ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ VOLUME 5 ISSUE 9 | SEPTEMBER 2026

PEDAGOGICAL APPROACHES TO DEVELOPING BIOETHICS COMPETENCE IN PROSPECTIVE EDUCATORS

Aliyev Lazizbek
Department of Clinical Sciences, Andijan Branch of Kokand University

DOI: 10.67620/sai.59b0003

ABSTRACT

Bioethics education is increasingly relevant to teacher preparation because educators encounter questions involving human dignity, health, environmental responsibility, digital privacy, inclusion, and the responsible use of emerging technologies. This conceptual paper examines pedagogical approaches for developing bioethics competence in prospective educators and proposes a coherent model for integrating ethical knowledge with reflective judgment and professional action. Drawing on established bioethics frameworks and research on ethics education, the paper argues that competence cannot be reduced to familiarity with principles or regulations. It requires ethical sensitivity, reasoned deliberation, contextual interpretation, and the capacity to act responsibly in educational settings. Six complementary approaches are examined: interdisciplinary integration, person-centered learning, reflective practice, case- and dilemma-based instruction, experiential learning, and digital ethics education. A three-stage developmental sequence—conceptual orientation, deliberative analysis, and practice-based consolidation—is proposed for teacher-education programs. Assessment should combine knowledge measures with reflective writing, case analysis, observation, and portfolio evidence. Bioethics is most effectively taught as a sustained dimension of professional formation rather than as an isolated theoretical unit.

ACCEPTED

28.09.26

Keywords: *bioethics; teacher education; ethical competence; reflective practice; professional ethics; digital ethics.*

CC BY

Introduction

Teacher education has traditionally addressed professional ethics through codes of conduct, institutional rules, and general discussions of responsibility. That foundation remains necessary, but it is no longer sufficient. Prospective educators now work within environments in which questions about health, disability, environmental risk, personal data, artificial intelligence, research participation, and the boundaries of professional authority frequently overlap. These issues are bioethical because they concern the value of life, human dignity, vulnerability, benefit and harm, autonomy, justice, and responsibility toward other people and the living environment. UNESCO's Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights places these concerns within a human-rights framework and emphasizes dignity, equality, non-discrimination, social responsibility, protection of vulnerable persons, and respect for cultural diversity (UNESCO, 2005). Although the declaration was not written specifically for teacher education, its principles provide a defensible normative basis for considering bioethics within professional preparation.

The educational problem is not simply whether prospective teachers know ethical terminology. A student may reproduce definitions of autonomy, justice, privacy, or responsibility and still struggle to recognize an ethically significant situation in practice. Ethical competence involves noticing the moral dimensions of a situation, identifying relevant stakeholders and obligations, examining competing reasons, reaching a defensible judgment, and translating that judgment into action. Rest's (1986) account of moral functioning is useful here because it distinguishes moral sensitivity and judgment from motivation and implementation. In professional education, these dimensions are interdependent: knowledge without practical judgment can remain inert, whereas action without conceptual grounding can become inconsistent or merely intuitive.

This paper develops a pedagogical account of bioethics competence for prospective educators. It revises the earlier emphasis on isolated techniques by treating competence as a developmental outcome of curriculum design, reflective learning, structured deliberation, supervised practice, and ethically responsible participation in digital environments. Evidence from ethics education in health professions is used cautiously because teacher education differs in professional mandate and context. Nevertheless, systematic reviews show that ethics learning benefits from active, contextualized, and mixed pedagogies rather than exclusive reliance on lectures (Andersson et al., 2022; D'Souza et al., 2020; González-Blázquez et al., 2024). The central argument is that teacher-education programs should integrate bioethics across disciplinary content and professional practice, while assessment should examine how students reason and act, not only what they recall.

Conceptualizing Bioethics Competence in Teacher Education

Bioethics competence can be defined as the integrated capacity to recognize ethically salient features of issues involving life, health, human dignity, technology, and the environment; to interpret those issues through relevant ethical principles and contextual knowledge; to deliberate about competing values; and to choose and justify responsible professional action. This definition deliberately combines cognition, reflection, disposition, and behavior. It also avoids treating bioethics as a list of predetermined answers. The UNESCO Bioethics Core Curriculum was designed around principles that can be discussed across different cultural settings, and its educational model gives considerable attention to case analysis and reasoned application rather than memorization alone (UNESCO, 2008, 2011). For prospective educators, this orientation is particularly appropriate because classroom decisions are relational and context-dependent.

A teacher-education interpretation of bioethics should also be broader than clinical ethics. Questions of benefit and harm arise when schools address health information, psychological well-being, safety, or disability. Respect for autonomy appears in age-appropriate participation, informed communication, and recognition of learners as persons rather than passive recipients of instruction. Justice is relevant to access, accommodation, resource allocation, and discriminatory practices. Environmental responsibility becomes concrete through school practices concerning sanitation, resource use, ecological projects, and education for sustainable living. Digital systems add questions about surveillance, data collection, automated decision support, authorship, intellectual agency, and unequal access. UNESCO's AI competency framework for teachers accordingly includes an explicit ethics dimension and places human agency, rights, and sustainability within teachers' professional competence (Miao & Cukurova, 2024).

Competence develops when socially articulated norms become part of the learner's own professional reasoning. This process should not be understood as uncritical internalization. Professional formation requires students to examine why a norm deserves authority, how it applies under conflicting conditions, and what limitations accompany it. Reflective professional judgment is therefore central. Schön (1983) described professional practice as involving reflection in and on action when practitioners confront

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

situations that cannot be solved through technical rules alone. In bioethics education, reflection creates a bridge between general principles and the particularities of an educational case.

Pedagogical Approaches

Interdisciplinary integration is the first requirement. Bioethical questions rarely belong to one subject area. A discussion of genetic information, for example, may require biological literacy, knowledge of privacy, an understanding of family and cultural contexts, and pedagogical judgment about age-appropriate communication. Environmental health may combine ecology, public health, civic responsibility, and school management. Digital ethics can involve information technology, law, psychology, and pedagogy. Consequently, bioethics should appear in several components of a teacher-education curriculum rather than being confined to a single lecture. Integration is strongest when the same ethical concepts recur in progressively more complex contexts, allowing students to see how a principle changes in practical meaning without losing its normative core.

A person-centered approach complements interdisciplinary work by recognizing that ethical learning engages the learner's prior commitments, experiences, and cultural assumptions. Ethical discussion becomes superficial when students are expected to repeat an instructor's conclusion. In contrast, a well-facilitated seminar requires students to state reasons, listen to competing interpretations, distinguish personal preference from professional obligation, and revise a position when warranted. Respect for cultural diversity is important, but it does not imply that every practice is ethically equivalent. UNESCO (2005) explicitly combines respect for cultural diversity with the protection of human dignity and fundamental freedoms. Teacher educators can use this tension productively by asking students to identify both culturally situated considerations and ethical limits.

Reflective practice provides a third approach. Structured reflection should be more demanding than a personal reaction such as "I agree" or "I felt uncomfortable." Students can be asked to reconstruct a situation, identify ethically relevant facts, separate observation from assumption, name affected parties, examine their own position of authority, and justify an alternative course of action. Reflective journals, brief analytic memos, and post-practicum conferences are useful when prompts require evidence and reasoning. Research in ethics education indicates that reflection is frequently used in assessment, although the quality and standardization of such assessment remain uneven (D'Souza et al., 2020). Rubrics should therefore specify criteria such as problem recognition, use of ethical concepts, consideration of perspectives, justification, and feasible action.

Case- and dilemma-based instruction is especially suitable for moving from abstract knowledge to deliberation. Cases should be realistic enough to contain uncertainty and competing obligations, yet sufficiently focused for disciplined analysis. A case might involve disclosure of a student's health information, pressure to exclude a learner with special needs from an activity, the use of facial recognition for attendance, or conflicting demands during an environmental health incident. Case-based seminars encourage students to define the moral problem rather than merely identify a rule, and they can reveal which aspects of a situation students initially overlook (Donaldson et al., 2010). Reviews of ethics education likewise identify case discussion among the most common active strategies (D'Souza et al., 2020). The instructor's task is not to manufacture controversy but to require explicit reasoning and attention to consequences, rights, duties, relationships, and institutional constraints.

Experiential learning extends this work into professional practice. Pedagogical placements, school-based projects, health-promotion activities, environmental initiatives, and supervised observation allow students to test ethical reasoning against institutional realities. The original manuscript's emphasis on sanitation, environmental assessment, and practical projects is retained here when these activities are connected explicitly to bioethical aims. A tree-planting project, for instance, is not bioethics education merely because it concerns nature; its ethical significance becomes educationally visible when students consider stewardship, collective responsibility, distribution of benefits, safety, and the relationship between

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

environmental conditions and human well-being. Similarly, observing experienced teachers becomes ethically instructive when students analyze decisions rather than simply imitate routines.

Collaborative learning can strengthen deliberation because ethical decisions in schools are rarely made in complete isolation. Team-based discussion requires students to articulate reasons publicly, respond to objections, and negotiate a shared recommendation. Recent systematic evidence from medical ethics education reports positive effects of team-based learning on engagement, ethical reasoning, moral sensitivity, and application, while also noting resource and assessment challenges (Alizadeh et al., 2025). These findings cannot be transferred mechanically to teacher education, but they support the broader proposition that structured peer deliberation can make ethical reasoning visible and open to critique. Small-group work is most productive when individual preparation precedes discussion and when the final group position includes a written rationale.

Digital ethics now requires explicit curricular attention. Prospective educators need to understand that convenience does not settle whether a technology should be used. Questions should include what data are collected, who can access them, how long they are retained, whether meaningful consent is possible, what biases may be embedded in automated systems, and whether technology weakens human judgment or learner agency. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence calls for AI ethics curricula and attention to privacy, human rights, inclusion, and responsible data use (UNESCO, 2021). The AI Competency Framework for Teachers further treats ethical use as a core professional dimension rather than an optional technical topic (Miao & Cukurova, 2024). Bioethics education can connect these digital concerns to established principles of dignity, autonomy, justice, non-maleficence, and responsibility.

A Developmental Model for Professional Preparation

A coherent program can organize bioethics competence across three developmental stages. The first, conceptual orientation, establishes vocabulary, normative frameworks, and basic legal-professional distinctions. Students examine concepts such as dignity, autonomy, benefit and harm, justice, vulnerability, privacy, responsibility, and environmental stewardship. At this stage, teaching should correct the misconception that ethics is reducible either to personal opinion or to compliance with law. Short cases can be used diagnostically, but the main objective is conceptual precision and recognition of ethical relevance.

The second stage, deliberative analysis, places students in situations where principles conflict or where relevant facts are incomplete. Learners compare options, identify assumptions, seek missing information, and justify a recommendation. The instructor can gradually reduce scaffolding: early cases may include guiding questions, whereas later cases may require students to formulate the ethical problem independently. Ethical competence is not demonstrated by reaching the instructor's preferred conclusion but by producing a coherent judgment that addresses relevant evidence, principles, stakeholders, foreseeable consequences, and professional responsibilities. Systematic reviews of ethics education suggest that programs use varied combinations of lectures, discussion, simulation, and other active methods, with no single method established as universally superior (Andersson et al., 2022; Moreira et al., 2021). A mixed design is therefore more defensible than reliance on one technique.

The third stage, practice-based consolidation, requires students to use ethical reasoning during field experience and then subject that reasoning to review. A practicum portfolio can include an anonymized ethical incident analysis, a reflective commentary on a professional decision, evidence from a school-based project, and a revised analysis produced after supervisory feedback. The purpose is not to collect private information about pupils but to demonstrate professional reasoning while protecting confidentiality. Students should also identify when an issue exceeds their authority and requires referral, consultation, or institutional action. Such boundary recognition is itself an ethical competence because responsible practice includes knowing when not to act independently.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

The proposed developmental sequence and its corresponding evidence of competence are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Developmental Framework for Bioethics Competence in Prospective Educators

Stage	Primary learning focus	Illustrative learning activities	Evidence of competence
Conceptual orientation	Ethical concepts, normative frameworks, and recognition of ethically significant issues	Focused readings, mini-lectures, concept mapping, and short diagnostic cases	Accurate use of concepts and identification of relevant ethical considerations
Deliberative analysis	Reasoned judgment when values, principles, or stakeholder interests conflict	Case analysis, structured discussion, ethical dilemmas, and collaborative deliberation	A justified decision addressing evidence, stakeholders, alternatives, and professional responsibilities
Practice-based consolidation	Transfer of ethical reasoning to supervised professional contexts	Practicum reflection, anonymized incident analysis, school-based projects, and portfolio revision	Context-sensitive action, protection of confidentiality, reflective justification, and recognition of professional boundaries

Note. The framework synthesizes the three developmental stages proposed in this paper. Activities and evidence are illustrative and should be adapted to institutional and practicum contexts.

Assessment and Quality Assurance

Assessment must correspond to the multidimensional nature of the construct. A written test can examine conceptual knowledge but cannot establish that a student will recognize or manage an ethical problem in practice. Conversely, a reflective essay may show thoughtful engagement while leaving factual misconceptions undetected. A balanced assessment system can therefore combine selected-response or short-answer items, structured case analyses, oral or team deliberation, reflective writing, and supervised practice evidence. González-Blázquez et al. (2024), reviewing bioethical knowledge among students and health professionals, found that targeted bioethics education generally improved knowledge, attitudes, and ethical values but also emphasized the difficulty of rigorous assessment. Earlier reviews similarly report substantial heterogeneity in teaching and evaluation (D'Souza et al., 2020; Moreira et al., 2021).

For teacher education, assessment criteria should be transparent and behaviorally interpretable. A case-analysis rubric might evaluate recognition of the ethical issue, accuracy of relevant concepts, use of contextual evidence, attention to affected persons, consideration of alternatives, justification of the proposed action, and awareness of implementation constraints. Reflective tasks should distinguish description from analysis. Field-based assessment should avoid claims about a student's character and instead document observable professional conduct and the quality of reasoning presented in supervision. Reliability can be improved through shared rubrics, assessor calibration, and the use of more than one task rather than a single high-stakes judgment.

Program-level evaluation should examine whether ethical learning is distributed coherently across the curriculum. Mapping can identify where each competence is introduced, practiced, assessed, and revisited. It can also reveal gaps—for example, a program that teaches environmental responsibility but never assesses it, or one that discusses digital privacy without addressing AI-mediated decision making. Quality assurance should include student feedback, but satisfaction alone is not evidence of competence. Stronger evidence comes from performance on structured tasks, improvement across stages, and the capacity to transfer reasoning to unfamiliar cases. Current reviews continue to call for more rigorous designs and longer-term evaluation of ethics education outcomes (Alizadeh et al., 2025; Andersson et al., 2022; Yin et al., 2026).

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Implications for Teacher-Education Institutions

Institutional implementation requires more than adding a course title. Faculty members need a shared understanding of the competencies being developed and sufficient preparation to facilitate disagreement without turning discussion into either moral relativism or doctrinal instruction. UNESCO's Ethics Education Programme emphasizes teacher training, locally responsive materials, and pedagogical methods for ethics education (UNESCO, 2026). A teacher-education institution can adapt this principle by developing a common case bank drawn from educational contexts, agreeing on core analytic questions, and using moderation sessions to improve consistency across instructors.

Local relevance is essential. In Uzbekistan, cases should be intelligible within the legal, cultural, ecological, and institutional conditions that prospective teachers are likely to encounter. Local adaptation, however, should be accompanied by accurate sourcing and a clear distinction between national regulation, institutional policy, professional norms, and broader ethical principles. The earlier manuscript sometimes moved from ecological or hygienic activities directly to claims about bioethics competence without explaining the ethical link. The revised framework resolves that inconsistency by requiring every practical activity to include an explicit ethical question, a reasoned decision, and reflection on responsibility. This makes the learning outcome assessable rather than assumed.

A final institutional consideration concerns the hidden curriculum. Students learn professional ethics not only from formal content but also from how faculty handle confidentiality, disagreement, assessment, authorship, inclusion, and power. A program that teaches respect for dignity while tolerating humiliating classroom practices sends contradictory messages. Bioethics competence therefore depends partly on institutional modeling. Faculty conduct, supervisory relationships, and assessment procedures should embody the same standards that students are expected to apply in schools.

Conclusion

Bioethics competence in prospective educators should be treated as a form of professional judgment that joins ethical knowledge to sensitivity, deliberation, and responsible action. Its scope includes familiar concerns about dignity, benefit and harm, justice, vulnerability, and responsibility, while extending to environmental conditions and the ethical use of digital technologies. The pedagogical consequence is clear: a stand-alone theoretical lecture cannot carry the full task. Students need repeated opportunities to interpret cases, examine assumptions, deliberate with peers, reflect on practice, and receive feedback on the quality of their reasoning.

A three-stage sequence of conceptual orientation, deliberative analysis, and practice-based consolidation offers a workable structure for teacher-education programs. Interdisciplinary integration, person-centered dialogue, reflective practice, case analysis, experiential learning, collaborative deliberation, and digital ethics are complementary rather than competing approaches. Assessment should likewise be plural, combining knowledge with evidence of reasoning and professional conduct. When these elements are aligned, bioethics becomes part of professional formation rather than an abstract addition to the curriculum. The aim is not to produce uniform answers to every ethical problem, but to prepare educators who can recognize ethically significant situations, justify decisions with intellectual discipline, respect the persons affected by those decisions, and act within the responsibilities of their profession.

REFERENCES

1. Alizadeh, M., Bahrami, S., Saeedi, Z., & Khaninezhad, L. (2025). Outcomes of team based learning in teaching medical ethics: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Ethics, 26*, Article 184. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-025-01329-8
2. Andersson, H., Svensson, A., Frank, C., Rantala, A., Holmberg, M., & Bremer, A. (2022). Ethics education to support ethical competence learning in healthcare: An integrative systematic review. *BMC Medical Ethics, 23*, Article 29. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-022-00766-z

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

3. D'Souza, R. F., Mathew, M., D'Souza, D. S., Palatty, P. L., & Lobo, M. R. (2020). Diversity in approach to teaching and assessing ethics education for medical undergraduates: A scoping review. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery, 56*, 178–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.06.028
4. Donaldson, T. M., Fistein, E., & Dunn, M. (2010). Case-based seminars in medical ethics education: How medical students define and discuss moral problems. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 36*(12), 816–820. https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.036574
5. González-Blázquez, F. J., Ruiz-Hontangas, A., & López-Mora, C. (2024). Bioethical knowledge in students and health professionals: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Medicine, 11*, 1252386. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2024.1252386
6. Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. UNESCO.
7. Moreira, F., Teixeira, P., & Leão, C. (2021). Effectiveness of medical ethics education: A systematic review. *MedEdPublish, 10*, 175. https://doi.org/10.15694/mep.2021.000175.1
8. Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. Praeger.
9. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
10. UNESCO. (2005). *Universal declaration on bioethics and human rights*. UNESCO.
11. UNESCO. (2008). *Bioethics core curriculum: Section 1: Syllabus*. UNESCO.
12. UNESCO. (2011). *Bioethics core curriculum: Section 2: Study materials*. UNESCO.
13. UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO.
14. UNESCO. (2026). *Ethics education programme*. UNESCO.
15. Yin, X., Wei, W., & Zheng, Y. (2026). The emerging trends of healthcare professions' ethics education in recent 10 years: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Medicine, 13*, 1748761. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2026.1748761