannot assume that knowledge of ethics will arise implicitly from within other course content. Professional ethical judgement incorporates knowledge, skills and dispositions that can be facilitated in formal preparation courses and I contend that such preparation is essential for early childhood educators in current times. Ethical judgement can be successfully introduced and practiced, and applied to “real-life” situations and is “generally recognized [as needing to be] explicitly taught as part of ...[professional development] coursework” (Jacob-Tim & Hartshorne, 1994, p.5).

Why introducing codes isn’t enough

Early childhood student teachers in Australia learn about ethical practice. They are generally introduced to the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) “Code of Ethics” early in their respective courses (Coombe & Newman, 1997). However, it is widely acknowledged that the existence of a code of ethics does not guarantee that practitioners will always act ethically. Codes contain statements that can conflict in some circumstances (for example, what staff think is best for a child, may not be what families think is best), or may be silent on an issue of concern. To prepare student teachers for the demanding professional world they will enter, much more needs to be done than simply introducing them to codes and guidelines. Changes are needed to embed ethical thinking and action into all aspects of the early childhood educator’s work (Newman, 2000). Little research has yet been undertaken however, as to how tertiary educators can facilitate student construction of ethical identity, knowledge and
practice and as to how students' ethical judgement and practice evolves. To be truly effective, ethical principles and codes must be embedded into all professional thinking and action and more research is needed to show the best ways to do this in already pressured teacher education courses. Figure 1 shows some aspects of the development of ethical judgement that can be considered in preparing courses for students.

**Student teachers' ethical practice during fieldwork**

Student teachers do report difficulties with ethical issues during fieldwork (Coombe & Newman, 1997). The issue of power relationships becomes evident as field supervisors or mentors hold the key to the student teacher's final grades. Ultimately, student teachers' ability to graduate and practice within their chosen profession depends upon successful final grades. Currently, there is an understanding that students and beginning teachers are "novices", who are only able to focus on "survival" or "direct care" of children, and are not yet ready to address higher order skills that involve thinking about complex issues (such as resolving ethical dilemmas) within their profession (Feeney, Christensen & Moravek, 1996). I do not believe that currently, our early childhood professionals can afford to spend extended time as novices in regard to their ethical identity. They need to spend more time in their courses learning how to think and act ethically, so that they begin teaching with the knowledge that they have the skills and tools to resolve the complex ethical issues they will certainly encounter. Recent moves in teacher education towards reflective practices support and underpin the development of ethical judgement, but still need further extension and support in the form of specific teaching about, and experience with, ethical judgement. Tertiary educators are challenged to conceive new methods for research about the development of ethical judgement and to develop more strategies for embedding opportunities for the development of ethical judgement abilities into coursework and fieldwork programs.
Professional preparation for ethical practice

Currently, student teachers are largely prepared for the functional and technical aspects of teaching (for example, identification of child needs, lesson planning, activity planning). As in other professions, the ethical dimensions of teaching have not received a great deal of attention in the literature or in teacher education courses, which have largely concentrated on the technical aspects of teaching. Hostetler points out the contrast between "technical tasks" where we already know what the ends will be, and want students to achieve these ends (e.g. learn to read, follow the rules of a game etc.) and "ethical action" which is concerned with determining ends where what is right "can only be known in the immediacy of the situation" (1997, p.12). There are many issues that arise in teaching that call for ethical practice. Teaching is a moral exercise in which power can be exercised, ends and means are chosen and decisions are made about values education. Responsible teachers need to reconcile dilemmas and have the opportunity to promote ethical sensitivity and moral reasoning (Strom, 1989, p.270-271). Student teachers in their pre-service preparation, need the knowledge and skills to develop ethical judgement for the issues of applied professional ethics that they will undoubtedly encounter.

However, preparation for ethical judgment is well intentioned, but often ad hoc, or integrated into professional studies subjects where little time is available. Teaching is not the only profession in which preparation for ethical practice has been minimally addressed. There are calls in a range of professions like law, mental health, policing, journalism, general medicine and counseling for a more cohesive framework for student preparation (e.g. Kirby, 1996; Parker, Price & Harris, 1997; Prilleltensky, Rossiter & Walsh-Powers, 1996).

Ethical issues that students encounter, do not only involve the "critical" incidents of physical, sexual and emotional abuse, but also more subtle or "open to interpretation" issues involving interpretations of policy, developmentally appropriate practice, power
and control etc. (Newman & Coombe, 1999; Prilleltensky, Rossiter & Walsh-Powers, 1996). If harm is to be prevented, ethical discourse must be undertaken and new frameworks for applied ethics must be developed (Prilleltensky, Rossiter & Walsh-Powers, 1996). Sottle (1994) and White (1988) point out that, as yet, there has been little in the way of systematic and successful preparation for the development of professional ethical judgment.

It is agreed that ethical judgment cannot be "taught" or "imposed" (Baumgart, 1996; Hostetler, 1997; Prilleltensky, Rossiter & Walsh-Powers, 1996), but needs to be lived and experienced. Students do however need help to address issues of morals and ethics and need assistance in knowing how to act in professional situations (Strom, 1989). Well considered preparation is needed though as traditional methods of professional preparation have relied on the imposition of codes which are "reactive, rule driven, professional-centered and relatively distant from actual workaday practice" rather than being "a central aspect of practice because they have been dominated by traditional conceptions of ethics that are distant and removed from concrete experience" (Prilleltensky, Rossiter & Walsh-Powers, 1996, p.289).

Unlike in some professions, early childhood educators in Australia, New Zealand and the United States are in a good position regarding support from profession driven codes of ethics. In the U.S., work by Feeney and Kipnis (for example, Feeney & Kipnis, 1985), and Feeney and Freeman (for example, Feeney & Freeman, 1999), has presented and supported the NAEYC code. In Australia the early childhood profession is advantaged as the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) "Code of Ethics" is not distant and removed, and is positive and aspirational, as it was developed from within the profession. There is a danger however, of any code becoming a token document to hang on the wall. For the code to live, continue to be useful and improve its position as an integral element of every good early childhood practitioner's practice, there must be continuing efforts to incorporate and use strategies to support it in
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preparation programs as well as in the daily practice of all services. As early childhood student teachers graduate as novices into the current climate of economic rationalism and change in children’s services in NSW, better ways to prepare them for the challenges of the ethical issues they will encounter must be found. Attempts to document the scope of ethical issues encountered by student teachers reveal a wide range of quandaries and some ethical dilemmas (Newman & Coombe, 1997). To learn how to recognize, categorize and resolve dilemmas, students need education in ethics.

Traditionally, ethics education has fallen within the discipline of philosophy but modern early childhood teacher education courses do not usually feature traditional philosophy subjects. The need for more ethics education within early childhood teacher education programs has become evident and so it falls to the early childhood teacher educators to develop applied ethics education components within their courses. As most early childhood teacher educators have not completed philosophy courses themselves, this task may seem daunting. I have attempted to present a model in which an initial exploration of the knowledge and skills related to applied ethics is made (see Figure 1, presented later). The diagram can be used as a basis for planning the content of subjects in which ethics education can be embedded. The model is not intended to be used in any strict hierarchical manner, but preferably to be seen as an interconnected web, within which concepts can be introduced, discussed and revisited in greater depth at another time. Individuals will need to spend more or less time at different points in the web and will be able to enter and exit at different points, depending on their experience and ability to assimilate the ethical notions related to each conceptual level within the model. In proposing this model, I support Nash (1996) who cautions that ethical preparation for students or graduates in courses like education must be “applied”. Early childhood professionals, or those preparing to be, have complex expectations placed on them and are dealing with “real life” issues like confidentiality, child abuse, whistleblowing the need for developmentally appropriate teaching, cultural sensitivity and authentic planning, to mention just a few. If teaching about ethics is not applied,
that is, based on “real life” “Confusion [may] arise ... as to the relationship of moral beliefs to actual professional behaviors” (Nash, 1996, p.6).

In the development of any ethics education for early childhood students it is also necessary to take into account the “real life” situation where most students will not have the opportunity to complete a whole subject, or unit, in applied ethics. It is more likely that they will encounter ethical preparation and issues in integrated subjects for fieldwork and professional preparation. Therefore, content relating to ethics will often need to be compacted and reinforced through other related subjects.
Figure 1: Contextual considerations for the development of ethical professional preparation for the early childhood educator.
Some new resources to support the development of ethical judgement

The knowledge, skills and dispositions outlined in Figure 1 can, and should be supported by a range of strategies, approaches and resources, such as decision-making models (for example, Kidder, 1995; Kitchener, 1984). With Lois Pollnitz (University of Newcastle), I have worked to develop specific early childhood resources to facilitate tertiary educators in their preparation of students for ethical judgment during fieldwork. Work has been carried out in conjunction with the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW. A project was commenced in 1994 and continues to the current time. The project has consisted of various stages, with the most recent culminating in the development of materials that incorporate the “Ethical Response Cycle”, a new model of ethical decision-making for early childhood educators (Newman & Pollnitz, in press). A kit has been produced that includes a teaching resource manual, a video depicting early childhood fieldwork dilemmas and a CD-ROM. The manual includes theoretical information about professional ethics and ethical dilemmas. The manual includes many suggestions for workshop leaders, including use of the video, and a resource bibliography. The CD-ROM is specifically designed for independent compacted teaching and learning about the recognition and resolution of ethical dilemmas.

Conclusion

Many people, in many professions are examining the need for better ethical preparation of professionals in order to produce practitioners who are more able to practice with the highest ethical standards. In this paper, endeavors being undertaken within the discipline of early childhood education in Australia, have been outlined. Further research is needed to better understand how people become, and remain, the professionals in our community who manage to put the interests of their clients or consumers as paramount, rather than taking the expedient, easy or lucrative practice option. The philosophies and traditions of early childhood education strongly support ethical practice - with the interests of vulnerable young children as critical. Early Draft
childhood educators have rarely been accused of acting unethically. There is always room for improvement however, and in the backlash from the "greedy eighties" and images of corruption and malpractice across a range of professions, the time is right to focus collective professional energies into improvements in the area of ethical practice. Early childhood pre-service educators are in an ideal position to influence the practice of a new generation of professionals. It is timely that they should incorporate more, and better ethical preparation of their students into coursework. Some ideas have been presented here to facilitate this and advance our practice to improve the standing of our profession and ultimately, the wellbeing children and their families.
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The nature of teacher education is changing. Where once, tertiary educators primarily prepared students for the technical tasks of teaching like lesson planning and selection of subject content (Hostetler, 1997), the language of teacher educators now revolves around such terms as reflective teaching, reflection in action, and teacher as researcher. There has been a shift from the general expectation that teachers should act as technical thinkers to an expectation that teachers need to operate as higher order or “better” thinkers.

In this paper, I will present an argument for the inclusion of components in teacher education courses that overtly include processes that will help student teachers to use higher order thinking. I argue that higher order thinking will facilitate understanding and demonstration of abstract teaching abilities, in particular, a high level of professional ethical behaviour. I will argue that student teachers need to be exposed to higher order thinking skills in order to be able to refine the cognitive and metacognitive processes that are an integral part of the development of ethical judgment. I contend that the processes needed for ethical judgment and resultant ethical actions are reliant on the processes involved in higher order thinking and metacognitive thinking. In the current socio-political climate of early childhood education, it is my opinion that it is imperative for student teachers to develop sound ethical judgment as early in both their fieldwork and professional careers as possible. The critical question surrounding this premise though, is what is the best way to prepare student teachers for ethical judgment considering their student and then novice teacher status?

I will also discuss the concepts of morals, ethics and professional ethics as they apply to student teachers undertaking fieldwork programs. Finally, I will describe some action that is being taken in New South Wales, Australia to assist tertiary educators working with early childhood student teachers undertaking fieldwork programs. A brief summary of some research that has been commenced will be included, as well as a description of resources currently being developed.

Student teachers as “wise thinkers”

Some authors caution against introducing student teachers and novice teachers, in their first year or so of teaching, to higher order concepts. It is argued that newly graduated teachers spend their first few years “surviving” – dealing with daily issues such as program planning and classroom management, and don’t think beyond this for some time (Katz, 1977; Clyde, 1989). It would seem to follow this argument then, that student teachers are not ready to grapple with abstract and complex issues such as ethics and ethical judgment, in which higher order thinking skills are exercised to solve ethical dilemmas. Student teachers do, however, encounter dilemmas (Coome & Newman, 1997), and tertiary educators need to be proactive in the preparation of student teachers to deal with dilemmas effectively.

I contend that student teachers need to be creative, active and “wise” thinkers for two main reasons: firstly, to develop creative and active thinking in children; and secondly, to operate in complex socio-political climates where problem solving will certainly be needed.

Davis (1997) defined wise practice as always situated in ...context (p.2.), as ethical judgment certainly needs to be. Further, Davis explained that wise practice by its very nature, is idiosyncratic, contextual, and probably inconsistent. It seems not standardised, not off-the-shelf, not one-size fits all (p.4). For student teachers to develop wise practice, it would seem that they should practice wise thinking as student teachers.

Hine (1996) called for “better” thinking for student teachers, which is in congruence with Davis’s ideas about wise practice. She explained that:
It is evident that people who have developed or acquired a good repertoire of cognitive strategies and can apply them to a wide range of learning and problem solving situations are likely to be highly effective in their cognition.... they will know a lot about how, when and why to operate these strategies, that is, they will have a high degree of metacognitive knowledge and reflective awareness (p.1).

Hine further explained that better thinking involves a process in which the student:

- considers more possibilities
- explores farther and wider
- exercises keener judgement
- marshals more data
- challenges assumptions
- exercises precision
- checks for errors
- maintains objectivity and balance.

The processes described can be used to develop sound ethical judgment. The outcomes then, of better thinking processes may include:

- more reliable conclusions
- deeper insights
- sounder decisions
- more finely crafted products
- more creative inventions
- keener critical assessments.

These outcomes are desirable for student teachers who are engaging in the complexities of ethics, ethical action and ethical judgment, all of which are dependant upon the ability to think critically, reflectively and with a degree of insight and understanding. However, the teaching of better thinking must be overt in tertiary courses if student teachers are going to exercise metacognitive awareness and transfer this into practice with families and children. Preparation for professional experience and fieldwork should encompass exposure to higher order thinking, practice in using higher order thinking processes, and should demonstrate the links between higher order thinking and ethical judgment that leads to ethical action during fieldwork – and beyond. Student teachers can benefit by immersion in higher order thinking through which they refine the abilities needed for ethical judgment.
Why do student teachers need to know about ethics?

Some authors use the terms ethics and morals interchangeably (Preston, 1996). In this paper, I regard the terms as having the same meaning. Ethics, may be regarded as the human capacity to make wise judgments based upon sound values. It is about doing what is right and proper. Ethics is an integral element of professionalism and student teachers are preparing to become professionals. Student teachers are exhorted to reflect and act ethically by their teachers and mentors, but may not understand why, or how. Socrates was a great moral leader and is reported as saying, “the unexamined life is not worth living” - affirming the importance of self-knowledge and self-reflection in a climate of change and lack of political support for early childhood services (see Newman, 1998). His life suggested that a life worth living is one that is lived for a worthwhile reason, one which goes beyond self-interest (Preston, 1996). His advice is relevant in the current climate for early childhood student teachers where the need for self-reflection and knowledge may never have been greater.

There is no worthwhile human life without ethics (Preston, 1996) and student teachers regularly engage in ethical choices as they make their personal and professional lives meaningful. They constantly live with mixed messages and confusion about what ethics is and what constitutes an ethical professional life.

Ethics is often associated with the notion of the ethical dilemma. Katz (1992), defines the ethical dilemma as a predicament wherein there is a choice between alternative courses of action and the selection of one of the alternatives sacrifices the advantages that might accrue from a different selection. She continues:

It is assumed further, that each of the two 'horns' of the dilemma, A and B, carry with them their own errors; alternative A involves certain errors as does alternative B; error-free alternatives are not really available. In principle, each of the available alternatives involves 'a choice of error'. Thus part of our task is to determine which error is preferred in each predicament. (Katz, 1992, p.165).

It is my opinion that the choice of error is best determined by a person who has developed the abilities to think wisely and exercise astute ethical judgment.

Research conducted with student teachers by this author, and others, demonstrated the need for better knowledge about ethics and ethical dilemmas. Students reported many problems as "ethical dilemmas", when indeed they weren't (Newman & Coombe, in 1997).

Student teachers perceive early in their education that ethics is an important element of their lives and certainly identify dilemmas that they have encountered. Reported dilemmas are mainly related to fieldwork (Coombe & Newman, 1997), but also arise during the students' daily life discussions about their choice of early childhood education as a career. When dilemmas are encountered, student teachers often need to decide on an appropriate action. Dilemma resolution is facilitated by the use of higher order thinking and is never simple because what constitutes ethical behaviour is context specific. What constitutes ethical action differs across professions and according many variables. Professional organisations determine which constraints, and what ethical principles, apply within that particular profession. Student teachers, as developing professionals, need to build on their knowledge, skills and attitudes not only to make the best ethical choices, but also to be able to justify their choices in an articulate manner to families, colleagues and supervisors.
The relationship between ethics and becoming a professional
The macro issues of ethics at a social and political level interact with the micro level of ethics at a professional level. The interlocking elements cannot be disconnected.

Early childhood teachers consider themselves to be professionals and so need to understand what constitutes professionalism. “Profession” means “to testify on behalf of” or “to stand for something”. “Professions may be seen to have an intrinsic commitment to the public good, including a willingness to provide services gratuitously beyond the call of duty” (Preston, 1996, p.160).

In practice, the label profession will probably indicate:

- a certain status within the community
- a university level professional preparation
- a professional association and code of ethics
- recognition of a trust on behalf of clients seeking specific services (Preston, 1996, p.160)

Most descriptions of professionalism contain some statement about ethics. Professional ethics will place a strong emphasis on community service informed by the idea of responsibility. To raise the status of the early childhood profession, it is imperative for tertiary educators and cooperating fieldwork staff to have a strong commitment to the preparation of future early childhood teachers as ethical professionals.

Student teachers, in their study of professional ethics need to understand the difference between “private” responsibilities (or ethics) and “public”. Family matters may be regarded as private, while political or commercial activities are in the public sphere. The private and the public necessarily interact and there may indeed be conflicts of interest. To be an ethical person it is necessary to achieve in the public interest or common good as well as the private (Preston, 1996).

When student teachers become employed early childhood educators, they have ethical obligations and responsibilities that stem from the role they are performing or the institution they are serving. Their public ethics will be involved. This is regarded as role ethics or an ethics of agency. The test of professional or public ethics is not that of satisfying one’s personal conscience, but of acting in ways that are consistent with the duties entrusted to one in a public or professional role (for example, teachers’ duty of care towards children). Student teachers must be cautious however, in assuming that the obligation is only to the employer, government etc. Historically, criminal acts have been performed in the name of “following orders”. Members of just societies will not tolerate this justification. Members of ethical societies and teachers, as members of an ethical profession, must know when and how to take a stand for ethical action. Student teachers may have to make such a stand for ethical action, while they are still students. Student teachers surveyed by this author reported being asked to perform actions that they deemed inappropriate, or which were, in fact, illegal (Coombe & Newman, 1997).

Within the teaching profession, there are many situations that require ethical judgment, but as yet, there has been little systematic preparation of student teachers. Sottile (1994), for example, pointed to the lack of preparation of teachers to deal with situations involving ethical decision-making. He found that the teachers he surveyed indicated that the three most common types of ethical dilemmas they experienced related to psychological
(emotional) abuse, confidentiality, and physical abuse. With a different perspective, Poplin and Ebert (1993), discussed the perceptions of parents that the moral and ethical stand taken by teachers might well undermine that which is part of the family culture. For practicing teachers as well as student teachers, matters of ethics are regularly apparent and demand resolution.

Student teachers engage in experiences associated with the practice of becoming professionals while undertaking fieldwork. Choices often confront them during these sessions. Choices, or problems may be perceived by students to be ethical dilemmas but often are not. An ethical dilemma is NOT about making a decision to do something that is against rules or regulations. There is no dilemma when it is clear what SHOULD be done. There may be a perception that a decision can be made - based on personal gain or interest, to act against what the rules or guidelines prescribe. Student teachers surveyed, during my research reported that they complied with an action they perceived to be wrong, because of fear of receiving unsatisfactory grades if they did not comply with the request from a cooperating teacher (Coombe & Newman, 1997). This is not an ethical dilemma - it is a decision about right and wrong. For example, if an early childhood student is asked to independently supervise a group of two year olds, there is no ethical dilemma involved. This is clearly against regulations as the student is not an employee. It may be difficult to say no...but there is no ethical dilemma.

A renewed focus on professional ethics in the nineties
Current discourse about ethics and renewed interest in Australia and around the rest of the world reflects important concerns about general moral decay in the 90s. In Australia, this is evidenced by:

• the widespread development of professional codes (currently in NSW there are new codes for journalists, politicians, judges and cricket players).
• the development of ethics education programs in schools and universities (such as the CUTSD funded package being prepared by Newman & Pollnitz (Newman, Pollnitz & Goodfellow, 1997)).
• the formation of ethics research and consultancy centres (e.g. St James Ethics Centre, Sydney).
• the formation of the Australian Association of Professional and Applied Ethics
• the publication of books such as Whistleblowers by Quentin Dempster (Dempster, 1997).

As schools and early childhood centres constitute a micro level of general society, student teachers need to be aware of societal trends, and must accordingly take account of the views of their families, the general public and other stakeholders as they go about their daily practice. Ecological theories suggest that children's lives are affected by what happens in the wider society in which families operate. Student teachers both reflect and influence the lives of the children and families with whom they work. Their ethical judgments have implications at many levels and families have a right to expect the highest level of professional ethics from the professionals who work with their children.

Ethics involves a reflective, critical and transformative aspect - to change social and technological conditions, by aiming to benefit those most disadvantaged in those contexts. When dilemmas arise for student teachers they take place within a complex interaction of social forces. Change based on ethical action generally takes place through struggle and conflict (Preston, 1996). There is much rapid change evident in the lives of children and families at present, and not all changes are perceived as positive. In NSW Australia, early
childhood teacher graduates are entering a context where not all services for young children are required to employ qualified teachers (Lyons, 1997). Economically rationalist policies are forcing many more mothers to give up paid employment as childcare services are too expensive to make working outside the home worthwhile. The implications for the child care services in which student teachers undertake fieldwork are profound. Many services are currently operating at less than capacity and adjustments are accordingly being made to levels and qualifications of employed staff. The prospect of ethical dilemmas arising is compounded under stressful working conditions. Students are more likely than ever to encounter dilemmas, and need to know how to think and act ethically.

Ethics as philosophical reflection is never enough but must interact with a realistic and accurate interpretation of social conditions and the prospects for their transformation. Even on their first field experience in childcare centres some student teachers find themselves in problematic situations where they must decide what to do. It is imperative that they have had some initial preparation for ethical judgment and action and are offered comprehensive debriefing after dilemmas occur.

In order to "act locally", exercising sound ethical judgment, student teachers should be informed by the ability to "think globally" (Preston, 1996, 10). They need some preparation in the general concepts of values and ethics for life, their own profession and particular contexts, before they encounter the dilemmas that frequently arise.

Preston (1996) advocated the study of ethics and explained that the study of ethics could enhance the capacity for critical judgment and practical decision making in a variety of personal, workplace and applied contexts.

But he further explained that:

\[ \text{the study of ethics alone, will not make us better (or more ethical people). Through the study of ethics we learn to think more reflectively, and systematically about the ethical impact of life decisions as well as about everyday practice. We can indeed learn to be more consistent and accurate in rehearsing and embracing modes of self and collective evaluation... (Preston, 1996, 14)} \]

How is ethical judgment learnt – and how is it best taught?
There is agreement that ethics and the ability to exercise ethical judgment cannot be "taught". Ethical beliefs and practices are learnt in complex ways. "Ethics is caught not taught" is a common saying. Ethics and morality are largely socio-cultural constructs. Values and morals are acquired within families, communities and society.

Moral or ethical behaviour is learnt experientially. The formal study of ethics and the language of ethics can help students to learn how to address ethical decisions and how to critique their own ethical decision making processes. Student teachers need to aim for ethical autonomy, - the capacity to exercise choice in making independent decisions.

Ethical autonomy requires owning and acting on a value system that is internalised rather than merely adopted because an external authority prescribes it. Doing something just because you are commanded to do it, or just because others are doing it, or because you will be punished if you do not do, are immature reasons for ethical action (Preston, 1996, 193).
The cultivation of moral autonomy is an important aim of ethics education. Students need to be able to examine the value patterns of their own community but also be able to critique the rules of society according to autonomously chosen ethical frameworks. Further, they need to be able to apply such processes to the knowledge and use of professional principles and relevant codes of ethics. Critical enquiry and higher order thinking are the best tools for developing ethical understandings along with the language or discourse of ethics which should be embedded into all teaching and learning. Student teachers need to learn when they are encountering ethical issues. Tertiary educators have to move beyond value clarification to conversations justifying ethical judgment in a caring environment.

As well as a discourse focused on ethics, ethical behaviour is learnt from the modelling of appropriate practices displayed by significant others such as parents, leaders and teachers, including tertiary educators. The role models put forward within society can have an important influence on children’s ideas about what is good, right or proper. Story telling or drama have been traditionally used (for example, Aesop’s fables) and can be powerful. Similarly, within early childhood teacher education courses, modelling of ethical behaviour is important. In fieldwork situations, it is desirable, but not always possible to place student teachers in situations of the highest quality. Where this is not possible, student teachers need carefully considered preparation and de-briefing within their tertiary institutions. Significant encounters, or dilemmas stay in the memory and shape the development of a moral or ethical sense. As in life, in tertiary institutions, modelling can be extended and enriched with the use of storytelling, or real life dilemma scenarios, that can be a powerful tool when used in relation to fieldwork experiences.

Research
Little research has been done to date, that specifically focuses on the ethical development of student teachers in relation to fieldwork. In recent years, as part of a broad project to facilitate the development of ethical judgment for student teachers I, with others, have engaged in several research projects that will be summarised below.

Pilot research that has been previously referred to, was conducted in 1996 and showed that student teachers had encountered many dilemmas during fieldwork, but identified a wide range of dilemmas as ethical dilemmas. Their confidence in dealing with the dilemmas grew as they proceeded through their course (Coombe & Newman, 1997; Newman & Coombe, 1999).

Following the pilot research, a video was made (Newman, 1996), depicting scenarios based on student reports of their dilemmas. Using focus groups, cooperating teachers, tertiary advisers, student teachers and families were asked about their perceptions of the video. Results indicated that the situations depicted were realistic and focused on the power relationships between staff and students student teachers. Participants felt that the dilemmas portrayed were complex, as in real life, and that the central issues were not always easily identifiable.

Participants identified strengths of the use of the scenarios for student teachers as well as for other stakeholders. Student teachers could be helped to analyse situations from the point of view of others. Other fieldwork stakeholders would gain a raised awareness of the dilemmas which may arise and pose dilemmas for students, and would be helped to realise
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that there is often no simple solution to a dilemma. Staff would be encouraged to re-examine their own values, practices and ethical judgment.

In 1998, first year student teachers (N=94) were asked about their perceptions of their own knowledge of ethics, and some specific questions about their knowledge. Results indicated that the majority of students did not have a great deal of confidence in their own knowledge about ethics with 39% reporting “very little” knowledge and 52% reporting “some” knowledge. No students reported “a great deal” of knowledge. Eighty percent of students felt that the teaching profession as a whole, in Australia, has a code of ethics, when in fact it doesn’t. Comments accompanying this response included I’m sure they would somewhere and I’m sure they would have to, as well as this is good, and, all professions have a code of ethics. Interestingly, despite the high number of students who thought that an overall code of ethics existed, sixty percent (60%) of students did not respond to a question asking them to name the code. There was a significant change in students’ perceptions of their own knowledge after an introductory ethics lecture (Newman & Martin, 1998).

Resources to support tertiary educators
In conjunction with research, resources are being developed to support tertiary educators as they work with student teachers in preparation for professional experience. Tertiary educators are often the people who first hear about student teachers’ dilemmas in relation to fieldwork. To underpin the use of strategies to develop ethical judgment such as exposure to higher order thinking, modelling and dilemma re-enactment, tertiary educators need to be familiar with, and pass on to students, the three levels of support which aid the ethical practitioner:

- Rules and Regulations (Government, System level, Policies)
- Knowledge of Ethics
- Codes and Guidelines

Teaching resource packages such as Fasoli, L. and Woodrow, C. (1991). Getting ethical: A resource book for workshop leaders are useful. Also, the resource kit currently under preparation by Newman and Pollnitz (Newman & Pollnitz, 1998), can be used to support teaching about professional ethics through the use of role playing of ethical dilemmas, videos, interactive CD Rom and WWW resources and other means of encouraging reflection and discourse. A comprehensive guide to documents, books, articles and web-based resources will also be contained in the manual.

Conclusion
Many student teachers are involved in situations in which they encounter dilemmas during fieldwork. Tertiary educators need to incorporate methods and strategies into their teaching that will help to prepare students to face dilemmas and will also help them to de-brief effectively after dilemmas occur. A greater knowledge about ethics and the development of ethical judgment will facilitate the effective preparation of student teachers for fieldwork. Research about ethical judgment needs to continue and must to be supported by resources that support tertiary educators in their endeavours to facilitate the development of ethical judgment. This can be supported by the teaching of “better thinking” strategies.
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Hosteler (1997), advocates the use of the term "ethical judgement" in preference to ethical "decision making". He points out that judgement is more than decision making, i.e. when good judgement is exercised, one decision is not arbitrarily chosen over another. "Judgement implies a non capricious process...not simple, mechanical application of rules...There is no algorithm or formula for judgement... there is more at stake in ethical matters...regarding justice, honesty, kindness, courage and so on" (p.9-10).

In Australia, relevant documents are:

* For more information about the resource package being developed for tertiary educators, contact Linda Newman at University of Western Sydney, Nepean on 61-2-4736 0048 or email l.newman@nepean.uws.edu.au
APPENDIX 3E

Published in Refereed Journal


In this article, the data obtained and published (Appendices 3a & 3b) were re-examined in a new way. This followed shortly after the first two attempts, and was accepted for publication soon after, but did not appear in the journal until 1999. In this article, student reported dilemmas were re-classified according to their degree of severity (*open to interpretation* and *critical*). Also previously published perspectives of dilemmas (Feeney & Kipnis, 1985) were used to ascertain how many of the reported dilemmas were of an ethical nature.

My contribution:
- Write draft, new analysis of data - Newman.
- Submit to journal and address reviewers’ comments for final submission - Newman.
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Facing the hard questions: Ethics for early childhood fieldwork programs

Linda Newman
University of Western Sydney, Nepean

Kennece Coombe
Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga

Marzieh Arefi, Fiona Davidson, & Jacqueline Humphries
University of Western Sydney, Nepean

The issue of professional ethics is often the subject of media attention. Currently in many parts of Australia, the behaviour of politicians, police, teachers, and journalists is under scrutiny, leading to work on the development of codes of ethics and conduct for many professions. The early childhood profession in Australia already has a Code of Ethics; however, the existence of a code does not guarantee its use. Student teachers need to be carefully prepared to exercise sound ethical judgment. This paper reports on a survey of early childhood student teachers in which student experiences and perceptions of ethical dilemmas in the practicum were examined; and suggests strategies for the development of ethical practice in early childhood fieldwork programs.

Introduction

This paper aims to generate discussion about ethical practices during early childhood fieldwork programs. It will discuss, in general terms, ethics in professional life, and will also consider ethics within the narrower field of education and fieldwork. Further, it will present the results of a survey of early childhood education students undertaken during 1995, before finally suggesting action and strategies to facilitate the preparation of early childhood preservice educators for fieldwork programs.

Professional ethics

Ethics or ethical behaviour encompasses a range of values relating to morality and what is considered to be 'right and proper'. Professions are specific groups within general societies, and each profession will differ as to what is considered ethical behaviour; it is context specific. The existence of a code of ethics has been acknowledged as one of the key criteria of a profession (as opposed to an occupation) (e.g. De Gioia, 1996; Katz, 1993). Although the general idea of ethical practice is acknowledged within a range of professions, the same code of ethics would not be appropriate for all professions. The implicit understandings of the members of a profession about what is right and proper form the basis of ethical conduct for that profession. It is the responsibility of an ethical member of that profession to 'get clear on those rules' (Kipnis, 1987, p. 26). For example, a medical practitioner is quite free to develop personal relationships but, if a prospective partner is also a patient, ethical consideration is called for. Thus, to conduct personal sexual relationships is not unethical behaviour, except within particular constraints, and it is within the realm of professional organisations to determine which constraints, and what ethical principles, apply within a particular profession.
Ethics in education

The role, application, and evaluation of ethics and ethical standards in education have received attention in the literature (Bredenkamp & Willer, 1993; Hatch, 1995; Katz, 1993; Poplin & Ebert, 1993; Smith, 1994; Sottile, 1994; Strike & Ternasky, 1993).

Sottile (1994), points to the lack of preparation of teachers in the USA to deal with situations involving ethical decision-making. He found that the practising teachers he surveyed indicated that the three most common types of ethical dilemmas they experienced related to psychological (emotional) abuse, confidentiality, and physical abuse. In 1997, press reports indicate that Sottile’s concerns are still relevant (Sydney Morning Herald, February–March, 1997).

The authors of this paper regard ethical decision-making as critical in early childhood education settings. Ethical decision-making invariably involves the notion of ‘dilemma’. Katz (1992) defines the dilemma as a predicament wherein there is a choice between alternative courses of appropriate action. The selection of one of the alternatives sacrifices the advantages that might accrue from a different selection. She continues:

> It is assumed further, that each of the two ‘horns’ of the dilemma, A and B, carry with them their own errors ... In principle, each of the available alternatives involves ‘a choice of error’... Thus part of our task is to determine which error is preferred in each predicament.

(Katz, 1992, p.165)

Difficult choices often confront early childhood student teachers during their fieldwork programs. In order to further understand student views and experiences, research was conducted about perceptions of problematic experiences. A survey was undertaken seeking students’ views of their ethical decision making processes during fieldwork. Results were used to develop strategies for the use of tertiary early childhood educators who are preparing students for fieldwork.

The Survey

Following initial analyses of results (see Coombe & Newman, 1997), a second analysis was conducted to shed more light on students’ reported perceptions. The second analysis is the focus of this paper. Therefore, findings of initial analyses will be reported only briefly in order to provide the necessary background information for the qualitative analysis and suggestions for action which are the main focus of this paper.

In July/August 1995, 179 students enrolled in early childhood teacher education programs at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean (UWS, Nepean) and Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga (CSU) completed a written questionnaire with 12 items probing the students’ knowledge about the existence of codes of ethics; their understandings about such codes; their awareness of the Australian Early Childhood Association Code of Ethics; their reports of experiences perceived as ethical dilemmas during their fieldwork sessions; and their knowledge and confidence in handling problematic situations. Fifty-four (30%), of the respondents were first year students, 50 (28%), were in their second year, and 75 (42%), were third year students. One-hundred-and-sixty-one students were from UWSN and 18 (10%), were studying at CSU. Quantitative responses were analysed according to students’ year of study, using Chi Square and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques.

Briefly, 171 of the 179 students were able to provide a response to the question, ‘What is a code of ethics?’ Analyses indicated no relationship between year of course and knowledge of the AECA Code of Ethics, indicating that students became aware of the Code of Ethics at the beginning of their respective courses in the universities studied. Full detail of initial categorisation of responses is contained in Coombe and Newman (1997).

It became clear that students were exposed to a range of situations which caused them to be concerned about behaviours they considered to be unethical while they were undertaking professional experience in schools and centres.
More than two-thirds of the students reported that they had witnessed three or more situations of dilemma (Coombe & Newman, 1997).

Students were also asked how confident they felt in handling dilemmas, and results indicated growing confidence as students proceeded through the years of their course. Analysis of Variance techniques (ANOVA) indicated that students’ perception of their knowledge of what to do was correlated with the year of their course (0.06, p<0.07) (Coombe & Newman, 1996).

Following initial analyses, it was decided that further examination of student responses was needed. If students have observed practices that were of concern to them, even if upon closer examination there was rational justification or explanation, they still need strategies to deal with their own feelings. One facilitating factor for responding to dilemmas may be knowledge of how to categorise dilemmas before attempting to deal with them, as suggested by Feeney and Kipnis (1985).

Initially, dilemmas were seen to fall into three major categories:

- **individual personal difficulties in knowing how to deal with the actions of a child**
- **students being requested to implement practices they do not think are appropriate**
- **student observation of staff members implementing practices the student judges to be inappropriate**

Within these categories, dilemmas were further categorised by the authors as ‘critical incidents’ e.g. *teacher in the nursery yanked a child by the arm out of the high chair and carried him like that into the other room because he hadn’t been eating his food nicely; and ‘open to interpretation’ e.g. when I was on one of my field visits a director threw a pair of shoes to a child, instead of giving it to that child or telling that child to pick up the shoes.*

As ‘perspectives of ethical awareness’ had previously been identified by Feeney and Kipnis (1985), these were used to further categorise the reported dilemmas. It was also decided that the subsequent development of strategies to help deal with dilemmas could be based on the Feeney and Kipnis perspectives. Responses were categorised according to the five perspectives: personal problems, legal problems, employment problems, social theory problems, and professional ethics problems.

**Personal problems** occur when decision-making is based on deeply held personal values rather than what an effective early childhood educator should do.

**Legal problems** occur when a dilemma arises in connection with mandated laws or centre/school policies.

**Employment problems** occur when an employee may not agree with employment regulations, or there may be no relevant policies.

**Social theory problems** revolve around ideas about how the world should be.

**Professional ethics problems** involve a dilemma about the shared process of understanding what the profession’s standards should be.

Student responses revealed that the majority of dilemmas were personal (N=42, 34%), followed fairly closely by legal (N=34, 28%). The third most common category was employment-related problems (N=20, 16%). The remaining categories held fewer responses—social (N=6, 5%); professional ethics (N=7, 6%). Thirteen responses (11%) were uncategorised.

It is worth noting that only a small number of the dilemmas reported by students as ‘ethical dilemmas’ actually fell into the category of ethical problems. This raised the question of how many student fieldwork problems actually involve ‘ethics’, in the strictest sense of the term. The authors decided that student perceptions of their dilemmas needed clarification. Students need to clearly understand what an ethical dilemma is, and how to classify other dilemmas, as a first step towards positive action. As many of the reported dilemmas involve communication difficulties (see Coombe & Newman, 1997) it is possible that further development of communication skills would also have helped to resolve many of the reported dilemmas.
Suggested Strategies for Facilitating Ethical Awareness

Dilemmas may arise in any setting, and it is not possible to ensure that students are placed only in 'perfect' fieldwork situations. It then becomes the responsibility of the tertiary institution to advise students about some of the dilemmas they might experience and to assist them with strategies to cope, and perhaps to institute change. This final section of the paper offers some strategies.

Currently, there are several projects under way, under the auspices of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW, to facilitate students' and other stakeholders' understanding and practice of ethical decision-making and behaviours during early childhood fieldwork experiences. The aim of the council, which is developing tertiary teaching support materials, is to encourage stakeholders to engage in critical discussion about ethics with a view to making the hard choices, for, as Kipnis suggests:

The result of a successful conversation in professional ethics ought to be more than merely a decision made in the case at hand. If the decision is sound—grounded in core professional values—then it might well be made by all early childhood educators under similar circumstances. It should be possible to state a rule telling professionals how to act under those circumstances.

(Kipnis, 1987, p. 29)

Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience have been developed by the Practicum Council. They did not evolve in isolation from the AECA Code of Ethics but rather as an adjunct to it, with a specific focus on particular situations which may present themselves in fieldwork programs. These guidelines consider the responsibilities for ethical practice that are applicable to the tertiary institution, the student, the cooperating staff, and the centre/school, and inform each about the expectations held for them and what they might expect of other stakeholders. Strategies which can be employed to introduce the guidelines to each of the stakeholder groups include information seminars within the tertiary setting, and inservice sessions for staff in individual settings or group inservices. In developing such strategies, care should be taken to ensure the involvement of staff and students in rural and remote locations. To support the guidelines, a pilot video has been produced by members of the Practicum Council and will be incorporated into a larger project currently under way to develop a teaching resource for the preparation of all early childhood stakeholders for fieldwork. The video includes a series of re-enacted scenarios, based on actual dilemmas described by early childhood stakeholders. The guidelines and teaching package will assist in individual or group preparation of students for field experiences. As Kipnis (1987) explains, the resolution of dilemmas is not simple and 'professions have sometimes laboured collectively for years, both intellectually and politically, working through an issue' (p. 29). However, his strategies for generating and testing principles may be helpful tools when using the guidelines and videos for discussion purposes.

Using video materials and the guidelines as a starting point, students may be asked to:

- **Generalise**
  Consider how uniform compliance with a rule might change professional practice.

- **Restate the problem**
  Instead of directly asking how the practitioner should act, it may be useful to change the question slightly to ask how an early childhood educator would act in an ideal world.

- **Guard against illicit topic changing**
  The discussion may be sidetracked by such issues as centre policies, which should indeed be changed. Make sure the right questions are asked.

- **Consider the role of the profession**
  Can peak bodies such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children or the Australian Early Childhood Association collectively assist in resolving the dilemma? Are there things the profession can do to prevent the problems from arising in the first place?
Nurture disagreement

Those who disagree nearly always teach us something new or remind us of something forgotten (Kipnis, 1987, pp. 29–30).

Further strategies involve encouraging universities and TAFE colleges to include the guidelines within fieldwork handbooks to ensure dissemination to all cooperating staff involved in any given fieldwork session. This strategy would allow the guidelines to be available for quick reference during fieldwork and provide a focus for debriefing by both staff and students following the fieldwork experience.

Conclusion

Students appear to need some support in determining what constitutes an ethical decision-making situation, and then in knowing how to deal with it. The dilemma situations in which students find themselves during fieldwork are on the whole, ‘fieldwork dilemmas’ rather than ethical dilemmas. Nevertheless, they are very real, and cause stress to students, sometimes to the point of causing them to question their future in their chosen profession. It is the responsibility of the institution preparing students for the early childhood work force to ensure that this preparation is as thorough as possible. This would mean inclusion of the study of ethics within professional education subjects. The Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience provides one source for such professional development. Others to be included could be the AECA Code of Ethics as well as various resource publications which direct attention to the understanding and implementation of ethical guidelines (see Fasoli & Woodrow, 1991; NAEYC, 1994).
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Editorial

In a society characterised by fragmentation and diversity, families are increasingly making use of early childhood services and relying on early childhood professionals for myriad needs. This volume of AJEC, the first for the new millennium, begins with the premise that early childhood professionals are (must be) leaders. Leadership refers to vision and influence. By vision we mean the foresight, imagination, and commitment to devise new and better ways; and by influence we refer to the capacity to motivate others to participate in the realisation of the vision.

Our question for this edition of the journal then has been 'In what ways can early childhood professionals consolidate their role as leaders in the profession and in society?' We unpack this question and provide case studies as examples.

Fraser provides an overview of the context in which children's services currently operate. She reinforces the need for leadership and action on behalf of children and children's services. She argues that early childhood professionals must create the infrastructures that allow them to be players in decision-making and provides suggestions for action.

Henderson-Kelly and Pamphilon explore the particular challenges for female early childhood professionals as they incorporate the discourse and actions of leadership into their roles. They argue that particular female approaches to leadership suit the times and society in general. They remind us that there is great scope for early childhood specialists who feel ready to assume the mantle of leadership. This premise is reinforced by Waniganayake, Morda and Kapsalakis, who describe the findings from an international project on leadership in early childhood.

The three articles by Pence and Ball, Humphries and Senden, and Hayden and Macdonald profile stories of leadership in the field. Their respective topics of indigenous teacher education, a change process in an occasional care centre, and promoting health within early childhood settings exemplify the benefits of collaboration for early childhood professionals. Pence and Ball describe a postmodernist approach to teacher preparation which they have developed with Canadian Aboriginal communities. The Generative Curriculum Model which they have described demonstrates how early childhood services can be both responsive and accountable under divergent circumstances. Hayden and Macdonald's research is leading towards a new role for early childhood professionals, and a new vision for early childhood settings. Child care settings they demonstrate, are health promotion settings; the loci for networking and collaboration, where the wellbeing of children, families, and community are facilitated and sustained.

Finally, Newman argues that leadership and ethics are synonymous. Beyond embedding service delivery within an ethical framework, Newman exhorts early childhood leaders to be proactive in clear articulation and promotion of the ethical aspects of their work.

Considered as a whole, these seven articles provide us with a multi-layered explication of leadership in early childhood education. They were chosen as examples of the promise and the challenges which the new millennium holds for the profession of early childhood and, by implication, for a more responsive and vital society.

Jacqueline Hayden and Helen Gibson
Edition Editors

Letter to the Editor

I would like to forward my congratulations for a superb issue of the AJEC titled 'Reconceptualising Early Childhood #1'. Glenda MacNaughton and Sue Dockett have provided a unique opportunity for early childhood staff to engage in critical thinking usually restricted to spaces available only to those interested in contemporary theory. The widening up of this theory to the early childhood sector will hopefully allow other practitioners the opportunity to engage in conversation which will critique our practices.

Well done to all involved and I eagerly await issue #2.

Cheers

Anthony Semann
Lady Gourrie Child Centre, Sydney
Ethical leadership or leadership in ethics?

Linda Newman
School of Learning, Development and Early Education
University of Western Sydney—Nepean

People in leadership positions in early childhood services have multifaceted jobs. Underpinning all aspects of their leadership is the need to act ethically and to lead their teams to do likewise. In this paper it is argued that acting ethically is not enough, particularly in a climate of change and challenge. Leaders are called on to re-conceptualise their ideas about the importance of the ethical agenda to all aspects of their work. They are prompted to show conceptual leadership by not only leading ethically but also finding ways in which they can move the ethical agenda in Australia forward. Some ideas are proposed and leaders are asked to reconsider the importance of ethics in their work within early childhood settings and beyond.

In a Sydney newspaper recently I saw a small article that outlined how child care centres were closing in less affluent suburbs of Sydney. The author (unnamed) went on to say that child care was fast becoming a privilege for the rich (Daily Telegraph, 1999). I was prompted to think about the ethical dilemmas that could arise for centre directors as they were forced to make economically influenced decisions about enrolment that could affect the lives of children and families. Many issues of an ethical nature arose for early childhood personnel in the 1990s and reflect a general trend in wider society.

The 1990s may well be remembered as the time when morals and ethics were re-discovered (or at least re-discussed) and our society's leaders were charged by the public to act more ethically. Following a period in the 1980s where greed was seen to dominate the corporate world, many commentators have called for a re-think about the goals of western society. In New South Wales there was a royal commission into corruption in government departments, and we now have an independent commission against corruption (ICAC). Today in the Sydney Morning Herald I read several ethics-related articles, including an advertisement for an Inquiry into Human Cloning (SMH, 1999, p.34); and a call by Geoffrey Robertson, a prominent human rights lawyer, for a 'third age' in the human rights revolution where the world begins to 'use ethical principle alone' to recognise that 'cowardice in the cause of human rights is no longer an option' (SMH, 1999, p.7).

Public discourse about ethics is now consistent and prominent. Many professions are struggling to improve the professional ethics of their members and thus improve public confidence. For early childhood leaders, there are increasing numbers of ethical issues, and many parallel those in society in general. Early childhood education in Australia is undergoing rapid change and, as people who work at all levels within the profession struggle to come to terms with the changes and new constraints related to economic rationalism, visionary leadership is called for. Nurses in Australia provide an excellent example of how a profession can embrace a great change and use it as a positive force. In recent years, their whole method of preparation has undergone radical change, from hospital-based to university-based. There was resistance and tension. Nurses, however, embraced the changes and are consistently rated by the public as the 'most ethical' professionals (Milne, 1997; The Bulletin, 1999).

The leaders who will move the early childhood profession forward in the new millennium must adopt the notion of a new conceptual and visionary level of leadership that will re-invigorate early childhood personnel after a period of change and the uncertainties that this brings. Without vision, leadership becomes mere management. Our leaders can take cues from the conceptual leadership of the past that has led to the development of quality assurance processes and codes of ethics and guidelines, and can now envisage further leaps forward. I am proposing that a new level of conceptual leadership can emerge, based on an ethical agenda, already soundly established in Australia.

Kagan and Neuman (1997, p.59) define conceptual leadership as 'about how we think together about the field's destiny and the role that early care and
education must play in a democratic society'. Conceptual leadership involves vision. In the United States of America George Bush unconvincingly talked about 'the vision thing' in an election campaign. He resoundingly lost the election to Ronald Reagan, who convinced the nation of his vision. In a later election, Bush addressed his recognised gap by calling for 'a kinder, gender nation'. The positive effect for him at the next election was dramatic (Kidder, 1995, p.101). In this paper, I discuss ideas that I hope will prompt early childhood leaders to see how they can show visionary leadership by promoting and advancing leadership in the ethical agenda that has begun strongly in early childhood education in Australia. I don't think I would receive much opposition from anyone within the profession to my personal desire to see early childhood educators rated as highly ethical, along with nurses.

As an early childhood educator I find myself constantly referring to Bronfenbrenner's systems theory (Lerner, Lowenthal & Egan, 1998) to draw parallels between what is happening in our society in general (the macro level of our lives) and what is happening within my profession (the meso level) and within individual early childhood settings (the micro level). For this reason Geoffrey Robertson's call to address issues in human rights prompted me to reflect on my own work in early childhood ethics, and inspired me to show how his notion of a 'third age' in human rights could provide a useful model for the progress early childhood educators are making with the ethics agenda in Australia. Robertson's conceptualisation of the 'third age' in human rights goes as follows: in the first age the rhetoric of liberty was established (French and American revolutions); in the second age statements of principles were developed (Universal Declaration; Geneva and Genocide Conventions); we now need to embrace the third age in which the concept of enforcement applies. He cites numerous current examples where leaders, internationally recognised as war criminals, are under arrest or being pursued. In the past, such leaders have been given immunity under the principle of national sovereignty and now live protected and in luxury. Robertson declares that the time has come for this to change (Robertson, 1999). As discussions about the need for renewed morality and ethics surround us, the time has come for early childhood leaders to embrace a 'third age of ethics' in our own profession.

**The third age of early childhood ethics**

The first age of ethics in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America was to recognise the need for an active ethics agenda and to educate and mobilise the profession to discuss and address the issue. Leaders thought, talked, and wrote about early childhood ethics. They were pro-active and led the educational field in defining this agenda. The second age came when these leaders moved the agenda forward and developed codes of ethics and accompanying support materials and disseminated them throughout the field. It is time now to move into the third age of early childhood ethics by reconceptualising the use of our codes and guidelines. The existence of documents does not ensure ethical practice. The principles that inform these documents must underpin daily practice. Our ethical agenda will then become constitutional rather than merely distributional (Hayden, 1999; Newman, 1999). Our fourth age in early childhood ethics will come when we have developed as a profession to the point where we have professional bodies that can embrace the concept of enforcement of sanctions for breaches of ethical action within the profession.

**How will the third age look?**

In the third age of ethics in early childhood education, ethical thought and action will be more overt and articulated clearly. Leaders in ethics will assist those people they lead to think through, and reflect upon, their ethical responses to many situations, including teaching and learning, management, and work with families. Ethical principles that commonly underpin early childhood codes and guidelines include *beneficence*, or the notion of 'doing good'; *non-maleficence*, the notion of doing no harm; *justice* or fairness; *fidelity*, or promise-keeping, faithfulness and loyalty; and *autonomy*, or the right to freedom of action and choice. Ethical principles will underpin all work, and will be openly discussed. Government policies, decisions, community services, and social justice for children and families will all be discussed in terms of the ethical implications. In the third age, early childhood leaders will join with families and other professionals to apply ethical principles to strengthen the argument for ethical treatment of all young children.

**Ethical leadership**

There is a strong literature base about leadership in general, and the early childhood literature is no exception. Hayden (1996), for example, has called
for a reconceptualisation of leadership in early childhood settings, and her ideas have received support from Kagan and Bowman (1997), who elaborate on the complexities involved in leadership as:

... A deeper and more far reaching developmental relationship between persons within and outside the organisation... leaders spend more time in reflective, dynamic and value based planning... leaders provide vision and are a source of inspiration as well as structure and direction, to their colleagues (Culkin, 1997, p.4).

Leadership then, goes beyond management. Culkin’s description of leadership implies the implementation of higher order skills such as the ability to inspire, motivate, imagine, and direct; that is to lead. Leadership specifically in terms of ethical issues has been less well addressed. Ethics for leaders has two main dimensions. The first is ethical leadership—the responsibility of a leader to think, act and lead ethically. The second is leadership in ethics—acting as a role model, mentor, and teacher to those who she or he aims to lead. Inherent to leadership in ethics is the ability to ‘talk the talk’ of ethics, that is to explain thought and action in terms of ethical principles and theories. This second dimension encompasses conceptual leadership in ethics.

Ethics can be described as

The behaviour of individuals... which is thought to be right, fair, good or just. The perceived level of rightness, goodness or justice of people’s behaviour determines whether their behaviour is described as being either ethical or unethical (Newman & Pollinz, in preparation).

In early childhood education, what is right, fair, good, and just is based upon educators’ knowledge and experience in child development, educational theory and pedagogy, sociocultural understandings, and the core values of early childhood education. Based on the aforementioned tenets, early childhood managers and leaders have a solid base for understanding how to act ethically, and most people involved in the field would agree that, overall, early childhood educators do their best to act ethically. Inherent to the role of leadership is an expectation by those who follow and support the leader that their leader will act ethically. (For an in-depth examination of ethics, professional ethics, and the development of ethical judgement see Newman & Pollinz, in preparation).

Early childhood educators have been at the forefront of the movements to address and improve professional ethics. In the USA, a code of ethics and support materials were developed under the auspices of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (Katz, 1997). In Australia, through the Australian Early Childhood Association (AEC), a Code of Ethics was similarly developed and adopted (AEC, 1991). This was followed and supported by the development of Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience (Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW, 1998). However, at times, there may be no code statement to support personnel in a specific issue, code statements can conflict with each other (Newman & Pollinz, 2000), and codes can become tokenistic documents that are not used and embedded into daily practice (Newman, 2000). Codes are necessary and useful, but insufficient on their own.

Conceptual leadership in ethics

Effective conceptual early childhood leaders need to use the codes and guidelines available to them not only to support their modelling of and motivation for ethical behaviour, but to actively instruct, direct, and lead their staff to better learn about, understand, and practise ethical behaviour. Kagan and Neuman (1997) call for early childhood educators to ‘think forward and to think broadly’ (1997, p.59). They explain that in the early childhood field this means thinking beyond the needs and interests of each program or centre to thinking about the field as a whole. I was saddened recently to hear a new early childhood graduate explain that she could not network with nearby colleagues for advice and support because the centres in her area were in fierce competition for clients. She recounted an incident where she rang a neighbouring centre. As soon as they heard where she worked, they hung up the phone. Our need for conceptual leadership and awareness of the relationship of current issues to the ethics of working with children and families may never have been greater. Kagan and Neuman outline the many different forms that conceptual leadership may take. In Table 1 some of their dimensions of conceptual leadership are related to various approaches and strategies that Australian early childhood educators can adopt to develop and extend their leadership in ethics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Leadership</th>
<th>Leadership in Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders inspire the creativity of their people and give them some sense of what the organisation could become.</td>
<td>Develop and promote your setting as an ethical organisation. Conduct an ‘ethics audit’ to see how ethics is incorporated in every aspect of daily work. Develop evaluation procedures to monitor ethical behaviour. Learn about and practise the resolution of ethical dilemmas. Engage in reflective ethical conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders call forth skills, talents and resources to make the future happen.</td>
<td>Develop an action plan to show how staff can improve ethical thinking and action. Know and articulate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to ethical practice. Discuss ethical practice with families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace the we-can’t-do that mentality with the how-can-we do it?</td>
<td>Target an issue that is concerning staff in your setting. Use the AECA Code of Ethics to devise strategies to improve the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move away from micro-management and allow oneself and others the space to be creative.</td>
<td>Join or start a local network to improve a practice or policy that is having a negative impact on the lives of children and families. Encourage and allow for staff involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep 'eyes on the horizon'.</td>
<td>With a network group, devise a 'five year plan' to improve the public image of the early childhood profession in your area. Learn about global issues for children and discuss in terms of ethical principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate a clear vision of the program’s future and a general plan of action for getting there.</td>
<td>Based on your ethics audit, devise a long-term plan to show how every aspect of the program can relate to the AECA Code of Ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus less on issues within the organisation and more on between and across them.</td>
<td>Join and become active in a professional association such as AECA or Association for Professional and Applied Ethics. Work with other members of the teaching profession in primary and secondary education to help them achieve advances in their ethical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider change within early childhood education and within the broader social context.</td>
<td>Consider the global issues for children and families by engaging in discourse with people from around the world. Know and disseminate: The United Nations Convention on The Rights of the Child. Work to improve social conditions in your community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate a large and diverse audience.</td>
<td>Talk in many private and public situations about the ethical practice of early childhood professionals. Join organisations outside the early childhood field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide policy-makers with ideas as to how early childhood knowledge can be incorporated into legislation.</td>
<td>Articulate early childhood philosophies and practices clearly and in a way that lay people can understand. Avoid jargon. Show how policies that advantage children and families can be devised at local, state, and federal level. Respond to calls for community input into inquiries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate links with the power sources in the community.</td>
<td>Take advantage of any opportunity to meet and influence policy-makers, politicians or financial advisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage parents to become better consumers and advocates for their children.</td>
<td>Articulate what you do and how you do it. Be accountable. Help parents to know what to look for. Show how your organisation uses the Code of Ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be involved in the life of the community, advancing early childhood education with other child and family issues.</td>
<td>Join transdisciplinary network groups. Consider yourself part of a wider group of professionals who care for and educate children and families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

At a time when early childhood education in Australia is faced with economic constraints, changes in the preparation and evaluation of staff, changes to regulatory bases, and increasing commercialisation, a unique opportunity is available for leaders to define a conceptual advance. Ethics can be the unifying thesis within which all arguments for improvement are centred. Using the ethical frameworks that have already been developed in this country, leaders can enhance early childhood practice by bringing ethics to the forefront of daily work, rather than using it as an underpinning, unseen framework. Our ethical base, our use of ethical principles, and our ethical practice must be overt and discussed widely and loudly. When all early childhood personnel can relate their teaching and learning, management, advocacy, and community activities to their ethical frameworks our profession will be viewed more positively within our society. The role of our leaders is to go beyond the modelling of ethical behaviour to the conceptualisation of a profession in which ethics is overtly and prominently addressed. This will be the third age of ethics in early childhood education.

Leaders need to be able to share the high quality work that has been commenced in early childhood education with other areas of the educational community, and beyond. They need to embrace a broadened vision of early childhood education that goes beyond the micro level of their own settings to encompass the meso level of their communities and the global level of all children and families around the world. As Snook (1999) exhorts so strongly:

[Politics, self interest and ideology] have now become part of the reality which educators have to recognise clearly, criticise trenchantly and work to subvert. It is no longer appropriate to retain a Romantic view of childhood...there is a need to relate early childhood to the wider social scene (p.1).

Policy-makers, funders, and consumers should all receive the message that early childhood personnel have a deep sense of ethical commitment to their work and will embed ethical principles into action at
a local, national, and international level. When all the children of the world are being cared for and educated ethically, early childhood leaders will know that their work has been successful.
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This paper was prepared following a conference presentation that was given, in response to several suggestions, that we discuss video making experiences to benefit other researchers who may be considering this method of research dissemination. To maintain a focus on professional ethics, the paper examined the “meta-ethics” aspect of the process. Researcher reflections are discussed as they relate to the dilemmas that arose during the process of making a video about ethics, that included child participants, are presented and explored. This article introduces an as yet unexplored aspect of the project – the experiences of the researchers. For the first time, the notion of using a model of dilemma resolution is introduced. This later led to the development of our own “Ethical Response Cycle”.
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RESEARCHER REFLECTIONS ON THE ETHICAL DILEMMAS OF ETHICS RESEARCH: THE MAKING OF A VIDEO ABOUT EARLY CHILDHOOD FIELDWORK DILEMMAS
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ABSTRACT

Student teachers, co-operating staff and tertiary advisers often encounter dilemmas during field experience. Dilemmas, by their very nature, are never easy to resolve. When researchers working in the arena of student teacher ethical dilemmas encounter their own ethical dilemmas however, interesting reflections result! In this paper the authors talk about their own dilemmas whilst researching ethical dilemmas. We will show how our own reflections led to the use of a model for critical evaluation which can also be useful for resolving early childhood fieldwork dilemmas.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper it is our intention to share some of the reflections that we have engaged in as researchers into the professional ethical preparation of early childhood student teachers. We have shared our reflections with some interested colleagues and fellow ethics researchers who have prompted us to expand upon the thoughts that usually remain confidential within research teams. We hope that our thoughts may be helpful to future researchers and students of ethics. We have been further prompted by writers who encourage the dissemination of real dilemmas as an appropriate vehicle for students and practitioners to use for the resolution of their own dilemmas (Holbrook, 1997; Kitchener, 1984). In this paper we describe how we found ourselves in interesting situations as ethics researchers. The processes and realities of applying research to making caused us to reflect about our own ethical stance. Our project is ultimately aimed at helping students, but our own studies of ethics were called upon to resolve our own dilemmas in the preparation of work about ethical dilemmas. Holbrook (1997) has described a situation in which oral history research became very problematic when the complexities of human nature interfered with the smooth process usually encountered in interviewing. Similarly, we encountered dilemmas that caused us to devote many hours to discussion about ethical issues. We describe our use of what Kitchener (1984) refers to as the intuitive level of ethical decision making which we employed as we engaged in the intense and time restricted process of making a video aimed at helping student teachers develop their ethical judgment abilities. It is our intention that this paper will contribute to the literature about ethical issues and the resolution of dilemmas, and encourage other researchers to engage in dialogue about their research and research application dilemmas. It is our desire to stimulate and extend debates about ethics and ethical issues in the field of early childhood education and early childhood research. The terms ethics and morals are used interchangeably in this paper.
BACKGROUND

The work described in this paper forms part of an ongoing project on ethics as it relates to fieldwork (commonly referred to as “prac”), that commenced in 1994 in conjunction with members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales. Major components of the project have included: the presentation of *Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience* for public consultation and feedback at the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) Conference in Perth in 1994; two research projects with students and other fieldwork stakeholders; the collection, review and refinement of a set of dilemma “scenarios” for use with students in the discussion of fieldwork dilemmas; the production of a pilot video in 1996; and the award of a Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) grant to produce an extended video for all stakeholders, write a resource manual and to produce an interactive technology package in 1997.

In this paper we focus on one aspect of the CUTSD funded project – the making of a twenty minute video entitled *Let's Get Ethical: Recognising and resolving ethical dilemmas in early childhood field experience*. The video depicts six typical situations of dilemma in early childhood fieldwork. Our role in this process was that of Project Managers. This involved, amongst numerous other aspects, contracting and consulting with a professional film company; selecting appropriate dilemmas for depiction in the video; consulting on script development, casting and filming; selecting locations for filming; liaison with appropriate personnel; consulting on editing; and management of the budget. The film company was responsible for converting raw scenarios into a script, casting, organising location logistics, filming, editing and final production. Other participants in the process included early childhood and school staff, families, children, acting cast, film crew and film company personnel. The number and range of participants involved led to some complexities in relationships that will be discussed later in this paper.

As Project Managers we have always remained conscious of the need to institute and maintain ethical safeguards for the project, particularly in any aspects of the work that involve vulnerable young children. Ethical consciousness has been at the forefront of our thinking, as we constantly read, discuss and develop our work about ethics. Some of the safeguards we have employed have included application to university ethics committees to conduct research; permission from Directors and Principals to use locations, including constraints on identification of people and schools as indicated by employing organisations; permission from parents for the involvement of their children; only voluntary involvement of children who were old enough to choose; and the presence on the film set at all times of qualified early childhood educators to monitor the ethical dimensions of the project. Even though all appropriate safeguards were in place dilemmas arose and decision making has not always been straightforward or easy.

The very nature of the project itself has given rise to dilemmas as we have struggled with definitions of ethical dilemmas, decisions about the nature of dilemmas to depict, choices about appropriate cast members, issues about using babies and children as actors to depict situations of dilemma in which there may be potential harm to real children, and impressions and reactions of actors, film crews, families and centre/school staff to the portrayal of dilemma situations in the early childhood field. Our dilemmas and experiences were numerous, fascinating, informative and the source of extended and in depth reflection about our roles and our chosen profession. We
will concentrate on a few examples in this article to illustrate a framework of dilemma resolution proposed by Kitchener (1984) as useful in the work of counselling psychologists. We found the framework helpful and it is our proposition that this framework can be usefully employed in early childhood education for discussion about, and resolution of, ethical issues.

A FRAMEWORK TO ASSIST IN DILEMMA RESOLUTION

Karen Kitchener (1984) has developed a framework for use by counselling psychologists in dilemma resolution when a problem [exists] for which no course of action seems satisfactory. The dilemma exists because there are good, but contradictory ethical reasons to take conflicting and incompatible courses of action (p. 43). There are parallels between counselling psychology and early childhood education as both are seen as “helping professions” in which there is an explicit charge to help and not to harm people. [and therefore] individuals involved in the helping professions have an obligation over and above that of the lay person to act in an ethically consistent and thoughtful manner (Kitchener, 1984, 43). Kitchener’s framework then, can be usefully applied to dilemma resolution in early childhood education, and specifically, fieldwork. If counselling psychologists can be helped by the use of the model as acting ethically involves professionals in difficult decision making for which they are poorly prepared [and] frequently they even lack the tools to identify what issues are at stake... (Kitchener, 1984, 43), then early childhood educators can be helped too. Research has suggested that this help is needed by students and practitioners (Coombe & Newman, 1997; Newman, Pollnitz & Goodfellow, 1997; Pollnitz, 1993).

Kitchener (1984) rationalises the need for her model by explaining that codes of ethics may give minimal guidance when practitioners are faced with decisions of ethical consequence. Ethical principles may conflict, or there may be no specific guideline to give direction in some situations. Use of the AECA Code of Ethics can lead to similar perplexities. Early childhood educators can be faced with difficult decisions such as weighing up two competing points from the code of ethics such as, 1.11 Work to ensure that young children are not discriminated against on the basis of gender, age, race, religion, language, ability, culture or national origin against, 2.3 Engage in shared decision making with families. Situations do arise where ethical statements compete, opinions differ, and educators must act (sometimes quickly) in a situation of dilemma. For example, it is conceivable that an early childhood teacher may institute policies in her/his centre to ensure that all children, regardless of gender, say, or religion, take part in activities or routines together, for example, role plays that include boys and girls dressing up in many types of clothing. The educator firmly believes that he or she is being fair, and doing what is in the best interests of all children. All children should be offered equal opportunities. At the same time, the educator is firmly committed to involving parents in decision making and may encounter a dilemma when different families have widely differing views from each other about what is appropriate or desirable for their children. For example, some clothes may be deemed inappropriate by some parents for their children. Educators too, will have views based on their education and personal value system and will need to decide which code statement takes precedence. The decision making process is complex. Kitchener offers assistance for dilemma resolution by outlining two levels of moral reasoning, which underlie ethical decision-making – the Intuitive Level and the Critical Evaluative Level.
The Intuitive Level

At the Intuitive Level of reasoning or decision making, professionals use the ethical beliefs that they have developed, based on what they “should” or “should not” do. For early childhood educators, knowledge about what they should or should not do is based on what they have learnt and believe about what is appropriate and best for children and families, as well as their knowledge about early childhood ethical principles. People sometimes need to respond immediately, or intuitively, in ethical situations, based on this knowledge. Often, there is not the time for reflection and everyday moral decisions are made (Kitchener, 1984, p.44). This is particularly evident in early childhood settings that are always busy and sometimes operate with minimum staffing. Time constraint was also evident in our making of a video that had to be completed within set time and budget constraints. Despite ethical preparation and education

some ethical dilemmas or issues will arise which we cannot possibly have foreseen. In these cases when we have not previously considered the ethical implications, when an immediate decision is necessary, and when there are no convenient professional rules on which to rely, our “moral good sense” or conscience is critical (Kitchener, 1984, 44).

This happened to us on the film set. A situation arose where we employed intuitive reasoning and is described in a following section.

Although there is certainly the need for recognition and understanding of the intuitive level of moral reasoning, Kitchener explains why this level alone is not enough. In some dilemma situations people may have no ordinary sense of which direction to take. Furthermore, intuitive decision making cannot always be trusted. Examples of professionals being sued for malpractice provide sufficient evidence of this. A higher order of moral reasoning is called for to guide, refine and evaluate ordinary moral judgment. The critical evaluative level is needed to illuminate our ordinary moral judgment and to redefine the bases for our actions in similar situations (Kitchener, 1984, 45).

The Critical-Evaluative Level

The Critical-Evaluative Level of reasoning is called for when people are called to evaluate or justify their ordinary moral judgments. Within the Critical-Evaluative Level, Kitchener has proposed a three-tiered hierarchy to be used as each form of justification fails to provide an effective basis for action. That is, if level one fails to provide sufficient justification for a decision, move up to level two, and so forth. Tiers 1 and 2 are discussed in this paper.

Tier 1 – Ethical Rules

The first tier comprises the moral rules of a profession – stated as ethical codes, which are based on ethical principles grounded in ethical theory. Within early childhood education in Australia, personnel may draw from the AECA Code of Ethics (1991), the Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience (1998) and the Principles of Field Experience in Early Childhood Professional Preparation Programs (‘Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW, 1999). For example, an early childhood practitioner may justify a particular child guidance or play strategy used within her centre on the basis of AECA Code statement 1.13 Engage only in practices that are respectful of and provide security for children and in no way degrade...them psychologically or physically. However, a parent may disagree with the approach and claim that
the practitioner is not (Statement 2.5) Acknowledging the uniqueness of each family, and the significance of its culture, customs, language and beliefs (refer to previous example). If someone challenges the judgment, or the person finds that rules are not sufficient, it becomes necessary to move to the next tier of ethical theory.

**Tier 2 – Ethical Principles**

Principles serve as the foundation of moral rules or codes – statements of principle are more general and fundamental than rule or code statements. Kitchener (1984) has chosen to adopt five well-recognised key principles for the evaluation of ethical concerns in Psychology and these are also useful for early childhood educators. The five key principles are: autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, justice and fidelity. These are briefly described below, and are related to early childhood education. For a more extensive description and discussion see Kitchener (1984). As in Psychology, these principles already underlie much of what is written about ethics in early childhood education.

**Autonomy**

The concept of autonomy implies freedom of action and freedom of choice. Along with the freedom of one person to act autonomously comes the responsibility to respect the rights of others to act autonomously. Respect for autonomy is embedded in many of the principles that underlie the AECA Code of Ethics. For example statement 5.6, Work to complement and support the child rearing function of the family, implies autonomy for the professional in deciding how to work, but also autonomy for families to make decisions about their child rearing practices. Statement 2.7, Respect the right of the family for privacy, implies that autonomous individuals within families have a right to make autonomous decisions about their own lives and what information is disclosed about them.

**Nonmaleficence**

The concept of nonmaleficence is about not causing harm to others. It includes both not causing intentional harm as well as not engaging in actions which risk harming others. It forbids certain kinds of actions. The concept of nonmaleficence is expressed in the AECA code, for example, in statement 1.6, Recognise that young children are vulnerable and use my influence and power in their best interests and maintain confidentiality.

**Beneficence**

The concept of beneficence is about “doing good”, not just doing no harm. The AECA code illustrates many examples of beneficence such as statement 2.9, assist each family to develop a sense of belonging to the services in which their child participates.

**Justice**

Justice, put simply is “fairness”. In society where there are limited goods and services available, rules must be made as to how they will be distributed. All cases should not necessarily be treated in the same way but the onus is on whoever treats people differentially to justify their actions.

**Fidelity**

The concept of fidelity is basic to all helping professions. It implies promise keeping, faithfulness and loyalty. Individuals are freely consenting to participate in a relationship and an ethical commitment for all parties is implied. Kitchener explains the principle of fidelity as
particularly important in psychology as issues like truthfulness and loyalty are basic to trust. While trust is basic to all human relationships, it is particularly vital to client-counsellor, researcher-participant, supervisor-supervisee and or consultant-consultee relationships (Kitchener, 1984, 51). While early childhood educators do not usually refer to “clients”, similar levels of relationship exist between early childhood practitioners and their children and families, and similar obligations on the part of the practitioner to be honest, truthful and reliable apply.

APPLYING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The use of the ethical principles described above provides a framework by which we can critically consider ethical issues. While the use of the principles alone may not resolve a dilemma, reference to the principles provides a starting point for action. In ethical matters the use of the term *prima facie* suggests:

*that we must abide by a principle unless it conflicts with another principle or unless there are extenuating circumstances that throw it into question. In other words, while ethical principles are not absolute, they are always morally relevant and give us consistent advice about what moral issues need to be considered... moral principles count even when they do not win* (Kitchener, 1984, p.52).

The following examples of dilemmas encountered during the making of a video about dilemmas during fieldwork show how the levels of decision making, and the ethical principles described above were usefully employed. The high-pressure environment of tight film schedules necessitated employment of the intuitive level of decision making on numerous occasions during filming. Because of budget constraints, all filming had to be completed within two days, and on three sites. There were no opportunities to rectify filming errors, or omissions later. As early childhood educators, unfamiliar with the language and culture of the work of actors and directors, we had to be vigilant at all times for matters of ethical concern to us. At the editing stage we were able to utilise Critical-Evaluative reflection and identified omissions in our own ethical vigilance. We identified issues that with more experience, we would have dealt with more effectively. For example, we were not involved in all casting decisions, necessarily leaving some decisions to the expertise of the film company. On the day of filming, when it was too late to change contracted actors and volunteers, we were distressed to find that in some instances, the chosen cast would actually change the nature of the dilemma due to, for example, age or ethnic background. We needed to make intuitive decisions in extreme haste, as filming commenced, about changes to scenarios so that they would maintain their strength and integrity, while incorporating characters who were quite different to those originally envisaged. In most cases we were satisfied with final results, but with the benefit of Critical-Evaluative reflection, we still see minor shortcomings in some scenarios that disappoint us.

As researchers, early childhood educators and tertiary teachers, we found that the ethical principle that most concerned us during the filming and production was that of nonmaleficence. This accords with Kitchener’s (1984) review of literature proposing that *noninfliction of harm [is] the most critical principle in applied psychology* (p. 47). We have chosen to write about three examples where we were concerned about causing some type or level of harm to either children or adults.
Example 1 – “Baby Lachlan”, getting too attached to babies

In this video scenario, a student at the centre seems to be the only person who can successfully settle a new child. The student expresses concern to his girlfriend about this as his Prac is nearly over. In order to film this scenario it was necessary to obtain footage that showed an unhappy child. We stressed to the film crew from the start that at no time would we permit anyone to purposefully cause the chosen child distress. “Lachlan’s” parent was a staff member at the university and was very positive about the project. She was happy for him to be involved and not concerned about the process. She was aware of the script. “Lachlan” was fairly new at the centre. The film company was extremely co-operative in taking the time needed to obtain “natural” shots of interactions within the centre. No interactions were contrived or forced. However, the very nature of the filming process means that scenes need to be re-shot several, or sometimes many, times. When filming is taking place in a normally operating child care centre this process is further complicated as children investigate cameras, want to – or don’t want, be in shot, parents arrive unexpectedly, and staff forget a scene is underway or express a need to change the environment for the children’s routine. Within these constraints, the scenario was progressing well until we discovered that “Lachlan” – supposed only to attach to student “Matt”, took a particular dislike to the actor playing the part. He was successfully comforted by his “mother”/actor, but this must have caused him some confusion as his arrival at the centre was repeatedly re-played. Every scene in which the child was supposed to feel reassured by the student resulted in the child being upset by the presence of the student/actor. As each scene was repeated many times, “Lachlan’s” confusion and frustration mounted and we became increasingly concerned. With the principle of nonmaleficence in mind, we needed to decide when to intervene. Luckily, the film company’s expertise came to the fore and they were able to abandon “real” interactions between the child and the actor and cleverly cut scenes to make it appear as if the student was interacting with the child, when in fact, the child was really interacting naturally in the setting with a familiar carer. The actor/student, when appearing to interact with the child is really talking only to the camera. Scheduling was reviewed to allow some scenes to be shot the following day, to allow the child a rest. The question of nonmaleficence to the young male actor, so rejected by the child, is another matter.

Upon critical-evaluative reflection we were cautioned by the words of Ramsey (cited in Kitchener, 1984), that

*Children, depending on their age, may be incompetent (e.g. an infant) or of limited competence...Because of their lack of, or limited ability to make autonomous choices, issues involving informed consent are particularly problematic. Clearly an infant cannot give informed consent to participate in research or treatment. For this reason Paul Ramsey (1970) argues for ethical conservatism in protecting the rights of children... he suggests that the concept of parental consent is a fiction, Parents cannot consent for their children, he argues, because they cannot know whether the child, if he/she were fully rational, would agree to participate... (p.47).*

Example 2 – “Student Marie”, borderline results

This scenario should strike a chord with anyone who has supervised fieldwork, and with many students. Towards the end of practicum it becomes evident that there will be a very difficult
decision to make about whether a student should pass. She has many strengths, but her work is inconsistent, and some is of a poor standard. The scenario includes a three-way conversation between the university liaison person, co-operating teacher and the student. The student is trying hard and very keen to pass. After filming the tense conversation many times the student/actor turned to the university liaison/actor and said “I hate the way you look at me when you say that. I just know you are not going to pass me”. She was visibly upset and tense. In discussion after filming was complete, the actor needed to “de-brief” with us. She expressed her emotion and felt very drained by the experience. She expressed surprise that any students would put themselves through such an experience. We felt sure that she had decided never to become an early childhood teacher after this episode. We wondered about the harm that may have been done to her on this occasion, but were also provided with a unique window into our profession and processes that appear quite normal to us. We received renewed empathy for students undergoing difficulties. On this occasion we were in the unusual situation of being able to view “ourselves” and our experiences vicariously, that is, through the eyes of people with no previous early childhood education experience. Similarly, following briefing of the actor/university liaison person, we were quite taken aback to see “ourselves” portrayed as the stern, no-nonsense arbiter of someone’s future. Perhaps the principle of nonmaleficence in this instance applied to ourselves as we were forced to face the way others see us.

Example 3 – “Ahmed”, differing child rearing practices
In this scenario, Ahmed is a child of approximately three years of age attending long day care. “Ahmed” was willingly played by a child who hadn’t attended the centre for very long and who spoke very little English. As the scenario unfolds, Ahmed and his good friend, who have had a lovely time making a complex block construction, are asked to pack up. Ahmed continues to play, and when the student teacher encourages him to help with the packing away, he ignores her. The parents of both boys have arrived to take them home and are witness to a hushed conversation in which the teacher explains to the student that it is centre policy to support families’ diverse child rearing practices. In this instance, Ahmed should not be forced to clean up because he is not expected to do this at home. The parent of the other boy communicates her displeasure on observing her own son packing up alone, as she has encouraged all her children to help together on tasks.

“Ahmed” was extremely co-operative and interested in the process of filming. A little too much so in fact. One of the English phrases he had managed to learn was the universal early childhood service “pack away time”. As soon as he heard it he immediately began to comply. A difficult process ensued, of trying to explain to a three year old, who has just begun to understand centre routines, and does not understand much of the language spoken around him, that when the “teacher” said “pack away”, we wanted him NOT to do that. We were very concerned about the confusions we were creating in his mind. Although Ahmed was a willing participant, we were concerned that he may not know exactly what he was volunteering for. We were unsure of just how much he understood. The scene further called for Ahmed to hold his “father’s” hand and walk out of the room. Again, we were concerned about the mixed messages he may be receiving. Salvation came fairly quickly however, when we discovered that “Ahmed’s” “father/actor, actually spoke his home language. We had been told originally that he did not. His “father” was able to explain to him that we were pretending and clearly outlined to him what he should do. “Ahmed” understood well, and it was heartening to see his surprise and delight at being spoken to in his home language. Our concerns were then allayed.
CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have briefly described one aspect of a large project that is being undertaken to facilitate the ethical judgment of students, specifically, the production of a video about dilemmas in fieldwork. We have shown how Kitchener’s framework for dilemma resolution can be used to reflect upon dilemma resolution. We have described some of the examples we encountered in the making of a video, where we employed Intuitive Reasoning and Critical-Evaluative Reasoning. All research has an ethical dimension. Processes and policies for ethics “clearance” for studies and projects are helpful as they allow researchers to anticipate situations such as confidentiality and participant consent. However, no formal processes of preparation can really prepare researchers for all the eventualities of “real life” once the project is underway. Some projects, because of their participatory nature, are more susceptible to dilemmas than others. Action research, interviews, and as it seems, video making engage the researcher directly with participants and ethical issues must be faced directly, and immediately. More research is needed into the ethical dimensions of research in action. It is our hope that this article will stimulate some thought amongst researchers, will facilitate discussion, and will encourage researchers to write about and further research the ethical dimensions of their own research.
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Implementing the Australian Early Childhood Association Code of Ethics: A Constitutional Strategy

Linda Newman

Abstract

Early childhood teachers report anxiety over ethical dilemmas during their preservice field experiences. While codes of ethics and codes of conduct are available for early childhood education, these need to be more than token distributions that are displayed as wall posters and forgotten about. Codes can be moved toward a more embedded constitutional feature of the profession by incorporating improved preparation for ethical judgment into preservice courses for early childhood teachers.

In this chapter, research and resources that are being developed in Australia to assist early childhood student teachers to develop ethical judgment abilities are described and a framework for the development of ethical judgment is suggested.

Introduction

Preston explains that the ethical responsibilities of professionals stem from the role they are performing or the institution they are serving, leading to the idea of role morality or an ethic of agency. Indeed, clarification of a coherent set of ethical responsibilities is an important defining characteristic of a profession. The test of professional ethics is acting in ways that are consistent with the duties entrusted to one in a professional capacity. Professional ethics tend to place a strong emphasis on community service, including a willingness to provide service gratuitously beyond the call of duty (Preston, 1996).
According to Hostetler, the ethical dimensions of teaching have not received a great deal of attention in the literature (Hostetler, 1997). Yet nearly all aspects of teaching reflect the need for awareness of ethical practice. Teaching is a moral exercise in which power is used, ends and means are chosen, and decisions constantly reflect values. Teachers, from their first day on the job, must be able to exercise sound judgment about ethical issues. Ethical issues involve the critical incidents such as physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, as well as the subtle or open to interpretation issues involving application of policy, developmentally appropriate practice, and the use of power and control (Coombe & Newman, 1997a; Prillettensky, Rossiter, & Walsh-Powers, 1996).

In 1991 the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) introduced their Code of Ethics and supporting materials (Fasoli & Woodrow, 1991). Two years later, in a representative survey, less than half of a group of 225 early childhood practitioners reported being aware of the AECA Code (Pollnitz, 1994). Of those who were, it was the more highly qualified and experienced practitioners who reported that they found the code useful (Pollnitz, 1994).

This is understandable. New teachers tend to be concerned with everyday issues of survival (Katz, 1977). “Graduands are unlikely to focus upon esoteric notions of ethics, values, or professional morality” until later in their careers (Clyde, 1989, p. 15). However, the complex issue of accelerated movement toward higher order skills such as ethical judgment and advanced advocacy, if addressed appropriately within tertiary preparation courses, will reduce, not add to, new teacher anxiety.

**Student Teachers and Professional Ethics**

It is increasingly common for students to return to their tertiary institutions following professional experience to describe problematic situations in which they were involved (Coombe & Newman, 1997b; Edwards, 1993; Skaff, 1997). These most frequently include dilemmas that involve conflicts of interest between parties involved in fieldwork (students, cooperating center/school staff, tertiary supervisors, institution administrators). The result is feelings of powerlessness in students. While student teachers are being taught to implement best practice, they do not always see best practice in action. Thus the student teachers come to question their role as players in the field. At what point should they be beginning to influence practice rather than observing and replicating it?

Student teachers appear to move developmentally, from beginner to practitioner, but the acquisition of ethical judgment does not necessarily
develop in predictable stages for all students. This acquisition often depends upon the chance of being confronted and having to deal with, reflect upon, and resolve an ethical issue. Preservice tertiary educators can assist in developing pedagogic practices that provide opportunities to move their student teachers toward higher levels of ethical judgment.

In 1995 and 1996, members of The Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales developed *Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience*. These guidelines grew out of the AECA Code of Ethics and were targeted at all stakeholders involved in fieldwork programs.

**The Pilot Project**

A pilot project aimed at empowering early childhood student teachers to effectively make appropriate and ethical judgment using the AECA Code of Ethics and the *Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience* was undertaken. The project involved the preparation of student teachers for their fieldwork placements.

In order to identify what student teachers saw as ethical issues, and what their experiences during field experience had been, pilot research was conducted to investigate student teacher experiences of dilemmas during field experience (Coombe & Newman 1997a, 1997b; Newman & Coombe, 1999). It was found that students encountered a number of situations of dilemma. Many dilemmas arose because students were in a situation of powerlessness, did not know how to refuse to comply with a request, and did not like what they were seeing. Many students were concerned that if they took action, their final grade would suffer (Newman & Coombe, 1999). These findings led to the production of a video to be used as a teaching tool (Newman, 1996). The video showed student teachers facing dilemmas and was accompanied by discussion starters for the tertiary classroom, for use before or after fieldwork sessions. Students reported that role playing the resolution to the scenarios with follow-up discussion was a useful method for the introduction of issues that may arise during fieldwork.

Further research involved evaluation of the video. Data were sought about the fieldwork priorities and experiences of students, cooperating fieldwork staff, employers and tertiary supervisors. The research provided previously undocumented information about the resolution of dilemmas, both ethical and practical, in early childhood field experience programs. Issues most often identified by respondents revolved around power and control, communication, and dilemmas involving gender (Newman & Pollnitz, 1997).
Following the pilot project, extended resources to facilitate a deeper level of preparation for students were developed. As Baumgart (1996) argues, "ethical behavior is likely to be more effective and more pervasive when developed through education, reflection and deliberate modeling". The resources aim to help tertiary educators to guide students through the maze of ethical judgment and dilemma. A second video was developed. This video addresses all stakeholder interests; reviews ethical dilemmas; is accompanied by a manual that outlines the difference between types of dilemmas; proposes models for ethical decision making; and includes teaching resources.

**Findings: A Taxonomy of Ethical Judgment**

Based on findings from the pilot project and follow-up research, as well as other reported student experiences, it became evident that preparation for ethical judgment can follow on set pathways. A taxonomy was developed as a framework for tertiary teaching. The taxonomy (Figure 1) outlines the conceptual elements of ethical judgment. Levels within the taxonomy are not intended to be strictly hierarchical but to be used as a guideline to give a sense of progression in the development of ethical judgment.

A complex process is involved as students make the shift from being members of the general public to becoming fully practicing early childhood professionals. Codes of ethics cannot ensure that practitioners act ethically because "ethical thinking and decision making are not just following the rules" (Baumgart, 1996; Strike & Soltis, 1985, p. 3). Teachers, as well as knowing legal rights and duties, need to assume an ethical perspective that requires “critical understanding of the moral basis of teaching and working knowledge of the value principles and processes of inquiry involved in ethical thinking, feeling, and acting” (Strom, 1989, p. 268).

While it is agreed that ethical judgment cannot be taught or imposed (Baumgart, 1996; Hostetler, 1997; Prilleltensky, Rossiter, & Walsh-Powers, 1996), students can address issues of morals and ethics and benefit from assistance in applying their knowledge to professional situations (Strom, 1989). The taxonomy shown below describes the stages toward embedding ethical judgment as student teachers move through stages from graduands to professional.

The taxonomy begins at the point of entry to tertiary study, where it should be noted that students come with a vast range of experiences and backgrounds. It culminates at the point where students are ready to graduate and are beginning to gain confidence in their judgment.
toward professional ethical judgment as a practitioner
↑
debriefing, reflection with others
↑
opportunity to exercise ethical judgment
↑
experimentation with dilemma resolution possibilities
↑
personal reflection on ethical issues and resolution options
↑
specialist professional knowledge of ethical issues
↑
awareness of concepts of ethics
↑
knowledge of problem solving skills
↑
development of reflective abilities
↑
knowledge of professional values, legal requirements, and codes
↑
awareness of personal morals and values
↑
introduction of ethical/moral theories

Figure 1 A Taxonomy of Movement Toward Ethical Judgment and Professionalism

Conclusion

Graduands of early childhood courses will be entering a rapidly changing professional world. They need to have the knowledge, skills, and confidence to assume a strong ethical stance. In the present climate of change, some, or much, of the content of their preparation courses could be outdated within a few years. Student teachers have reported a need for greater scope and depth in their preparation for movement toward ethical judgment and professionalism. The ability to reflect upon the ethical dimension of teaching may be the most important tool that tertiary educators can supply.
In this case study, a process has been described that is aimed at supporting and extending use of the AECA Code of Ethics. The study and resources developed will move early childhood teachers toward a better understanding of the need for professional ethics with some guidelines for acting appropriately in situations of dilemma.
Notes

1. For further information or copies of the Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience contact the author at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean, PO Box 10, Kingswood, NSW, Australia 2747; l.newman@uws.edu.au
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Professionals and Ethics

The exercise of ethical decision making is often seen as the highest fulfillment of the human condition (Kidder, 1995, p.186).

It can be argued that to a great extent, the functioning of a community is dependent on the effectiveness of services provided within it, and the quality of service provided in the community has an overall impact on quality of community life. Members of the community who provide human services for others are expected to be knowledgeable, skilled, and behave according to general rules of conduct and community moral principles. Members of professions, for example, doctors and lawyers, constitute a particular group of service providers. They are identified as having higher levels of qualification, greater depths of knowledge, autonomy and higher levels of expertise than other service providers. As a consequence, community members generally highly value their contribution, and in return, expect professionals to behave ethically.

In this chapter, five main themes relating to the ethical behaviour of professionals are discussed. Firstly we discuss professionalism and the implications for ethical behaviour in general, followed by some thoughts about professionals’ use of codes of ethics for dilemma resolution. This leads to discussion about why codes of ethics don’t always provide sufficient guidance to professionals in complex problematic situations. To support the use of codes, we outline frameworks that incorporate the use of ethical principles and theories to facilitate dilemma resolution for professionals. Finally the Ethical Response Cycle is introduced to provide professionals with a model to guide their processes of ethical judgement.

According to Feeney (1985), a profession is:

an occupation requiring advanced study in the liberal arts and sciences and specialised training. But this is not the whole story; profession is an honorific title, a term of approval that is a highly valued collective symbol (cited in Fleet and Clyde, 1993, p. 201).

Brock cites an Australian Council of Professions discussion paper in support of his contention that a profession can be distinguished from a commercially minded occupation by professionals’ obligation to:
at all times place the responsibility for the welfare, health and safety of the community
before their responsibility to the profession, to sectional or private interests, or to other
members of the profession (Brock, 1999, p.12).

Most descriptors of 'a profession' include the fact that the group has a code of ethics to guide ethical action
that is based on that profession's core values. Codes of ethics are aspirational, indicating the users' ability
to apply the code with autonomy, as opposed to codes of conduct that are prescriptive. It is a common
community understanding that professionals are obliged to behave ethically in their relationships with
clients (those individuals and groups who are recipients of the service) rather than to adhere to formal and
specific rules of conduct.

Codes of ethics [as opposed to codes of conduct] usually contain a smaller number of
general or fundamental principles, which will be of particular importance in instances
where a code of conduct is silent or unclear. A code of ethics is better than a code of
conduct for ensuring long term commitment to important values because it demands
something more than compliance. It calls for people to exercise judgement and take
responsibility for decisions they make (Forster, 1999, p. 1-2).

To inform their ethical behaviour and use of codes, professionals can benefit from formal or informal study
of the traditions of ethics. Like the study of any discipline, the study of ethics requires learning definitions,
approaching ground rules and applying strategies to help reach resolutions. Ethics takes practice and requires
a willingness to entertain views in opposition to our own, and a commitment to try to form the most
responsible judgement.

Behaving ethically therefore involves professionals making informed, responsible decisions and acting with
discretion. They take actions about which they are honest, that are just, that have the consent of their
clients, and that maintain the confidentiality of clients. Such decisions and actions are for the good of the
clients and protect their rights. Any decision made by an individual professional should be a decision that
all good members of a particular profession would make (Bayles, 1981; Mitchell & Lovat, 1991; Rich,
1984). In recognition of these characteristics, the community usually places trust in members of the
professions and treats them with respect.

**Personal morality and professional ethics - do we need to differentiate?**

Professional ethical behaviour has specific elements related to professionalism and the core values of each
profession and is not merely based on personal preference. It extends beyond personal or 'private' norms
of behaviour (Strike, Haller & Soltis, 1988, p. 38), that is, those values and standards which govern
individuals' judgements about how they should behave. Furthermore, ethical behaviour can be
distinguished from behaviour that adheres to 'ordinary norms' (Bayles, 1981, p. 16) or public moral
principles that serve to 'regulate the interactions among human beings' (Strike, Haller & Soltis, 1988, p.
41). Ethics, or behaving ethically may be seen as 'obedience to the unenforceable' (Kidder, 1995). A law, it
can be argued, must be obeyed or you will be punished, or fear being punished. So therefore, obeying a law
is 'obedience to the enforceable'. In contrast to this notion is 'obedience to the unenforceable', where
people choose to 'do the right thing', when there is no law binding them to do so, in other words, obedience
to self-imposed law. Nevertheless, personal moral standards always underpin professional ethics. Making choices, as we do on a daily basis, between what is thought to be right and what is thought to be wrong affects the development of our own character and usually affects others (Boersliner, Carlson, Gac & Swanson, 1997); so being ethical and moral has a personal and social aspect (Preston, 1996). Kidder (1996) suggests that the level of ‘obedience to the unenforceable’ (or ethics) is the true measure of the success across communities or nations.

Issues of morality gain complexity when a person chooses to work as a professional. No longer can decisions be made on the basis of personal, family or affiliation group morality. They must be made on the basis of what values are held by the profession. Conflicts can arise. Consider the case of a doctor whose personal religious affiliation prohibits abortion, but who must complete internship requirements in a public hospital to gain registration. Consider the teacher whose community and cultural upbringing has led to her belief that smacking children is a positive and necessary form of loving guidance. In a school system where hitting children is strictly prohibited, she may deeply believe that she is doing long term harm to the children for whom she is responsible by neglecting to physically punish them for misdemeanors. In such situations there is a conflict between personal principles and professional principles. To work as a professional both the medical intern and the teacher must adhere to the values of the profession, rather than to their own personal principles. When working as a professional, a person will still have to decide between competing principles, but the principles are those of the profession and are firmly grounded in the profession’s core values. The decision made between competing principles becomes a professional judgement about what will result in the greater good or the lesser evil (Brock, 1999).

Professional ethics is not, therefore, about behaving with expediency or in ways that cause least trouble for either the professional or the client. Nor is it about behaving solely on the basis of individual or group morality. Individual and group morals are influenced by specific values, attitudes and beliefs that are held either personally, shared with others, or specific to particular cultures or social groupings. Hence, what is perceived by an individual or by one group as morally right may be perceived by others as wrong or inappropriate (Bayles, 1981; Kipnis, 1987). While some individuals, for example, may think that smacking children is acceptable others would regard smacking as child assault. In some cultures monogamy in marriage is valued; in other cultures, polygamy is sanctioned. As providers of services to the community in which there is a diverse range of moral beliefs, it is insufficient for professionals to be guided in their decision-making solely by private, group or public morals. Decision-making on this basis would continually plunge them into conflict with their clients.

*I’ll just check my code of ethics: Why codes and guidelines aren’t always enough.*

It is usual for professional groups to have a code of ethics that guides members’ professional behaviour, though some codes have been criticised as being ‘window-dressing’, or written for protection of the profession itself. Most contain statements of principle about the obligations of the profession to its clients, colleagues and the community. The statements of principle in codes are

not meant to be precise ethical action guides, and they should rarely be applied [this] way. Codified principles and practices can never cover every situation, because circumstances vary and discretionary professional judgement is always necessary (Nash, 1996, p.95-96).
Rather than being simple action guidelines, the statements of principles in codes portray the image of the profession and the professional and establishing moral expectations for the demonstration of professional moral values such as orientation to service, competence, commitment, trust, confidentiality, collegiality, respect for clients, fairness, honesty, fidelity and goodwill (Nash, 1996).

It is a common assumption that when confronted with a dilemma, professionals can resolve it simply by adhering to their code of ethics. In some situations it may be possible to find a solution to a dilemma by referring to statements in the relevant code and by adhering to them, but more often than not, the dilemma exists precisely because a situation arises where the professional is torn between complying with code statements that are in conflict. If she adheres to one statement she finds herself in breach of another (Newman & Pollnitz, 2000).

Codes of ethics may, in reality, give minimal guidance when professionals are faced with decisions of ethical consequence. When drawing on their code to help them resolve a specific dilemma, professionals may find that statements of ethical principle conflict, or there is no specific guideline for direction.

Situations do arise where ethical statements compete, opinions differ, and professionals must act (sometimes quickly) in a situation of dilemma. For example, it is conceivable that an early childhood teacher may institute policies in her/his centre to ensure that all children, regardless of gender, say, or religion, take part in activities or routines together such as role plays that include boys and girls being given the opportunity to dress up in many types of clothing, including clothes traditionally worn by the opposite sex, or in a diverse range of cultures. The educator firmly believes that he or she is being fair, and doing what is in the best interests of all children. All children should be offered equal opportunities. At the same time, the educator is firmly committed to involving parents in decision making and may encounter a dilemma when different families have widely differing views from each other about what is appropriate or desirable for their children. For example, some clothes may be deemed inappropriate by some parents for their children. To support her judgement about how to respond an early childhood educator can consult her code but will need to decide which code statement will take precedence. For example, use of the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) Code of Ethics (AECA, 1991) may conceivably lead to perplexities. Early childhood educators can be faced with difficult decisions such as weighing up two competing points from the code of ethics such as, 1.11 Work to ensure that young children are not discriminated against on the basis of gender, age, race, religion, language, ability, culture or national origin against, 2.3 Engage in shared decision making with families. The decision making process is complex. Forster (1999) contends that for ethical decisions to be made, there must be an awareness of what lies behind ethical choices (p.3).

The following scenario illustrates how an Australian early childhood teacher could find that use of the AECA Code of Ethics (AECA, 1991) was only a beginning point in her reflections about a current dilemma. The scenario illustrates too, her awareness of what lies behind ethical choices. On a busy party day in an early childhood centre, a volunteer parent failed to notice that a young Muslim boy was eating ham, which his parents had explicitly explained during enrolment was strictly forbidden within their religion. What does the AECA Code of Ethics say that is relevant to this situation? Specifically, what does it say that will help the teacher to decide whether or not to stop the child from eating the ham sandwich? For guidance, the teacher can draw on these statements from the Code.
In relation to children, I will:

- Engage only in practices that are respectful and provide security for children and in no way degrade, endanger, exploit, intimidate, or harm them psychologically or physically;
- Ensure that my practices reflect consideration of the child's perspective.

In relation to families, I will:

- Acknowledge the uniqueness of each family and the significance of its culture, customs, language and beliefs; (AECA, 1991).

Trying to adhere to all these statements presents the teacher with a problem. If she takes the unfinished food away, the teacher is clearly meeting her obligation to the family but in the process, may not meet her obligations to the child. By intervening, she may upset the child in front of the other children. As a member of a minority group on this occasion, he may feel embarrassed about what he has done. He may feel distressed about his difference being noted, and even feel like an ‘outsider’. He may feel very guilty about what he has done and be worried about the punishment which may follow. He may no longer be able to enjoy the party. So, by intervening, the teacher exposes the child to potential emotional and perhaps even to physical harm if his parents punish him.

By not intervening though, the teacher knowingly allows the child to be deceived and knowingly allows him to break a central tenet of his religion. Attempting to adhere to all the relevant Code statements doesn't help the teacher decide what she should do.

What does the Code say that will help the teacher decide whether or not to tell the child’s parents that he has eaten some ham. For guidance, the teacher can draw on these statements from the Code, in addition to the previously cited ones:

In relation to children, I will:

- Ensure that my practices reflect consideration of the child's perspective.

In relation to families, I will:

- Consider situations from each family's perspective, especially if differences or tensions arise;
- Strive to develop positive relationships with families that are based on mutual trust and open communication (AECA, 1991).

Again, trying to adhere to all these statements presents the teacher with a problem. If she adheres to the Code statements that relate to the family, she will tell the child’s parents about his eating ham. She cannot know, however, what their reaction will be. Their reaction may put the child at risk of punishment for something the teacher feels was not his fault. Her obligations to the child include protecting him from
potential psychological or physical harm; so in her attempt to adhere to the statements which relate to families, the teacher may not be able to meet her obligations to the child.

If the teacher attempts to adhere to the statements relating to children, she may or may not decide to tell the child's parents about him eating ham. On the one hand she is obligated to protect the child from harmful practices; on the other hand, she is obliged to be respectful of the child within the constitution of his family, so may decide to tell his parents. This would enable them to act in accordance with their religious procedures and practices. Again, it is clear that attempting to adhere to all the relevant Code statements doesn't help the teacher decide what she should do (Newman & Pollnitz, in preparation).

Reference to the Code reveals too, that in relation to the scenario, there are obligations the teacher has to herself (work to complement and support the child rearing function of the family); her colleagues (work with my colleagues to maintain and improve the standard of service provided in my workplace); and to the community and society (provide programs which are responsive to community needs). These obligations may further complicate the dilemma for the teacher because the outcome of choosing between the conflicting obligations can lead to the early childhood service being pulled in different directions (Henry, 1994).

Though not all alternative and potential outcomes relating to the scenario have been explored, enough have been addressed to demonstrate that reliance on adherence to the Code alone is not sufficient to resolve these and other ethical dilemmas that arise in early childhood staffs' daily work with children and families. Similar quandaries can arise for other professionals. As illustrated by the discussion, what codes can do is help professionals identify what their obligations and responsibilities are, where obligations and responsibilities conflict, and what the issues are. According to Henry (1994), identification of these obligations is crucial to the resolution of ethical dilemmas. Professionals who use the codes to identify obligations and responsibilities can feel more certain that colleagues will support them in situations where they have taken a 'risky or courageous' stand in order to resolve an ethical dilemma (Katz, 1988). Codes will not solve ethical dilemmas but will facilitate raising levels of ethical awareness and hopefully encourage ethical practice (Clyde, 1989; Henry, 1995). What is needed to complement and supplement codes as a tool for resolving ethical dilemmas are procedures and strategies which enable professionals to draw on ethical principles and theories to evaluate competing obligations and responsibilities and arrive at ethically defensible decisions.

Forster (1999) supports the contention that reference to widely accepted ethical principles and theories can facilitate the complex process of ethical judgement.

**Thinking beyond the code**

Professionals who understand the ethical dimensions of their work ascribe to agreed underpinning core values for the profession. These have been defined for early childhood professionals and are modified here for professions in general. Professionals should:

- be clear about their goals
- be confident without certainty (healthy skepticism)
- accept and respect their clients
• avoid tricks, gimmicks, bribes and white lies
• use power and resources appropriately (adapted from Stonehouse, 1991)

Professionals who understand the ethical dimensions of their work use ethical indicators to assist them make ethical judgements in problematic situations. Professionals should consider:

• what is right rather than easy, purely pragmatically based or expedient
• what is good rather than simply practical
• what members must not do or condone even if it works or they could get away with it.
• what they must never be accomplices, bystanders, or contributors to (adapted from Katz, 1978, cited in Stonehouse, 1991).

It is these core values that professions draw on when they write their codes of ethics. The professional core values are underpinned by historical and philosophical theoretical positions. As Western world professionals working in the field of ethics we have chosen a specific group of ethical theories and ethical principles that accord with western thinking. We use these to guide ethical analysis and incorporate them into a strategy for resolving dilemmas.

Ethical Theories

Rule-Based Thinking

In rule-based thinking the highest sense of principle is followed despite any consequence. Decisions are based on a clear intrinsic view of what is right or duty rather than considering, or despite, the consequences. Duty is absolute and the standard created is what all others should obey from now on. The maxim ‘do unto others as you would have them do unto you’ applies in rule-based thinking. Decisions are not based on the outcome of the action, but the obligations in performing it.

Ends-Based Thinking

In ends-based thinking decisions are made based on what will be the best for most people. Decisions are made based on the possible consequences of actions, or the realisation of a goal. The decisions made will bring about ‘the greatest good for the greatest number’. This framework focuses on the results of actions rather than the motivation.
Care-Based Thinking

In care-based thinking care about others is a prime concern. Decisions are influenced by putting oneself into ‘others’ shoes’. It embodies the ‘Golden Rule’ of reversibility, ‘do unto others as you would have them do unto you’. The maintenance of human connectedness, stressing the importance of context and situational demands directs decision making. Responses emphasise the moral sentiments of nurture and care. This framework is often associated with women’s reasoning about dilemmas.

Proportionalism/Prudential Personalism Thinking

In proportionalist or prudential personalist thinking standards for behaviour are set but in making decisions about inappropriate behaviour, specific circumstances are also taken account of. Prudential personalists hold that making decisions about what is right or wrong behaviour is a matter of intelligent and systematic seeking for human, personal and communal goals. Judgements are based on informed, intelligent ethical decisions (Newman & Pollnitz, in preparation).

Ethical Principles

Autonomy is an individual’s right to determine a course of action and includes being free to decide and being free to act, but also, autonomy requires the individual to be respectful of the dignity and autonomy of others.

Nonmaleficence is about not causing harm to others, either intentionally or unintentionally and about not taking action that puts others at risk of harm.

Beneficence is about making decisions and taking actions that make a positive contribution to the health and well being of others.

Justice is about being fair to others and about making decisions which promote common interests.

Fidelity is about keeping promises, keeping faith with others and maintaining loyalty to others (Newman & Pollnitz, in preparation).

Frameworks of dilemma resolution for the professions

It has been argued that the resolution of ethical dilemmas requires more than adherence to a code of ethics. As discussed, codes are useful for identifying where problems of obligation and responsibility occur, but have limitations. To address the limitations professionals can learn to use the thinking processes and
language of ethics more and consequently their ethical behaviour, resolution of dilemmas and justification of actions will be greatly facilitated. Frameworks or models of dilemma resolution incorporating reference to ethical principles and ethical theories can help professionals to do this. Frameworks and models can be used as tools by students to prepare for their professional life and by practicing and experienced professionals to reinforce and support sound ethical behaviour and dilemma resolution. Models can show how a step by step process, incorporating reference to codes of ethics, can be used to assist the resolution of ethical dilemmas. When the processes are learnt and used, the professional becomes immersed into the language of ethics and processes of dilemma resolution which then become integral to daily practice. After all, there is no benefit to be gained from recognising a dilemma, if there is no attempt to resolve it satisfactorily. Ethics is complex, and ethical analysis can be largely an intellectual enterprise that relies heavily on clarifying concepts and using specific terminology. By learning the language of ethics, as difficult as it may seem at first, professionals become better equipped to use it for their own purposes of ethical reasoning and sound justification for actions. Kidder (1995) explains that there is no magic formula for churning out the answer, but that

in the act of coming to terms with the tough choices, we find answers that not only clarify the issues and satisfy our need for meaning but strike us as satisfactory resolutions...that as we practice resolving dilemmas, we find ethics to be less a goal than a pathway, less a destination than a trip, less an inoculation than a process (p. 176).

Approaches designed to assist with the resolution of ethical dilemmas are often presented as models to demonstrate a step-by-step process of finding concrete and justifiable solutions to ethical dilemmas. In the next section three such models will be described and a new model, specifically developed for early childhood educators, but applicable to other professions, will be presented.

**The Preston Model**

The first model advocated for professions in general is Noel Preston's (1996) *Ethical Decision-Making Model*. The model outlines a

Responsive sequence of considerations [that] aims at an ethical decision which is consciously justified, and where those justifications are able to be articulated clearly (p. 75).
Figure 1 The Preston Ethical Decision-Making Model

Assessing the Situation
- Facts
- Persons
- Alternatives
- Consequences
- More consequences

Values
- Substantial
  - Respect for life
  - Justice, fairness, neighbourliness
- Covenantal integrity

Process Considerations
- What if the decision was universalised?

Dispositional or Character Factors
How does the decision relate to the kind of person(s) I/we ought to be?

Comprehensive Assessment
Are there any factors which warrant greater priority or weight?
Why?
What is the fitting decision?

Decision
Can I give an account of the decision?
Is the decision not only desirable but feasible?
By working through Preston’s step by step critical-evaluative model, professionals can resolve dilemmas and ensure that their decisions are based on sound ethical reasoning and hence, can be defended. Professionals’ accountability is maintained by their adherence to this transparent process. The process of working through such a model though, can be time consuming and professionals do not always have the luxury of making a reflective and well considered decision over a period of time. Often, ethical decisions need to be made immediately.

The Kitchener Model

A second model, designed by Karen Kitchener (1984) for clinical psychologists, addresses this need for immediate decisions on some occasions. Her model consists of two levels. As well as a critical-evaluative level, similar to that advocated by Preston, Kitchener’s model contains an intuitive level. For on-the-spot decisions, Kitchener asserts that professionals need to draw on their intuitive level of ethical response.

Kitchener’s model is designed for use when a problem [exists] for which no course of action seems satisfactory. The dilemma exists because there are good, but contradictory ethical reasons to take conflicting and incompatible courses of action (Kitchener, 1984, p. 43) and is useful for professions such as counselling psychology and early childhood education, for example, which are both seen as “helping professions” in which there is an explicit charge to help and not to harm people [and therefore] individuals involved in the helping professions have an obligation over and above that of the lay person to act in an ethically consistent and thoughtful manner (Kitchener, 1984, p.43). The model is designed for counselling psychologists, but professionals in similar ‘helping’ professions such as teaching and nursing can be helped by its use as acting ethically involves professionals in difficult decision making for which they are poorly prepared [and] frequently they even lack the tools to identify what issues are at stake... (Kitchener, 1984, p.43). Research has suggested that this help is needed by early childhood students and early childhood educators (Coombe & Newman, 1997; Newman, Pollnitz & Goodfellow, 1997; Pollnitz,1993). As does Preston’s model, Kitchener’s model supports reference to relevant codes of ethics.

Kitchener offers assistance for dilemma resolution by outlining two levels of moral reasoning, which underlie ethical decision-making – the Intuitive Level and the Critical Evaluative Level.

Kitchener’s Intuitive Level

At the Intuitive Level of reasoning or decision making, professionals use the ethical beliefs that they have developed, based on what they ‘should’ or ‘should not’ do, formed through their professional preparation programs, the core values of their profession and their experience and expertise. People sometimes need to respond immediately, or intuitively, in ethical situations, based on this knowledge. Often, there is not the time for reflection and everyday moral decisions are made (Kitchener, 1984, p.44). Despite ethical preparation and education

some ethical dilemmas or issues will arise which we cannot possibly have foreseen. In these cases when we have not previously considered the ethical implications, when an immediate decision is necessary, and when there are
no convenient professional rules on which to rely, our 'moral good sense' or conscience is critical (Kitchener, 1984, p. 44).

Although there is certainly the need for recognition and understanding of the intuitive level of moral reasoning, Kitchener explains why this level alone is not enough. In some dilemma situations people may have no ordinary sense of which direction to take. Furthermore, intuitive decision making cannot always be trusted. Examples of professionals being sued for malpractice provide sufficient evidence of this. A higher order of moral reasoning is called for to guide, refine and evaluate ordinary moral judgment. This is where Kitchener’s critical evaluative level is needed to illuminate our ordinary moral judgment and to redefine the bases for our actions in similar situations (Kitchener, 1984, p.45).

**Kitchener’s Critical-Evaluative Level**

The Critical-Evaluative Level of reasoning is used to arrive at or justify ethical judgements. Within the Critical-Evaluative Level, Kitchener has proposed a three-tiered hierarchy. If no sufficient justification for a decision can be made at the first tier, the reflective process moves up to tier two, and so forth. Analysis at the critical-evaluative level might confirm the intuitive decision or might reveal that a more appropriate judgement could have been made. Critical-evaluative analysis, then, can guide, refine and evaluate the intuitive judgement. The outcome of the critical-evaluative analysis is then assimilated into the individual’s existing body of ethical knowledge and experience and can contribute to intuitive judgements that need to be made in future situations.

The previously discussed scenario of the Muslim child eating a forbidden food provides a good example of a predicament for which Kitchener’s model is useful. Resolution of the teacher’s dilemma requires both immediate action and a follow-up response.
Since the parents will not be arriving to pick the child up for several hours, the teacher has the opportunity to work through an evaluative process as advocated by Preston (1996) or through Kitchener's Critical-Evaluative level. She has time to take all factors into account, and to arrive at a decision based on sound ethical reasoning. By the time she has worked through the steps or tiers proposed in the models, she can feel confident about the validity of her decision and will be clear about how to implement it. Her decision about whether or not to stop the child from eating the ham sandwich portion however, must be made immediately. There is no time to engage in the step-by-step ethical analysis described in the Preston model or in the Kitchener Critical-Evaluative Level. She must make an on-the-spot decision and carry it out at once. The strength of Kitchener's model is that it recognises professionals' need to make on-the-spot decisions and so includes an intuitive as well as a critical-evaluative level of ethical response.

Professionals' intuitive responses are the outcome of what they have learned about what they ought to do and what they ought not to do as individuals and as professionals. If they act in accord with their internalised ethical beliefs or virtues in any given situation where an immediate response is required, professionals can be fairly certain that they have acted with conscience, with good sense, and how other good members of their profession would behave in similar circumstances. The critical factor for making intuitive judgements that can be ethically defensible is that an established firm set of personal and professional ethical beliefs has been developed.

If the teacher's intuitive response in the scenario is to stop the child from eating any more ham her decision may be based on: her knowledge that in the child's religion, eating ham is forbidden; her knowledge that the centre has a policy which states that staff will cater to the diverse needs of families, including those
which relate to cultural and religious practice; and her personal commitment as a professional to honouring any undertaking she makes. She is not deterred by the realisation that there is only a little bit of ham left in the sandwich, the child’s seeming ignorance of what he is doing, or by her thought that the family may not adhere strictly to all their religious beliefs; so won’t be worried about their child eating the ham.

**The Kidder Model**

In a third model of ethical analysis Kidder has devised a framework to help people when *potentially deadly blows [come along] before we’ve even begun to grasp their significance* (p.181). Without a full understanding of cause, only a little hint of possible consequences, and with little room for reflection, professionals must make rational decisions. Kidder suggests a logical and sequential process that helps to fuse intelligence with intuition, and internalises the process in order to make decisions quickly, authoritatively and naturally. Like an athlete or musician, an ethical decision-maker needs training, practice and maintenance of skills to become and remain *ethically fit* (Kidder, 1995).

Kidder suggests that decision-makers should:

- Recognise that there is a moral issue
- Determine the actors
- Gather the relevant facts
- Test for right-versus-wrong issues

And then apply:

- **the stench test** - does it have an odour of corruption that makes others look askance? Does it go against the grain of moral principles?
- **the front-page test** - how would you feel if what you were about to do was in the headlines of tomorrow’s morning newspaper?; and
- **the Mum test** - if I were my mother (or any other moral exemplar) would I do this?

If any of these tests cause the decision-maker uneasiness about the intended judgement, then it may be the wrong judgement.

These three tests conform to the ethical theories discussed previously. *The stench test* is a form of rule-based reasoning, which asks about moral principles rather than consequences. *The front page test* is ends-based reasoning that looks to outcomes – if people know what I’m doing, will there be outcomes? *The Mum test* involves care based reasoning, putting yourself in the shoes of others and following the Golden Rule. If the intended decision fails to satisfy the tests, then clearly a right versus wrong issue is being dealt with and must be resolved by choosing the right decision rather than the wrong decision. Any further elaboration of the process will only be to justify an unconscionable act.

If a choice is made to proceed with the analysis, then the following steps are taken:

- **Test for Right-versus-Right paradigms** (ethical principles are applied). If the issue gets through the right-versus-wrong test, the next question is ‘what sort of dilemma is this – truth versus loyalty; self versus community; short term versus long term; or justice versus mercy?’ This establishes that it is indeed an ethical dilemma that pits two deeply held core values against each other.
• **Apply the resolution principles** (ethical theories are applied). When the choice between the two values is clear, apply the three resolution principles — the ends-based or utilitarian principle (what would bring the greatest good to the greatest number of people); the rule-based or non-consequentialist principle (do it because it is right and don’t consider the consequences); and the care-based principle (based on the Golden Rule). Arrive at a resolution based on the line of reasoning that seems most relevant and persuasive to the issue at hand.

• **Investigate the “trilemma” options** (can be implemented at any stage in this process). Is there a third way through the dilemma? Can there be compromise between the two rights, or is there a creative and unforeseen action that has come to light?

• **Make the decision.** Using the moral courage that is required of leaders, decide.

• **Revisit and reflect on the decision.** At a later time, go back over the decision and reflect on its lessons. *This process builds expertise, helps adjust the moral compass, and provides new examples for moral discourse and discussion* (Kidder, 1995, p. 186).

---

**Developing a new model of ethical response for early childhood education professionals.**

The three models described so far have been developed for the professions in general, and in the case of Kitchener’s model, for a specific profession. In our respective positions as early childhood teacher educators we have conducted research (e.g. Newman & Coombe, 1999; PolInitz, 1993), gathered copious anecdotal evidence and considered and applied these models extensively. Consequently, we have devised a new model that draws on the work of the author’s previously cited, but also addresses the specific needs of early childhood professionals. We have considered the limited time that professionals have available, the unique nature of the early childhood profession, and the core values and ethical knowedle base already developed in early childhood education. This model is useful and useable for early childhood educators and considers the contexts and complexities of their work. For example, an underpinning supposition to precede the use of this model is that early childhood professionals have an extra responsibility to act in the highest ethical manner because of the vulnerability and powerlessness of their primary clients, children aged from birth to eight years, and therefore should respond reflectively and ethically in **any** problematic situation. Consequently, emphasis is not placed on labelling or classifying dilemmas as ethical or otherwise. The emphasis is on responding ethically in **all** situations where there is doubt about what is ‘right’ or what the appropriate decision may be. Unlike Kitchener’s model, where critical evaluation is not always employed, *The Ethical Response Cycle* incorporates reflection as integral to all resolution situations. It extends on Kitchener’s intuitive level of reasoning by incorporating a phase of **Informed Inclination** into every judgement. This **informed inclination** is based on many of the recognised attributes of professionalism and calls on professional experience and expertise, recognising the autonomy and specialised knowledge that professionals develop through their study and work. We consider that it is important in **any** judgement to consider **all** aspects of ethical resolution as described in the *Cycle*. Further to the Preston and Kidder models, without prescribing a rigid set of steps to follow, the *Cycle* outlines a straightforward and simple process to follow, that can be quickly learned, remembered and then practiced and incorporated into daily work. We anticipate that the model we have designed will be useful for many other professionals.
The Ethical Response Cycle

The Ethical Response Cycle can be used by tertiary educators and students working in professional preparation programs and by professionals already in the workplace at times when they find themselves in problematic situations where there are no rules or policies in place to guide their decisions, or when the rules and policies already in place seem to be counter to core professional values. Sometimes there are clear-cut rules or policies in place but finding the best way to do the right thing presents a dilemma.

The Cycle is represented by a diagram that outlines a process of ethical analysis. Ethical analysis is always complex and so it is recommended that the Ethical Response Cycle be used as a framework to support and validate systematic and sensitive reasoning. It is presented as a tool to assist the reflection and purposeful decision making that will lead students and professionals to reach sound ethical judgements, and to determine and justify subsequent actions. The phases in the Cycle are presented in a sequence, but it is not hierarchical or intended for rigid application in an inflexible manner. For example, the phase of Informed Inclination can be employed at the beginning, end, continuously, or at any point during the process.

Consider the example of an early childhood student teacher who is asked to assume responsibility for a group of young children, knowing that it is illegal in her state for someone, as yet unqualified, to take on that responsibility. Her initial intuition may be to refuse, or to comply, depending on her reasoning. With the benefit of further information, the student teacher’s reasoning may be influenced by learning that the only temporary teacher who could possibly fill in treats the children in a disrespectful manner that could be considered to border on emotional abuse. This information increases the complexity of the student teacher’s dilemma. Her dilemma involves making decisions about what is good for the children; possible harm to them; the level of extent to which she feels bound to the legal rule; and her personal desire to demonstrate her abilities and please her supervisors to gain a good grade. In this situation, her code of ethics is insufficient to guide her judgement, so she will need to prioritise ethical principles and call on ethical theories to make her decision about what to do and how to do it. Knowledge of the Ethical Response Cycle will provide the student with the intellectual content and language of professional ethics to provide a framework for making her decision and explaining it. It will help her to resolve what she has determined as a ‘right versus right’ issue. It is right to protect children, and it is right to obey the law. Early childhood educators face many right versus right dilemmas in the course of their daily work with children and families, in which the Ethical Response Cycle can provide a guideline for judgement and action.

By working through the Ethical Response Cycle, students and professionals can apply systematic, sensitive ethical reasoning to the resolution of problematic situations including those that present them with dilemmas. The outcome of this process will be a decision or judgement which is most likely to achieve a wise solution, even though there may be varying degrees of benefit or disadvantage for some of the individuals involved. Furthermore, as an outcome of the process students and professionals can feel confident that the judgement they have made would be the judgement all good members of their profession would make in similar circumstances.
(Insert Ethical Response Cycle)
How does the Ethical Response Cycle work?

Because ethical analysis is a complex process, it would be unwise to advise strict adherence to a specific step-by-step process for the resolution of all problematic situations. Rather, what is recommended is that the Ethical Response Cycle is used as a framework to support and validate systematic and sensitive reasoning.

There will be some situations where each phase of the Cycle will be fully addressed. In these situations, the professional's informed inclination might be used either to support the judgement to be made or as the last determining factor when reference to all other phases has exhausted wise options. In some situations, not all phases will need to be comprehensively addressed, but will always be taken into account (for example, there may be no relevant legal factors involved, but this needs to be determined).

Reflection occurs throughout the process towards judgement, and after the judgement has been made as a means of determining appropriate strategies for implementing the action, and for providing information for future judgements. Documentation may be recorded during the process or at the end. What follows should be considered a general guide for using the Ethical Response Cycle. It attempts to illustrate how the Cycle may be applied. A more detailed illustration can be found in Newman & Pollnitz (in preparation).

Determine the facts of the dilemma and consider:

**Legal Aspects**

including:

- national laws
- state laws/regulations
- system regulations/codes
- employer regulations/codes

- Check to see if there are any enforceable legal factors to be taken into account. If there are, and the decision is made to adhere to them, then the analysis process moves forward, considering the other phases to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement, including the reasons for making it.

- Alternatively, if the situation or dilemma appears to warrant exemption from a rule or regulation or inclination suggests a good reason for 'bending' a rule or regulation, the process of analysis moves forward to more comprehensively consider the phases of ethical principles and theories and to draw on the professional's informed inclination. If the decision is made to breach the legal aspect, the decision with reasons is documented.

**Professional Considerations**

Refer to:

- core values
- codes of ethics
- principles of professional practice
policies & guidelines
quality assurance system

- If there are no legal factors involved, analysis moves forward to professional considerations that are to be taken into account. If there are professional considerations relevant to the situation or dilemma, and the decision is made to adhere to them, then the analysis process moves forward, considering all phases, to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement, including the reasons for making it.

Ethical Principles
Draw on historically recognised principles such as:

- autonomy
- beneficence
- nonmaleficence
- justice
- fidelity

- When professional considerations were considered but lack relevance, are only partially helpful, or appear to be in conflict with each other, reflections are documented and the analysis process moves forward to examine how ethical principles might assist with decision making.

Any one of the ethical principles may be used to assist the decision. The professional may decide for example, that her autonomy as a professional is sufficient to make a wise judgement. Alternatively, she may rely on her informed inclination to decide which principle to draw on. Arriving at a decision about which principle to draw on may require some prioritising of the principles. For example, in a specific situation, it may be decided that keeping the trust (fidelity) of some of the individuals involved, should outweigh the anticipated level of harm (nonmaleficence) that may be caused to others involved. If drawing on a principle resolves the problem or dilemma, reflection and decisions are documented and the analysis moves forward, considering all phases, to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement.

Ethical Theories
Draw on philosophical positions such as:

- the absolute moral obligation to adhere to religious and societal dictates (rule-based)
- the obligation to make judgements that result in the greatest good for the greatest number of people (ends-based)
- the obligation to make judgements that are underpinned by systematic and rational thought processes and take the specific circumstances into account (proportion-based)
- the obligation to make judgements that are situation sensitive and are underpinned by consideration of the maintenance of nurturing and caring human relationships (care-based)

- If reference to principles did not resolve the problem or dilemma, or only partially helps, analysis moves forward to the consideration of ethical theories. Here, the professional draws on a range of theories. She may use her autonomy or draw on her informed inclination as a professional to decide which theory best suits her philosophy and practice or which theory best fits the situation, and to prioritise the theories. Her reflections and any decisions are documented. If the problem or dilemma
is now resolved, the analysis moves forward, considering all phases, to the judgement, and then proceeds to action and documentation of the judgement.

**Informed Inclination**

Draw on professional:

- dispositions
- knowledge and expertise
- extended experience

➢ If analysis has taken into account legal and professional aspects, ethical principles and ethical theories, and still the professional is not sure about what she should do in the situation, she must rely on her informed inclination to make the judgement. Her informed inclination is cumulative. It is based on her own professional dispositions, her depth of knowledge, her level of expertise, her extended experience, and the process of ethical analysis just undertaken. All of these contribute to her sense of what she must do and to her sense of what the wise judgement will be.

**Judgement**

Make judgements that:

- are the outcome of a well-considered reasoning process
- can be justified
- form the basis for a sound ethical response

➢ Reflections and the judgement are documented, and the process moves forward to the action.

**Action**

Take appropriate action:

- as determined by the judgement

**Documentation**

Record and date detailed information about:

- the process of arriving at the judgement
- the judgement
- the proposed and actual action
- any implications for further action
- developments arising in the aftermath of the judgement

**Reflection**

Critically evaluate:

- the outcome of the judgement and action to determine if the resolution is complete or requires further consideration
- the implementation of the Ethical Response Cycle for future reference
- the development of own competence to resolve dilemmas
Conclusion

Professionals are expected to act ethically by members of the communities in which they work. Knowing how to go about making sound ethical judgements and justifying them is a complex process for which professionals need preparation, guidance and practice. It takes more than a sound moral preparation for life in general. Codes of ethics provide one tool to assist professionals but often they are not enough. Models of ethical resolution provide a further supportive tool. No one model provides a recipe for success but can provide guidelines and procedures that can assist with the finding of solutions for ethical dilemmas. The strength of the models lies in their transparency. The procedures are logical, clear and include accountability measures. They are particularly apt for professionals such as early childhood teachers. As students and professionals learn about and use the outlined models they will enhance their abilities to make sound and ethical judgements as well as being able to justify their judgements in a clearly articulated manner. Using the language of ethics, as the basis of decision making, will become integral to daily practice and ultimately enhance the professionalism and the profession in which users are employed.

The Ethical Response Cycle is a new model for ethical analysis that consolidates and extends the work of previous authors to incorporate recognition of professionals' specialised knowledge, expertise and experience, as well as helping them to overtly articulate a theoretical foundation for their judgements that is drawn from traditional western philosophical positions. Use of this Cycle will help professionals to more easily resolve dilemmas, behave in an ethically justifiable manner and clearly articulate their ethical reasoning to their own profession, clients, and the wider community.
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endangering the social fabric or morality. He wants universities to resist any pressure
to promote politically correct politics, environmental ethics, or the marketing of
shirts—ideological salience is irrelevant to universities. Reid is much more pragmatic
in his rationality than Anderson. However, Reid’s language is much more crisp and
interrogative, and he sees the dialectic between internal collaboration and external
competition, between old disciplinary standards and mundane needs, between
incompatible cognitive frames as an ongoing one.

Each seeks to reconcile two principles of value on which the modern university has
rested since the establishment of Cornell over 130 years ago—the practical training
of citizens for productive contributions to their society and the pursuit of greater
knowledge and understanding as intrinsic benefits—with an historical perspective of
that general culture provided by the humanities. Alistair MacIntyre says of Prescrib-
ing the Life of the Mind that no university president, provost, or dean should be
allowed to hold office until he or she has passed an examination on this book. That
Anderson should be seen to be providing ‘the correct answers’ gives some clue to the
dangerous essentialism of his thinking. I would suggest that any vice-chancellor in an
Australian system who followed Anderson’s idealist rhetoric would run a very real
danger of seeing his/her university shortly become redundant.

I suspect that the book’s readership will consist of a general public rather than an
academic audience or the politicians that we wish would hear the message of
intrinsic worth of intellectual reflection. It is bland enough to satisfy initial curiosity
and give traditionalists some feeling of complacency. Those academics who do read
it may well become impatient not only with the lack of rigour but with the idealism
which makes little contact with the pragmatics of funding and increasing student
numbers. The author is self-taught, with no credentials either in philosophy or in the
study of higher education, and his naivety shows. The best use for this book would
be to present it to a graduate group of students for just the critical analysis that
Anderson argues should be the function of a university.

Felicity Hatnes
University of Western Australia

Ethical Judgment in Teaching
Karl D. Hostetler, 1997
Needham Heights, MA, Allyn & Bacon
ISBN 0-205-17408-6
US$24.95, 229 pp.

Karl Hostetler’s book is important and timely. It comes as media commentators and
researchers are paying increasing attention to the ethical dimensions of professions,
teaching included. Many researchers and commentators have called for improved
ethical practice and improved preparation of students across a range of disciplines,
but few have offered guidance as to how this can be done. Hostetler has contributed
to the discourse and offered guidance without proposing ‘cookbook’ solutions,
which are unsuitable when considering ethical issues. Rather, he has offered incentive for reflection and debate.

The book uses teachers’ dilemmas as a window into the world of ethical quandaries and actions. It employs case studies to introduce important issues in the ethical life of teachers such as ‘freedom and discipline’, ‘self and others’ and ‘unity and diversity’, to name just a few. Interestingly, for each case study, Hostetler has invited a writer or researchers concerned with ethics to comment on the case study and then invited response from another writer, followed by counter response to each other’s comments. Thoughtful and informative dialogues engage the reader and encourage self-reflection, and agreement or disagreement with authors who have spent many years studying and writing about ethics. For example, in chapter 3, the case presented focuses on a teacher called Lucy, who questions her school’s new policy of compulsory achievement testing and subsequent grade placements. Nel Noddings discusses the teacher’s options and outlines what her responses may be, based on an ethic of care. In response, Dilafruz Williams explores the teacher’s possible decisions in terms of her own sense of self. Noddings counter responds pointing out the similarities and differences in the respective responses to the case study dilemma. For a teacher reading, the debate presented is a useful framework for considering all options. It is similar to an informed staffroom debate, with the added benefit of a panel of experts participating.

I found one very useful aspect of the book to be Hostetler’s use and definition of the term ‘ethical judgment’, which he uses throughout. He points out that ‘judgment’ is much more complex than ‘mere decision making’ which can be arbitrary, capricious and rule driven. He explains that judgment is a much more appropriate term when it comes to thinking about and acting upon ethical issues and dilemmas; the book does stress the need for ethical judgment to the extent of pressing you to take some stands, to sort through your ethical beliefs for the sake of beginning to make some discriminations between what is ethically desirable and what is not... When we exercise good judgment we are not arbitrarily choosing one or another option ... There is no algorithm or formula for judgment. In this way judgment differs from calculation.

The book begins with an introductory chapter, which I found to be one of its few shortcomings. I felt that if teachers are to be the intended audience for the book, as Hostetler claims (p. 2), then this chapter should be written to include more introductory information about the study of ethics. Teachers do not generally have the comprehensive background in the study of ethics that is needed to gain the best advantage from this chapter. Some quite detailed information about types of ethical models and concepts is outlined without simple explanations. There is no glossary of terms, to help the novice in ethics. Most teachers would feel lost at some points in this chapter. For example, a discussion of the difference between a ‘consequentialist’ and ‘non consequentialist’ ethics is not preceded by a clear explanation of the fact that there are different ‘schools’ of ethical thought to which students of ethics ascribe. Most teachers would need to supplement the reading of this chapter with something like Noel Preston’s *Understanding Ethics* (1996) to make sense of the ideas Hostetler has presented. I think many may
close the book before doing this, which is a pity as the subsequent chapters have much to offer.

Although most of the case studies do not specify the ages of the students involved, it is apparent that they are all pertinent to the upper primary (elementary) and secondary school level of schooling. It is a pity that Hostetler did not choose to include some case studies focused on early childhood education (0–8 years), as the study of ethics is extremely active in this area of education. While an early childhood teacher could certainly generalise from the information presented, the inclusion of specific issues relevant to early childhood education would have broadened the appeal of the book to a wider, and very interested, audience.
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LINDA NEWMAN  
University of Western Sydney, Nepean

Finding Freedom in the Classroom: a practical introduction to critical theory  
Patricia Hinchey, 1998  
New York, Peter Lang Publishing  

This is an impressive book which has gone straight on to the reading list for my postgraduate research students. It may sound odd to call it ‘impressive’ because it looks so unassuming. The trappings of academic writing—footnotes, lengthy lists of references, abstract terminology, the passive voice—are at a minimum. Indeed, it is written in a style reminiscent of self-help books: the ‘made easy’ approach is backed up with personal anecdotes of the author’s family life in the USA. In contrast, the major texts of critical theory are noteworthy for their high level of abstraction and complexity. A further difficulty for a popular approach in the USA is the great distance which separates mainstream political attitudes from the kinds of class politics that underpin critical theory. So as I began reading I was extremely sceptical about the possibility of using a ‘self-help’ style to present this difficult set of arguments to an audience likely to be unfriendly to them. The book was setting out to do what so many other books have promised and failed: to make this set of theories familiar, comprehensible and applicable; and to do so without losing the uncomfortable, unpopular, emphasis on the politics of social, class, race, gender and sexuality. To my pleased surprise, I think it keeps its promises.

The book covers all the major concepts of critical theory and does so in relation to the politics of social class—so difficult to address in the USA—as well as to the politics of gender, sexuality and race. She signals this broad political challenge early
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Following involvement in the development of the “Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience” through the auspice of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales, I was invited by the Editor of “Every Child” to publish the Guidelines, with a supporting, explanatory article. This journal reaches early childhood practitioners and professionals at all levels, across Australia, and has some distribution internationally.
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Literacy Development: the years before school
How to Teach Literacy: what the experts say
A Whole School Approach to Literacy: powerful impetus for change
Sociocultural Literacy Learning: respecting cultural differences

The National Literacy Survey

An Australian magazine focusing on the needs of children from 0-8 years
Bridging sociocultural contexts for literacy learning

There is a notion that there is one definition of literacy that will serve the needs of all students. In this article, Nora White uses examples from Alaska Native cultures to support her argument that there is no single definition of literacy; that it is constantly changing, and that there are multiple literacies that people encounter daily; that language and literacy represent varied individuals, communities and institutions, and therefore what counts as literacy depends on who has the power to decide.

Page 4

Developing a whole school approach to literacy

Schools which have been successful in whole school planning have a clearly outlined implementation process. Staff at the Forest Crescent Primary School in WA had expressed concern over literacy development for some years, and staff changes provided the impetus needed to closely examine both the literacy growth of the students, and the teaching and assessment approaches used throughout the school. In this article Jean Rice and Bruce Shortland-Jones explain what steps were taken at Forest Crescent to develop a whole school literacy strategy.

Page 6
... And this says, "No rats allowed".

Literacy development before school

Literacy learning is not just about desks and classrooms; it is all around us in our everyday lives. Literacy is learnt through food packaging, on the covers of children’s videos, on shopping lists, and in junk mail etcetera. Lyn Hunt gives us a tour of her centre and shows us where children are experiencing literacy through their play and in their daily lives—from the 14-month-old reading with her father, to the five-year-olds in the dramatic play area who have set up a hairdressing salon.

Page 8

What the experts say: how to teach literacy

A significant proportion of young children fail to achieve minimum standards in literacy learning and are unable to catch up in subsequent years. The Early Literacy Research Project—an improvement project currently being undertaken in Victoria—illustrates what can be done in a relatively short time to raise literacy outcomes. Carmel Crévola describes the nine design elements upon which the ELP is based and emphasises the need for a systematic whole school approach with government support to achieve improvements in literacy outcomes.

Page 10
Confronting the hard issues for student teachers

Ethical behaviour of the highest standard is the hallmark of best practice within professions. In Australia, early childhood professionals are encouraged to adopt the Australian Early Childhood Association's (AECA) Code of Ethics. There is however, a danger of the code becoming tokenistic if ethical judgement is not embedded in tertiary courses.

The existence of codes does not ensure ethical action as 'ethical thinking and decision-making are not just following the rules' (Strike & Soltz, 1985, p.3). Ethical judgement cannot be 'taught' but students need to address issues of morals and ethics, and need assistance to apply their knowledge (Strom, 1989).

Fieldwork provides opportunity for complex issues surrounding professional ethics to come into focus. Members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales aim to promote the AECA Code of Ethics beyond rhetoric, and have developed materials specifically for use within fieldwork situations. The purpose of the materials is to empower early childhood student teachers to make appropriate and ethical judgments about what is right and proper.

Students returning to their tertiary institutions after fieldwork often describe problematic situations in which they became involved. These include 'critical' incidents of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse; and 'subtle' questions around application of policy, implementation of developmentally appropriate practice, and the exercise of power and control (Coombe & Newman, 1997a; Coombe & Newman, 1997b; Prilleltensky et al., 1996).

Some situations have relatively simple resolutions; others involve ethical dilemmas or issues of child protection and are not so easily resolved. Student teachers quickly realise that theory and best practice are not easily or consistently implemented in all early childhood settings.

Codes of ethics do not necessarily ensure that practitioners will act ethically

The resources

To support AECA's Code of Ethics, members of the council have developed Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience*. They have also gathered and refined a set of scenarios—describing dilemmas that have occurred—in order to facilitate the incorporation of these guidelines into tertiary courses. These scenarios are currently being used within fieldwork preparation programs in conjunction with the guidelines. Role-playing the dilemmas helps students to recognise, reflect upon, and resolve problematic fieldwork issues.

To support students and teachers in this area, Newman and Pollinitz (1997) are developing a video addressing ethical dilemmas; a manual outlining differences between types of dilemmas, proposing models for ethical decision-making, and including teaching resources; and a web site. Student teachers and others can undertake interactive independent learning activities to facilitate their ethical decision-making capabilities.

Conclusion

There is currently concern about loss of quality in early childhood programs as a result of social, political, and financial constraints. High standards of ethical behaviour are needed to enhance and protect the quality of these programs.

Early childhood educators are addressing concerns about the rapidly changing professional world that early childhood students will enter. There is a need for research that not only identifies specific ethical needs, but also follows progress and outcomes for student teachers as they strive to develop and maintain ethical practice after graduation.

Linda Newman
University of Western Sydney
Nepean

*See page 13.
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Journal Article


Following involvement with the development of the "Principles of Field Experience in Early Childhood Professional Preparation Programs" through the auspice of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales, the Editor of the union journal for the Independent Education Union invited publication of the Principles with a supporting article about the ethical implications for professionals deciding about whether or not to accept student teachers for fieldwork placements. The request followed concerns that in an increasingly complex early childhood environment, more and more professionals were opting out of the responsibility to assist in the preparation of the next generation of teachers. The article focuses on professionalism, and professional responsibilities to one's chosen profession.

This article was edited by the journal editor and I did not see the final copy until after publication. All changes sent were not incorporated.

My contribution:
- Write article – Newman
- Review and edit – Newman & Pollnitz
- Submit to journal and address editor’s comments – Newman
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Do we need another student just now?

Linda Newman and Lois Pollnitz reflect on the ethical issues facing early childhood centre staff when they’re thinking about student placements in their services.

Early childhood educators fit Kidder’s description of ‘good people’ who sometimes have to make ‘tough choices’ as professionals (Kidder, 1996). As the philosopher Kenneth Kipnis discovered when he began to work with early childhood educators, they are frequently in ‘ethical pain’, as they attempt to deal with the complexities of their professional lives in the best ways they know how. In Australia, in recent years, the complexities within the profession have increased with political changes that have influenced funding support, and increases in economic pressures that often guide management decisions. Early childhood centre directors in particular, in their endeavours to demonstrate ethical and effective leadership, grapple with complex decisions. One of the decisions that consistently has to be made is whether or not to accept students for fieldwork placements, and if so, how many? Who? How often? And when?

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS
How many students? Should we have students in every room at the same time? Teaming students may be good for their peer support and learning. Is it good for children? How will our philosophies and policies influence our decisions?

Which students? We are asked to accept architecture students, medical students, law students, Secondary work experience students, TAFE students, private college students, university students. How do we decide and prioritise who to accept? Do we accept students from competing institutions or remain loyal and consistent with selected institution? Should we select on a ‘first come-first placed’ basis or develop other criteria? How will our philosophies and policies influence our decisions?

How often? Do we have students in every session across the whole year? Should we have students every year?

When? Are there times of the year when it is better to have students than at other times? Should we be influenced in our decisions by the students’ needs? What if, for example, for personal reasons a student couldn’t undertake her prac in the regular period and is only waiting on her prac results to graduate. Should we accept her at Christmas time? Or in January?

Sadly, TAFE and university personnel report that, increasingly, centres are choosing not to take part in th field experience programmes that are the very life- blood of keeping their profession alive, growing and improving. Without students working towards the
attainment of qualifications, our profession would rapidly become a non-profession and move towards the unqualified and corporatised child-minding model so often cited as abhorrent to professionals who value their profession and the children and families for whom they work. Factors cited for influencing directors to decide not to accept as many, or any, students include the pressures on staff to spend extra (unavailable) time checking students’ practical and written work as well as those to do with the number of changing adults involved with children. All seem valid and, unfortunately, deeply committed and reflective staff sometimes make the decision to “take a rest” from students for a while, in their own and their children’s interests.

Dilemmas such as this occur often in early childhood settings and cause early childhood professionals to experience much anxiety as they struggle to make a wise and ethical judgement. The development of your own profession, by helping to prepare your successors, certainly involves issues of ethics, as expressed in the Australian Early Childhood Association Code of Ethics, and necessitates processes of ethical judgement. By following reflective processes early childhood professionals will be able to analyse problematic situations and the dilemmas they generate, and subsequently arrive at a decision that can be justified as appropriate professional ethical judgement. This can be applied to the important decision about whether to commit yourself and your staff to the nurturing and education of “yet another student”.

As our professional landscape changes, student preparation becomes more diversified and is increasingly more centre-based as the economic structures of TAFE colleges and universities inhibit the ability of their personnel to spend the time in the field that they did in previous years. At the same time, questions are being asked about the need for degree level qualifications for early childhood educators, so it is timely to reflect on the importance of qualifications and the role of fieldwork to a strong, committed and enduring profession.

 Lyons, in a critique of the early childhood professionalism, stated the opinion that we could never be seen as a ‘real’ profession, as long as we allowed unqualified people to work in our field. Think for a minute, if you will, about those professions generally accepted by society as ‘real’ professions, like medicine and law, and ask yourself who is allowed to call themselves a doctor or a lawyer. Everyone who works around that profession in support? Certainly not. These professions have a large degree of autonomy (another indicator of a profession) in their choice and control of their own membership and their ethical behaviour through their professional associations, for example, the Australian Medical Association, and unions. And reflect on the processes of student preparation where practicing professionals take interns through an extended period of induction or internship. Professionalism involves, amongst other elements, a commitment to the preparation and nurturing of the next generation of high quality professionals – a ‘passing on’ of wisdom. It is interesting that when we “teach” others we often articulate for the first time, the details of what it is that we do. This process enhances and clarifies our own knowledge to improve our professional actions and professionalism.

Interestingly, working through the processes of “inducting” a student into your profession can be an excellent avenue for remaining up-to-date with current research and practice, re-energizing you and reinforcing the importance of your work and helping you to frame the responses that are so important when you talk to families about what it is that we do, and why we do it well.

The Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW is a group of early childhood professionals (representing tertiary personnel [TAFE and university], employers and peak bodies) who are committed to the development and maintenance of high quality professional experiences, with the ultimate aim of supporting and enhancing the profession of early childhood education in general. The Council has undertaken several projects over the past few years to achieve its aims, with the latest one being the development of a set of principles for field experience for all early childhood participants.

The principles are designed to be used by all early childhood stakeholders – students, practitioners, other personnel such as tertiary staff, and employers – to enhance the highest quality in professional experience. They can be used for a range of purposes, with the primary one being the articulation of what is important about field experience for developing professionals and for those whom they aim to join as colleagues. The principles can be used to:

- articulate what it is that we do in field experience programmes and confirm their purpose and importance
- frame and support current practices and programmes
- advocate for the development, improvement or maintenance of programmes
- encourage further discourse in the field about professional experience issues

The principles are presented for your use, to reaffirm the importance of fieldwork to the maintenance of the most important profession in the world. Please display them and use them to support the development of policies and decision making related to professional experience and student placement.

For more information about The Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW or ethics and processes of ethical response and dilemma resolution contact: Lois Pollinitz at the University of Newcastle or Linda Newman at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean School of Learning, Development and Early Education ph: (02) 4636 0048, Email: l.newman@uws.edu.au
9 March 2000

Linda Newman
School for Learning Development & Early Childhood Education
University of Western Sydney
PO Box 10
KINGSWOOD NSW 2747

Dear Linda

Please find enclosed a copy of Bedrock, which includes your article.

I would like to thank you for your contribution to the journal Bedrock which is a joint publication of the NSW and Queensland Branch of the Independent Education Union and is distributed to early childhood members of the IEU in NSW, Queensland and Victoria and to many subscribers throughout Australia.

The arguments raised in your article on the ethical issues facing the profession when taking student placements are certainly timely and crucial debate that we must have in the teaching profession particularly in the early childhood area. It was also useful to put the Practicum Councils Principles as a point of reference for those centres involved in the student placements. The union looks forward to having further dialogue with the Council when appropriate.

Thank you for your contribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Verena Heron
Industrial Officer

Encl.
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PUBLISHED CONFERENCE PROCEEDING
APPENDIX 6

Published Conference Proceeding


This paper describes an unfunded research project which formed the initial investigation upon which the work presented in the teaching resource kit presented in Appendix 7b is based. Participants representing early childhood practitioners, employers, families and students were asked to view the pilot video presented in Appendix 7a and offer feedback, based on their own experiences, needs and views. Feedback was incorporated when the follow-up video was made.

My contribution:
- Draft and write article - Newman.
- Liaise with selection committee
- Edit and suggestions - Newman, Pollnitz and Goodfellow.
- Edit, incorporate changes and submit to Journal - Newman
PARTNERSHIPS IN PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
TOWARDS RESOLUTION OF DILEMMAS

Paper presented at "Children in the Balance". AECA National Conference
Melbourne, Australia. September, 1997

*Linda Newman - UWS Nepean
*Lois Pollnitz - University of Newcastle
Joy Goodfellow - Early Childhood Consultancy Services

This paper has three purposes. Firstly, some preliminary exploration of the existing literature on teachers and ethical judgement will be presented, in the context of current media interest in NSW. It is necessary when considering the ethical judgement competencies of early childhood educators to situate deliberations within the context of the wider teaching profession. Secondly, a current research project will be described, and finally, the literature review will be used as a rationale for the development of a cross-institutional process aimed at exploring, articulating and addressing the ethical dilemmas encountered in fieldwork by student teachers, their co-operating teachers in the field and their university supervisors.

The current context "in the field"
For observers of early childhood education in NSW, media scans prove most fertile of late. Three predominant themes emerge: economic rationalism; the place of ethics in education and society, and; the changing face of Australian families. All of these issues hold vital implications for early childhood teachers in preparation, but a parallel concern for tertiary educators is how to prepare students, many of
whom are young, for the rapidly changing professional world they will enter. The Australian community judges schoolteachers as less ethical than nurses, pharmacists and doctors (Milne, 1997). Prominent writers in the field of early childhood education (e.g. Clyde, 1989; Katz, 1977) caution against overloading student teachers who, they advise, will emerge into their profession as novices, mainly concerned with everyday issues of survival. In this paper a critical question is raised - in current times, do we have the luxury of allowing our graduates to emerge as novices? If the answer is "no", then the complex issue of accelerated movement towards higher order skills such as ethical judgement and advanced advocacy need to be addressed urgently. However as Sotille (1994) and White, (1988) point out, as yet, there has been little in the way of systematic and successful preparation for developing professional ethical judgement.

**The current context for student teachers**

Early childhood education students regularly partake in fieldwork or professional experience programs as an integral element of their tertiary preparation. A range of stakeholders are involved - student teachers; employers or their representatives; co-operating staff; tertiary supervisors, and others. It is not uncommon for student teachers to return to their tertiary institutions following professional experience to describe problematic situations in which they have been involved (Coombe & Newman, 1997; Edwards, 1993). The student teacher often identifies a dilemma which involves a conflict of interest between stakeholders and an accompanying perception of powerlessness. While on the one hand they are being taught about best practice, on the other, they are not always seeing best practice in action. Student teachers question their role - as a beginner in the field, is it their role to influence practice in the field? Their co-operating staff have more experience than they do, but student teachers receive many and varied messages as
they reflect on their own readiness for their rapidly approaching professional lives. Relatives and acquaintances offer opinions about the value of early childhood education and the nature of their work, and the media has recently showed great interest in early childhood, particularly child care, issues. For student teachers there are complexities on which to reflect. Appropriate action, based on these reflections, does not always come easily.

When tertiary advisers are consulted they are drawn into the dilemma as yet another stakeholder’s interests come into consideration. To fulfil requirements, tertiary educators must place students in fieldwork settings, but frequently student teachers report perceptions of poor quality programs they have been sent to observe. What is the role of tertiary educators and what are their rights in assessing quality in services used for fieldwork programs? Answers are unclear and impinged upon by shortage of places and the lack of resources for quality assurance processes to be personally conducted. Increasing workloads in universities also means that there is little time available for visits in the field.

Some problematic situations have relatively simple resolution, but others involve ethical dilemmas or issues of child protection and are not quickly or easily resolved. Decision making is complex and difficult. Stakeholder interests may impact on final judgements. Student teachers sometimes undergo a "baptism of fire" as an induction to their chosen profession. They quickly come to realise that theory and best practice are not easily or consistently implemented in all early childhood settings. Tertiary educators face reflection about their role in ensuring quality practice in the profession for which they are preparing student teachers. Tertiary administrators must make decisions about the quality of experience offered for student teachers in some professional experience sites, and the implications of placement of
student teachers. On the other hand, tertiary educators sometimes receive complaints from co-operating staff and employers about the inappropriate actions of student teachers.

One issue that is emerging as critical, is the preparation of early childhood professionals for ethical judgement and practice. Hostetler (1997) prefers the term "ethical judgement" over "decision making" He points out that judgement is more than decision making, i.e. when good judgement is exercised, one decision is not arbitrarily chosen over another. "Judgement implies a non capricious process...not simple, mechanical application of rules...There is no algorithm or formula for judgement... there is more at stake in ethical matters...regarding justice, honesty, kindness, courage and so on" (p.9-10). Hostetler’s definition and term will be used throughout this paper. Tertiary educators are grappling with devising the best methods for preparing students, and peak bodies such as the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW have also noted the concerns of employers and cooperating field staff about the ethical practices of all early childhood stakeholders (including student teachers).

**Background to the research and preliminary applied action strategies**

In 1995 and 1996, following copious anecdotal evidence, and consultation with the field The Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW developed "Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience". These guidelines can be used as the basis for discussion and exercises to help prepare student teachers for Professional Experience. Pilot research was also conducted by Coombe & Newman (1997) to investigate student teacher experiences of dilemmas during field experience. To further facilitate student teacher preparation a video, "What Should I Do? Issues in Early Childhood
Field Experience" has been produced (Newman, 1996). It consists of three re-enacted scenarios depicting real dilemmas that have occurred in child care centres. The video can be used as a trigger for discussion either before or after Professional Experience sessions. It is apparent that an area of need has been addressed, and further, that research and development of resource materials needs to progress to address the needs of stakeholders other than student teachers. There is also a need for further in depth research and development about the complexities of student teachers’ development of ethical judgement.

The current research
The presentation at the AECA conference in Melbourne will focus largely on the reporting of findings from a further stage of the research into ethical judgement. The research project currently underway involves both evaluation of the pilot video and the gathering of rich data to inform a further stage of a teaching development project funded by the Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD). The evaluation aspect involves formal early childhood stakeholder review of the video. Further, to address a gap in the literature, data will be sought about the fieldwork priorities and experiences of students, cooperating fieldwork staff, employers and tertiary supervisors. The project will provide previously undocumented data about the resolution of dilemmas, both ethical and practical, by stakeholders who work in partnership in early childhood field experience programs.

Method
Focus Group methodology was employed. Focus groups are used frequently, and are helpful, when little is known about a phenomenon (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990, 52). Participants were invited to respond to open ended questions about fieldwork experiences and offer comment after viewing the pilot video. The video consists of three
scenarios, acted out by professional actors, of fieldwork dilemmas. "Focus groups produce qualitative data that provide insights into the attitudes, perceptions, and opinions of participants. These results are solicited through open ended questions and a procedure in which respondents are able to choose the manner in which they respond and also from observations of those respondents in a group discussion. The focus group represents a more natural environment than that of an individual interview because participants are influencing and influenced by others - just as they are in real life" (Krueger, 1994, 19).

Four focus groups were conducted: City (Sydney), Country (Bathurst) Regional (Newcastle), and Metropolitan (Kingswood).

In each focus group there were a range of fieldwork stakeholders represented:
2 students (1 university, 1 TAFE)
2 qualified service staff (1 uni, 1 TAFE)
2 tertiary supervisors (1 uni, 1 TAFE)
2 management/employers (1 for profit, 1 community)
2 service users (family members)

Subjects
A total of forty participants were recruited - ten people per focus group "Focus groups are typically composed of 6-10 people" ...The size of the group must allow for "everyone to have opportunity to share insights and yet (be) large enough to provide diversity of perceptions". Four groups will be used as " The focus group interview is conducted in a series. Multiple groups with similar participants are needed to detect patterns and trends across groups" (Krueger, 1994, 17). "Convenience sampling" was used to select participants and is "the most common method for selecting participants in focus groups".
The researcher is obliged to match the sample to the objectives of the research, and will structure the membership to maximise the probability of the desired outcome (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990, 53). Small sample size is not an issue as rather than testing hypotheses or seeking to establish generalizability, focus group research aims to "learn about others’ experiences and perspectives" (Morgan, 1983, 44).

The focus groups were conducted by one moderator, unknown to the participants, with a different assistant moderator in each region. Assistant moderators who knew each region selected participants who were "similar to each other" with homogeneity determined by fieldwork stakeholder status. Participants are preferably unknown to each other although in some communities it is virtually impossible to locate strangers...researchers are questioning the necessity and practicality of this guideline" (Krueger, 1994). Only one participant will be invited per early childhood service.

Results
Preliminary results will be reported in the conference session and will be disseminated through early childhood journals.

Towards advanced strategies
After initial involvement in the presentation and implementation of the strategies previously described follow up strategies which will facilitate a deeper level of preparation for students will be developed. As Baumgart argued (1996), "ethical behaviour is likely to be more effective and more pervasive when developed through education, reflection and deliberate modelling". However there is little literature available to help tertiary educators to know how to guide students through the mazes of ethical dilemma. A computer administered examination has been suggested as a means to address the problem of
minimal course time in the preparation of counsellors to act ethically because "no universally accepted model of ethical training has emerged (White, 1988). In a recent workshop conducted at University of Western Sydney, Nepean, second year student teachers were able to develop useful conceptual diagrams about the development of ethical judgement which offered insight into their own perceptions of the stages they have been through, to their current point of development - and the stages to come. There is a challenge for tertiary educators to find meaningful strategies to facilitate a deeper level of thought about ethical decision making - and the accompanying ability to act according to the values and principles of the teaching profession. Linda Newman from UWS Nepean and Lois Pollnitz from the University of Newcastle have accepted this challenge. A follow up video will be made which looks at ethical dilemmas from the point of view of all stakeholders in early childhood professional experience. The video will be accompanied by an extensive manual which outlines the difference between types of dilemmas - not all dilemmas are ethical dilemmas. Also included will be teaching resources for tertiary educators to assist them in guiding student teachers through the process of becoming competent at ethical judgement. Further exploration of the complexities of ethical decision making will be conducted by the development of World Wide Web materials in which student teachers can undertake interactive independent learning activities to facilitate their ethical decision making capabilities.
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GRANTS
APPENDIX 7A

*Project funded by University Grant*

Initiatives in Teaching and Learning Grant, UWS Nepean. To make Pilot Video: *What Should I Do? Issues in Early Childhood Field Experience*. $6,000

This grant allowed for the production of short video consisting of three scenarios. The budget was extremely limited, and the project was designed to seek funding for a more extensive project. This was achieved and is presented in Appendix 8b.

My contribution:
- Determine funding source – Newman
- Write application – Newman
- Budget and reporting - Newman
What should I do?...Video cover
APPENDIX 7B

Project Funded by a National Grant

Awarded a $48,008 Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) grant by Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs to develop resources to facilitate the ethical decision making abilities of stakeholders in early childhood field experience.

This grant grew out of and extended the video grant presented in Appendix 8b. It allowed for changes and extension to be made in accordance with feedback and the extended knowledge of researchers involved.
APPLICATION FOR A 1997 CAUT NATIONAL TEACHING DEVELOPMENT GRANT

1. Details of Applicants

Applicant 1

Title: Ms
Surname: Newman
Given Names: Linda
Department: Faculty of Education
University: University of Western Sydney, Nepean
Campus: Kingswood
PO Box: PO Box 10
Town or Suburbs: Kingswood State: NSW Postcode: 2747
Telephone No: 047 360138
Facsimile No: 047 360400
Email address: l.newman@nepean.uws.edu.au

Applicant 2

Title: Ms
Surname: Pollnitz
Given Names: Lois
Department: Faculty of Education
University: University of Newcastle

2. Project Title

The Development of Decision Making as it Relates to Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Student Teacher Education.

3. Project Funding and Duration

Total amount sought from CAUT $50,000
Expected completion date: 31 December 1998

4. National Teaching Development Grants Previously Received by the Applicant(s)
5. Project Discipline Code

2.6

6. Project Summary
The specialist content of teacher education courses in Australia is decreasing as a result of the current trend towards the introduction of teacher education courses which have a generic and broad base. There remains however, a critical need for specialist preparation of students in areas of content. One such area is preparation of students to enable them to make ethical decisions in their work with children, families and other professionals. In a pilot study conducted with early childhood students (Coome & Newman, 1996), it was found that students encountered many ethical dilemmas during their fieldwork and were not sure how to deal with them. There is, therefore, an urgent need to enhance students’ abilities to understand and implement ethical practice during fieldwork. Ethical decision making is difficult, stressful, and scarcely addressed in current early childhood student teacher preparation courses.

The production of a teaching package will ensure that all early childhood teacher education students have the opportunity to address ethical issues they may encounter in their professional practice. The package will be used in group teaching sessions, and by individuals on campus. It will also be used by distance education students on their own or in a tele/video conferencing session with their lecturer. Students therefore, will be more fully prepared for field experience, and will have less stressful encounters. Dissemination of the teaching package throughout Australia and internationally will benefit students, other stakeholders and most importantly, the vulnerable young children in early childhood settings, with whom they work, .

*Paper is currently being prepared for submission to Journal for Australian Research in Early Childhood Education (referred).

7. Additional Team Members

Title: Mr
Surname: Freedman
Given Names: Rod
Organisation: Summer Hill Films Pty Ltd

8. Project Reference Group

* Associate Professor Margaret Clyde - author in the field of ethics in Early Childhood Education, recognised leader in the field.

* Associate Professor Maureen Savage, Monash University - interested in the project and willing to trial, evaluate the monitor resources with students at Monash.

* Tonia Godhard (employer representative), Manager, Sydney Day Nursery and Nursery School Association - willing to trial and evaluate materials with teachers receiving fieldwork students in her Association.

* Professor Neil Baumgart, UWS Nepean - evaluation expert, advice on monitoring and evaluation instruments. Roslyn Elliott, UWS Nepean - lecturer in Early Childhood Care and Education subjects.

* One first year, one second year and one third year student from UWS Nepean or University of Newcastle.

* Pio Macri - university trained early childhood service Director.

* Anne Walker - TAFE trained early childhood service Director.

* Kathy Meyers - Head of School, Associate Diploma in Social Science (Child Studies), Werrington TAFE.

* Kerry Stubbs - Manager, Corporate Human Resources, Sydney Water. Member of St. James Ethics Centre and developer of Sydney Water Code of Ethics.
9. Description of the Project

i) a) Sets out clearly what it is intended to do

The project aims to:

a) make available effective teaching materials to introduce the concept of ethical practice in fieldwork to students who have not yet commenced their first fieldwork placement (e.g. at UWS Nepean, for first year students, in Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) 1 and 2). This will allow for thorough preparation of students who have had little or no experience in child care centres, and have previously entered fieldwork unprepared for ethical decision making.

b) facilitate the de-briefing of students after fieldwork experiences, which may have been stressful, by the provision of materials based on actual events, which will be meaningful to them (e.g. for first, second and third year students in all ECCE subjects at UWS Nepean).

c) provide tertiary educators with support materials, currently non-existent, for the introduction, or enrichment of sessions about ethical practices in field experience in order to improve quality and depth of teaching about ethical practice. Students will learn to recognise, define and classify ethical dilemmas. Further, the effective preparation of fieldwork stakeholders, will reduce or eliminate dilemmas for students through improved communication between tertiary institutions, schools and centres.

d) provide students and educators with strategies for identifying, classifying and dealing with ethical dilemmas in field experiences.

e) allow opportunities for tertiary educators to introduce and teach about ethical dilemmas in a flexible manner. In this way different learning styles and enrolment patterns will be better accommodated. Students will be able to independently pace their learning, learn in their chosen location, and evaluate their progress (e.g. via reflective journals set as assessment items in all Early Childhood Care and Education subjects).

The project involves the production of a teaching resource package that is expected to improve teaching and learning about ethical decision making in early childhood field experience. It will include a video with accompanying manual and teaching notes as well as an extending, interactive CD Rom which will be used by all early childhood education students (University and TAFE) preparing for, or debriefing from, their first or subsequent field experience session. Students will learn concepts of ethical practice and decision making, how to identify and classify ethical dilemmas (Kipnis, 1987) and develop strategies to practice ethically and resolve dilemmas.

Integral to the lecture’s role in student preparation for fieldwork, is the preparation of cooperating staff in schools and early childhood centres, tertiary supervisors (University and TAFE) and employers. The package will have further benefits for their preparation. It is further envisaged that the package could be used by primary and secondary teaching students, nurses and other professionals in training who have human fieldwork components as part of their course content. The materials in the package could be used with or without an informed lecturer present.

The package will have two evaluation components. The first component is evaluation and self monitoring instruments for the use of students and workshop leaders, to ensure that materials are meeting objectives of facilitating preparation for ethical practice. Secondly, the package will include evaluation proforms of the material it contains. These two procedures will allow the applicants to monitor the project and extend current research on ethical fieldwork practices, thereby reducing dilemmas for all stakeholders.

Packages made available to students would consist of the following elements:

Video
A broadcast standard video which introduces the concept of ethics and the problematic nature of ethical decision making (Katz, 1992; Kipnis,1987). The introduction would be followed by a series of vignettes depicting scenarios of ethical dilemma in settings for young children (e.g. child care centres, pre schools, schools). The dilemmas will be followed by discussion and questions which stimulate the thinking of students about the decision making process.

Students would be encouraged to see the dilemma from different points of view to facilitate the understanding that ethical dilemmas usually do not have a "right" answer (Katz, 1992). Students will be introduced to strategies to assist them in the process of making ethical decisions.

Manual
To accompany the video, a workshop leader, or study guide will provide users with varying methods for discussion or
Further discussion questions and issues will extend on those raised in the introductory video. The manual will accompany, but extend on the issues raised in the video.

The guide will also include a reference and resource list for further study. The guide could include the Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA) Code of Ethics and the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience.

CD Rom

Independent use of the package could be extended for students by the production of an interactive CD Rom that allows students to work at their own rate through a program that raises issues and questions about dilemmas depicted. The CD would incorporate some segments of the video, but extend, as this technology would allow students to view scenarios, select responses and then seek feedback from the CD as to the implications of their decision. This interaction, and ability to canvas a range of decisions at the learner's own pace and discretion, is not possible in a video. As ethical dilemmas are rarely unproblematic (Katz, 1992), it is not anticipated that "correct" answers be provided, but rather, that students be encouraged to think through the implications of different decisions and see the solutions from the point of view of other stakeholders: parents, other professionals, employers etc.

Material for the "dilemma" scenarios depicted will be drawn from the series of "Practicum dilemma vignettes" already written by members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW (Prac Council). These are based on the real experiences of students, lecturers, teachers and employers, representing all stakeholders.

i) b) Why it is expected the proposed development will be effective

The project is expected to be successful because it will produce materials that will allow students and educators to work more effectively on professional ethics preparation which has been identified as a educational deficit, both in Australia and internationally (At AREC conference, 1996, Associate Professor Margaret Clyde, Associate Professor Maureen Savage (RMIT) and Sue Cherrington, Associate Director, School of Early Childhood Teacher Education, Wellington, NZ, all endorsed the need for resources and reinforced the need for this work). It is particularly timely in the current climate of media attention to child abuse.

The use of flexible delivery methods has been identified as an effective strategy to support independent student learning. With this strategy, lecturers can ensure that ethics remains on the agenda and is taught effectively, in a climate of reduction of subject content. Through the use of technology and multi media, lecturers can encourage students to embark on more of their learning in an independent, supported manner. Ethical development is an area that lends itself to flexible teaching as it requires introduction and discussion, followed by student observation of the practices of qualified professionals, their own practice, and subsequent evaluation and reflection. It is not a "one off" topic. On the contrary, ethics requires ongoing observation, practice and reflection. Flexible delivery packages will allow students to independently work through, revisit, and consolidate their views and understandings at their own pace and in their preferred setting.


ii) a) Addresses an educational problem

The preparation of early childhood (EC) teachers has undergone radical and extensive change in recent years. The integration of early childhood education into universities is perceived by some in the field with scepticism as greater theoretical knowledge has replaced some areas of specialised training for early childhood students. Currently, in most universities, including UWS Nepean, planning is underway to further increase the generalisation within all teacher education courses (Principle, UWS Nepean Faculty of Education Retreat, 1996). The University of Newcastle has already restructured its teacher education course and subjects considered "early childhood specialisation" constitute only 120 of the possible 320 SLF points. Not withstanding the benefits for students, there are critical issues to be considered for prospective teachers who will enter the field as specialist EC educators. The Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW has identified one specific deficit, being, the teaching of ethical practice. The Council members represent all university EC courses in NSW, TAFE, major employer groups and private trainers and providers. The Council has called for tertiary EC course developers (university and TAFE) to develop and implement strategies which will facilitate and enhance the ability of students to act ethically during field experience. This call is based on the premise that students do not now have sufficient understanding of ethical practice.

The inclusion of another area of content into EC courses seems an obvious solution but is not possible with current
within considerably fewer teaching hours. Creative solutions are needed to achieve this.

Currently, students at UWS Nepean, do not receive any formal preparation for ethical decision making and practice. Ethics is not written into course content at present, if it is addressed, this is because individual lecturers decide to add it to prescribed content. Teaching is ad hoc and fragmented.

Specific preparation in the ethics of EC field experience work, is an extension of general ethical understanding and practice and so pre requisite to ethical behaviour is student understanding of ethics and ethical practice in general. The majority of early childhood students come to tertiary institutions with little, if any experience in child care centres and schools, or with young children. They are unprepared to understand and interpret the dilemmas that they will inevitably be involved in during field experience. Anecdotal evidence of this inability is extensive and educators themselves, currently and regularly, face dilemmas as they struggle to counsel students who report scenarios of unethical behaviour. Although students’ coping skills do increase with their experience in tertiary courses, they still feel unprepared and can be very stressed by their experiences (Coome & Newman, 1996). In particular, first year students, entering child care centres for the first time, can be a little over zealous in their interpretation of unethical behaviours and can become personally stressed leading to further stress for staff as the attempt to resolve dilemmas in effective ways. The other element, therefore, is reports of students behaving unethically. It is currently rare for tertiary courses to thoroughly and comprehensively prepare students to understand and interpret the behaviours of other professionals during fieldwork, to always know what is ethical behaviour, or to resolve dilemmas effectively. This situation could be exacerbated in restructured courses if definite and specific strategies are not developed to include the teaching of ethics.

The educational problem is more complex for students who will be working with children under eight years of age as they will be responsible for children, many of whom are pre verbal, for extended hours. There is a great deal of physical contact between carers and children, and a high degree of responsibility for children’s psychological well being. There is also much greater contact with families, than with children over eight years of age.

Furthermore, EC field experiences are conducted in a manner in which students are asked to make many more independent decisions than in primary or secondary school practice. There is no prescribed curricula, and students may not be supervised by a university trained graduate. There is far less accountability as students will mainly be in services which are privately run and do not come under the umbrella of any recognised organisation such as the Department of School Education.

The implications are that students who are unprepared for ethical decision making, may make critical misjudgements and suffer undue stress. It is imperative that tertiary educators can, and do, prepare their students more effectively for ethical decision making and practice than is currently the case.

ii) b) Defines steps already taken to improve learning outcomes

Tertiary educators from around Australia have urged the applicant and other members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW, (at a national conference - Australian Research in Early Childhood Education, Canberra, 1996) to continue research and development of strategies to address an area of pressing need. The project will be an extension of research and development tasks already underway. To date the project has consisted of a pilot research study with students about experiences in fieldwork (Coome & Newman, 1996); a UWS Nepean Seed Grant application to further the aforementioned research to cover other stakeholders in fieldwork; the development and publication of Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experiences; the preparation and publication of a series of vignettes based on the fieldwork dilemmas of stakeholders in early childhood fieldwork experiences; and the production of a short pilot video (UWS Nepean ITL grant) based on the aforementioned vignettes.

The video currently under production will be limited in length and scope due to budget restraints. It will be VHS standard only. It will be for approximately fifteen minutes and will only involve about 2-3 vignettes, without supporting discussion. It will only be able to deal with general fieldwork dilemmas and will not develop understandings about how an “ethical dilemma” differs from a general dilemma. It will not suggest strategies for developing ethical understanding or resolving dilemmas. It will only be used as a discussion trigger and will rely on the presence and knowledge of an informed lecturer for use.

iii) Identifies learning outcomes in relation to the target student group or groups

Through the use of the planned package, students will understand ethics, ethical decision making and ethical practice in much greater depth. They will know how to discuss and reflect on ethical practice and decision making. They will feel confident to confront the difficult process of making decisions ethically, and will be expecting ethical dilemmas to arise. This will contrast to the current situation where students are shocked, frightened, and poorly prepared when they initially encounter the inevitable situations of dilemma that occur in all early childhood settings.
1. Students will be prepared for their initial fieldwork experience with thorough understanding of their own need to act ethically. Specifically students will:

a) demonstrate understanding of the concepts of ethics, codes of ethics, their rationale and use as well as having an emerging understanding of ethical practices and decision making.

b) recognise ethical dilemmas, understand the difficulties involved in dealing with them and begin to develop the confidence to understand and make ethical decisions.

c) be familiar with and resolve to abide by "Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience", thereby preventing a situation of ethical dilemma of their own making.

d) demonstrate the ability to consistently act ethically while on field experience.

2. Students will have the skills to understand, interpret and follow through on their observations of the actions of others, which they consider to be unethical. Specifically, students will:

a) expect to observe and become involved in situations of ethical dilemma during fieldwork, before embarking on field experience.

b) have learnt how to identify and classify an ethical dilemma (as opposed to a general fieldwork dilemma).

c) feel confident they have learnt a range of strategies to understand and deal with situations of ethical dilemma, early in their fieldwork careers.

d) have learnt the skills to take part in reflective discussion about situations of ethical dilemma in field experiences based on learned understandings of identification and resolution of dilemmas.

e) demonstrate understanding that inappropriate behaviour is context and dilemma bound and interpret the actions of fieldwork stakeholders in the light of ethical decision making processes.

f) be able to identify appropriate courses of action to take which may include notification of unethical behaviour to the Department of Community Services. Students will feel confident, supported and justified if such action is taken.

3. Students will graduate from their course of study with the necessary understandings and skills to be a competent ethical decision maker and practitioner. Specifically, students will be able to:

a) demonstrate confidence in dealing with ethical decision making situations, and discuss and justify their decisions

b) demonstrate assurance that they can deal with situations of dilemma.

c) graduate from their EC course, feeling ready to assume the role of competent ethical decision makers.

d) use package materials to reflect on, evaluate and monitor their own progress in dealing with situations of dilemma as they occur.

As a further benefit, the stakeholders who work with students, i.e. the cooperating teachers, tertiary supervisors and employers, will accrue similar outcomes, and in future, problems arising from ethical issues will be reduced.

iv) Is based on sound educational principles

The need for inclusion of ethics education in early childhood teacher education is widely called for and well described (Katz, 1992; Kipnis, 1987; Woodrow, 1995). The delivery strategies chosen to teach ethical practices in field experience, are also widely described and supported in the literature. Reflective practice has received extensive attention in recent years (e.g. Wilson et al, 1995) and flexible delivery approaches have the advantage over face to face teaching, of allowing students to learn in their own time, at their own pace, and in their preferred pace. They can also receive instant feedback from an interactive CD Rom. This makes education more achievable for a wider range of students. Flexible delivery techniques are also more likely to be evaluated regularly by students, through the inclusion of evaluation pro formas, to be completed at the end of each learning session. Further, with a wider range of users, different people in different situations will be able to provide a broad based evaluation of the materials. Students will learn to use a range of flexible delivery
will be generalisable to other areas of content.

Students will be able to learn and use an extended range of new thinking approaches, introduced by workshop leaders or independent CD Rom use, such as Brainstorming, Concept/Mind Mapping, Think Aloud Techniques (Hine, 1996). With these approaches, students can identify and begin to use strategies to solve situations of dilemma for themselves.


Woodrow, C. *Every Child, 1995* 

v) **Leads to practical advances in teaching, learning and/or assessment in the department where it is carried out, and more widely**

Members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW have agreed to incorporate the materials already developed into fieldwork preparation courses in their tertiary institutions and early childhood settings. This represents a large number of the existing settings in NSW. Distribution of the package would facilitate more comprehensive and formal implementation and evaluation of methods and materials. Further, the materials could have distribution potential outside Australia. Interest in the project has already been shown by conference participants from NZ, USA and Iran, who have identified similar needs in their countries. Hence, a critical area in the development of early childhood practitioners could be addressed formally, rather than in an ad hoc and variable manner. Although there would still be room for individual approaches to the delivery of materials in the package, educators would be more likely to include the abstract and difficult area fieldwork ethics into subject delivery, if they were given the guidance and support offered by the package.

vi) **takes account of work done elsewhere, and avoids unnecessary duplication of work**

The applicants, along with other members of the Practicum Council and the reference group, have a wide ranging knowledge of current developments in Australia and internationally. Applicant 2 has recently completed a Masters thesis in the area of professional ethics in early childhood and is conversant with the current literature. Both applicants have been involved in the development of the AEC Code of Ethics and have directly developed the Practicum Council’s “Guidelines for Ethical Practice...”. The only work of a similar nature that has been discovered, is a short video on the NZ early childhood “Code of Ethics”, which although useful, is not Australian, and does not address fieldwork ethics. The applicants are in regular communication with Sue Cherrington, the academic who led the team which developed the NZ video. Sue Bredekamp, an acknowledged world leader in the field of early childhood, who was at the forefront of developing the US NAEGYC Code of Ethics has also urged development, as there is nothing to her knowledge, in the US. It is the applicants’ contention that no work of a similar nature, either in the form of research or practical materials, has yet been developed in Australia, NZ or Northern America.

vii) **Will integrate successfully into the department and course of study**

At UWS Nepean the package would be used within the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) strand of subjects taught in the Department of Professional studies, Faculty of Education.

The package would allow lecturers to introduce, discuss and consolidate the teaching of ethical decision making into fieldwork preparation sessions, alongside the more practical preparation (e.g. lesson planning) which is now the focus of preparation sessions.

ECCE subjects are taught in each year of the EC course as follows:

**Year 1**
- ECCE 1: Introduction to Early Childhood Education
- ECCE 2: Programs for Infants and Toddlers

**Year 2**
- ECCE 3: Programs for the preschool and early school years 1
- ECCE 4: Programs for the Preschool and Early School Years 2

**Year 3**
- ECCE 5: Curriculum Development
- ECCE 6: Quality Programs

viii) **Integrates monitoring and evaluation into the project (including where practical student evaluation)**

The project will be evaluated at both the development and the implementation phases. Firstlv, evaluation of the project
to be developed and will be precisely linked to the aims and expected outcomes. Secondly, the project contains an inbuilt evaluation process for users. Students and others will be asked to evaluate their progress in understanding, classifying and dealing with ethical dilemmas as part of the process of reflection, monitoring of learning and measurement of self improvement. Further, users will be asked to complete an evaluation of the package after use, related to the aims. Members of the Practicum Council will be fully involved in formative and summative evaluation.

ii) **Contains plans for dissemination of information about the project throughout the higher education systems**

The UWS Nepean Early Childhood team already has a home page on the World Wide Web and information about the materials could be disseminated further through this medium.

The Practicum Council members will disseminate materials through their respective courses or employees.

The package will be introduced at early childhood conferences such as Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA), Australian Research in Early Childhood (ARECE) and in America at National Association for Education of Young Children (NAEYC), where the applicant is presenting a paper about ethics research.

Publications which would be appropriate for dissemination of information include "Every Child" (AECA), of which Associate Professor Alison Elliott of UWS Nepean is the Editor, and Australian Journal of Early Childhood. There are also several national early childhood "newsletter" forums such as "Contact" and "Broadside".

Summer Hill Films were chosen as a suitable company to develop the material, as they have an excellent reputation in the early childhood field for producing high quality, sensitive and sympathetic videos that are widely known and held in high regard. As they already have an existing group of early childhood resources which are comprehensively advertised, marketing would not be a problem. They have worked extensively in workplace contexts and in adult education and also have experience in the design of video covers and accompanying materials. They are currently working with UTS on the production of a video about application of statistics in Australian Industry, funded from a CAUT grant.

iii) **Has the support of the applicants' university for the implementation of project outcomes.**

The project has strong support from Professor Jim Walker, Dean of the Faculty of Education, UWS Nepean and Associate Professor Alison Elliott, who is Coordinator of the Early Childhood course at Nepean.

Similarly, at University of Newcastle, the project has the support of the Dean of the Faculty of Education, Professor Terence Lovat.

10. **Budget Outline**

   Pre production, including script writing, production and editing of Broadcast standard 45 minute video - $25,000

   Time release for Project managers. - $4000

   Travel and expense costs of reference group meetings - $1000

   Employment of clerical assistant for development and maintenance of data base for distribution and evaluation of materials - $3,000

   Pre production, production and editing of CD Rom - $14,000

   Printing and preparation of 20 Manuals for pilot phase evaluation - $1,000

   Copying of Manuals, Videos and CD Rom for final distribution - $2,000

11. **Justification of Budget**

   Pre production, including script writing, production and editing of Broadcast standard 45 minute video - this cost estimate has been presented by Summer Hill Films.

   ¥ research and script development (16 days of research (including selection of appropriate locations), selection of vignettes, discussions with reference group, and scripting of selected vignettes). If filming is to be used for CD Rom production there are considerations to be taken into account at this point - $4,000
**Production** - (4 shooting days with one supplementary day for presenter shoot with autocue, on location).

Contingency day allowed for further shooting after edits. Highly experienced director and crew filming on Broadcast quality Betacam SP equipment - $12,000

**Post production** - 7.5 days of editing time. Two versions will be edited and tested before producing the Master Edit of the Program - On-line editing, viewing and testing of the tapes occurs in stages. First a "rough cut" is made and screened for comment by project managers. Changes are made and a "fine cut" produced. Testing with a target audience can then be arranged. The final edit with sound mixed and balanced, music and effects added is presented, before duplication proceeds - $7,500

**Time release for Project managers.** 20 days release from normal course marking requirements to advise on script development, facilitate filming in the "case study" locations, and assist with editing - $4,000

**Travel and expense costs of reference group meetings** - the reference group would need to meet for formative evaluation sessions. One member would need to fly from Melbourne (approx $500). Meetings would be necessary at least twice, for the video and the CD Rom.

**Employment of clerical assistant for development and maintenance of database for distribution and evaluation of materials and word processing of manual** - it would be important at all stages of the project, to maintain careful records of the distribution and evaluation of materials. Costs cover approx. 187 hours (4.5 weeks) of word processing at HEW level 4, approximately $16 per hour.

**Pre production, production and editing of CD Rom** - editing of approximately seven scenarios would take 350 hours of programmer time at approximately $40 per hour.

**Printing of 20 Manuals for pilot phase evaluation** - it is important to trial the manual before final production.

**Copying of Manuals, Videos and CD Rom for final distribution** - Cost estimate from Summer Hill Films, based on their previous production of Home Away from Home. Cultural sensitivity in family day care. A video and training package for family day care.

- e.g. Duplication, packaging and marketing of VHS video, labels and cases:
- 50 video copies $550
- 50 copies of CD - $1000
- 50 copies of manual - $450

12. **Professional Background**

**Linda Newman** originally qualified with a Diploma in Teaching (Early Childhood) at Sydney Kindergarten Teachers College and later completed her Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) at University of Newcastle. She currently has a Master of Education (Hons) thesis, on the subject of Transition to School for Children with Special Needs, under examination.

Linda has worked in Long Day Care, and a Preschool Director, having the responsibility for budgeting and submission writing for a multipurpose centre. She has also worked as an Early Intervention teacher in a range of services. In recent years she has also taught in the Assoc. Diploma, Child Care course at TAFE and has been employed as a Lecturer in Education at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean since 1990. She lectures in Early Childhood teaching studies and Early Intervention. Linda has been the recipient of a UWS Nepean Seed Grant to study family views on the transition to school of their children with disabilities. This grant led to conference presentations and publications.

Linda is currently a member of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW, and was formerly acting Chair. As a member of the Council she has been actively involved in formulating the "Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience" and in collecting vignettes to support the Guidelines.

**Lois Pollnitz** graduated as a teacher specialising in the education of children in the early years of school (K-2) (Dip T [Inf]). She has had teaching experience in NSW, SA and the UK.

Lois is currently a lecturer in early childhood education at the University of Newcastle. Her research interest is in the area of professional ethics in early childhood. She has recently completed a Masters thesis entitled Early Childhood Practitioners' Perceptions of the Australian Early Childhood Association Code of Ethics. Lois has presented papers
Lois is currently the Chair of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of NSW. As a member of the Council she has been actively involved in formulating the "Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience" and in collecting vignettes to support the Guidelines.

13. Certification of Application

Certification by Applicant(s)

I certify that all details in this application are correct and complete and that all persons listed have agreed to take part in the proposed project.

Applicant 1  Linda Newman  signature  date
Applicant 2  Lois Pollnitz  signature  date

Certification by applicant’s head of department

I certify that I support this project and have confidence in the applicant’s ability to undertake it successfully.

signature  date

Name:  Professor Jim Walker - Dean
Name of Department:  Faculty of Education, UWS Nepean
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Details of Applicants

Applicant 1

Title: Ms
Surname: Newman
Given Names: Linda
Department: Faculty of Education
University: University of Western Sydney, Nepean
Campus: Kingswood
PO Box: PO Box 10
Town or Suburbs: Kingswood State: NSW Postcode: 2747
Telephone No: 047 360138
Facsimile No: 047 360400
Email address: l.newman@nepean.uws.edu.au

Applicant 2

Title: Ms
Surname: Pollnitz
Given Names: Lois
Department: Faculty of Education
Project Funding and Duration

Funded Amount $48,008

Expected completion date: 31 December 1998

Project Summary as Proposed

Aims:

Make available effective teaching materials to introduce the concept of ethical practice in fieldwork to students who have not yet commenced their first fieldwork placement.

Facilitate the de-briefing of students after fieldwork experiences.

c) provide tertiary educators with support materials, for the introduction, or enrichment of sessions about ethical practices in field experience.

d) provide students and educators with strategies for identifying, classifying and dealing with ethical dilemmas in field experiences.

e) allow opportunities for tertiary educators to introduce and teach about ethical dilemmas in a flexible manner.

Materials:

Video
A broadcast standard video introducing the concept of ethics and the problematic nature of ethical decision making.

Manual
A facilitator’s guide, providing users with varying methods for discussion or learning, to accommodate the different learning styles of users.

CD Rom
An interactive CD Rom allowing students to work at their own rate through a program that raises issues and questions about dilemmas depicted in video clips.

Progress:
The project is progressing well and several stages have been completed. Though the aims of the project remain the same, extensive consultation with reference group members, and evaluation of each stage in the project has resulted in our decision to produce materials of greater range and depth than was originally proposed. We believe that the proposed extensions to materials will produce resources of greater value to the educational community.

Video
The video has been completed as proposed. It depicts six dilemmas set in early childhood services and schools. Each scenario is followed by focus questions to trigger discussion about ethical
Manual

A first draft of the manual is nearing completion. It consists of four sections. Section one comprises an extensive theoretical knowledge base relating to ethics, professional ethics and the ethical dimensions of teaching. In section two a case study approach is used to apply the theoretical information presented in section one. Models for dilemma resolution are presented and strategies for applying the models are included. Section three relates directly to the video, providing a synopsis and script for each scenario as well as focus questions to trigger discussion. Section four consists of an extensive collection of suggested resources and includes an annotated bibliography of ethics related references.

This component of the project is considerably more extensive than was originally planned. Interest in publication has been expressed by Prentice Hall Publishers who have invited us to submit a publication proposal. They have suggested that the manual would make a significant contribution to educational literature as a text book. More time has been spent on this component of the project than was originally envisaged. Further research and wide consultation has convinced us of the need to include in depth information which is currently not readily accessible to the educational community.

CD-ROM

Production of the CD-ROM relies heavily on information from the manual. Since the manual is now much more extensive than planned, the timeline for production of the CD-ROM has been delayed. Negotiations are now underway. Negotiations needed to be recommenced with new consultants as the services of the original consultant are no longer available. The CD-ROM will accompany the text as a marketable product.

WWW Site

This is a new stand alone component of the project. Following advice from several consultants, we have decided that a WWW site would be an effective way of reaching the target audience and would provide flexibility for presenters and users. The material developed as a Web site would then be converted to CD-ROM format to allow access for a wider range of users. WWW technology allows for wide access, interaction with lecturers if applicable. This technology will allow the possibility for continuation of the project in the long term. The site can be fully interactive, easily updated and used for student teaching and assessment.

Consultation and Dissemination

Papers Presented at Conferences:

*Partnerships in professional experience: Towards resolution of dilemmas.*


L. Newman. *Taught or caught? Ethics for professional practice in early childhood teacher*


Publications:


Published Conference Proceedings

Conference Attendance

Research
Newman, L., Pollnitz, L. & Goodfellow, J. Towards Ethical Practice. Unfunded research with focus groups of early childhood stakeholders to elicit views and opinions about professional experience issues and to evaluate pilot video What Should I Do?
Budget (Please see attachment)

Production, including script writing, production and editing of Broadcast standard 45 minute video - $25,000. **$20,000 to date.**

One release for Project managers - $4,000. **$2,347 to date.**

Travel and expense costs of reference group meetings - $1,000. **No expenditure to date.**

Employment of clerical assistant for development and maintenance of data base for distribution and evaluation of materials - $3,000. **No expenditure to date.**

Production, production and editing of CD Rom - $14,000. **No expenditure to date.**

Financing and preparation of 20 Manuals for pilot phase evaluation - $1,000. **No expenditure to date.**

Copying of Manuals, Videos and CD Rom for final distribution - $2,000. **No expenditure to date.**

Balance available as at September, 1998 - $24,684
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Details of Recipients

Recipient 1
Title: Ms
Surname: Newman
Given Name: Linda
Department: Faculty of Education
University: University of Western Sydney, Nepean
Campus: Kingswood
PO Box: PO Box 10
Town or Suburb: KINGSWOOD
State: NSW
Postcode: 2747
Telephone No: (02) 4736 0138
Facsimile No: (02) 4736 0400
Email address: l.newman@nepean.uws.edu.au

Recipient 2
Title: Ms
Surname: Pollnitz
Given Name: Lois
Department: Faculty of Education
University: The University of Newcastle
Campus: Callaghan
Address: University Drive
Town or Suburb: CALLAGHAN
State: NSW
Postcode: 2038
Telephone No: (02) 4921 6411
Facsimile No: (02) 4921 6895
Email address: pollnitz@mail.newcastle.edu.au
Project Funding and Duration

Funded Amount: $48,008
Expected completion date: 31 December 1998

Summary of Proposed Project

Aims:
1) make available effective teaching materials to introduce the concept of ethical practice in fieldwork to students who have not yet commenced their first fieldwork placement.
2) facilitate the de-briefing of students after fieldwork experiences.
3) provide tertiary educators with support materials, for the introduction, or enrichment of sessions about ethical practice in field experience.
4) provide students and educators with strategies for identifying, classifying and dealing with ethical dilemmas in field experiences.
5) allow opportunities for tertiary educators to introduce and teach about ethical dilemmas in a flexible manner.

Materials:

Video
A broadcast standard video introducing the concept of ethics and the problematic nature of ethical decision making.

Manual
A facilitator’s guide, providing users with varying methods for discussion or learning, to accommodate the different learning styles of users.

CD Rom
An interactive CD Rom allowing students to work at their own rate through a program that raises issues and questions about dilemmas depicted in video clips.

Progress:
The recipients acknowledge that progress has been slow and the project development has taken much longer than originally intended. In part, progress has been inhibited by the weight of academic workload and by the need to find extended time together to work on each component of the project. Though technology has been used extensively for communication, planning and development, it has been found that clarifying understandings and reaching shared understandings about this difficult area of professional practice is best achieved in face to face extended discussion.

Researching the concept of professional ethics has taken much longer than originally anticipated. Through extensive research, the recipients reached new understandings which influenced them to
originally proposed. Advised against taking this pathway by the Committee, the recipients have been refining the materials so that the original proposal remains intact but also incorporates the new understandings.

A significant and recent development has been the formulation of a tool to support ethical reasoning. Though based on others' models of ethical reasoning, the Ethical Response Cycle presents a new approach to ethical reasoning for the purpose of resolving dilemmas in professional practice. This approach is currently being tested for effectiveness with early childhood student teachers and the diagrammatic representation of the Cycle is being further refined. The significance of the Cycle is that it can be used to 'tie together' all the components of the teaching and learning package - the video, manual and CD-ROM. Given progress to date, the package should be completed by the end of 1999.

**Video**

The video has been completed as proposed. It depicts six dilemmas set in early childhood services and schools. Each scenario is followed by focus questions to trigger discussion about ethical dilemmas. In 1998, the scenarios were evaluated for their effectiveness as triggers for discussion by focus groups of early childhood students, early childhood tertiary educators, early childhood professionals in the field, and parents of children enrolled in early childhood services. During this year, 1999, the scenarios are being used with early childhood teacher education students. The purpose is to test the effectiveness of the Ethical Response Cycle recently developed by the recipients. The scenarios are being used in conjunction with the Cycle to stimulate systematic ethical reasoning towards making judgements which resolve dilemmas.

**Manual**

The outcome of the Committee's advice to restrict the project to its original dimensions and the interest expressed in publication of the material in the first draft of the manual as a textbook, have caused the recipients to reconceptualise the content of the manual for the project.

The reconceptualised manual is in the process of being written. Though it draws on information in the first draft, the reconceptualised manual will contain less theoretical information and will relate specifically to the video scenarios. The manual will consist of an Introduction, six sections relating to the six scenarios, and a resource section. Though each scenario includes a range of ethical considerations, a specific aspect, for example ethical principles, is addressed through each scenario. Facilitators will use the Ethical Response Cycle, incorporating the essential core features for ethical reasoning, in conjunction with each video scenario to facilitate learners' understanding and practice.

**CD-ROM**

A significant amount of work has been put into developing the CD-ROM during 1999. Development to date has been well received by early childhood tertiary educators and early
national conference of the Australian Early Childhood Association held in Darwin in July, 1999. Further development of the CD-ROM has been put on hold so that once it has been proved to be effective, the *Ethical Response Cycle* can be incorporated into the CD-ROM.
Consultation and Dissemination

Presentations and Workshops

tpaper prepared for BEd Early Childhood and Primary students at UWS Nepean studying
Understanding Education 1. March.

Services Advisers, Department of Community Services, Campbelltown, September.

Newman, L. (1999). Learning to recognise and resolve ethical dilemmas in early childhood
fieldwork. Visiting scholar presentation to Faculty Staff at Honolulu Community College,

Newman, L. (1999). Ethical leadership or leadership in ethics? Visiting scholar presentation to
Board Members of Hawaii Association for the Education of Young Children, Honolulu,
Hawaii, U.S.A. April 17.

presentation to Hawaii Career Development Coalition. Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, 19 April.

presentation to College of Education staff. University of Hawaii, Hawaii, USA, 23 April.

presentation to demonstration teachers at University of Hawaii Manoa Children's Centre.
Hawaii, USA, 20 April.

Papers Presented at Conferences

research: The making of a video about early childhood fieldwork dilemmas. Paper
presented at Conference for Australian Research in Early Childhood Education. University
of Canberra.

resolving ethical dilemmas. Paper presented at "Children at the Top", Australian Early

Early Childhood Association Conference, Melbourne, September.


Publications

Hawman, L. (submitted to Australian Journal of Early Childhood). *Ethical leadership or leadership in ethics?*


issues in preparation of pre-service educators. A case study from Australia. In J. Hayden
(Ed). *Early Childhood Landscapes: Cross National Perspectives on Empowerment and

Philosophy and Theory*. 30(3), 318-320. ISSN 0013-1857.

Published Conference Proceedings

Towards Resolution of Dilemmas*. Conference Proceedings of Australian Early

Conference Attendance

Reasoning and Decision Making Conference of Australian Association of Professional and Applied
Sciences, Canberra, October, 1999.

Reasoning and Decision Making Conference of Australian Association of Professional and Applied
SciencesCharles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, NSW. December, 1998.

Reasoning and Decision Making Conference of Australian Association of Professional and Applied
Sciences, Melbourne, 1997.

Search

L. Swam, L., Pollnitz, L. & Goodfellow, J. *Towards Ethical Practice*. Unfunded research with
focus groups of early childhood stakeholders to elicit views and opinions about
professional experience issues and to evaluate pilot video *What Should I Do? Issues in
early childhood field experience.*
Summary of Expenditure 1999

Carried forward from 1998 - $22,208

Expenditure 1999
Summer Hill Films - $5,000
AV Supplies (blank video tapes) - $199.44
CADRE Design (CD-ROM), Payment 1 - $4,916
Salary (Word Processing for Manual) - $198.95
Salary oncosts - $14.75

Current Balance as at 12/10/99 - $11,891.08
Committed Funds CADRE Design (CD-ROM completion) - $10,000
Mrs. Heather Maxwell
Director CUTSD Secretariat
University of Canberra
PO Box 1
BELCONNEN ACT 2161

14 October 1999

Dear Heather Maxwell,

Please find enclosed an interim report dated September 1999 for the CUTSD Grant Project *The development of decision making as it relates to ethical practice in early childhood student teacher education.*

Yours sincerely,

Lois Pollnitz & Linda Newman
Project Recipients
Faculty of Education
Tel. (02) 4921 6411
Fax. (02) 4921 6895
email: pollnitz@mail.newcastle.edu.au

Professor Nigel Bond
Pro-Vice Chancellor Academic
Senior Executives Office
UWS Macarthur
GPO Box 555
CAMPBELL TOWN NSW 2560

14 October 1999

Dear Professor Bond,
Please find enclosed a copy of an interim report dated September 1999 for the CUTSD Grant
Project *The development of decision making as it relates to ethical practice in early childhood student teacher education*. The report has been forwarded to the CUTSD Secretariat, University of Canberra.

Yours sincerely,

Lois Pollnitz & Linda Newman
Project Recipients
Professor John Hay  
Chair of the Committee  
CUTSD Secretariat  
University of Canberra  
PO Box 1  
BELCONNEN ACT 2161

28 October 1999

Dear Professor Hay,

**Re: Project The development of decision making as it relates to ethical practice in early childhood student teacher education.**

We are writing in response to the attached email received from Sharon van Reyk on Tuesday 26 October, 1999.

Early in 1999 when it became clear that the project would not be completed by 30 June 1999, we made a telephone enquiry about an extension. We acted on the advice we received at the time and did not submit a formal application for an extension of time.

The email from Sharon van Reyk was prompted by our submission of a progress report in October, 1999. We request that you accept the report as evidence of the progress made during 1999 and as confirmation of the need to extend the completion date of the project until the end of 1999.

Yours sincerely,

Lois Pollnitz & Linda Newman  
Project Recipients
APPENDIX 8

TEACHING RESOURCE MATERIALS
APPENDIX 8A

Production of Pilot Video


This video was one of the earliest stages of the project described in this portfolio. It depicts three typical problematic situations encountered by early childhood students during fieldwork programs. Two of the scenarios were later incorporated into the video presented in the teaching resource kit presented in Appendix 8b. Feedback from participants in a focus group based evaluation was also considered for the remake of the video. The next video, which was funded more extensively, included six scenarios and incorporated scenarios in which the interests of stakeholders other than students were also depicted.

My contribution;

- Employ film company and arrange contract – Newman
- Liaise with film company on casting, location etc. – Newman
- Arrange location – Newman
- Review script – Newman & Pollnitz
- Supervise filming & editing - Newman
what should I do?
APPENDIX 8B

Production of Teaching and Learning Resource Kit


This teaching resource kit allowed for extension of the work commenced in the pilot video presented in Appendix 8a. It consists of a video, instructor’s manual and CD-ROM. The video, extends on the pilot video by presenting six scenarios of problematic situations during fieldwork, and extends the student perspective to cover the perspectives of other stakeholders in fieldwork. The manual extends greatly upon the one prepared for the pilot video and incorporates the Ethical Response Cycle, which was only developed towards the end of the project. This necessitated an entire re-write and re-production of the manual and CD-ROM. The CD-ROM summarises the video and manual, is interactive, and is intended for independent student use (See separate package for a “mock-up” of the kit.

My contribution:

Video;

- Joint project – Newman & Pollnitz
- Liaison with film company, contract, budget, casting and locations – Newman

Manual

- Joint project - Newman & Pollnitz

CD ROM

- Employment of IT company, liaison and development, contract, budget – Newman
- Review and edit – Newman & Pollnitz
Will my response be ethical?
A reflective process to guide the practice of early childhood students and professionals

Proposal
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<td>Implementation</td>
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</table>

Appendices

List of Presentations
This project, funded by a CUTSD Grant, was undertaken in response to concerns that arose from individual lecturers who were working with students returning from field experience programs, stressed because of dilemmas they encountered. At the same time, through the forum of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales, it became evident that there were issues to be resolved for all stakeholders – students, tertiary staff and employers. The issues were consistent throughout TAFE and all universities represented on this body. Initial work commenced to develop the *Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience*, and to conduct some research. The first (pilot) video was also made, based on dilemma scenarios collected from the field.

Early childhood professionals often have to resolve problematic situations that arise in their daily work with children, families and colleagues. Finding solutions, making right or appropriate decisions in these situations can be difficult, particularly when the situations present early childhood professionals with a dilemma. When faced with a dilemma, early childhood professionals recognise that there is more than one solution to the problem but that none of the solutions is clearly ‘right’ for all the people involved.

This teaching and learning package is designed to assist early childhood students and professionals resolve dilemmas that confront them in the workplace. Specifically, it is designed to assist them make ethical responses in situations where there is no clear ‘right’ solution. The *Ethical Response Cycle* is presented as a process for assisting early childhood students and professionals to apply systematic, sensitive ethical reasoning to the resolution of dilemmas. Though the package has been designed specifically for early childhood students and professionals, the *Ethical Response Cycle* can be used to assist students enrolled in other professional preparation courses. The *Ethical Response Cycle* can be used in conjunction with scenarios or case studies based on situations and dilemmas encountered in their professional practice.

The development of the package, consisting of a manual, video and CD ROMs builds on and supports previous research and publications by early childhood professionals in Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America. All work has been supported and influenced by members of the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales.

Because ethical analysis is a complex process, it would be unwise to advise strict adherence to a specific step-by-step process for the resolution of all problematic situations. Rather, what is recommended is that the *Ethical Response Cycle* is used as a framework to support and validate systematic and sensitive reasoning.
Product Description

Will my response be ethical? A reflective process to guide the practice of early childhood students and professionals consists of:

- an instructor's manual;
- a video Will my response be ethical? A reflective process to guide the practice of early childhood students and professionals; and
- a CD ROM

Instructor's Manual

The manual contains an introduction to the package, material for instructors to be used in conjunction with the video, and other resources. The resources include:

- statements of professional core values
- the Australian Early Childhood Association Code of Ethics
- the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales Principles of Field Experience in Early Childhood Professional Preparation Programs
- the Early Childhood Practicum Council of New South Wales Guidelines for Ethical Practice in Early Childhood Field Experience
- descriptions of strategies for supporting ethical analysis
- a glossary of terms
- a list of books and articles related to ethics and to ethics and teaching.

Video

The video consists of six scenarios set in either early childhood services or schools. The scenarios depict dilemmas experienced by early childhood students, cooperating staff and tertiary supervising staff during early childhood field experience. Each scenario is followed by focus questions to stimulate discussion about the dilemma. The video can be used on its own to raise awareness about the complexity of ethical decision making. It can be used in conjunction with material in the manual and the Ethical Response Cycle to help early childhood students and professionals resolve the dilemmas depicted in the scenarios.

CD ROM

The interactive CD ROM can be used in conjunction with the manual and video but has been designed primarily for use by individuals. Early childhood students and professionals can work through the program at their own rate. The CD ROM incorporates components of the manual and video and features a case study approach that enables early childhood students and professionals to apply the Ethical Response Cycle.
Market Research

Market research was conducted over the past four years to gather information about what the market are looking for in such products. This included an extensive range of presentations made to promote the project and obtain feedback on work carried out to develop "Will my response be ethical?" (See attached list of presentations)

Response to the presentation of the work in progress has been consistently positive and participants have always strongly encouraged us to continue and further the work. Presentations have been state based, international and international and have been to practitioners, academic staff, students and professional bodies. The positive feedback has been consistent across all groups. International presentations have been to the American early childhood professional organisation (National Association for the Education of Young Children), early childhood leadership group, centre based demonstration teachers, college teachers, Hawai’ian professional group (Hawai’ian Association for the Education of Young Children), academics (Hawai’i and San Francisco). All participants are anxiously awaiting production of the package, and have indicated a strong desire to purchase.

Focus group research was carried out in 1998 and ascertained the validity of the scenarios used in the video (Sydney, Newcastle and Bathurst).

Competitors

Extensive literature reviews, including that for a doctorate showed no other work of this nature in education in general, in early childhood education and little from other professions.
SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- proven market demand
- quality material based on research
- a systematic approach that can be used by a range of stakeholders to improve practice

Weaknesses
- the time practitioners/lecturers have to learn or practice the process
- restricted to particular market segments

Opportunities
- improve the ethical practice of early childhood students and practitioners
- innovation originating in early childhood education to be used in other areas of education and other professions
- renewed student market each semester
- potential for ethics market

Threats
- competition entering such a small market

Target Market
- Child care centres
- TAFE colleges
- Universities
- Early childhood students/lecturers
- Ethics market
- Libraries
Implementation

Project Management

Project Management will be the responsibility of Linkwest and include the following functions:

- Coordination of production / distribution
- Maintenance of open communication channels between all parties
- First point of contact for product enquiries
- Administrative requirements of university, eg. implementation of policies and procedures, processing of all relevant financial data, maintenance and reconciliation of financial transactions, disbursement of funds
- Regular report on activity.

Production

A master copy of the CD and video are complete. The manual is at final draft stage with graphics completed. We are currently seeking a partnership with a distributor to adopt mass production and distribution of the products. Linkwest will assist in marketing through university channels, however marketing will primarily be the responsibility of the distributor.
Costing

Project fixed costs
1 Linkwest Administration $200
2 Brochure artwork (10 hours @ $40) $400
3 Brochure printing $300
4 Research and development $1,500
Total 1–4 $2,400
UWS Operating Return 10% labour costs $190
Contingency (10% 1-5) $862
Total Project Costs (apportioned to each item below) $2,830

Video and manual

Fixed Costs
Master Video Production $25,000
Proportion of project fixed costs $1,887
Design manual (80 hours @ $40) $3,200
Design Slick (5 hours @ $40) $200
Total fixed costs $30,287

Variable Costs
Video Reproduction $4
Print manual $3
Total variable costs $7
Total Costs per item (200) $158
Mark-up 25% $40

Video & Manual Market Price (Breakeven quantity – 157) $199

CD ROM

Fixed Costs
Master CD Production $10,000
Proportion of project fixed costs $943
Design slicks $100
Total fixed costs $11,043

Variable Costs
CD Reproduction $3
Total Costs per item (200) $65
Mark-up 25% $16

CD ROM Market Price (Breakeven quantity – 128) $89

Additional Linkwest Management Fee - $500 per annum
Profit distribution is 50% Authors 25% School/Division: 25% University.
Profit is only distributed after all fixed costs are paid.
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Presentations

International Conference Presentation (Australia)


International Conference Presentation (Australia)


International Conference Presentation (Australia)


International Conference Presentation (Australia)


International Conference Presentation


International Conference Presentation


National Conference presentation


International Conference Presentation


International Conference Presentation


National Conference Presentation

Invited Presentation to Students


Invited Staff Development Presentation for NSW Department of Community Service Advisers

Newman, L. (1999). *Professional Ethics in Focus.* Invited to present workshop to Children’s Services Advisers, Department of Community Services, Campbelltown, September, 1998

Invited Staff Development Presentation


Invited Presentation to HAEYC Board


Invited presentation to University and College Professors


Invited Staff Colloquium for University Professors


Invited Staff Development for Demonstration teachers


Invited Guest Presentation to Professional Experience Students


Invited Staff Development


International Conference presentation in Australia

UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING
PROFESSIONAL ETHICS: PROCESSES AND
FRAMEWORKS OF ETHICAL RESPONSE
FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS AND
STUDENTS

EDUCATIONAL DOCTORATE
2000

L. R. NEWMAN
University of Western Sydney