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INTRODUCTION

Purkey’s book, *What Students Say to Themselves*, discusses the inner dialog that students have about classroom fears and success. While we academics may have similar kinds of interior conversations about our teaching, there is rarely time to discuss these with colleagues.

--Dr. Jolyon Mitchell, University of Edinburgh

From April until December 2008, field research was conducted to determine how ethics and moral philosophy were being taught in six leading English-speaking universities and in five additional leading departments or programs elsewhere. Supported by a Page grant, by sabbatical support from Emerson College, and by guest scholar-in-residence status at the University of Edinburgh and Union University, the researcher visited and/or corresponded with scholars at eleven British and U.S. campuses.

Forty participants (see “Participants”) were selected and interviewed (see “Methods”) to understand not only their pedagogical philosophy and methods, but also to determine how they have evolved or enhanced classroom effectiveness over time. The interviewer also asked about the extent to which ethics may be taught, about why these professors teach ethics, about creative teaching tools they have invented (see inventory below), about problems they and students faced, about how they taught, about what constitutes outstanding moral philosophy teaching, about the role of technology in the classroom, about the relative effectiveness of differing approaches to improving teaching, and about what draws forth the greatest learning and growth from students. Throughout the text the terms “ethics” and “moral philosophy” will be used interchangeably.
SUMMARY OF PRIMARY FINDINGS

Although other findings are printed below, selected primary findings are:

1. While participants almost unanimously agree that ethics and moral philosophy should be taught as a form of critical thinking and internalized moral reasoning, they are evenly divided about whether such instruction should aspire toward or may effect moral improvement or character development.

2. While the ethics instructor may initially focus primarily upon subject matter as determined by others, she typically later develops a twin focus upon 1) subject matter increasingly informed also by personal research and 2) students—their comprehension, capacity, satisfaction, learning speed, threshold, application, needs, feedback, assessment, and improvement.

3. Participants are equally divided about whether ethics professors should (appear to) be neutral referees to avoid “bias” or should reveal their own positions and views to model conviction, courage, transparency, “taking a stand,” and other pro-social values.

4. Although some participants have used several tools to enhance their pedagogical effectiveness and a few have used no tools, the majority utilized one tool—student feedback, whether formal, informal, solicited or/and unsolicited, as their primary learning gauge, rather than enrolling in teacher development courses, introducing new technologies (some oppose “bells and whistles”), or working with a mentor.

5. Participants have primarily learned to teach through trial and error, academic acculturation, student feedback, and observation. Only in a few cases have they also learned by peer observation, formal training, workshops, and by recording their classes.

6. Almost four fifths of all instructors have used a lecture format; almost two thirds have also employed seminar or/and tutorial formats featuring discussion, while one third have emphasized student-driven formats such as debates, presentations, and student-led discussion. Of those who commented about class size, all thought reduced class size enhances the effectiveness of all venues.

7. Although four (10%) of those interviewed emphasized the importance of students knowing class content, twenty-eight (70%) stressed the greater importance of teaching intellectual processes and critical skills such as analytic precision, (counter-) argument,
identification and assessment of moral issues and questions, historical methods, questioning presuppositions, or internalizing moral reasoning.

8. In the aggregate, allowing for the categorization and clustering of participant comments, interviewed faculty felt that the greatest keys to outstanding teaching and student inspiration/growth pertain to 1) instructor’s support, love, or respect for students (40%), 2) teacher’s engagement with, passion for, or enthusiasm about the subject, issues, philosophical thinking, or ideas (35%), 3) classroom communication skills such as listening, eye contact, clarity, preparation, or pacing (35%), 4) character traits such as honesty, generosity of spirit, humility, authenticity, compassion, and fairness (30%), or 5) ability to evoke sustained and genuine student interest and participation (28%).

9. Although 28% have used university teaching websites, 25% have employed Power Point type technologies, and yet another 23% have sometimes used a form of visual (DVD/film, computer, or video clips) media, the majority emphasized the central importance of an undiluted, unmediated student/teacher relationship, and the opening and refinement (not the filling and entertaining) of the human mind. Nevertheless, a strong case was made by 25% for the power of media within instruction.

10. Over half of those interviewed have implemented a combined inventory of 34 creative individual teaching inventions and resources (see abridged list below) for classroom use rather than importing the technologies and programming of others. Several suspected that bowing to trends (e.g. PowerPoint, constant DVD immersion, and virtual learning) contributes to student laziness and cloned thinking and thus they prefer to model individual innovative thinking or/and unique pedagogical systems.

11. While over half emphasized academic skills such as logic-driven writing, systematic reflection, penetrating questioning and answering, hermeneutics, deconstruction, and critical reading as important classroom activity, one third also emphasized that such skills should be applied to moral decision-making in life itself.

12. Summarily, despite exceptions, a few technology advocates, and multiple perspectives, participants saw teacher development, technologies, techniques, and trends as secondary to the primacy of intellectual rigor, moral reasoning, the legacy of apex thinking, and the direct student-teacher relationship.
Other findings are embedded within discussion below.

THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR SELECTION

With the assistance of APA advisors, selected department chairs, emeritus faculty, and other philosophers, fifty-eight potential participants were initially identified from among those teaching ethics and moral philosophy within philosophy departments and professional colleges at six leading English-speaking universities. Thirty-three of these at Cambridge (6), Harvard (5), Oxford (7), Princeton (4), the University of Edinburgh (6), and Yale (5) responded that they were available to participate. On average, 5.5 professors from each institution completed the interview. The twenty-five who declined mentioned that they were either on leave, ill, over-committed, traveling extensively, or gave no reason.

Following consultation with advisors from the American Philosophical Association (Executive Director David Schrader and Teaching Committee Chair Randall Curren), and several senior philosophers, the researcher decided to add a seventh group of thirteen selected professors from five leading philosophy departments, institutes, and programs which feature moral philosophy or ethics. Of these, seven ethicists proved available from New York University (2), the University of Chicago (1), the University of Illinois (1), the University of Michigan (2), and Vanderbilt University (1).

Participants in all seven of these clusters (one cluster from each of the six selected universities and one added cluster from selected departments/institutes at five other universities) totaled forty. Those interviewed included six department or program chairs, three (semi-) retired faculty, and one visiting professor. Despite repeated invitations to larger numbers of women and those from a diversity of races, only eight women (20% of the participant total) and one diversity faculty member (3%) accepted invitations to participate. These numbers seem roughly consistent with the small numbers of women and individuals from diverse cultures within this sector of higher education. Approximately half of those interviewed were from the United States and half from the United Kingdom, although several had taught in both environments, and some had taught in at least three countries.

A list of those participating below is alphabetized by last name with current or most recent affiliation in parentheses. It should be noted that, although six faculty with fewer than fifteen years teaching experience were included to add balance regarding age and generation, overall the
participants averaged over twenty-nine years of teaching in higher education and almost fifteen years teaching at their current or most recent institution. They have taught ethics an average of twenty-three years and over half have taught it an average of thirty-five years.

On average the participants have taught a total of sixty-three ethics and moral philosophy classes yielding an estimated two thousand four hundred and twenty total classes taught, including classes taught repetitively and in multiple ethics sections. Of these, on average 30% were graduate, 55% percent were undergraduate, and 15% were mixed classes. Of these approximately 62% were taught in philosophy departments, 28% in professional (e.g. medicine, law, divinity, journalism, and business) colleges and (ethics) institutes, while 10% were taught in other departments or mixed venues.

In the list of participants below those who are currently or recently affiliated with two selected institutions are followed by two names (Princeton, Harvard). Two additional administrative heads, Daniel Garber (Princeton) and Tom Moore (Oxford), who were interviewed to add overview information about moral philosophy curriculum within their philosophy departments, have been added to the list such that it includes 42 names. Garber and Moore did not participate in the standard teaching interview. In summary 40 participants were asked 40 standardized questions about teaching while 6 of these and two others, all of whom had administrative experience, were asked additional program overview and curriculum questions. All reported statistics pertain only to replies to the standard interview taken by forty teachers.

ADAMS, Nick (Cambridge, University of Edinburgh)
ANDERSON, Elizabeth (University of Michigan)
APPIAH, Kwame Anthony (Princeton)
BLACKBURN, Simon (Cambridge)
BIGGAR, Nigel (Oxford)
BROOME, John (Oxford)
CHRISMAN, Matthew (University of Edinburgh)
CHRISTIANS, Clifford (University of Illinois)
CRISP, Roger (Oxford)
COOPER, John (Princeton)
DARWALL, Stephen (Yale, University of Michigan)
FARLEY, Margaret (Yale, retired)
GARBER, Daniel (Princeton, chair)*
GURLAND, Robert (NYU, semi-retired)
JAMIESON, Dale (NYU)
KAGAN, Shelly (Yale)
KAMM, Frances (Harvard)
KORSGAARD, Christine (Harvard, former chair)
LATHAM, Stephen (Yale)
LEAL, Dave (Oxford)
LILLEHAMMER, Hallvard (Cambridge)
MATRAVERS, Derek (Cambridge)
MCCARTHY, David (University of Edinburgh)
MITCHELL, Jolyon (University of Edinburgh)
MOORE, Tom (Oxford, administrator) *
NORTHCOTT, Michael (University of Edinburgh)
NUSSBAUM, Martha (University of Chicago)
O’DONOVAN, Oliver (University of Edinburgh, Oxford)
O’NEILL, Onora (Cambridge, semi-retired)
RAILCLIFFE RICHARDS, Janet (Oxford)
RAILTON, Peter (University of Michigan)
REATH, Andrews (Harvard, guest faculty, 2008)
RIDGE, Michael (University of Edinburgh, chair)
ROSEN, Gideon (Princeton)
SAVULESCU, Julian (Oxford, program head)
SCANLON, Thomas (Harvard, former chair)
SCOTT, Charles (Vanderbilt, director)
SINGER, Peter (Princeton)
SMITH, David (Yale, director)
THOMPSON, Dennis (Harvard, former director)
TOLSTOY, Margaret (Cambridge)
WEDGWOOD, Ralph (Oxford)

*administrative interview only

**APPROACH AND METHODS**

Adapting questions used by Kenneth Bain in his Harvard University Press award-winning book, *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Harvard, 2004), the researcher created a forty-question interview that was uniformly administered to all forty participants in person (63%), on-line (34%) or by phone (3%) according to their preference and availability. Two fifths (40%) of all participants also provided additional materials such as relevant syllabi or hand-outs. One third (33%) were also observed during lecture or seminar teaching.
Of the forty questions, ten focused upon general teaching (e.g. “What are your teaching methods?” “How do you prepare to teach?”) as developed by Bain while twenty were created for this study to focus upon 1) how teaching effectiveness is enhanced and evolves over time (10 questions) and 2) how ethics and moral philosophy courses are specifically taught by these faculty within philosophy departments and other university curricula (10 questions). Another ten questions solicited basic contact information and empirical data about teaching experience. To add overview to this standardized interview, some participants who (in some cases) formerly chaired departments or administered ethics centers, institutes, and programs, were asked additional or distinctive questions about their overall ethics and moral philosophy curriculum and programs.

Concurrently, germane course catalogs, program websites, and related materials were reviewed. A rich literature, such as by Curren, Kahn, Bowie, and others (see works cited), about the role of ethics in professional education, ethics pedagogies such as case studies, and ethical issues which arrive in the employment of grades and evaluations, was inspected. Classroom observation of participants included those in U.S. and U.K. undergraduate, graduate, and mixed (undergrad/grad) ethics and moral philosophy courses offered within philosophy departments and professional colleges based upon availability, logistics, and permission.

All in-person and phone interviews were conducted between April and November 2008 in offices, homes, or public settings on or near campuses. On-line interviews employed an on-line attachment questionnaire also appended to this article (see Appendix).

Data (e.g. number of courses taught, years teaching) provided was subject to human error since it was based upon the memory and estimates of the participants. Percentages did not always total 100% since several participants gave multiple answers to questions. Moreover, some categories were not sharply defined as in “courses taught,” because numbers did not include students taking independent studies, writing graduate theses, or (as at Oxford and Cambridge) being independently tutored. The participant interpreted terms such as “ethics” and “moral philosophy,” which were often used interchangeably, according to her or his institutional and cultural context. Other terms such as “leading institutions” were determined by many criteria such as international ranking systems, advisory input from the APA and senior (including Emeritus) scholars within the discipline, and worldwide consistency of reputation.
At no point were teachers at these leading English-speaking institutions assumed to be better than teachers at other universities or nations. There was insufficient data and consensus about what constitutes “great” teaching, and by which cultural standards and whose “ethics,” to so determine. Instead institutional ranking systems and long-term consistency of reputation were used to determine “leading institutions” for the first six clusters and for a combination of leading departments, institutes, courses or institutions for the seventh cluster. Only English-speaking institutions were selected 1) due to limitations of time, budget, and the researcher’s minimal language fluency beyond English, 2) because the researcher had already completed research books about international and indigenous ethics to which this research provided expansion and balance, and 3) specific invitations from academic institutions in the U.K. and U.S. were given to the researcher.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS BY TOPIC

Each section below summarizes patterns that emerged in response to the specific questions enumerated in parentheses following subtopic headlines (see Appendix).

Teaching Ethics (Question 31)

When asked what they had to say to those who felt that ethics couldn’t be taught, 73% felt that ethics, when defined as moral reasoning, could definitely be taught. However, 40% did not believe that ethics, if defined as moral improvement or character development, could be taught, while 40% felt that classroom moral philosophy could or does make at least some students better persons. In other words most thought that ethics instruction can effect changes in moral thinking, but participants were divided about whether it is also the role and nature of ethics instruction to motivate changes in moral action. Some of the views expressed were “You may not change their overall behavior, but you can give them corrective lenses” (David Smith, Yale, 2008); “You can’t make every student a good person but increasing students’ moral insight is helpful” (Margaret Farley, Yale, 2008); and “Does (classroom ethics) make people more virtuous? I doubt it. But it may make them more responsible, thoughtful decision-makers when hard decisions arise” (Elizabeth Anderson, University of Michigan, 2008).

Those voicing support for normative and corrective ethics included appeals to Kant: “Since ethics is not inbred, it must be taught” (Stephen
Latham, Yale, 2008); or to modeling: “When showing is better than telling, thinking about ethics is best taught and displayed by who you are in students’ presence” (Nick Adams, Cambridge, 2008); or to social necessity: “given the state of the world, ethics must be taught” (Julian Savulescu, Oxford, 2008).

Still others noted subtleties and middle ground when providing answers. Harvard Professor Christine Korsgaard observed, “What can be taught is not exactly goodness, but good thinking about goodness. But the two are inextricably linked.” Dr. Robert Gurland (NYU) affirmed both “sides:”

Will students become more ethical persons as a result of taking courses in ethics? In some cases ‘yes’, in some cases, ‘no.’ There are no guarantees … but if you don’t put the tools in the toolbox, you can rest assured that they will never be used (2008).

For other participants the matter was more clear cut. Derek Matravers at Cambridge argued that ethical behavior is indeed taught “somewhere, whether at mother’s knee or behind the bike sheds” (2008). But Professor Kwami Appiah at Princeton did not assume that this “somewhere” includes the classroom: “Conceivably, a sociopath could get a high grade in an ethics class … character development is not what we are teaching. Rather I want students to think more deeply about moral problems and I seek to provide them with many more options” (2008).

**Toward What End? (Questions 2, 13)**

When asked why they teach, over one third (35%) mentioned the enjoyment, “stimulation,” fun, and “theater” which make teaching engaging. Others (25%) noted that teaching ethics and moral philosophy has unique societal rewards since high quality moral decision-making is a “service to society” and “moral life fundamentally matters to human life.” Ten (25%) who noted practicality said they felt it was important to teach about “issues of value,” or “of daily significance.” Other top reasons for teaching included “love for” or “assistance to” students (25%), “it pays the bills” (23%), teaching “accompanies” or “supports” research (18%), “one learns” from teaching and students (18%), university life is “important” or “fulfilling” (18%), it is a social network (10%), and “teaching ethics is valuable for its own sake” (10%).

Dr. Korsgaard (Harvard) elaborated on the valued linkage of teaching to personal research:
Your teaching and your research—that is, your own philosophizing—can remain very closely linked. You can share your thoughts with the students—and they find it exciting. In fact I find routinely that if I lecture on a topic I am currently working on, most of the better students write their paper on that topic—they pick up on my own interest and excitement, even if I don’t tell them that is the topic I am working on right now (2008).

Many teachers also teach (ethics) for the gratification of completing an effective or rewarding job. When asked, “How do you know when you’ve done a good job teaching?” over one third (35%) talked about formal student positive feedback, three tenths (30%) noted informal student feedback (such as spontaneous excitement, pleasure, e-mails, and office visits), while one fourth (25%) commented about more measurable changes such as improved examination scores, grades, and other means of assessment. Closely connected with this outcome was the satisfaction reported by ten (25%) regarding student “evolution”—better writing skills, deeper questions, substantiated answers, engaging discussion, independent thinking, greater abstraction, persuasive argumentation, more penetrating textual exegesis, and mastery of more difficult material.

Almost all answers revolved around some level of increased dynamism: both the professor and the student become “energized” or “animated” in new ways. As Robert Gurland (NYU) expressed:

My enthusiasm for my work has never waned, fifty-three years in the classroom, better than 25,000 students…If I lived forever, I would never experience boredom if I were permitted to occupy the classroom platform … new faces, new ideas … teaching is an intoxicating … and invigorating activity which not only enhances the life experiences of my students but it provides the means of continual self-renewal … to quote Dylan … it allows one to remain ‘forever young’ (2008).

For several (35%) this dynamism has an implication not only for the individual mind but also for the off-campus collective moral compass.

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

I want (students) to think Socratically, questioning everything. I want them to believe that the questions are important and that a life without facing those big questions is incomplete.
On the surface these professors seemed to use standard teaching tools. For example, although 13% opposed the use of final exams, over half (53%) gave finals, and almost all (93%) assigned and graded long (40%) or short (30%) papers or both (23%). Other common forms of grading included mid-term exams (33%), discussion/participation (20%), group projects (13%), and class presentations (13%). Many used tools less typical of other disciplines such as case studies (40%)—half of which were historically based (20%), and half of which were imaginary conundrums (20%), innovative, individually created tools (30%, see below), and debates (20%). There was also an infusion of two types of new material into ethics classrooms: 1) almost all participants frequently (50%), sometimes (25%), or rarely (25%) used publications they have (co-) authored themselves; and 2) most (86%) use other new ideas and literature in the field, whether frequently (35%), occasionally “when relevant” (18%), primarily in graduate courses (13%), occasionally “in subtle ways” (10%), or rarely (10%).

This new material was usually (80%) balanced with an emphasis upon traditional “canon” texts by seminal moral philosophers such as Aristotle, Kant, and Mill, and sometimes included more modern thinkers (e.g. Rawls, Parfit, and Korsgaard) or in some cases more multi-cultural (e.g. Confucius, Chief Seattle) and feminist (e.g. Gilligan, Noddings) voices. Since over one third (37%) opposed the use of textbooks, trots, anthologies, thumbnails, and commentaries as primary texts, they have found creative ways to insure the reading of original (cf. traditional) philosopher texts. Such texts are emphasized by requiring reading them for major exams (60%), finding penetrable yet potent excerpts (15%), explaining canonical texts in relation to issues or cases (15%), matching excerpts to specific (graduate, upper level, entry level) classes according to difficulty (13%), and providing substantial historical, sociological or intellectual context for each text (10%).

Attitudes toward incorporating newer technologies in the classroom were mixed. Not quite half (45%) have used university teaching websites such as Web CT, Blackboard, and Whiteboard and many found them helpful. Fewer (25%) also employed a PowerPoint type technology, although one third of these later terminated such use due to “technical difficulties,” “increased student laziness and passivity,” “formulaic classroom predictability and monotony,” “redundancy of word and image,” “overly structured presentation,” and “reduction of complex philosophi-
cal arguments into shopping lists.” Indeed one third (33%) spoke out against using PowerPoint type technologies.

Although a few (10%) have experimented with blogs, podcasts, and other new formats, and almost one quarter (23%) have successfully incorporated visual media (DVD, video, films, computer clips, etc.), participants seemed more likely to safeguard mental discipline against electronic shortcuts, entertainment, and “bells and whistles.” Indeed one quarter (25%) have never used any medium other than print (i.e. publications and hand-outs).

On the other hand, another quarter (25%) have successfully imported website materials into the classroom or onto reading lists. Some of these also recommended such teaching tools as the on-line *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and on-line academic journals. Others (15%) spoke enthusiastically of how, for example, “clips and still images can enliven discussion, sharpen thinking, and make topics more accessible….” Still others (10%) felt that media punctuation and rotation created greater engagement and participation than their previously dry lectures.

Participants employed a variety of strategies when preparing to teach ethics, the most frequent of which were 1) rereading class reading assignments (35%), 2) reviewing notes (33%), 3) thinking about and searching for new examples, questions, and topics (23%), 4) writing a fresh outline or “map of topics” (23%), 5) reading widely from related texts and journals (23%), writing the entire lecture afresh (15%), editing and adapting previous notes (13%), preparing student hand-outs (13%), “working hard in several preparatory modes” simultaneously (13%), and “rehearsing bits” of thinking, examples, or arguments (10%). Other forms of preparation were unique to individuals such as “Prepare three truly engaging questions;” “Review the last class carefully and where that will lead;” “Prepare complete notes and outline and then discard both just prior to the lecture to think on my feet;” “Send out questions via e-mail to students the night before class;” “Formulate my own position on each question;” “Strive for living thinking in class;” and “Create an alternative outline for other possibilities.”

As the earlier comment by Martha Nussbaum (University of Chicago) indicated, “how” a moral philosopher teaches is not primarily about their content and tools. The professor’s approach to thinking, questioning, and probing may well engage a student as much if not more than a book or technology. For example, Professor John Cooper at Princeton challenged “all of their moral beliefs including those from parents,
TV, political leaders, and other sources of values” (2008). There was much agreement about this approach: at Harvard, Professor Frances Kamm stated, “I teach them to question all pat answers, their own and others—indeed they must question their entire mindset” (2008). In Professor David Smith’s (Yale) words, “You must question fundamental beliefs, whether religious, anti-religious, or indifferent without of course assaulting the student” (2008).

Smith’s colleague, Dr. Stephen Latham (Yale), especially countered the conventional wisdom de jour:

I want them to question the prevailing naïve relativism—not all beliefs are equally justified. Opinion is insufficient; “I think” is insufficient. I want them to learn to present strong arguments for the side opposed to the one they advocate and not to assume that all sides and arguments necessarily have equal merit (2008).

At the University of Michigan, Professor Elizabeth Anderson wrote:

I present arguments pro and con for a variety of positions, pointing out strengths and weaknesses. Students should be able to recognize key types of moral argument and principle, key issues in applied cases, to deploy moral reasoning thoughtfully, not mechanically, and show a healthy appreciation for difficulties, ambiguities and conceptual distinctions (2008).

Overall, ethics pedagogy may feature a diversity of techniques and communication forms, but there is an all but unanimous agreement that its core mechanism is critical thinking orbiting serious questions. Oxford Professor Dave Leal summarized this well when he concluded “I encourage a healthy skepticism toward all established theories and a general critical stance. But beyond and within that process, I am aiming to teach them most of all one thing—intellectual integrity” (2008).

**Primary Problems Facing Faculty and Students (Questions 15, 16, 34, 35)**

When asked about the problems that both they and their students faced, participants identified both the pedagogical challenges which may prove common to all disciplines and which seem unique to ethics. The most frequently articulated problems faced by faculty included student resistance to or difficulty facing philosophical rigor, methods, ambiguity, depth, pluralism, and “lack of spoon-feeding” (48%), student skepticism and relativism (23%), the eroding quality of training in basic (writing,
reading, reasoning, etc.) skills within secondary schools (20%), age/culture/interest gap (18%), classroom size (15%), inadequate time (15%), hazy student thinking (15%), and a lack of student motivation (13%).

According to those interviewed, students may perceive or experience some but not all of these primary problems differently and may have problems of their own. Perceived persistent student problems included the inherent disciplinary and cognitive challenges of ethics (43%), age, culture, and language differences (25%), teacher access and availability (18%), personality or mindset mismatches (13%), and the religious or ideological beliefs of students confronted by teacher iconoclasm or questioning (13%).

One problem was given special attention via questions about the impact of a professor’s declared political, religious, or other beliefs in class, and about whether faculty must guard against (the appearance) of personal “bias” regarding issues. Participants seem almost evenly divided about whether there should be (the appearance of) belief neutrality (35%) or whether faculty should “take a stand” or “reveal personal positions” (33%). Those arguing for neutrality stated it was “pedagogically and morally obligatory” to “suspend one’s own views.” Some were apprehensive about teacher intimidation of students who held other beliefs and about the appearance of subjective grading, whether deliberate or subconscious, based upon teacher ideology.

At Yale, Professor Shelly Kagan seeks to seem impartial and employs a novel technique to test his perceived neutrality: “I like to keep my views close to my chest so that students can make their own decisions. Then during the last class I play a little game with them by asking them to name my positions and views” (2008). At Harvard, Professor Dennis Thompson also advocates a self-disciplined restraint which “comes naturally to any instructor whose commitment to the ideal of this kind of inquiry is greater than to any political or theological agenda” (2008).

Conversely, participants who advocated professor “transparency,” “disclosure,” or “commitment” argued that neutrality is impossible, dishonest, or the artifice of a particular belief system. Some proffered that students must see professors model commitment and social conscience as an important aspect of ethical training.

At the University of Illinois, Dr. Clifford Christians commented, “I don’t believe there can be neutral, rational inquiry in the classroom in which advocates do not show their bias” (2008). At the University of Edinburgh, Department of Philosophy head Michael Ridge argued simi-
larly, “It is impossible to be neutral. In fact students will often find your research and figure out your position in any event” (2008).

Despite their preference toward “taking a stand,” the proponents of visible “commitment” were nevertheless sensitive to the case made by “neutrality” advocates. Indeed both “sides” recommended counter-balancing safeguards to teacher advocacy or disclosure. Such balancing techniques included 1) insuring that the teacher’s views are publicly questioned and examined, 2) openly demonstrating respect for all student perspectives, 3) creating a safe “atmosphere for careful questioning,” 4) playing devil’s advocate toward each position, 5) tolerating moral ambiguity, pluralism, and uncertainty, 6) promising that students will not be punished for expressing views antithetical to those of the professor, and 7) “giving multiple examples, perspectives, and choices regarding moral options.”

Outstanding Teaching and Educare (Questions 30, 40)

As noted within the primary findings, in the aggregate interviewed faculty felt that the greatest keys to outstanding teaching and student growth pertained to 1) instructor’s support, love, or respect for students (40%), 2) teacher’s engagement with, passion for, or enthusiasm about the subject, issues, philosophical thinking, or ideas (35%), 3) classroom communication skills such as listening, eye contact, clarity, preparation, and pacing (35%), 4) character traits such as honesty, generosity of spirit, humility, authenticity, compassion, and fairness (30%), and 5) ability to evoke sustained and genuine student interest and participation (28%).

When asked if there were any secrets or keys to outstanding teaching, two fifths (40%) noted specific ways that great teachers acknowledge or “hear” students including learning their names, remembering what it was like to be a student, demonstrating full-spectrum listening to each question, enjoying their company, and engaging students within their own range of lived experience. Almost as many (38%) participants voiced specific ways that loving the subject matter or discipline renders excellence. These included “Make the subject alive and connected,” “Demonstrate an infectious passion for the entire learning process including questioning, sharing ideas, and voicing counterpoint,” “Genuinely struggle with philosophical questions publicly rather than having canned answers,” “Convey consistent inspiration and enthusiasm about your own research and thinking,” and “Show the depth and value of discovering multiple points of view.”
Participants were also asked about the root word of education *educare* which means to “lead or draw forth” and about what draws forth the “best ethical thinking, passion for learning, and growth” from students. In addition to the five rank-ordered answers above (regard for students, enthusiasm for subject, public communication skills, positive character traits, and engagement/participation), several other important answers included “helping students apply moral philosophy to their lives” (15%), small group and one-on-one personal attention (15%), giving detailed and consistent feedback (10%), modeling encouragement and motivation (10%), demonstrating in-depth questioning and answering approaches (10%), invigorating the reading and understanding of difficult texts and thinkers (10%), and “it varies from student to student” (8%).

Several faculty members commented on the growth of the professor (not just the student) and the need for a teacher to be teachable, flexible, humble, and open to the input of others to eventually obtain mastery. One even commented that it would be helpful for university faculty to teach high school (“a crucible for managing a high load and for learning genuine interaction”) as he had done. However, of equal importance were the obvious essentials of top-level instruction in higher education voiced by some participants—authority in the subject field, extraordinary cognitive skills, fixation upon intellectual purpose, and a “paranormal work ethic.”

Many faculty had learned over the years that rote, stale lecturing seldom enhances student engagement. For Professor Onono O’Neill (Cambridge), great teaching involves enabling “students to be active rather than feeling that they are being lectured at” (2008). At Princeton, Dr. Gideon Rosen elaborated: “You can’t just read boring notes or give dreamy lectures. Students must be thinking actively about the issues themselves rather than trying to decode dry speeches” (2008).

Outstanding teaching also implies developing a radar or sonar to sense where students are “located” in their interests, abilities, and culture. As Janet Radcliffe Richards (Oxford) stated, “I take seriously what students have to say. It’s important to first see where they are and then give them a reason for moving” (2008). In agreement, Professor Michael Northcott (University of Edinburgh) articulated: “The act of engaging students is what helps you to find out where they are; so too does finding and using examples from their culture” (2008).

Indeed Professor Ralph Wedgwood at Oxford aspired to relocate himself within his own previous student culture: “Great teaching requires putting yourself in their shoes and remembering what it was like to be a
student” (2008). When a teacher is considering this different student culture or vocabulary, it is important to carefully translate: “Great teachers take seriously the obligation to explain what is difficult or distant in clear and interesting fashion” (Kagan, Yale, 2008). Summarizing many of these thoughts, Gurland (NYU) felt

the teacher’s job is to find out where that student is and work with them so that their thinking, their picture becomes richer in content and perspective, more sophisticated and more pragmatically grounded so that they are more able to successfully cope with the problems which will ultimately invade their lives (2008).

The final question on the survey, stated below, asked for summative thinking about outstanding teaching:

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

Although it was the longest question, it drew the shortest, and possibly most powerful reply. At Cambridge, Professor Simon Blackburn replied with only one word: “Honesty” (2008).

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

With only two exceptions, participants (92%) reported making temporary or long-term changes in their approach to teaching. Three fifths (60%) of all changes were made to accommodate student feedback, performance, and assessment. Most student-directed changes (80% of the three fifths) pertained to “finding” the students’ work capacity, engagement level, wavelength, learning pace, and similar. Faculty reported becoming “not as intense,” “more realistic,” “more mellow,” “more aware of students as individuals,” “more humane,” “less ambitious regarding huge scope,” and thus often reduced the amount, intensity, speed, or level of course presentation, reading material, homework, lecturing, or similar after several years. Often participants also added more discussion, user-friendly examples, clarity, focus (“I used to ramble much more”), or, in fewer cases added creative arts, novel cases or stories, or, in other words “more adventurous teaching.”

Of the others who made changes, the adjustments often related to effecting updates and upgrades, experiments with technology, introduc-
tion to multidisciplinary or alternative materials, self-assessment adjustments, input from other faculty, and new ideas learned from workshops, conferences, and reading (e.g. Collingwood’s autobiography about his answer/question pedagogy, Rosenberg’s book on teaching philosophy, or Bain’s text on outstanding teaching). Many made the usual “maturing” or “learning” changes after assessing trial and error, experimenting with new materials, and accruing classroom experience. Over one third reported implementing a new medium (slides, art, music, PowerPoint, DVD) as a form of change or growth, although many of those later changed their minds (see above) and withdrew the tool. Two (5%) also reported no changes in their teaching or reported movement in the other direction (8%) toward speed-up, adding materials, or increasing the difficulty of the course.

Student written (formal) and spoken (informal) feedback effected instructor changes a great deal (43%) or “sometimes” (38%), although a few participants (10%) felt that the performance of students on exams and written assignments constituted all the feedback they needed, while five (13%) felt that feedback was unnecessary or unimportant. Another five (13%) deliberately initiated additional student input by creating their own feedback forms and processes. Student-induced changes included a broad range of adjustments within course content, discussion/lecture ratio, reading materials, pace, listening to questions, detailed explanation of difficult materials, and instructor style (e.g. reducing didacticism, show-boating, redundancy, and illegible hand-writing).

The second source of enhancing pedagogical effectiveness was reported as the input of other faculty. While one fifth (20%) felt that their courses were not influenced by faculty colleagues, others felt they had learned 1) informally, by observing their own teachers, guest lecturers and other faculty (46%), 2) from collaborative or team-teaching processes (25%), 3) by sitting in on each other’s classes (13%), 4) by more formal peer evaluation (10%), and by “osmosis in the university atmosphere” (10%). To a lesser extent participants learned by other formats such as teacher surveys, workshops, conference panels, correspondence, and teacher supervision.

In addition to evaluating their teaching via student and faculty input, participants had also inspected their teaching by other means such as 1) setting aside a deliberate time of reflection or analysis (20%), 2) systematically studying student work as an assessment of teaching (15%), 3) recording their classes or simulated lectures (13%), 4) observing or interacting with students after class (10%), 5) spontaneously mentally revisit-
ing teaching moments (10%), and 6) intuitively making self-corrections (10%).

The majority (55%) had never enrolled in institutional faculty development processes such as prescribed workshops or assigned mentoring. Of those (45%) who had, they were evenly divided regarding the value of such work. Comments ranged from “I learned a lot from being videotaped in the course.” “I made important changes,” and “It was moderately useful,” to “It was not helpful,” “Because the mentor was arbitrarily selected and imposed, it was not a natural fit and we did not work well together,” and “What a waste of time.” Similarly those who had once worked as graduate teaching assistants had mixed comments: “I discovered that the instructor I was assisting was the best possible mentor when I later found my way into teaching full-time;” “I was an assistant to two faculty, one of whom was a perfect role model, although the other put students to sleep;” and “Being a grad assistant can be good teacher training but only if you can chose the faculty with whom you work.”

As a result of all forms (student, peer, self, institutional, and other) of evaluation, almost all (95%) participants reported making substantial or moderate changes in their teaching. These included changes 1) in tone (33%) such as more spontaneity, lightness, humor, silences, informality, etc., 2) in interaction patterns (30%) such as greater discussion, calling upon silent students, increasing Socratic questioning, making cultural sensitivity adjustments, spending time with students outside class, and genuine listening, 3) content (30%) such as more varied material, minimal compression, new readings, international expansion, scope reduction, and more theory, 4) tools and techniques (13%) such as eliminating or adding PowerPoint, overhead projection, hand-outs, DVD clips, and online assignments and questions, and 5) structure (13%) such as planning and mapping a trail of ideas, replacing some lectures with discussion, interspersing Q & A within lectures, distributing a course outline, and changing to co-teaching. At the extremes, other participants said the changes they made were “comprehensive” (10%), “very few” (10%) or “none at all” (5%).

Of the 95% who made teaching changes, most felt their changes greatly improved (60%) or somewhat improved (20%) their overall effectiveness. Positive comments included “a new overwhelmingly different order of engagement,” “far fewer cultural sensitivity issues;” “keeping it lighter works much better,” “students are better served,” and “greatly improved evaluations.” Others were more tempered: “Results were uneven;” “There are trade-offs since meeting the needs of many students
may not serve the needs of the brightest students;” “Some improvement but not across the board;” and “I don’t know.”

One primary pattern which emerged was that successful changes were almost always in the direction of bringing the student closer. Over time the professor became willing to remove the “fourth wall” of theater to permit the student to have a more authentic relationship. Professor/student “apartheid” broke down as instructors developed greater confidence and pedagogical sensitivity.

When enhancing their appeal over the years, some teaching tips that faculty learned were “Knowing student’s names, making more time for their questions, and winning their trust” (Nick Adams, Cambridge, 2008), “Don’t be in a hurry; it is a process and the pace must be set by all” (Kwami Appiah, Princeton, 2008), and “Let students experience your generosity of spirit and hospitality; let them feel that you want to share not only ideas but also time and experience with them” (Margie Tolstoy, Cambridge, 2008).

Several noted that they had migrated from lecturing to smaller class discussion. Indeed many felt that they taught better, or students learned better, or both, in small group situations. Dr. Nigel Biggar at Oxford University stated, “I’ve learned that both students and I do better in small groups, with face-to-face conversation in which one-on-one dialectical engagement occurs. The smaller the class the better” (2008). Similarly, Professor Peter Singer at Princeton preferred “small group discussions about a challenging text in which students may really become involved” (2008). At the University of Edinburgh, philosopher David McCarthy has discovered that what most helped students was “one-on-one attention … as well as something interesting, fun, and challenging which looks like it is amenable to solution” (2008).

Some participants spontaneously voiced “asides” when answering questions about effectiveness. These included “Perhaps we should undergo more formal training after all?,” “I’m usually too busy to think about teaching but this interview makes me wonder if I shouldn’t address it more conscientiously?,” and “So what are other interviewees saying about teacher workshops … I’m wondering if I should take one or not?” Such questions raise larger ones about whether at least some teachers need additional venues and choices for enhancing their effectiveness, whether students are fully served, whether formal, informal, or mixed teacher development instruction works best, or whether to trust the current laissez-faire attitude toward the present confluence of institutional and informal evaluation methods, socialization, and “osmosis.”
Why Teach Ethics? (Questions 14, 17)

Those who felt that ethics instruction may enhance character development or moral improvement stated that their courses are contributing not only to the usual goals of education and philosophy, but also to making the world more civil, to reversing or opposing a downward spiral of human (and in some cases animal and environmental) abuse, and to correcting unfairness, injustice, inequality, and other “unethical” practices. However, those who see ethics as primarily cerebral and reflective voiced other intentions for teaching ethics. When asked about what students should be able to do after taking their classes which they could not do before, participants responded: look at social issues and moral problems differently or more seriously (25%); think more rigorously, make sharper distinctions, morally reason, or engage beyond opinion (25%); develop more philosophical, theoretical, abstract, or transcendent perspective (20%); analyze and pose increasingly important questions (15%), advance, deconstruct, counter, and articulate logical arguments (15%); learn important historical figures, contexts, and influence (15%), write more philosophically and accurately (10%), read difficult thinking with greater understanding (10%), change one’s mind in light of compelling arguments (10%), and, in general, experience intellectual growth (10%).

As noted in previous quotations, one of the most important goals expressed by most (80%) of those interviewed was to teach students to question suppositions, opinions, and hidden contexts. Such questioning extended to just about everything from “anything unproven or presupposed” (30%), “ordinary beliefs” (20%), “predictability and the status quo” (15%) to more specific mindsets such as dogmatism (20%), relativism (10%) political correctness or any fashionable “ism” (10%), and “any form of authority including the professor” (10%).

However, such thorough skepticism did not mean that participants wished to deflate all student beliefs and goals. When asked what they wished to teach their students to believe, half stated one or more of these objectives: “believe what is true, real, or factual” (15%), “believe on the basis of good evidence and rational thought” (15%), believe that ethics is “important,” has “moral authority,” and is “essential” to the examined life (15%), believe that “life is serious and must include awareness of the impact we have upon others” (10%), and believe that “truth is non-negotiable” (8%). One third either said they did not intend to impart any beliefs or did not answer.

A few (10%) stated that they had “no specific goals” for student learning. However, the vast majority used ethics and moral philosophy as
an intellectual fitness center, if not as a civic improvement lab or humanitarian training ground.

Creativity Inventory (Questions 36, 38, 39)

Many participants have developed special teaching resources and techniques whether unique or similar to those in other disciplines. Others (33%) have developed lengthy reading materials such as textbooks, handbooks, and case study anthologies to fill a specific need in the classroom. Fewer than half that many (15%) have developed special compendia of shorter written materials (hand-outs, bibliographies, webliographies, outlines). Still others (10%) have developed unusual juxtapositions, such as African novels with philosophy texts, or photos of the martyrs of 9/11 alongside the martyrs in Westminster Abbey, to evoke fresh thinking.

Several created a total of thirty-five unique teaching tools, especially for ethical and moral philosophy classes. These include:

1. Variant debate formats including
   a) Adaptation of Lincoln-Douglas format and
   b) Spontaneous mid-discussion debates
2. Analysis of lawyer obituaries to decode latent values
3. Research about each student's cultural/religious ethical values regarding specific issues
4. Philosophical analysis of news articles with ethical themes
5. Development of pedagogical guide hand-outs for graduate assistants
6. Production of (a) film(s) about specific philosophers
7. Creation of specific relevant hypothetical stories for classroom debate
8. Construction of compendia of charts, graphs, and commentary
9. Authoring of special topic-driven websites (e.g. racial discrimination, animal rights, history of ethics)
10. Locating and excerpting special media examples such as
    a) Gilbert and Sullivan excerpt (C.D.)
    b) BBC radio comedy
    c) Feature film sequences about arresting moral dilemmas
    d) Illustrative music and art
    e) Editorial cartoons
11. Adding optional special sessions, “movie nights”, or additional workshops
12. Integrating special pedagogies (e.g. Collingwood questioning approach)
13. Importing multiple disciplines (e.g. economics, math, sociology, theology)
14. Technical innovation (e.g. blog groups, pre-class e-questions; web lectures)
15. Group dynamics (e.g. warm-up dyads, small group question reports, etc.)
16. Developing case studies from well known literary and dramatic scenes
17. Ending each class with a question which must be discussed to begin the next class
18-35. Many others to be included in a longer forthcoming essay.

Faculty also reported helpful resources that they had gleaned from other colleagues. These included on-line teacher-created articles for students about how to write a philosophy paper and how to read philosophy, scholarly on-line reference guides (such as *Oxford Companion*, *Stanford* and *Routledge Encyclopedia(s) of Philosophy*, and *Philosophical Index*), numerous on-line journals, ethical theory websites, ethics news listservs, college and university teaching websites, and much more (see works cited). One tenth (10%) made note of particular film or television documentaries that well illustrated particular ethical issues.

Many of the most engaging classroom materials were found within, not beyond, standard ethics literature. For example, participants reported identifying these topics of intense student interest which inspired heated debate or additional spontaneous reading: individual vs. social responsibility; objectivity vs. relativism; the existence and nature of God and of evil; moral conflict; Kant’s Categorical Imperative(s); social justice; moral duty, loyalty, and conscience; nihilism and amorality; and the existence and nature of absolutes (truth, reality, universals, norms, etc.). Within more *applied* ethics, some of the most arresting topics included cloning, animal rights, human enhancement, euthanasia/assisted suicide, abortion, human rights, global distributive justice, U.S. First Amendment rights/freedom of expression, terrorism/torture, environmental protection, stem cell research, (the “rules” of) war, capital punishment, mediated violence, cultural relativism, wealth/resource distribution, and sexual ethics.

Summarily, although six (15%) participants felt that innovation was unnecessary within their teaching, most (85%) had identified or invented creative tools, additional resources, arousing topics, and enticing examples to involve students. A majority seemed sensitive to the dangers of
relying upon gimmicks. Hence individual faculty creativity was often, although not always, integrated into more traditional teaching methods.

Tools of the Trade

Two fifths (40%) provided examples of their standard teaching tools such as handouts, syllabi, CDs, DVDs, and policies. Some tools proved more comprehensive and innovative. For example, Dr. Shelly Kagan (Yale) authored a multi-page “How to Write a Philosophy Paper” handout with step-by-step explication.

Perhaps the most elaborate and practical tool proved to be the fifteen page “Teaching Sections in Philosophy” hand-out which Professor Thomas Scanlon at Harvard developed for his teaching assistants in the early 1990s. Although written for section leaders in philosophy courses, the discussion guide seems excellent advice for teachers at all stages. Professor Scanlon wrote:

When a student asks a question, and you are deciding how to answer it, try not to think about what The Answer is (the one that would show your complete mastery of the subject). Your main thought should rather be what answer would be most helpful to the student. You are like a medical doctor, who should give the answer that is most comprehensible and helpful to the patient, not the one that shows the greatest command or cutting edge medical literature on the topic (1992).

Later Scanlon advised:

Don’t be too critical, or allow yourself just to refute their suggestions or objections, like a tennis instructor who slams the ball back at the beginning player. This not only discourages them but also sets a bad example (1992).

Tim Scanlon’s thorough hand-out not only suggested a code of communication ethics graduate assistants may employ but also the means for them to create a respectful discussion ethic among the undergraduate students themselves. Finally, the essay covered some of the more difficult questions facing younger (if not all) teachers such as confidentiality, equal treatment, when to interrupt students, and grading.

Syllabi which were submitted often resembled the “Model A” conventional prototype of most disciplines which included class schedule, course description, assignments, reading list, and contact information. However, some faculty went further and said it was important to “put one’s self in the student’s dorm.” Hence some provided lists of library
and book store locations, complete grading policies, a list of the professor's expectations, a class roster, detailed assignment outline, explicit lists of course aims and assessment, historical documents, class difficulty level, professor's philosophy, “for further reading” lists, and answers to student FAQs. Similarly, while some handouts were a traditional summary of notes or daily outlines, others added multiple “customer service” tools such as definitions of vague or confusing terms, rank ordered primary and lesser concepts and arguments, clarification of difficult passages, complex evaluations and analysis of readings, alternative perspectives/readings/ arguments, footnote-type addenda, and links to class on-line tools and other websites.

Only a few faculty had been involved in the development of CDs, DVDs, films, etc., although some had used documentaries, instructional DVDs, and similar visual tools created by educational companies. About half who submitted materials included some type of policy they had developed in such time-honored arenas as grading, academic misconduct, and attendance. A few were grappling with more current policies such as student classroom use of cell phones, laptops, text messaging, headsets, and other distractions.

**SUMMARY**

It is not enough to teach on the surface. You must bring to life the fire within great texts and art.

--Roger Crisp, Oxford, 2008

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

--Julian Savulescu, Oxford, 2008

While participants were seldom unanimous, a large majority agreed upon the importance of rigorous ethics and moral philosophy instruction and the centrality of reciprocal teacher-student interaction. Many participants felt that both faculty and students experienced barriers to full-spectrum communication. In an effort to reduce such barriers students proffered feedback to professors and faculty orchestrated a variety of teaching tools, adjustments, and inventions.
Almost all felt ethics and moral philosophy can improve moral thinking and half of those who addressed the issue of “normativity” also felt that such instruction could improve moral action. The group was divided about whether ethics faculty should disclose, if not advocate moral positions, or instead serve as a neutral menu presenter and referee. Over thirty teaching inventions surfaced, although these supplemented rather than replaced more traditional pedagogy.

Two findings which might have been expected did not materialize. First there seemed to be no noticeable differences overall in the aggregate views reported by men and women. Secondly, there was a similar plurality of perspectives reported by those teaching in both U.S. and British institutions. Hence, despite the uniqueness of the tutorial teaching system used at Oxford and Cambridge, this study did not reveal appreciable national and cultural differences between U.K. and U.S. findings.

While no one voice may speak for the field, here are two which summarized several essences expressed by multiple participants:

Great teaching requires full-spectrum interest in everything, especially in learning. The teacher’s passion for the material and issues, respect for the student, and ability to help them open up a book in a new way means a love for the entire education process. Great teacher’s never wing it.

--Margaret Farley, Yale, 2008

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

--Jolyon Mitchell, University of Edinburgh, 2008

Findings, interviews, and quotations cannot be taken to fully represent moral philosophy writ large, nor the participant institutions, nor ethics instruction in the U.S. and the U.K. Nevertheless in the absence of greater evidence and samples, it seems safe to conclude that moral philosophy, to the extent it is represented by this faculty group, still champions the flowering of younger minds within the influential presence of older, rigorously trained minds who can both accurately “channel” and critique the great kindred minds of other eras.

Trends and technologies to the side, the centerpiece of ethics instruction in such leading English-speaking institutions is mind-to-mind engagement within a figurative séance in which other seminal spirits viv-
idlly enter and leave the room. Striking exceptions to and variations upon this rule include the greater use of case studies and debates, the occasional embracing of technology, especially class websites, and the creation and adaptation of teaching inventions.

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

Indeed one goal of this research is that such improvement may occur when readers learn from these forty participants. After all, as a body they have taught ethics and moral philosophy with increasing success for approximately nine hundred years, and done so at extremely influential institutions now collectively four thousand years old.
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**Interviews**

Adams, Nick; Andersen, Elizabeth; Appiah, Kwami; and 37 others (see Participants, page 9); in person at Cambridge, MA.; New Haven, CT.; Princeton, NJ; Oxford, U.K.; Edinburgh, U.K., and Cambridge, U.K. April 14 – Oct. 23, 2008; by telephone, June 4, 2008 (Boston-to-New York); and on-line correspondence to Nashville, TN; Urbana-Champaign, IL; Chicago, IL, Ann Arbor, MI, and to locations listed above, April 25 - Nov. 30, 2008.

**On-Line**


**Video**


**APPENDIX: INTERVIEW FORM**

**ENHANCING PEDAGOGICAL EFFECTIVENESS**

1) Name__________________________________________________________

2) Address_______________________________________________________

3) Phone (office)__________________________________________________

4) E-mail_________________________________________________________

5) Title/institution_________________________________________________

6) Years teaching
   a) in higher education____________________________________________
   b) at this institution______________________________________________

7) Years teaching ethics or/and moral philosophy______________________

8) Total number of ethics courses/sections taught______________________

9) a) Total graduate courses (%)____________________________________
    b) Total undergraduate courses (%)_______________________________
    c) Total mixed (%)______________________________________________

10) Total courses taught in (fill in bottom two and other which apply)
    a) philosophy department (%)____________________________________
    b) professional school/program (%)_____________________ type
    c) divinity school (%)___________________________________________
    d) institute (%)_____________________ type
    e) other (%)_____________________ type
A. PEDAGOGY
11) What are your teaching methods? *

12) What do you hope students will be able to do conceptually and perceptually after completing your class, which they could not do upon entry? *

13) What do you expect of their learning if you are to regard it as successful? *

14) Why do you teach?

15) What if any problems do you face in helping students to learn? *

16) What if any problems do students face in learning from you? *

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

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

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

20) How do you prepare to teach? *

B. GROWTH AND REFINEMENT OF COURSES
21) How have your courses and teaching evolved over the years? *

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. TEACHING ETHICS

31) What have you to say to those who believe that ethics cannot be taught?

32) What are the most effective ways to include primary sources by leading philosophers, moral philosophers, and other thinkers?

33) If you employ case studies, which studies and approaches do you find most useful and engaging?

34) How do you insure that ethics instruction encourages free and rational inquiry without imparting a political, theological, or other bias, if you think that is possible?

35) If you think that students can detect your own beliefs, whether religious, political or other, what type of positive, negative, or neutral impact, if any, do you sense that has on students?

36) Which ethics-related written and electronic (video/DVD/on-line) teaching materials have you found the most valuable to students?

37) To what extent do you draw upon and assign publications which you have authored or co-authored and with what impact?

38) Which topics, ideas, debates, or questions most engage your students?

39) What unique tools, topics, materials, or techniques, if any, have you personally created or adapted for your classes?
40) Given that the Latin root of education, educare, means to rear or draw forth, what have you discovered draws forth the best ethical thinking, passion for learning, and growth from your students?

*questions so denoted are part of Kenneth Bain’s original teaching studies reported in WHAT THE BEST COLLEGE TEACHERS TEACH (Harvard University Press, 2004).