

## ASSESSMENT #6 ASSESSING PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

(NAEYC Standard 5\*)

**\*Alignment of the Assessment with the Specific SPA Standards addressed by the assessment as Identified in Section III: The Ethics Assessment is aligned with specific SPA standards 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 2c, 4a, 5a-5e & CTC Standard 6. However, because this assessment is holistically scored, it provides faculty with “impressions,” albeit strong ones, relative to each of the Standards noted, and is particularly informative of Standard 5, Developing as a Professional.**

***Description of the Assessment and Use in the Program:***

Initial ECE Program Professional Ethics Assessment		Description
I.	E-Test Pre and Post (independent performance assessment)	Measures candidate ethical sensitivity (DVD prompt)
II.	Defining Issues Test (standardized)	Measures candidate moral/ethical judgment
III.	Moral Motivation & Commitment Survey	Measures candidate conception of professional role identity
IV.	Ethical Implementation	Final Student Teaching Evaluations measures implementation skills

**I. Pre Test (Independent Performance Assessment: Component 1)**

**At Orientation:** *The E-Test (The Educator’s Ethical Sensitivity Test)* assesses critical thinking around ethical issues of practice. It requires candidates to demonstrate sensitivity (insight) into issues of culture, gender, language and power as well as sensitivity to the mandates and principles of the profession. The scenario dilemma-based interactive program requires the candidate to view (DVD version) or read a professional situation in which a problem or potential problem is imbedded. Candidates respond with a word-processed short essay and the response is stored and later scored by KSOEHD Early Childhood faculty. This assessment is theoretically grounded in the Four Component Model of Moral/Ethical Maturity (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau and Thoma, 1999).

**I. Post Test (Independent Performance Assessment: Component 1)**

**At Program Exit Interview** *The E-Test (The Educator’s Ethical Sensitivity Test)*. The Candidate again responds to an *E-Test* prompt (form B). Research with Ethical Sensitivity assessments has shown that both classwork and field experience are necessary to demonstrate growth in this dispositional area. The candidate responds electronically (word-processed short essay) and the response is again scored by KSOEHD Early Childhood faculty. Post test scores have demonstrated significant score increases when compared to pre test scores. At this time, multiple years of scores have been collected. **Professional dispositions are imbedded in the Ethics Scenarios.**

**II. Pre Test At Orientation** (Defining Issues Test: Standardized Assessment: Component 2) **Moral/Ethical Judgment.** In contrast to the previous measure—the production task of the E-Test, moral judgment is measured by a recognition task. The Defining Issues Test (Rest & Narvaez, 1998) is the most researched measure in the field. We are confident that the DIT-2 is the most effective tool to measure life-span moral judgment development of our teacher education candidates. The DIT has been found to be particularly sensitive to educational interventions with change effect sizes ranging from .40 to .65. Reliability, reported by Cronbach Alpha is in the upper .70s and low .80s. Further, the DIT is significantly linked to many “prosocial” behaviors

and to desired professional decision-making (Bebeau, 2002). The DIT-2 is the specific instrument form used in this study. Pre-to-post score increases for ECE initial program participants has been consistently demonstrated since 2001.

II. Post Test **At Program Exit Interview** (Defining Issues Test: Standardized Assessment: Component 2) **Moral/Ethical Judgment**. In contrast to the previous measure—the production task of the E-Test, moral judgment is measured by a recognition task. The Defining Issues Test (Rest & Narvaez, 1998) is the most researched measure in the field. We are confident that the DIT-2 is the most effective tool to measure life-span moral judgment development of our teacher education candidates. The DIT has been found to be particularly sensitive to educational interventions with change effect sizes ranging from .40 to .65. Reliability, reported by Cronbach Alpha is in the upper .70s and low .80s. Further, the DIT is significantly linked to many “prosocial” behaviors and to desired professional decision-making (Bebeau, 2002). The DIT-2 is the specific instrument form used in this study. Pre-to-post score increases for ECE initial program participants has been consistently demonstrated since 2001.

III. Pre Test **At Orientation** Moral Motivation and Commitment Survey: Component Three. We chose to measure MMC component #3, moral motivation and commitment, by having our candidates write about what they think society and the teaching profession will expect of them. Additionally, respondents describe their volunteerism (and reasons for) community service, role models and professional issues of dedicated interest. Prompts about volunteerism were added based on the many findings connecting service and associated, reflective activity and professional-role-identity formation.

III. Post Test **At Program Exit Interview** (Moral Motivation and Commitment Survey): Component Three. We chose to measure MMC component #3, moral motivation and commitment, by having our candidates write about what they think society and the teaching profession will expect of them. Additionally, respondents describe their volunteerism (and reasons for) community service, role models and professional issues of dedicated interest. Prompts about volunteerism were added based on the many findings connecting service and associated, reflective activity and professional-role-identity formation. Pre-to-post change is consistently demonstrated by initial candidates over their three semesters in the program.

**Assessing Ethical Disposition Following the Four Component Model**

Component One: Ethical Sensitivity

***Elementary Teaching Test of Ethical Disposition  
“E-Test”  
Professional Ethics Assessment***

***Form A: Pre test***

*Case #1: Friends and Colleagues*

*Case #2: Caring for Juan*

*An Assessment & Curriculum Project designed  
for the purpose of advancing Ethical Disposition in  
Early Childhood Professionals*

***E-Test (Form A: Dilemma #1) Direction:***

**Work independently. Take the role of Wendy. What would you say to Kimberly? (Please respond in dialogue, as though you were having a conversation 1-2 pgs). E-mail your essay to \_\_\_\_\_ within 48 hrs. In your dialogue, respond to the following questions:**

1. Why did you say what you said?
2. How do you think Kim will respond to what you said?
3. What would you say are the issues in this case?

E-Test (Moral and Ethical Sensitivity):

FRIENDS AND COLLEAGUES

Kimberley Adams and Wendy Castro became friends in college. Both were Liberal Studies majors and they took several classes together. Once graduated, they enrolled in the Multiple Subject Credential Program, completed the course of studies and began their careers as teachers in different districts. They attended each other's weddings and periodically kept in touch.

Several years later, Kimberly changed jobs and was hired in Wendy's district and at Wendy's school, Durban Elementary School. They both taught third grade and were on the third grade planning team that met regularly to plan instruction. Much of their conversation focused on strategies to improving reading, always with an eye on the upcoming standardized test. They both completed district inservice workshops on the latest reading techniques such as individualizing a reading program, taking running records to assess students' reading fluency, implementing literacy centers in conjunction with a literature focus unit, teaching guided reading with books the students had not read before, etc.

Durban Elementary School was a low-performing school and the extra staff development was all focused on improving standardized achievement scores. After all, Durban's scores would be published in the newspaper, and without improvement they would lose the possibility of incentive rewards, the principal might lose her job and teachers might be reassigned. This was high-stakes testing.

As the dates for standardized testing came closer, all Durban teachers focused increasingly on the skills and knowledge their students would need to perform at their best. Fliers were sent home asking for parental participation to ensure that their children were calm, got plenty of sleep and ate well. Staff inservice on administration procedures took place. The principal held a "Testing Week Pep Rally" for the students and sent a daily reminder of motivational statements to the teaching staff. Each day teaching practiced and practiced.

The third grade teachers decided to spread the testing out over a two-week period, giving small doses of the test each day rather than larger amounts over fewer days. This was their choice.

Wendy Castro had playground duty that first week. Third grade recess was at 10:35 a.m. right after the morning's testing was completed. At the end of the first week of testing, on Friday, Wendy overheard some girls talking about the test. One girl said, "My teacher pointed to questions that she thought I needed to think over again." "That helped me answer better."

That night at home, Wendy thought about what the child said and came in early on Monday morning. She went straight to Kim's room. Kim was sitting at her desk. Wendy said, "

***E-Test (Form A: Scenario #2) Direction to Teacher Education Candidate:***  
**Read the scenario. The task requires time for reflection. Work independently. Begin drafting your 1-2 page essay focusing on the prompt questions provided. E-mail your essay to the address provided within 48 hrs.**

**Take the role of Suzanne and write a dialogue in which she shares her thinking about what to do about Juan with her husband that night at dinner (1-2 pages).**

1. Include the reasons behind your thinking.
2. What questions might Suzanne's husband ask her?
3. What would you say are the issues in this case?

**E-Test (Moral and Ethical Sensitivity):**

**CARING FOR JUAN**

Suzanne Hayston was a first grade teacher in her first year of her first "real" job. She had good experiences in student teaching and was highly recommended for the position. Just before the Winter Break, she noticed marks on student Juan's arms and legs that looked to her like cigarette burns. Suzanne asked Juan where those marks came from and he said, "Why?" and then, "bug bites." Suzanne had previous evidence that Juan's family disciplines him harshly at home. In fact, during parent-teacher conferences, Juan's father told Suzanne to "swat" Juan when he doesn't follow directions. The parent said, "It's the only thing that gets his attention." Suzanne also knows that Juan's family hasn't been in this country for very long. Juan is an English Language Learner. Juan's mother speaks no English. Suzanne speaks no Spanish.

Suzanne has hesitated to bring up Juan's behavioral problems with the parents as she does not want to cause Juan further stress or endanger him physically. Juan has potential, but often seems distracted. Juan's hygiene is poor. The younger sibling in Kindergarten is also having behavior problems. That child's teacher told Suzanne that she thinks the family is going through a divorce. None-the-less, Suzanne believes that Juan's parents truly love him and want what's best for him.

Suzanne knows how to make a report to Child Protective Service but worries about the repercussions of doing so...for Juan and for herself. She takes home her worries of the day and shares them at dinner with her husband, Jim, a school principal. **Suzanne says,** “

***Elementary Teaching Test of Ethical Disposition  
“E-Test”***

***Professional Ethics Assessment***

***SCORING MANUAL***

***Form A: Pre test***

***Dilemma #1 Friends and Colleagues***

***Dilemma #2 Caring for Juan***

***An Assessment & Curriculum Project designed  
for the purpose of advancing Ethical Professionalism in  
Early Childhood Professionals***

1. Why did you (Wendy) say what you said?

Respondent ID # \_\_\_\_\_

**Respondent demonstrates moral sensitivity informed by insight into problem context including the personal relationships, as well as the issues of professional behavior.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Minimal sensitivity demonstrated. Minimal insight into context Missed major elements of the context.	Some sensitivity demonstrated to some, though not all of the contextual elements embedded in the case.	In addition to demonstrating sensitivity to individuals, respondent shows awareness of Fiduciary relationship though is unclear about how that affects behavior in this case.	Respondent demonstrates moral sensitivity to individuals and ethical sensitivity to principles/mandate of the profession... mentioning concern for individuals as well as concern for action discharging duty as assessor of learning and fair testing practices	Reveals professional and mature sense of role expectation plus willingness and ability to sensitively address colleague misbehavior "Forward thinking" with respect to consequences of on interpersonal relationship and professional role demonstrated.

2. How do you think Kim will respond to what you said?

**Respondent demonstrates understanding of effective interpersonal skills.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Limited perspective- Taking with few attempts to intuit thoughts and feelings of individuals.	Unlikely perspective-taking. Unreasonable predictions made about thoughts, feelings and motives of others.	In addition to demonstrating effective perspective taking, respondent makes reasonable predictions re: consequences of words and actions.	Respondent demonstrates skilled social inferencing as well as effective interpersonal language in dialogue.	Demonstrated sensitivity results in mature, professional language and behavior conveying understanding and compassion along with a clear sense of duty.

3. What would you say are the issues in this case?

**Respondent identifies critical aspects of the problem context: fair testing practices, professional, problem-solving communication, the nature of collegiality/friendship, fiduciary relationship, duty to the student, the employer and the profession.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Failed to identify many issues	Misinterpreted and/or missed elements of context	Named a majority of issues	Demonstrated Sensitivity and identified most issues	Mature, Professional response incorporating 1-4

1. Why did you (Suzanne) say what you said?

Respondent ID #\_\_\_\_

**Respondent demonstrates moral sensitivity informed by insight into problem context  
Including the personal relationships, as well as the issues of professional behavior.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Minimal sensitivity demonstrated. Minimal insight into context evidenced: cultural gender elements embedded issues, emotional dispositions, law, etc...	Some sensitivity demonstrated to some, though not all of the contextual elements in the case.	In addition to demonstrating sensitivity to individuals, respondent shows awareness of mandated reporter role though is unclear about how that affects behavior in this case.	Respondent demonstrates moral sensitivity to individuals and ethical sensitivity to principles/mandates of the profession... mentioning concern for individuals as well as concern for discharging mandated reporting duty.	Professional and mature sense of role expectation, plus well articulated, differences, principled rationale for reporting behavior. Evidence of "forward thinking" with respect to consequences of mandated reporting. Well integrated sensitivity to persons and profession demonstrated.

2. How do you think Suzanne's discussion with her husband will affect her communication and action with respect to Juan's situation?

**Respondent demonstrates understanding of effective interpersonal skills.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Limited perspective- Taking with few attempts to intuit thoughts and feelings of individuals.	Unlikely perspective-taking. Unreasonable predictions made about thoughts, feelings and motives of others.	In addition to demonstrating effective perspective taking, respondent makes reasonable predictions re: consequences of words and actions.	Respondent demonstrates skilled social inferencing as well as effective interpersonal language in dialogue.	Demonstrated sensitivity results in mature, professional language and behavior conveying understanding and compassion along with a clear sense of duty.

3. What would you say are the issues in this case?

**Respondent identifies critical aspects of the problem context: teacher role as mandated reporter, professional communication, advocacy, cultural differences, emotional climate and safety.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Failed to identify many issues	Misinterpreted and/or missed elements of context	Named a majority of issues	Demonstrated Sensitivity and identified issues	Mature, Professional response incorporating 1-4

## Notes Related to Scoring of Responses to Dilemmas

It is helpful to consider the qualities of “high scorers” versus “low” scoring respondents. These qualities are described based on years of data collection and analysis. Considering the ethical sensitivity dilemma prompts, the high scoring individual invariably focuses on the future—in addition to the challenge of the moment. High scorers’ notions of ethical action involve the consideration of possible impact on the profession, society, and the future. In addition, higher scoring individuals regard their professional role identity as integrated, though distinct from that of other professional child and family advocates. They are aware of and eager to consult with the team. Also, higher scorers are sensitive to the many contextual elements involved in any challenging situation arising in the educational setting and readily mention these characteristics of the context that need to be considered before a course of action is embarked upon. High scorers know their NAEYC code of ethics and make reference to it in responses. And finally, when a legal issue is important to a presented dilemma, the high scorers identify it and clearly indicate the professional action required as a result.

In measuring Component 2, Ethical Judgment, ECE Faculty have depended upon the most reliable and valid measure of moral reasoning in use today. Although it is not within the purview of this work to enter into an exhaustive discussion of the *Defining Issues Test* (DIT), the authors refer interested readers to Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau and Thoma, 1999 for a comprehensive treatment of the DIT.

Similar to the previous depiction of high scorer characteristics, DIT high scorers focus on the universal, the future, the greater good and the individual’s responsibility for the same. Data indicate the instrument’s capacity to demonstrate pre-to-post score change.

Component 3, Ethical Motivation and Commitment, may be measured by the administration of a simple survey at pre and post intervals. The following survey has served the Kremen School Early Childhood Program well in that it has provided qualitative information about professional role identity formation. Early identification with professional role models and issues appropriate for professional advocacy has been associated with ethical professionalism and long-term commitment to the chosen field.

The survey consists of five questions:

*Ethical Motivation and Commitment Survey*

**Candidates:** Please e-mail short essays based on these prompt questions **within 48 hrs** to the address provided. Remember, the purpose of the assessment is to help us understand what you know and to evaluate the effectiveness of our teaching. Information in no way conveys to class grades. Feedback on all measures is available from your advisor. Thank you.

You have made a decision to become an Early Childhood Educator. Your teacher education program selected you based upon your character, competence, and potential to become a teacher. You responded to these very questions three semesters ago. Please demonstrate what you understand about what your profession and society expects of teachers.

What will be expected of you when you become a teacher?

- a) What will **your profession expect** of you?
- b) What will **society expect** of you?

When you have finished responding to questions a) and b) above, please consider the following:

- c) What volunteer or **community service activity** have you participated in (the last two years)?
- d) Whom do you consider your **role models** (personal and professional—from the field of education) and why?
- e) What are the **major issues** in Education today? For which of these issues might you become an advocate?

With respect to scoring responses to the Component 3, the EMC Survey, qualities associated with high scoring responses are: a sense of role identity that encompasses societal responsibility, willingness to advocate, a history of community service, and the ability to identify both personal and professional role models who motivate and inspire commitment to the profession. Low-scoring responses are associated with little notion of the professions’ parameters, no history of community service, and a lack of identification with early childhood professional role models. The scoring rubric follows:

*Ethical Motivation and Commitment Scoring Rubric*

a) Sense of Mission (professional role identity)				
1 None	2 Emerging	3 Defined	4 Professional	5 Mature Ethical Professional
	-some knowledge of professional role expectations.	-clear though not extensive knowledge of professional role expectations.	-in addition to defined, awareness that profession and societal expectations are often the same.	-in addition to meeting the conditions of the professional level, respondent demonstrates awareness that there is a higher "standard of care" for the profession.
b) Sense of Mission (societal role identity) What does society expect of you?				
1 None	2 Emerging	3 Defined	4 Professional	5 Mature Ethical Professional

-some knowledge of social role expectations.	-clear though not extensive knowledge of social role expectations.	-in addition to defined, awareness that profession and societal expectations are often the same.	-Respondent demonstrates a passionate commitment to the professional responsibilities associated with preparing the next generation.
--	--	--	--

c) **Volunteerism and Service**

1 None	2 Emerging	3 Defined	4 Professional	5 Mature Ethical Professional
	one cause or activity	-significant dedication to one or several	-thematic causes.	-thematic, focused, aligned with other comments pertaining to professional mission(devotion).

d) **Role Models**

1 None	2 Emerging	3 Defined	4 Professional	5 Mature Ethical Professional
	-general, no specifics	-a few, named	-in addition to named individuals, there are personal and professional examples.	-personal and professional examples with elaboration as to determining characteristics.

e) **Advocacy**

1 None	2 Emerging	3 Defined	4 Professional	5 Mature Ethical Professional
	-some knowledge of issues associated with the profession, though lacking clarity.	-issues defined, but not centered in the profession.	-in addition to defined, focused and thematic issues are central to the profession.	-in addition to qualities described in rating four, response is aligned with comments about mission and there is evidence of passion/dedication.

Notes on scoring discrimination:

**Ethical Motivation and Commitment: Scoring Discrimination**

In order to assist scoring discrimination, a pool of experts was sought to provide mature, ethical responses to the same survey questions addressed by the novice candidates. An expert response is included along with novice responses at various levels. Brief explanations on scoring decisions and descriptions of respondents accompany each example.

a) **Sense of Mission (professional role identity)**

**Novice Response**

“to teach reading”

**Low scores are characterized by narrow view of educator mission.**

**Expert Response**

“to serve our ultimate clients—while improving the profession through research, engaging in best practice and advocacy.”

**Higher scores are associated with the educator’s awareness that the profession may guide quality service to children and families and that each teacher has responsibility affect the profession in order improve education.**

b) **Sense of Mission (societal role identity)**

**Novice Response** “to keep students safe and teach them basic skills”

**Lower scores are characterized by narrow view of educator mission.**

**Expert Response** “to prepare, along with parents, the next generation of life-long learners, literate citizens and productive workers.”

**Higher scores are associated with the educator’s understanding of “the Big Picture” and a focus on the future.**

**c) Volunteerism and Service**

**Novice Response** “I have run in races for charity on several occasions”

**Lower scores are associated with few and not thematic instances of helping.**

**Expert Response** “I serve on several boards that have as their focus the improvement of Education in our schools.” “I also teach a Sunday school class at my church.”

**Higher scores are characterized by their thematic nature and/or a high degree of dedication and involvement.**

**d) Role Models (professional role identity)**

**Novice Response** “My mom...she was a good teacher.”

**Lower scores are generated by personal role models only and little explanation.**

**Expert Response** “My grandmother was my first excellent teacher. After her example and since entering my profession, I have selected some local and historical examples for inspiration. Among them are: my high school principal and Early Childhood Educator, Lillian Katz.” All my role models were concerned with *whole child* and the next generation.

**Higher scores are associated with responses that combine personal and profession-consensus role models—in addition to demonstration of values demonstrated by the selected role models.**

**e) Advocacy**

**Novice Response** “I believe that all kids need to learn to read.”

**Lower scores are associated with responses that articulate functions inherent to the profession.**

**Expert Response** “I have done and will continue to advocate for a balance between the academic and social-emotional educational needs of children. I serve on a character education and service learning boards.” I believe that there are many ways to advocate for curriculum change—some of those are education and some are political. I am involved in both.”

**Higher scores are characterized by the respondent’s articulation of perceived need in the profession and a record of personal advocacy seemingly based on belief that individual contributions can make a difference.**

#### Component Four: Ethical Implementation

ECE Faculty determined that the most 'ecologically valid' measure of Ethical Implementation is Final Student Teaching. All program influences come together in the experience and context of demonstrating ethical maturity as a preprofessional. Therefore, supervisor evaluations have become the data descriptive of Ethical Implementation.

Thus, The Four Component Model guides both our Professional Ethics Curriculum and our assessment. Future goals for improvement include developing a rotating ECE rotating scoring team. With a small faculty team, scoring scenario responses is persistent challenge.

## Recent Data Analysis

**Alignment of the Assessment with the Specific SPA Standards addressed by the assessment as Identified in Section III: The Ethics Assessment is aligned with specific SPA standards 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 2c, 4a, 5a-5e & CTC Standard 6. However, because this assessment is holistically scored, it provides faculty with “impressions,” albeit strong ones, relative to each of the Standards noted, and is particularly informative of Standard 5, Developing as a Professional. At this time more specific disaggregation of data relative to each individual Standard is not possible.**

- 1a. Knowing and understanding young children’s characteristics and needs.
- 1b. Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning.
- 2a. Knowing about and understanding family and community characteristics.
- 2b. Supporting and empowering families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships.
- 2c. Involving families and communities in their children’s development and learning.
- 4a. Knowing, understanding, and using effective approaches, strategies, and tools for early education.
- 5a. Identifying and involving oneself with the early childhood field.
- 5b. Knowing and upholding ethical standards and other professional guidelines
- 5c. Engaging in continuous, collaborative learning to inform practice.
- 5d. Integrating Knowledge, reflective, and critical perspectives on early education.
- 5e. Engaging in informed advocacy for children and the profession.

The subjects and contexts of the ethical dilemmas are child and family situations, the behaviors being encouraged are professional dispositions. Scoring for the three Ethics Assessments is completed in the following manner:

Scoring Pre and Post Tests	Does Not Yet Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
I. Ethical Sensitivity	<b>1 novice</b>	<b>2 developing practitioner</b>	<b>3 emerging professional</b>
II. Ethical Judgment	“	“	“
III. Ethical Motivation & Commitment	“	“	“
IV. Ethical Implementation	“	“	“

Component I and III (Ethical Sensitivity and Moral Motivation) responses are analyzed periodically by ECE faculty. Components II and III (Ethical Judgment and Implementation) are regularly analyzed. What follows is a most recent ECE Credential Program evaluation of pre-to-post effects with respect to Component II, Ethical Judgment, as measured by The Defining Issues standardized assessment. This instrument has been used in multiple studies where determining program effects on ethical maturity is the goal (Bebeau, 2002). The ECE testing interval is always three semesters. The data address the question,

### **“Does an Ethics-Infused Early Childhood Education Credential Program increase Ethical Judgment in program participants?”**

In Spring Semester 2012, two years of candidate DIT-2 scores were sent to the Center for Ethical Development at the University of Alabama. Scoring was returned and data analyzed. Independent t-tests were performed between two groups across four variables (ethical judgment sub scales). Although the teacher candidate pre-tests ( $N=41$ ,  $M=35.20$ ,  $Sd=14.68$ ) and graduating post-test ( $N=54$ ,  $M=40.48$ ,  $Sd=14.16$ ) did not differ significantly from each other on N2 scores,  $t(93)=1.77$ ,  $p=.08$  (an ethical judgment summary score), two subscales demonstrated important statistically significant results; *maintaining norms* and *post conventionality*.

**Maintaining Norms:**

The candidate scores on the pre-test were characterized by higher maintaining norms scores ( $M=43.54$ ,  $Sd=12.81$ ), than at post-test ( $M=35.27$ ,  $Sd=14.21$ ),  $t(93)=2.93$ ,  $p<.01$ . This dimension of the Defining Issues Test refers to a law-and-order mentality in which actions are judged in a 'black and white manner', without much attention to contextual factors. It is understandable that novice teachers might have higher maintaining norms scores at pre rather than at post-test. During their program, Early Childhood Education Teacher Candidates process many scenarios with their faculty in which gender and cultural contextual variables, for example, come into play and require attention. In these *Future Teacher Forum* sessions, candidates grow in their understanding of ethical, professional behavior—in addition to and beyond what the law requires. The difference between the pre and post candidate scores was statistically significant in this area.

**Post Conventionality**

According to the authors of the Defining Issues Test, post conventionality refers to the ability to see beyond an immediate ethical challenge, to the far reaching, universal and future-focused issues implicated by taking one ethical action over another. Candidates with high post conventional scores might demonstrate more thinking about *The Greater Good* and *The Future*, when making an ethical, professional decision. In our Kremen School, Early Childhood Education sample, novice teacher candidates scored significantly lower on measures of post conventionality ( $M=31.42$ ,  $Sd=13.82$ ) when compared to our graduating teachers ( $M=39.99$ ,  $Sd=15.14$ ),  $t(93)=2.84$ ,  $p<.01$ .

In becoming more ethically mature, both maintaining norms scores and post conventionality contribute to development. In successful candidate future physicians, nurses, dentists and educators, maintaining norms scores tend to decrease and post conventionality scores tend to increase over time, with direct instruction (Bebeau, 2001). The Early Childhood Education faculty at Fresno State continue to be heartened by the data supporting the ethical development of our teacher candidates over the three semesters they are with us.