

## COMPARISON OF THE MAIN APPROACHES TO ETHICAL EDUCATION

*Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education Project (Darcia Narvaez and colleagues)*

	Character Education (Traditional)	Values Clarification	Cognitive Development (Dilemma Discussion)	➔	Raves: Ethical Expertise Development (umbrella for all approaches)
<b>Leader</b>	Ethical role model	Supporter of individual development	Facilitator, Expert		Designer, Liaison to community
<b>Role</b>	Expose students to traditions		Role model of rational thinker		Facilitator, Nurturer
<b>Leader</b>	Explicit instruction on	Presents/invites statements/questions	Poser of questions		Incorporates ethics into regular instruction
<b>does:</b>	how/why to behave	to which students respond	Discussion facilitator Models ethical reasoning		Draws attention to skill development Links with community
<b>Pluses:</b>	Clear behavioral ideals Value building Habit development May develop motivation Increased sense of community	Increased self-understanding Fosters critical thinking Positive support	Fosters critical thinking Develops perspective taking Empirical support for its effectiveness		Concrete, broad view of ethical behavior Research-based framework Novice-to-expert skill building Community partnership Student empowerment Infusion into regular curriculum
<b>Minuses:</b>	Disagreement on specific enactments of values Ethical & critical reasoning deemphasized Outmoded, inappropriate pedagogy Outmoded understanding of character (traits ) Authoritarian emphasis Little assessment	No separation of personal and ethical Western romantic notion of development Ignores too much of ethical domain May foster self-centeredness Narrow focus Weak pedagogy Little assessment	Can be too narrowly focused May not deal with sensitivity, motivation or implementation		Requires ethics across the curriculum Requires teacher lesson development
<b>Empirical evidence:</b>	Fewer negative behaviors	None	Development in ethical reasoning Just Community: Increased sensitivity, increased prosocial behavior		Makes suggestions based on evidence Under assessment (preliminary evidence suggests increase in ethical identity)

## 主要道德教育方法比較

明尼蘇達社區聲音和道德教育計畫 (Darcia Narvaez 和同事)  
 Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education Project (Darcia Narvaez and colleagues)

	角色教育 (傳統的)	價值澄清	認知發展 (兩難討論)	道德專業知識發展 (所有方法的架構)
<b>領導角色</b>	道德角色楷模 讓學生接觸傳統	支持個別發展者	點評人、專家 理性思考者的角色楷模	設計者、團體聯絡人 點評人、培育者
<b>領導者作為</b>	明確的指導學生應如何做 及為何要做這些行為	提出問題邀請學生 回答	提出難題的人 討論的點評人 楷模的道德說服	融合道德至原有的指導中 留意技能發展 與團體連結
<b>欲增加 的行為</b>	明確的行為典範 建立價值 發展好的習慣 可能發展動機 增加團體社區感	增加自我了解 促進批判思考 正向支持	促進批判思考 發展觀點思考 效果的實徵證明	具體化、擴展道德行為的視野 有研究基礎的架構 新手至專家技能的建立 團體的合作關係 對學生的授權 融入至原有課程
<b>欲減少 的行為</b>	不同意某種特殊制定的價值  不重視道德和批判推理 教育法過時或是不合適的 對品格瞭解已經不合時宜 強調權威主義 很少實施評量	無法將個人與西方對道德發展 浪漫的觀點分離 對道德領域過於漠視 可能促使自我中心 狹隘的見識 差勁的教育法 很少實施評量	可能太過狹隘的聚焦 無法處理敏感性、動機或是執行	要求跨課程的道德 要求教師發展教學單元
<b>實徵 證據</b>	較少負面行為	無	發展道德推論 針對團體: 增加敏感性與親社會行為	根據證據做建議 評估 (初步證據指出道德一致性的增加)

