

Foundational Values in University Education: An Historical Understanding of Values in Practice

John Koskey Chang'ach
Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya

Preface

Foundational values in a university classroom: Understanding values in practice explores the way in which philosophy of education and ethics is a values enterprise and that an exploration of values is necessary to work out the full purpose of a higher education to guide practices and help academics understand academic work. Philosophy of education and ethics inform thinking and actions and although this is well recognized, values philosophy of education and ethics are seldom brought to the forefront of inquiries as practices in higher education are developed. This book argues that by putting philosophy of education and ethics firmly on the agenda of those who teach work and learn in higher education, the academic profession can open up new spaces for moral education conversations and potentially transform the way in which they practice.

Foundational values in a university classroom: Understanding values in practice is key reading for university lecturers, those with responsibility for leadership and management of higher education.

There are few books that directly address the broad and complex question of foundational values in a university classroom: Understanding values in practice in teaching in higher education, yet at the same time, values are widely recognized as permeating all our practices. In this sense, an accepted part of academic life remains in the realm of “taken for granted” rather than being consciously and explicitly explored and practiced. The book deals with the idea of values in both a philosophical and practical manner. It is based on original research and uses both empirical data and theory to address teaching values in higher education and the current values of the higher education system. It explores what academics have valued historically in teaching and also addresses the major reforms of the 21st century. Reforms have essentially changed the nature of African higher education but have made little real difference to the outcomes for student learning and society, whereas teaching with values in all subjects has the potential to radically alter student experiences.

Dedication

I dedicate this book to Sally Jemutai Kosgey. She is the inspiration for my writing and my life. Because, of her, as wife, supporter, and detailed and careful reader. I am able to work long hours, keep the home fires burning, and be a productive researcher and book writer. Thank you, Sally, from the bottom of my heart for being there for me through all of the stages of this book.

Acknowledgements

This book could not have been written without the encouragement and ideas of the 14 students in the doctoral-level programme that I taught at Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya. Specific students instrumental in its development: George Kegode, Samson Barasa Omajar, Michael Kariuki, Joseph Kiprop, Beth Mwai, Joan Jelimo, Beatrice Namatsi, Johnstone Burudi Musungi, Robert Ngeno, Margaret Kamaara Kosgei, Richard K. Rono, Duncan M. Mukhwana, Leen Kavulavu, and Pius Wanyama Muricho. The courses I taught have been laboratories for working out ideas, incorporating new ones, and sharing my experiences as a writer and researcher. In addition, I want to thank the members of the Department of Educational Foundations over the years that have helped to conceptualize content in this book. I am indebted to the scholarly work of George Kegode. In addition, I am grateful for the insightful suggestions provided by the Mercy Jeruto. I also could not have produced this book without the support and encouragement of my friends in the School of Education. I especially owe much to my mentors Prof. Peter Odhiambo Ndege, Prof. Nicholas Makana, Prof. John Mwaruvie, and Dr. Prisca Too Tanui.

My family members: Sally Kosgey, Mercy Jeruto, Dennis Kipkogei, Sharon Jepkemboi, and Brenda Jerotich have been most supportive of my work and have encouraged me throughout the process.

Thanks! CERM-ESA family!

Contents

Preface	
Dedication	
Acknowledgements	
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Definition of Education: An Overview	1
Education as a Social Process	1
The Background	2
What is the Problem?	3
Pertinent Questions	3
Rationale for Character and Integrity Education	3
Chapter 2 The Essence of Education as a Normative Enterprise	4
Overview	4
Towards a Definition of Moral Education	4
Chapter 3 Developing Moral Education in Institutions of Higher Learning	11
Overview	11
Trends in Moral Education	11
Moral Education as the Transmission of “Moral Substance”	12
Moral Education as Lived Experience	13
Moral Education as a Set of Tools and Procedures	15
The Role of University in the Development of Moral Education	16
Can Ethics be Taught?	16
The Learner as a Moral Agent	18
The Role of the Teacher as Moral Educator	19
Chapter 4 The Notion of Classical Conceptions of University Education Based on Modern and Post-Modern Perspectives	22
Philosophy of University Education	22
What is Philosophy?	22
The Nature of Philosophy	23
What Scholars Say About Philosophy?	23

Value of Philosophy	23
Philosophy of Education	24
Importance of Philosophy of Education to a University Lecturer	24
What do You Understand by Term Education?	24
What Scholars Say About Education?	25
Chapter 5 The Philosophy that Guides the Practice of University Teaching	26
Vision of the University	26
Mission of the University	26
Core Values of the University	26
Institutional Philosophy	26
Objectives of the University	27
Quality Policy Statement	27
Philosophy of University Education	27
The University Notion of Publish or Perish	31
What is Philosophy of Education?	33
Competency-Based Education: Philosophy of University Education	33
Chapter 6 Personal Statements of Philosophy	36
What is Your Philosophy of Life?	36
How to Create a Master Plan for Your Life	36
Chapter 7 The Role of Students and Lecturers in University Education	38
Student Responsibilities	38
Rights and Responsibilities	39
Lecturer's Job Description	39
What Does a HE Lecturer do?	39
The Duties of Professors at the Universities	40
Responsibilities	42
What to Expect	43
The Roles of a Teacher in the 21st Century	43
Teacher's Authority as Power	45
The Role of the Lecturer as an Authority in the Classroom	47
Chapter 8 Ethics in a University Classroom	48
Course Purpose	48
Objectives of the Course	48

Expected Learning Outcomes	48
Meaning of Ethics	48
Ethics and Professional Conduct	49
A Case for Ethics Education in University	50
Current State of Ethics Education in Universities	51
What Ethics Education in the University Classroom Ought to be?	52
Why Ethics in the University Classroom?	53
Pedagogical Neglect	54
Aristotle's Rhetorical Triangle	55
Virtue and Character in HE	55
The Various Sources, Types, and Aspects of Ethics in the University Classroom	56
Types of Ethics	56
The Concept of Academic and Scholarship Integrity at the University	57
Chapter 9 Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	59
Overview	59
The Crucial Importance of Moral Education	59
Strategies and Recommendations for Moral Education	59
Making Moral Education Central to the Educative Process	59
Building a Sound Institutional Culture	60
Investing in Teacher Education Programmes	60
Suggested Ways Through Which a Lecturer and the School System Can Enhance Moral Values in Learners	61
References	61

Chapter 1

Introduction

Definition of Education: An Overview

This introductory chapter presents a general introduction to the book. The existence of a moral vacuum in the education of the youth is explicitly presented as an issue in need of serious attention.

Education is one of the basic activities of people in all human societies. The continued existence of society depends upon the transmission of culture to the young. It is essential that every new generation must be given training in the ways of the group, so that the same tradition will continue. Every society has its own ways and means of fulfilling this need. Education has come to be one of the ways fulfilling this need.

The term “education” is derived from the Latin work “educare”, which literally means to “bring up” and is connected with the word “educere”, which means to “bring forth”. The idea of education is not merely to impart knowledge to the pupil in some subjects, but to develop in him those habits and attitudes with which he may successfully “face” the future.

The Latin author Varro wrote—“The midwife brings forth, the nurse brings up, the tutor trains, and the master teaches”. Plato was of the opinion that the end of education was to develop in the body and in the soul (of the pupil) all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable. It means, in short, a sound mind in sound body (“mens sana incorporate sano”).

According to the Aristotelian conception, the aim of education is “to develop man’s faculties, especially, his mind, so that he may be able to enjoy the contemplation of the supreme truth, goodness, and beauty, in which perfect happiness essentially consists”.

As Peter Worsety says, “A large part of our social and technical skills are acquired through deliberate instruction which we call education. It is the main working activity of children from the ages of five to 15 and often beyond”. A large part of the budget of many developed and developing countries is set apart for education. Education employs a large army of people.

Sociologists are becoming more and more aware of the importance and role of educational institutions in the modern industrialized societies. In recent years, education has become the major interest of some sociologists. As a result, a new branch of sociology called “sociology of education” has become established.

Durkheim (1961) conceived of education as “the socialization of the younger generation”. He further states that it is “a continuous effort to impose on the child ways of seeing, feeling, and acting, which he could not have arrived at spontaneously”.

Education as a Social Process

Education stands for deliberate instruction or training. Man does not behave in society impulsively or instinctively. He behaves in a way according to which he is trained. Some thinkers have equated it with socialization. A few other regard education as an attempt to transmit the cultural norms of the group to its younger members. It is also understood more knowledge. All these three interpretations of education as a process or a continuous entity the word process stressed continuity.

Firstly, education, viewed as socialization, is continuous. Socialization is social learning. This social learning is not intermittent but continuous. Perfection in social learning is rarely achieved the more we try to learn our own society and fellow beings the more remains to be learned.

Social learning begins at birth and ends only at death. It continues throughout our life. There is no point or state in our life at which we have learned everything about one group or society and beyond that nothing remains to be studied. We belong to different groups at different stages of our life. As these groups change, we must learn new rules and new patterns of behavior.

Furthermore, we do not always remain within the same role. We being as children, pass through adolescence into adulthood, marry, become parents, enter middle age, retire, grow old, and finally die. With each role comes pattern of behavior that we must learn and thus throughout our life, we are involved in the socialization process.

Secondly, education viewed as an agent of cultural transmission is also continuous. Culture is growing while there can be break in the continuity of culture. If, at all, there is a break, it only indicates the end of a particular human group. The cultural elements are passed on from generation act as the agents of cultural transmission. Education in its formal or informal pattern has been performing this role since time immemorial. Education can also be looked upon as process from this point of view.

Thirdly, education implies, as an attempt to acquire knowledge, is also continuous. Knowledge is like an ocean, boundless and limitless. No one has mastered it or exhausted it. No one can claim to do so. There is a limit to the human genius or the human grasp of the things. The mortal man can hardly know anything and everything about nature, which is immortal.

The universe is a miraculous entity. The more one tries to know of it, the more it becomes mysterious. Not any the natural universe, but also the social universe is complex. The human experiences limited to have a thorough knowledge of acquiring more and more knowledge about the universe with all its complexity. Education thus is a continuous endeavor process.

The Background

Among the most important goals of education, the following objectives are paramount:

1. The sustenance of the true convictions on which the human society is founded;
2. The preparation of citizens for the public work, which is a crucial factor for human survival. Hence, education has the duty of creating and sustaining public good;
3. The training and education of a humane capital;
4. The enhancement and promotion of corporate objectives; that is, socio-communication objectives.

To achieve these objectives, educational institutions as centres of learning need to be knit together as humane institutions with a constant awareness of their noble responsibility to future generations. In their charge is placed the responsibility of insuring the societal posterity. Thus, these institutions must labour to bring forth holistic persons as endowed with sound character, quality, and intelligence. On the contrary, schools and even the highest institutions of learning have generally reduced the learner to an object subject to market forces far away from his/her nature as a person. Seemingly, this is the general perspective in which the learner is viewed even by those in the teaching profession. Evidently, something seems to be going on seriously wrong with educational institutions. There is a need, therefore, to go back and find out where the rains started beating the universities.

This book suggests that the worst rains that have hit institutions of learning can best be defined in the context of the departure from lofty goals of education, namely, the development of learners for life, in other words, learners who should become critical, intelligent, and good choosers and moral actors in the world. Thus, while maintaining the vital traditional ideals, the purpose of education needs to be continuously re-defined in the context of the contemporary consumerist situations. Daniel Webster had this to say of education:

If we work on marble, it will perish. If we work upon brass, time will efface it. If we erect temples, they will crumble to dust. But if we work upon men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with the just fear of God and love of their fellow men, we engrave on those tablets something that no time can efface and that will brighten and brighten to all eternity. (Gries, 1996)

For Webster, education is not principally about imparting knowledge in the sense of pouring facts into minds; rather it is all about imbuing minds with high principles, with a reverence for the sacred that institutes absolute things and concepts, and with a love for fellow men and women. On the contrary, as Gries (1996) has further observed, education has been short-changed and instead has been used:

To pour facts into people, to prepare them with a particular skill to make a living, and to earn money. These are important, but more important are the high principles, the high values, the search for a meaning to their life, the fact that only through loving all men, no matter what their culture, can the world be at peace.

What is the Problem?

Life in the society is about the decisions, choices, and actions that people undertake and not merely about what they know (cognitively). However, in a world fascinated by utility and practical sense, by efficiency and accountability, and by management and control, the educational enterprise will often tend to be perceived and evaluated accordingly. Hence, instead of being seen as the overall process of propagating desirable survival skills and values from one generation to the next, education is likely to be compromised for mere marketable pragmatic definitions. This is often the case in institutions of learning, where education is hardly directed towards the formation and development of civility in the learners.

Instead, the focus is on "pumping ideas into the heads" of learners, who are supposed to reproduce the same for good certificates. Consequently, character development is often overlooked. It is this seemingly forgotten moral dimension of education that determines the quality of the people and the society which they constitute. There is, therefore, a need to re-affirm the centrality of moral education in the broad structure of our educative processes in order to make education regain its principle role of forming holistic citizens that are able to choose, decide, and act appropriately.

Pertinent Questions

The book has been guided by the following questions in its inquiry:

1. What is moral education?
2. What is the importance of moral education in universities?
3. In which ways can moral education be enhanced in institutions of higher learning?

Rationale for Character and Integrity Education

Interest in moral education is justified on the simple argument that we can evaluate the quality of a society not by the number and/or level of academic certificates that individuals hold but simply on the nature of the decisions, choices, and actions that they engage in. These elements (choices, decisions, and actions) are the ultimate indicators of civility. They define the survival chances of both individuals and the entire society as a whole. These then ought to be the ultimate focus of education.

On the other hand, it can be argued that the development of a rich civil culture coupled with the formation of morally apprehensive individuals is the surest way of establishing a lasting culture of peace and mutual co-existence. Hence, an investment in the moral education of the youth is almost an unchallengeable adventure.

Chapter 2

The Essence of Education as a Normative Enterprise

Overview

This chapter delves into the literature related to moral education in the broad perspective of the general objectives of education. The normative nature of education is critically examined alongside other related components of education. In order to emphasize the necessity for urgent interventions in moral education, an illustrative discussion on the moral decadence in institutions of higher learning is presented. Finally, the chapter ends by examining the close relationship between education and morality in the development and formation of a cultured person.

It is almost certain that the term “education” transcends the mere act of accumulating ideas and concepts in the minds of the learner. Various educational thinkers have defined the aims of education with a focus on the transmission of desirable qualities from one generation to the next.

Both Plato and Aristotle (Wikipedia, 2006), notably some of the earliest important educational thinkers echo this irreplaceable goal of education. For instance, Plato saw education as the key to creating and sustaining his “Republic”. Education would be holistic, including facts, skills, physical discipline, and rigidly censored music and art.

Similarly, in his treatise *On Education*, Aristotle (1982) considered nature, habit, and reason to be three equally important forces to be cultivated in education. Thus, for example, he considered repetition to be a key tool to develop good habits. The teacher was to lead the student systematically. This differs, for example, from Socrates’ emphasis on questioning his listeners to bring out their own ideas (though the comparison is perhaps unfair since Socrates was dealing with adults). One of education’s primary missions for Aristotle, perhaps it is most important, was to produce good and virtuous citizens for the “polis”. The primary impetus of this mission is to vest individuals with the necessary survival skills.

Though often defined and indeed confused in the context of schooling, the concept of education cuts across mere schooling especially when viewed from an institutional dimensions. Schooling is descriptive notion: It describes the various activities and processes that take place within certain kinds of institutions (called “schools”). Education, on the other hand, is prescriptive or normative: It contains an irreducibly ethical component. The reason for this is that what characterizes or defines education is a set of desired goals or outcomes, rather than a descriptive concept of schooling process, method, activities, or even content, per se. If we agree that the criteria for what constitutes education are to be formulated in terms of desired outcomes, then those criteria—hence the educational process itself—must be seen as normative. This overall conception forms the point of departure that accounts for the normative definitions of education. It is seen as involving the formation, and/or development of holistic individuals as fully human.

Meanwhile, within the broad spectrum of the normative nature of education, Bennaars and Njoroge (1987) had identified four important dimensions to it. These are the knowing (cognitive), the normative, creative, and dialogical dimensions. The focus of this study is on the normative dimension which is fundamentally concerned with the development and growth of the learner as a moral person in the society. The contents and the effects produced by the normative dimension of education constitute what is commonly referred to as moral education.

Towards a Definition of Moral Education

The concept of moral education. The concept of moral education is so complex not to be captured in a single approach. Indeed varied terms are often employed to in reference to one and the same reality. For

example, moral education has been invariably referred to by terms, such as character education, virtue education, and value education, among others. Generally, the term is used to refer to a wide range of learning and activities ranging from training in physical health, mental hygiene, etiquette and manners, appropriate social behaviour, civic rights and duties to aesthetic, and even religious training. Different positions, however, are often presented and contested to emphasize certain points of interest.

To some extent, moral education is simply a matter of developing appropriate behaviour and habits involving inculcation of certain virtues and habits. In opposition to such a conception, it is pointed out that value education has an essentially cognitive component in it and that this should not be ignored. Actually, the ability to make moral judgment based on sound reasoning is a very important aim of moral education and has to be deliberately cultivated.

Moral development of a child, according to some, results automatically from the social life of the school. The child as a member of the group imbibes the attitudes, values, and general behaviour of the group and continually tries to mould himself according to the group norm. Such adjustment to life constitutes his moral development. To this extent, moral education is seen as a process of aiding the child in such adjustment. Such a view is contested on the ground that although children learn the rules of group living from the social life of the school, such learning does not constitute value education. For morality, it is pointed out, is not concerned so much with “what is” as with “what ought to be” and “what ought to be done”.

Moral education, according to one more view, is essentially a matter of education the feelings and emotions. It is the “training of the heart” and consists in developing the right feelings and emotions. It does not involve any cognitive abilities that can be trained. Like poetry, it is “caught” rather than taught. It is essentially a matter of creating the right atmosphere, imitation, and learning, for example, communion with nature or modeling oneself after an ideal. Such a view is countered by saying that mere imitation of a “good” person and modeling oneself after an ideal does not confer any morality on an individual.

Morality is not a thing that simply “radiates” from one person to another. Moral development includes both thinking morally and behaving morally. Moral thinking is a distinct type of thinking characterized by the exercise of rational choice. A moral person is not only a person who does the “right” thing, but also one who does the “right” thing for the “right” reason. This is essentially the target of the educative process sought through moral education.

Objectives of moral education. Generally, educational objectives refer to explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process (Seetharam, 2006). That is, the ways in which they will change in their thinking, feelings, and actions. For instance, the Kenyan educational system defines its objectives through the 1976 Gachathi Report which sets forth six major goals. These are: Education should promote national unity, national development, and self-fulfillment, social equality, respect and development of cultural heritage, and finally, international consciousness. Such objectives and/or goals are fundamentally of a moral or normative nature and must penetrate each and every other curricular area. Thus, the enhancement of moral education will greatly depend on the clear understanding of its nature as the core of the educative process.

An assessment of the general learning environment in educational institutions: The case of universities. In order to capture the point of focus, it perhaps suffices to make general observations about most institutions of higher learning especially in the developing world. These (universities and other institutions of

similar levels) are supposed to be exemplary of how the education structure should be run in a country. However, most significantly, learning in these institutions is no longer geared towards the development of the person as a responsible “self” or a moral being. Instead, the learner has come to be viewed as an object of profit in capitalistic sense. Additionally, new programmes and quasi-academic structures are gradually evolving with a primarily explicit aim of attracting more people who are willing buyers. In effect, knowledge is to be purchased under the strict rules of capitalist market forces. What then are likely to be the consequence of this trend—failed civility?

Reflecting on Ghandi’s (1957) “*Seven Blunders of the World That Lead to Violence*”, it can be said that in spite of the higher education (HE) levels; the society is resolutely characterized by a chase for:

Wealth without work,
Pleasure without conscience,
Knowledge without morality,
Science without humanity,
Worship without sacrifice and
politics without principle
(His grandson Arun adds),
Rights without responsibility.

These blunders best describes the tragic deviation in the universities. They characterize the root causes of the diminishing civic and spiritual mission of our higher institutions of learning. It is in this regard too that we find it difficult to build bridges among human divides. Bridges that would have united sexes through gender equity, bridges between races and social-economic classes among others. Acts and trends of isolation are cherished over connections. Thus, as Fontaine (1997) put it, we produce graduates who mirror what our institutions and we ourselves are, and have both implicitly and explicitly created them to be; namely, civic consumers rather than citizen leaders.

In a word, HE is slowly loosing the ideals of hard work, conscience, morality rectitude, humanity, sacrifice, principles, and responsibility, as it continues to yield to pressures of competition in the commercial sector. Consequently, students who are supposed to be the focal point of education structures are slowly becoming not our business, work, and interest in HE. Instead, they have come to be regarded as what gets in the way of our work or even our way in making profits in monetary categories. So far, one fundamental question remains unresolved: Whether knowledge in its finest forms can be subjected as a commodity to market forces and still survive to serve the ideals of societal good and continuity! This is the greatest test of our time.

Meanwhile, as various structures in HE continue to succumb to external pressures, concern is once more directed to the quality of students that finally graduate from these institutions. Citing Payne (1997) had argued that “Education is what is left after you have forgotten what you have been taught”. Then, what form of civility and intelligence can be said to distinguish our graduates from those who are not? What can be said to be left in them after they forget their lecture halls? This is what finally directs their decisions and actions in life; and is what constitutes and defines their received moral education. It is in this regard that we can note four basic failure indicators in most of our HE learners; namely (Payne, 1997):

The failure of our students to acquire basic moral values,
The failure of our students to acquire critical thinking ...
The failure of our students to acquire rich and civil culture,

The failure of our students to acquire a love for service and willingness to serve.

Similarly, according to Nash (1997), the crisis in HE is made manifest at three critical levels of illiteracy in the learners: functional illiteracy, cultural illiteracy, and moral illiteracy. We still have many who graduate with no grasp of the general principles of logic, an awareness of themselves and the world around them, and finally, no concept of moral values and their nature. In spite of this, they remain the ones to whom we entrust the future and destiny of our societies in terms of policy formulation and implementations. The rates of moral illiteracy are even more worrying having been enhanced by radical relativistic trends of subjective value clarification. Thus, many graduates have very little idea of the fundamental principles of distinguishing right from wrong—and of moral absolutes. Matters of right or wrong decisions and actions are left to depend entirely on what individuals define them to be. Hence, the sense of objectivity of knowledge and/or truth, and with it, moral values is seriously compromised.

In practice, a form of double standards manifest itself in the sense that administrators in HE punish some perceived faults in students, yet a climate seems to be allowed whereby students are not encouraged to persist in the perceived “right”. Instead, they persist in making sure that the right is that which is egoistically correct even if it is objectively known to be wrong, so long as they are not discovered by their superiors to have gone wrong. To some extent, if moral absolutes are meant to be governed by the sanctions of knowledge as justified true belief, then this form of moral relativism that dominates the HE environment calls into question the grounding of the knowledge that is received or propagated in these institutions. As Kovac and Brian (1997) rightly observe, by its very nature, education is designed to affect the way students look at the world, thus it must have some effect on their character. In other words, “Education is not worth anything unless it changes behaviour” (Gries, 1996).

The paradox here is that students remain for quite a long time in an environment popularly thought to be the fountain of knowledge and wisdom, yet they are hardly affected by these positively. Seldom are they assisted to build up a strong “moral force” to stand firm on what is at once true and right. Finally, a tragedy is being sounded especially when such graduates become the kind of citizens who by an appreciably high percentage, our institutions of higher learning are constantly ushering into the sacred duty of nation—building. Such observations make it even more urgent to affirm that moral education and rectitude must quickly find their central place in the HE sector. More than ever before, there is a need to critically assess the health of our HE, diagnose its possible ailments, and prescribe a therapy.

The lines of fault in HE. There seems to be two main sources of decay in HE. In the first place, the decadence can be defined by a general loss of the concept and reality of character education for the youth. As it has been argued before, this scenario has been amplified by trends of subjectivism and relativism. There is an urgent need to focus more closely on how best to explain and influence the practical moral growth of our future society in the light of the various theoretical perspectives. Perhaps, the most preferable approach should involve a willingness to sift through all the available perspectives of moral development, adopt the commonalities and adjudicate among the discrepancies. This is a more integrative approach, which can yield an all-encompassing structure of major aspects of moral growth and education under one conceptual umbrella.

However, it should be quickly admitted that this is not destined to be an easy task. It demands a willingness to appreciate a dialogue among the technical trends in education with theoretical disciplines. Hence, fields, such as psychology, philosophy, education, and theology must engage themselves in an

inter-disciplinary relation in search for a dialectical synthesis.

The second source of weakness within the institutions of higher learning that directly touches on students is characterized by a loss of history. HE has not helped learners to gain connection to their socio-cultural past from which their present has dialectically sprung. Consequently, they have equally lost the capacity to engage the present into rationally meaningful future. In other words, there is a gradually diminishing sense of purpose in what goes on in these institutions. To this extent, it can be forcefully argued that university graduates who have lost a sense of history and/or their cultural heritage in the context described above cannot be effective agents of development. It does not matter the amount of facts and “bits of knowledge that can be poured” into their minds.

To say it once again, these two fault lines in HE are largely manifested in the continued process of commercialization of knowledge. In a paper entitled “Perversion in Higher Education”, Burrstein (1997) had pointed out three “insidious trends” in HE. First, among these, is what he refers to as the “industrialization of education”. This trend has seriously compromised the “paradigm of highly personalized relationship between teacher and learner (which) has been replaced by technologies that focus on the rapid and efficient storage and transfer of data”. The climax of this trend is now exemplified in the so called “distance learning”. Even in formal lecture settings, programmes have come up in which teachers are literary seen as “credit hour producers, (while) students become purchasers of grades and credit hours” Seemingly, this is what the market “outside there” needs. That is, graduates with grades and/or credits.

Secondly, there is the pervasive trend of assigning university structures and management to bureaucrats, a factor that is likely to breed a climate of “administrative bloat and faculty divisiveness, selfishness, and political apathy”. Finally, citing Robert Hutchins, Burrstein (1997) invited us to consider seriously the perverting capitalistic:

Love of money as one of the chief sources of problems that plague universities. He (Hutchins) describes in painful detail the degradation, the perversion that results when the leadership of the university tries to shape the institution by sending it on a chase after dollars rather than on the basis of philosophical and moral reflection.

As a result of these pervasive trends, the entire society is gradually losing its value for knowledge as a major factor for civility and development. The reduction and subjection of the educational system to empirical market forces has rendered the conception of knowledge as an item to be bargained for and purchased as any other commodity. Seemingly, knowledge is no longer viewed as an agent for the creation of wealth. Instead, wealth has become the agent for purchasing knowledge. This, the author’s thinks is one of the greatest errors of our age in the education sector. It partly explains why education has not effectively succeeded as an agent of development.

There is a need to reflect seriously on this one crucial question: For what reason do we have to spend numerous public and private resources on HE? We believe it is not merely to create scholars, an elite class or mechanical robots filled with bits and facts. Instead, the goal is to build a healthy humane society. If this be the case, then there is a continuous need to systematically reflect on the theoretical and/or philosophical grounding of our educational activities.

A justification for moral education. Education is often conceivable in normative terms and can basically be regarded as a moral practice or undertaking since it seeks to instill and/or propagate qualities which the society considers to be desirable in the learners. There is always an ethical (moral) dimension to education.

For instance, educational aims constitute ethical contentions. Similarly, ethical principles and considerations (of moral right and obligation) are constitutive of teaching as a professional practice. Moreover, teachers in schools are often held responsible for the moral development of their pupils. By and large, in and through education, we aim at creating civility in the society through the process of character formation and development. Thus, at the heart of the educational process, lies the absolute commitment to bring forth a desirable moral person.

Relationship between education and morality. Morality, moral, and immoral are terms commonly used in our daily experiences. We describe certain actions or behaviour either as moral or immoral.

The term “morality” from the Latin noun “Mos” (or “mores” in plural) refers to customs and conventions of any social group or community. Hence, being “moral” originally meant “to live or act in accordance with the customs (morals) of a particular community, ethnic, religious group or otherwise”. However, while retaining elements of this meaning, our philosophical conception of morality is wider than mere customs and conventions of a people. It refers to any set of norms or standards whether traditions or otherwise, that define guide and regulate good (acceptable) behaviour among human beings living together in society.

From this description, Bennaars (1993) had identified four aspects of morality. These are the cognitive, behavioural, motivational, and societal.

The cognitive aspect. Here, morality as a set of norms governing human conduct refers to a concept in our minds, i.e., morality as understood by reason. For instance, we are able to say confidently that we “know” that taking other people’s property without their consent and/or against their will is wrong. Thus, the key issue there is that we “know”. It is this cognitive aspect that is applied to everyday life. That, which goes against what is held by reason (the mind) to be true or good, becomes immoral.

However, the mere cognitive knowledge of what is right/good and wrong/bad does not bequeath on an individual any moral quality. Morality in this sense is not mere knowledge rather it is to be found in the context of omissions and commissions. Hence, we must move to the next step, where we wait on an individual to respond to what he/she knows to be right/good and wrong/bad. Nevertheless, this knowledge is indispensable for moral rectitude.

The behavioural aspect. This refers to morality in so far as human beings respond or react to given norms. In this case, it is properly understood that morality is not merely limited to what one knows as right/good and wrong/bad. Thus, we come to appreciate the objective moral order which is not simply dependent on the way I, as an individual view things (subjectivism) or as the author’s particular society (relativism) view them. It is therefore important to widen one’s moral conception beyond mere subjectivism and relativism.

Now, if individuals respond positively, and thus conform to the norms, their behaviour or conduct is said to be good, desirable, or acceptable, otherwise it is immoral or deviant. For instance, an engineer graduate knows the exact quotations of the materials required to make a firm road. If he does not, then he has a professional moral duty to find out. This is as far as the cognitive aspect is concerned, namely, the knowledge of what is good or bad. But, after all, such knowledge is possessed, the engineer moves to the next moral level where he is expected to respond to the objective moral order. He can choose to respond positively by doing what is required in building a good road or not. The choice to respond negative may not even be as a result of lack for funds, but may result from an attempt to embezzle the public funds allocated to such a project. Thus, the behavioural aspect of morality is very important in the development of moral persons.

However, even as one responds either positively or negatively, this does not exhaust the individual’s moral quality. One may simply act in a manner to win some favour as in the case of an engineer who builds a good

road not because this is a professional moral duty, but because he actually wants to win the favour of the people, so as to be promoted or elected as a member of parliament in the next general election. Hence, the apparent good act is painfully done as a selfish stepping stone to a personal gain and not out of an objectively motivated common good. This explains the importance of inquiring into the motivation behind what people do.

The motivational aspect. This refers to the underlying motives behind our behaviour or conduct, hence, the question: “Why do we conform or refuse to conform?” These motives are likely to be rational. This implies that they may flow from what we firmly hold at the cognitive level to be right or wrong. However, they need not be rational; they may also be non-rational. They could as well be emotional, traditional, and religious or acquire some other non-rational foundations. For instance, “Why did you (as an engineer of roads) choose to appropriate part of the funds allocated for the construction of the road to your own self, even after knowing that your action would lead to the construction of a poor or unfinished road and amount to stealing?” Or, in any case, why did you decide to be very diligent in using all the funds provided in a very accountable manner and so come up with a good road anyway?

Traditional motives include taboos and customs which may effectively serve to reinforce or even undermine morality by influencing human behaviour. Normally, the motivational aspect defines our personal values, and/or value-systems whether resulting from our personal experience or from a given socio-cultural context.

The societal aspect. As social persons, our conduct is not an individual affair. It concerns the community in which we live, be it at the neighbourhood or school level, or even at national and international level. In other words, the society we live in whether at school or otherwise exhibit an indispensable educational value in moulding and defining our character and value system. Silently, though in a very powerful and insistent way, our society gives us the reasons for our course of action. This reality echoes the normative role of education as a socialization process. It attempts to set up the ideal norms which we ought to strike towards. Indeed, no society can hope to recreate itself and so develop unless it creates ideals to be pursued.

Thus, this aspect plays an important part in morality as a whole. It directly affects our moral understanding (thinking), our moral decision making (willing), and our moral action. Occasionally, the societal aspect tends to overrule the other aspects, thereby, reducing morality to an issue of social morality. This fact explains the greater reason as to why educational institutions need to be developed into authentic moral institutions alive with an institutional culture able to enhance moral rectitude in the learners with a considerable measure of objectivity.

On the overall, education as a growing-up and/or nurturing process has a central role in reinforcing the above four aspects of morality. Knowledge of the right thing is likely to enhance the pursuit of the same. In other words, moral precepts should be congruent to the cognitive development of the learners, so that at no time should the two be seen to be arbitrary to each other. What is right (cognitively) ought to be necessarily good (morally). There must always exist a close relationship between the two, hence, education’s cognitive moral duty.

Similarly, effective education ought to lead to a change of behaviour. Indeed, only then can learning be said to have occurred. Learning cannot be confined to mere mental recall or memorization of what can be termed as correct fact. Ultimately, it must be translated to practical existential situations, whereby what is held to be correct and true ought to influence personal choices, decisions, and action. Whereas this argument does not rule out the essential distinctions between “what ought” and “what is” the case, or better put, between

“principles” and “preferences”, it remains binding upon education that it should strive to bring about congruency between knowledge and action. Thus, by virtue of the education process, learners ought to be enabled to effect practical positive moral responses.

In the same way, education must continuously play the role of refining the learners’ motivations in the decision-making and the choice of action. This is the crux of Kohlberg’s theory of moral development where upon across the six stages, the motivations behind moral action are steadily refined. Ultimately, one is able to be motivated by reasons which lie outside the realm of mere personal interests. In other words, an individual is able to transcend mere egoistic orientations in the choice of moral action and embrace the Kantian ethical universality. Meanwhile, the learner ought to be armed with the ability to discern moral rectitude in the context of the society. All these reflections emphasize the fact the education should serve to bring about good life in a more practical sense by instilling and/or cultivating moral values in the learners. Then, it follows that the concept of moral education has to be clearly understood both by the teachers as well as the learners.

Chapter 3

Developing Moral Education in Institutions of Higher Learning

Overview

This chapter identifies and presents a discussion on three principles models in moral education. The first model looks at moral education as a process of “filling into or putting into” the learner the necessary elements that finally dispossess one to act morally or desirably. This approach emphasizes the deliberate, direct, and active role of a moral educator “on” the learner. Secondly, moral education can be conceived as an unconscious gradual growth of desirable qualities in the learner that are drawn from the surrounding “moral environment”. In this model, neither the learner nor the educator takes a direct active role. Finally, the third model presents moral education in Freire’s (1993) paradigm of developing a critical mind in the learner with an aim of enhancing a liberated person. Thus, by and large, it is the learner who takes the direct and active role. These three models of moral education are conceived to be mutually complementary in the overall development of the moral person. Thus, based on this approach, the chapter proceeds to assess the indispensable role of the teacher as a moral educator.

Trends in Moral Education

As Splitter (2006) has argued, the concept of moral education can be located at the intersection of a number of familiar views, each of which is so important, yet none is exhaustive or satisfactory on its own account. Moral education can be characterized by three fundamental components. These perspectives are structured as follows:

1. Moral education as the inculcation or transmission of a set of values, beliefs, attitudes, rules, habits, skills, dispositions, etc;
2. Moral education as a kind of “lived experience” which occurs in certain kinds of environments. It is something which is “caught” rather than “taught”;
3. Moral education as a set of procedures or tools designed to help young people think about moral issues (critical thinking and reasoning, ethical inquiry into assumptions, consequences, intentions, motives, etc).

A view which may seem to cut across these three aspects is that moral education is in the province of the home, rather than of institutions, such as the school, understood from a purely academic perspective. Hence, in

so far as any of these institutions take on the task of moral education, they are acting in some sense in “*loco parentis*” (the place of parents).

Moral Education as the Transmission of “Moral Substance”

There is no doubt that morality and living the moral life has something to do with values, beliefs, rules, habits, attitudes, skills, and dispositions. However, there are many questions about which specific values and rules, count as worthy of appraisal. Indeed, various moral thinkers and educators have attempted in different ways to describe ethical precepts that ought to govern appraisable actions. The Aristotelian thesis gives a central role to the development of character and virtue. In the Kantian framework, the consequences of one’s actions are subservient to the more fundamental deontological principles, which constitute his categorical imperative, namely, “act from motives which you could want to be general principles regulating everyone’s actions” and “treat people always as ends, never as means”. On the other hand, the Confucian focus is on filial piety and modesty. All these along with a host of alternative views and positions, must surely play some role in thinking about morality and the moral life. However, the issue at hand is not morality per se, but moral education, and it is far from clear how (or even if) such grand theories and noble traditions as those mentioned here translate in educational terms.

The first of the above three components of moral education seeks to remind us that whatever we might say about moral education, its content is strongly normative in nature. That is, a person who warrants being described as morally educated will, in both thought and action, behave in normative terms. Hence, moral education is often termed in Aristotelian terms as “character or virtue education” or in Kant’s categorical imperative as the infusion of “universal moral principles” in the learner as a moral agent. It is not just that one’s actions can and will be appraised by others as right or wrong, good or bad, just or unjust, but that she herself is willing and prepared to appraise her own actions (and those of others) in these ways.

The problem with this view is, however, not at the level of content, but at the level of procedure. For in so far, as it relies on such dynamics as inculcation or transmission, it cannot be justified. It is fair to say that the so-called “transmission model of education”—called the “banking” model by Dewey and “pouring in” by Freire (1993) is almost universally rejected by contemporary educational theorists—notwithstanding its stubborn persistence in practice. As with knowledge generally, we should reject the view that values can be transmitted from one generation to the next—like family inheritances, sacred, and inviolable.

Why do some people persist in pushing a transmission model when it comes to moral education? There are doubtless numerous answers to this question, ranging from socio-political to more strictly educational. Certainly, the fear of alternatives—such as some form of crude relativism—drives some in this direction. But it is also possible that a certain kind of logical error plays a part. Suppose, we accept that, those whom we would describe as being of good moral character normally live in accordance with some sense of moral law, belief, even habit, and that, moreover, moral character in this sense. It does not follow that the most appropriate pedagogic style for moral education is one which is rule-governed, or based on rote learning or inculcation of principles or habituation. Rote memorization of principles does not always produce virtue. The logical error here is confusion between process or means and product or end. In so far as, there is a product in moral education (knowledge or understanding of beliefs, rules, and principles), this product does not automatically yield an appropriate process or pedagogy. By and large, a system of moral education which aims to produce persons who are habitually inclined to act well, or live according to some (perhaps flexible) set of moral principles,

must at the same time invest in an approach whose pedagogy is inquiry-based rather than rule-governed.

Another way of highlighting the inadequacy of taking the first view as a model for moral education is to point out that it omits any reference to points covered in the second and the third. No amount of teaching which is directed toward following or living, according to rules, habits, or principles will guarantee that students of moral education are affected in the sense of being moved by certain kinds of experiences to act in a certain way. Furthermore, this approach cannot guarantee that such students are aware, in a reflective sense, that moral judgment and decision-making are procedures which are governed by principles of rational thought and inquiry. For instance, such learners will hardly conceive the importance of supporting judgments and decisions with sound criteria, acting reflectively rather than always on impulse or in accordance with an external set of rules as may be the case. We would not describe as moral a person who lived “by the book”, with no regard to the affective aspects of morality, such as the notions of compassion, care, and sensitivity in context. These affective aspects are the tools and skills needed to think well about moral issues besides one’s knowledge of the so-called “moral principles”. Arguably, the definition of a moral person ought to correspond with being a morally educated person.

Action which is criteria or reasonable and reflective does not have to replace action which is rule—governed or even habitual. Indeed, one of the challenges of moral education is to prepare students to be able to distinguish among situations where acting out of conformity, habit or tradition is appropriate, and those where more reflective and constructive deliberation is required.

Moral Education as Lived Experience

Over and above any commitment to or theory about specific normative or meta-ethical rules, principles, or beliefs, an appropriate pedagogy for moral education has at its heart, an affective or qualitative dimension which guarantees students a “lived experience”. This notion of lived experience is not only consistent with, but actually models, and to some extent, exemplifies a paradigm of moral behaviour. In other words, if schools, all educational institutions, and classrooms are to qualify as environments for moral education, then they themselves must function as moral or ethical environments, in which appropriate forms of action occur. For instance, aspects, such as fair, reasonable, and self-correcting behaviour ought to be exemplified in as much as they are talked about. John Dewey (1916) powerfully captured an important element of this notion of lived experience, when he stated that, “We always live at the time we live and not as some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future. This is the only preparation which in the long run amounts to anything” (Dewey, 1916). Dewey’s contention is that we should never underestimate the power of our present experience in moral development and future moral possibilities.

Consider, for example, such central ethical concepts as kind and fair, and such central ethical strategies as empathy and moral imagination. Is it not reasonable for students to demand, or at least expect, a classroom environment in which these concepts and strategies are practiced and valued? No amount of instruction, discussion, or other pedagogic practice could compensate for a learning environment in which cruel or unfair behaviour was allowed to pass unnoticed or unchallenged, or in which there was no attempt to model empathetic and imaginative strategies.

This point may seem too obvious to warrant any attention. But it is easier to accede to it in theory than in practice, and students are quick to identify the inconsistencies and even hypocrisy that results when schools,

teachers, and others in authority do not “practise what they preach”. A good example here concerns the concept of democracy. It has been pointed out by contemporary writers of civics and citizenship education that if we want students to value democratic ways of thinking and living, then it is not enough to teach them about democracy (whether through history, politics, literature, semantics, or whatever). It is not enough even to provide them with tools and skills appropriate to living in a democracy (as might be done through a classroom “mock parliament”, for example).

The point that the second view highlights is that the classroom itself, in all its aspects and procedures, should function as a democratic environment. This does not rule out the notion of the teacher as being in authority, even (when appropriate) as being an authority. But, it does rule out a classroom environment, which is authoritarian or in other ways undemocratic in nature.

Another way of making this point is to stress that an appropriate environment for moral education must move or affect students in morally significant ways. Behind this point is the realization that moral education involves an integration of thought, action, and feeling.

It is partly for this reason that the classroom environment known as the community of inquiry is so appropriate when it comes to moral education because of its ability to provide a lived experience. Moreover, in so far as, it is not restricted to any specific subject area the classroom environment provides an ethical environment for teaching and learning in varied subject fields, such as in science, mathematics, history, religious studies, art, and so on.

It must be said, however, that while the second view signifies a necessary ingredient in moral education, it too is not sufficient. We cannot assume that merely by placing students within a certain kind of environment, where central ethical concepts and strategies are actually “lived”, that they will become better people. On ingredient missing here is the issue of substance or content: The “what” of moral education, which is provided by the first view. Still, it is possible that learners in a positively lived moral experience can come out to develop negative personal responses even to those moral norms that have been lived positively before them. Similarly, learners can also grow to respond positively out of situations of negatively lived moral norms (experiences). Once again, there is no guarantee that moral environments will automatically compel individual character and moral responses correspondingly. Thus, the provision of such an environment alone does not suffice for a moral education.

Critics of the “ethical environment” view of moral education are right to point out that such an environment must itself be subject to moral scrutiny. This leads to the second missing ingredient, namely, a pedagogy or methodology which actively empowers students to think about and reflect on, moral issues—including the issue of the very classroom and school environment of which they are part. At the heart of this pedagogy, lie the tools of ethical inquiry, about which more will be said in the third section below. The key point here is that moral education is, in part, a mode of inquiry. That is reflective and structured thinking driven primarily by the concerns of those who engage in it as a process.

Moral education does involve moral practice, but such practice, if it is to be truly educational, must be reflective rather than mindless; reasonable rather than unreasonable; and self-corrective rather than dogmatic. Moreover, the process of reflection must yield morally appropriate judgments which are themselves, the outcomes of structured and criteria thinking.

Moral Education as a Set of Tools and Procedures

If students are to be in a position to make judgments based on criteria, they must be empowered to do so—and this is where the tools of ethical inquiry become crucial. From critical reflection on the values, ideals, beliefs, and principles, which provide a conceptual focus to ethics, learners are able to proceed to self-corrective thinking and a fallibilistic disposition. Thereafter, they will ascend to the self-conscious use of such strategies as empathy, moral imagination, and building on different perspectives. Ultimately, it is the capacity to apply these tools that makes students of moral education into moral agents, able to take charge of their own lives.

The capacity to inquire, as understood here, comes, in part, from traits that we develop in early childhood: specifically, wonder, puzzlement, and a desire to make sense of things. If we want to motivate young people to think seriously about moral concerns, we must, in Deweyan (2014) terms, “begin where they are at”, by helping them to identify questions and issues, which are genuinely problematic for them.

In practice, these questions and issues are not so different from those which puzzle us the adult members of the society. Wonder and puzzlement, like all modes of thinking and inquiry, have both substantive and procedural components. We cannot wonder, puzzle, think, or inquire about nothing. However, we cannot satisfy our craving to solve the puzzles and make sense of things by expecting those who are more “expert” to write the solutions on the blank slate of our minds. We have to do the wondering, puzzling, thinking, and inquiring, and to do this well we need certain tools: the tools of inquiry.

In other words, moral education does not thrive in the context of John Locke’s idea of “*tabula rasa*”, whereupon mere experience and not otherwise, will write moral knowledge to the extent of compelling the same into a positive response. The learner’s critical-rational element is indispensable. To this extent, no level of a morally upright teacher can simply cause moral uprightness to learners in a classroom or any other educational environment. This fact is emphasized enough by Paulo Freire’s castigation of the oppressor’s intent to undermine the learner’s personal critical learning, so that they cannot think and/or deliberate for themselves. In Freire’s (1993) words:

Education, thus, becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits, which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat In the last analysis, it is the people themselves who are filed away through the lack of creativity, transformation, and knowledge in this (at best) misguided system. For apart from inquiry and the praxis, individuals cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, the restless, and impatient continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other. In the banking concept of education ... the teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence.

This approach destroys the development of the relevant tools that insures the success of the educative process. Important of these includes the acquisition of a disposition for a critical inquiry.

We should, however, not pretend that these tools come to all those who need them as naturally and inevitably as the child-like wonder that sparks off the process. In no other area of the curriculum, do we simply assume that students implicitly know how to think and act—how to do arithmetic and algebra, how to analyze a piece of literature, and so on. Children from a young age might wonder about what it means to be good or fair, or what constitutes a courageous act and whether they could be as courageous as their favourite super-hero. But they do not automatically come equipped with the tools needed for investigating that which they are wondering

about. In short, the learners have to be taught how to think well and how to inquire, or rather ushered into the process of critical thought and inquiry.

Rule-following which is driven by fear or threat of punishment or desire for reward may be one ingredient in the way we make judgments and decisions, but it is not the only one. The tools of reasoning, empathy, imagination, and dialogue, to mention just a few, are at least as vital. By and large, an on-going system of moral education which aims to produce persons who are habitually inclined to act well or live, according to some (perhaps flexible) set of moral principles, must at the same time, invest in an approach whose pedagogy is inquiry-based rather than rule-governed.

Once again, however, the procedures which lie at the heart of the way we think about moral issues are necessary but insufficient with respect to moral education. There is more to being moral and to being morally well-educated than sound technique. This is why a brilliant dictator or a brilliant corrupt senior public servant, or a criminal master-mind, may indicate an ill-oriented moral education. More topically, a computer does not qualify as a moral agent). There is, in addition, an adherence to ideals, values, and principles, which are themselves, continually up for examination utilizing the tools of ethical inquiry, as well as the notion that moral agents are moved to act within certain kinds of moral environments which must themselves be experienced as part of the process of moral education. In short, the third view must be complemented by the first and second.

The upshot of the discussion so far is that moral education is a complex business, involving a number of components, which are each necessary but not sufficient in exclusion. These components may be summarily labeled as follows:

- (a) The content or “stuff” of moral education;
- (b) The affective or experiential dimension of moral education;
- (c) The procedures of moral education (tools of ethical inquiry).

These three components described are jointly sufficient in the sense that, taken together, they capture what is most important about moral education.

The Role of University in the Development of Moral Education

When the teacher takes upon himself/herself the educational role of facilitating the development of holistic persons in and for the society, he/she is actually reassuming a responsibility traditionally assigned to teachers. Indeed, the role of the school is not simply to make children accumulate knowledge, but rather mould them into a well cultured citizenry.

Educational institutions must help learners acquire the skills, the attitudes, and the dispositions that will help them live well and that will enable the common good to flourish. The schools’ and teachers’ failure to strive towards this noble end and instead to do only half the job or even completely journey in the opposite direction only serves to put the individual child and all the rest of the human society in danger. Perhaps, the most fundamental question is to start by inquiring into the possibility of teaching morality and/or ethics.

Can Ethics be Taught?

As Sheriff (1988) defined it, ethics is a study of one’s perception of what is right or wrong in a given context or a situation. It is an attitude of how one reacts or relates to an incident, happening or a stand one takes in ordinary day-to-day life experiences. It is an inherent quality learnt as a part of a development process of a personality. In other words, an individual learns the values of life as a part of an educational process of growing up without being separated as distinct instructional behaviour to be taught as a part of the curriculum.

Sheriff (2001) further noted that the imbibing of value system predetermines the ethical behaviour of an individual. These behavioural responses are dependent upon certain external factors like one's culture, religious beliefs, and regional influences. In an Indian context, the institution of family as well as community system plays a major role in the embryonic nurturing of ethical attributes and judgment. An individual learns to respect the values imparted by the family in particular and society at large. Rather one's lifestyle embraces within its fold the ethical guidelines. Parents, many a time, become the role models for their children and act as vehicles of learning of life values.

An individual learns the basic concepts of life in a contrasting milieu of personal observation and tutoring. The family sets down its own traditional behaviour. With these influences setting the tone for ground rules of rights and wrongs, teaching of ethics as a doctinated subject has to cross layers of set ideas in the minds of the learners. Along with it, the change in the past lifestyle of simplistic approach to holistic but complex present day high technology life demands the intrusion of newer life value systems. Concern and understanding, therefore, become the most important key words of ethics. The social upbringing of a person, the level of literacy as well as the standard of living of a social person do play and influence the learning process of ethics. In other words, the blending of professed values with operational values do determine the moral sensitivity of a person to simple day to day activities to complex issues of one's occupation.

Therefore, teaching of ethics may be an attempt to justify our actions or inaction in the name of science or medicine or humanities. Technology, if simply stated, could be defined as the manipulation of nature for human well-being (Schilpp, 1952). Universities or places of learning generally feel apprehensive about the sudden spurt of knowledge explosion, which has outpaced the general understanding of a common man who has to reap the benefits and consequences of advanced knowledge of living. A common man must understand what is happening in the name of science, which is going to penetrate the lifestyle of living.

Indeed, there is a communication gap between the advent and advancement of science and the common man. The gap has necessitated the need to teach ethics to the givers of science or policy makers, so that their methods of application of science bring no harm to the simple interests of living. In other words, modern day demands that sensitivity to human feelings and needs become paramount. Logic, common sense, knowledge, technical skills, economic upliftment, health and disease, and more—these aspects are juxtaposed against the value and reverence for human life. With many options in hand, a giver has to face many ethical dilemmas, which can be solved when one has the right science fused with humanities in him or her. That ability to judge what is right science requires the student or teacher or scientist to learn the basics of human introspection loudly taught as ethics.

The knowledge to decide which option is suited to the individual's need demands proper guidance and education. Therefore, it is high time that we have proper dissemination of knowledge to the common man who will understand and follow what needs to be followed for his well being. That dissemination of knowledge depends upon true education of information to the consumer. Keeping these contradicting needs and apprehensions, education of ethics needs proper communication skills. This is an important indispensable responsibility for every true citizen of the world. Keeping all these in mind, it can be argued that ethics must be more of an imbibed virtue rather than a taught science without minimizing the latter. Nevertheless, the moral formation of the learner within the context of an educational institution is an inescapable obligation for the teacher. Hence, the latter must constantly be aware of this sublime duty.

The Learner as a Moral Agent

In order to assist the learner to journey the path of moral formation and development, the teacher needs to have a vision of the moral person, in other words, some sense of the person as moral actor or agent. To this extent, the structure of the moral agent contends that the human character emerges from the workings of three components, namely: knowing, affect, and action (Ryan, 2006). These elements are central to the teacher's consideration in view of their interplay role towards a character development.

Knowing. Learners as persons should first be recognized as reasoning beings as knowers. They have a natural "telos" to understand the world inside and outside themselves. Also, and quite important, they exist in community central to which is a moral heritage. Each community has found certain patterns of behaviour, certain human character traits or rather, a certain "bag of virtues", which is deemed necessary in the sustenance of the life of the individual and the community.

The moral person learns these values, not simply in a rote or passive way, but in a conscious and intellectual manner. Indeed, they are the stuff of social consciousness. For instance,

What is courage and when is it needed, what happens to me and to my community if I become irresponsible, what is kindness and what are its consequences? The moral agent also knows the behavioural referents to kindness: What does kindness mean within my family or within my class situation? What does persistence mean in my life as a student, and later in life?

Emphasis upon the moral agent's knowing means that students need to come to know the moral wisdom of their culture, what has been learned over the years. It means that they need to know its best literature and the most important aspects of its history. They need to know these stories and accounts, not simply for the sake of cultural literacy, but to assimilate the moral lessons embedded in them. What is to be learned from say Gandhi's humble crusade about the power of a moral idea whose time has come? Students need to know where we have been and what we have learned as a moral community. This is not to be taken as the final word, but as the unfinished repository of our moral successes and failures. On the strength of our successes, the learners hang-on to move forth to greater moral heights, whereas in the knowledge of our failures, they recognize what ought to have been done, which indeed, they aspire to. This is why they need the best story, literature, and history rather than some hack attempt to socialize the young to the biases of the tribe.

To insure against moral passivity, the youth need to know how to think morally and how to reason through an issue or problem rather than receiving someone else's decision. "What is the good and right in this situation?"; "How do I choose among competing goods"; and "What are the consequences of this course of action?" To be moral agents, students need to be ethicists. Over their years of education, they need to acquire the skills of ethical thinking. For instance, "Is this really a moral problem?"; "What are the facts?"; "What are the positive consequences for various courses of action?"; and "What are the negative consequences?".

Also, involved, here is the formation of a moral imagination in order to enter within the world of the other and to consider possibilities without having to be presented with concrete events. Finally, part of developing the moral agent is to develop the quality of good judgment or what Aristotle (1968) called, "practical wisdom", we need to cultivate in our students a judicious style.

Affect: The affective component. The moral agent is not raw intellect or disembodied reasoning, but has feelings, emotions, and passions, which play a great part in one's moral life. This affective component is one that many of us ignore, or at least, underestimate. In reality, it is an energetic, vital moral engine which frequently takes over the life of the moral agent, drives him in directions his/her reason forbids, or gives energy to

decisions to which reason points only timidly. We all know those who can talk a good moral game and can reason with the angels, but whose behaviour is all too human. We need to help the learner acquire not simply intellectual skills or habits of the mind, but habits of the heart. In other words, one should grow up to love the good.

Part of this learning to love “the good” lies in developing commitments, and in particular, commitments to the moral life. This means developing a conscience or an inner voice, not merely of reason but of “affect” also, which calls us in a certain direction. It is a voice that can confront emotions of greed, self-interest, and envy with a stronger desire to do what is right and good.

Another part of this moral affect is love of self or concern for one’s own well-being. Moral education of affect involves the growth of self-love outward from the self, to family and friends, to communities seen and unseen, in order to develop a continually larger definition of what it means to love the good. Affect, though, has one other function, perhaps its most important, namely, to be a bridge between knowing and the third component action: A link between thought and action.

Action. Any effort at moral education or character development, which fails positively to affect the learner’s behaviour in some important way is doomed: Moral action is the bottom line. Action has three elements or subcomponents: will, competence, and habit.

The term “will” in this context refers to what is needed to mobilize and channel our moral energy. It provides the strength to push beyond our self-interest and laziness and fears. It will spur us to moral action and carries us forward to do what our mind and heart tells us we ought to do.

Competence refers to a repertoire of behaviours and skills, which the moral agent needs in order to act effectively in the world. For instance, one needs to be able to listen and understand, to empathize with the troubled, and to serve those in need. One needs to be able to lead others to see and do the good, and to be able to stand up to injustice. These competencies need to be learned the same way, the skills of decoding and encoding symbols, and the scientific method are learned.

Good will and the competence or the capacity to act is not enough. They must be habituated. Such a moral action as telling the truth when a comfortable life is handy, or saying that the right but unpopular thing when silence is easy, needs to be a practiced response. One cannot stop and weigh consequences every time a moral event arises. They have to be practiced and habituated responses to life situations.

This, then, constitutes an integrated model of the learner as a moral agent: A person whose understanding, emotions, and behaviour are fully developed. This in turn can become an important foundation for the teachers’ own preparation for their roles in moral education and character formation.

The Role of the Teacher as Moral Educator

The role of the teacher is almost indispensable if character education has to achieve the desired outcome. Nevertheless, although the general public strongly supports a more active role for teachers in the moral education of the young, many teachers are uncertain about how to proceed in this effort. Hence, it is important to inquire into the teacher’s preparedness, dispositions, and approaches in moral education. Teachers must therefore acquire and develop the necessary skills and competencies, which will enhance their effective role in the domain of moral and character education of the young.

The following is a discussion on the six-way approach adapted from Kevin Ryan (2006) referred to as “the six E’s of the moral educator and character developer”. These are: example, explanation, exhortation,

environmental expectation, evaluation, and experience.

Example. The most obvious and indeed a very influential form of moral education in the classroom is the example teachers provide for their students. However, this reality remains quite troublesome and uncomfortable to many teachers. Those who came through the era of teacher-as-technician are put off by the notion that teachers are supposed to be models of moral excellence for their students. Nonetheless, research has now confirmed what humankind long ago recognized intuitively: People with power and prestige are imitated by those around them. And, though some teachers may not think of themselves as figures of power and prestige, the children they teach certainly see them as such. It is undeniable that one of the facts of school life is that children watch their teachers to discover how grown-ups act. Therefore, teachers need to be constantly aware of the powerful influence that their actions in the classroom have on students. While not suggesting that teacher must be saints, secular, or otherwise, they should be people who take the moral life seriously. In the same way that teachers should be models of people using their minds, they should be seen as models of people responding to life in a moral admirable way.

There is yet another aspect to this moral modeling besides the teachers own personification. As already indicated, many of our most important moral truths are embedded in the stories, situations, and circumstances, and in the historical and literary figures that we encounter in the course of instructions. When young people read history, they are exposed to the heroes, the weaklings, and the villains of the culture; they see the consequences of human courage and cowardice, and they are inspired or repelled thereby. Meanwhile, many of the culture's most profound moral ideas are embedded in its stories. Good literature gives pleasure and instructs. For example, the learners may need to know about Adolph Hitler and Martin Luther King among many other personalities in their local histories and traditional heritage. Hence, the teacher should strive to bring to the attention of the learners the wealth of such profound moral illustrations both in the classroom and in the general school setting.

Explanation. It takes years of poor teaching to subdue a child's natural curiosity. Much of children's inquisitiveness is directed at moral issues: "Why am I being punished, and he is not?"; "How could great men like Jefferson and Washington have owned slaves?"; "What do I owe my neighbour?"; "Is it fair?"; "Is it right?"; and "What should I do?". A major task of teachers is to explain the moral order to the young.

Emile Durkheim, the French sociologist, is often cited as an apologist for the school's socialization of the young. He saw the school as a social vehicle to instill in the young the society's dominant values and rules of conduct. However, Durkheim (1961) insisted that these efforts must be rational: "To teach morality is neither to preach nor to indoctrinate; it is to explain". This teaching starts on the playground when the teacher explains why we do not fight using sharp sticks, and it continues through the senior year when the teacher explains to the soon-to-be high school graduates what their duties are to the Republic.

We need to teach moral education through explanation—not simply to fill the students' heads with the rules and regulations of society, but to engage them in the great moral conversation of the human race. Indeed, it is the very existence of this conversation that makes us human. The teacher's role of a continual explanation of the rules is, in and of itself, one of the most important messages of the school.

Exhortation. Explanations are a crucial part of children's moral education, but teachers' urgings and exhortations also have a place in that process. Several examples can serve to dramatise this fact. A child who is discouraged by academic failure or by having been cut from a team, a cast, or a musical group often needs something stronger than sweet reason to ward off self-pity. A student who is quietly and simply moving-on

through the school structure so passively may need a teacher's passionate appeal to inspire him or her to shape up and use the opportunity offered by education and study more diligently.

Similarly, a youth who is alive with thievery ideas may not question this kind of sloppy thinking until he/she feels the heat of a teacher's moral indignation. In the same way, a student who struggles so much academically and yet he/she is not rewarded while those who have not done as much are, may need more than the teacher's mere explanation that life is unfair. He/she may need to be inspired or even motivated if he/she is to endure and transcend his disappointment.

Thus, to become adults who are capable of standing up for their values, students need to see teachers who do so. However, exhortation should be used sparingly and should never stray very far from explanation. Nonetheless, there are times when teachers must appeal to the best instincts of the young and urge them to move in particular directions.

Environmental expectations. A classroom is a small society with patterns and rituals, not only for relationships and standards for academic performance, but also for student behaviour. In classroom with a positive moral environment, students are respected and grow to respect one another. Moreover, specifically set standards of excellence are reachable, and students' satisfactions come from achieving those standards. The ability to establish such an effective, a purposeful, and a civil classroom environment is what distinguishes the good from the ineffective teacher.

A central factor in a classroom environment is its moral climate. For instance, are the classroom rules fair and fairly exercised, does the teacher play favourites, does good balance exist between competition and cooperation, are individuality and community responsibility both nurtured, are less able students protected, but also challenged and are ethical questions and issues of "What ought to be part of the classroom dialogue?"

There may be not definitely defined rules of establishing and maintaining an environment of moral expectation, and, once established, it is always vulnerable to collapse. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that the moral climate which exists within a classroom or a school setting has a steady and strong influence upon the formation of character and of the learner's sense of what is right and what is wrong. Indeed, a moral classroom environment is greatly affected by conditions and factors outside the classroom, such as a hostile school environment or a pleasure-oriented or a corruption inclined community. Thus, the building and maintaining of a moral classroom environment is a continuing struggle. But, this daily, all-encompassing quality is also what makes the moral classroom environment such a powerful teacher in itself.

Evaluation. Another factor which is of importance for the moral teacher is the ability to allow learners to evaluate themselves. In this regard, the teacher should strive to create opportunities for students to reflect on what they value, what they think is the good, and what they believe is the right thing to do. This approach, sometimes referred to as "values clarification" has its focus on involving students in the kind of moral and value issues which have meaning in their lives. It may also take the form of involving learners in structured discussion of ethical dilemmas.

Experience. Sometimes, in the 20th century, James Coleman, commenting on the enormous changes which had taken place among the youth in the society, wrote that: "The modern generation of American youth is information rich and experience poor" (Coleman, 1975). This seems to be the general case in many societies across the world. Going by the standards of any previous generation, today's youth exist in a self-focused and a pleasure-dominated world. Only rare and fortunate teenagers encounter the kinds of experiences that help them break out of this envelope of self-interest and learn to contribute to others.

Schools have a unique role of providing opportunities for these experiences through both academic and co-curricular activities, such as sports and theatre. Such experiences enable students to provide services to the needy in the society besides promoting the ideals of mutual support. Meanwhile, teachers help students understand the moral lessons and experiences that such activities afford. Such service programs teach the skills of effective helping and cause young people to define themselves as individuals who are connected to others. In this way, learners begin to appreciate the need to couple moral thinking with moral action.

This last “E”—experience—comes straight from Aristotle’s *Nicomachean ethics*. According to Aristotle, a man becomes virtuous by performing virtuous acts; he/she becomes kind by doing kind acts; and he/she becomes brave by doing brave acts. Thus, a school that institutes a community service program is merely operationalizing Aristotle.

Chapter 4

The Notion of Classical Conceptions of University Education Based on Modern and Post-Modern Perspectives

Philosophy of University Education

Course purpose. To guide the lecturer towards an awareness of the philosophical principles that ought to direct the development and processes of university education.

Objectives of the course.

The objectives of this course are to:

- (a) analyze the underlying philosophical tenets of teaching as both a science and an art and how it relates to learning;
- (b) evaluate the role of HE in the cultivation of creativity and innovativeness for national development;
- (c) create instructional models that relate education to experience.

Expected learning outcomes of the course.

At the end of the course, the student lecturer/instructor should be able to:

- (a) outline and explain the various values of a university course;
- (b) describe statements of philosophy that shape personal orientations to teaching;
- (c) deconstruct the essential elements of teaching and thus integrate them appropriately into the process of learning;
- (d) critique and detect practical avenues for fostering creativity and innovativeness in HE;
- (e) design instructional approaches that are richly grounded in a learner’s experiences.

What is Philosophy?

Philosophy is the study of general and fundamental problems concerning matters, such as existence, knowledge, values, reason, mind, and language. ... Philosophical methods include questioning, critical discussion, rational argument, and systematic presentation. Essentially, philosophy is a reflective activity. Nothing is taken for granted. Everything is critically analyzed, at least to reach a coherent conclusion. Therefore, it is one of the oldest and respected provinces of knowledge. Therefore, to philosophize is to reflect on human experience in search of answers for some fundamental questions as man reflects on himself/herself, his/her field will wonder and some fundamental questions arises in his/her mind. Therefore, philosophy means love of wisdom. Wisdom is the study of things in their deepest and general aspect. Philosophy assists man to understand himself/herself,

his/her powers, limitations, and circumstances of life, so that he/she is able to use them to overcome failure and succeed in life. Therefore, it is a struggle to explain our life, phenomena and to understand reality in general.

The Nature of Philosophy

Is a product of man's mind, therefore, a reflective activity and it involves the struggle, culture, and curiosity to explain himself/herself and the world he/she lives in. Man tries to search for answers to questions that passes him/her. Therefore, is a question cultured towards reality and all we encounter, e.g., joy, death, success, and failure. Therefore, philosophy is a rational critical thinking of a more systematic kind about him/her, his/her experiences and the general nature of the world. Therefore, philosophy is referred to as the mother of all science and arts.

What Scholars Say About Philosophy?

1. From the ancient Greek thinkers, philosophy is the love of wisdom/knowledge. And, according to Aristotle, all men desire to know by nature;

2. Philosophy is the investigation of the basic issues related to human beings and their interaction with reality. Therefore, it is a form of inquiry, a process of analysis, criticism, interpretation, and speculation;

3. According to Henri Odera Oruka (1990), a Kenyan philosopher: Philosophy is reflective and critical thinking which enables man to understand fundamental principles of nature, society, and the entire universe.

Philosophy is a tenacious attempt of reason for men to think through the fundamental issues of life to reach a reasonable conclusion. It involves a systematic and critical thinking to form coherent judgment or conclusions.

Value of Philosophy

1. Philosophy is the love of wisdom, so as to acquire knowledge and make sound judgments concerning people and regarding the conflict of life and circumstances that we encounter.

2. Enables us to clarify what we believe in, e.g., a believe in God. And, it stimulates us to think about ultimate questions and answers towards encounters.

3. It rewards narrow mind and bigotry enabling us to think critically about issues.

4. It makes us free, liberates us from rigid and conservative attitude towards reality, e.g., female genital mutilation, domestic violence, tribe animosity, etc.

5. It removes the narrow attitude towards life, circumstance, and reality. Therefore, it gives a wider horizon towards life and reality in general.

6. Helps to shape our personal outlook towards life, circumstance, and reality. Therefore, it gives a wider horizon towards life and reality in general.

7. In every institution in society, is best a philosophical ideas, e.g., slogans, mission, vision, the goals, and objectives of education. Therefore, philosophy enables us to come up with the direction or strategies that direct our entire programmes, life, and even the country at large, e.g., personal philosophy, political slogans, institutional matter, or missions.

8. We study philosophers of the past and use their ideas, thoughts, and doctrines to direct our lives positively, e.g., Socrates, Greek philosophy, the father of philosophy said: "Know thy self", the unexamined life is not worth living. Knowledge is virtue.

9. Philosophy is a source of morals, moral values that affects the way we relate to others in a society.

10. A language we speak daily uses classifications derived from philosophy, i.e., in the English language,

the classification of nouns and verbs shows that there is a difference between things and actions. This is a philosophical in nature.

Philosophy of Education

Philosophy of education can refer either to the application of philosophy to the problem of education, examining definitions, goals, and chains of meaning used in education by teachers, administrators, or policymakers. There are some questions as follow:

1. Why teach?
2. What to teach?
3. How to teach?

There are different schools of thought in the philosophy of education. There are five such schools of thought: essentialism, progressivism, perennialism, existentialism, and behaviourism. It is the application of philosophical ideas and theories to the process of education in general. It is also process of analysis and reflection on education theory and practice. Logical, consistent, and sustainable examination of education, its aims, ideas, and measures to produce conclusion that are sound and consistent in all class. It is the sum of practical ideas of a society, in general, which guides the content and practice of education. It seeks to clarify the objective, goals, aims, and terms used in education and to give critical and analytical analysis on issues pertaining education theory and practice.

Importance of Philosophy of Education to a University Lecturer

1. Knowledge for knowledge sake—That is for personal and intellectual gain.
2. Enhances open mindedness and removes bigotry or premature appreciating to an issuer.
3. Enables a learner to think logically, therefore, eradicating fallacies or false believes in the teaching and learning process.
4. Enables the lecturer to appreciate works of great philosophers and their contribution in education, e.g., Paul Freire (1993) from America said that “Education should liberate us from chains, makes us critically aware of our own humanity”.
5. Removes conservativeness and dogmatic attitude towards issues enabling us impress changes in education and life approaches in electric media.
6. Enhances research on medical educational policies and practices.
7. Helps an instructor to critically rational and creative in his/her profession he/she becomes a creature not a creator.
8. Basis of morality that is moral in activity for a learner and instructor.
9. Makes an instructor develop skeptical doubts.
10. Enhances skeptical doubt, approach towards issues in education leading to further research and better education system, practices, and theories.
11. Makes an educationist more confident in his/her work process, reason with facts thus making the instructor acquire theoretical basis of all educational activities.
12. Give a unified view on educational objectives, goals, aims, and policies.

What do You Understand by Term Education?

Education can be understood to mean the act of bringing out. From whichever case, education can be seen as a process and as a product. The learner is like a raw material that goes through an industrial process for

transformation into finished product. Education is a process of receiving or giving systematic instruction. It is the act or process of imparting or gaining knowledge, skills, judgment, and level of intellectual maturity. The product that comes out of the education process must be refined and of high quality just as an industrial raw material that has undergone refining process. An educated individual must be refined economically, socially, politically, morally, and intellectually endowed. Education is also defined as both a product and a process. As a product, education is said to be the sum total of what has been perceived, acquired, and retained expressed in terms of abilities, attitudes, and other behaviour of positive value to the society. Education as a process is best explained by Plato (1891), who defined “education as turning the eye of a soul from darkness to light”.

Hence, as a process, education eradicates error and falsehood, hence, enabling the learner to discover truth, leading the learner from their current situation to where they ought to be. Education in the general sense is any act or experience that has a formative effect on the mind, character, or physical ability of the individuals. In its technical sense, education is the power by which the society deliberately transmits knowledge skills and values from one generation to another. Education, therefore, deals with acquisition of knowledge, skills, socialization, individualization, and liberation, and involves truth and development. Therefore, education means a deliberate process which facilitates or transmit knowledge values, cultivates to the learner to enable him/her utilize his/her potentiality to the fullest to be self-reliable and responsible member of the society. Education, thus, is a continuous endeavor and a process.

What Scholars Say About Education?

Education is a vast powerful and complex institution throughout the world, a form of enablement available for social and economic change. Scholars define education as follows:

1. Aristotle (1968) defined education as a creation of a sound mind in a sound body. It develops man’s faculty specially his/her mind, so that he/she may be able to enjoy the contemplation of supreme truth, goodness, and beauty.
2. Plato (1891) argued that education develops in the body and soul of the pupil, all the perfection he/she is capable of.
3. Sifuna and Otiende (1992) defined education as a social process through which a member of society achieves individual growth and development and social competence carried out in selected and well defined institutional settings. As a social process, in which the individual attains social competence and growth which within a selected and controlled institutional setting. A process brings about changes in the behaviour of the individual and society at large.
4. And according to Langford (1968), education is a process of learning to be a person.
5. John Henrich Pestalozzi (1946) concluded that “life itself educates”. An educated person has access to optimal states of mind regardless of the situation they are in, and that he/she is able to perceive accurately, think clearly, and act effectively to achieve self-selected goals and aspiration.
6. Pestalozzi (1946) stated that, “Education is the natural harmonizers and progressive development of man, inert powers for or capabilities to the fullest”. According to him, life itself educates.
7. Oluoch G. P. (1982) defined education as the process of acquiring and developing desirable knowledge, skills, and attitudes.
8. Nelson Mandela (1995) looked at education as the great engine of personal development. “It is through education that the daughter of a peasant can become a doctor that the son of a mine worker can become the

President of a great nation”.

9. Frankena William (1968) argued that education as a process displays conscious effort to bring about permanent change in the individual. He argued that the change in behavior should be ongoing and the knowledge and skills of the learner must be presented in the manner that is morally acceptable. Therefore, education should entail instructional methods and content that commensurate with the learners’ levels of understanding. Education as a product must be considered in terms of the concept of an educated man.

10. John Dewey (1916) said that, “Education is development of all capacity in an individual that will enable him control his environment and fulfill his potentially to the fullest”.

11. According to Paulo Freire (1993), a Brazilian philosopher, educator/political thinker’s looks at education liberating or freeing man from all kinds of chains, enslavement, and limitations to enable him/she act humanly in the world, and develop critical conscious mind. He perceives education as the process of nurturing, liberating learners by initiating growth and development by improving them with their thinking/reasoning, and therefore, helping them come up with new ideas.

12. Gandhi Mahatma (1957), one of the greatest Indian educators said this education: “The real difficulty is that people have no idea what education truly is”. We assess the value of education in the same manner as we assess the value of land or of shares in the stock-exchange market.

13. Nyerere (1967) said that, “Education is transmission of knowledge and values from one generation to another, a preparation for life making and creators not creatures that are self reliant. Education is a deliberate attempts to transmit and acquire the acquainted worldwide knowledge, skills, and attitude, so as to enable man liberate himself from all forms of entanglements or chains of society, develop a critical conscience and from function in this society”.

Chapter 5

The Philosophy that Guides the Practice of University Teaching

Vision of the University

To be university of choice in nurturing innovation and talent in science, technology, and development.

Mission of the University

To preserve, create, and disseminate knowledge, conserve, and develop scientific, technological, and cultural heritage through quality teaching and research; to create a conducive work and learning environment; and to work with stakeholders for the betterment of society.

Core Values of the University

- (a) Intellectual freedom, excellence, and truth;
- (b) Teamwork, networking, and a culture of peace;
- (c) Transparency and accountability;
- (d) Professionalism and social justice;
- (e) Self-respect, institutional loyalty, and patriotism;
- (f) Continual improvement of services, competitiveness, and relevance.

Institutional Philosophy

Putting knowledge to work is our guiding philosophy. At the university, the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge are synergistically balanced. The university is driven by the process of

involvement—involvement in world affairs; in the needs of individuals and their communities, business, industries, and governments; in nurturing of inquisitive minds; in the transfer of ideas from the campus to market-place; and involvement in societal problems in Kenya and beyond. The creation of new knowledge that will benefit society is at the heart of our mission as a university. The distinction between basic and applied research has become more blurred as the process of discovery, scientific inquiry, and scholarship inform all aspects of the educational enterprise.

Objectives of the University

Advancement of knowledge through teaching, scholarly research, and scientific investigation as follow:

- (a) promotion of learning in the student body and society;
- (b) promotion of cultural and social life of society;
- (c) support and contribution to realization of national economic and social development;
- (d) promotion of the highest standards in and quality of teaching and research; education training and retaining higher level professional, technical, and management personnel;
- (e) dissemination of the outcomes of research conducted by the university to the general community;
- (f) facilitation of lifelong learning through provision of adult and continuing education;
- (g) fostering of a capacity for independent critical thinking among its students;
- (h) promotion of gender balance and equality of opportunity among students and employees;
- (i) promotion of equal opportunities for persons with disabilities, minorities, and other marginalized groups.

Quality Policy Statement

The university is committed to providing quality education and services that meet the needs of its customers and stakeholders through quality and relevant teaching, research, and community service and outreach. The university is committed to quality work and learning environment that is grounded in intellectual and academic freedom, teamwork, quest for excellence, professionalism, discipline, and continuous improvement of its programmes, activities, and services, so as to achieve client/customer satisfaction. To be able to realize this commitment, the university will continuously review its programmes, activities, and services to conform to the quality management systems.

Philosophy of University Education

Contemporary universities face many challenges and external pressures. Yet, they have few resources to enable them reorient themselves in the light of these challenges and pressures. It is said that most universities have not responded robustly to the challenges because of inadequate state funding. However, the major problem universities face today is that of identity. Bloom (1987) observed that HE is in crisis and this crisis concerns not the usual issues of funding and access but deeper and more important questions of identity. This situation has been occasioned by the call for utilitarian approach to university education, which has thrown universities into identity crisis in terms of their cultural, social, and economic role.

Barnett (2003) concurred that the contemporary university is besieged by malevolent forces that threaten to destroy it. On the one hand, the university is understood as becoming an instrument in the hands of the state for advancing the interests of the state in the global knowledge economy. On the other hand, university education is simply part of a market economy, putting its services at the disposal of anyone or any constituency that finds an exchange value in its commodities. The university is seen as having abandoned any calling to

pursue universal reason and has given itself up to local or national agendas, to the exigencies of the moment, and to the particular. Universities are also seen as becoming part of an interconnected global world. Since their medieval inception, they have always been international, taking their members from around the world and making their knowledge claims available to worldwide publics. Now, they are becoming global in character, networking globally, and acting globally, independently of their host society.

The university, as an idea, faces three substantive forms of undermining: philosophical, sociological, ideological, and cultural. Philosophically, the key ideas for which the university has stood—of knowledge, truth, and reason—are now even more slippery than they ever were. The university cannot be assumed to be their ultimate safeguard any more. Sociologically, the university has become a state apparatus, as societies see in the university vehicles for advancing their interests in the global economy, in developing high level human capital.

Ideologically, the university fragments as it positions itself in relation to its multiple possible client groups. Culturally, too, the university becomes unsure of itself, hesitant of all things elitist. Bloom's (1987) lament was just this: High culture in the university had given way to no culture at all. Given these apparent undermining, it is perhaps hardly surprising that it is felt that the university is "in ruins". The key question is simple, therefore, do we just shrug our shoulders and accept that the story of "the idea of the university" is at an end "or" can we continue the lineage? What can salvage the situation is much more than adequate funding. It is a sound philosophy of university education.

Meaning and purpose of philosophy of university education. Philosophy of university education is concerned with specific problems arising from the existence of universities and HHE institutions. Such problems include the specific aims of a university education, the distinction between university and other formal and non-formal aspects of education, the conflict among the faculties (or in a more modern understanding, the hierarchy among academic disciplines), academic freedom, social mission of the university, the relation between teaching and research, the academic crisis of the humanities, the production of knowledge, the kind(s) of thinking which university study leads to, the collective practice of study, education as a commons, the public role of the universities, neo-liberalism in the academia, etc. At national level, say Kenyan society, philosophy of university education is a set of principles that inform the educational process, with its internal and external organizational dimensions that scientific and administrative leaders in HE must possess and believe in order to build a future strategy for HE.

Therefore, the philosophy seeks to build an informed, armed, and knowledgeable human being, open and purposeful, respect diversity, differentiation and dialogue among cultures, create the right environment for enhancing the abilities of HE workers, build an advanced knowledge society based on values, developing the main principles within the HE system (university environment, sustainable human development, technology of education programs, and scientific research).

The field of philosophy of university education. Barnett (2003) observed that today we lack a recognized field of study that might be called "philosophy of university education". Apparently, no university in Kenya has such a course at post-graduate level. Correspondingly, scholarship on subject is scanty. There are works by philosophers who have only treated the subject of university education only in passing (Brubacher, 1977). It was a short text-book, addressing, chapter by chapter, some key issues including academic freedom, institutional autonomy, access (HE for whom?), general and vocational education, and the ethics of scholarship. Barnett (2003) noted that, up to this time, there are no serious works on philosophy of university education.

Towards a philosophy of university education. As Barnett (2003) observed, we have little in the way

of an adequate philosophy of university education. But, we can make suggestions as to how we can develop such a field of enquiry—seriously to be adequate to the challenges in front of it and the complexity of the university in the 21st century. To be equal to the task, we need to have a good understanding of the global forces underlying and shaping universities. And these forces are both conflicting and widening. An adequate philosophy of the university has to take account of the wider social, economic, political, and policy context within which HE finds itself. Any serious philosophy of HE has to be a social philosophy. Without such a reckoning, emerging proposals are bound to run the risks of being naive and even of being ideological.

Barnett (1997) said the university as moving on three planes. The “first” of the three planes is that of “the university as institution and as idea”. By the “university as institution”, a satisfactory account of the university has to move well beneath the empirical and observable features of the university to attempt to unravel its deep social ontology and to reveal the structuring mechanisms at work.

There is understandably much focus on, not to say concern over, neo-liberalism as a major global force. Here, public services are being made evermore subject to market forces, even if the state takes on the task of steering and managing those markets. However, there are at least six other global forces that have a degree of independence from each other, namely (Barnett, 1990):

(a) globalization as such, with its global interconnectedness and fast life (in the digital age, the university and academics are always on duty in a global fast space);

(b) the knowledge economy (a feature to be distinguished from neo-liberalism although they influence each other);

(c) the university as a site of bureaucracy—This feature is particularly pernicious (and is again to be distinguished from neo-liberalism. Indeed, neo-liberalism and bureaucracy are often antagonistic towards each other);

(d) managerialism as such (with academic management becoming a site of power in its own right and irrespective of external forces);

(e) national and global academic competition, reflected in particular by national and increasingly global rankings (which is placing huge pressures on academics especially in relation to research);

(f) regional, national, and cross-national audit regimes.

Sometimes, some of these phenomena are run together as if they are necessary concomitants of markets, but it is important that the contingency of any such association be recognized. Each one of these phenomena exerts a force in its own right. None is immediately observable (say, on walking into a university), but are at work in a complex of interactions, constituting large structuring and causal mechanisms that influence the shaping of universities across the world. This co-presence of multiple societal and global forces compounds the weight of the pressures that act upon universities, but their very co-presence opens “potential spaces” both at micro- and macro- levels into which universities might move.

Carr (2007) distinguished three different models or ideas of the university. Firstly, the German or Humboldtian model regards the pursuit of knowledge and understanding for its own intrinsic value—apart from any practical, instrumental, or utilitarian purposes that such knowledge might be thought to serve—and is so primarily focused on pure research. Secondly, the French or Napoleonic model emphasizes more the professional, vocational, and practical contribution to the public good of higher academic or other study.

Thirdly, however, a more English model which emphasizes the liberal educational role of the university. On this view, the pursuit of knowledge plays a key role in the personal formation of learners as individual

moral agents or prospective professional practitioners.

Hence, from at least the last decade of the 20th century, there has been large scale erosion of traditional distinctions between universities and other institutions and colleges of HE, either via incorporation into traditional universities of former colleges (of, for example, teacher education or arts), or the raising of such institutions (especially the former “polytechnics”) to university status.

In consequence, modern universities—but also increasingly that elsewhere are no longer quite the ivory towers of “pure” intellectual speculation that the 19th century apostles of liberal education might have envisaged as the main business of university education.

In consequence, the 21st century university would be commonly thought an important site of training and preparation for a broad range of professions, vocations, and public services—teaching, social work, nursing, computer sciences, music technology, and so on—and accordingly offers a wide range of courses designed to accommodate such training needs.

Today’s universities are probably, therefore, generally more aware—in all departments—of some responsibility not just to teach what they teach for its inherent academic worth, but with an eye to the wider significance, implications, and consequences of such knowledge for professional and public good (Carr, 2007).

The second of the planes is that of “the university in time and space”. The university is an extraordinary institution in having at least 900 years of history (and some would say much more, looking to Greek, Chinese, and Islamic former variants). This is a crucial matter, because straightaway we gain a sense of the university unfolding over time. The university has extraordinary qualities of resilience and emergence. A corollary is that the university’s present dominant form—which happens to be that of the entrepreneurial university—has to be seen as merely a stage in the university’s continual evolution. Inevitably, this is a more particular plane, in that each university has its being in its own time and space, and thereby, its own possibilities for its own unfolding.

These latter possibilities are not entirely given to it but have to be gleaned, discerned, and imagined. And then, there lie before a university the practical challenges of attempting to realize its possibilities, which forever stretch ahead of it. The third plane on which the university moves is that of singularity and universality. The university is self-evidently, an assemblage of events, open to immediate empirical enquiry. Individuals clatter a way on their word-processors or manipulate data in all manner of iconic forms on their computer screens, teams busy themselves in laboratories, teachers can be espied engaging with their students through glass paneled doors to classrooms on a corridor, committees work through their agendas, conversation takes place in refectories and in open spaces, meetings take place off campus, and students work at their assignments. But these singulars cannot exhaust the understandings of universities, with whatever sophistication in qualitative and quantitative techniques is brought to bear.

For universities, not least in the orientations of the members of universities themselves, have also to be understood through concepts that make universities intelligible as universities. Here, we may pick up four points made earlier: Firstly, that—far from shrinking, as some would contend the conceptual hinterland of universities is widening; secondly, that the empirical instantiations of concepts never exhaust the possibilities inherent in concepts, but that there always remains an unfulfilled conceptual potential; thirdly, that ideas of the university are not merely widening but often stand in antagonistic relationships to each other; and lastly, that the antagonisms are indicative of negative dialectics at work, such that the potential of universities is frequently undermined (by underlying mechanisms, ideologies, policies, actions, and events) and undermined still further

by forms of resistance (where, for instance, they lead to a suppression of debate and a limitation of perspectives rather than their maintenance).

Particular events in the university, therefore, have to be understood as spaces for the playing out of antagonistic universals (of truth and expediency, self-interest and the public interest, equity and hierarchy, markets and well-being, and freedom and regulation). So, the university lives uneasily not only with a melange of particular events nor just with antagonistic universals, but with the awkward interplay between its particulars and universals.

We see this awkwardness too playing itself out in the determination of universities each to be themselves, to be individual (and in a marketized HE system) to secure their own “brand”, on the one hand, and yet also, on the other hand, wish to be part of the national and international interplays among universities as global institutions (as evident in the global league tables and in their propensity to fall in with the dominant idea of the global university, complete with its vapid talk of “excellence” and “world-classness”). Accordingly, the pretensions of the university still to be in some senses a universal institution need continually to be revisited and to be adumbrated anew.

The establishment of the field of the philosophy of university education is an urgently needed task. While the university is an extraordinary institution and is ubiquitous across the world, it is though falling short of its potential. And in a changing world, that potential needs continually to be revisited and re-imagined. The philosophy of university education, at least as sketched here, would help to do that. It would play its part in helping to construct the university anew. Such a task, of course, would call for a scholarly inquisition into the grand tradition of philosophical writings on the subject and to discern the resources that that literature contains for the 21st century. Such a task, too, should be carried further, so as to build upon that literature to assist the realization of the university in the 21st century.

The University Notion of Publish or Perish

In Aristotelian square of opposition, the logic of sub-alternation dictates that if the universal categorical proposition is true then its corresponding particular proposition is true. But, if subaltern is false, then its superaltern is false as well. In other words, superaltern is the universal concept, while subaltern is the particular concept (Nyarwath, 2007, p. 69). In ordinary terms, what is true of the whole is true of the part. What is true of national philosophy of education is true of university philosophy of education assuming that the latter is logical derivative of the former.

Philosophy of university education is subaltern, while national philosophy of education is its superaltern. By logic of subalternation whatever that can be said of philosophy of education, in general, it can be said of philosophy of university education in particular. Philosophy of university education is particular concept, while national philosophy of education is a universal concept.

National philosophy of education in Kenya is superaltern, while philosophy of university education in Kenya is subaltern. The former is universal in Kenyan context, while the latter is particular. In defense of philosophy as general theory of education, Dewey (2014) constructed the following conditional argument: If we are willing to conceive education as the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and moral, towards nature and fellow men, then philosophy may be defined as the general theory of education. From this Deweyian’s argument, we can infer by logic of subalternation that philosophy of university education is a general theory of education at university level. Every practice has a theory and every theory has a practice.

Philosophy of university education is the theory of educational practice at university. Practice without theory is blind and theory without practice is impotent. Dewey (1916, p. 328) was categorical in stating that: "If a theory makes no difference in educational endeavor, it must be artificial".

Theory is outcome of reflection upon practice and theory is conceptual understanding of practice. Philosophy of university education is the broad theory that guides university educational practice. "Education is the laboratory, in which philosophic distinctions become concrete and are tested" (Dewey, 1916, p. 329). In its broad sense, theory means "a general conceptual background to some field of practical activity that unifies diverse activities in organized and systematized unity" (O' Connor, 1992, p. 76). Teaching and research are the two practical activities germane to university education. General theory or philosophy of university education provides conceptual background of how these activities are to be harmonized, integrated, and synchronized. Whereas universities in the Western world privilege research due to the funding, it attracts in African universities teaching engagement eclipses lecturers' time for research. Overload on teaching assignments rob lecturers time for serious research. Trimester arrangement of academic calendar also leaves lecturers doing more teaching than research.

Sabbatical leaves for lecturers are rare, yet they are opportunities for lecturers to do more research and serious publication. It would seem lecturers are made to believe only annual leave or study leave suffices for their absences from teaching. Lecturers cannot be expected to engage in socially relevant research if university almanac expects them to continuously teach. They need long holiday at least to break from monotony of teaching in order to research and publish.

This allows them to interact and network with government agencies and civil societies to identify problems for research, and thereby, attract funding to universities. Mere academic research without practical social response to problems in the society isolates university from its social relevance. General theory of philosophy of university education should define the nature, value, and purpose of university education both in research and teaching. Education as such has no aims (Dewey, 2014). Education is a social construct relative to needs of a society.

Dewey asserts university advances frontiers of knowledge through research and must disseminate this knowledge through teaching and publication. The caution of "publish or perish" reminds university dons that their vocation has two reinforcing sides namely teaching and research. The universal aims of education as listed by O' Connor (1992, p. 8) are relevant in suggesting the aim of university education these includes:

1. To provide men and women with a minimum of the skills necessary for them: (a) to take their place in society; and (b) to seek further knowledge;
2. To provide them with a vocational training that will enable them to be self-supporting;
3. To awaken an interest in and a taste for knowledge;
4. To make them critical;
5. To put them in touch with and train them to appreciate the cultural and moral achievements of mankind.

These aims of education are relevant in university philosophy of education since philosophy deals with general and fundamental questions of human experience. What is university? What is the purpose or value of education? The "intimate connection between philosophy and education appears ... when philosophic issues are approached from the side of ... the difference in educational practice they make when acted upon" (Dewey, 1916, p. 328). The history of philosophy eloquently chronicles the relation between philosophy and education in that the stream of European philosophical thought arose as a theory of educational practice (Dewey, 1916, p.

331). This intimacy between philosophy and education is analogous to theory and practice. Education is the laboratory where philosophical theory is tested in practice.

What is Philosophy of Education?

Philosophy of education is “not external application of ready-made ideas to a system of practice having a radically different origin and purpose” (Dewey, 1916, p. 331). That is philosophy of education is not an a priori theory applied to practice rather philosophy of education should be constructed based on experience of particular society at some specific time. Philosophy of education is an “explicit formulation of the problems of the formation of right mental and moral habitudes in respect to the difficulties of contemporary social life” (Dewey, 1916, p. 331). Based on this view of philosophy of education, Dewey (1916) went on to assert that the most penetrating definition of philosophy is “the theory of education in its most general phases” (p. 331).

This definition indicates that philosophy deals with general and fundamental problems or questions of education. Philosophy of university education is not some ready-made theory, but it must arise from critical reflection on difficulties or challenges of society and there from formulate a theory of how university education can respond to these challenges. Philosophy of university education is not some dogma, but a general theory guiding educational practices at the university. Philosophy of university education is evolutionary not static dogma.

Changes in society, emerging challenges, and needs demands reconstruction of social ideals. Education is used as means of regenerating society, and therefore, it requires constant reform at its philosophical base. Dewey (1916, p. 331) put it well that the “reconstruction of philosophy, education, and social ideals” go hand in hand. It would be instructive on this point to review national commissions of education in Kenya to find out if their philosophy of education is the same. For instance, given ideology of Kenya Vision 2030, what should be philosophy of university education?

Competency-Based Education: Philosophy of University Education

Competency-based curriculum (CBC) is proposed as a response to ideology of Kenya Vision 2030, which intends Kenya to become a knowledge-based society (KBS). Education is charged with responsibility of equipping students with relevant skills for KBS, which are generic skills for 21st century citizens. This requires reconstruction of philosophy of education at university level in response to Kenya Vision 2030 educational reforms. For instance, Kenya Vision 2030 calls for modernization of teacher education to meet demands of 21st century. What kind of modernization should be done in university teacher education programme? Philosophy of university education is the theory that guides university educational practice. It is the “business of philosophy” of university education to make a broad survey of the aims and methods of university education in contemporary society. This safeguards university education against degenerating into “a routine empirical affair” (Dewey, 1916, p. 329).

Philosophy of university education as an ideology. Philosophy of university education is also an ideology. Ideology is “system of beliefs which gives general direction to the educational policies” (Little, 1996, p. 120). It influences the nature and purpose of education and curriculum of a country. Little Dyke (1996) formulated a theoretical framework, which illustrated relationship among ideology, pedagogy, and epistemology. Curriculum is ideological derivative of the political philosophy. That is under social efficiency, “the central purpose of schooling is to meet the current and future manpower needs of a society by training youth to become contributing members of society”. This is what Dewey (1973, p. 191) calls the “remote term

of the problem of education”, which is “the destination toward which education aims”. “Productive membership in society” is the ultimate educational goal that should inform both individual and society in planning curriculum for its citizens.

Bennaars (1998, p. 14) lamented the “chasm between theory and practice” in education which creates “opportunistic theory of education”. This problem is captured by Dewey (1916, p. 137) as “nominally accepting one educational philosophy and accommodating ourselves in practice to another”. Examination oriented education ignores the aims of education explicitly stated the graduates are obsessed with “success in exams” not actual skills, knowledge, and attitude they acquire. This is diploma disease where mere acquiring of diploma certificate overrides all else in an immoral belief that the end justifies the means. The degree certificates become paper tigers. Philosophy of university education is both a product and process. The latter is critical reflection on education practice and beliefs. Dewey (1916, p. 335) described philosophy of education as a process in the following ways.

Middle term. University education is the middle term between two terms proximate and remote. The proximate term is the students’ capacities, abilities, and interests, while the remote term is the needs economic, political, and social needs of society. Whereas the proximate term is psychological, the remote term is sociological. University education is the middle term which bridges the student and the society. University education is a means to empower learners with competencies to accomplish socially productive engagement (Dewey, 1948). The construct of university education as means to bridging student’s capacities with social needs is instrumental or utilitarian. This idea of university education as a bridge between individual student and social wellbeing is as ancient and classic as Plato.

Plato articulated how society is individual writ large that is society is defined by character of its individual who constitutes its populace. It is the role of university education to regenerate society by producing citizens who believe in national ideology. Unfortunately, there is also a hiatus between national ideology and university education, particularly when university remains immune and unresponsive to ideological shifts. At individual level, some professors may continue in dispensing and advancing knowledge uninformed by the new ideology, thus, rendering education irrelevant to social realities. It should be incumbent upon professional consciousness of professors to articulate and explicitize individual philosophical positions vice a vise philosophy of university education in the country. Often times, lectures are unaware or espouse personal philosophies of university education, which may be antithetical to current ideology of university education. This may mean that even research interest is unresponsive to prevalent social, economic, and political challenges.

Philosophy of university education is an aspect of national ideology. Since independence education is a social construct for national development. Ominde’s (1964) commission was declared that education is a function of the Kenyan society. Ideology of university education in democratic society is utilitarian. Utilitarian goal of education is instrumental view of education, as a tool for, to serve the ends of national society. National philosophy of education is the social, political, and economic vision of education for the nation.

University education is national investment in production of competent skilled human resource for national development. University education as is a function of the national government. Educational systems mirror philosophical creeds (Hovre, 1930). Professors at university are intellectual mid-wives who regenerate the society by creating human resource with requisite competencies desirable for social, economic, and political wellbeing of the society. Since the times of Plato as evident in his “magnus opus”, the Republic society is regenerated and reconstructed through its national education particularly university education. Plato established

the Akademy which became the first university in Western society. Its role was to produce philosopher—kings and queens and other royal leaders to the society. Only those who attained requisite intellectual and moral aptitudes could be admitted at university.

The concept of university education has two components philosophy and university education. Philosophy is the perspective from which university education is analyzed and evaluated. Philosophical view of university education means application of philosophical knowledge in critical reflection on the nature and value of university education for the nation. Philosophy has examines the most general and fundamental principles of reality. Philosophy of university education examines the most general and fundamental nature, principles, and properties of university education. An activity or perspective is philosophical when the concepts, principles, and methods of philosophy are employed. These concepts, principles, and methods are derived from the core branches of philosophy, namely, logic, epistemology, axiology, and metaphysics.

Logic of university education. Logic is concerned with correct thinking. It identifies types of reasoning and analysis and evaluation of their merit. University education must train students in logical skills of thinking. In most universities, a course on logic or under its variant appellation, critical thinking is offered as an undergraduate university common unit. The caliber of educated person is judged in quality of his/her thinking. University education should produce graduates with logical reasoning skills useful in defending a position or applicable in critical analysis of an argument. University graduates should be critical thinkers who are skeptical and curious to find out rational evidence or support of what is heard or read. Every discipline has its logic which specifies its methods of investigation and validation of its principles and theories. The quality of thinking is an intellectual activity that distinguishes educated university graduate from the non-university graduate.

Epistemology of university education. Epistemology is philosophical study of the nature and justification of knowledge. University is supposed to create, disseminate, and demonstrate application of knowledge in social, political, and economic sectors of society. Classic epistemological question remains poignantly valid today as it was when it was raised by Herbert Spencer (1861). What knowledge is of most worth? This question suggests curriculum panning as a deliberative epistemological process. Public universities are mandate to produce knowledgeable graduate with masterly of knowledge and competencies in adaptation and use of knowledge germane to their areas of specialty.

Fundamentally, university education should facilitate learners to acquire pragmatic and epistemic beliefs, which verify ideas, theories, and concepts by practical application or experimentation. The Biblical verse cautions that you shall know them by their fruits (Morrison, 2000). The fruits of intellectual labor are evident in practical usefulness and productive capacity of knowledge. Learner's epistemic beliefs should be acknowledged, analyzed, and continuously reconstructed in the course of university education. Whereas it is necessary for learners to acquire knowledge, it should be necessary and useful for creation for 21st century workers.

Philosophy of university: Teaching or research? Philosophy of a university is reflected in how the university defines itself as either research or teaching university. Maher and Tetreault (2001) described existential tension between teaching and research at university. There is a tendency in major universities to reward research and publication than teaching (2001, p. 31). In such scenarios, pedagogical issues are muted and classrooms are not viewed as centers of knowledge construction. Newman (2012) considered the question of whether university is a place of dispensing or discovering new knowledge. He explained that, "To discover

and teach are distinct functions; they are also distinct gifts and are not commonly found united in the same person” (p. 10). Newman (2012) suggested that “university teaching and research are distinct specialties rare in the same individual”.

That is a don is either good in research or in teaching, but not in both. Classroom lecturer spends his/her time dispensing knowledge to students and he/she is unlikely to have energy to acquire new knowledge. Ethical dimension of university education has ethical mandate to serve wellbeing of society not for individual egoistic interest.

University graduate should appropriate altruistic moral beliefs and conviction. Their egoistic moral proclivity should be tempered with self-application for social service. Ethical theories attempt to respond to the question of: “Who is the good?”; “What is the good life?”; and “How ought I to act?”. University must challenge students to critically examine their moral compass, its presuppositions and ingredients. Socrates cautioned that unexamined life is not worth living. University graduate should be ready to critically interrogate conventional and traditional moral beliefs and practices.

Moral dogmatism engenders fundamentalist attitudes and beliefs which predispose learners to vulnerabilities of recruiting sects and cults. Uncritical moral and religious beliefs tempt susceptible graduate to immoral beliefs and are easily credulous and gullible to propaganda of terrorists groups like Boko Haram or Al Shabaab. How come we are shocked that university graduates are recruited into Al Shabaab? We need to examine the caliber of ethical reasoning those university graduates are exposed to.

Chapter 6

Personal Statements of Philosophy

Philosophy is defined as the most basic beliefs, concepts, and attitudes of an individual or group. The author’s focus is on personal philosophy, and the essential philosophical elements are centered on beliefs, concepts or ideas, and attitudes.

What is Your Philosophy of Life?

Your philosophy is the greatest determining factor in how your life works out. Both the lecturer and student need a philosophy. This is how to build a meaningful one.

An example as follow:

Dennis was broke at 25 and a millionaire by 31. As I was considering what to do, I met Davidson, a wealthy entrepreneur who became my employer for the next five years. He revolutionized my life and taught me the importance of developing my personal philosophy, to look for those few things that make the most difference and to spend most of my time doing those things. It is not a complex or mystical process, but a principle that can make a difference in how your life turns out.

How to Create a Master Plan for Your Life

Set your sail. The winds of circumstance blow upon all of us. We all have experienced the winds of disappointment, despair, and heartbreak, but why do people arrive at such different places at the end of the journey? Have we not all sailed upon the same sea? The major difference is not circumstance; it is the set of the sail or the way we think—It is what we do after we have set our sails and the wind decides to change direction. When the winds change, we must change. We have to struggle to our feet and reset the sail in a manner that will steer us in the direction of our own deliberate choice.

The set of the sail, or how we think and how we respond, has a far greater capacity to destroy our lives than any challenges we face. How quickly we respond to adversity is far more important than adversity itself. The great challenge of life is to control the process of our own thinking.

Learn from success and failure. The best way to establish a new and powerful personal philosophy is to objectively review the conclusions you have drawn about life. Any conclusion you have drawn that is not working for you could be working against you. The best way to counteract misinformation and wrong data is to input new and accurate information. Gather information from personal experience. If you are doing something wrong, evaluate what you did wrong and change things. Seek an objective and outside voice about how you are and what you are doing. An objective opinion from someone you respect can lead you to early and accurate information about your decision-making process.

Listen to the freshness of an outside voice someone who can see the forest and is not lost in the trees. Observe the successes and failures of other people. If people who failed were to give seminars, it would be helpful. You could see how people mess up and you would not do what they did. Past failures and errors prompt us to amend current conduct, so we do not replicate the past. Study from people who do well. Each of us should be in a constant search for people we admire and respect and whose behavior we can model. It is far better to deliberately choose the people; we will permit to influence us than to allow bad influences to affect us without our conscious choice.

Read all you can. People from all walks of life who have had some of the most incredible experiences have taken the time to write of these experiences, so we can be instructed and amend our philosophies. The contributions of other people enable us to reset our sails based upon their experiences. Books offer treasures of information that can change our lives, fortunes, relationships, health, and careers for the better. There are two books you need to read to build your philosophy: *Think and Grow Rich* by Napoleon Hill and *The Richest Man in Babylon* by George S. Clason.

Keep a journal. A journal is a gathering place for all of our observations and discoveries about life. It is our own handwritten transcript that captures our experiences, ideas, desires, and conclusions about the people and the events that have touched our lives. The past, when properly documented, is one of the best guides for making good decisions. The very act of writing about our lives helps us think more objectively about our actions. Writing tends to slow down the flow of information and gives us time to analyze and ponder the experience. The intense scrutiny of journal writing can enable us to make refinements in our philosophy that are truly life-changing. Jot down what you learn and be a buyer of empty books. It is the small disciplines that lead to great accomplishments.

Observe and listen. Pay attention during your day, watch what is going on. Surround yourself with people you respect and admire. Find people whose personalities and achievements stimulate, fascinate, and inspire you, and then strive to assimilate their best qualities. This is called “the skill of selecting”. Do not waste your time on the silly and shallow. One of the major reasons people do not do well is because they keep trying to get through the day, while a more worthy cause is to get from the day. We must become sensitive enough to observe and ponder what is happening around us. Be alert! Be awake! Often, the most extraordinary opportunities are hidden among seemingly insignificant events. Be a good listener! Find a voice of value and stay for a while. With so many voices vying for your attention, you need to develop the skill of selective listening and only dial into the radio station that appeals to you. If a voice is not leading to the achievement of your goals, exercise caution in how long you listen.

Be disciplined. Every day is filled with dozens of personal crossroads, the moments when we are called upon to make a decision regarding minor as well as major questions. These decisions chart a path to a future destination. With careful mental preparation, we can make wise choices. The development of a sound philosophy prepares us for making sound decisions.

When we eat healthy foods, we experience positive results in a short time. When we start exercising, we feel a new vitality almost immediately. When we begin reading, we experience a growing awareness and a new level of self-confidence. New disciplines practiced daily will produce exciting results. The magic of new disciplines causes us to amend our thinking.

Do not neglect. Neglect is the major reason people do not have what they want. If you do not take care of things in your life, neglect becomes a disease. If you neglect to do good things with your money, you probably neglect to do good things with your time. If you do not know what is going on with your health or your bank account, you could be at risk.

Chapter 7

The Role of Students and Lecturers in University Education

Student Responsibilities

The university seeks to provide all members of the university community with an environment conducive to learning. Membership in this community entails rights and responsibilities for each of its members. By enrolling in or attending a course or program of study at the university, all persons are deemed to have agreed to respect the rights of the university and its members, to abide by the provisions of this code and the rules and regulations of the university, and to be subject to any sanctions which may be imposed for their violation.

The code of student responsibilities presupposes that there will be civility and respect for others within the university. Because academic life requires standards of behavior of a higher order than those of the wider society of which Boston University is a part, the university's standards substantially exceed the minimum expectations of civil law and custom. The general laws of society confer rights and impose obligations on all citizens. When they enter the university, students retain their rights under the laws of society, but student status confers no immunity or sanctuary from federal, state, or municipal laws. Nothing in this code is intended to infringe upon or limit the jurisdiction of courts and law enforcement authorities over the Boston University community. By the same measure, nothing in this code is intended to restrict the rights of the university to the modest limits of public law. The university reserves and will exercise the right to insist upon the highest standards of personal conduct from all members of the university community.

The university is an independent and autonomous institution; admission to the university, continued enrollment, graduation, and use of its facilities are privileges, not rights. The code of student responsibilities is established to provide a system for dealing fairly and responsibly with students whose actions fail to meet the standards of the university or infringe upon the rights of others. The code of student responsibilities establishes procedures to deal with violations of university standards. Behavior that violates the rights of others or the standards of academic life is not a private matter. Such violations threaten the ability of the university to exist as an authentic university.

While this code establishes university-wide standards of conduct, it does not supersede the codes, rules, and regulations of the schools and colleges and other units of the university, nor does it supersede the procedures established by the university for resolving violations of conduct or academic behavior relating to the

schools or colleges.

Disciplinary action against any student may entail serious consequences. It may result in the student's temporary or permanent separation from the university, and thus, may jeopardize his/her future career. In recognition of the support and concern provided by most parents and in light of the importance of such support to a student who faces serious disciplinary action, it is the policy of the university that a student's parents be notified of serious disciplinary action involving their son or daughter.

The university reserves the right to amend this code or the rules and regulations of the university and its schools, colleges, and programs at any time.

Rights and Responsibilities

The legitimate expectation of all students is that the university will provide an environment, in which they may study, learn, work, and live without unwarranted interference from others.

The basic responsibilities of the student include:

- (a) respecting the rights of others;
- (b) respecting the highest standards of academic integrity and reporting any violations of those standards to the dean of his or her school or college or the dean of students for appropriate investigation and disposition;
- (c) respecting the property of others, and the property, equipment, facilities, and programs of the university;
- (d) refraining from actions that endanger the health, safety, or welfare of any member of the university community or its guests;
- (e) complying with the normative standards, rules, and regulations of the university as well as with federal, state, and local laws.

The failure to fulfill any of these responsibilities is a basis for disciplinary action under this code or the academic regulations of the schools and colleges of the university.

Lecturer's Job Description

HE lecturers are employed by universities and HE establishments to undertake teaching, research and administrative duties within a specialist subject area. There is no legal requirement for HE lecturers to gain formal teaching qualifications.

What Does a HE Lecturer do?

Typical responsibilities of the job include:

- (a) interviewing course applicants;
- (b) lecture planning, preparation, and research;
- (c) contact and teaching time with students;
- (d) checking and assessing students' work;
- (e) encouraging personal development via tutorial or pastoral work;
- (f) invigilating examinations;
- (g) attending staff meetings;
- (h) general administration;
- (i) writing research proposals, papers, and other publications;
- (j) reading academic journals;
- (k) supervising Ph.D. students and research staff;

- (l) managing research budgets;
- (m) attending and speaking at conferences and seminars.

The requirement to publish research work and general commitment to the job commonly results in HE lecturers working long hours, including evenings and weekends. An excellent teaching and research record is generally necessary for career progression as there is strong competition for senior positions.

Typical employers of HE lecturers. (a) Universities; and (b) HE establishments.

Many people enter the profession via part-time teaching or temporary contracts. Vacancies are advertised via the internet in local, regional, and national newspapers, in *Times Higher Education* and in publications relevant to the subject area to be taught. A few specialist recruitment agencies also handle vacancies.

Qualifications and training required. To become a HE lecturer, you must have a relevant degree. The minimum academic requirements are a good undergraduate degree (minimum 2:2) and a postgraduate qualification (often a Ph.D.). Many HE lecturers are mature candidates who have also gained several years' pertinent professional or industrial work experience.

Key skills for HE lecturers.

- (a) Highly motivated;
- (b) Excellent presentation skills;
- (c) Excellent research skills;
- (d) Written and verbal communication skills;
- (e) Expertise in a particular subject area or other areas.

The Duties of Professors at the Universities

A member of our Board of Regents once calculated the amount of time that professors spend in the classroom. He/she used that number, and his/her assumption that professors only work at the front of a classroom, to conclude that professors of HE only work about 200 hours a year.

I was surprised that anyone charged with oversight of an academic institutions (or any institution) would have so little idea what their employees were doing.

His/her remark prompted me to make the following list of things that college and university professors are required to do "outside" the classroom:

Work directly related to classroom teaching.

- (a) Prepare lectures for classes;
- (b) Prepare syllabi for classes;
- (c) Prepare labs for classes;
- (d) Grade class assignments;
- (e) Prepare exams;
- (f) Give make-up exams;
- (g) Grade exams;
- (h) Calculate grades;
- (i) Meet with students outside class for help;
- (j) Integrate new learning into existing classes;
- (k) Develop new classes.

Other work related to teaching.

- (a) Supervise and evaluate graduate student teaching;
- (b) Evaluate teaching by colleagues;
- (c) Lead field trips;
- (d) Attend department colloquia.

Service to students.

- (a) Advise students regarding course selection;
- (b) Counsel students on careers opportunities and choices;
- (c) Write letters of recommendation for students seeking jobs;
- (d) Write letters of recommendation for students applying to graduate schools.

Teaching and supervision of graduate students.

- (a) Supervise graduate student research;
- (b) Help graduate students with their research;
- (c) Read, make suggestions to improve, and evaluate graduate student thesis proposals;
- (d) Read, make suggestions to improve, and evaluate M.S. student theses;
- (e) Read, make suggestions to improve, and evaluate Ph.D. student dissertations;
- (f) Read and evaluate written Ph.D. comprehensive exams;
- (g) Participate in Ph.D. oral comprehensive exams;
- (h) Participate in graduate student defenses.

Research activities.

- (a) Write grant proposals for submission to funding agencies;
- (b) Do ground-breaking verifiable and publishable scholarly research;
- (c) Monitor spending from grants obtained from funding agencies;
- (d) Maintain laboratories for faculty and student research;
- (e) Write papers for publication in academic journals;
- (f) Present research at meetings of scholarly societies to promote the university;
- (g) Give presentations at other institutions of HE;
- (h) Read scholarly journals to keep abreast of new developments.

Service to one's field of study.

- (a) Edit academic journals;
- (b) Review papers submitted to academic journals;
- (c) Review grant proposals submitted to funding agencies;
- (d) Serve on review committees of funding agencies;
- (e) Serve on committees and in elected positions of scholarly societies.

Service to one's university.

- (a) Participate in departmental faculty meetings;
- (b) Serve on departmental committees;
- (c) Participate in departmental retreats;
- (d) Serve in departmental administrative positions;
- (e) Participate in or host faculty searches;

- (f) Serve in faculty senate;
- (g) Serve in university council;
- (h) Respond to information requests from administrators;
- (i) Serve on university committees;
- (j) Participate in university convocations;
- (k) Participate in commencement exercises.

Service to the public.

- (a) Respond to public queries in faculty areas of specialization;
- (b) Perform public service in faculty areas of specialization;
- (c) Give public lectures;
- (d) Oh, and by the way, teach.

The point: Just as it takes months to make a two-hour movie or to prepare for a day-long courtroom appearance, the work behind the scenes at academic institutions goes far beyond what happens at the front of a classroom. You will need expertise in your subject area as well as teaching, research, and administration experience to work as a HE lecturer.

As a HE lecturer, you will teach academic or vocational subjects to undergraduate and postgraduate students aged 18 and over. Teaching methods include lectures, seminars, tutorials, practical demonstrations, field work, and e-learning. Multi-media technologies are becoming increasingly used.

You will also pursue your own research to contribute to the wider research activities of your department or institution. The aim is to have this published in books or scholarly articles, which can help raise your institution's profile.

Administrative tasks take up a significant part of the working day. Many lecturers also take on a pastoral role with their students.

Lecturing takes place in universities.

Responsibilities

As an HE lecturer, you will need to:

- (a) deliver lectures, seminars, and tutorials;
- (b) design, prepare, and develop courses and teaching materials;
- (c) develop and implement new methods of teaching to reflect changes in research;
- (d) assess students' coursework;
- (e) set and mark examinations;
- (f) supervise students' research activities, including final year undergraduate projects, masters, or Ph.D. dissertations;
- (g) supervise your own research group, which typically includes research assistants (post-docs), Ph.D., and master students;
- (h) support students through a pastoral or advisory role;
- (i) undertake personal research projects and actively contribute to your institution's research profile;
- (j) write up research and prepare it for publication;
- (k) prepare bids to attract funding to your department for a range of research projects;
- (l) carry out administrative tasks related to the department, such as student admissions, induction

programmes, and involvement in committees and boards;

(m) contribute to professional conferences and seminars in your field of expertise;

(n) establish collaborative links with other institutions, as well as with industrial, commercial, and public organizations;

(o) participate in staff training activities.

As your career progresses, you may also be responsible for managing and supervising other staff in your department. At senior level, this could include taking on the role of head of department.

What to Expect

1. You will typically split your time between teaching contact, administrative tasks, and your own research activities. The amount of time devoted to each activity varies between institutions and specialties, and in some roles, you may only be required to teach, while in others, you will undertake varying amounts of both teaching and research.

2. Depending on your subject area, you may work in lecture theatres, classrooms, studios, laboratories, hospital wards, or outdoors (if your activities include field work).

3. Lecturers are employed in HE institutions throughout the UK. You may need to move institution to get a permanent post or to progress in specialist subject areas that are only available at a limited number of institutions.

4. Some lecturers get the chance to work outside their own institution in areas, such as consultancy, the media, publishing, and public speaking. Lecturers in areas, such as art and design often come from industry and maintain their own professional practice in addition to lecturing.

5. There are opportunities to work abroad and you may need to travel overseas for conferences, seminars, and collaborative work with other institutions.

The Roles of a Teacher in the 21st Century

Think about the type of lesson you normally teach:

1. In which roles are you often involved?

2. Are there any roles in which you have less experience?

3. Are there any new roles you might try in the future?

It is clear that the 21st century classroom needs are very different from the 20th century ones. In the 21st century classroom, teachers are facilitators of student learning and creators of productive classroom environments, in which students can develop the skills they might need at present or in future.

Harmer J. (2007) stated that, “It makes more sense to describe different teacher roles and say what they are useful for rather than make value judgments about their effectiveness”. So, here are some of the most common teacher roles:

Teacher’s roles. Most teachers take on a variety of roles within the classroom, which role do you think most defines your role in the English as a second language (ESL) classroom?

The controller. The teacher is in complete charge of the class, what students do, what they say, and how they say it. The teacher assumes this role when a new language is being introduced and accurate reproduction and drilling techniques are needed.

In this classroom, the teacher is mostly the center of focus, the teacher may have the gift of instruction, and can inspire through their own knowledge and expertise, but does this role really allow for enough student

talk time? Is it really enjoyable for the learners? There is also a perception that this role could have a lack of variety in its activities.

The prompter. The teacher encourages students to participate and makes suggestions about how students may proceed in an activity. The teacher should be helping students only when necessary.

When learners are literally “lost for words”, the prompter can encourage by discreetly nudging students. Students can sometimes lose the thread or become unsure how to proceed. The prompter in this regard can prompt but always in a supportive way.

The resource. The teacher is a kind of walking resource center ready to offer help if needed or provide learners with whatever language they lack when performing communicative activities. The teacher must make himself/herself available, so that learners can consult him/her when (and only when) it is absolutely necessary.

As a resource, the teacher can guide learners to use available resources, such as the Internet, for themselves, it certainly is not necessary to spoon-feed learners, as this might have the downside of making learners reliant on the teacher.

The assessor. The teacher assumes this role to see how well students are performing or how well they performed. Feedback and correction are organized and carried out.

There are a variety of ways we can grade learners, the role of an assessor gives teachers an opportunity to correct learners. However, if it is not communicated with sensitivity and support it could prove counter-productive to a student’s self-esteem and confidence in learning the target language.

The organizer. Perhaps, the most difficult and important role the teacher has to play. The success of many activities depends on good organization and on the students knowing exactly what they are to do next. Giving instructions is vital in this role as well as setting up activities.

The organizer can also serve as a demonstrator, this role also allows a teacher to get involved and engaged with learners. The teacher also serves to open and neatly close activities and also give content feedback.

The participant. This role improves the atmosphere in the class when the teacher takes part in an activity. However, the teacher takes a risk of dominating the activity when performing it.

Here, the teacher can enliven a class. If a teacher is able to stand back and not become the center of attention, it can be a great way to interact with learners without being too overpowering.

The tutor. The teacher acts as a coach when students are involved in project work or self-study. The teacher provides advice and guidance and helps students clarify ideas and limit tasks. This role can be a great way to pay individual attention to a student. It can also allow a teacher to tailor make a course to fit specific student needs. However, it can also lead to a student becoming too dependent or even too comfortable with one teacher and one method or style of teaching.

Now that, we have had a chance to look at some of the variety of roles, let us see how we can adopt these into a real classroom activity/task: What we notice here is that the roles are often interchangeable. The teacher’s role is never static. One activity could see an experienced teacher smoothly transition from one role to another. That said, the 21st century classroom is created on the premise that students experience what they require to enter the 21st century workplace and live in the global environment. The characteristics of the 21st century classroom, therefore, set it apart from the 20th century classroom.

Lectures on a single subject at a time where the norm in the past. Today, collaboration is the thread for all students learning. For instance, the collaborative project-based approach ensures that the curriculum used in this classroom develops:

- (a) Higher order thinking skills;
- (b) Effective communication skills;
- (c) Knowledge of technology that students will need for 21st century careers and the increased globalized environment.

While there is certainly a place for teacher-centered and lecture style learning, the evolving ESL teacher must embrace new teaching strategies that are radically different from those previously employed. The curriculum must become more relevant to what students will be exposed to in the 21st century.

An interactive teacher is by definition one that is fully aware of the group dynamics of a classroom. As Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) explained, the success of classroom learning is very much dependent on:

1. How students relate to each other and their teacher?
2. What the classroom environment is?
3. How effectively students cooperate and communicate with each other?
4. The roles not only the teacher plays, but the learners engage in.

Brown H. Douglas (2007) mentioned that,

Teachers can play many roles in the course of teaching and this might facilitate learning. Their ability to carry these out effectively will depend to a large extent on the rapport they establish with their students, and of course, on their own level of knowledge and skills.

According to Harmer J. (2007), the term “facilitator” is used by many authors to describe a particular kind of teacher, one who is democratic (where the teacher shares some of the leadership with the students) rather than autocratic (where the teacher is in control of everything that goes on in the classroom), and one who fosters learner autonomy (where students not only learn on their own, but also take responsibility for that learning) through the use of group and pair work and by acting as more of a resource than a transmitter of knowledge.

Facilitating learning is empowering for both the learner and the teacher and frees the teacher from many of the burdens that having to be an “expert” might entail. It would traditionally have been seen as a weakness for a teacher to say “I do not know, let us find out” or “I do not know, do any of you students know the answer?” But, times have changed and so must the role of the university lecturer.

So, here is hoping the next time you teach a class you consider how your role might affect your students’ learning. Are your classes teacher-centered with you always at the center controlling everything? Or are you able to “let go” and allow students to take center stage?

Regardless of the roles they assume, teachers shape the culture of their classrooms, improve student learning, and influence practice and production. Making the shift from teacher as an expert to facilitator is sometimes seen as diminishing a teacher’s power and authority, but this should not be the case at all.

Teacher’s Authority as Power

Due to the fact that the teacher is in the role of the manager of the class, they require power in another form: The authority to influence student behavior. This could be termed as teacher authority. Teacher authority is, in a sense, the right to ask others to do something. We ask students to do many things in a day, and we need to make our requests from a basis of authority. Without it, we would have little efficacy. In French and Raven’s (1959) examination of classroom interactions, there are five basic forms of teacher authority. Each needs to operate to some degree, but some will be emphasized and utilized more than others. These five types of authority are: attractive/referent, expert, reward, coercive, and position/legitimate.

Attractive (referent) authority. When the teacher relies on personality, relationship building, or the fact that they share common interests with students, they could be said to use “attractive authority”. Attractive authority can be developed through getting to know and emotionally investing in students. In a sense, when the teacher makes deposits in what Covey (1990) calls “the emotional bank account they can use their withdrawals as opportunities to influence behavior”. Attractive authority can also come from the teacher’s having a personality that is perceived by students as being likeable, funny, or charming. It is natural, as well as strongly encouraged by our media-driven culture, for students to want to follow and respect those that have qualities that are judged to be cool. We could imply that teachers to varying degrees have the ability to cash in these qualities that could be termed personality capital.

The use of attractive authority to influence student behavior can be both effective as well as healthy. It is difficult to be effective without having it to some degree. Students work harder for teachers they like and perceive as caring (Murray & Pianta, 2007). However, pandering for student approval and letting the need to be liked drive one’s teaching choices leads to problems. If the teacher confuses relationship-building with an implicit bargain that says,

I will be nice to you if you are nice to me; they start down a slippery slope that leads to giving away power and being taken advantage of.

Expert authority. When the teacher is perceived as being knowledgeable in the subject, well-prepared or intelligent, they possess what could be called expert authority. We have all had teachers who did very little to invest in the affective quality of the class, yet were well respected and able to manage the class to a great degree due to the fact that students felt there was a great deal of value in what these teacher had to say. Expert authority is driven by the students desire to know. Some of this power comes from a natural human deference for those who are perceived as wise or possess what could be called intellectual capital.

The use of expert authority to lead can be effective. It can translate into respect, if the teacher is not arrogant or entirely imperceptive of the needs of his or her students. Humor can be a great asset for the teacher who chooses to integrate it.

To trust exclusively that expert authority will be sufficient has been the downfall of countless teachers (Valli, 1992). Many teachers enter the profession with a passion for their subject but leave only one year later when their passion is met by a disappointingly high degree of disinterest and disrespect.

Reward authority. Teachers have the ability to reward their students in many forms. Those rewards are usually employed to influence student behavior. This form of influence could be termed reward authority. Various forms of rewards are discussed, which include grades, recognition, prizes, praise, privileges, and anything else that students might desire, given to them (externally) by their teacher. The notion of rewarding student behavior can be potentially effective, but effects differ vastly from different kinds of rewards.

The book discusses the need for teachers to maintain the social frame relationship between student success and the corresponding teacher reward. This implicit relationship is important to ensure that students feel valued and competent. Over time, it may be desirable for the teacher to help foster intrinsic sources of motivation within students rather than develop an expectation that the only way students will understand success is from extrinsic rewards. In its most healthy form, reward authority is experienced as a deep affirmation and a willingness on the part of the teacher to recognize student effort. In its least healthy form, it is a tangible or emotional token economy related to extrinsic rewards and the use of praise. In this application, student behavior

is conditioned by a systematic use of extrinsic rewards and/or the giving of love. It does have the effect of modifying behavior, yet essentially creates addicts of reward and praise whose work is primarily undertaken to obtain the reward rather than learning or growth.

Coercive authority. The teacher has, in their power, the right to use disincentives, to say no, withhold privileges, and give consequences or punishments to students. When they do this, they are exercising “coercive authority”. Coercive authority implies that if a line is crossed something will happen that will be less than desirable for the student. No matter how much of the other forms of authority a teacher possesses, without some amount of coercive authority, it is likely that some students will take advantage of their freedom to cross lines without concern for boundaries.

Used constructively, this form of authority is important to draw lines and boundaries. It helps promote a sense of security in the class for those students who are not inclined to cross lines and who count on the teacher to take action when necessary. Used zealously (in its traditional form), it can bring a hostile energy to the class. Relying on coercive authority can undermine the level of motivation in the class. Shame, punishments, guilt, humiliation, personal attacks, and withdrawal of affection are all forms of ineffective coercive authority.

Position (legitimate) authority. By virtue of the fact that the teacher is, in the position of the teacher, they have authority. The governance of the school places each teacher in a position of responsibility for the management of the students in the class. In a sense, it is not so much earned as it just exists. There is no other person in the classroom that can fulfill the duties of the teacher. We could use the term “in loco parentis” (in the role of parental authority) to describe this type of power. The teacher is the sanctioned authority in the room as well as the educator.

Unlike the other forms of teacher authority, “position authority” is not so much earned or cultivated, it exists by default. Nevertheless, we can do a better or worse job of protecting our merit of this role. This is especially true of new and of substitute teachers. Those who expect respect usually receive it. While position authority may come essentially from a contract, it is also projected in an air of legitimacy and confidence. Those who project an affect characterized by illegitimacy or doubt that they belong in the position will suffer from a limited amount of position authority and will have problems that come with this.

To be effective, one must incorporate at least some amount of each of these five types of authority. However, each teacher must thoughtfully consider the use of each of them within their goals and personality. Each form will produce different effects on the socially constructed classroom reality and lead to different sorts of results with students. For the most part, they are not mutually exclusive. One could utilize a higher or lower degree of any or all of them simultaneously. As noted in our discussion of each form, it may be more the case that effectiveness will be less related to which forms of power are employed than the manner in which each is employed.

The Role of the Lecturer as an Authority in the Classroom

Legitimate authority. Legitimacy is the trait that determines the effectiveness of the authority. Learning is one of the most important fields of educational system that over history has been addressed by philosophers. The main components of learning are teacher and student. The reason of emphasis on the role of the teacher and student, especially teacher within learning process is the influence of other educational factors, such as educational objectives, curriculum, textbook content, and teaching methods takes place through teacher to the learners.

Specialty authority. If someone is known by the group as a skillful and expert one or its knowledge is pondered as higher regarding certain subject, the group grants it certain authority. Such authority is known as specialty. The meaning by the specialty authority is high level of knowledge and skill of the teacher as well as its ability to offer and transfer this information and skill to learners. Therefore, in a classroom with a teacher that is potent in terms of proficiency on lesson matter and explanation and transfer of materials, the students attempt to use to the greatest extent and emphasize on the learning process (Mesrabadi, Badri, & Vahedi, 2010).

Reference authority. Reference authority implies the influence of the teacher in students' heart through showing respect and affection toward them. Within a class that proper emotional relation can be observed between the teacher and students, students meet appropriately their own needs, such as need to power, activity, and having entertainment, and the teacher can accomplish its educational objectives. Reversely, the teachers having negative emotions toward students cannot attain students' respect. The portrait demonstrates that teacher authority is most essentially a form of professional authority granted by students who affirm the teacher's expertise, self-confidence, and belief in the importance of his/her work. In this way, effective instruction and teacher authority become mutually reinforcing reciprocal processes.

Chapter 8

Ethics in a University Classroom

Course Purpose

To introduce the instructor to aspects of authority, integrity, and rights of the lecturer and student in the university classroom.

Objectives of the Course

The objectives of this course are to:

- (a) analyze and apply professional ethical prescriptions in HE academic practice;
- (b) evaluate varied behavior in one's workplace environment;
- (c) characterize a sound ethical conduct in one's academic practice.

Expected Learning Outcomes

At the end of the course, the instructor should be able to:

- (a) integrate and use professional values in ones academic practice;
- (b) detect and make correct judgments over the diverse modes of conduct in one's working environment;
- (c) commit oneself to persist in appropriate ethical behavior at all times;
- (4) make deliberate attempts to influence university students towards ethical practices that are in conformity with both their professional practices and the society's national values.

Meaning of Ethics

It is a branch of axiology. Axiology is the study of values and value systems. Ethics can be defined as a system of moral principles, e.g., "moral principles of culture". Moral principles governing an individual, e.g., "My ethics forbids to cheat". It is a philosophical discipline that studies values and guidelines, by which we live and the justification by these values and guidelines. Referred to as moral philosophy, it investigates why certain actions are universally right and others forbidden; looks at motives and consequences of human action; and gives us guideline on what to do obligation collide (moral dilemma).

It is the branch of knowledge that deals with moral principles. Schools of ethics in Western philosophy can be divided, very roughly, into three sorts. The first, drawing on the work of Aristotle, holds that the virtues (such as justice, charity, and generosity) are dispositions to act in ways that benefit both the person possessing them and that person's society. The second, defended particularly by Kant, makes the concept of duty central to morality: Humans are bound, from knowledge of their duty as rational beings, to obey the categorical imperative to respect other rational beings. The third, utilitarianism asserts that the guiding principle of conduct should be the greatest happiness or benefit of the greatest number.

Ethics and Professional Conduct

Normative dimension. According to R. S. Peters (1966), education not only involves the transmission of knowledge and understanding, but also the transmission of what is valuable desirable. This is the value condition of education referred to as normative dimension. The word "normative" comes from Latin language Norma—which means stand, values, guidelines, and disposition that direct education theory and practice. This may include the objectives, goals, vision, and mission. It looks at what ought to happen, the idea in any educational activities. It looks at education as worthwhile form of validity. Therefore, there is value judgment.

Meaning of morality. Morals—means right contact, not only in our immediate social relations, but also the way we deal with our fellow citizens and the wide human race. Therefore, it is based on clear ideas of what is right and what is wrong. It can also be defined as right contact, the ability to distinguish between right and wrong in the society. Morality originates from a Latin word "mas" and in plural "morles", it means the following:

1. A system of roles that requires social interaction and social relationships of individual within the society and is based on concept of welfare, trust, justice, and rights;
2. The term "morality" means code of regulations that governs conduct universally. Therefore, it is the degree of conformity toward principles;
3. Means customs, character, or conventions of rightness or wrongness of behaviour within a social community. Hence, to be moral means to be able to live or act in accordance with the customs of a particular community.

Ethics in the university classroom. Despite much recent concern with the possibilities of moral character education in elementary schooling and professional training, the university and higher educational prospects of such education have only lately received much attention.

This brings me to the main question of this talk. If universities are not just a way of growing the economy, then what are universities for? Universities have a moral purpose. Of course, universities have to be competitive and commercially-oriented. They cannot afford to be (nor should they be) against making money. There is nothing illegal or improper in universities trying to exploit the commercial value of their intellectual property. But commercial transactions carry their own ethical imperatives, which may not always be compatible with academic values or the best interests of the larger society.

The social benefits of universities are rarely debated. Media discussions of universities focus on their status and the achievements of their students and staff. Little is said about what universities are trying to achieve for society. As we can see, when asked to justify government subsidies, universities respond by stressing their utilitarian nature. They have put so much emphasis on this aspect of their activities it is not surprising governments have become convinced universities exist mainly to confer economic benefits. The

social benefits of universities hardly rate a mention.

Ethical conduct on an individual and an institutional level is problematized by the current context of HE in an age of super-complexity (Barnett, 2000). The university has shifted from the *Infusing Ethics into Everyday Practice in Higher Education*, so-called “ivory tower” model of the collegial university to become the economic engine of societies whose future wealth and material wellbeing is based on knowledge, which has intrinsic value only as a marketable commodity rather than as a cultural and scientific resource educational institutions, who had over the years turned out first class students and highly successful professionals and excellent specialists wondered at how this could happen with their bright students acting in freedom as “moral crooks”, but lacking in responsibility and virtue! Educational institutions produced them. These institutions are challenged to revisit their educational content, the school curricula, and their overall systems, which produce bright managers lacking in integrity and engage in teaching, training, and research that links the heart and the mind of the human person in wholeness.

The role of university is to provide holistic education for individuals to function as an ethical force in society. This role is threatened by academic capitalism. In our global marketplace, under conditions of sharply decreased public funding for HE, colleges aim to retain or increase their viability by competing for money, students, and professorial “stars”. The students bring the college their tuition payments or proportional (if reduced) public funding; the star professors attract more students, especially graduate students who pay more tuition or teach undergraduates for a pittance.

The context of HE across the world currently presents evidence of university failures. These failures are evident in areas, such as governance, financial, and risk management, conduct of senior leaders and quality assurance issues surrounding international education. Having this in mind, the present paper argues the need to add a new definition (to what is already known) of quality. The conceptual approach proposed by the authors takes into account ethics and morals as key virtues of the HE sector. The literature shows that it is still difficult to find agreement on a single definition of the concept. University leaders and quality assurance professionals define quality in many different ways. However, despite the ethical challenges in the current HE landscape, little has been discussed on the connection among quality, ethics, and moral values. Therefore, the authors provide the unexplored relationship between these concepts.

Newspaper articles reveal some depressing observations about modern universities. Writers claim that universities have been: “corrupted by their scrabbling for money”; “there are few rules to govern how institutions behave”; “naked self-interest” governs international student recruitment; and “political correctness and the cult of liberal ideas are causing discrimination in universities and suppressing debate”.

A Case for Ethics Education in University

The moral status of education is generally not unproblematic. R. S. Peters, the founding father of British (analytical) educational philosophy, clearly regarded education as a normative concept, observing that we would not normally consider someone to be educated unless they had been improved or made better by the experience (Peters, 1966). Pring (2001), a distinguished heir to and representative of the educational philosophical tradition pioneered by Peters has often quoted the letter of a concentration camp survivor alluding to the inhuman atrocities committed by people who had “benefited” from extensive formal education in prestigious German schools and universities (Pring, 2001). Still, it is evidently not Pring’s point to endorse any such separation of education from moral concerns, but to aver that something has gone wrong with any

education that leaves agents lacking such sensibilities.

Good ethics education matters, because the role of professionals, such as teachers and religious leaders is not just to execute a particular task or skill efficiently, but precisely to exemplify to or for others of what it is to be a virtuous, honourable, or admirable human being importance of good character and moral example in the classroom.

The preparation for some other occupations, in which public example is a priority. For example, politics, social work, judiciary, and the military services also require ethics education. Thus, for example, one might want nurses to be personally, not merely “professionally”, caring, and compassionate people; lawyers to be personally honest and just; soldiers to be courageous; or priests and nuns to be chaste—and take some steps to encourage or reinforce such compassion, justice, courage, or chastity in courses of vocational training for aspirants to these particular professions or vocations (Carr, 2017, p. 118).

The notion that ethics is not for us: Like the church, the university has a problem with ethics. It teaches how others are to be ethical, but it does not teach itself to be ethical. We are aware of quite a number of recent unethical stories at universities across the world. The examples include: cases of sex abuse case, widespread cheating among students in examinations, overpaid university presidents, conflicts of interest, plagiarism, grading inflation, and numerous others. These scandals happen at universities, and they are part and parcel of the culture of the contemporary university.

That the university has no evident interest in ethics cannot be addressed by simply developing a code of conduct for professors, lecturers, students, administrators, managers, and the rest. Before we ever articulate a professional code of conduct for each community within the university, we need to develop a culture of awareness among faculty, staff, administrators, and students. For a university to grow, it needs to recognize the integral and constitutive role of ethics in the formation of a flourishing community.

This will not be easy. We have no courses that address university professional life, and no professors who teach any course on university ethics.

At any university, anyone can take a course on ethics in a number of fields, including business, nursing, law, medicine, or journalism. In fact, if one is looking for ethical training in a profession, the courses are found at a university. The only professional institution about which you cannot find any ethics courses listed among the hundreds of courses at any university is precisely the university itself. If you search for a course on university ethics, you will simply not find one.

The complaint is not only that the faculty has no training in professional ethics, but also that other university members are not subject to professional ethical standards, whether they are in teaching, admissions, sports, student affairs, security, hostels, or any other sector of the university. Most of all, the administrators—in particular, those at the highest level of the university, from vice chancellors and the chancellor to managers/senate have not been trained in professional university ethics. It is a small wonder, then, that they do not promote a culture of ethical consciousness and accountability.

Current State of Ethics Education in Universities

There is a distinction among approaches to ethics at university and school levels of education. The approaches to ethics education in universities tend to be so concerned with disciplinary knowledge and rigorous analysis—tend, that is, to be so discursive and academic—as to be unconcerned with whether or not the students (or faculty) are living ethical lives; while approaches to ethics education below college/university,

which are mostly programs in values education, are so concerned with shaping students' ethical beliefs and conduct that they tend to be glaringly un-academic: Lacking in historical perspective, philosophical depth, and methods of value inquiry.

In HE, it is safe to say that ethics education, which takes place mostly in philosophy departments, in social services programmes, and in professional schools, is pretty thoroughly academic in both the positive and the negative senses of that word. The predominant approaches to teaching philosophical ethics are the historical and the topical or applied. In the former, ethics is taught as a history of moral and political (and in some cases, aesthetic) ideas and thinkers. This approach treats ethics as an area of content: a body of historical and theoretical knowledge and of perennially contestable questions, as well as an ongoing program of exegetical and theoretical inquiry. Topical ethics courses typically employ the method of case study to apply ethical theory to controversial current events and issues. Though most of the students in these courses will sooner or later confront at least some of the issues covered in them, the students are sure to be evaluated for the ingenuity of their analysis, rather than for their growing capacity or disposition to make sound ethical judgments in their own lives.

A third approach to philosophical ethics education, mostly reserved for graduate programs, is meta-ethics, in which contending theories are studied conceptually and logically, but then the move is made to epistemology and/or to critical theory in order to determine how these theories can be evaluated. Now and again, professors of philosophy raise concerns about the ethical ineffectiveness of ethics courses. Camenisch (1986) observed that the curricular objectives of philosophical ethics courses are typically limited to cognitive outcomes, especially the capacity for reasoning about moral issues (pp. 496-497). James B. Gould (2002) noted that, "Too often ... current ethics instruction seems to aim at ... theoretical moral knowledge as an end in itself" (p. 1).

There is much to recommend philosophical approaches to ethics education. They provide students a foundation in historical, theoretical, and meta-theoretical content and practice in textual analysis, theory construction and criticism, and in other intellectual processes. However, these very strengths become liabilities when philosophical discourse becomes "merely academic" in the sense of being self-contained; when the study of ethics becomes removed from being ethical in the sense of being a certain kind of person or living in a certain kind of life.

What Ethics Education in the University Classroom Ought to be?

The aim of ethics education ought to be the self-corrective study of how we ought to live.

Ethics education should be based on a more holistic notion of personhood (someone who thinks and feels about what she is doing "cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects of moral life") (Lickona, Schaps, & Lewis, 2007, p. 1).

Cognitively, the virtuous person does not just know what is expected, but has an educated understanding of the virtues. This requires the study of relevant literature, history, and philosophy, as well as practice in conceptual analysis, group discussion, and personal reflection.

Emotionally, the virtuous person cares genuinely about values and about others. This requires practice in "developing empathy skills, forming caring relationships ... communicating feelings, (and) active listening" (Lickona, Schaps, & Lewis, 2007, p. 1).

Learning to behave virtuously requires opportunities to exercise practical wisdom: To actually practice virtues in concrete situations that call, e.g., for collaborative work, dividing labor, reaching consensus,

resolving conflict, and creative problem-solving (Lickona, Schaps, & Lewis, 2007, p. 2).

The method of indoctrination cannot work in the university. In the university classroom, ethics education ought to be a skills-based course. In this regard, there are two elements of such a course:

1. Ethical or moral sensitivity: An ability to perceive the ethical implications of a situation. It is essential in any situation to be able to identify the moral aspects. Without the initial recognition of moral facts alongside scientific or “hard” facts, it is impossible to make any moral decisions. Ethical sensitivity is also about an ability to understand the moral networks and implications of moral actions;

2. Moral reasoning: An ability to engage in sound moral reasoning and use practical problem-solving strategies. The person must be able to make a judgment about which course of action is morally right (or fair, just, morally good, or adequate), and thus, label one possible line of action as what a person ought (morally) to do in that situation. Moral reasoning is also called “moral cognitive skills” (Clerkeburn, 2002, p. 311).

In view of the increasing number of frauds, scandals, and other malpractices being committed in various disciplines all over the world, teaching of ethical values has become important to all students especially professional students. Universities across the world should make teaching of ethics as compulsory subject at the under graduate level. Ethics can be taught as a compulsory subject as well as through incorporation of teaching of ethical values and skills in different subjects. This will definitely enhance the quality of university education. The university should function as an ethical force in society.

Why Ethics in the University Classroom?

Teaching is ethical practice which should be guided by normative moral principles and beliefs. Ethics is the study of morals. Morals are corpus of knowledge, beliefs, and practices used as a normative guide to good behavior. Often times, morals are left unexamined which creates ethical neglect. Ethical knowledge equips lecturers with moral skills of reasoning, reflection, analysis, and evaluation of classroom experiences. Ethics of university classroom is the reflection on the beliefs and practices that a lecturer should use in teaching. The meaning that professors and students make of their academic culture is important in shaping lecturer’s pedagogies, students’ educational experiences, and ways of constructing knowledge in each classroom (Maher & Tetreault, 2001, p. 25). In constructivist epistemology, how knowledge is created is as important as how it is taught. However, positivist epistemology view knowledge as objective content (body of knowledge) to be presented to students, where “the means of presentation is considered unimportant” (Maher & Tetreault, 2001, p. 14). This is described as the intellectual tradition at the academy, which is “used to rationalize male dominance” (p. 29).

This is a charge against traditional androcentric pedagogy, which places authority of university lecturer in possession of knowledge. “Pedagogy which focuses mainly on the process of attaining knowledge is thus cut off from the enterprise of knowledge production” (Maher & Tetreault, 2001, p. 15). However, feminist pedagogy resists “the persistence of the fundamental epistemological position that has divided the academy for generations” in “the split between knowledge and pedagogy” (p. 14). The process of knowledge construction and learning is as important as the content of knowledge. The split between knowledge and pedagogy has negatively affected initiatives on improving undergraduate teaching in university classrooms. This is because dominant university professors and disciplines have ignored “the potential contributions of teacher preparation programs and education departments to campus wide discussions of learning” (Maher & Tetreault, 2001, p. 15).

Dewey (2014) integrated science and ethics, knowledge, and pedagogy. Knowledge as objective content acquires ethical meaning in its use as means to an end. When knowledge is subject matter to be taught and

learned it enters ethical universe. Students must learn what is desirable in society. Knowledge taught at university classroom must be morally good since its use is for the good of society. There should be no split between knowledge and pedagogy in university classroom.

Pedagogical Neglect

The term “pedagogy” is commonly used in educational discourse within Eastern Africa in the narrow restricted sense of “instructional methods” (Bennaars, 1998, p. 32). However, the meaning intended here is pedagogy as a broader construct denoting a social normative vision of educational practice (p. 33). Narrow view of pedagogy reduces lecturers to mere instructors, engaged in routine mechanical empirical practice (Dewey, 1916). Emphasis is on mechanical acquisition of factual knowledge delimited by requirement for examinations. Associated with examination obsessed education is diploma disease which creates paper tigers.

Students want academic certificates regardless of whether they are transformed by requisite knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and competencies to handle challenges of world of work. Pedagogy that gears towards passing examination is opportunistic (Bennaars, 1998, p. 14). The main focus is classroom delivery of subject matter or content to be regurgitated by students during examination. This is what Freire (1993) castigated as banking education or oppressive pedagogy. It equivocates schooling with education yet education is multi-dimensional concepts cognitive dimension eclipses dialogical, normative, and creative dimensions (Bennars & Njoroge, 1987). The failure to reflect on pedagogy in the wider concept engenders pedagogical neglect, non-education, and mis-education (Bennaars, 1998; Dewey, 1938). Classroom practice based on pedagogy as instructional method implies constricted vision in teaching. It degenerates lecturer-student interaction into “a mechanical exercise, a task of operant conditioning” (Bennaars, 1998, p. 7). Pedagogical ethics in university classroom is neglected when pedagogy is viewed within narrow prism of instructional method (Bennaars, 1998).

Pedagogical ethics is normative social vision which inspires a humanizing pedagogy that respects and uses the reality, experience and perspective of students as “an integral part of educational practice” (p. 47). University classroom suffer from “a constitutive lack” which is a regulative ethical principle of pedagogy (p. 46). This lack is due to absence of pedagogical reflection on classroom experience. Instead an implicit pedagogical theory influences educational practice. Implicit pedagogical theory is “a set of beliefs, ideas, and assumptions underlying people’s ways of thinking and acting in educational contexts” (Bennaars, 1998, p. 36).

Such theories are dogmatic, blind, and uncritical, they fail Socratic caution that “unexamined life is not worth living” (Plato, 1891). What is the moral theory of a lecturer in the classroom? What moral imperatives, beliefs, and principles guide his/her conduct? Or does the lecturer engage individual students in a moral vacuum devoid of any moral consideration? The power that a lecturer enjoys and exercises upon student is morally constrained by dictate of what is in the best interest of the student. The society delegates that moral power upon lecturers and when deemed necessary that power can be withdrawn for the greater good of students. There is democratic view of education as progressive growth of setting free individual capacities towards social aim (Dewey, 1916).

Pedagogical problem focuses on devising ways in which students can get the sort of knowledge, experience, and abilities which will enable them to participate actively and creatively in social life (Dewey, 1973, p. 226). Lecturers require pedagogical vision to strategize how classroom practice is more than passing on of inert ideas.

Aristotle's Rhetorical Triangle

In rhetoric, the art of persuasive speaking or writing, there are different ways of persuading someone to your opinion called “appeals”. The Greek philosopher Aristotle categorized three kinds of appeals: logos, ethos, and pathos. Each kind of appeal attempts to persuade the audience to the writer’s or speaker’s point of view, but they do so in different ways (Brown, 2017). In order to enhance ethics of university classroom, lecturers can appeal to students by use of the three kinds of rhetoric appeals.

Ethos. This is the moral character of an individual or identity of group of individuals as members of society or profession. The ethos of a lecturer refers to his/her credibility, authority, and relevant experience in the discipline he/she is handling. This influences lecturer’s receptivity and rapprochement with students. Award of marks on non-academic grounds is unethical. It is repugnant to ethos of teaching profession. Students and lecturer in classroom constitute a moral community. The morality of classroom is for success of each learner through cooperative endeavor with others. Academic work is moral work it is endeavor engaged for self-actualization of the learner as future contributing citizen in the society. Lecturers ought to be models worth of student’s emulation and moral edification. This is only possible when pedagogy is anchored on a normative ethical social vision of educational practice in the university classroom.

Pathos. Pathos is Greek word for emotional experience. It refers to appealing to readers’ or listeners’ emotions or feelings rather than to logical thought. Appeals to feelings try to resonate with the learners’ emotions in order to make them identify emotionally with the lecturer. Lecturers should persuade learners by use of emotional examples in attempt to get them to take action or gain interest or develop desirable attitude, value, or belief in their course of study. Effective lecturers appeal to emotional intelligence of students.

Logos. Logos is the Greek word for reason, mind, or intellect. It refers to appealing to learners’ capacity to think logically. Logical persuasion makes use of arguments in a systematic and procedural manner. Principles, ideas, and theories are supported by examples and powerful illustrations. Whereas, ethos appeals to character of the lecturer logos appeals to rational capacity of the learner. Practitioner lecturers in university classrooms should integrate the three rhetorical appeals in order to model, inspire, and instruct learners in an effective and transformative pedagogy. This requires conceptualization of pedagogy in the broad sense of “a social vision of teaching”, which guides the choice of instructional practices (Bennaars, 1998). This avoids restrictive and narrow view of pedagogy as methods of instruction. Classroom pedagogy at university classroom should be evolutionary and progressive by learning from past experiences and modern theories. For instance, feminist theories are influencing approaches to students learning by improving on shortcomings of traditional pedagogy. Some feminist scholars practice feminist pedagogy in the university classrooms by encouraging students to participate in classroom constructivist generation of knowledge. The enactment of new epistemologies in the classrooms draws upon the viewpoints and experiences of students and teachers (Maher & Tetreault, 2001, p. 4).

Virtue and Character in HE

HE is clearly much concerned with preparing students for a wide range of professions, vocations, and public services, in which moral character clearly matters greatly. It should also be clear, public ill has often been traceable to such failures of personal character as greed, vanity, egotism, intemperance, prejudice, discrimination, weakness of will, cowardice, and so on. This is why the incorporation of formal courses of ethics in programmes of professional training—while arguably necessary for satisfactory professional education may not be sufficient to ensure the development of morally appropriate occupational sensibilities. It

may also have been too often the case that too narrow a university and HE focus on training in the specialized competences or skills of particular professional fields has fostered a blinkered vision of the human concerns of such specialisms to which a rather broader liberal education might better conduce.

In sum, while there is clearly a strong case for moral character or virtue education, or even for interventions designed to improve or strengthen character for those entering professions and public services in which this crucially matters, this case needs tempering in light of the plain fact that not all learning in HE is clearly pointed in this vocational direction. Even more crucially, it has to be recognized that institutions of HE, unlike primary and secondary schools, generally cater for those who have attained “years of discretion”, which must make many initiatives designed to shape or “re-form” adult character highly problematic in any free society. Indeed, it is of some present concern that some HE moral character agendas may well be counter-productive, if those mature adults who have embarked on courses of further education—which could be in and of themselves character building, are actually discouraged from such study for fear or distaste of such intrusion.

The Various Sources, Types, and Aspects of Ethics in the University Classroom

The issues of ethics in the university and the role of HE in society are addressed. Distinctions are made between legal behavior and ethical behavior, and the question of how the university needs to balance the two in order to fulfill its unique role in society, while it simultaneously strives to reside and survive within it is discussed. Certain university activities can create problems in ethics, such as economic development activities, intercollegiate athletics, sponsored research, faculty consulting arrangements, and presidential and trustee service on corporate and bank boards. In addition, HE faces a growing number of new ethical problems simply because of the steady increase in science and technology, raising such issues as the creation of computer viruses, privacy of computer-stored information, and liability for malfunctions in computer programs.

How a university governs its own affairs and how its own incentives, traditions, and reward system often inspire unethical behavior are problems for which the university is solely accountable. Such problems arise, because universities only use one model of excellence as a standard, that of the major research university. The model frustrates faculty who are not well funded, unreasonably heightens competition, and unnecessarily creates a large, sometimes insatiable, appetite for more funding.

Governance in HE is the means by which institutions for “HE” (tertiary or post-secondary education) are formally organized and managed (though often there is a distinction between definitions of “management” and “governance”). Simply, “university” governance is the way in which universities are operated. Governing structures for HE are highly differentiated throughout the world, but the different models nonetheless share a common heritage.

Internationally, “tertiary education” includes private not-for-profit, private for-profit, and public institutions governed by differentiated structures of management. Governance and management of post-secondary institutions becomes even more diverse with the differences in defining the relationships between higher and tertiary education (university education), postsecondary education, technical and “vocational education”, and “community college” models of education. The issues are complicated by current debates over “collegial” and shared forms of governance “contrasted” to corporate and “business” forms of institutional governance.

Types of Ethics

Descriptive ethics. They are the morals of a society. People use descriptive ethics as a way to judge

particular actions as good or bad based on the social contract of a particular society. It is possible for people in one group to hold a different set of morals than people in another group. Descriptive ethics also change over time. For instance, the acceptability of racism changed in the United States over the course of generations.

Normative ethics. This implies what should be good or bad in a society. The view of what is an acceptable ethic requires subjectivity. Normative ethics conflict with descriptive ethics at times. An example of normative ethics is the debate concerning abortion.

Meta-ethics. It involves the examination of ethical terms, such as justice and morality, as broad concepts for a society. It also seeks to define a middle ground among terms, such as good and evil. Emotivism, a part of meta-ethics, involves using a seemingly objective claim as an emotional response. An example of meta-ethics includes questioning the existence of free will in a society.

What is a code of ethics? The primary focus of ethics is to determine right and wrong conduct, both in theory and specific situations. While issues in ethics are often debated, primary ethical imperatives, such as not committing murder, can be codified into law, which allows for a standard of justice. Practically applied, ethics is important, because it gives individuals a basis on which to praise or decry an action and punish or reward it. Without the study of ethics, there can be no government and no law. Without an ethical system in place, all actions are equally acceptable and no one is safe from his/her neighbour. Ethics is not only important for interpersonal relations, but it is also important for the environment and the way animals are treated by humans. Ethics seeks to protect parties that cannot speak for themselves. It is a major factor in industries that deal with livestock, wild animals, and natural resources.

Why are ethics important in communication? In communication, ethics work to enhance credibility, improve the decision-making process, and allow for trust among the two parties. Ethics provide the groundwork for right and wrong, allowing two parties to communicate with a basic understanding of what is expected. The purpose of ethics is to avoid doing harm and this is vital in communication, because it works to build trust. This allows both parties to define what is acceptable to allow for better relations between individuals and different departments in the case of organizations. The same level and understanding of ethics applies to all forms of communication, including verbal, written, and digital.

The Concept of Academic and Scholarship Integrity at the University

What is academic integrity? Fundamental to the academic work you do at university is an expectation that you will make choices that reflect integrity and responsible behavior. University will ask much of you. Occasionally, you may feel overwhelmed by the amount of work you need to accomplish. You may be short of time, working on several assignments due to the same day, or preparing for qualifying exams or your thesis presentation. The pressure can be intense. However, no matter what level of stress you may find yourself under, university expects you to approach your work with honesty and integrity. Honesty is the foundation of good academic work. Whether you are working on a problem set, lab report, project or paper, avoid engaging in plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, cheating, or facilitating academic dishonesty. Follow this advice:

1. Academic dishonesty, academic misconduct, or academic fraud is any type of cheating that occurs in relation to a formal academic exercise. It can include:

- (a) Plagiarism: The adoption or reproduction of original creations of another author (person, collective, organization, community, or other type of author, including anonymous authors) without due acknowledgment;
- (b) Fabrication: The falsification of data, information, or citations in any formal academic exercise;

(c) Deception: Providing false information to an instructor concerning a formal academic exercise—e.g., giving a false excuse for missing a deadline or falsely claiming to have submitted work;

(d) Cheating: Any attempt to obtain assistance in a formal academic exercise (like an examination) without due acknowledgment (including the use of cheat sheets).

2. Bribery or paid services: Giving assignment answers or test answers for money.

3. Sabotage: Acting to prevent others from completing their work. This includes cutting pages out of library books or willfully disrupting the experiments of others.

4. Professorial misconduct: Professorial acts that are academically fraudulent equate to academic fraud and/or grade fraud.

5. Impersonation: Assuming a student's identity with intent to provide an advantage for the student.

Academic dishonesty has been documented in every type of educational setting from elementary school to graduate school. Throughout history, this type of dishonesty has been met with varying degrees of approbation.

Academic integrity. This is the moral code or ethical policy of academia. The term was coined by the late Don McCabe, who is considered to be the “grandfather of academic integrity”. This includes values, such as avoidance of cheating or plagiarism; maintenance of academic standards; honesty and rigor in research; and academic publishing.

Dishonesty. It is to act without honesty. It is used to describe a lack of probity, cheating, lying, or being deliberately deceptive or a lack in integrity, knavishness, perfidiousity, corruption, or treacherousness. Dishonesty is the fundamental component of a majority of offences relating to the acquisition, conversion, and disposal of property (tangible or intangible) defined in criminal law, such as fraud.

Intellectual property rights. A right that is had by a person or a company to have exclusive rights to use its own plans, ideas, or other intangible assets without the worry of competition, at least for a specific period of time. These rights can include copyrights, patents, trademarks, and trade secrets. These rights may be enforced by a court via a lawsuit. The reasoning for intellectual property is to encourage innovation without the fear that a competitor will steal the idea and/or take the credit for it.

Intellectual property protection. Intellectual property protection is protection for inventions, literary and artistic works, symbols, names, and images created by the mind. Learn how you can protect your intellectual property by using patents, trademarks, trade secrets, and copyrights.

Intellectual property protection explained. Entrepreneurs and business owners need to understand the basics of intellectual property law to best protect their hard-earned creations and ideas from unfair competition. Intellectual property includes distinctive items that you have created and ones that give you an economic benefit. Seek professional experience from an intellectual property attorney to help your company plan for success and avoid theft of ideas, designs, and other concepts. Since filing and re-filing intellectual property applications can get expensive and waste time if done incorrectly, determine what you need to protect when it comes to intellectual property: Decide which of your ideas fall under which specific protection option; file as quickly as possible to reduce your chance of losing out on protection; and investigate international patents as well as those registered in the United States. Make sure to plan and execute your planned strategy as soon as you start your company or invent something new. There are four types of intellectual property protection for businesses: patents, trademarks, trade secrets, and copyrights.

Chapter 9

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Overview

Throughout this book, two issues come out very distinctly. Firstly, it is evident that moral values and norms have generally been relegated as unimportant in the practice of education. Secondly, the study has also emphasized beyond doubt that these same values remain the indicator of a healthy human society.

Based on these premises, the crucial importance of re-emphasizing the centrality of moral values in education has been affirmed. The justification of this position can be summed up by trying to respond to the question as to whether and/or why learners should acquire moral values or norms in and through education.

The Crucial Importance of Moral Education

To sum up this discussion, the importance of moral education consists in the following:

1. Through the normative dimension, education deliberately attempts to form morally upright and cultured citizens. Hence, learners (youths) are developed into useful members of the society. To this extent, moral education is important in the production of a morally apprehensive and upright citizenry. It is therefore the best investment if we want to insure the existence of a moral society, an adventure which depends critically on educating and/or enhancing the values or norms of the society in the learners.

2. The successful formulation of educational objective depends on their grounding in the values and norms that the society intends to propagate in its youth. Similarly, the achievement of such educational goals and objectives is largely determined by the society's commitment to moral education. For instance, as it is the case in the Kenyan educational practice, education can hardly realize the objective of achieving national unity unless and not until we get convinced of the centrality of moral education in our educational theory and practice. In other words, educational aims, goals, and objectives are fundamentally normative in nature, and so provide the normative definitions of education.

3. By way of sharpening critical thought, moral education helps in cultivating in an individual, a disposition to make good judgments, choices, decisions, and actions. It affects an individual's thinking, willing, and acting. Thus, moral education becomes the most effective way of reshaping a society towards good, worthwhile, and desirable goals. By investing in the moral education of the youth, a society can be able to redefine its culture and civility, thus, learners will be able to bring about positive change in the society. Ultimately, moral values and norms contribute to the development of the individual and the entire nation, thus, leads to national development.

4. Finally, education is meant to promote good life, and so the need for moral education.

Strategies and Recommendations for Moral Education

In spite of the clear importance of moral education, numerous challenges still abound. These challenges range from utilitarian tenets which undermine moral values at the expense of other dimensions (especially the cognitive one) to the lack of preparedness and will to affect the demands of moral education. Nevertheless, it is in the light of this realization that the following strategies and recommendations are made.

Making Moral Education Central to the Educative Process

In a society that is deeply inclined towards academic certificates and excellence, very few people would appreciate the centrality of value excellence. Indeed, school leaving certificates which used to carry a

normative evaluation of the learner have since lost their significance. Many job seekers are no longer worried about poor school leaving certificates, so long as they have an excellent academic certificate. Similarly, employers hardly inquire into the availability, content of such certificates, or even the moral rectitude of job seekers as an aspect of their educational process.

Perhaps, it is such a scenario that has contributed to the lack of interest in moral education. Ultimately, this could be responsible for the growing break-down in the civil culture, and with it, the growth of corruption in the society. Such observations should be strong enough to compel a society to invest more and more in the moral education of its youth. Besides the cognitive development of the learners, education is essentially about life and how to fit in the society, and moral education is central to this.

Thus, it is recommended that curriculum developers and implementers must take keen interest in structures that will enhance the holistic development of the learner with a focus on the normative dimension. Curriculum activities that will promote moral values, such as elements of community, hard work, and mutuality among others ought to be enhanced. Elements which threaten to undermine this realization should equally be addressed. For instance, excessive emphasis on academic development at the expense of creativity, individual and moral development of the learner cripples the holistic mission of education.

Building a Sound Institutional Culture

It has been emphasized that “lived experience” forms a vital component of moral education. Hence, it is worth noting that educational institutions and schools which have any interest in moral education will do everything possible to create an enabling environment towards this goal. In short, both the classroom and the general institutional environment should mirror what the learners are expected to become. Institutional culture will in this case go beyond what is merely stated in word. Instead, it will include both what is intended and expressed in action and “silent speech”.

This approach to moral education re-echoes the Aristotelian contention that values or character education is fundamentally caught by the learners than taught in formal settings. Schools should have behaviour codes that emphasize civility, hard work, kindness, and honesty among others. Hence, it is recommended that rich institutional cultures must be enhanced in educational centres as an essential part of moral education.

Investing in Teacher Education Programmes

Whether moral education is to be conceived in the transmitting model, lived experience, or through the development of critical reasoning in learners, the teacher remains the focal person charged with the responsibility of mitigating the moral development of the learner. Several options rest on the teacher. For example, he/she can choose to enhance the moral education of the learners or not, and may do this either positively or negatively. Furthermore, even the setting of an enabling environment for moral education/development may finally and entirely depend on the good will of the teacher.

It is for these reasons that any successful attempt to enhance moral education in and through the educational system must have the teacher as the most practical starting point. For instance, mere formulations of curricula which are friendly to moral education cannot bring about any desirable effect in the learners if such interventions are not owned by the teachers. It is therefore recommended that effective moral education should have its preparatory stage not in school classrooms but in teacher education programmes. This is the stage at which we should seek to achieve both the preparedness and even the will of the teacher to become an effective moral educator.

Many teachers either have this role imposed on them or simply find themselves having to satisfy the demand of a moral educator while in the field yet many others may even have no idea of such a duty. On the contrary, teachers must move out of their training convinced of their obligatory role as moral educators. Thus, this must become one of the focal points of their training.

The moral culture that is expected to be cultivated by teachers in the field must find an explicit, if not the best expression in teacher-education programmes and institutions. Some teachers often fail to emphasize on moral values for fear that they could be accused of brainwashing learners when they insist on basic value, such as civility, decency, honesty, and fairness. Such fears can be countered through a deliberate preparation of teachers as moral educators.

Similarly, just as it is difficult to develop morally sound learners in a school programme and environment that is hostile to moral education, so is it difficult to have teachers who will become effective moral educators from a training environment that is alien to moral education. This is perhaps the underlying challenge to effective moral education in the society today. The society of which teachers are part of may, generally be convinced of the necessity of a just moral order; it may as well be convinced of the role of education in the realization of this end. However, it is until teachers get fully convinced and fully prepared both in theoretical as well as practical ways to regard themselves as irreplaceable moral educators that education will contribute to the growth and development of a rich civil culture.

Suggested Ways Through Which a Lecturer and the School System Can Enhance Moral Values in Learners

To conclude this study, the following are suggested as avenues through which the teacher and the school system can effectively attempt to enhance moral values in the learners. It should be noted, however, that the list below does not seek to exhaust such avenues:

- (a) Guidance and counseling;
- (b) A teacher as a good role model;
- (c) Reference to life experiences;
- (d) Encourage moral education through problem-solving approach, such as providing learners with real time moral conflicts and dilemmas for discussion and resolution;
- (e) Allusions to moral lessons during both “in-classroom” and out of classroom instructions;
- (f) Rewarding good conduct and punishing bad conduct accordingly, always punctuated with explanations;
- (g) Correcting learners when they do wrong or contrary to moral expectations;
- (h) Organized instructions on good conduct;
- (i) Enhance moral education through non-academic activities, e.g., through clubs, societies, and games;
- (j) Organize for resource persons and talks on moral issues and guidance.

Finally, this study affirms that virtue can be taught, and that effective moral education appeals to the emotions as well as to the mind. Thus, the best moral teaching inspires students by making them keenly aware that their own character is at stake.

References

- Altbach, P. (2001). *Academic freedom: International realities and challenges*. International Higher Education, Campion Hall, Boston College: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Aristotle. (1968). *Aristotle on education: Extracts from ethics and politics*. (J. Burnet, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Axelrod, P. (2002). *Values in conflict: The university, the marketplace and the trials of liberal education*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Barnes, J. (1992). *Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, K., & John, M. (2003). Vision, relationships and teacher motivation: A case study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(1), 55-73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230310457439>
- Barnett, R. (1990). *The idea of higher education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of super complexity*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond all reason: Living with ideology in the university*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Beck, J. (1999). Makeover or takeover? The strange death of educational autonomy in neo-liberal England. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 223-238.
- Bennaars, G. A. (1993). *Ethics, education and development: An introductory text for students in colleges and universities*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Bennaars, G. A. (1998). *Schools in need of education: Towards an African pedagogy*. Nairobi: Lectern.
- Bennaars, G. A., & Njoroge, R. J. (1987). *Philosophy and education in Africa: An introductory text for students of education*. Nairobi: Transafrica Press.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bolton, G. (2006). Narrative writing: Reflective enquiry into professional practice. *Educational Action Research*, 14(2), 203-218.
- Brown H. D. (2007). *Principles of language and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, R. (2017). *What is the meaning of logos, ethos & pathos?* Los Angeles: Colin Higgins and Robyn Walker.
- Brubacher, S. J. (1977). *On the philosophy of higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burrstein, A. G. (1997). *Perversion in higher education*. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from <http://web.utk.edu/unistudy/values/proc1997/agb.htm>
- Camenisch, P. F. (1986). Goals of applied ethics courses. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 493-509.
- Carr, D. (2007). Character in teaching. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(4), 369-389.
- Carr, D. (2017). Virtue and character in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 65(1), 109-124.
- Chang'ach, J. K. (2014, February). The centrality of character and integrity education in Kenya's institutions of higher learning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 46-56.
- Chomsky, N. (2003). *Chomsky on democracy and education*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Clark, B. R. (1997). Small worlds, different worlds: The uniqueness and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus*, 126(4), 21-42.
- Clarkeburn, H. (2002). The aims and practice of ethics education in an undergraduate curriculum: Reasons for choosing a skills approach. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(4), 306-315.
- Clough, P. (2002). *Narratives and fictions in educational research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1975). *Youth transition to adulthood*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Collier, G. (1993). Learning moral judgment in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 18(3), 287-297.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Covey, S. (1990). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Cullen, M. (2005). *Address to the association of university staff conference*. Retrieved November 5, 2008, from <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/minister/michael+cullen?page=5&type=speech>
- Davies, B., Gottsche, M., & Bansel, P. (2006). The rise and fall of the neo-liberal university. *European Journal of Education*, 41(2), 305-319.
- De Hovre, F. (1930). *Philosophy and education*. (E. B. Jordan, Trans.). New York: Benziger Brothers.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1973). *John Dewey: Lectures in China 1919-1920*. Honolulu: University Press.

- Dewey, J. (2014). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Delhi: Aakar Books. (Original in 1916).
- Donyei, Z., & Murphy, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in English language classroom*. Ehrman: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education*. New York: Free Press.
- Education Act Amendent. (1989). Part 14 establishment and disestablishment of tertiary institutions, S162, 4(a)(v) New Zealand Government. *Education*, 41, 205-219.
- Eisner, E. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of representation. *Educational Researcher*, 26(6), 4-10.
- Elbaz, F. (1992). Hope, attentiveness and caring for difference: The moral voice in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8(5/6), 421-432.
- Fontaine, B. M. (1997). *Education as public work*. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from <http://web.utk.edu/~unistudy/values/proc1997/fmb.htm>
- Frankena, W. K. (1968). *Philosophy of education*. Macmillan: New York.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Books. Retrieved May 8, 2006, from <http://www.webster.edu/~corbette/philosophy/education/freire/freire-2.html>
- French, J., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in group dynamics*. Oxford, England Harper +Row.
- Gandhi, M. (1957). *An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gathathi, P. (1976). *Report of the national commission on educational objectives*. Republic of Kenya, Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425-463.
- Gould, J. B. (2002). Better hearts: Teaching applied virtue ethics. *Teaching Philosophy*, 25, 1-25.
- Grant, R. (2002). The end of liberal education. In D. S. Preston (Ed.), *The university in crisis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Gries, D. (1996). *What's education for?* Address at the Opening Convocation, Daniel Webster College. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from <http://www.cs.cornell.edu/degreeprogs/ugrad/uphilos>
- Grix, J. (2002). Introducing students to the generic terminology of social research. *Politics*, 22(3), 175-186.
- Harland, T., & Staniforth, D. (2008). A family of strangers: The fragmented nature of academic development. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(6), 669-678.
- Harland, T., Tidswell, T., Everett, D., Hale, L., & Pickering, N. (2010). Neo-liberalism and the academic as critic and conscience of society. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(1), 85-96.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Essex: Pearson Education Limitd.
- Harris, S. (2005). Rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(4), 421-433.
- Herbert, S. (1861). *Education: Intellectual, moral and physical*. London, Williams and Norgate, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Reprinted in 1932 with an Introduction by F. A. Cavenagh).
- Hinchcliff, J. (1997). *Values integrating education: An exploration of learning in New Zealand*. Auckland: Mirilea Press. Initiatives Limited.
- Kelsey, J. (1998). Privatizing the universities. *Journal of Law and Society*, 25(1), 51-70.
- Kovac, J., & Coppola, B. (1997). *Universities as moral communities*. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from <http://web.utk.edu/~unistudy/values/proc1997/jk.htm>
- Langfold, G. (1968). *Philosophy and education: An introduction*. Macmillan: London.
- Lickona, T., Schaps, E., & Lewis, C. (2007). *CEP's eleven principles of character education*. Washington, D.C.: Character Education Partnership.
- Little, D. M. (1996). Ideology, epistemology, pedagogy and the national curriculum for science: The influence on primary science. *Curriculum Studies*, 4(1), 119-139.
- Lovell, A., & Hand, L. (1999). Expanding the notion of organizational performance measurement to support joined-up government. *Public Policy and Administration*, 4(2), 17-29.
- Macfarlane, B. (2004). *Teaching with integrity: The ethics of higher education practice*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. (2001). *The feminist classroom: Dynamics of gender, race, and privilege*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mandela, N. (1995). *Long walk to freedom: The autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Little Brown & Co.

- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McNay, I. (1995). From collegial academy to the corporate enterprise: The changing cultures of universities. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The changing university*. Bristol: Taylor & Francis.
- McNiff, J. (1996). *Teaching as learning: An action research approach*. London: Routledge.
- McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2006). *All you need to know about action research*. London: Sage.
- Mesrabadi, J., Badri, R., & Vahedi, S. (2010). *Examining the extent of lack of discipline within students in the conditions of exerting different resources of teacher's authority*. Science-Research Journal of Psychology, Tabriz University.
- Morrison, T. (2000). How can values be taught in the university? *Michigan Quarterly Review*, XL(2). Retrieved August 3, 2010, from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.act2080.0040.201>
- Murray, C., & Pianta, R. C. (2007). The importance of teacher-student relationships for adolescents with high incidence disabilities. *Theory into Practice*, 46, 105-112.
- Nash, R. (1997). *The three kinds of illiteracy*. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from <http://www.reformed.org/webfiles/antithesis/v1n5/ant-v1n5-illiteracy.html>
- Newman, J. H. (2012). *On the scope and nature of university education*. Hard Press Publishing.
- Nixon, J., Marks, A., Rowland, S., & Walker, M. (2001). Towards a new academic professionalism: A manifesto of hope. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(2), 227-244.
- Noble, D. F. (1998). Digital diploma mills: The automation of higher education. *Science as Culture*, 7(3), 355-368.
- Nyarwath, O. (2007). *Traditional logic: An introduction*. Nairobi: Consolata Institute of philosophy.
- Nyerere, J. (1967). *Education for self-reliance*. Retrieved from http://www.swaraj.org/shikshantar/resources_nyerere.html
- O' Connor, D. (1992). *An introduction to the philosophy of education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- O'Neill, O. (2002). *A question of trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olouch, G. P. (1982). *Essentials of curriculum development*. Nairobi: Elimu Bookshop.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- Ominde, S. H. (1964). *Kenya education commission report*. Republic of Kenya, Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Oruka, H. O. (1983, December). Sagacity in African philosophy. *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 23(4), 383-393.
- Oruka, H. O. (1990). *Trends in contemporary African philosophy*. Nairobi: Shirikon.
- Oruka, H. O. (Ed.). (1991). *Sage philosophy: Indigenous thinkers and modern debate on African philosophy*. Nairobi: ACTS Press. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990)
- Payne, D. E. (1997). *Promoting cultural and moral values in higher education*. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from <http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf-www/staff/cultural.and.moral.values.paper.doc>
- Pestalozzi, J. H. (1946). Complete works and letters. In E. Dejung (Ed.), *Critical education*. Zürich: Orell Fussli Verlag.
- Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Phillips, D., & Siegel, H. (2013). *Philosophy of education*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Plato. (1891). *Apology: In the dialogues of Plato*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1996). *The tacit dimension*. New York: Doubleday.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. Hatch and R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative*. London: Falmer Press.
- Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1969). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York: Dell.
- Pring, R. (2001). Education as a moral practice. *Journal of Moral Education*, 30(2), 101-112.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis: Qualitative methods series 30*. London: Sage.
- Roberts, P. (2007). Intellectuals, tertiary education and questions of difference. *Education Theory and Philosophy*, 39(5), 480-493.
- Rogers, C. R., & Freiberg, H. J. (1994). *Freedom to learn* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Macmillan.
- Rowland, S. (2000). *The enquiring university teacher*. Buckingham: Open University Press/ McGraw-Hill Education.
- Ryan, K. (n.d.). *In defense of character development*. Retrieved June 9, 2006, from <http://www.crvp.org/book/series03/iii-2/chapter-ix.htm>
- Ryan, J., & Sackrey, C. (1984). *Strangers in paradise: Academics from the working class*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Schilpp P. A. (1952). *The philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*. New York: Tudor Publishing Company.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Seetharam, A. R. (n.d.). *Concept and objectives of value education*. Retrieved May 8, 2006, from <http://www.ncte-in.org/pub/rimse/spk11.htm>
- Sheriff, D. S. (1988). Literature and medical ethics. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 81, 688-690.
- Sheriff D. S. (2001). Can ethics be taught? *Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics*, 11, 15-17. Retrieved April 12, 2006, from <http://www2.unescobkk.org/eubios/EJ1111/ej1111i.htm>
- Sifuna, D., & Otiende, J. E. (1992). *An introductory history of education*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press.
- Sifuna, D. (1990). *Development of education in Africa: The Kenyan experience*. Nairobi: Social Power for Social Research.
- Splitter, L. (n.d.). *How philosophy and schools can contribute to moral education*. Retrieved May 8, 2006, from [http://philosophy.arts.unsw.edu.au/contacts/associations/APPEND/publications/PDF/vol2/12\(Sri@20Soeprapto\)Pdf](http://philosophy.arts.unsw.edu.au/contacts/associations/APPEND/publications/PDF/vol2/12(Sri@20Soeprapto)Pdf)
- Strathern, M. (2000). The tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal*, 26(3), 309-321.
- The seven blunders that lead to violence*. (2005). Retrieved February 1, 2005, from <http://216.239.63.104/search?q=cache:095-vlhSIJYJ:www.tlgroup.org/GandhisList.htm>
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(1), 1-10.
- Valli, L. (1992). *Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Van Manen, M. (1995). On the epistemology of reflective practice. *Teachers and Teaching Theory and Practice*, 1(1), 33-50.
- Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. (2006). *Philosophy of education*. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy of education](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_education)
- Wyatt, J. F. (1982). The idea of the university: An existentialist argument for an institution concerned with freedom. *Studies in Higher Education*, 7(1), 21-34