

Social Responsibility of a Profession: An Analysis of Faculty Perception of Social Responsibility Factors and Integration Into Graduate Programs of Educational Technology

Stephanie L. Moore

Asking the question of ethics is one of asking "What is good?" At the end of the day, when our work as educational technologists is done, when may we say to ourselves, "Well done"? When the technology is adopted? Not hardly. When the system has changed and adapted? That depends. Ely (1976) states: "Neither stability nor change have any intrinsic value. The worth of stability is in the goodness it preserves, while the worth of change is in the goodness it brings about" (p. 151). This maxim of sorts is an excellent crux for an ethical stance educational technologists can adopt.

Asking the question of ethics is one focused on caring about our craft and its impact on society. Caring about one's work is the internal aspect that creates "good" in what one produces. When we begin to ask members of a system to modify their thinking and processes or actions, this introduces several notions of ethical obligations aimed at doing good work that reflects true caring. In fact, we can begin to operationalize good in the practice of educational technologists.

The purpose of this study is to offer an empirically driven definition of *good* in our profession and examine the presence of it in graduate programs. If the technologists do not care about their work, then it is highly unlikely that others using technology will perceive quality in the product. Research shows that ethics in action do indeed increase quality and raise the bar for performance, enhancing the financial

Although ethics are commonly regarded as an important characteristic and performance attribute, they are also regarded as a slippery or ill-defined topic leaving practitioners and faculty flat-footed in how to teach and assess ethics. This article reports part of the findings from an investigation on deriving an empirical definition of ethics, namely social responsibility, focused on faculty perceptions of whether a set of ethical outcomes identified as "social responsibility" is relevant to the profession of educational technology and human performance technology and therefore ought to be part of graduate curricula. Findings focus specifically on faculty perceptions of the role of educational technology and human performance technology in society and its impact on society. Although other professions have increasingly identified their responsibilities to society and integrated content into curricula, early findings indicate a lag in the instructional design and human performance technology community.



bottom line and the social bottom line at the same time (Dobni, Ritchie, and Zerbe, 2000; Kaufman, 1997, 2000a, 2006; Verschoor, 1998). Ethics are more than philosophical pondering of some abstract concept; they are a means of defining exemplary performance standards that can be expected of members in a profession (Dean, 1993).

Driving Forces for Ethics in College Curricula

Davis (1999) describes what he calls an “ethics boom” in higher education during the past thirty years, where one by one professions have been faced with a requirement to integrate ethics explicitly into university programs. Technological advances, national scandals, and poor performance have driven other professions to build ethics into college curriculum as a means of ensuring good decision making and defining standards for members of a profession.

Ethics are more than philosophical pondering of some abstract concept; they are a means of defining exemplary performance standards that can be expected of members in a profession.

The medical profession was among the first to identify a gap of ethics integration into college curricula (Davis, 1999). Advances in medical technology confronted practicing physicians with difficult decisions, as they had to choose what deserved budget allocations. Although one

machine could save the lives of a few dozen patients, the equipment was so expensive that the same amount of money could also build an outpatient clinic that would serve many more people but not save lives. To address these issues directly in practice and train the next generation of physicians for these decisions, the medical community turned to the philosophy department to help them build courses on practical ethics.

For the legal profession, it became a public point of embarrassment that many of President Richard Nixon’s team members involved in the criminal activities of Watergate were lawyers. The legal profession faced public demand for ethics in its practices and training. Some states started requiring ethics courses as a condition for admission to the bar; other states quickly followed suit, and law schools suddenly found themselves facing social and legal requirements to teach ethics to their students (Davis, 1999). Davis states that the law profession was a little different from the medical field because the law literature had developed ethical concepts; however, the profession was still caught in the same problem of definition: how do codes of ethics translate into professional responsibilities and performance standards? As the profession grappled with distinctions, courses on ethics in major national programs became the norm and remain a staple requirement today.

Soon, a cluster of engineering and science disciplines followed suit. Spiro Agnew, Nixon’s vice president, resigned office because of a bribing scandal involving a number of engineers during his office term in Maryland. Civil engineers seeking state contracts had bribed Agnew to obtain those

contracts. When news spread, "Engineers all over the country were appalled that so many engineers could be involved in such a flagrant violation of professional ethics" (Davis, 1999, p. 7). Davis explains that engineers were already uneasy because their field had been involved in fake testing on B. F. Goodrich's A-7D airbrakes, the Ford Pinto's exploding gas tank, and the McDonnell Douglas DC-10's misdesigned cargo door.

From this period forward, many disciplines started following the same pattern—business, accounting, nursing, journalism, financial analysis, public administration, dentistry, and others. The trend is clearly toward integration of ethics into college curricula, specialized to each discipline (Davis, 1999). Frankel (1989) explains that in the recent past discussion on professional ethics occurred only within the professions themselves. Historically, professions have maintained a negotiating process with society, keeping a tension between the autonomy of a profession to define and regulate itself and the public's demand for accountability. He writes, "Society's granting of power and privilege to the professions is premised on their willingness and ability to contribute to social well-being and to conduct their affairs in a manner consistent with broader social values" (p. 110).

Educational technology and human performance technology may not have had front-page scandals that dominated media outlets for an extended time, but there are publicized reports (*A Nation at Risk*, 1983, U.S. Department of Education National Commission on Excellence in Education), recent policy (such as *No Child Left Behind*), and vocal critics (Cuban, 1986, 2001; Healy, 1990, 1999) that all underscore a perceived failure of technology advocates to contribute anything worthwhile to educational or learning systems.

Early Educational Technology Literature: Ethics Recognized by Founding Authors

Attention to the requirement for educational technology to contribute to the "worthwhileness" of learning and performance environments (Davies, 1996) is a long-time topic in the literature, appearing in foundational pieces for the field. Authors such as Finn (1996a, 1996b), Davies (1996), Kaufman (1996, 2000a, 2006), and Kaufman, Corrigan, and Johnson (1969) explicitly raised awareness of ethics for the profession, calling for a professional code of ethics, reflection on the ethical nature of educational technology, and assessment procedures that ensured the profession ultimately contributed to society (Ely & Plomp, 1996). Founding literature did recognize that technology was significantly altering the landscape of education, and those changes called for an enhanced sense of moral obligation. According to Davies (1996), even though technology and creativity expanded the range of choices available to educators, they also "made it more difficult to foresee the full consequences of the choices made and the actions taken" (p. 15). He states:

Technology, contrary to popular belief, is not necessarily confined to the *means* [sic] by which educators realize their ends. Technology also

raises anew questions about the nature of the ends themselves. It forces us to reflect on the morality of what we are about, by its very insistence on defensible choices. (p. 15)

Finn (1996b) states that technology is not a collection of gadgets, hardware, and instrumentation but is instead “a way of thinking about certain classes of problems and their solutions” (p. 48), underscoring the notion of a results orientation. For Davies and Finn both, this results orientation maintains the question of “What is desirable, and why is it desirable?”—a question they believe is best answered through ongoing contemplation (Davies, 1996), or philosophical examination (Finn, 1996b). What Finn addressed through philosophical examination, Kaufman addressed through an assessment approach.

Asserting the importance of a results orientation, Kaufman (1996, 2000a, 2006) suggests a practical way of discussing results (or ends) and societal benefit by framing this discussion in terms of assessment. Kaufman outlines the explicit relationship between what educational technologists do (or what education planners in general do) and the ultimate impact of such work on society:

The simple truth is that what the schools do and what the schools accomplish is of concern to those who depend upon the schools, those who pay the bills and those who pass the legislation. We are not in a vacuum, and our results are seen and judged by those outside of the schools—those who are external to it. ... This external referent should be the starting place for functional and useful educational planning, design, implementation, and evaluations—if education does not allow learners to live better and contribute better, it probably is not worth doing, and will probably ending up being attacked and decimated by taxpayers and legislators. (1996, p. 112)

Thus, according to Kaufman, the practice of educational technology should first begin by determining and justifying what the ultimate *desirable* impact of our actions is on society and using that as a guide for the design process. Kaufman has developed this over the years into a full framework for assessment that he calls “Mega” (2000b, 2006), which may very well prove to be an *ethical* framework for the field given its focus on social impact. As the field took shape, Davies (1996), Finn (1996a), Kaufman (Kaufman, Corrigan, and Johnson, 1969; Kaufman, 1996), and others made it explicit that this question of social responsibility—of the profession’s ultimate impact on society and the results of our actions—was something that the field must answer to if it was to be a viable, respectable profession.

Ethics as Performance Standards for Professionals

Peter Dean (1999), an author on ethics research in the human performance technology (HPT) literature, argues that the study of ethics is critical

in two ways. First, ethical codes are behavioral guidelines for professionals. They “reflect and support the ethical values of the organization, clarify expectations, and recognize specific ethical issues” (p. 703). Codes of ethics may not eliminate unethical behavior, but they do establish clear expectations for performance, and, as Dean points out, “Isn’t establishing clear performance expectations one of the first things we recommend for achieving exemplary performance?” (Dean, 1993, p. 5). Second, HPT professionals are in a unique position to help clients and organizations achieve their goals ethically and guide them toward ethical actions from the start (Dean, 1993). By the very nature of HPT work, professionals can help organizations and clients “recognize that the ethical climate in an organization is one of the environmental factors that impact performance and productivity” (p. 5).

Research in business ethics demonstrates that practitioners who have been trained in ethics do perform better on the job and tend to have higher productivity (Delaney & Sockell, 1992). Dobni, Ritchie, and Zerbe (2000) examined the relationship between organizational value systems and employee productivity. They found that in systems where values were clear and articulated, employees had a higher level of commitment and higher positive affect about their job. Research in business ethics also showed that how ethics were implemented or modeled made a difference in the ethical behavior of employees. It is not enough to have a code of ethics, and it does not work to punish employees when they fail to adhere to the code (Dean, 1993). Findings in Weaver (1999) suggest that leadership in and modeling of ethical behavior, as opposed to simply demanding it, has a greater impact on the ethical behavior of employees. For application in educational programs, these findings would suggest that students will exhibit more ethical behavior if faculty model that same behavior.

Higher Education: The Place for Ethics Training

Clearly, as ethical issues have been identified and ethical decision making studied, professions have turned to higher education programs as the place for “improving” the ethics of future generations of professionals. The role of ethics in professional education has long been noted as essential, even stemming back to Socrates, who said that no craft or profession should seek its own advantage but should benefit those who are subject to it (Baumgarten, 1982). Baumgarten argues that, through university teaching, “we express our conviction that thoughtful inquiry ennoble a human life and contributes to human excellence ... there is special reason to value a profession that is solely committed to enlarging the power and influence of reason discourse and imaginative questioning” (p. 294).

Professional ethics pertain to members of a particular profession, and entrance into that profession is gained only through some form of advanced study. Thus the place of advanced study is the very place where professional ethics must be learned, either as a formal part of the education or in some less formal way in job settings. Furthermore, universities are viewed as the place

**Failure to be deliberate
in the approach to
teaching ethics may have
a number of unintended
consequences.**

where training in ethics should take place prior to graduates entering the workforce. Procario-Foley and Bean (2002) report that organizations require recruitment of “graduates who have world-class ethics to accompany their world-class knowledge” (p. 105). Indeed, this reflects recent findings that more than 60% of organizations rank ethics as one of the top priorities they look for in candidates for open positions (Hammond, personal communication, 1992, cited in Dean, 1993). Caron (1999) insists that higher education institutions are in a unique position to train graduates on how to address social concerns without having to adopt any particular political agenda and can do so with intellectual rigor and professional capacity.

Finally, research indicates that the ethical philosophies and values (and resulting behaviors) of management or leaders influence ethical choices and behavior of employees and other organizational members (Brenner & Molander, 1977; Ford & Richardson, 1994; Petrick & Quinn, 1997; Procario-Foley and Bean, 2002). We can translate the language of business to education programs, where faculty in leadership and mentorship positions model philosophies and behavior that may influence students in their programs. O’Connell (1998) states, “Our task in universities is not only to teach ethics and values for the marketplace but to model these values ourselves as we fulfill our own moral responsibility as educators in the universities where our students begin the business ethics journey in the first place” (p. 1620). Procario-Foley and Bean (2002) explain that students are keenly aware of the ethical behavior their course instructors demonstrate: “Teaching faculty are exemplars for students and it is essential that they reflect and personify the values of the institution” (p. 112).

Matchett (2008) asserts that ethics *are* modeled to students by faculty in universities every day: “All colleges teach ethics across their undergraduate curriculums, yet relatively few institutions do this deliberately” (p. 25). Matchett explains that this may not necessarily be bad for students, but it bears examination because research has shown the number of formal years of education to be a powerful predictor of moral judgment, beyond any other variable (McNeel, 1994; Nucci & Pascarella, 1987; Rest, 1994). However, failure to be deliberate in the approach to teaching ethics may have a number of unintended consequences (Matchett, 2008). Thus college programs are the place where professional ethics are both taught and modeled, practically and daily.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which the ethic of social responsibility, defined as adding measurable value to our shared society, is present in U.S. and Canadian graduate programs in educational technology and then examine possible factors and barriers that explain the absence or presence. This section presents the findings for three research

questions aimed at answering the overall question of whether social responsibility is on the professional development radar in educational technology.

As Kaufman (1999, 2006) and Brethower (2005) continue to assert, if you are not adding value to society, you are likely subtracting it. Thus, one may not safely assume that the educational technology profession is necessarily benefiting society without a means for determining the accuracy of the assumption. As a profession, the field of educational technology has a social contract with society in general to ensure that it benefits society and does not harm individuals or the social system in its practices. The results presented in this chapter afford a first glance at where the profession of educational technology as practiced in North America is in relation to that possible ethics boom in professional studies.

Research Design

The design of this study was nonexperimental, involving descriptive statistics and correlational designs. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) state that questionnaires and interviews are commonly used to collect data about "phenomena that are not directly observable: inner experience, opinions, values, interests, and the like" (p. 222). Because this research design is primarily descriptive on unobservable phenomena such as philosophies and beliefs and will be sent to members covering a wide geographic area, a questionnaire design is appropriate.

An online questionnaire was selected for ease of administration and elimination of paper and mailing costs (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2003). Because this questionnaire was delivered to faculty in a technology-related field, it was assumed that participants had e-mail as a means for distributing the questionnaire and access to computers as a means for completing it. The questionnaire was developed on a server with the capability of collecting data electronically and ensuring integrity of the data.

Participants

Correlational statistics were used to answer research question three. To detect a medium effect size using correlational statistics with $\alpha = .05$ and $\beta = .30$ (power set at .70), Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) state that the sample size should be 66 (see table on p. 143 of that book). The research questions and findings reported here are a subset of the analyses conducted on a broad study (Moore, 2005). For the full study, some more demanding statistics were involved, so the statistical power of analysis demanded a higher sample size.

Sampling. The population of interest in this study was faculty teaching in educational technology graduate programs. Programs were identified through the listings in the *Educational Media and Technology Yearbook*

(Fitzgerald, Orey, and Branch, 2003, 2004). The yearbook categorizes programs by emphasis areas and provides detailed information on the programs, such as what degrees they offer and how many faculty teach (full-time and part-time) for the institution. The publication includes programs in educational technology, educational media, instructional design, information and library sciences, and computer information systems. For the purposes of this study, only those programs with primary emphasis in educational technology and media or instructional design were chosen. The only programs not included in the study were those for which no faculty contact information was available or faculty were not easily identifiable in the target programs. A total of 694 faculty were sampled for this study. After one initial email invitation and three reminders, 169 participants (25% response rate) completed the survey.

Tables 1 and 2 show the demographic data of the participants most relevant to this discussion.

Instrument: Perception of Societal Impact. One existing instrument was used for faculty perceptions of educational technology's impact on society, adapted from Kaufman (2000b): a gap analysis for "what is" and "what should be" for the frequency of societal impact. This instrument consisted of 13 questions, using the same concepts from the elements of the basic ideal vision. Kaufman (2000b, 2006) suggests that the HPT professional community use his instrument as an initial measure for determining how

TABLE 1 PRIMARY TEACHING EMPHASIS: FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES

PRIMARY TEACHING EMPHASIS	N	PERCENTAGE
Instructional design	35	22
Multimedia development	16	9
Change and technology integration	26	15
Systems design	2	1
Human performance technology	10	6
Critical theory	2	1
Assessment	0	0
Evaluation	8	5
K-12 media	16	9
International studies	0	0
Research	17	10
Distance learning	9	5
Other	27	16
Blank	1	1
Total	169	100%

TABLE 2 PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS: FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP	N	PERCENTAGE
AECT	84	49.7
ISTE	58	34.3
ISPI	26	15.4
AERA	71	42
APA	8	4.7
ASTD	19	11.2
None of the above	26	15.4
Blank	1	0.6

committed they are to delivering positive societal impact as a professional in the field. The instrument has a Likert-type scale on either side of each question, both ranging from 1–6 (1 = *does not apply*; 2 = *rarely, if ever*; 3 = *not usually*; 4 = *sometimes*; 5 = *frequently*; 6 = *consistently*). On the left side, respondents indicated “what is,” describing what their practices currently looked like. On the right side, respondents indicated “what should be,” describing what they believed their practices should look like.

A note is in order on how some of the answers were coded and analyzed. Very early faculty responses to the instruments indicated that some were uncomfortable with the items in Kaufman’s elements, such as murder and rape. Even though they could choose “does not apply,” their visceral reactions to some items indicated that “does not apply” did not really capture their response. Thus another option was added: “I prefer not to answer this question.” This response was coded as minus 1 in the raw data but treated as zero for computations. Additionally, when participants skipped a question entirely (not marking anything), that answer was recorded as zero. For the purposes of this study, the two responses were treated as zero because they were interpreted as participants’ desire to simply not think about the item or consider how it does or should apply in their work. Thus, a zero in the analysis was treated as distancing oneself further from social responsibility than a “does not apply.” The implications of this decision are discussed later in implications for future research.

Research question 1: With what frequency do faculty report they should be committed to societal impact (Kaufman, 2000b) as a professional in educational technology?

The researcher assessed the frequency with which faculty reported they should be committed to societal impact by reviewing the mean and median ratings for each item. Because this variable was measured on an ordinal scale, the median was determined to be the most appropriate statistic of central

tendency (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996; Guerra, 2001). The median is not sensitive to extreme scores, so it is an appropriate index for finding the typical score. Although the mean is not well suited for ordinal data, means were also estimated and included in this chapter for comparison purposes. Mode was determined to be an inappropriate measure for central tendency as well because it is very unstable, and a distribution can have more than one mode (Ary et al., 1996). Use of mode is usually limited to inspection purposes, not reporting purposes (Ary et al., 1996).

One item received a median rating of 2 (never): war and/or riot. Seven items received a median rating of 3 (rarely): shelter; murder, rape, and crimes of violence or destruction; substance abuse; disease; pollution; child abuse; and discrimination. One item received a median rating of 3.5 (between rarely and sometimes): consequences. Three items received a median rating of 4 (sometimes): unintended human-caused changes to the environment, starvation and/or malnutrition, and accidents. One item received a median rating of 6 (always), the highest score on the scale: partner/spouse abuse. See Table 3 for a summary of median and mean scores for each item.

Research question 2: With what frequency do faculty report they are committed to elements of societal impact (Kaufman, 2000b) as a professional in educational technology?

The researcher assessed the frequency with which faculty reported they are committed to societal impact by reviewing the mean and median ratings for each item. All items but one received a median score of 2 (never) or 3 (rarely). Six items received a median score of 2 (never): war and/or riot; murder, rape, and crimes of violence or destruction; substance abuse; disease; pollution; and discrimination. Six items received a median score of 3 (rarely): shelter, unintended human-caused changes to the environment, starvation and/or malnutrition, child abuse, accidents, and consequences. One item received a median score of 5 (usually): partner/spouse abuse. See Table 3 for a summary of median and mean scores for each item.

Research question 3: What, if any, is the relationship between how frequently faculty think they should be and are committed to societal impact?

To determine the relationship, the medians and means of "what is" responses were subtracted from the "what should be" responses. Table 3 summarizes those gaps for all items. For every item, the "what should be" ratings were higher than the "what is" ratings. Using the median as the unit of comparison, the largest gap was 1, which was obtained for nine items. One item had a median gap of 0.5. Using the mean as the unit of comparison, the largest gap was 0.56, which was obtained for one item: unintended human-caused changes to the environment. The next largest gap was 0.48, obtained for one item: accidents. The third largest gap was 0.46, obtained for one item: pollution.

TABLE 3 MEDIAN AND MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM	WHAT IS			WHAT SHOULD BE			GAP	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>M</i>
War and/or riot	154	2	2.47	154	2	2.76	0	0.29
Shelter	154	3	2.79	154	3	3.11	0	0.32
Unintended human-caused changes to the environment, including permanent destruction of the environment and/or rendering it non-renewable	154	3	3.23	154	4	3.79	1	0.56
Murder, rape, or crimes of violence, robbery, or destruction of property	154	2	2.63	154	3	2.91	1	0.28
Substance abuse	154	2	2.61	154	3	2.92	1	0.31
Disease	154	2	2.38	154	3	2.73	1	0.35
Pollution	154	2	2.55	154	3	3.01	1	0.46
Starvation and/or malnutrition	154	3	3.08	154	4	3.39	1	0.31
Child abuse	154	3	2.83	154	3	3.10	0	0.27
Partner/spouse abuse	154	5	4.52	154	6	4.88	1	0.36
Accidents, including transportation, home, and business/workplace	154	3	2.93	154	4	3.41	1	0.48
Discrimination based on irrelevant variables, including color, race, creed, sex, religion, national origin, age, and location	154	2	2.54	154	3	2.78	1	0.24
<i>Consequences of the basic ideal vision: Any and all organizations—public and private—will contribute to the achievement and maintenance of this basic ideal vision and will be funded and continued to the extent to which they meet its objectives and the basic ideal vision is accomplished and maintained. People will be responsible for what they use, do, and contribute and thus will not contribute to the reduction of any of the results identified in this basic ideal vision.</i>	154	3	2.42	154	3.5	2.85	0.5	0.43

Note. 1 = does not apply, 2 = never, 3 = rarely, 4 = sometimes, 5 = usually, 6 = always, 0 = "I prefer not to answer."

In addition to gap scores, the relationship between "what is" and "what should be" scores was also explored through statistical means using correlational analysis. The results of Spearman's Rho are presented in Table 4. For all

TABLE 4 SPEARMAN'S RHO CORRELATIONS FOR "WHAT IS" AND "WHAT SHOULD BE"

ITEM	SPEARMAN'S RHO
War and/or riot	.946
Shelter	.920
Unintended human-caused changes to the environment, including permanent destruction of the environment and/or rendering it nonrenewable	.826
Murder, rape, or crimes of violence, robbery, or destruction of property	.917
Substance abuse	.896
Disease	.929
Pollution	.875
Starvation and/or malnutrition	.876
Child abuse	.933
Partner/spouse abuse	.673
Accidents, including transportation, home, and business/workplace	.838
Discrimination based on irrelevant variables, including color, race, creed, sex, religion, national origin, age, and location	.868
<i>Consequences of the basic ideal vision: Any and all organizations—public and private—will contribute to the achievement and maintenance of this basic ideal vision and will be funded and continued to the extent to which they meet its objectives and the basic ideal vision is accomplished and maintained. People will be responsible for what they use, do, and contribute and thus will not contribute to the reduction of any of the results identified in this basic ideal vision.</i>	.911

13 items, the "what is" and "what should be" scores had high correlations that were significant at the .01 level (two-tailed).

Discussion

The results were that faculty believed the elements applied rarely or never in all cases but one. In one case, the element of spouse/partner abuse was rated highly in terms of faculty saying they *should be* committed to this and *are* committed to it. Comments and feedback from faculty corroborated the notion that most faculty just do not see these elements as having anything to do with what they teach and do in the field of educational technology. Sample comments from faculty that support this interpretation:

"I care about those issues and do some small things to combat them (and especially not add to them) but I don't see my having much chance or responsibility to change those things in my instructional technology classes. The closest I can come to that is to see that people

understand issues like the digital divide and that the deaf/blind are not disenfranchised by bad technological decisions.”

“I was very confused by the Elements of Social Responsibility section of this survey. Although the design of this portion of the instrument was creative, I was often unable to see the connection to instructional technology.”

“The first section on ethics did not relate at all to our educational technology program.”

“That last set of questions ... well I just don’t get it. ... What is the application to my work in instructional technology as an instructor? Is this just a generic survey for all professions? It assumes I believe poverty can be eliminated. It cannot. God says the poor will always be with us and we should care for them. Disease will not disappear. Sin is a part of the nature of man and therefore people will seek and find ways to abuse others. It cannot be eliminated but it can be controlled and minimized.”

“The 13 questions on social responsibility were difficult to answer. For example I could have easily checked ‘does not apply’ on all of them (both on the ‘what is’ and ‘what should be’) because I do not consider these issues (e.g., hunger, poverty, disease, etc.) as part of my profession. As a human being or on the personal level I certainly think about them and sometimes take action related to such issues (e.g., give to charity or join an environmental group) but in my ‘profession’ which is what I think the question was asking I do not integrate these issues or include them in my teaching or research.”

“The content for many questions in what is vs. what should be is not appropriate for classroom instruction.”

“The ‘What is’ and ‘What should be’ seemed unrelated to my educational technology efforts.”

“I found the last series of questions confusing in terms of relating these very broad social issues to my teaching.”

Although these comments are not representative of all the comments from faculty, comments of this sort did occur often enough to give some indication of why elements were not rated highly and why faculty may not have really seen any distinction between the elements. In fact, it could be that the elements do represent a single construct to most participants in the study: “social issues,” where issues are separate from forms of professional responsibility that can be codified into behavior or performance expectations. Kaufman (2000b) and Kaufman, Oakley-Browne, Watkins, and Leigh (2003) suggest that resistance to Mega is often explained by the fear that respondents have relative to understanding and accepting linkages between their professional contributions and modeling or using it.

Additionally, it should be noted that the purpose of the social responsibility scale developed by Kaufman is not to get professions or organizations

to take ownership over all the Outcomes, but rather to identify which one(s) they specifically contribute to. As is common to new content domains, people who have not been asked to think about these things may see them all as one in the same at first and develop a clearer organizational schema only over time. This would imply that as profession, we are in a very early understanding of our social responsibilities.

It is important to note that the findings in this study with this population are somewhat different from findings in a similar study conducted with a practitioner population. In 2001, Guerra conducted a study to determine the perceived gaps for competencies required for certification as a certified performance technologist (CPT). Those competencies included ethics that were stated in terms taken directly from Kaufman's Mega model of societal impact (2000b). The competencies relating to organizational impact on society received the lowest median ratings of all the competencies for both "does apply" and "should apply." However, the measured gap between "does apply" and "should apply" was larger than the measured gap here, and the measured perception of how often it should apply was higher than what was reported in this study. Guerra (2001) found that general practitioners reported they should apply societal impact competencies sometimes; experts reported that these competencies should be applied frequently (pp. 109–110). These ratings are higher than what faculty in the field report, and the difference is worth noting.

To explain the findings, Guerra (2001) suggests that some professionals have not yet made the *paradigm shift* (Kuhn, 1974) necessary for them "to recognize the relevance and ethical and practical importance of such competencies in their professional practice" (p. 110). Many well-known figures have ceaselessly argued that members of a profession have an obligation to clients and to society (Dean, 1993; Kaufman, 2000b, 2006; Westgaard, 1988; Watkins, Leigh, & Kaufman, 2000). Indeed, the findings from this study suggest that faculty too have not yet made the paradigm shift to seeing the relevance of social responsibility to their professional practices. However, the difference between the findings of this study, where faculty rated Kaufman's elements consistently low, and Guerra's study (2001), where practitioners rated the "should apply" higher, suggest another possible explanation for the findings. Guerra's findings indicate that practitioners are more likely to see the relevance of social responsibility to their practice than faculty teaching in graduate programs. It could be that general practitioners tend to be closer to the point of implementation of designs and therefore are closer to the results and impact.

As a point of contrast, other participants in this study had more positive comments, saying they teach about some of these elements in their courses and are concerned about both students' ability to solve ethical problems and about decisions regarding the use of technology in education made at broader governmental levels. The sample size for this study was not large enough to disaggregate the data and compare groups; however, it could be that for faculty who believe these elements are related to professional responsibilities and who explicitly integrate ethics into their courses, the

elements would load onto factors that could be interpreted according to ethical principles. This might indicate that people who view social responsibility as important would also likely have a cognitive schema, or a cognitive map, of those types of responsibilities—how they are different and how they relate. Given the results, where basically all elements were regarded as never or rarely applicable, the majority of participants in this study appear to not consider social responsibility (as defined by Kaufman's elements) as important in their professional activities.

However, the raw data show that there were seven participants in the study who rated all the elements highly (at a 5 or 6, where 5 = *usually* and 6 = *always*). One participant rated all the elements a 6. These seven participants would be of interest for a follow-up study investigating how they view ethics, how they teach ethics, and what their cognitive schema of ethics looks like, and identify any personal or professional characteristics that would differentiate this group from those who did not accept the Mega concept as relevant to them and their curriculum.

As to the one element that did rate highly in the current study, the one reason spouse/partner abuse may have rated so highly compared to the others is because faculty may deal with this social issue more on a day-to-day basis as a result of their advising responsibilities to adult students. The divorce rate is anecdotally known to be high among graduate students, so faculty may be in a position to confront spouse/partner abuse (or at least interpersonal difficulties) more than other types of social issues, making them more sensitive to this particular element. If such is the case, then the response on this item possibly indicates that faculty answered this part of the survey thinking of themselves as professionals more in terms of being a professional faculty member than a professional in the field of educational technology.

Summary

The results indicated that Kaufman's elements of the basic ideal vision did consistently measure a stable construct of social responsibility, but participants did not distinguish among ethical principles in those elements and did not perceive the elements as anything they should be particularly committed to in their professional work. A review of planning documents from programs corroborates this interpretation with data that are not based on self-report. No programs in educational technology in the United States or Canada incorporated societal impact in planning documents in clear, measurable terms. Some are thinking about it but have not yet linked them to clearly stated objectives or results. Future research possibilities include further exploration of the construct of social responsibility. A focused study with outliers, or "experts," could provide a clearer structure or schema for social responsibility, which could then be used to determine novice, intermediary, and expert levels of comprehension. Such a study could also be expanded to other populations within the same field, to other fields that deal with technology, and to development and testing of a structural model of professional ethics. Additionally, a change

perspective that looks at "awareness" and other concerns or levels of use (Hall & Hord, 2001) might determine that the variables do not necessarily correlate because social responsibility is a new "innovation" that simply has yet to diffuse.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College.
- Baumgarten, E. (1982). Ethics in the academic profession. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(3), 282-295.
- Brenner, S. N., & Molander, E. (1977). Is the ethics of business changing? *Harvard Business Review*, 5(1), 57-71.
- Brethower, D. (2005). Yes we can: A rejoinder to Don Winiecke's rejoinder about saving the world with HPT. *Performance Improvement*, 44(2), 19-25.
- Caron, B. (Ed.). (1999). *Service matters: The engaged campus*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Cuban, L. (1986). *Teachers and machines: The classroom use of technology since 1920*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom, 1980-2000*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Davies, I. (2001). Educational technology: Archetypes, paradigms and models. In D. Ely & T. Plomp (Eds.), *Classic writings on instructional technology* (pp. 15-30). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Davis, M. (1999). *Ethics and the university*. London: Routledge.
- Dean, P. J. (1993). A selected review of the underpinnings of ethics for human performance technology professionals. Part one: Key ethical theories and research. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 6(4), 3-32.
- Dean, P. J. (1999). The relevance of standards and ethics for the human performance technology profession. In H. Stolovitch and E. Keeps (Eds.), *Handbook of human performance technology* (2nd ed., pp. 698-712). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Delaney, J., & Sockell, D. (1992). Do company ethics training programs make a difference? An empirical analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 719-727.
- Dobni, D., Ritchie, J. R., & Zerbe, W. (2000). Organizational values: The inside view of service productivity. *Journal of Business Research*, 47, 91-107.
- Ely, D. (1976). Creating the conditions for change. In S. Faibisoff & G. Bonn (Eds.), *Changing times: Changing libraries* (pp. 150-162). Champaign: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science.
- Ely, D., & Plomp, T. (1996). *Classic writings on instructional technology*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Finn, J. D. (1996a). Professionalizing the audio-visual field. In D. Ely & T. Plomp (Eds.), *Classic writings on instructional technology* (pp. 231-241). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Finn, J. D. (1996b). A walk on the altered side. In D. Ely & T. Plomp (Eds.), *Classic writings on instructional technology* (pp. 47-56). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Fitzgerald, M., Orey, M., & Branch, R. (2003). *Educational media and technology yearbook 2003* (Vol. 27). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Fitzgerald, M., Orey, M., & Branch, R. (2004). *Educational media and technology yearbook 2004* (Vol. 28). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Ford, R., & Richardson, W. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, 205-221.
- Frankel, M. (1989). Professional codes: Why, how, and with what impact? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8, 109-115.

- Gall, M., Gall, J., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Guerra, I. (2001). *A study to identify key competencies for performance improvement professionals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles and potholes*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Healy, J. (1990). *Endangered minds: Why our children don't think*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Healy, J. (1999). *Failure to connect: How computers affect our children's minds—And what we can do about it*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kaufman, R. (1996). Needs assessment: Internal and external. In D. Ely & T. Plomp (Eds.), *Classic writings on instructional technology* (pp. 111–118). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Kaufman, R. (1997). A new reality for organizational success. Two bottom lines. *Performance Improvement*, 38(8), 3.
- Kaufman, R. (1999). From how to what to why: The handbook of performance technology as the gateway to the future. In H. Stolovitch & E. Keeps, *The handbook of performance technology* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossely-Bass.
- Kaufman, R. (2000a). Education past, present and future: From how to what to why. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 9(1), 2–8.
- Kaufman, R. (2000b). *Mega planning: Practical tools for organizational success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kaufman, R. (2006). *Changes, choices and consequences: A guide to Mega thinking and planning*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
- Kaufman, R., Corrigan, R., & Johnson, D. (1969). Towards educational responsiveness to society's needs: A tentative utility model. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 3, 151–157.
- Kaufman, R., Oakley-Browne, H., Watkins, R., & Leigh, D. (2003). System (and systems) thinking. In R. Kaufman (Ed.), *Strategic planning for success: Aligning people, performance, and payoffs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Kuhn, T. (1974). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Matchett, N. (2008). Ethics across the curriculum. *New Directions for Higher Education: Practical Approaches to Ethics for Colleges and Universities*, 142, 25–38.
- McNeel, S. P. (1994). College teaching and student moral development. In J. R. Rest & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development in the professions. Psychology and applied ethics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Moore, S. L. (2005). The social impact of a profession: An analysis of factors influencing ethics and the teaching of social responsibility in educational technology programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Northern Colorado.
- Nucci, L., & Pascarella, E. (1987). The influence of college on moral development. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 3). New York: Agathon.
- O'Connell, D. W. (1998). From the universities to the marketplace: The business ethics journey. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 1617–1622.
- Petrick, J., & Quinn, J. (1997). *Management ethics: Integrity at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Procario-Foley, E., & Bean, D. (2002). Institutions of higher education: Cornerstones in building ethical organizations. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 6, 101–116.
- Rest, J. R. (1994). Background: Theory and research. In J. R. Rest & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development in the professions. Psychology and applied ethics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Verschoor, C. (1998). Corporations' financial performance and its commitment to ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 1509–1516.

- Watkins, R., Leigh, D., & Kaufman, R. (2000). A scientific dialogue: A performance accomplishment code of professional conduct. *Performance Improvement*, 38(4), 17-22.
- Weaver, G. R. (1999). Compliance and values oriented ethics programs: Influences on employee's attitudes and behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 9, 315-335.
- Westgaard, O. (1988). *A credo for performance technologists*. Western Springs, IL: International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction.

STEPHANIE L. MOORE

Stephanie L. Moore is director of engineering instructional design at the University of Virginia for the School of Engineering and Applied Science, where she works on distance education and will be teaching ethics for undergraduate engineers. *E-mail*: Stephanie.moore@virginia.edu