CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION
1.1 Present Scenario of the Country:

Education constitutes the backbone of the life of a nation. It is the most important single factor in the achievement of rapid economic development and technological progress as also in creating a social order based on the values of freedom, social justice and equal opportunity. It is very much essential for the refinement of the cultural life of a society. So long as the educational system of civilization is sound and comprehensive, it is alive. Otherwise, it would fall to pieces in no time.

One of the most significant bottlenecks of modern Indian education is the absence of any clear objectives and programmes promoting value education in it. Our educational system does not consistently foster an attitude of reverence. The growing indiscipline, the lack of human consideration are the result of weakening of social and moral values in the younger generation and this is a matter of grave concern for any right thinking man. The need of the value component in the educational system has never been felt so much as today. Our contemporary social scene may truly be described as a period of value crisis. When we look around today, we see the continuing process of spiritual degeneration and moral degradation of human society all over the world. The present day social scenario
in India reflects corruption, hypocrisy, exploitation, dishonesty and inhuman attitude all around which is indicative of the fact that we are in the midst of the worst value crisis. This loss of human values is leading to a general discontentment and frustration for all those who have a concern for education of the child. As violence reigns supreme in all walks of life, everyone is feeling insecure (Chilana, 93). As a result, we have today a problem of survival, not only economic but social as well. The fabric of society is being threatened by violence, greed, theft, bank robbery, drug addiction, pollution and so on. One of the main causes for such a situation to have occurred is our inefficient and superstitious way of rearing the child. We allow either permissiveness to the child or use harsh punitive ways, both of which have been shown counter-productive in relations to rearing (Dagar, 1993).

Non-violence which made India win freedom from the foreign rule, appears to be a forgotten concept. The caste system still dominates leading to inequalities and social hierarchy. Galloping corruption in all walks of life has taken away from us the spiritual heaven that India was once considered throughout the world. Money power has taken over the moral power. In fact, most of the people today are infatuated towards material gain than towards what is spiritual.
As a consequence, we find our youth bewildered, aimless and frustrated. If this situation is left uncared for or ignored, it may create a serious threat to the very foundations of our society and will ultimately make us completely rootless. It appears that in the hierarchy of our traditional values—Kama, Artha, Dharma and Moksha, we have become fixated at the first two only and the other subtler and higher values seem to have been completely forgotten. The material (Artha) has blinded us and eclipsed from our vision both the moral and spiritual aspects of our value system (Dharma and Moksha) in the modern times. The reasons for this are not far to seek. The power that we misuse for our personal gains results in authoritarianism causing injustice to others. The power first corrupts those who wield it and then gradually debases the innocent and hapless. A vicious circle starts operating and, if not broken, it will lead to our complete decadence and ultimate doom, as a nation. Responsibility to appreciate and to remedy this malaise lies on our institutions of learning in general and the universities in particular which have the most vital role to play in the process of nation building. The teacher at every level is both the lynchpin as also the man behind the machine. His role in building or destroying a nation is by far the most crucial and the Government and
the society must understand this. The teacher represents the conscience of a nation. He is the ideologue for the overwhelmingly illiterate population of our country, and is, therefore, successful in creating a public opinion for or against a particular issue, irrespective of the fact whether it is good or bad for the country. It is through examples rather than percepts that the teachers can help students imbibe human values. But to initiate students in rational human values, the teacher will have to adopt a definite non-doctrinaire approach in teaching. The student must understand why a particular action and behaviour is good. It is not the content of moral education but rather its form that should guide our behaviour.

This has compelled many countries of the world including India, to reconsider their educational policies and give due place to the moral, social and spiritual values in their educational system. It is a matter of great satisfaction to find that several experiments are being conducted in the country to promote the programme of value orientation of education. These experiments are undertaken at state level as well as by some individual organisation.

The most significant among these are the experiments undertaken in Sri Satya Sai Institute, Prasanthi Nilayam, Rishi valley School of J.Krishnamurti, Banasthali Vidyapith,
Sri Satya Sai Institute of Higher Learning accords high priority to the Programme of value education. The programme of value education in the institute emerges from the fundamental Sai Philosophy of Education which is known as 'INTEGRAL EDUCATION'. The major role of the system is transformation of both the individual and the society. The content of the programme has a framework of five basic values of Truth, Righteous Conduct, peace, love and Non-violence. Named as 'Education for Human Values', the programme focusses on harmonious development of an individual at cognitive, conative and affective levels. Each value is further divided into sub-values, so that a teacher may have the facility to implement the programme. Teachers in the Institute follow three methods of teaching i.e. direct instructions, indirect teaching and mixed techniques of both. The maximum impact is seen in the personal example of the teachers. The methods followed by the teachers include telling of stories, role play, dramas, skits, silent sitting and organisation of activities relating to goodwill for religions. The institute attaches
great importance to the professional development of teachers in this regard. They have also prepared manuals for teachers as well as guide books including lesson plans so that teachers have the facility to implement the programme. The Institute organises summer course which is attended by faculty members and students. A course on awareness is another significant feature of their programme. The training of teacher at B.Ed. aims at preparation of teachers for teaching moral education through all subjects.

J.Krishnamurti at Rishi Valley emphasized experimental approach to value education. Though values are not mentioned directly in the curriculum, the school stresses on values like knowing the self, pursuing the Truth, and Understanding of the Society'. The school emphasizes on the development of a student as a 'First Hand Person' so as to lead him to search for values like Truth, Peace, Good Conduct, Love and Non-violence. The learning modes in the school include open discussions and dialogues. There is multi-media learning material and opportunities are provided for practising silence and meditation.

Dayalbagh Educational Institute at Agra aims at evolving a 'Complete Man' through its programmes of work-based training and core-courses consisting of Indian culture, comparative study of religions, study and
scientific methodology, general knowledge and current affairs and understanding of rural areas with a view to foster a fuller understanding of life in the villages. Co-curricular activities of the Institute also contribute to development of value education through culture and literal activities, games and sports, social service and programmes of individual development for students. It is planned to bring about physical, intellectual, emotional and ethical integration of an individual with a view to evolving a complete man who possesses the basic values of humanism, secularism and democracy.

Banasthali Vidyapith stresses on 'Panchmukhi Shiksha' which aims at balanced development of five aspects of an individual viz. physical, intellectual, moral, aesthetic and practical. Emphasis in this Vidyapith is on the ethos of peace, mutual love and development of such values which lead to the realisation of the spirit of simple living and high thinking. The authorities in the Vidyapith feel that value orientation is affected by four factors, namely, one's Sanskaras, family ethos, social ethos and ethos of educational institution. The Indian view of life is given due importance in the Vidyapith.
Ramakrishna Institute of Moral and Spiritual Education (RIMSE) is exclusively devoted to the mission of value education. It organises many types of activities such as ten months course for B.Ed., in-service education for teachers of value education, training of the youth through 'Retreats', national integration camps, extension activities and organisation of national seminars on value education. The Institute also undertakes research and development activities in the field of moral and spiritual education.

Jain Vishvabharti, Ladnun (Raj.), has developed value oriented educational programme through 'Jeevan Vigyan' (Science of Living). This programme is an integral part of education at all levels i.e. primary, secondary, college and university. Main objectives of the programme are moulding healthy individual with balanced physical, intellectual, mental and emotional development and building of a new society which is free from violence, exploitation and immorality. The core content of the programme includes development of the innate powers of self-control to overcome the psychological distortions like cruelty and retaliation, to subdue tendencies like fear, hatred, jealousy and to develop positive attitudes and personality factors essential for high character and morality such as to develop 'Viveka' (Reasoning) and 'Prajna' (Wisdom). The curricula of
the Science of Living comprises of various branches of learning drawn from both the modern sciences and ancient spiritual sciences.

The work of the Brahmkumari's World University includes imparting of education in human, moral, social and spiritual values to all age groups. The institution believes that all personal, interpersonal, national or international problems and sufferings have their origin in the absence of moral, social or spiritual values. Children come to their various educational centres for consciousness training. They want the parents to realise the importance of "Sanskaras" which may lead to positive thinking in development of love and fellow feeling. They stress on development of higher, nobler and inspiring goals for every individual. They stress on development of values like cleanliness, and purity, humility, honesty, integrity, calmness, cheerfulness, fearlessness and quality of thought and judgement.

The Government of India is committed to the task of value orientation of education. It is now for the key institutions at state and national levels to prepare a realistic programme of action. The implementation would, of course, require cooperative efforts of teachers, teacher
educators, educational administrators and planners as well as mass media and other social agencies.

1.2 Need and Importance of Moral Education:

"They should be brought to know and love God and to practise in the school community the virtues appropriate to their age and environment." These words from the Plowden Report on primary education (1966) not only highlight the importance of moral education, but also illustrate very effectively the confusion that surrounds a good deal of thinking about moral and religious education and especially about the relationship between them.

Any discussion of the theory and practice of moral education must begin, then, by attempting to define in some detail what is meant by moral education and what are its fundamental principles. In order to do this, we must first endeavour to discover what kind of relationship exists between moral education and religious education and indeed, whether there is or should be any such relationship.

Most people often think that moral development of man is inseparably connected with his religious development. According to them, morality emanates from religion. But some critical examination of the concept of morality would indicate that the two are not necessarily related. If there
is any such relation it is not necessary but only contingent. There are certain misconceptions about the relationship of these two concepts which need to be made clear before one can attempt worthwhile perusal of moral behaviour and its development in children.

1.3 Misconception about relationship between Morality and Religion:

The first misconception of morality occurs as a result of relating morality with religion. There has been often a tendency to settle any issue concerning moral behaviour or to restore any moral dilemma by taking final verdict from religious Gurus. Often people consider religious scriptures like Vedas, Quran or the preaching of Jainism or Buddhism etc, as the final authority. But the question to be considered is whether it is proper to consider morality deriving its sustenance from religion or can it be considered independent of it (Dagar, 93).

To attempt a distinction between moral education and religious education, we must say to ourselves that it is possible to live without a religion but it is unthinkable to live without any set of moral values to guide our behaviour or our human choice. Such an idea casts greatest doubt on the validity of any linking of morality with religion.
Secondly, a moral education derived from or linked with religion must essentially be authoritarian whereas education in its true meaning is anti-authoritarian. Education enables us to be autonomous, to think on our own and to make independent choices. That is, to be educated, any person must accept a particular code of conduct not because it is recommended by some God-head but because it is good in itself. For example: If, I believe on other grounds that I should treat my neighbour as myself, then my code of morality is not a religious one. If I believe this because God or Jesus Christ demands it of me, then I am tacitly accepting that the only reason for acting in that way is that it is required of me by an authority whose right to make such demands I recognize. Any morality that is based on religion therefore, is essentially authoritarian (Downey and Kelly, 82).

Again, linking of morality with religion is unacceptable on another ground, too. It is unacceptable because it denies to the individual, the right to choose the principle of morality and behaviour according to his own thinking. Such a proposition is unacceptable also because it puts a dead end to any evolution or growth of moral knowledge or understanding. Nobody then can think that moral "knowledge" like all other knowledge will develop &
change. But it is tacitly accepted that our moral understanding must be such as to enable us to adjust to changing social circumstances, to meet new moral problems, and to modify our principles to deal with them. Such a situation is inconceivable with a morality that is based on authority. For example, today there is a common social problem of birth control about which religion is ambivalent. This is a moral problem, the solution for which is based on man's thinking. Otherwise, the problem of over population will devour us all. If population is allowed to increase as it does we shall be deprived of even the basic needs required for mere existence. In such a situation, no religion, no morality worth the name will stand and man may be compelled even to commit the heinous crimes in order to save his life.

So we have to leave such questions to the decision of the individual. This is to imply that religion can provide no firm basis for moral decision and so proper morality has to be seen as independent of religion. If there is any connection, it is not that morality is dependent on moral beliefs, rather, it is much more likely that man's religious beliefs are a result of moral awareness. As Kant said, "Belief in God is grounded' in the moral consciousness, rather than the moral law or belief in God". So we can examine every question of morality independent of the religion on grounds that make it universally acceptable.
Two further points must be made about this trend in the teaching of religion in schools which are of crucial importance for moral education. Firstly, it is a trend which reflects a distinction that has come to be made by some theorists, theologians and educationists alike within religious knowledge. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that all religious utterances are not of the same kind and are not, as a result subject to the same kind of verification procedures. In other words, what we call religious knowledge is a body of assertions of several different logical types. We need for example, quite different methods for testing the truth of such diverse kinds of assertion as "Moses led the Israelites out of bondage in Egypt," "Jesus Christ is the Son of God", "God is love" and "Goodness is treating one's neighbour as oneself". A broad distinction can be drawn therefore between what might be called "historical or 'factual assertions, a category which would include statements concerning the history, the social significance and the ritual of a religion and those that have been called the 'parahistorical' a category which includes the doctrinal, the mythological and the ethical.

Because of the dangers inherent in the rejection of religious beliefs, therefore, and in the adoption of an authoritarian morality, we in recent times consider moral
education independently of the teachings of religion. This is one of the reasons for the growing interest in moral education.

1.4 The value of Moral Education - in traditional theory and practice:

From earliest times in educational theory and practice moral education has been seen as the very core of the education process, and moral upbringing has been regarded, almost without question, as the central feature of education itself. The truth of this is immediately apparent from an examination of the work of any or all of the great theorists and practitioners of education. R.S. Peters, for example, while defining education asserts that education is an initiation something worthwhile. But no knowledge, skill or understanding will serve any purpose for increasing the quality of human life if they are devoid of worthwhileness of these. And further the worthwhileness of these is determined only by the value content. So education devoid of value content is no education at all.

All of the great theorists throughout the centuries have been quite explicit on this point. For Socrates virtue was knowledge of the good and, in Plato's elaborate development of this theme, the role of education, its whole point and purpose, was to help people, those at least who
were blessed with the necessary intellectual capacity for it to acquire the kind of knowledge that would of itself bring virtue in its train and lead to the attainment of that wisdom that comes from knowledge of the good. All other forms of intellectual activity were regarded as means to that end. The coping stone of all knowledge, for Plato, that which bound all knowledge together into one unified whole, was knowledge of the supreme, "Form" of "beauty, truth and goodness". Not only therefore, was morality seen as the central feature of education, "goodness" also was regarded as the focal point of all human knowledge.

For the Roman Quintilian, too, the development of virtue was the core of educational practice. Quintilian's concern was with education in rhetoric, the education of the orator, a concern which reflects not only the more practical approach that he himself takes in discussions of education but also the major difference in "the national genius of the two peoples, Greek and Roman" (Rusk, 1957). Nevertheless, the primary aim of this training in rhetoric is the production of the good man rather than merely the good politician or lawyer. In this way Quintilian attempts to give an educational rather than a purely vocational dimension to the training in rhetoric by introducing into it as a central
core notion of moral upbringing.

The Judaeic tradition likewise stresses as the focal point of education an upbringing according to the law enshrined in the Torah and a commitment to living according to its demands. Christianity, as a fusion of these two traditions, similarly regarded character training as the central task of education and even condoned practices as far from moral in themselves if they appeared to be conducive to the establishment of a proper sense of moral rectitude in children. As a result most of the great educational theorists have seen moral education in one form or another as the hub of any activity that was to merit description as educational. Indeed, the term "Humanities" indicates by its derivation that relations between man and man were seen as the central or even the only, concern of education in the full sense. Moral upbringing, or character training therefore, was for long the central feature of what education itself was understood to be by the great theorists and, indeed, by the great practitioners (Downey and Kelly, 1982).

Thus Comenius tells us that the curriculum should include "all those subjects which are able to make a man wise, virtuous and pious. Locke claims, "It is a virtue,
then, direct virtue, which is the hard and valuable part to be aimed at in education." This is echoed in Rousseau's assertion "Life is the trade I would teach him", and taken up by Pestalozzi with his claim that the ultimate goal of education is preparation for life, by Herbert who tells us that "the one and the whole work of education may be summed up in the concept-morality" and by Froebel's recommendation that the main purpose of education should be to bring out and develop to the full the innate goodness of the child.

It was probably with the development of education for all and the concomitant introduction of a vocational component into the curriculum that moral education lost in part this central role. There was, of course, an element of "Gentling" of the masses in the early thinking about education for all, some kind of training for everyone in obedience and good behaviour, but much stronger was the need to provide every member of society with the basic skills that a developing industrial community needed and to trap as efficiently as possible the human wealth of the nation. Most practical decisions in education as elsewhere are made on economic grounds. Thus schooling came to be seen rather less as the education of the cultured gentleman and rather more as a national investment. New subjects came to
be added to the curriculum whose prime justification was social or vocational, rather than based on their contribution to moral development so that moral education or character training lost its central place and was no longer seen as the focus of the schools activities. Within the curriculum, it came to be regarded as the concern almost solely of lessons in religion.

1.5 The Value of Moral Education in Current Theory and Practice:

Recent years, however, have witnessed a revival of interest in moral education as such, as evidenced by the establishment of several curriculum projects in this area and by the appearance of moral education as a subject on the timetable of many secondary schools. There would seem to be several reasons for this. One must see the decline in religious beliefs or at least in allegiance to institutional religion that has characterised the development of many societies in recent times. If morality is too closely linked to religion, then, as we have seen, a growing tendency to reject religion will raise difficult moral questions and may even suggest prima facie a rejection of morality. Hence, faced by an increasing reluctance on the part of many pupils to accept what religious education has offered them, especially in the way of moral teaching,
schools have been forced to consider other ways in which their responsibility for the moral education of their pupils might be fulfilled. A good example of this process has been the increased secularization of the compulsory daily "act of worship" in many schools at all levels in the country e.g. the singing of national anthem after the worship song.

An equally cogent factor, however, has been the change that has taken place in our view of morality itself. The ideas of the theorists are based on a theory of morality that few today would regard as tenable. That theory is one that sees moral percepts as objectively valid and as a result, regards it as sensible to speak of moral knowledge or knowledge of "the good" and to talk about "right behaviour". It results, therefore, in a view of moral education as a kind of character training and such a view is only tenable if one accepts the theory of morality as its base - fixed and objective. It is a view, therefore, which leads to the notion that the morally educated person is one who has come to recognize the truth of certain particular moral values and to act on them and that the purpose of moral education is to instil these values in pupils, to bring them to a knowledge of them.
The conflict between the traditional view of education as essentially concerned with moral upbringing and the change that has taken place in our attitude to morality itself is clearly reflected in the work of John Dewey which must be seen both as a culmination of the ideas that were first preferred by Rousseau and then developed by other theorists in the 19th century and at the same time within a new intellectual setting, characterized by such major intellectual advances as theories of evolution and "revolution" in philosophy. For Dewey the central concern of education is still life or living itself, so that its main purpose is still to provide man with control over all aspects of his environment. But now the environment is seen as a changing one and the prime need is to produce people who can adopt to and control these changes, this they will do by learning to make decisions not in the light of some notion of fixed values and unchanging moral standard points but from the point of view of moral positions, that must be seen as themselves subject to the same process of continuous change and evolution.

Herein lies the major clue as to the changes that have taken place in our view of education and especially of the role of moral education within it. The traditional
theory of morality as fixed and unchanging which formed the basis of so many educational theories is no longer adequate. There have been several other contributory factors and since they all combine to offer further perspectives on our main question of what is moral education.

The first of these is the fact of social change. Society in every respect has changed dramatically in recent years. Major advances have been made in technology and these have transformed life in all parts of the world to the point where most adults today take for granted features of their daily existence which in their own childhood they would have regarded as science-fiction.

However, technological changes bring social and moral change in its wake, at the very least it raises moral question for which tradition can provide no ready-made answers and for which new answers must be found. The development of the ability to transplant organs from one body to another, to abort a birth or to prevent conception has presented us with many new moral problems and these are among the more obvious examples of the way in which improved technological skills create moral and social change by forcing us to adjust our systems of values to meet these changes.
Furthermore, it is quite clear that on all of these issues many different instances are possible. There is no single hard and fast answer to them. Even established religions fail to offer solutions to them that all can accept and this must be seen as one factor in the decline of the influence of organised religion. Indeed, many societies now are multi-ethnic and thus contain a variety of religions which often offer a corresponding variety of moral codes. As a result there has grown an awareness that moral issues can't be dealt with in a once and for all manner by the offering of universal moral answers, but that each individual will reach his own conclusions on most moral questions.

It should be quite clear by now that we can't prepare pupils for this kind of world by offering them set answers to these problems. We are aware of at that point in time when we happen to be attending to their moral education. Even if we think we have the "right" answers to current problems and can persuade young people to accept them, this will not help them when new problems come along. The Crowther Report (1959) suggested that the rapidity of technological change required not a vocational training for young people in specific skills but the development of a
"general mechanical ability" that would enable them to cope not only with the technology of the present but also with that of the future.

However, there are perhaps good reasons why we should not even want to approach moral upbringing in this way. For a second, and closely related, reason why our thinking about moral education is changing is that we have come to take a different view of the nature of man, and different model of man as a basis for our thinking. The pressures for this can be traced to a number of sources. One is experience of social change and another one is "existentialist" view, whose view of individual autonomy goes back at least as far as Immanuel Kant and who have stressed the uniqueness of each human being and his consequential right to make his own decisions and thus determine his own "essence". As a result, there has emerged a growing hostility towards any theory especially within education, which like the views of the behaviourist, psychologists, for example, is based on a passive view of man, as a being who is acted upon, shaped and guided, like an inanimate object, by forces external to himself rather than on a view of him as an active, dynamic being in charge at least to some extent of his own destiny and therefore, responsible for his actions and behaviour.
Certainly in the whole world this has come to be a dominant feature of our way of looking at existence. For it is of course, closely bound up with the ideal of social freedom that is fundamental to the explicit philosophy of what has sometimes been called the "free world". Such an ideal entails the notion of man as an active agent responsible for his own destiny and entitled to make his own moral choices according to his own moral values. Clearly, if acting on such choices, putting his beliefs into practice, is likely to lead unjustifiably to harm or threat of harm or loss of freedom to others, then his freedom of action must be curtailed.

If this view of man is taken then an authoritarian approach to morality can't be adopted. A man's values must be his own since he is not free if his behaviour is controlled by a code of values imposed by others. This is the source of the great tension that existed in Christian theology between the notion of free will, of the freedom of the individual to choose or to reject God, and the idea of an authoritarian code of morality set for man by God. This in turn, is the source of some of the moral dilemmas the Christian church has faced. If an authoritarian view of morality can't be accepted, then an approach to moral education that derives from it can't be accepted, either.
Among the reasons for the recent revival of interest in the moral aspects of education are, firstly, the changing nature of society and, secondly, consequential changes in our view of what it means to be a human being. In doing so we have begun to discover part of the answer to our question of what moral education is, since we have seen that if it is to be a response to the demands of a changing society and suited to our concept of man as a free and active being, then this will to some extent determine the form it must take. Not only, then, must we recognize this as a demand for the freedom and autonomy of the individual; we must also acknowledge that nothing less than respect for that freedom and autonomy can enable us to help people to live in society as we know it. Hence not only are we made aware of an increased need for moral education; we are also made aware of the need for a different concept of what it is, the first aspect that it must enable people to do their own moral thinking rather than encourage them to conform to an externally imposed moral code.

1.6 What is Morality

Morality signifies a code of ethical principles which are essential for leading a noble life. Moral education is
the education of a unique synthesis of heart and the mind without which no individual can be completely human. Moral virtues like honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, cooperation, fellow feeling, justice, temperance and self control promote the social efficiency of an individual.

Early writings in the area of moral development were left to philosophers, who evolved three major doctrines of morality, each of which is represented in contemporary psychological theorizing. The doctrine of original sin which assumed that parental intervention was necessary to save the child's soul. Current day vestiges of this view point may be found in theories of personality structure and the development of the conscience, or superego, as propounded by Freud and the neo-Freudians which argue that the child internalizes parental standards of right and wrong.

The doctrine of innate purity as advocated by naturalist thinkers like Rousseau and Froebel, argued that the child is basically moral, or pure, and that society, and especially adults, are corrupting influences. This view is also represented in the theorizing of Piaget (1932), who argues that morality develops from the acquisition of autonomy emerging from the need to get along with peers.
For Piaget, moral thinking develops through peer to peer interactions that lead to an understanding of rules. Piaget believes parents do not allow this autonomous thinking to develop because parent-child relationships are basically heteronomous, that is, the child is ruled by the parents. Hence, the parents retard moral development (Dusek, 1987).

The third philosophical doctrine is the tabula rasa -(Blank Slate) notion, which assumes that the child is neither innately pure nor corrupt but rather the product of environmental influences. The current-day representatives of this position are, of course, the learning theorists (Thorndike, Skinner), who believe that development is the result of reinforcement and imitation mechanisms.

In addition to these differing philosophical and theoretical views regarding the origin of morality, we must, keep in mind the distinctions between three concepts: systems of morality, moral behaviour and moral character. System of morality may be defined as "system of rules that are external to people, designed to guide social or interpersonal behaviour, and which may to some degree be codified and spelled out (Hogan 1973, p.219). This broad definition includes all types of social behaviour, not just those we usually consider moral behaviour; for example, this
definition includes rules for behaviour towards friends, teachers and peers, as well as formally codified laws. From this perspective, moral behaviour are those behaviours that are consistent with rules of morality.

Moral character is a much more difficult concept to define, largely because it involves an individual's motives for behaving in a particular manner. As Hogan noted, the basic problem in defining moral character is to determine those personality dimensions that determine it and vary as a function of it. Moral knowledge, socialization, empathy, autonomy and moral judgement are the major concepts defining moral character.

1.7 Who is a Morally Educated Person

A critical analysis of the concept of education would at once reveal that moral conciousness is a sine-qua-non of education. Education, as R.S.Peters would put is "an initiation into something worthwhile". By using this analytical approach one can also show that moral education is distinct from moral training or moral instruction. We would not like to call a person morally educated who has a traditional moral upbringing, that is, a man who has been taught what to believe and not how or why to believe. This
is a "bag of virtues" concept in which there are certain fixed and unchangeable values which are to be instilled in children. Such children are exposed to character training rather than to moral education. A person who is either not capable of reaching his autonomous moral decisions or reaches these without thought or consideration of the factors that determine the particular situation, will not be described as morally educated person.

Regarding positive characterization of a morally educated person, in the first place such a person should possess sufficient factual knowledge relevant to the issue. A. V. Kelly (1964) calls this 'non-moral' facts of the case. The relevance of such awareness is not that one can logically deduce the ultimate choice of decisions from the factual premises, rather it enables one to understand the likely consequences of certain alternative courses of action. It helps the morally educated person in reaching his conclusions. If he lacks proper scientific knowledge he may base his choices on misinformation or ignorance which may mark the quality and nature of his moral choices. So the morally educated person should be fully and accurately informed of possible non-moral facts of each situation; only then can one make right moral choices.
In making proper moral choices the individuals should also possess certain skills, especially the social skills, for no moral decisions can be reached merely intellectually or theoretically. He must for example need to understand how to relate to people, get on with them, even communicate with them.

Then a morally educated person needs to possess knowledge and understanding of the feelings of others. But it is not sufficient that he understands such feelings only at cognitive level, as facts only. If we do so and calculate accordingly what our behaviour to those persons should be, then there will be a coldness in our behaviour and such behaviour will be characterized by nobody as moral. This should be done at the effective level, we must realize the part played by emotions.

The understanding of the feelings of others has several features which need to be made more explicit. Firstly, that there should be an emotional commitment to men. Then we should accept the significance of the feeling of others, that is, to realize that other's feelings are as important as ours. It is emotionally rather than merely cognitively directed towards the rights, interests and
feelings of others. There is another way in which feelings and emotions enter our moral decision making. Our moral behaviour is influenced by our own feelings and emotions even more than by a consideration of those of others. It is because moral decisions cannot be carried out merely by an understanding. This aspect of human behaviour has been considered as of vital significance since the time of Aristotle.

Aristotle, taking a more realistic view of man, realized that taking a moral decision at intellectual level is not sufficient. When we come to implement the decision we are pulled by many other forces which he called 'pleasure'. It is a fact that we do not always do what we ought to do. St. Paul also once confessed that, "The evil that I would not—that I do and the good I would, I do not". For Aristotle, therefore, moral education involved not merely the teaching of 'right rule' it also involves a kind of character training to enable them to act on it once recognized.

There is no denying the fact that emotions play a significant role in moral development of man. They are not to be considered as merely an unpleasant reminder of human
infirmity. As Aristotle and other philosophers thought, it must be seen as playing an essential role in the development of morality. It is not undesirable and unfortunate excessence. As has been clearly understood that computers can not behave morally, since they lack the ability to respond emotionally. It is the emotional response that constitutes his humanity, and enables one to live as moral being.

Therefore, we can hold that moral education has three dimensions, the caring dimension, the judging dimension and the acting dimension. It is only the last one (the acting dimension) that we use while training people in moral behaviour. But moral education per se would be incomplete, without the earlier two.

1.8 Need and Justification of the Study:

Education, to be worthwhile, should be man making and it is the character which can equip the persons as a man-the able and responsible members of the society. Therefore, at every stage, in any system of education, character development is regarded as one of the important aims of education. But modern education is not character oriented. One of the most important defects of modern education is that
it lacks the idea of any clear objectives and programmes. The growing unrest among students is a matter of great concern. Today the world, the peace of the world is in danger. International tension continues. Lack of ideals and the weakening of social and moral values in the younger generation have caused grave concern in many countries of the world including India. Gandhi's Satyagraha, Swadeshi and a sacrifice for the country stand replaced by scandals like Bofors and other kickbacks. Scams and blackmails are the order of the day. Hoodlums and mafias are getting patronised and sages are in hiding in the woods. Smugglers and crooked businessmen have been permitted to become respectable. Gangsters have become powerful. Shirkers of work are thriving and educationally we are producing only rats. Immortality is becoming the victor almost each day because policy makers are cosy with racketeers and politicians sup with the underworld. In this age of materialism, one finds the evils and vices of all sorts reigning all over the world. Human life is beset with pitfalls and dangers all around.

In this prevailing darkness, character of an individual is the only light house, the bedrock of life in its real sense. A man of character is devoted to high ideals of life. He is a man of virtue and nobility and
sincerely pursues the highest ideals of Truth, Beauty and Goodness. Herbert rightly remarks - 'Education is the development of good moral character." For this, training in morality is necessary. Morality is the valuable treasure of every nation. Without a high sense of morality, national character does not develop. Even individual character is not formed without the inculcation of moral and spiritual values. Education is the only means to develop this moral sense and train children for moral behaviour and moral activities.

Many countries of the world, tried to reconsider their educational policies and give due place to the moral, social and spiritual values in their educational system. The goals and aims of education also include development of values among children. The aim of value development may be achieved by designing a curriculum for the same at school level. Development of values, unfortunately has not been given serious attention.

So considering prevailing situation, which we have described above, the need for conducting a study on moral education is required. Moral education is the education of the heart, without which no individual can be completely human. Moral virtues like honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, cooperation, fellow feeling, justice, temperance and self
control promote the social efficiency of an individual. The Central Advisory Board of School Education (1944-46) recognised the importance of ethical and religious instruction. University Education Commission (1948-49) also recommended the provision of moral instruction in educational institutions by doing such activities - silent meditation, remembering great religious leaders. National Policy on Education (1986) recommended that:

i) The growing concern over the erosion of essential values and an increasing cynicism in society has brought to focus the need for readjustment in the curriculum in order to make education a forceful tool for the cultivation of social and moral values.

ii) In our culturally plural society, education should foster universal and eternal values, oriented towards the unity and integration of our people. Such value education should help eliminate obscurantism, religious fanaticism, violence, superstition and fatalism.

iii) Apart from this combative role, value education has a profound positive content, based on our heritage, national goals, universal perceptions. It should lay primary emphasis on this aspect.
Acharya Rama Murti Committee which was set up for the revival of NPE (1986) recommended that:

1. Education must further provide a climate for the nurture of values, both as a personalised set of values forming one's character and including necessarily social, cultural and national values, so as to have a context and meaning for actions and decisions, and in order to enable the persons to act with conviction and commitment.

ii) Education, as an instrument of development, must, therefore be also a truly freeing experience, a process of liberation. In our Indian context, liberation from the numerous prejudices based on caste, gender, religion, region, language etc; from prejudices based on superstitious beliefs; from a variety of unfounded fears; and positively, freedom to explore, to investigate; freedom to accept truth, even when it goes against one's earlier notions and beliefs. In that frame of reference, the more educated a person is, the less prejudiced, the more open he should become, less fearful to stand by one's convictions and when need arises, make demands from oneself and from others as well as for them. This is what is meant by education becoming a freeing experience, an instrument of
liberation. True education must humanise the person. Our forefathers experienced an effortless harmony between themselves, others and nature. Bhuthdaya or a feeling of universal compassion is one of the finest expressions of this mind-set of our ancestors and of our cultural heritage.

iii) There is enough attention paid to the development of the individual through education. The social dimension of education necessitates that education be essentially valuebased. There cannot be an education that is neutral or of a uniform type. Hence there cannot be an educational process and objectives that would fit every people and every nation. Education has to be culturally coloured and enriched. We may view culture from three levels of a depth:

a) the superficial or external level gives a sense of identity to a community, group, region or nation. In our case, the different kinds of distinctive dresses, the way birth, marriage or death rites are performed by different groups, food preferences and preparations, celebration of festivals etc. fall into this category and level.
b) at a deeper second level, the more substantive aspects of a culture and its achievements are to be found, such as the different dance forms, music traditions, art and architecture, literature, as well as planning, systems of management etc.

c) at the third or deepest level lie the foundational values, world-views, perspectives, mind-sets, and the philosophy of a people about the way they view basic realities of life, relations and after life.

In brief, we can say that deliberate inculcation of moral and spiritual values is the only cure of many ills that our world of education and our society as a whole is suffering today. Moral education will produce men of strong character and integrity. It will be helpful in resolving conflicts and tensions and generating happiness, order and contentment in the world. It will end disaster, destruction exploitation, selfishness, hatred and aggression in this world. Without moral and spiritual values, we shall be a nation without soul. So keeping all these considerations in mind, the need for conducting present study becomes clear and hence this study was undertaken.
1.9 **Statement of the Problem:**

Moral education cannot be imparted in vacuum. It can only be inculcated through specific goal-oriented programme at the classroom level. Second, for proper moral development of the child it has been clearly visualized that as an essential one requisite the child must learn how he ought to behave in a particular situation, for we can well imagine that moral education in its proper form must not be authoritarian nor fixed rather. Any human behaviour to be genuinely called desirable must be supported by good reasons - the moral reason. If a child acts in accordance with rules of behaviour, it is not necessary that he is morally educated. He can only be said to be normally trained. But training in the field of morality is by its very nature indoctrinatory and not moral. What is most needed, therefore, is the development of moral reasoning in children. Moral reasoning even though it is not a sufficient condition of moral behaviour but certainly it is the essential condition. Hence, to basically explore the issue, the investigator has chosen her study entitled "A Study of the Development of Moral Reasoning and its Correlates."
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