SUMMARY
SUMMARY

Education is a social enterprise, aiming at development of worthwhileness in children. But present day trends in education with significant shift in emphasis towards individualism and to the almost complete neglect of humanism is certainly an indication of a menace to the stability of Indian society. The social scenario, as we find it today, which is marked by violence, greed, rapes, thefts, bank robbery, drug addiction, terrorism, pollution etc. is the consequence or the product of our ill conceived educational theory and practice of child rearing. Our education today is preparing only efficient individuals; not good human beings. But are we serious enough to know the cause(s) of such a situation?

It is axiomatic that value education lies at the heart of the very concept of education; without the inclusion of this facet of education no process of teaching and learning can rightly be called education. It will be rather a contradiction in terms to say that a person is highly educated but does not recognize a value structure in his thoughts and actions. The education being imparted today in our schools and colleges is, in most cases, an example of such contradictions. Now the question arises : what is value education? To understand value education one needs to clarify a "value" first and then a moral value as well.

Human values have been employed in two distinctively different ways in human discourse. It is often said that a person has a value or an
object has a value. These two usages have been explicitly recognized by writers in various disciplines such as Charles Morris in Philosophy, Brewster Smith (1969) in Psychology and Robin Williams (1968) in Sociology.

Rokeach (1973) defined value as an enduring belief, a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence along a continuum of relative importance. Any conception of human values if it is to be fruitful, it must be able to account for the enduring character of values as well as their changing character. The enduring character of values arises mainly by their initial teaching and learning in isolation from other values. A mode of behaviour or end state is always desirable. The isolated and absolute learning of values more or less guarantees their endurance and stability. In case of values as a belief, Rokeach (1968) has distinguished three types of beliefs: (i) descriptive or existential beliefs, something being true or false; (ii) evaluative beliefs, wherein the object of beliefs is judged to be good or bad; and (iii) prescriptive or prospective beliefs, wherein some means or end of action is judged to be desirable or undesirable. Values like all beliefs have cognitive, affective and behavioural components. A value refers to a mode of conduct or end state of existence.

"A value is a belief upon which a man acts by preference" (Allport, 1961, P. 454).

According to Kluckohn (1951) a value is a "conception of the desirable" and not something "merely desired". A conception of the desirable seems to be nothing more than a special kind of preference – a
preference for one mode of behaviour over an opposite mode, or a preference for one end state over other end state. A value is a conception of something that is personally or socially preferable.

"The word value as understood in the context of educational philosophy refers to those desirable ideals and goals which are intrinsic in themselves and which, when achieved or attempted to be achieved evoke a deep sense of fulfilment to one or many or all parts of what we consider to be the highest elements of our nature". (Kireet Joshi, 1994)

According to Shaver (1976), values are "Standards and principles for judging worth. They are criteria by which we judge things (people, objects, ideas, actions and situations) to be good, worthwhile, desirable, or on the other hand, bad, worthless, despicable, or, of course, somewhere between these extremes". According to Hersh et al (1980) Shaver's definition has three key elements. The first is that values are concepts, not feelings. Hence they can be defined, analysed and compared with other values. Responsibility, for example, is a value by which we judge the actions of ourselves and others.

The second key element is that values exist in the mind independently of self awareness. As contrast to value clarification scheme, where values are only those beliefs which are chosen rationally and acted on repeatedly, the value, in Shaver's terminology may operate beneath the surface of rational choice and overt action. For example, a man may value hard work even though he never made an explicit choice to work hard or
openly declared his commitments to it.

The third element is that values are dimensional rather than absolute categories. For example we never consider a person to be totally responsible or totally lazy. People's behaviour falls along a continuum an any value.

Values, according to Shaver may be aesthetic, instrumental and moral. Aesthetic values are those by which we judge beauty. Such judgements, however, are distinct from moral judgements and we should not confuse aesthetic proposition with attributions of virtue or morality. Similarly, Shaver distinguishes between instrumental values and moral values. Instrumental values are standards set in order to achieve other standards rules concerning discipline, attentiveness and punctuality are upheld not as ends in themselves but as means towards effective learning. Instrumental values are intermediary standards designed to serve larger ends.

Shaver places moral values on a continuum from personal preference to basic values. Values like solitude and cleanliness etc. are purely personal preferences and hence, are least significant moral values. But sanctity of human life is perhaps the most basic moral value, because it is essential to our humanity. In a democratic society basic values include the principles of freedom of speech, equal protection of the law, and religious freedom. Between the two poles of personal preference and basic values lie a range of middle-level moral values.
Honesty, cooperation and patriotism qualify as middle-level values. They are not grounded in human nature, yet they are important conventions.

While moral values differ in their degree of importance and generality, all moral values express something more than a purely individual standard. When we are faced with a moral decision, we need to ask what we ought to do rather, than what we might like to do. Deciding whether abortion, or capital punishment, or euthanasia is right or wrong is simply not on the same level as any instrumental or aesthetic value. Unlike aesthetic or instrumental values moral values necessarily carry a message of obligation.

In actual life situation, one inevitably experiences a tension between different types of values economic, aesthetic, moral or instrumental. Ideally we might be preferring one value but actually practise another. We may, for example, affirm the ideal of human equality but expect our children to marry within the same religion, region or caste. We may stand for equality before the law, but like to have special attention for our kiths and kins or friends. Value identification is something related with self awareness which is possible only when we explore the connections among our values. We need to ask ourselves "What our values are, how strongly we feel about them, and how they function as a whole". So locating and surfacing value commitment, by such a process of self-searching is called by Shaver, value identification.
But since values are dimensional categories they can not be fully identified or clarified unless examined in concrete situations of choice. For example, one student may cherish the ideal of equality of treatment. But what exactly does this value of equality enjoin? Should a vagabond and a law abiding student be treated the same way? Should we treat a mentally backward child the same way as we treat a normal or a gifted one? or, should they, in order to treat them equally, be provided with similar opportunities in the classroom or for a vocation? In such situation rationality demands that they should be treated not in the same way but in appropriate ways, so that ends of justice are met. And equality here should be taken as equity or justice or appropriateness. So values can not be considered as fixed, objective and unchanging.

**Value Clarification as a distinct way of value development:**

Some people strongly believe that human or moral values can be and should be taught to students along with and like other curricular content such as history, literature, religion or natural sciences. They, therefore, advocate that value education or more especially the moral education should find a distinct place in curriculum of children. The adherents of such belief consider values as objective, fixed, eternal or unchanging. For this reason values for them are like a "bag of virtues" and hence can be instilled, inculcated or learned through modelling, repetition or reinforcement. But the bag of virtues approach has been criticized by Peters, Kohlberg, Raths and
others as indoctrinatory according to which morality can be defined in terms of moral rules.

The present investigator however, while defining values, has tried to make it clear that values cannot be considered as fixed and unchanging, universally true. Secondly, indoctrination as a way of moral education was discarded on the grounds that since indoctrination is quite a distinct process different from education, indoctrinative approach to morality can never be accepted as truly educational.

As against the indoctrinative approach to moral education value clarification (Raths et al 1969, 72, 78) offer a model of moral education which is open-ended on the other extreme. The advocates of value-clarification have explicit assumption about the nature of values as well as how the learning of values can take place. These assumptions are:

1. Values are not fixed and objective, but rather a matter of personal opinion. No person can tell another person what is right for him/her. Though values are based on specific criteria a particular value is neither right nor wrong under all circumstances. Every one of us have values which we prize and cherish. We may or may not like someone else’s value but he or she does have values.

2. Learning is largely a matter of increasing awareness of the self.

3. In value-clarification there is an implicit assumption that traditional moral norms of the society have broken down and the moral
pluralism of today's society forces individuals to choose.

Democratic living by its very nature, requires and maximizes our capacity to make value choices and value decisions. There are areas such as politics, love, friendship, property, sex, and religion which provide more such opportunities, but at the same time many influences intervene in our ways of making such choices, tending to make these more difficult and confusing. Students are often exposed to varieties of influences such as parental, peer group, family, school, religion etc. which often tend to contradict one another. The school does not provide any value education directly so that such confusions can be removed. The students go on learning values through what may be called hidden curriculum. But quite often what is learnt through such unstated value curriculum is 'obedience to authority' and the awareness that adults do not conform to their own standards and values which they profess to others, thereby, creating more value confusion among students.

In order to solve such problems Louis Raths, Merril Hermin and Sidney Simen (1973) developed a model for value education, called Value clarification. This model is an attempt to decrease value confusion and promote a consistent set of values through, what is called a valuing process. The central focus in this process is the need to avoid indoctrination and to promote the use of reason in determination of values. It is designed to make intelligent value choices through a process of choosing, prizing and behaving.
The value clarification lays stress on four key elements.

I. A Focus on Life - By focussing on relevant life issues the students are encouraged to know how their personal priorities reflect a hierarchy of values.

II. Acceptance of what is - This element of the valuing process helps students in accepting themselves as individuals and in being honest with themselves.

III. An Invitation to Reflect Further - It calls out not only to accept what one is but also for reflection on values. This is done through more informed choices, more awareness of what it is a person prizes and cherishes, and better integration of choices and what one prizes in day to day behaviour.

IV. Nourishment of Personal Power - It is the conviction of the proponents of value clarification that as a result of constant process of clarification of values, the individual can gain a sense of personal direction and fulfilment.

Theory - There are several kinds of problems that children often display at home or at school. Such problems are often caused by a lack of values. The value clarification theorists believe that those who are clear about the relationship between themselves and the society, often exhibit the qualities of being positive, purposeful and consistent; whereas those who are confused about such relationships are often apathetic, over-dissentive or over conforming and inconsistent in their behaviour with others. The
value clarification model is an attempt to provide an educational solution - a valuing process, that can be taught and that will reduce the value confusion in them.

It may therefore be understood that values are not to be considered as eternal truths but rather a style of life that emerges out of social experience; something that we consider right, desirable or worthy - something that can help people relate to the ever-changing world in a satisfying and intelligent way.

However according to Raths (1969-78) specific values are held to possess seven criteria which are insisted upon in defining what a value is. In order that a belief possesses the status of a value it must be:

1. Chosen freely
2. Chosen from among alternatives.
3. Chosen after thoughtful consideration of consequences.
4. Prized and cherished
5. Publicly affirmed
6. Acted upon in reality,
7. Acted upon repeatedly.

Of the seven sub processes of the valuing process the first three are related to choosing, IV and V to prizing, and VI and VII to behaving or acting. Corresponding to each sub process of valuing, particular value exercises can be prepared and given to students.
1. **Choosing Freely**: Only those values which are chosen freely are likely to be integrated with the value structure of the individual; any Value that is forcibly adopted by him is unlikely to be a part of the individual.

2. **Choosing from Alternatives**: If a number of value choices are made available to the individual, the chance that the individual can choose freely is increased.

3. **Choosing after Considering the Consequences**: Acting on a particular value is beset with specific consequences. So while choosing values, the individual should give proper thought to the consequences that such a value choice might lead to. Acting impulsively on a particular value will not lead to an intelligent value system. However, it should not mean that one should choose values on the consideration of expediency or purely personal benefits, but on the criteria of rationality and public intelligibility.

4. **Prizing and Cherishing**: The values chosen should be such that we feel proud of having adopted them. We should cherish them as integral aspects of our existence.

5. **Affirming**: This sub-process of the valuing process relates to our willingness to share these values with others. Values chosen should not be idiosyncrasies.

6. **Acting upon in Reality**: The value chosen should be reflected in our behaviour; that is, these should be apparent in all activities we do.
7. Acted upon Repeatedly: Whatever Values we choose and act upon, we should do so with consistency. If our actions are inconsistent with our values, then we should examine more closely the relationship between our values and actions.

According to Hersh et al (1980), the valuing process applies to three kinds of content: (i) The value indicators, such as goals and aspirations (ii) personal issues which include questions about love, friendship, sexuality, work, marriage, and loyalty and (iii) Social issues such as poverty in communities, racism, freedom of speech, right to strike etc.

But reflecting on the seven sub-processes one can observe certain difficulties in their application. For example, it is not clear as to what can be considered as "thoughtful consideration", under what situations can the action be repeated; for no action can be repeated under all circumstances. This means that the approach suffers from lack of specific criteria. Recognizing these difficulties Kirschenbaum (1977) expanded the model, to include five dimensions: thinking, feeling, choosing, communicating, and acting.

Prior to Kirschenbaum's expansion of value clarification model, thinking and feeling had been its main concern. In general it can be said of value clarification that it is the application of critical thinking skills to the affective domain. Kirschenbaum while dealing with "cognitive and affective dimensions stresses the need for critical thinking, divergent thinking and moral reasoning. At the same time he emphasizes the need for
development of a mature self concept under the dimension of feeling".

According to Kirschenbaum this model essentially involves social discourse, communication. "Sharing thoughts and feeling with others is a critical demand of the model". The choosing and acting, dimensions as given by Kirschenbaum in fact are included in the original seven sub processes of the model.

**Practice**: According to Hersh et al (1980) this model is rooted in the classroom dialogue, with the ultimate goal of helping students utilize the seven sub processes of valuing in their own lives and apply these to existing and emergent beliefs and behaviour. To accomplish this task the teacher utilizes specifically designed techniques or exercises developed to help students clarify their values in accordance with the criteria specified in each of the seven sub-processes. First the value indicators are recognized by both teachers and students. The eight value indicators have been mentioned by Raths, 'Hermin and Simon which are : (i) goals or purposes, (ii) aspirations, (iii) attitudes, (iv) Interests, (v) feelings, (vi) beliefs and convictions, (vii) activities, (viii), worries, problems and obstacles.

The importance of value education can be well assessed by the fact that the framers of the new education policy (1986) very well realized and emphatically recommended that education to be meaningful must be "value oriented". The moral context in the education needs to be brought back which has been worn thin probably as a result of the mad race, where in people derive maximum satisfaction in leaving others behind in defeating
them. Such a negative conception of growth probably is the major source of man's anguish, his frustration, and anxiety. In the pursuit of what is superficial, peripheral, and physical, man has lost the essential, the subtle and the spiritual.

Statement of the Problem:

So the present investigator visualised a need to conduct an empirical study as to how value clarification strategy helps children in clarifying of the values they cherish, prize and tend to act upon i.e. to say whether children can develop stable value structures depending upon the context of the situation. Moreover an investigation to see whether in the clarification and development of values the socio economic status of the individual, parental disciplinary practices and intelligence of child play any significant role. Therefore the present investigator defined the present problem as under:

"Effect of value clarification model on moral reasoning of children".

Objectives of the Study:

1. To study the effect of value clarification on moral reasoning of boys.
2. To study the effect of value clarification on moral reasoning of girls.
3. To study the effect of value clarification on moral reasoning of both boys and girls.
4. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of boys belonging to different socio economic status.
5. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of
moral reasoning of girls belonging to different socio economic status.

6. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls belonging to different socio economic status.

7. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of boys at different levels of intelligence.

8. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of girls at different levels of intelligence.

9. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls at different levels of intelligence.

10. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of boys in relation to different types of attitudes of parents towards their children.

11. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of girls in relation to different types of attitudes of parents towards their children.

12. To compare the effect of value clarification on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls in relation to different types of attitudes of parents towards their children.

Hypotheses:

1. Value clarification has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of girls belonging to different socio economic status.
of moral reasoning of boys.

2. Value clarification has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of girls.

3. Value clarification has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls.

4. In the development of moral reasoning of boys through value clarification socio-economic status is not a significant factor.

5. In the development of moral reasoning of girls through value clarification socio-economic status is not a significant factor.

6. In the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls through value clarification socio-economic status is not a significant factor.

7. In the development of moral reasoning of boys through value clarification intelligence is not a significant factor.

8. In the development of moral reasoning of girls through value clarification intelligence is not a significant factor.

9. In the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls through value clarification intelligence is not a significant factor.

10. In the development of moral reasoning of boys through value clarification accepting attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

11. In the development of moral reasoning of boys through value clarification concentrating attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

12. In the development of moral reasoning of boys through value clarification avoiding attitude of parents is not a significant factor.
13. In the development of moral reasoning of girls through value clarification accepting attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

14. In the development of moral reasoning of girls through value clarification concentrating attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

15. In the development of moral reasoning of girls through value clarification avoiding attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

16. In the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls through value clarification accepting attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

17. In the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls through value clarification concentrating attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

18. In the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls through value clarification avoiding attitude of parents is not a significant factor.

**Delimitations of the Study:**

Due to limitations of time and resources the present investigation has been delimited to the following aspects:

(i) The study was delimited to a sample of 100 students only.

(ii) The study was delimited to students of adolescent age group studying in high schools of Bahadurgarh Tehsil of district Jhajjar.

(iii) The study was delimited to the following tools:
(a) Standardized moral dilemmas to measure moral maturity.

(b) Dr. Rajeev Lochan, Dr. Kumari Shama Gupta, Prof. Narender Singh Chauhan's socio economic status scale was used in order to see socio economic status of subjects.

(c) Dr. Shyam Sawaroop Jalota's group test of intelligence was used to know the level of intelligence of the subjects.

(d) Dr. G.P Sherry and Dr. J.C. Sinha's family relation inventory was used to see parents attitude towards their children.

All these tests are standardised with well defined reliability and validity.

(iv) Only three independent variables viz. socio-economic status, intelligence and parental attitude were taken up to study their effect on the development of moral reasoning.

Sample:

A representative cluster sample of 100 students was selected for the study. The subjects were the adolescents studying in IX class in various high schools. All the students of a particular class were included in the sample. The subjects selected were from various types of schools i.e. Hindi Medium, English Medium, Rural and Urban.

Procedure and Design of the Study:

A sample of 100 students was drawn from the schools of Bahadurgarh tehsil of district Jhajjar. Taking into consideration that adolescents can well understand and explain the concept of values the
students studying in IX class were selected. To collect data on value
clarification model Raths et al. value clarification strategy (1969) was used.
For measurement of moral maturity, some standardized moral dilemmas
were given to students. These moral dilemmas were different from the ones
used in value clarification.

Dr. Rajeev Lochan and Dr. Kumari Shama Gupta, Prof. Narender
Singh Chauhan's, socio economic status scale was used to see subjects
socio-ecnomics status.

Dr. Shyam Swaroop Jalota's group test of intelligence was used to
know levels of intelligence of subjects.

To see the family attitude, family relation inventory scale by
Dr. (Mrs.) G. P. Sherry & Dr. Jagdish Chander Sinha was used.

Statistical Techniques Used :

Mean, SD and t-values were computed for testing the significant
difference between student's performance in pre and post test and the
mean gain scores of subjects.

Findings of the Study :

1. Value clarification technique has a positive significant effect on the
development of moral reasoning of boys.

2. Value clarification technique has a positive significant effect on the
development of moral reasoning of girls.

3. Value clarification technique has a positive significant effect on the
development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls.

4. Socio-economic status of boys does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning as a result of value clarification.

5. Socio-economic status of girls does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning as a result of value clarification.

6. Socio-economic status of both boys and girls does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning as a result of value clarification.

7. Intelligence has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of boys as a result of value clarification.

8. Intelligence has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of girls as a result of value clarification.

9. Intelligence has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls as a result of value clarification.

10. Accepting attitude of parents has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of boys as a result of value clarification.

11. Concentrating attitude of parents does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of boys as a result of value clarification.
12. Avoiding attitude of parents does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of boys as a result of value clarification.

13. Accepting attitude of parents has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of girls as a result of value clarification.

14. Concentrating attitude of parents does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of girls as a result of value clarification.

15. Avoiding attitude of parents does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of girls as a result of value clarification.

16. Accepting attitude of parents has a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls as a result of value clarification.

17. Concentrating attitude of parents does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls as a result of value clarification.

18. Avoiding attitude of parents does not have a significant effect on the development of moral reasoning of both boys and girls as a result of value clarification.
Conclusion:

There is a significant positive impact of value clarification technique on the development of moral reasoning of children. On the basis of the findings of the present investigation the following conclusions concerning development of moral reasoning can be drawn:

When the data were analysed with respect to different socio economic group, it was observed that socio economic status has no specific effect on development of moral reasoning as a result of value clarification. However, intelligence is found to have a positive significant effect on development of moral reasoning as a result of value clarification. Similarly in the parental disciplinary practices the accepted group was found to have significant positive gain score in comparison to the avoided and concentrated group.