


☐

I'm not robot


reCAPTCHA

I'm not robot!

Normative and descriptive ethics examples

What is descriptive and normative ethics. Difference normative and descriptive ethics. What is an example of normative ethics and descriptive ethics.

Study of people's beliefs about morality Descriptive ethics, also known as comparative ethics, is the study of people's beliefs about morality.[1] It contrasts with prescriptive or normative ethics, which is the study of ethical theories that prescribe how people ought to act, and with meta-ethics, which is the study of what ethical terms and theories actually refer to. The following examples of questions that might be considered in each field illustrate the differences between the fields: Descriptive ethics: What do people think is right? Meta-ethics: What does "right" even mean? Normative (prescriptive) ethics: How should people act? Applied ethics: How do we take moral knowledge and put it into practice? Description Descriptive ethics is a form of empirical research into the attitudes of individuals or groups of people. In other words, this is the division of philosophical or general ethics that involves the observation of the moral decision-making process with the goal of describing the phenomenon. Those working on descriptive ethics aim to uncover people's beliefs about such things as values, which actions are right and wrong, and which characteristics of moral agents are virtuous. Research into descriptive ethics may also investigate people's ethical ideals or what actions societies reward or punish in law or politics. What ought to be noted is that culture is generational and not static. Therefore, a new generation will come with its own set of morals and that qualifies to be their ethics. Descriptive ethics will hence try to oversee whether ethics still holds its place. Because descriptive ethics involves empirical investigation, it is a field that is usually investigated by those working in the fields of evolutionary biology, psychology, sociology or anthropology.

<h1>Metaethics vs Normative Ethics</h1> <p>Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3333333333 www.differencebetween.com</p>		
	<h2>Metaethics</h2> <p>Metaethics is the study of the origin and meaning of ethical concepts</p>	<h2>Normative Ethics</h2> <p>Normative ethics is the study of ethical action, typically focusing on what is morally right and wrong</p>
DEFINITION		
	<h2>FOCUS</h2> <p>Focuses on what is morality</p>	<p>Focuses on what is moral</p>
FIELD	<p>Connected to philosophy as it analyses fundamental ethical concepts</p>	<p>More practical as it applies to basic human behavior</p>

Information that comes from descriptive ethics is, however, also used in philosophical arguments.[2][3] Value theory can be either normative or descriptive but is usually descriptive. Lawrence Kohlberg: An example of descriptive ethics Lawrence Kohlberg is one example of a psychologist working on descriptive ethics. In one study, for example, Kohlberg questioned a group of boys about what would be a right or wrong action for a man facing a moral dilemma (specifically, the Heinz dilemma): should he steal a drug to save his wife, or refrain from theft even though that would lead to his wife's death?[4] Kohlberg's concern was not which choice the boys made, but the moral reasoning that lay behind their decisions. After carrying out a number of related studies, Kohlberg devised a theory about the development of human moral reasoning that was intended to reflect the moral reasoning actually carried out by the participants in his research. Kohlberg's research can be classed as descriptive ethics to the extent that he describes human beings' actual moral development.

- * The development of digital technologies and social media is leading to rapid changes in traditional power dynamics, allowing more of us to share our opinions, publish our ideas and contribute to public debate - with all its ambiguities. We spoke to **PD Dr. Gotting Ullshöfer** about her work in developing an ethics of power for the digital age.

ETHICS OF POWER

Many different conceptions of power have been developed over the course of history, with thinkers throughout the ages exploring the underlying ethical foundations of power. In the development of new digital technologies extending across information and telecommunication, changing communication relationships, Dr. Gotting Ullshöfer is looking again at an ethics of power. "There are essentially two parts to this project. There's a theoretical part, where I discuss the meaning of power and its ethical dimensions from a theological point of view. Power there is seen

as a classical definition of power, for example described in the work of the sociologist Max Weber. But if you look at the work of Michel Foucault, or Hannah Arendt, they also examine other dimensions of power, including the communal side," continues Dr. Ullshöfer. "Part of the project is about looking at which meaning of power is relevant in which context."

The part of theoretical development is an important component in this respect. While the traditional media still play a central role in shaping debate and creating the public sphere, the growth of social media means

and look at issues from more of a theological perspective.

This could then provide a basis for Dr. Ullshöfer to analyse ethical questions about changes in power and their contribution to the literature. In particular, Dr. Ullshöfer aims to contribute to literature of theological ethics and also to the public discourse concerning questions around power, "she outlines.

First of all, I aim to identify the **important ethical questions** around these technological developments and look at **their influence on society**. From there, we can then start to **intensify considerations** of the normative questions.

more in the sense of empowerment, or in service to the state," she says. The second part of the project centres around what Dr. Ullshöfer describes as fields of influence, for example power dynamics in the sharing economy, or in the use of data, or in social media. "I am looking for examples at issues around online influence and the use of data," she says.

Power dynamics

Power dynamics are very much emblematic, says Dr. Ullshöfer because that traditional ethical frameworks and theological concepts are still relevant in examining contemporary power dynamics. With a background in theology and economics, Dr. Ullshöfer draws on established ideas of ethics and justice to develop a new understanding of power. "It's important to look at this from an ethical point of view," she says. Part of the project centres on looking at different definitions of power. "There is

more and more people today have a platform to share their opinions, which has positive as well as negative effects on the creation and use of data in the public sphere, for example with hate speech. "Nevertheless there are more outlets than ever before," acknowledges Dr. Ullshöfer.

With theological change supporting views, Dr. Ullshöfer believes it's important to consider the ethical implications and impact of new technologies on power dynamics, a topic that is central to her work. The different social media by big internet companies and influencers also play an important role. "In research, as well as in individuals like consumers and the phenomenon of 'the influencer', first of all, I am interested in the important ethical questions around these technological developments and look at their influence on society," she outlines. "From there, we can then start to intensify considerations of the normative questions.

ETHICS OF POWER

The project is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and implemented at the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Tübingen University, Germany.

Project Coordinator:
Professur für Geistliche Ethik
Eberhard Karls Universität
Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät
Ludwigsstrasse 12
D-72076 Tübingen
T +49 7141 2721 231
E: gotting.ullshoef@uni-tuebingen.de
W: <http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/w/ethik>

PD Dr. Gotting Ullshöfer is a member of a Heidelberg grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft at Tübingen University, Germany. She holds positions in theology and economics at the Faculty of Protestant Theology in Protestant Theology. She has studied at the Faculty of Protestant Theology in Theology and Protestant Theology, University.

DFG Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
ERHARDT KARLS
UNIVERSITÄT
TÜBINGEN
Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät

www.euresearcher.com

83

In contrast, he had aimed to describe how humans ought to develop morally, his theory would have involved prescriptive ethics. References = "comparative ethics | philosophy | Britannica", www.britannica.com. Retrieved 2025-01-19. ² Greene, Joshua D. (July 2014), "Beyond Point-and-Shoot Morality: Why Cognitive (Neuro)Science Matters for Ethics", *Ethics*, 124 (4): 695–726. doi:10.1086/675875. S2CID 9063016. ³ Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter; Wheatley, Talia; Sugden, Sherwood J. B. (2012). "The Disunity of Morality and Why it Matters to Philosophy". *Monist*. 95 (3): 355–377. doi:10.5840/monist1201295319. ⁴ Kohlberg, Lawrence. (1971). "Stages in Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education." In C.M. Beck, B.S. Crittenden, and E.V. Sullivan, Eds. Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Toronto: Toronto University Press. Further reading Härmäläinen, Nora (2016). Descriptive Ethics: What does Moral Philosophy Know about Morality?. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/978-1-137-58617-9. ISBN 978-1-137-58617-9. Coleman, Stephen Edwin, "DIGITAL PHOTO MANIPULATION: A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF CODES OF ETHICS AND ETHICAL DECISIONS OF PHOTO EDITORS" (2007). Dissertations. 1304. See also Experimental philosophy List of ethics topics Meta-ethics Moral reasoning Moral psychology Retrieved from "The field of ethics is usually broken down into three different ways of thinking about ethics: descriptive, normative and analytic. It isn't unusual for disagreements in debates over ethics to arise because people are approaching the topic from a different one of these three categories. Thus, learning what they are and how to recognize them might save you some grief later. The category of descriptive ethics is the easiest to understand - it simply involves describing how people behave and/or what sorts of moral standards they claim to follow.

Descriptive vs. Normative Ethics

Descriptive ethics:

- Describes people's moral beliefs, claims, behavior, etc.
- Studied primarily by psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc.

Normative ethics:

- Attempts to discover which actions are in fact right or wrong, which things are in fact good or bad, and what it takes to be a good or bad person.
- Studied primarily by philosophy, theology, etc.

Be careful not to confuse the two; ethics as a branch of philosophy deals primarily with normative questions.

Descriptive ethics incorporates research from the fields of anthropology, psychology, sociology and history as part of the process of understanding what people do or have believed about moral norms. The category of normative ethics involves creating or evaluating moral standards. Thus, it is an attempt to figure out what people should do or whether their current moral behavior is reasonable. Traditionally, most of the field of moral philosophy has involved normative ethics - there are few philosophers out there who haven't tried their hand at explaining what they think people should do and why.

Descriptive vs. Normative

- **Remember:**
 - Descriptive theories concern what moral views or practices are **ACTUALLY APPLIED** or **ADOPTED** (i.e., what things people **BELIEVE** to be good, right or virtuous, or what practices they **DO** have).
 - Normative theories concern what moral views or practices are **CORRECT** (i.e., what things are **REALLY** good, right or virtuous).

The category of analytic ethics, also often referred to as metaethics, is perhaps the most difficult of the three to understand. In fact, some philosophers disagree as to whether or not it should be considered an independent pursuit, arguing that it should instead be included under Normative Ethics. Nevertheless, it is discussed independently often enough that it deserves its own discussion here. Here are a couple of examples which should help make the difference between descriptive, normative and analytic ethics even clearer.

NORMATIVE ETHICS

- It deals with *acceptable judgments* regarding what ought to be in choice and value. "We ought to keep our promises" and "you ought to be honorable" are examples of normative judgments— of the *moral ought*, the subject matter of ethics
- From the time of the early Greeks, philosophers have formulated principles of explanation to examine why people act the way they do, and what the principles are by which people ought to live; statements of these principles are called *ethical theories*.

1. Descriptive: Different societies have different moral standards. 2. Normative: This action is wrong in this society, but it is right in another. 3. Analytic: Morality is relative. All of these statements are about ethical relativism, the idea that moral standards different from person to person or from society to society. In descriptive ethics, it is simply observed that different societies have different standards - this is a true and factual statement which offers no judgments or conclusions. In normative ethics, a conclusion is drawn from the observation made above, namely that some action is wrong in one society and is right in another. This is a normative claim because it goes beyond simply describing what is and what is not. In analytic ethics, a conclusion is drawn from the above, namely that the very nature of morality is that it is relative. This position argues that there are no moral standards independent of any social group. It is not that one society's standards are better than another's, but that each society's standards are right for that society. In other words, if a society decides that right is right and whatever it decides is wrong is wrong - there is nothing "above" the group to which we can appeal in order to challenge those standards. 1. Descriptive: People tend to make decisions which bring pleasure or avoid pain. 2. Normative: The moral decision is that which enhances wellbeing and limits suffering. 3. Analytic: Morality is simply a system for helping humans stay happy and alive. All of these statements refer to the moral philosophy commonly known as utilitarianism. The first, from descriptive ethics, simply makes the observation that when it comes to making moral choices, people have a tendency to go with whatever option makes them feel better or, at the very least, they avoid whichever option causes them problems or pain. This observation may or may not be true, but it does not attempt to derive any conclusions as to how people should behave. The second statement, from normative ethics, does attempt to derive a normative conclusion - namely, that the most moral choices are those which tend to enhance our well-being, or at the very least limit our pain and suffering. The third statement, from analytic ethics, draws yet a further conclusion based upon the previous two and is the very nature of morality itself. Instead of arguing, as in the previous example, that morals are all relative, this one makes a claim about the purpose of morals - namely, that moral exist simply to keep us happy and alive.