UNIT 16 · MODELS OF MORAL EDUCATION
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16.1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding unit (Unit 15) we have studied three view points to explain and understand development of morality. These view points are: the psychoanalytic view-point, the learning theory approach and the cognitive developmental approach to moral development. We have also explained that moral learning takes place explicitly or implicitly both within the school as well as outside the school. But the moral learning that continues, may not necessarily be moral education in the true sense; so it essentially needs to be transformed into moral education. Transformation of moral learning into moral education may necessitate deliberate efforts on the part of teachers to help students develop a right perspective of moral education and moral development. Such deliberate attempts on the part of a teacher may involve use of certain points of view or a theory. Such strategies or principles, which help students develop morality, may be termed as models of moral education. In
educational literature as many as six models of moral development find a mention including Kohlberg's model in terms of six developmental stages which have already been discussed in Unit 15. The remaining five models are being discussed very briefly in the present unit. These models are: 1) Rationale Building Model; 2) Consideration Model; 3) Value Clarification; 4) Value Analysis Model, and 5) Social Action Model. It may, however, be remembered that all these models are mutually complementary, each zeroing-in on some significant aspect of moral development. While no single approach can account for moral development in full from the point of view of judging, caring and acting, a study of all of these models, can certainly develop a better insight into the process.

16.2 OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you should be able to:

- distinguish between a value and a value judgement,
- make a distinction between an aesthetic judgement and a moral judgement,
- identify and analyze values and value-conflict by process of self-searching,
- use observational and social modelling to teach students to care,
- discuss the need of value clarification in a democratic living,
- discuss valuing process in terms of choosing, prizing and behaving by citing appropriate examples,
- make a distinction between value criterion and value principle by giving examples,
- clarify the aim of social action and the role of environmental competence,
- relate the different components of social action model of Newmann.

16.3 RATIONALE BUILDING MODEL

James Shaver (1976) developed a jurisprudential model of a moral education and named it Rationale Building Model. Though this model sheds light on the different facets of morality – judging, curing and acting, its main concern is with the realm of judging. It can act as a guide to those teachers who want to run a special programme of moral education in their schools. Shaver is more directly concerned with teachers' moral decision making. So, first of all this model seeks to clarify such basic questions as What is a value? What is a moral value?, How do values of a democratic society relate to decisions teachers make in the class?, How can teachers help students develop more meaningful ways of dealing with moral issues? (Dagar and Dhull, 1994). Instead of making prescriptions, Shaver's conceptual framework is related to the role of critical reflection on the part of both teachers and students in moral education. The theoretical base of Shaver's model comprises three parts: i) defining a value, ii) nature of democracy, iii) an analysis of moral education in a democratic society.

16.3.1 Definition of a Value

According to Shaver, 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, or somewhere between these extremes. Analysis of what Shaver calls values, have three key elements. These are given below:

- That values are concepts, not feelings; and hence can be defined, analyzed and compared with other values. Responsibility, for example, is a value by which we judge the actions of ourselves and others.

- That value exists in the mind independent of ourselves or our awareness. These may operate beneath the surface of rational choice and overt actions. For example, a man may value hard work even though he never made an explicit choice to work hard.

- Values are dimensional rather than absolute categories. For example, we never consider a person to be absolutely or totally responsible or totally lazy. There is always a continuum between two extremes of a value which are only ideal points.

16.3.2 Value and Value Judgement

Shaver distinguishes a value from a value judgement. According to him, value judgements are assertions we make on the basis of values. Values are grounds not conclusions. For example, when we say to our students “Dear, you should get to the class on time”, we are making a value judgement. The values or criteria which support the judgement may be paternal, social order, or respect for institutional authority.

Values are to be examined not only in relation to a specific judgement on a particular value, but also in relation to other values. They are to be understood as interlocking parts of a total value network, rather than as self-contained units. They are linked to one another; one value impinges upon the other. For example, we may value both liberty and equality. The value of liberty directs us to maximize individuals’ freedom and self-expression. The value of equality, on the other hand, guides us to guarantee to each individual the same or justifiable access to public goods. Sometimes in fulfilling the claim of equality, we may be required to trade off the ideal of liberty. For example, we believe that the wealthy should pay more taxes than the poor, even if the wealthy claim that this limits their economic freedom. Or, we may say that socially deprived persons be given preferential treatment even though it may limit the liberty of the normals.

16.3.3 Types of Values

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 propositions with attribution of virtue or morality. Similarly, instrumental values and moral values are also distinct and separate: instrumental values are standards set to achieve other standards. For example, rules concerning discipline, attentiveness, punctuality, etc. are upheld not as ends in themselves but as means towards effective learning. They are intermediary standards to save larger ends.

Shaver places moral values on a continuum from personal preference to basic values. For example: values like solitude, cleanliness, etc. are purely personal
preferences and hence are least significant moral values. But sanctity of human life may perhaps be one of the most basic moral values, because it is essential to our humanity. In a democratic society basic values include the principle of freedom of speech, of equal protection, religious freedom, etc. Between the two poles of personal preference and basic moral values lie a range of "middle-level" values and "moral values". Honesty, co-operation and patriotism qualify as middle-level values. They are important social conventions. When we are required to make a moral decision we need to ask what we ought to do rather than what we might like to do. Deciding for example, whether abortion, or capital punishment, or euthanasia (mercy killing) is right or wrong, is simply not on the same level as any instrumental or aesthetic value. Unlike instrumental or aesthetic values, moral values, of necessity, carry a message of obligation.

16.3.4 Nature of Democracy

According to Shaver, the basic moral value that sustains democracy is the value of human dignity, which means that every human being is important as an end in itself, and hence, demands respect. Every individual deserves consideration, by virtue of his humanness apart from consideration of wealth, race, sex, or physical or intellectual ability.

The attributes of the ideal of dignity is the right to freedom to make important choices and also the right to self-determination, because all humans are rational and hence, have a right to autonomous decision-making.

16.3.5 Moral Education in a Democratic Society

Since democracy by its very definition believes in human dignity – i.e. treating the individual as an end in itself – the teacher is, therefore, expected to promote self-determination and rational behaviour in students. The aim of the teacher is to help students develop free-will and enable them to think on their own. Obviously, the teacher cannot impose anything on students. In this way, the fundamental purpose of education will be development of intelligence – the ability to think rationally and on one’s own. The teacher should make efforts to see that the democratic values are absorbed by the students.

16.3.6 Rationale Building in Practice

Though Shaver is not in favour of direct and specific programme of moral education, he suggests some basic considerations for instructing or guiding students in this direction. These considerations include (i) identification and clarification of values, (ii) label generalization (iii) value conflict analysis and (iv) qualified decision-making. These are explained below:

(i) Identification and clarification of values: In our actual life almost all of us experience a tension between values – the ideal and the practical. Ideally we may be preferring one but when it comes to actual practice we become more practical. We may, for example, ideally believe in equality before law, but tend to have special attention or considerations for our near and dear ones. In such a situation, what we need is to ask ourselves, “What are our values? How strongly do we feel about them? How do they function
as a whole?" Locating and surfacing value commitments by such a process of self-searching is called value identification by Shaver.

But since values are dimensional categories, for practising them, they need to be clarified and examined in concrete situations of choice. For example, we may cherish equality of treatment or equality of access. But what exactly does this mean? Should we treat a vagabond and a law-abiding student the same way? Or, should we treat a mentally backward or socially disadvantaged the way we treat a normal child. In such situations, rationality demands that justice be done to them. Hence, some preferential treatment should be allowed to those who are disadvantaged.

(ii) *Label generalization:* Putting values in the context of moral norms is called label generalization by Shaver. For example, a child retorts "I have a right to do what I want", when an adult is trying to silence him/her. In this situation the value he/she is invoking is what may be termed "freedom of speech". This is label generalization.

(iii) *Value conflict analysis:* Very often we experience a value conflict while making a judgement. It is a situation where two or more values have competing claims. For example, you may affirm the standard of majority rule, but you are supposed to protect the rights of the minority also.

In life situations we face moral dilemmas. Such dilemmas need to be engineered by the teacher in the class by free discussion. For resolving moral dilemmas, Shaver suggests the use of analogies. They can be helpful in coming to rational decision-making.

(iv) *Qualified decision-making:* Judgement about any conflict situation is usually not simple or categorical. So one has to search for criteria or principles by which one can distinguish between two situations characterized by conflicting values. By qualified criteria, Shaver means "One that takes into account the possible negative consequences of an action to be supported and the circumstances under which one can support a different value." For example, there may be a judgement. "It is better to elect governments of the same party both at the Centre and in the states". Such a statement is too simple and categorical. One may cite a number of arguments to contradict it. So, in order to make it meaningful, it needs to be properly qualified. It may for example, be done as:

"For better co-ordination we should elect governments of the same party both at the Centre and in the States, provided that the election manifesto of the two do not significantly differ and such co-ordination in the past have displayed their commitments to the welfare of the people". Instead of stating a generalization, "I believe in freedom of speech", one can say, "Freedom of speech should be guaranteed under all circumstances except when such speech presents a danger of inducing violence to others."

On the basis of the above discussion, Shavers Model is really like jurisprudence. No value, however dear it may be to us, can take a categorical position of being good under all circumstances. For example, a respect for individual dignity is reflected in the values of liberty and equality. Nevertheless, in specific situations, the overall standard of
dignity may represent a compromise, a trade-off between these two values. To use a 'qualified position' is to hero-in on the particular conditions that make one value more relevant than another.

16.4 CONSIDERATION MODEL

In _Rationale Building Model_ the emphasis is given more to the _form_ of morality than to its _content_. It highlights the importance of reason and judgement. It is not the presence or absence of a particular value like truthfulness, honesty, co-operation and consideration for other people's interests _per se_ which determine the moral worth of an action, but rather one has to take into account the totality of situation or circumstances which lead to that particular act. McPhail's _Consideration Model_, on the other hand, is a complementary process of moral education in which the focus is on the person's life-style of relating to self and others. This model seeks to demonstrate that living for others is self-rewarding and motivating; and this is truly living for one-self. Developing this kind of attitude (living for others) is really an experience of liberating oneself from destructive impulses, egocentricity, narcissism, selfishness, etc. According to McPhail, moral education must work towards freeing individuals from fear and distrust, and empower them to give and receive love, respect and dignity of the self and others.

16.4.1 The Approach, Its Genesis, Theory and Methodology

McPhail and his associates (1975) authored "The Life-line Series" and a "Teachers Guide to Life-line", entitled "Learning to Care". The life-line programme is based on an intensive study of adolescent students' needs. In this programme, they were asked to cite one example of a situation in which an adult had treated them badly, and one example when they were treated nicely by the adult. As a result of this, a common view of the good evolved. The positive incidents showed the qualities of consideration for others and willingness to compromise. It was demonstrated, for example, that shared responsibility is good and domination is bad. On the basis of these studies, McPhail unequivocally showed that consideration for others' needs, feelings and interests come under the category of good treatment.

McPhail, on the basis of his investigations, further showed that the fundamental human need is to get along with others, to love and to be loved. Students wanted freedom to effectively make choices and reaching decisions. The freedom they seek is distinct from licence. Teenagers admire adults who provide a good example by their own behaviour, and who lived up to the standards they professed. That is, they admired consistency in behaviour. Based on questionnaire and interview data, McPhail concluded that students can discriminate between firmness and stubbornness and between conviction and dogma. Impartiality was appreciated by most students.

16.4.2 Teaching Students to Care

"Learning To Care" is introduced by McPhail with a quotation from Ruskin: _Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know, it means teaching them to behave as they do not behave_. Accordingly, moral education is concerned with cultivating dispositions and behaviours which are desirable. He observes that we learn values by observing how significantly
others treat us and others. That is, morality is contagious, something we pick up from considerate people around us. Learning from examples is the cornerstone in moral and natural development of the child. Therefore, observational learning and social modelling cannot be over-emphasized. The maxim that morals are caught and not taught holds good in McPhail’s approach. The essence of moral functioning lies in moral style which should essentially be “genuinely affiliative”. Moral education is, therefore, learning to care and is a matter of fulfillment of an individual’s natural harmony with others.

16.4.3 The Practice

Life-line is divided into three sections which present students with progressively more complex situations. These are named: (i) in other peoples’ shoes, (ii) providing the rule, and (iii) what would you have done?

(i) In other peoples’ shoes: The situations in the first section are built around common interpersonal problems and experiences in the home, school and neighbourhood. The purpose of providing such situations is to identify where the motivation is and then to concentrate on developing consideration for others. Some sensitivity cards are provided in which the situation is depicted. The salient features of this section are that the situations are derived from the experiences of students; and the questions asked concern “doing” rather than ‘theorizing’. For example, one of the situations shown on the sensitivity cards is: “your mother who is tired and distracted by a younger child is not listening to something important you are trying to tell her. What do you do?”

(ii) Providing the rule: The activities relating to “Providing the rule” move from comparatively simple instances of pressure and conflicts in interpersonal relations to more complex conflicts of group interest and problems of authority. McPhail cites an example: Paul was helping with the school fund drive. One day he promised to take his girl friend Liz to the movies. But he was caught red-handed and sent to the principal. The principal called Paul’s parents to tell them about the situation, and to notify them that he was suspending Paul from the school for a week.

On the basis of such a situations, questions like the following may be asked:

(i) Did the principal behave fairly?
(ii) What would you have done, had you been the principal?
(iii) Is Paul really a law-breaker?

(iii) What would you have done: There are dramatic moments in history which act as springboard for formal reflection. One can provide such examples from other fields like social studies, language, etc. One of the examples mentioned is: Gale in the Hospital. It deals with a teenage girl, Gale, who is in hospital and suffering from the aftereffects of drugs. What would you have done, had you been intimately associated with Gale?

To sum up, the life-line series is a relatively comprehensive approach to moral education. The situation moves from simple and immediate face to face interactions to complex historical problems.
16.5 VALUE CLARIFICATION MODEL

While defining values in an earlier chapter, it was argued that particular values cannot be considered as fixed and unchanging, universally true under all circumstances. Secondly, we also discussed that indoctrination as a method of moral education, cannot be accepted, because it is not educational in full sense of the term ‘education’.

16.5.1 Underlying Assumptions

As against the indoctrinative approach to moral education, according to which values are objective, fixed and unchangeable, Value Clarification Model of moral education offers an approach which is open-ended to the other extreme. The advocates of value clarification approach have clear-cut and explicit assumptions about the nature of values. These assumptions are:

(i) Values are not fixed and objective but rather a matter of personal opinion. Though values are based on specific criteria, a particular value is neither right nor wrong under all circumstances. Everyone of us has values which we cherish and prize.

(ii) Learning is largely a matter of increasing awareness of the self.

(iii) Traditional moral values of the society have broken down and the moral pluralism in today’s society forces individuals to choose.

16.5.2 Need for Value Clarification in Democratic Living

Democratic living by its very nature requires and maximizes our capacity to make value choices and value decisions. But many influences intervene in our ways of making such choices. Students are often exposed to influences such as parental, peer group, family, school, religion, etc. which may often contradict one another. Thus, the students go on learning values through what may be called hidden curriculum. Quite often what is learned through such unstated curricula is obedience to authority. Such an ambiguous social scenario leaves the child confused regarding choice of values or making value decisions.

16.5.3 The Method

In order to solve such problem of value choice, Louis Raths, Merril Harmin and Sidney Simen (1973) developed a model for moral education and named it Value Clarification Model. It is an attempt to minimize value confusion and tends to promote a consistent set of values through a process called “Valuing Process”. The central focus in this process is finding ways to avoid indoctrination and to promote the use of reason in determination of values. This process involves three sub-processes - choosing, prizing and behaving.

The value clarification, further, lays stress on four key elements: focus on life; accepting what is; an invitation to reflect further, and nourishment of personal power. These key elements are explained below:

- **Focus on Life**: By focussing on relevant life issues, the students are encouraged to know how their personal priorities reflect a hierarchy of values.
• **Accepting What is:** In the valuing process the students should be encouraged to accept themselves as well as the situation around them as such. They have to be encouraged to be honest with themselves.

• **An Invitation to Reflect Further:** After accepting the self and the situation as what it is the students should be helped and encouraged to reflect on the values they have accepted. For this, the teacher should present more informed choices, more awareness of what a person cherishes and prizes in day-to-day behaviour.

• **Nourishment of Personal Power:** The advocates of value clarification have the conviction that as a result of constant process of clarification of values, the individual (practitioner) gains a sense of personal direction and fulfillment.

The value clarification theorists believe that those who are clear about the relationship between themselves and others (i.e. society), often show the qualities of being positive, purposeful and consistent, whereas those who are confused about this relationship 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 can reduce value confusion in them.

### 16.5.4 Meaning of Values

According to the advocates of value clarification, values are not to be considered as eternal truths but rather something that we consider right or desirable, something that can relate to the ever-changing world in a satisfying and intelligent way. Raths (1969, 78), while specifying the criteria of what we call value, holds that in order that a belief can be said to possess the status of a value, it must be (i) chosen freely, (ii) chosen from among alternatives, (iii) chosen after thoughtful consideration of the consequences, (iv) prized and cherished, (v) publicly affirmed, (vi) acted upon in reality, and (vii) acted upon repeatedly.

These criteria are also called sub-processes of the valuing process. Of these seven sub-processes, the first three obviously are related to choosing, (iv) and (v) to prizing, and (vi) and (vii) to behaving or acting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You as a teacher can help students practice each of these sub-processes of the valuing process. Using your resourcefulness, prepare some hypothetical situations and encourage students to practise the valuing process, by working on each of the sub-processes separately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16.5.5 Nature of Content in Valuing Process

Hersh et. al. (1980) maintains that the valuing process can usually contain the following three kinds of contents:

**Value indicators** – such as goals and aspirations.

**Personal issues** – which include questions about friendship, love, sexuality, marriage, loyalty, etc.
Social issues – such as poverty prevailing in communities, racism, freedom of speech, etc.

16.5.6 The Practice

According to Hersh et. al. (1980) the value clarification is rooted in classroom dialogue with the ultimate goal of helping students utilize the seven sub-processes of valuing in their own lives and applying the same to beliefs and behaviour that one has developed. To accomplish this task the teacher can utilize specially designed techniques or exercises to help students clarify their values.

Identifying value indicators

First of all, value indicators are identified by both teachers and students. Rath, Harmin and Simen have identified as many as eight value indicators. These are:

(i) Goals or purposes
(ii) Aspirations
(iii) Attitudes
(iv) Interests
(v) Feelings
(vi) Beliefs and convictions
(vii) Activities
(viii) Worries, problems and obstacles.

For clarification of the eight value indicators some typical keywords are mentioned for each value indicator as examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Indicator</th>
<th>Typical Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Purposes</td>
<td>i) We are thinking about doing .............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) When I get........ I am going to do .....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>i) If I pass this exam. I will .............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) In future ...................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>i) In my opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) My choice is ......................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>i) My hobby is ...........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) After school hours I daily .............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>i) I feel guilty when .....................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                        | ii) I feel bad if .........................
| Beliefs and convictions                 | i) I believe in ...........................  |
|                                        | ii) It is good to ..........................|
| Activities                             | i) After school I usually ..................|
|                                        | ii) I just like to play ...................  |
| Worries, problems and obstacles        | These indicate concern but usually do not represent well developed values. |
The value indicators are revealed in common classroom dialogue. Though such indicators are not values as such but their identification helps in creating an environment which facilitates the clarification of values.

Clarifying responses: Since the whole process of value clarification is a dialogue between the teacher and the students, the teacher in this valuing process should not impose his idea of “right” or “wrong”. The teacher should create an environment where each individual feels respected and free to express, is trusted or remains silent, and listens to others. For clarification of responses, the following elements may be kept in view:

- Moralizing or focussing on right or wrong responses should be avoided.
- Students should be helped in a way that they are able to decide for themselves.
- Setting a mood should be the aim, and not changing the behaviour.
- Stimulating the thought.
- The teacher is not expected to respond to everything overtly or to what everyone says or does in the class.

16.5.7 Resume and Appraisal

Value clarification is a process of making such decisions that concern us and are necessary for making value judgements in actual life situations. Instead of asking young people to act according to the traditional set of values (virtues) given to us by culture in a dull way, we should tell them that their task is to create their own values by the valuing process which involves choosing, prizing, and behaving.

However, value clarification theory and practice is also beset with problems and difficulties. First, the theory fails to make a proper distinction between moral and non-moral values; and secondly, the problem of ethical relativism has remained unresolved. Recording the second difficulty/problem, Lockwood (1976) remarks that “a programme of value education which devotes its attention to questions of personal preference and desire represents (only) a truncated and myopic view of morality. A programme which avoids the controversies associated with value conflicts and conflict resolution, under-evaluates the complexity of value issues in human affairs. Secondly, a value education programme which perhaps is unwillingly grounded in ethical relativism must accept the possibility that students will embrace ethical relativism as their moral point of view.”

16.6 VALUE ANALYSIS MODEL

Value Analysis, according to Hersh et. al. (1980), “is a close cousin of Rationale Building Model; both approaches are connected with the philosophic underpinnings of value education, both appreciate the centrality of conflict in making decisions about values and both tend to emphasize the controversial public issues.” The only clearly, visible difference between the two is that value analysis model pays greater attention to pedagogy. It helps students learn a highly systematic step-by-step process of making moral decisions. In the main, this model is concerned with making moral judgements or decisions. In
this framework are included systematic “procedures for explaining the difference between particular, general and conditional facts, between value criteria and value principles; between relevant and irrelevant evidence; and between various tests of acceptability of value principles (ibid., p.10). Value analysis, however, is silent about caring.

16.6.1 Value Criteria

Drawing a distinction between value criterion and value principle, Jerrold Comb – the author of value analysis model, holds that in value criterion, value is ascribed to some class of conditions. Commonly held criteria include statements like, it is wrong to cheat, lie, steal, kill, hurt other people etc.; and it is good to keep promises, pay debts or taxes and be healthy. Obviously in these criteria no manner is specified how certain type of condition is to be rated in all circumstances. They include how the condition is to be rated in main or other things being equal. For example, the value criterion that “deceiving others is wrong” is generally acceptable and valid. But deceiving others may be right at times, especially when by deceiving one intends to save the life of someone else or interests of the country. It shows that the value criterion is generally right but in exceptional circumstances, it may not apply.

16.6.2 Value Principle

According to Comb, value criteria give positive or negative “valence” to facts. In the case of euthanasia, for example, the value criterion – killing is wrong – gives a negative valence to the fact that euthanasia involves killing. The fact thus supports a negative evaluation of euthanasia. The moral decision is related to the nature of relevant facts. If all the facts are uniformly positive or uniformly negative in valence, the decision to be made becomes fairly simple. It becomes difficult when the relevant facts have conflicting valences, i.e. when some facts indicate the value object to be good, while other facts suggest that value object is not good. In such a situation the evaluator must balance the facts and come to a decision (Comb, 1971, p.17).

In most day-to-day situations involving moral conflicts, it is observed that facts involved in the case, have both positive and negative valences. In such situations, therefore, direct and simple decision is not possible. The judge, in order to deliver a judgement in a legal case has to weigh different valences and evidences. The judgement delivered is not a simple statement, but rather it is a principle which clearly states the conditions or circumstances in which the particular value criterion can be said to hold good.

You can think of situations or circumstances wherein some value criteria with positive valences do not hold good and some criteria with negative valences hold good. Discuss such situations with students to help them to understand the dynamics of making judgements.

Comb cites an example of a value principle by evaluating the proposition whether United States should withdraw from the war in Vietnam. After stating the different facts and criteria, Comb comes to the following value principle: “A nation ought not to be involved in a civil war to save a country from repressive government if that involvement increases the level of killing in war and diverts the nation’s attention from pressing social problem.”
16.6.3 Value Conflict and Value Analysis Strategy

According to Comb, value analysis comprises six essential conflict resolution sequences.

Value Analysis Tasks are:

1. Identifying and clarifying the value question
2. Assembling relevant facts
3. Assessing the truth of relevant (intended) facts
4. Clarifying the relevance of facts
5. Arriving at a tentative value decision
6. Testing the value principle implied in the decision.

(i) Identifying and clarifying the value question

What is required of teachers is that they should state the question unambiguously or clarify the value question. If such clarification demands citing of an example, one should do it. For example, consider the question: “is it alright to use drugs?” In this question, we do not know whether to focus on a particular drug or drugs in general. In order that the deliberations are encouraging and productive the students must know precisely. In the above example, for that matter, the term ‘drug’ could be defined as addictive, ‘consciousness altering circumstances’.

(ii) Assembling relevant facts

The students should be encouraged to gather relevant facts about the value object. Often we observe that students confuse a factual statement from an evaluative statement. It may be noted here that a factual statement describes observable conditions or events, whereas the evaluative statement rates the worth and acts as guide as to how persons are to act, choose or feel about something. It is factual, for instance, that lack of vitamins causes disease in human body. On the other hand, it is evaluative that to keep fit and healthy we should take vitamin-rich diet. The evaluative statements cannot be verified or justified on the basis of observation. The concept of ‘should’ in such statement cannot be discovered. The teacher can help students regarding (i) organizing facts about different concerns (economics, ecological, aesthetic and moral); (ii) distinguishing facts on the basis of positive or negative valences, etc.

(iii) Assessing the truth of relevant (intended) facts

The factual statements can be appraised by asking questions like the following:

i) How do we know this is true?
ii) Is there any evidence to show that this is true?
iii) Who said this is the case?
iv) Why should we believe what this person says?
v) Do other authorities agree with what he says?
(iv) Clarifying the relevance of facts

We should determine whether the facts gathered are really appropriate to the value decision required to be made. We must see that such facts have direct bearing. If they do not, they may be rejected.

(v) Arriving at a tentative value decision

A value principle is rational only if the evaluator can accept the value principle implied in the decision but only tentatively.

(vi) Testing the value principle implied in the decision

A value principle is rational only if the evaluator can accept the value principle implied in the decision. Teachers should help students uncover the value principle involved in the judgements, identify analogous situations, and determine whether the value principle holds equally good in such analogous situations.

16.7 THE SOCIAL ACTION MODEL

The main aim of the Social Action Model is to bring the desired social change by actively participating in the different programmes of citizen’s concern, which have already been well deliberated upon and considered socially good. This model was developed by Fred Newmann to teach students how to influence public policy by developing in them the environmental competence. Environmental competence involves actions to effect specific consequences on the environment.

16.7.1 Concept of Morality

According to Newmann morality does not merely comprise judging or caring at individual level. Actual morality is the ability to effect the desirable social changes so that the social injustice embedded in the system at macro-level is minimized, and people develop a caring attitude and do not overlook their moral obligations. In general they start acting as moral agents. A moral agent according to Newmann (1975, p.29) is one “who deliberates upon what he/she ought to do in a situation that involves possible conflicts between self-interest and interests of others or between rights of parties in conflict.”

Some people feel incompetent to effect the environment and to that extent, they cannot act as moral agents. Rampant corruption in the Indian society, for example, is a big social and political problem. A single individual, or a few individuals, find themselves incompetent to fight against this evil in Indian society, which has become deep rooted. It is because of such situations of social concern that social action model assumes significance and relevance.

16.7.2 Environmental Competence and Psychological Development

The environmental competence in a person is important not only to enable one to act as a moral agent but for one’s psychological development also. The ability to gain a sense of competence is integral to development of one’s ego-
strength and the ability to overcome anxiety. It is a significant aspect of a person's wholesome personality.

16.7.3 Consent of the Governed

It requires that in any democratic form of government each adult has equal opportunity to effect the use of power by electing their own leaders. It also attempts to ensure that equal rights of the governed are not violated and that public arena is the proper place for testing of ideas and policies. This can be attained through maximum participation of citizens in the socio-political activities when the general participation is low, the special interest groups can control or manipulate the political process and consequently the consent of the governed will be in danger. So Newmann’s program aims at developing social action skills of the citizens.

16.7.4 Major Components

Newmann suggests that without ignoring other competencies, development of environmental competence should be one of the main aims of the school. The major components of Newmann’s model are outlined as under.

The first step is to formulate policy goals based on moral deliberations and social policy research. One policy goal, for example, can be withdrawal of abortion laws. Having formulated goals, the citizens are required to gather support to implement the goals. This involves knowledge of the political processes, advocacy skills, group process skills and management skills. As a result of involving oneself in citizen action, one may sometimes face dilemma between two values. Newmann calls such dilemmas psycho-philosophic concerns. One such concern is commitment and openness. In such case an individual is required to maintain or develop an appropriate balance between being committed to a cause and at the same time keeping reasonable flexibility or openness. Another dilemma may be between concerns of the individual and concerns of the institutions. The third may be an issue of maintaining one’s integrity. At times during a social action project a person may be faced with choices where one has to compromise or trade off one’s basic integrity or basic values that one cherishes and prizes. In such situations care should be taken that the dilemma is resolved without trading off the basic integrity of the individual. A brief description of these components is presented below:

- **Formulating policy goals:** In the moral deliberation students should be encouraged to reason in open debate concerning the policies and principles that govern, for example, functioning of the school. Depending upon the motivation and concern of the participants, general issues and policies of the government may be included as subjects of debate and discussion. Newmann holds that in order to make moral deliberations meaningful and effective, rational arguments to some substantive values should be the main concern.

- **In social policy research the objective is to reflect upon and thus to ascertain the consequences of certain policies:** The students should be encouraged to examine the effect of probable consequences of certain policies.
• **Working support of one’s goals**: Formulating policy goal is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for social action. After formulating such goals what is required is to actively engage in realizing the goal. To realize the same, one needs certain social skills and relevant knowledge. For example, to begin with, one must be familiar with how a bill is passed in the legislative assembly or in the parliament and how decisions can be appealed.

• **Resolving psycho-philosophic concerns**: As one gets involved in citizen action, one might face certain dilemmas which need to be resolved. In such situations one should show reasonable amount of flexibility to compromise without trading off the basic values. Constructive criticism, if any, should be accepted without prejudice to one’s commitment to the cause. For attainment of higher policy goals one has to compromise with some values or self-interest.

### Activity 2

Think of such dilemma situations where foregoing some other interests or value can be in the larger social interest; and discuss such dilemmas with students. Obtain their viewpoints or suggestions.

### 16.8 LET US SUM UP

In this unit five distinct models of moral education have been discussed, though briefly. These models are (i) Rationale Building model of Shaver, (ii) Consideration model of McPhail, (iii) Value-Analysis model developed by Louis Raths and others, (iv) Value Analysis model of Jerold Comb, and (v) Social Action model of Newmann. All these models are mutually complementary to each other, each providing an essential aspect of a larger unity of moral education.

The Rationale Building model, though touches upon different aspects of moral education, yet its main concern is with realm of judging. This model provides an inspiration and guidance for teachers who wish to begin moral education programme. It is more directly concerned with teachers’ moral decision-making and seeks to clarify how teachers can help their students develop more meaningful ways of dealing with moral issues. The conceptual framework of the model is related to Jurisprudential model. Hence, emphasis is given more to “form” of morality than to its “content” and tries to clarify certain main concepts related to values and more especially to moral values. For examples, it makes a distinction between value criteria and value principle, value and value judgement, and between aesthetic, instrumental and moral values. It highlights the importance of reason and judgement in moral education.

In McPhials Consideration Model, the focus is on a person's life-style of relating to self and others. It seeks to demonstrate that, in practice, living for others is rewarding and motivating, in real sense as living for one-self. More specifically it seeks to freeing individuals of ego-centricity and narcissism, etc. Accordingly, moral education must work towards liberation of individuals from shackles of fear and distrust, to empower students to give and receive love and consideration. So it is concerned with cultivating disposition and
behaviours which are desirable. Cultivation of such behaviours is facilitated by methods of observational learning and social modelling and the essence of education lies in moral style which is essentially affiliative.

"bag of virtues" approach to moral education which is affiliaive, Value Clarification offers a model of moral education on the other extreme; where values instead of being a matter of personal preferences, something that one end acts accordingly in real life situations. This key elements which are (i) focus on life, question to reflect further (iv) developing a fulfillment. The values depend on certain conditions after thoughtful consideration of events in reality and repeatedly. All this focus of this process is to avoid development and promote the use of choosing, prizing and behaving.

It is a close cousin of Rationale and is to develop capacity to make between the two models is that of procedural step-by-step framework are included between particular, general value principles, between the tests of acceptability of things the desired social of citizen's concern and socially good. It policy by developing of the model are and social policy. This involves stress skills and It, in other committed to flexibility or

_____

_____

and

_____
4. Describe the underlying assumptions of Value Clarification model. Also explain four key elements that the model stresses.

5. Explain any four value analysis tasks as explained by Value Analysis model.

6. What is the aim of Social Action model? What are its major components?

16.10 SUGGESTED READINGS


