

Jin-Whan PARK**A STUDY ON THE EVALUATION MODEL OF MORAL JUDGMENT EDUCATION¹**

*Moral Judgment, one of the key elements in moral education, has seen no significant progress since the cognitive moral education model developed by Piaget and Kohlberg in the 1980s. Although this model has been criticized in many ways, it is still the dominant model in Korea. In 2000, the theory of knowledge has undergone revolutionary change—from objective view of theory to the constructivist view of knowledge; from modernism to post-modernism; and from academism to pragmatism. Such change has shaken the existing cognitive approach at its root and requires a new model of moral judgment education. If moral knowledge is objective, modernistic and is based on academism, the moral judgment based on such moral knowledge is simple in its form. It is like applying a simple mathematic formula. However, moral knowledge is constructivist, post-modern and pragmatic, then moral judgment cannot be but complex. The same is for the evaluation of moral judgment education. Although constructivist-based moral judgment education was introduced in new curriculum, appropriate evaluation model was not developed so far. This study proposes that Matthew Lipman's Philosophy for Children model is suitable as the new evaluation model for moral judgment education. Of course, Matthew Lipman himself did not systematically develop an evaluation model for moral judgment education. However, he paved a way a new evaluation model. We can find some suggestions from his books, *Lisa and Nous*, the text for moral judgment education, and manual for instructors, respectively. This paper is the extended research of his study and is in memory of him who passed away in 2011.*

Keywords: *evaluation model, moral judgment education, constructivism, complex thinking.*

Changes of Moral Knowledge Theory

The two major existing theories of moral knowledge are teleological and deontological, both of which have maintained the objective approach to knowledge. The utilitarian view in which the happiness of the majority is seen as the objective moral knowledge and the deontological view where the universal and objective

¹ This Work(GNUDDF-2009-19) was Supported by Academy-oriented Research Funds of Development Fund Foundation, Gyeongsang National University, 2011.

morality is viewed as the moral knowledge are essentially similar to the perspective of the theory of knowledge. Deontological view shares its tradition with rationalism. Since Descartes, it is assumed that we have separated human body and mind, denied the body and emphasized the mind. "I think, therefore I am" clearly reveals that the mind is the essence of human. Through the mind we can pursue the truth, and such objective truth continues its existence in this world. This has formed the foundation of the objective theory of knowledge; Kant's transcendentalist pursuit of a moral truth inherited the Descartes tradition. Teleological morality, especially utilitarian view, is related to the empiricist tradition. In *Novum Organum*, Bacon modified the three types of Aristotelian knowledge and classified them into history, poetry and scientific inquiry. He argued that history is nothing more than collecting information and poetry is fantasy, but that only scientific inquiry is the right path to the truth. To him, scientific inquiry was the search for the laws of the nature and he saw morality as the psychological phenomenon the cause and effect of which were sought.

Unlike such objective theory of knowledge, it has been recently highlighted that knowledge is built by the members of the society (Elgin, 1996). Wittgenstein saw ethics as a form of "language games." As language is the social byproduct, moral knowledge can be seen as being constructed by the members of the society. The social nature of knowledge was also discussed in the scientific arena where objective theory of knowledge was prevailing. In the theory developed by Thomas Kuhn and others, it was asserted that forming normal science was determined by the political power of the relevant group of academics, not by the scientific theory itself. Vygotsky stressed that knowledge is the internalization of social interaction, which became the prevalent theory in the education sector since 2000.

For those who teach moral judgment, moral judgment based on objective theory of knowledge cannot be but simple. Because there is an objective theory of knowledge, following it makes it correct judgment. There can be no criticism here. The constructivist view of moral knowledge can be interpreted in two ways. Because moral knowledge is constructed, it can always be renewed in accordance with social change. Reflection and criticism can contribute to the construction of the new moral knowledge. In Joseon Dynasty, Koreans believed the discrimination between *yangban*, the aristocratic class, and merchants, and gender discrimination to be objective knowledge, but today, it is wrong. Today's moral knowledge can be wrong later. It is therefore necessary to have the development of the judgment ability to be the core of moral judgment education. Some call this critical constructivism. There may be those who do not believe in criticizing social norms or tradition, even if they are based on constructivism.

Another change in relation to moral judgment is contextualism. Existentialist philosophy, hermeneutics and pragmatic philosophy suggest that moral

principles need to take context into account, instead of applying the principles regardless of the context. For instance, decontextualism demands that the moral principle against a lie should be applied in all circumstances, and this decontextualism and objectivism were the main characteristics of the existing moral judgment. Contextualism states that moral judgment may vary; for example, is telling a lie to your neighbor is bad when he find his wife who comes to you to hide her from her husband who is trying to kill her?

One of the theories on moral judgment from the perspective of contextualism is the expert model. The focus is given to the judgment made by experts in the practical fields. For example, a medical doctor will prescribe based on the comprehensive review of the condition of the patients. The context, including the patient's medical history, will determine the proportion of different kinds of medication prescribed to the patient with brain tumor. The principles and theories will apply to such prescription, but because they do not reflect the details specific to that case, much of the contextual circumstances will rely on the long experience of the doctor. The studies on the expert model are particularly noteworthy among the studies based on cognitive psychology. In this model, there is a series of stages from beginner to expert and the beginner stage is where context is not considered. The specific circumstantial complexities are not accounted for in this stage. However, the expert stage considers the specific circumstantial complexities. The experts make the appropriate judgment based on long experience.

What is moral judgment based on constructivist and contextualist philosophy like? What can moral judgement education provide? The weakness of the expert model is that it does not provide answers as to how moral judgment should be taught. One of the more fundamental reasons is that it cannot be proposed as the education model as making a judgment based on various circumstantial factors is seen as relying on long experience. To teach, it is necessary to be able to present the specific idea as to what constitutes a good judgment. Constructivism focuses not on result but on methodology as good construction ensures a good result. The good construction depends on the way of thinking. The good construction is about creativity and it is without contradictions. The emphasis on critical and creative thinking is an inevitable byproduct of the constructivist theory of knowledge. The tradition of studies on ways of thinking can be found in philosophy. It is William M. Kurtines who regarded critical thinking as a key element of the moral judgment education (Kurtines, 1995). He saw critical thinking as the core. Furthermore, he thought the process of communication in the course of making a moral judgment—the ability to utilize critical thinking and critical discussion in the communication—was important. In this respect, he called his theory, co-constructivist approach. Unlike social constructivism, it is not just for the adaptation to the changes in environment. When people make a moral judgment within the

socio-cultural context in which they are situated, they usually follow the existing hierarchy of values. However, people that Kurtines thought of went beyond. To him, the hierarchy of values was only a starting point. The existing means and purposes are made justified by whether the successful resolution of the existing, specific problems that people experienced has been drawn, or whether the problem of having new means and purposes due to the changes in the conditions has also been successfully addressed. In other words, following the existing hierarchy of values is only limited to the cases in which it is helpful for the resolution of problems. Let us assume that someone reports his slave who ran away but was close to him. Considering the ethics, law and institution or, the hierarchy of values of the time, reporting may have been the right answer. If that person possesses the faculty of mature, critical thinking and is able to communicate, the means and purposes underlying that certain circumstance may be discussed and the limitations may be pointed out. If he comes up with the modified means and purposes, it means that his hierarchy of values has changed. He may now see the slave as a human, not as property, the result of which may be to help him escape instead of reporting. What Kurtines stresses is the process, not the result. More accurately, it is the ability to communicate based on critical thinking. Making a moral judgment is not about seeking objective, absolute moral knowledge or principle; it is about the ability to solve a problem. However, Kurtines does not specifically mention what critical thinking is and what kind of communication process is necessary.

Matthew Lipman (Lipman, 2003) focused on the significance of critical, creative and caring engagement in the construction of judgment. He made it clear that good thinking is about presenting how it is done. What is creative thinking? Let us go back to the example of a runaway slave. In order for the master to think of the matter differently, he would need critical thinking (why should people be discriminated based on the color of their skin?) and creative thinking (do they not deserve the respect as I do?). If he decided to help the slave escape, he would also need a creative and effective way to do so. Considerate thinking here would mean to extend help to those who are in need. These ways of thinking are universally necessary for those who are involved in practical activities. Lipman called this, complex thinking.

As such, Lipman specified the three ways of thinking and what he emphasized was that such engagements are necessary tools of inquiry. Inquiry is taking imperfection to perfection. This issue was systematically addressed by Richard Paul. Although he does not talk about complex thinking specifically, he viewed and talked critically of the elements that come into use in the process of thinking. Paul (Paul, 2002) suggested eight elements of thoughts: purpose, question at hand, information, inferences, concepts, assumptions, implications and point of view. Paul's eight elements overlap with the engagements suggested by Lipman but it can also be noted that the eight elements provide the basic problem-solv-

ing process. A problem arises when there is an obstacle to the purpose and the answer is sought by turning that problem into a question. In the process of inference based on information, inquiry of concept and assumption is essential. After reaching a conclusion, the implications may be pondered upon to point out any limitations. Everything may re-start from a new point of view. According to Lipman, question, discussion and application repeat themselves. As Kurtines said, if the purpose based on the existing value changes after self-reflection, new questions arise, leading to the repeated inquiry of discussion and application. I modified Paul's elements of thoughts to fit Lipman's engagements for a better problem-solving process. First, it is necessary to add context after purpose. The significance of context has already been addressed previously. Second, the scope of inferences needs to be expanded, as only the hypothetical inferences and formal and informal inferences are limitedly addressed. Third, caring engagement should be provided. Caring engagement is crucial to be considerate of others or escape the existing hierarchy of values to go to the next hierarchy. Through this caring process, the master of the slave in the previous instance could have come to a realization that the slave is a human who deserves as much respect as the master does.

Attempt to interpret the problem is frustrated (purpose) Making a question—Information—Context—Finding an alternative (inference of hypothesis)—Inference of conclusion—Concept—Finding an assumption—Point of view (Observing from another person's point of view—Observing from a new point of view).

The situation or context in which the slave makes an escape can be seen as a problem individually or socially. The master as inquirer could interpret the situation as suffering a property loss. His purpose or goal to protect his property could be frustrated. Or he could also view this as a situation in which he needs to help his friend who is risking his life for the pursuit of happiness. Or the situation may be that these two different purposes are in conflict. To resolve the situation that he sees as a problem, the inquirer will formulate a question: what to do with the escape of a slave? He may try to resolve the matter based on his knowledge of the law or customs. He would be knowledgeable in the fact that slaves cannot run away from their masters and the law of his time requires him to report a runaway slave. He can also check to see if such information is accurate, after which he can review the concept and assumptions. Is the value or norm upon which the law is based correct? Is slavery right? What is the law? What is freedom? These are some of the concepts that the inquirer may explore (critical thinking). He will look at the options in following the existing hierarchy of values as well as the results of such alternatives (creative thinking). Next, he may look at the problems arising from the existing points of view, not to mention the concepts and assumptions against slavery. Here, the ability to stand

in the shoe of the slave will be crucial (caring thinking). The new point of view will allow the master to see the problem from a different angle, helping him to go from “how to stop a slave running away illegally?” to “how to help a fellow human make an escape for freedom?”

Of course, this process may potentially unfold in a completely different manner and order, depending on situational character and thinking abilities of inquirer. The critical character of Lipman’s model is that it is not simply for problem solving inquiry but philosophical inquiry in every stage. Usually problem solving model does not deal with philosophical questions. It focuses on scientific questions. In this sense Lipman’s approach can be called philosophical inquiry. Philosophical inquiry makes it possible to go another level of inquiry and to see another world view beyond traditional one.

Evaluation of Complex Thinking

The definition of complex thinking may vary from one thinker to another. Lipman defines it as critical, creative and caring thinking. Complex thinking applies to a single judgment, and the judgment manifests itself through action, saying, emotion and making. Moral judgment expressing itself in such form can also mean that our action, language, emotion and work come as the result of complex thinking.

How critical, creative and caring thinking operates on a single judgment is explained by Lipman in his concept of reasonableness. According to Lipman, reasonableness is a condition in which critical, creative and caring thinking is in balance. Rawls said that reasonableness is when the different elements of judgments are in a reflective state of balance. This balance is an ideal and there is no way to verify whether a certain action has reached its balance. All it means is that it is the optimal choice.

Another example is the concept of consistency, or coherence in legal judgment. The concept of consistency is in contrast to the concept of reasonableness. Consistency refers to less or no contradiction in the conflicts between various elements related to making a judgment. If the existing judgments were based on the metaphysical code of ethics in the Western law, the new concept of judgment is about consistency of various elements, while considering the conflicting elements that affect the judgment. For instance, the master who witnessed his slave running away can make his judgment based on what the law says. This can be described as a reasonable judgment. However, considering various elements surrounding the judgment on the escape and making a judgment in which such elements are not in conflict of each other is consistency. Paul Thagard found the grounds for coherence in cognitive science. When we judge, our brain seeks multi-coherence between the elements. Thagard called them conceptual

coherence, unifying coherence, deductive coherence, analogical coherence and emotional coherence. (Thagard, 2000) They can be summarized as follows: conceptual (slave is not human but commodity); unifying (slave is necessary to maintain a plantation); deductive (slave cannot escape without the permission of the master); analogical (just as a person has a right to possess a product he paid for, the slave is also paid for and thus owned by the master); and emotional (just as a person is angry when he loses one of his belongings, the master is rightfully angry when he sees his slave escape). After considering all these elements, it is reasonable to come to a judgment to report the slave. As mentioned earlier however, critical, creative and caring complex thinking may apply to self-reflection and allow the person to have a different point of view and lead to the following: conceptual (slave cannot be a commodity); unifying (labor is necessary to maintain a plantation but I do not wish to use the labor based on exploitation because it does not make me happy); deductive (human cannot be sold or bought. Human has the freedom to choose his own life. Therefore, the escape is in no way wrong); analogical (just as it is the right thing to help those in need, it is also right to help a slave escape); and emotional (if someone helps me when I am in need, I will be in gratitude). Thus the coherent judgment from the new point of view would be to help the escaping slave. Then which one of these two conflicting judgments is right? Those who are against coherence criticize that it leads to relativism.

The Issue of Relativism

The issue that Lipman came to face in discussing reasonableness was relativism. Reasonableness within the relevant context depends on the hierarchy of values. The previous example shows us that we can go from the existing hierarchy of values to the new one via complex thinking and reflection. The important thing is that the purpose changes as the hierarchy of values does. Thus the point of view on the context varies as it changes to the higher-order thinking (values). That is, the process of reflection by way of complex thinking leads to such progress. Because the absolute value is not recognized, this can be called relativism. Among various options to resolve the problem, there is one that is better than others and thus it can be described as objectivism. Thagard argued that the judgment to help the slave that is coherent with more elements was a better judgment. What is the scientific ground that justifies slavery? What is the basis for the discrimination based on the color of skin? Is it scientifically valid that African American is intellectually inferior? If that is because the social and historical inequality has robbed them of the opportunity to develop their intelligence, is it justifiable to discriminate them for their lack of intellect? Can the low intellectual ability be the ground for those with higher intellect to own them as property? The existing judgment on

such problems was less likely to be coherent than the new judgment. Therefore, it is inferior to the new judgment, that is, to help the slave escape. According to the relativism, no choice can be put above the other. Therefore, coming to a conclusion that something is superior over others is not relativism.

Evaluation in Practice

The evaluation of moral judgment can be divided into evaluation to see whether complex thinking is applied in an appropriate manner and evaluation of inquiry. By using Lipman's critical, creative and caring thinking, the engagements of thoughts can be evaluated based on doing, saying, making and emotion. Making a judgment is a combination of all three: critical, creative and caring. For instance, if a relative asks for money, it is only right to lend it from the caring perspective but there can be times when it cannot be done from the critical perspective. This is where creative comes in to find an alternative. The manifestation of the balance between these three will help reaching an appropriate judgment. An appropriate judgment is based on reasonableness. We can make an evaluation model of doing, saying, making and feeling. The regulative ideal is reasonableness. Its evaluating dimensions could be critical, creative and caring thinking. Maybe we can give 1–5 points for each box of evaluation by its appropriateness, relevance, consistency, or precision of each thinking elements

Evaluation of product

Doing saying making feeling

Critical thinking

Creative thinking

Caring thinking

If such an appropriate judgment may be called a perfect state, what is the process of inquiry like? How should it be evaluated? The process of inquiry is about going from fragments to integration and from imperfection to perfection. Going into the arena of perfection is the process of self-criticism, self-modification and self-control. It is ideal to inquire as the community because it is more efficient than that of the individual. If the master is able to critically review his concept that a slave is commodity, not human and re-establish the concept via self-modification, he will reach the new level of making a judgment. Inquiry is not only change: it is improvement, as when its subject-matter goes from being an indeterminate to being a determinate situation, or from a disorganized to an organized situation. Ethical inquiry therefore moves through phases of imperfection in the direction of perfection as a baseball pitcher seeks always to move in the direction of a "perfect game." The phases of imperfection involve (a) self-criticism, (b) self-correction, and (c) self-control. (Pierce, "Ideals

of Conduct,” Collected Papers). This is so whether we are talking about the self-improvement of the individual or of the inquiring community. The latter involves first a stage of critical self-analysis, secondly a stage of self-correction, and thirdly a stage of self-control, as products of the three major phases of the community of inquiry: questioning, discussion and application.

Evaluation of process

Doing saying making feeling

Self-criticism

Self-correction

Self-control

The work to be examined consists of a fabric of judgments, each one of which takes the whole work into consideration. The warp and woof of the fabric is made up of judicative threads derived from the concept of judgment itself. One set sees the concept of judgment as based on four criteria: making, saying, doing and feeling. Another set also consists of two criteria: (1) each expresses the person who made it; and each (2) appraises the world of that person.

Each judgment appraises the world of the person making it. That is to say, each judgment takes into account, at least to some extent, the contextual circumstances surrounding the making of that judgment. Another way of putting this would be to say that one makes a judgment while estimating all relevant situational characteristics. Thus a driver makes a 90° turn while coming to be aware of and coming to evaluate the pedestrians, the traffic regulations, the other vehicles, the visibility, and other relevant factors, insofar as these impinge upon the driving decisions made by the driver. In order to examine an episode in experience, utilizing the criteria for judgment, we make use of a number of criteria which are definitional or stipulation, and a number of others which are empirical. That all judgments have products and that all judgments are product are true by definition, since they are correlative terms, like cause and effect, or husband and wife. Those judgments are to be found distributed in four modes-making, saying, doing, and feeling-is an empirical finding. Furthermore, it is an empirical finding that is asserted when one claims that each judgment appraises the world of the person making it, that each judgment expresses oneself, and that each judgment expresses one's world

Evaluation of interpretation

Doing saying making feeling

(1) expresses

(2) appraises

We have omitted the criterion of being a product, on the ground that it is a stipulated trait, much like human or intentional. Thus the questioning phase of the reflection is aided by means of the following questions:

What did she make? How did she make it? What did she say? How did she say it? What did she do? How did she do it? What did she feel? How did she feel it?

- How did what she made express her?
- How did what she said express her?
- How did what she did express her?
- How did what she felt express her?
- How did what she made appraise her world?
- How did what she said appraise her world?
- How did what she did appraise her world?
- How did what she felt appraise her world?
- How did what she made express her world?
- How did what she said express her world?
- How did what she did express her world?
- How did what she felt express her world?

Each judgment is an expression of oneself. Each judgment, that is, each act or move is a representation or indication of one's individuality—the sum of those differences that make one an individual. A single note played by the orchestra is often enough for an audience to say itself, "That's Brahms." Thus the note is expressive of Brahms but impressive to the concert audience. The critic or musicologist tries to follow up on this identification of the unique "Brahms quality", articulating it to the world of music listeners.

Each judgment is an expression of one's world. As the sun expresses itself thought a lens, a mountain may be said to express itself thought the artist who paints it. On a dreary day, one may feel oneself depressed, so that one's conduct is to some extent a reflection of the weather. Likewise, a broker's conduct is an expression of the current market conditions, and an entire army may express its spirit through the behavior of just a few of its members. The quality of one's expression of one's world through oneself is a situational or tertiary quality, in that it is pervasive of the context of one's behavior. Inquiry into one's situation guides itself by the qualities that permeate that situation, even though one may not feel capable of putting them into words.

The worksheet discussed here has been designed for use primarily with adults, such as college undergraduates or prospective teachers. The column on the left that has been left blank is for the professor's remarks. The box at the top left is for the student's name. The title of the worksheet (center, top) identifies its use. Thus, when used for aesthetic experience, the title may be something like "Judgments of Appreciation", while for moral experience the title could be "Judgments of Approbation." One may lend further focus to the worksheet by utilizing a particular value principle, such as "appropriateness", "relevance", "consistency", or "precision". This could come in especially handy when the

worksheet is used as a probe to determine the extent of one's students' understanding. Since the worksheet can be used for one's own experiencing as well as for other people, one should choose the format that reflects whether the possessives refer to oneself ("my"), to others ("his" or "her") and to plurals ("their").

In selecting a project about which the worksheet is to be used, one should obviously choose one that one knows about, e.g., one's own experience, or an artist about whose experience one has a good deal of information—one thinks here of Van Gogh, etc., or the National Anthem, rather than a passage from Homer or Shakespeare, about whom we know little or nothing. If one chooses to grade these worksheets, the twenty factors can each be assigned 5 points. High grades should not be expected.

Evaluation of value system

"Azalea Flowers"

When you hate to see me
 And decide to leave,
 I'll quietly let you go.
 I'll pluck an armful of azaleas
 In the Yaksan hills at Yungbyun
 To strew over your path
 Tread softly on the flowers
 Each step soft and silent
 When you hate to see me
 And decide to leave
 I'll never shed tears.
 Poem by Kim Sowol

Appropriateness relevance, consistency, precision (grade 1–5 5x20=100)

1. What did she make?
2. How did she make it?
3. What did she say?
4. How did she say it?
5. What did she do?
6. How did she do it?
7. What did she feel?
8. How did she feel it?
9. How did what she made express her?
10. How did what she said express her?
11. How did what she did express her?
12. How did what she felt express her?
13. How did what she made appraise her world?

14. How did what she said appraise her world?
15. How did what she did appraise her world?
16. How did what she felt appraise her world?
17. How did what she made express her world?
18. How did what she said express her world?
19. How did what she did express her world?
20. How did what she felt express her world?

In spite of paradigmatic change of the epistemic background of moral knowledge, we had not any appropriate evaluation model of moral judgment education. This paper tried to figure out characters of new moral judgment education based on Matthew Lipman's theory. Those are process-centered constructive skill-centered interpretation-centered. Thinking skills are critical, creative and caring thinking. Processes can be specified self-critic, self-correction and self-control. Moral judgment education cannot separate from interpretation of world and self. So ability of interpreting all human activities is important to moral judgment education. On this model we can make three kinds of evaluation fabrics. These fabrics could not cover whole area of moral judgment education. But it can be useful for understanding constructivistic approach of moral judgment education.

References:

1. Elgin, Catherine (1996) *Considered Judgment*: Princeton University Press.
2. Kurtines, W.M & Jacob. L.G. (1995) *Moral Development: An Introduction*, Allyn & Bacon.
3. Lipman, M. (1985) *Ethical Inquiry*: Lisa, University Press of America.
4. Lipman, M. (2003) *Thinking in Education*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
5. Paul, R. & W. Elder L. (2002) *Critical Thinking: Tool for Taking Charge of Your Professional and Personal Life*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
6. Pierce, Charles Sanders (1931) ed. by Charles Harthorne and Paul Weis, *Collected Papers*, The Murray Printing Company.

Джин-Ван Парк. Дослідження моделі оцінювання у вихованні морального судження.

Поняття «моральне судження» як один з ключових елементів етичного виховання не зазнало істотних змін з часу створення когнітивно-моральної моделі освіти Ж. Піаже та Л. Кольбергом у 1980-х роках. Хоча ця модель піддавалася критиці з точки зору різних підходів, вона продовжує залишатися домінуючою в Кореї. У 2000 році теорія пізнання зазнала революційних змін—від об'єктивістського погляду на теорію до конструктивістської точки зору щодо знання; від модернізму до постмодернізму; і від академізму до прагматизму. Така зміна підважила існуючий пізнавальний підхід в його засадничих позиціях і висунула

вимогу нової моделі етичного виховання. Якщо моральне знання є об'єктивним, модерністським і базується на академізмі, то моральне судження опирається на таке етичне знання, яке наявне в цих формах. Це уподібнюється до використання простої математичної формули. В той же час моральне знання є конструктивістським, постмодерністським і прагматичним, а моральне судження таким бути не може, і в цьому проблема. Це ж саме стосується оцінювання в моральному вихованні. Хоча етичне виховання, що базується на конструктивізмі, було введено в нову навчальну програму, відповідна модель оцінювання не була розроблена. Дане дослідження припускає, що методика Метью Ліпмана «Філософія для дітей» підходить в якості нової моделі оцінювання для морально-етичної освіти. Звичайно, сам Метью Ліпман особисто систематично не розробляв модель оцінювання для морального виховання. Тим не менш, він проклав шлях для нової моделі оцінювання. Ми можемо знайти ці ідеї в його книгах, таких як «Ліза» та «Нус», в текстах про морально-етичне виховання та відповідно в підручниках для викладачів. Ця стаття є розширеним дослідженням спадщини Метью Ліпмана, який пішов від нас у 2011 році, і вшануванням його пам'яті.

Ключові слова: модель оцінювання, моральне/етичне виховання/освіта, конструктивізм, комплексне мислення.

Джин-Ван Парк. Исследование модели оценивания в воспитании морального суждения

Понятие «моральное суждение» как один из ключевых элементов нравственного воспитания не претерпело никакого существенного изменения с момента развития когнитивно-моральной модели образования, разработанной Ж. Пиаже и Л. Кольбергом в 1980-х годах. Хотя эта модель была подвергнута критике во многих отношениях, она по-прежнему остается доминирующей в Корее. В 2000 году теория познания претерпела революционные изменения — от объективистского взгляда на теорию к конструктивистской точке зрения на знания; от модернизма к постмодернизму, и от академизма к прагматизму. Такая трансформация потрясла существующие познавательные подходы в корне и потребовала новой модели нравственного воспитания. Если моральное знание является объективным, модернистским и основано на академизме, то нравственное суждение, которое базируется на нем, вписывается в эти формы. Это подобно простой формуле в математике. Однако, если моральное знание конструктивистское, постмодернистское и прагматичное, то нравственное суждение таким быть не может, и в этом проблема. Это же касается оценивания в моральном образовании. Хотя моральное образование, основанное на конструктивизме, было введено

в новую учебную программу, соответствующая модель оценивания не была разработана. В данном исследовании предлагается методика Мэтью Липмана «Философия для детей» в качестве новой модели оценивания в моральном образовании. Конечно, сам Мэтью Липман систематически не разрабатывал модель оценивания для морального воспитания. Тем не менее он начертал путь для новой модели оценивания. Мы можем найти эти идеи в его книгах «Лиза» и «Нус», текстах по нравственному воспитанию и соответственно в учебных пособиях для учителей. Эта статья является расширенным исследованием наследия Мэтью Липмана, который ушел от нас в 2011 году, и почтением его памяти.

Ключевые слова: модель оценивания, нравственное/моральное образование/воспитание, конструктивизм, комплексное мышление.

Джин-Ван Парк (Південна Корея), доктор філософії, професор Національного університету Гьонсан, Президент МО «Філософія для дітей країн Азії та Океанії», Віце-президент Міжнародної ради з «Філософії для дітей» (2009–2011 рр.), член Міжнародного товариства «Філософська освіта країн Азії та Океанії у розвитку демократії» під егідою ЮНЕСКО. jinwhan2003@yahoo.com

Jin-Whan Park (South Korea), PhD, Professor at Gyeongsang National University, President, Philosophy with Children and Youth Network in Asia and the Pacific (PCYNAP), Vice-President, International Council on the Philosophical Inquiry with Children (ICPIC) (2009–2011). jinwhan2003@yahoo.com