

Emergence of Ethics in Education

Dr. Rashmi Mishra

Abstract—Ethics is defined as the discipline dealing with what is good, what is bad and what is a moral duty and obligation? Ethics in organization deal with behavior of people that to an educational environment and by the body corporate with respect to ethical issues in public interest. The main sources of ethical behavior are values & goals. Now a day's in organization principle codes such as ethical code, enforcement, and communication system are not followed well. Developing an ethical environment is a long term process in business it is not only a social responsibility but also an asset which have their own return in financial and non-financial terms. Recently have seen an increasing stress on the need to monitor and manage educators, and hold them to account for ethics. Learning outcomes can be valuable if properly used, they have been misappropriated and adopted widely at all levels within the education system to facilitate the managerial process. The claim that they can be made precise by being written with a prescribed vocabulary of special descriptors so as to serve as objective, measurable devices for monitoring performance, is fundamentally mistaken, and they may be damaging to education when used in this way. The people are taking buyer and seller relationship in teacher and student role. That is the reason it has taken the shape of teaching organization rather than temple of olden time.

Index Terms- Ethics, Education System Human values.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ethics refers to a system of moral principles, badness of action and their motive and consequences. Study of ethics involves study of good and evil, right and wrong, just and unjust actions in any sphere or dimension.

A profession is bound by certain ethical principles and rule of conduct which reflects its responsibility, authority, and dignity. The professionalization of business management is reflected in the increasing acceptance of business ethics. The most important professional ethic is expressed by Oath of the Greek physician, *Primum nocere* ("not knowingly harm") which means that professional should carefully evaluate his decision and ensure that his actions will not produce any negative and adverse effects. In this context there are two theories which are pertinent about the nature of ethics.

A. *The Theory of Moral Unity*

Essentially advocates the principles that business action should be judged by the general ethical society. There exists only one ethical standard which applies to business and non-business situation.

B. *The Theory Of Amoralty,*

Which argues that business can be amoral and the action of businessman need to be guided by the general ethical standards.

The invisible hand of the market assure that by pursuing his own interest (merchant) frequently promotes that the society more effectively. (Adam Smith)

II. WHY ETHICS IS IMPORTANT?

A. *Organization Perspective*

The main sources of ethics are religion, culture, & legal system. Ethic corresponds to basic human needs. It is a human trait that a man desires to be ethical; not only in his private life but also in his business affairs where being a mentor he knows his decision may affect the life of many people or employee. The basic ethical need force organization to be ethically oriented.

B. *Societal perspective*

Now a days more and more crime are happening, law cannot protect society as such in a manner ethics can protect, government, lawyer cannot do everything to protect society. Technology develops faster than government can regulate. People in an industry know the danger in particular technology better than regulatory agencies, where law fails ethics can succeed.

III. DIFFERENT WAYS FOR FOLLOWING ETHICS OR GUIDELINES FOR FOLLOWING ETHICS

A. *The Golden Rule*

"Act in a way that you would expect others to act toward you"

B. *The Professional Ethic*

Only take actions that would be viewed as proper by an objective panel of your professional colleagues

C. *When in doubt, don't*

If you feel uneasy about the moral or social consequences of a decision, defer. If something inside (head, heart, guts) feels wrong, consult with another whose moral compass and judgement you respect and trust.

D. *The Wall Street Journal Test*

A good test for everyone in an organisation is to ask, "Would I feel comfortable explaining these actions to the general public." (Patrick E. Murphy and Gene R. Laczniak; 2006)

Dr. Rashmi Mishra, Department of Business Studies, Ministry of Manpower, College of Technology, Sultanate of Oman.

E. *Never Knowingly Do Harm*

Called by some The Silver Rule (because it doesn't hold marketers to as high a standard as The Golden Rule)

F. *Slippery Slope*

As necessary as it is to avoid clearly wrongful practices, it is equally important not to engage in debatable behaviors that over time might lead to subtle, but significant erosions in ethical behavior.

G. *Parent/Child On Your Shoulder*

A naïve child, your mother or the founder of your company is comfortable with the ethical decision you've made? Could you explain to them, in common sense terms, why it was a good decision and the right thing to do? Ethical behavior goes well beyond mere compliance with legal and regulatory standards. "If one only aspires to a legal standard of moral excellence, we will have missed the point. Man can do better" (Aleksandra Solzhenitsyn.) "If the firm does not have a moral compass point, it has the potential to contribute to the bankruptcy of the human soul". (C. William Pollard,)

IV. DIFFERENT APPROACHES OF PEOPLE TOWARDS ETHICS

Different people have different ways of viewing the world. It is important to understand all of these views. Occasionally, they are the basis for conflict between people, especially when one group is intolerant of another's viewpoint. There are three models below."

A. *Materialistic Model*

A materialist does not believe in a spiritual aspect of life. She/he believes that the only world that exists is the physical world and that natural laws govern all of nature's secrets. All behaviours that have evolved have done so because of natural selection.

B. *Spiritual Model*

Under the spiritual model, life has a purpose. Every person has a spiritual centre (soul) which is real but not material. This centre is a person's link with God. The ultimate purpose in life is unification with one's spiritual centre. Behaviour and morality originate from divine law in this framework.

C. *Humanistic Model:*

Humanists believe that life has a purpose and that every person has dignity and worth. They feel that an ideal world of compassion and tolerance can be attained with man-made moral principles. Divine laws are not necessary. Humanists do not believe in a spiritual afterlife.

V. SUGGESTION FOR MAKING ETHICAL DECISION

Individual in business can take a number of steps to resolve ethical problem.

A. *Moral Idealism*

Postulates that certain acts are good and other are bad. Pursue those acts then are good and avoid the bad ones. Moral idealism gives definite answer to ethical issues.

B. *Intuition*

Leaves it to the individual concerned to sense the moral gravity of the situation. If he or she feels that his or her motives are good and they do not intend to hurt anyone, he or she is taking intuitive approach to morally difficult situation

C. *Utilitarianism*

Seeks to establish the moral focus not on the act or the motives but on the consequences. If the consequences represent a net increase in society's happiness.

VI. THE MODEL OF ETHICS IN EDUCATION

Education serves a moral purpose. It is a public good and necessarily centers consideration on the individual student not the organization. Ethical leadership requires a consideration of the fundamental purposes of education, the nature of schools as institutions, and the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders (Beck & Murphy, 1994). Administration cannot ignore its moral purposes and obligations because it cannot isolate itself from the teaching/learning discourse despite efforts to do so (McKerrow, 1997; Murphy, 2005; Murphy, Hawley, & Young, 2005).

Recently, the study of ethics has been introduced into some programs (Beck & Murphy, 1994; McCarthy, 1999). The problem is that ethics is seen as a separate course of study or an additive for other course content. Just as technology cannot be confined to computer courses, ethics cannot be viewed as idiosyncratic particular to be studied outside the context of actual practice. It remains unclear how this recent emphasis on ethical discourse alone will disrupt the traditional exclusionary, unjust, administrative narrative (Brunner, 2002; Grogan, 1996; 2000). The model of education process identifies following key factors,

A. *Factor- I Nature Of The Learner*

The Nature of the Learner considers three familiar constructs in education: cognitive ability, affective ability, and psychometrics ability. Each of these relates to specific abilities that define the learner. Perhaps not so familiar is conative ability and it speaks to motivation, focused interest, and perseverance. (Herzberg, Mauser, Snyderman (1959/2002) focus on social justice issues emerging from the affective and conative domains is no less important than either the cognitive or psychometrics domains. This means that the courage and willingness to act when there is social injustice is as important as identifying it when it occurs.

B. *Factor II - The Role Of The Educator*

Role of the Educator, the position of the educator as moral stands equal to the role of facilitator. In this model, educators, including professors and administrators, must acknowledge the importance of teaching, of facilitating, of advocating, of taking a stand, and of having a point of view. While there is clear understanding of the roles teaching and even facilitating, the necessity for serving as a moral model cannot be underestimated. Each one of these elements, operating together, constitutes the educator's role. None should be ignored in the education of administrators or the teaching done by professors.

C. Factor III - The Needs of Society

Needs of Society appreciates the necessity of including both individual rights and obligations when examining social needs. The call for equality, responsibility and responsiveness attest to the necessity for social justice in a free, democratic, society. If it is important to consider individual and collective rights, it is just as important to consider the responsibilities that accrue to them. In addition, there is a call to be responsive to those rights and obligations within the community, to display socially responsible behavior, to get involved, to safeguard against elitist stratification, and to reject all forms of authority that restrict equality. This puts particular responsibility on both the professor and administrator to be activists who understand their unique institutional obligation to promote democracy, equity and justice.

D. Factor IV-The Demands Of Knowledge

Demands of Knowledge are the most important factor. All meaning is situated on these particular curricular frames: empirics or scientific problem-solving knowledge, aesthetics or exposure to and training in the arts, symbolic or logic, mathematics, and linguistics, ethics or moral thinking, synnoetics or personal/social knowledge and, synoptics or philosophical and historical knowledge. Moral leadership, which requires ethical, synnoetic, and synoptic knowledge, has been recognized as a vital role for administrators to perform in educational organizations. Moral leadership is at the core of education process model.

Morality or ethics in educational administration is not the result of sustained dialogue and mutual understanding between teachers and administrators in the organization. Education generally and education administration specifically are relational and require the "will to remain in a caring relation to the other" (Noddings, 1984). Knowledge production must be judged by ethical as well as epistemological ideals. The Curricular Taxonomy for Just and Ethical Professional Education establishes social justice, undominated discourse important ethical educational ideals (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986). Education administration cannot ignore those ideals when constructing its narrative.

Synnoetic or personal/social knowledge, such as self-interest or cowardice or confidence in decision-making, is important. Synnoetic understanding helps administrators examine the principles they operate under and the reasons they do what they do. Both altruistic and self-serving motives exist in administration so students must understand the actions and reactions of those in the organization. Synnoetics promotes an examination of where administrators stand in relation to the organization, to the people in it, and to themselves. It brings to the forefront issues of accountability, domination and dialogue and the impediments to each. It facilitates administrators' ability to take a point of view and challenges their willingness to maintain it against public and personal pressures. In other words, synnoetic knowledge acknowledges the necessity of courage and exposes the lack of it.

Synoptic or philosophical /historical knowledge should be

included as part of administrative core as well. This type of knowledge is essential if one expects educational administration students to be reflective and critical. It offers a perspective of education and administration against which students can assess their own practice. Without such a perspective, students are likely to be narrowly socialized to support the very system they must necessarily critique. Without synoptic knowledge students do not have the tools to pose alternatives to the traditional narrative.

VII. CONCLUSION

The search for ethical questions opens up the discourse and encourages voices to emerge that have been traditionally stifled, namely parents, teachers, students, women, and minorities. The Curricular Taxonomy for Just and Ethical Professional Education is more dynamic than traditional models. It allows the research and practice of academics and practitioners to be as responsive and dynamic as the students, teachers, and parents they serve. This is because there is an implicit assumption that administrative practice and research are both guided by morals and ethics. Finally, this process exposes the necessity to make the term accountability mean more than blameworthiness for failure to accomplish organizational goals. It expands the idea of accountability to include the degree of participation among those affected by decisions. Educational administration should be viewed as a moral enterprise and specific content areas like law, finance, and personnel evaluation as extensions of broader moral questions. Deciding not to think about moral questions in education administration is itself a profoundly moral decision. (Raywid's 1986). So hence in a nutshell the role of ethics in education is more pertinent for the making of stronger people for stronger nation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrews, M., Shockley Lee, S., & James, D. (2001, November 2-4).
- [2] Beck, L. G. & Murphy, J. (1994). Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [3] Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- [4] Blount, J. (1998). Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendence, 1873-1995. New York: SUNY Press.
- [5] Bredeson, P. (2002). Paradoxes in professional development: Implications for principal learning, work, and licensing.
- [6] Brunner, C. (2000). Principles of power: Women superintendents and the riddle of the heart. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- [7] Brunner, C. (2002). A proposition for the reconception of the superintendence: Reconsidering traditional and nontraditional discourse. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3), 402-431.
- [8] Clark, B. R. (1960, May). The "Cooling-out" functions in higher education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65, 569-576.
- [9] Cusick, P.A. (1992). The educational system: Its nature and logic. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [10] The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 976-998. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (2nd ed.). (pp. 25-43). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [11] Fazzaro, C.J., Walter, J.E. & McKerrow, K.K. (1994).. In S. Maxey (Ed.), *postmodern school leadership* (pp. 85-95). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- [12] Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- [13] Goffman, R. (1952). On cooling the mark out: Some aspects of adaptation to failure. *Psychiatry*, 15, 451-463.
- [14] Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College.

Emergence of Ethics in Education

- [15] Grogan, M. (1996). *Voices of women aspiring to the superintendency*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- [16] Grogan, M. (2000). Laying the groundwork for a reconceptualization of the superintendency from feminist postmodern perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 117-142.
- [17] Herzberg F., Mauser, B., & Snyderman, B. (2002). *The Motivation to work* (5th printing). Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick. (Original work published 1959).
- [18] Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational Leadership: The moral art*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.
- [19] Jellen, H.G. (1986). Miseducation of the gifted and talented: An educational trend and condition that exists world-wide. In D. Sisk (Ed.), *Gifted international: Critical trends and issues in gifted education*, 3(2), (pp. 17-28). Monroe, NY: Trillium Press.
- [20] Laible, J. C. (2000). A loving epistemology: What I hold critical in my life, faith, and profession. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(6), 683-692.
- [21] Lyotard, J.F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.
- [22] MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- [23] Marshall, C. (2000). The emperor and research on women in school leadership: A response to Julie Laible's loving epistemology. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(6), 699-704.
- [24] McCarthy, M.M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership programs. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.), *The Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 119-140). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [25] McKerrow, K. K. (1997). Ethical administration: An oxymoron? *Journal of School Leadership*. 7(2), 210-225.
- [26] Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 154-191.
- [27] Murphy, J. (1992). *The Landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park: Corwin Press.
- [28] Murphy, J., Hawley, W. & Young, M. (2005). Redefining the education of school leaders: Scaffolding a learning-anchored program on the ISLLC standards. *Education Leadership Review*, 6 (2), 48-57.
- [29] Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [30] Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- [31] Parker, W. C. (1995). The urban curriculum and the allocating function of schools. In E. Stevens & G. Woods (Eds.), *Justice, ideology, and education* (pp. 178-182). New York: McGraw Hill.
- [32] Phenix, P. (1964). *Realms of Meaning: A philosophy of curriculum for general education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [33] Purpel, D.E. (1989). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion in education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- [34] Raywid, M. A. (1986). Some moral dimensions of administrative theory and practice. *Issues in Education*, 4(2), 151-166.
- [35] Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*, (Updated Ed.), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [36] Shakeshaft, C. (1998). Wild patience and bad fit: Assessing the impact of affirmative action on women in school administration. *Educational Researcher*, 27(9), 10-12.
- [37] Strike, K.A., Haller, E.J., & Soltis, J.F. (1994). *The ethics of educational administration*. New York: The Teachers College Press.
- [38] U.S. Department of Education. (2002, January 8). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Washington, DC: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- [39] Young, M. (2000). Considering (irreconcilable?) contradictions in cross-group feminist research. *Qualitative studies in Education*, 13(6), 629-660.
- [40] Young, M., & Laible, J. (2000). Introduction. *Qualitative studies in Education*, 13(6), 585-589.
- [41] *Marketing Ethics – Cases and Readings*, Patrick E. Murphy and Gene R. Laczniak; Prentice Hall, 2006 (reprinted here in pre-publication).
- [42] *Professional Ethics in Public Education: An Autopsy*, by Myron Lieberman, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).
- [43] A Comparative Study of Values, *Journal of Business Ethics* (1989).
- [44] Dietrich L. Schaupp 1988 *Discussion About Ethics in Education*
- [45] Frazer, M.J. and A. Kornhauser. *Ethics and Social Responsibility in Science Education*. Pergamon Press. Oxford, UK. 1986.
- [46] Jennings, Bruce, Kathleen Nolan, Courtney S. Campbell, and Strachan Donnelly. *New Choices, New Responsibilities*. The Hastings Center. 1990.
- [47] Lickona, Thomas. "Four Strategies for Fostering Character Development in Children." *Phi Delta Kappa*. 69;419. February, 1988.
- [48] McLean, George. *Act and Agent: Philosophy for Moral Education and Character Development*. University Press of America. Lanham, MD. 1986.
- [49] Power, F. Clark. *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education*. Columbia University Press. New York, NY. 1989.
- [50] Ryan, Kevin and George McLean. *Character Development in Schools and Beyond*. Praeger Publishers. New York, NY. 1987.
- [51] Laura P. Hartsman, *Perspective in Business Ethics*, Tata McGraw-Hill, 2003, pp 97-9
- [52] Andrew Harrison, *International Business*, Oxford university press, 2000, pp 120-2
- [53] <http://archive.cnx.org/contents/867ec434-944e-43ab-8a10-563e536f70ae@1/social-justice-a-model-for-unraveling-the-ethics-of-administrative-discourse>



Dr. Rashmi Mishra

I have 12 years of teaching experience and 4 years of corporate experience. I served both national and international levels. During this tenure I served Ministry of Education in Africa and currently associated with Ministry of Manpower in sultanate of Oman. I have presented 15 papers in national conferences and 5 papers in international conferences. I have done my **PhD**. From department of commerce Lucknow University, India in

2015 **Post Graduate** in Economics from Kanpur University (2007-09), **MBA** (2000-02) program from Lal Bahadur Institute of Management & Technology, Bareilly. in Marketing and HRM. Some of my publications, are Titled "**Six Sigma and Software Development Process**" Contemporary Management Journal of the LBSIMDS Lucknow, Vol.01, Part-02, Year Jan-June 2008, Page No.70-81 'LBSIMDS' Published by R.K Printers, Lucknow-21. ISSN 0974-4002., Titled "**The Kaleidoscopic View of Information Technology for Retailing**" Commerce & Business studies, biannual Journal of Economics, commerce & Management, A Publication of Integral University, Lucknow (U.P.). Issue: 2, Vol.: 1, December, 2008, pp.89-100, Titled "**Talent Attraction and Retention**" Contemporary Management Journal of the LBSIMDS Lucknow, Vol.01, Part-02, Year July-December 2007, Page No.43-47 'LBSIMDS' Published by R.K Printers, Lucknow-21.