Philosophical and Sociological Background of Value Education

Ramandeep Singh

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Panjab University

ABSTRACT

This research paper aims to provide a theoretical framework that demonstrates how values development is viewed from philosophical and sociological background. The paper acknowledges the various ethical traditions that underpin various teaching practises. Various scholars in this field develop a wide range of theories for value development from time to time. To comprehend the philosophical framework for education, we must first comprehend moral philosophy and ethics. Two major branches of ethics are meta-ethics and normative ethics. While meta-ethics seeks to determine the meaning and objectivity of moral concepts such as good and bad, or right and wrong, normative ethics seeks to determine which character traits are good and which actions are wrong. In normative ethics there are seven major philosophical positions that espouse key arguments surrounding the question of whether it is possible to educate children to be virtuous, all these are discussed in this chapter. Finally I will discuss about Sociological background of value education especially the contribution of Durkheim in moral domain. Apart from discussing these major philosophical and sociological theories, I will also discuss their critique given by various experts in field. This is done so to provide comprehensive picture of values education.

Keywords: Philosophical background of value education, sociology and value education, value education.

INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to create a unified picture of the theoretical background of values education because the literary extracts represent opposing viewpoints and unresolved disagreements. Despite these constraints, the chapter attempts to present a compelling case for a theoretical understanding of value education. Various scholars in this field develop a wide range of theories for value development from time to time. A wide range of arguments and viewpoints complicates the process of searching through the vast amount of literature. It is clear that this review of literature cannot do justice to the complexity and nuance of the issues discussed, especially since any one of them could be the subject of several books. Furthermore, any grouping of educational philosophers is arbitrary and is not intended to imply that they adhere to a specific set of ideas. However, in general, the account acknowledges the various major ethical traditions that underpin various moral practises.

Moral education or value education Education was discussed on several levels. On a philosophical level, it can be attributed to whether or not moral education is required. Moral philosophy consists of three distinct elements: first, abstract questions about the nature of morality and the language of morality; second, the investigation of various frameworks or sets of guidelines or rules for determining what is good or bad, right or wrong; and third, the application of those moral theories to specific cases or issues. To comprehend the philosophical framework for education, we must first comprehend moral philosophy and ethics. Two major branches of ethics are meta-ethics and normative ethics. While meta-ethics seeks to determine the meaning and objectivity of moral concepts such as good and bad, or right and wrong, normative ethics seeks to determine which character traits are good and which actions are wrong. Further in normative ethics there are seven major philosophical positions that espouse key arguments surrounding the question of whether it is possible to educate children to be virtuous. Furthermore, any grouping of educational philosophers is arbitrary and is not intended to imply that they adhere to a specific set of ideas. However, in general, the account acknowledges the various major ethical traditions that underpin various moral practises. So I will discuss all these in this article.

Firstly, I start with meta-ethics theories and then move on to normative ethics theories.

Meta-Ethics Theories:
Major meta-ethical theories include naturalism, non-naturalism (or intuitionism), emotivism, and prescriptivism. Naturalists and non-naturalists agree that moral language is cognitive—i.e., that moral claims can be known to be true or false. They disagree, however, on how this knowing is to be done. Naturalists hold either that these claims can be ade-

quately justified by reasoning from statements employing only nonmoral terms or that moral terms themselves can be defined in nonmoral (natural or factual) terms. So they are not based on emotions or values alone. Intuitionists deny both of these positions and hold that moral terms are sui-generis, meaning that moral statements are autonomous in their logical status. Emotivists deny that moral utterances are cognitive, holding that they consist of emotional expressions of approval or disapproval and that the nature of moral reasoning and justification must be reinterpreted to take this essential characteristic of moral utterances into account. Prescriptivists take a somewhat similar approach, arguing that moral judgments are prescriptions or prohibitions of action rather than statements of fact about the world. As a result, both prescriptive and emotivist moralists believe that morals are created by humans and have no objective truth; they are based on human values and opinions.

Next, I will present major normative ethical theories. These theories try to explain how morals can be developed and what the various requirements for moral development are.

Normative Ethics Theories:
Normative ethics is the subfield of ethics that investigates ethical behaviour. In essence, normative ethics seeks to establish which actions are right and immoral, as well as which character qualities are admirable and repulsive. Therefore, they set some ethical standards or norms. Among the prominent normative ethical frameworks are:

The rationalist view of Socrates and Plato, Aristotle's virtue ethics, Locke's empiricist position, Kant's rationalist ethics, Rousseau's idealism, Wilson and John Dewey were consequentialists, Moral educational philosophy, as demonstrated by the work of Montessori, Buber, MacMurray, and Noddings, is based on developing relationships of mutual respect and caring within a community.

All of these theoretical traditions will be examined in depth in the next section. In this article, I will explain a particular thinker's contribution to a philosophical school, as well as its criticisms. Therefore, I am presenting a whole picture of a certain philosophy, including its contribution as well as the critiques of these theories.

Socrates and Plato on Moral Development
Socrates believed in the efficacy of reason in the pursuit of the truth. He also believed that happiness could only be achieved by doing what is morally correct. Plato, like his teacher Socrates, reasoned that morality is the most important aspect of life (Waterfield, I993). This philosophy was the basis for Plato's views on moral education. However, he believes that morality varies across social classes. Moral education based on reason was reserved for the elite. Because of their nature, he reasoned, only a select few were capable of perceiving the form of the good. These individuals would set the standard in moral matters and demonstrate that only a morally good life can bring happiness and human fulfilment. Therefore, he acknowledges the importance of education in the formation of morality. Plato argued in The Republic that the early years of a child's education require careful monitoring of the child's environment because children absorb every impression that anyone wishes to imprint on them. Also, Plato believed that the development of morality must be subject to certain constraints. Therefore, Plato does not advocate the unimpeded development of autonomy (personal freedom) by permitting children to choose their own values and conduct. Rather, he asserts that the young must have the opportunity to be educated in the process of rational inquiry and a comprehension of personal and social values in order to achieve disciplined autonomy. Young people must be given the opportunity to be educated in the process of rational inquiry, according to Plato's specific views on values education. This is comparable to Socrates' and Aristotle's moral emphasis.

The Virtues Ethics of Aristotle
Aristotle emphasised the importance of instilling morally acceptable behaviour in children. He argued that moral behaviour should be taught to children. Therefore, he coupled the direct teaching of morality with an emphasis on living virtuously. And from the other hand, moral education, the pursuit of virtue, and inner excellence were to be acquired through practise and reflection. Thus, there may be a link between living a virtuous life and achieving personal happiness and satisfaction. This is therefore Aristotle's significant contribution to the field of moral education. Aristotle was preoccupied with virtue and the identification of exemplary individuals. His Nicomachean Ethics is almost entirely devoted to a sophisticated analysis of the virtues required for and fostered by the good life. Because virtue is central to the good life as described by Aristotle and because virtuous people—people of good character—display virtues in every aspect of their lives, children should be taught to respond virtuously to the demands of life. The virtues are positive aspects of personality that are defined by society and should be practised by all. According to Aristotle, one becomes virtuous by acting virtuously.

When discussing moral education, we will speak at length about Aristotle's influence on character education. Aristotle is therefore regarded as the founder of the virtue-based approach to moral education. The Aristotelian theory of virtue has had a significant impact on moral education over the past quarter century. This influence was so pervasive that two

of the most popular trends that followed Lawrence Kohlberg's developmentalism are avowedly Aristotelian: character education, which is broadly based on the principles of virtue ethics, and social and emotional learning, which is derived from the concept of emotional intelligence. Despite their deviations from "the Philosopher," these two Aristotle-inspired educational approaches have sparked unprecedented interest in "Aristotelian" practical methods of moral education: moral habituation, sentimental education, service learning, and role modelling (Kristjánsson, 2007).

Although his virtue ethics is the most deliberate approach to value education, it has also received criticism. Those who question the Aristotelian notion of the absolute nature of values. For critics of virtue ethics, the potential relativism of such ethics is therefore their primary concern. Ethical/moral relativism is the belief that moral values, such as conceptions of the good and the right, are relative to specific societies or communities. What is considered good in one culture may be viewed as indifferent or even evil in another.

Despite these criticisms, Aristotle influenced many contemporary thinkers, who were more or less influenced by his moral education philosophy. The work of Rousseau, Buber, and, most recently, Noddings can be traced back to Aristotle's emphasis on the cultivation of virtues.

An Empiricist's Position on Moral Education
Empiricism is an approach to moral development that evaluates an individual's moral development based on objective, observable behaviour. Therefore, they believe that everything that can be observed through the senses or scientific method, as well as everything that can be measured, is accurate. John Locke (1632–1704), one of the foremost empiricists who discuss moral development, associated values with appropriate behaviours and habits resulting from training and conditioning. As an empiricist who derives knowledge from experience alone, he believed that a person's mind could be compared to a tabula rasa on which experience is written. He believed that children should be taught and encouraged to practise rules until they become part of everyday life. Therefore, he believes that an individual has no innate dispositions; everything he is is the result of his interaction with the environment. Consequently, the empirical view of moral development is significant because it supports a form of education that largely disregards the child's innate dispositions. Instead, it aims to instil civilised behaviour based on a set of rules that enable the child to adopt moral conduct.

This empirical view of education was further developed by B.F. Skinner in the 20th century, which led to the development of pedagogy based on behaviour modification (Skinner, 1978). He advocated various pedagogical principles, whose fundamental premise is that children can be taught anything using an appropriate pedagogical approach. As a proponent of behaviourism, Skinner also emphasised socialisation as the driving force behind moral development. Therefore, Skinner emphasised the influence of external forces (reinforcement contingencies) on an individual's growth.

Kant's Ontological and Rationalist Ethics
It is essential to consider Immanuel Kant's (1724–1804) outstanding contribution to moral philosophy. Immanuel Kant argued that the supreme moral principle is the "Categorical Imperative," a principle of practical rationality (CI). Kant described the CI as an objective, rationally necessary, and unconditional principle that we must adhere to despite any contrary natural desires. According to Kant, this principle justifies all specific moral requirements, so all immoral actions are irrational because they violate the CI. Using these practical imperatives (principles) allows the child to transition from natural inclinations based on desire to making a moral decision based on the idea that it is the right thing to do in and of itself. As the philosopher he elevated individual human rationality over all forms of authority in ethics, Kant has been both revered and reviled. Act in such a way that you can (logically) will that your decision be made law; that is, act in such a way that you can insist, without contradiction, that everyone else in similar situations act as well. Kant deduced from this fundamental principle several absolute rules for human conduct, including his well-known ban on lying. Therefore, Kant's rationalist ethics emphasises the importance of rational thought in making ethical decisions. In this perspective, he argued that unethical behaviour stems from a lack of developed reasoning. Thus, teaching morality entails teaching rationality. Once a person's rational thinking has matured, he must conduct himself morally.

In light of this, he advocated the role of education in the formation of morality. The purpose of education is to cultivate moral autonomy, thereby creating a moral society and possibly perfecting the human race. Pestalozzi, and later philosophers such as Hare and educational theorists such as Kohlberg, were profoundly influenced by him. Kant appears to advocate a pedagogy that fosters the development of understanding and autonomy by focusing first on the child's nurturing capacities and then introducing discipline (without stifling freedom) and instruction. Such an individual-centered pedagogy can be found in the work of Pestalozzi.

Numerous critics of Kantianism exist. Numerous contemporary philosophers contest the Kantianism-fundamental universalisability criterion. They object that the categorical imperative cannot be used to derive absolute principles. The majority of us prefer to be the recipients of acts performed out of love, care, or desire rather than out of obligation. Kantians have accordingly shrunk the moral universe. Consequently, actions performed out of love are frequently

viewed as having no moral significance, and a large body of literature has been devoted to the highly debatable problem of separating moral issues from other matters of value. Some critics also assert that he devalues other forms of human thought and emotion and places an undue emphasis on human rationality.

Rousseau's Idealism and the Ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel.
Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1775), in contrast to Kant and Wesley, advocated a romantic view of childhood. The influence of Rousseau's idealistic views on education on later writers and educationists is substantial . He desired to demonstrate that in a corrupt society, an individual could be educated to be autonomous. In his book Emile, he argued for this claim. Rousseau argued against the acquisition of a moral vocabulary before the age of reason because he believed that a child could not comprehend what it means to be moral until puberty. Rousseau's heuristic approach to education was to ensure that the child became self-sufficient, master of oneself, and most importantly, master of one's own imagination . Therefore, Rousseau's belief that moral development occurs within an individual and that a child is capable of moral development. For this, he must be a morally independent thinker without any external moral influence.

Kant and progressive educational thinkers such as Pestalozzi, Froebel, Dewey, and Montessori were influenced by his philosophy.

Pestalozzi examined the issues surrounding the relationship between the school system and the public morality of the individuals it helps to shape. He advocated three stages of education: family life, the encouragement of altruistic impulses in practise, and reflection on daily life, which would enable children to develop an internal state that would allow them to comprehend the nature of moral judgement.

Friedrich Wilhelm Froebel argued that students should be assisted in adhering to the eternal law of development in order to foster independence, individuality, and liberty. He devoted his entire life to arguing that a child's educational experiences should be grounded in practical, real-world situations. Therefore, Froebel emphasises firsthand experiences for the moral development of children. He argued that knowledge of the laws of child development should be incorporated into teaching.

Utilitarianism
Utilitarianism is an ethical theory that determines right from wrong by focusing on outcomes, so it is a form of consequentialism. In contrast to Kantianism, utilitarianism insists that a conception of the good must be based on what is right. Happiness is the greatest and most obvious human good, according to utilitarians, and an ethic should direct us toward producing as much happiness as possible. In its most basic form, utilitarianism seeks "the greatest good for the greatest number of people." Instead of defining the duty of ethical agents as doing what is right (as determined by Kant's logical process), utilitarians define the right as maximising this happiness-to-pain ratio. In addition to Kant's moral philosophy, utilitarianism is a major ethical theory. It elevates happiness to the status of the greatest good, against which all human actions should be evaluated.

John Wilson, a British philosopher of education, has proposed a utilitarian approach to moral education. Its purpose is to produce moral agents who are capable of identifying and applying the principles most likely to produce the best results. Wilson proposes that morality should be actively and explicitly taught. Many college-level programmes now require ethics courses, and the motivation for these courses is frequently utilitarian, at least implicitly. Teaching ethics and moral philosophy is likely to increase the proportion of happiness to suffering. Similarly, a significant portion school educational policy is influenced by utilitarian considerations.

Dewey Ethics
As with utilitarianism, Dewey's pragmatic ethics is consequentialist; that is, an act is deemed ethically acceptable or unacceptable based on the consequences it produces. However, Dewey and utilitarians disagreed on a number of significant issues. First, he believed that positing a single greatest good, even one as obvious and desirable as happiness, was incorrect. Humans desire a variety of goods, and happiness may not be the immediate good sought at any given time. Therefore, Dewey's ethics are both pragmatic and consequentialist. He differs from utilitarianism in a number of ways. For instance, Dewey placed a much greater emphasis on individual and institutional responsibility than is typical in utilitarianism. According to Dewey, the most important criterion for ethical behaviour is the willingness to accept responsibility for the entire spectrum of anticipated outcomes. A moral agent, like a problem-solver in any field, must consider all possible outcomes and determine if he or she is willing to accept responsibility for each one. Dewey resembles existentialist thinkers in this respect. However, Dewey also demands a public examination. Therefore, Dewey compares moral thinking to other types of thinking in which a person must consider a variety of possible outcomes and accept responsibility for choosing a particular course of action. Therefore, Dewey's view of moral reflection is consistent with his pragmatism. First, Dewey believes that moral inquiry and intelligent inquiry serve the same purpose, which is to serve human interests. Second, according to Dewey, there is no single universal principle that could be ap-

plied to all moral problems; the general principle can only be discovered through ongoing investigation. Third, Dewey insists that moral judgement is situationally dependent. We must comprehend the situation in order to choose among the numerous possible courses of action. According to Dewey, the correct response to a problematic situation can vary from person to person and society to society. On the basis of this interpretation, Dewey's ideas may be understood as ethical relativism.

There is significant opposition to the Dewey approach to morality. Dewey's critics argued that there ought to be no distinction between the moral domain and others. Can values be taught as a mere process? Must there not be specific content and values to be taught? . Dewey makes no distinction between fact and value or between moral and nonmoral values, according to Dewey's critics. This approach, which is regarded as so effective in numerous situations, may not be suitable for moral issues.

Moral Philosophical Tradition Based on Developing Relationships of Mutual Respect
Traditional theories of ethics have recently been challenged due to their overemphasis on reasons and denial of the role of emotions in human ethical decision making. Feminist scholars argue that the majority of ethical theories are male-centered, thereby undermining the feministic feelings of love and care. Educators within this tradition argue, therefore, that schools should prioritise cultivating positive relationships, care, respect, and mutuality within the community. Care, trust, and empathy are the three major tenants of feminist ethics. Female ethics emphasises a relational rather than an individualistic self and favours a less rule-based, more empathic approach to human interactions. It is an alternative to the rule-based ethics of Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill, and John Rawls, as the ethics of care, trust, and empathy represent a realistic, pragmatic alternative. Some feminists emphasise the role of emotion in action; more specifically, they emphasise the role of care in inciting action. As a result of their association with women, emotions in general and care in particular have been ignored or denigrated in traditional moral theory. They believe that if we are to end the oppression of women, we must include in our philosophical theories aspects of women and the feminine that have been previously excluded. Care theorists attempt to avoid a universalizing care response and advocate for a practise that recognises individuals' unique needs, desired outcomes, and values. They place a heavy emphasis on listening and receptive attention, as well as the growth of self-awareness and empathy.

Positive Psychology and Virtue Ethics
The existing rule-based moral philosophy, psychology, and education, according to the arguments of positive psychologists, cannot effectively encourage students' moral motivation for actual moral behaviour and may even lead to undesirable outcomes such as moral schizophrenia. "Moral schizophrenia," which occurs when a person tries to find the source of moral motivation in the moral justifications of modern moral philosophy, such as utilitarian moral philosophy and Kantian moral philosophy is an example of something that can lead to this condition. Because both utilitarian and Kantian moral philosophical vantage points require us to behave for the sake of the utility of society (in the case of utilitarianism) or universal moral rule (in the case of Kantian ethics), the pursuit of moral goals suggested by modern moral philosophy would deprive us of the possibility of living a good and happy life. This is because these vantage points require us to sacrifice other important elements that are crucial to our good and happy life, such as care and love. For example, altruistic behaviour that is driven by certain moral passions, such as compassion, becomes ethically inferior when compared to altruistic behaviour that is motivated by pure moral principles given the vantage points of modern moral philosophy. As a direct consequence of this, this contemporary moral theory downplays the significance of emotions, feelings, and affective feelings in human beings. The field of positive psychology endorses these feelings and considers them to be consistent with ethical conduct.

According to this emerging school of thought, future moral education should work toward the goal of improving the students' health in both the mental and physical realms. Therefore, in recent years, the pursuit of happiness has emerged as the primary objective of positive psychological education. The field of positive psychology advocates for reorienting our educational system around the pursuit of student fulfilment as both the means and the aim of life. Positive psychologists, for instance, suggest that the path to well-being need to be taught in all facets of school education. Furthermore, they claim that well-being may be taught and fostered in classrooms by means of educational interventions (Seligman et al. 2009). The importance of what positive psychologists refer to as "positive education" lies in the fact that it takes this goal head-on and proposes practical means through which "skills for happiness" might be taught (Seligman et al., 2009).

As a result, the implications of the positive education project for current moral theory are that we need to make certain that education in and about values is the primary focus of teacher education and that it is founded on joy. This does not necessarily mean more classes in moral philosophy in the narrow sense; rather, it means a broader education in those subjects — in particular, arts and literature — where teacher candidates have the best opportunity of gaining reflective self-knowledge and learning to evaluate themselves from a moral perspective. Therefore, positive psychology supports the idea that the purposes of education and schooling should be rethought, with the pursuit of happiness serving as the ultimate objective of human learning and education.

Postmodernism and Values

In contrast to the modernist belief in certainty, necessity, and meta-narrative, postmodernists believe that these concepts should never be referenced. Particularly in the domains of values, morals, politics, and education, universal and continuous theoretical underpinnings should never be emphasized. Values are culturally dependent and vary from culture to culture. Postmodernism denies universal moral and spiritual ideals and embraces the relativism of all values in all domains. Therefore, there is no special value preference. There is not a single value or source of values in the world; rather, there are countless values and numerous sources of values. A person is free to accept ideals that he believes more accurately reflect his "social self" and his peer group. In postmodern thought, there are no innate, internal, or intrinsic values; instead, values are chosen based on social and cultural circumstances and discourses. In essence, postmodernism holds that humans cannot recognise a common nature as the source of values; rather, the values that humans choose are manufactured.

Each of these philosophical frameworks devotes some attention to the formation of values or morals. In the next section, I will make an effort to provide an examination of moral formation and education from a sociological point of view.

Sociologist Perspectives on Value Education

At the sociological level, discussions regarding value education centre on the role that power plays in society as well as the various social groups. This kind of socialising education is taught in schools under various subjects uses terms like citizenship education, ethical education, and democracy education, amongst others. Therefore, moral education is understood as education for citizenship from a sociological point of view.

Durkheim

In Durkheim's course on moral education, he went to a direct engagement with morality, the core issue of his entire body of work. The basis of a modern moral education, according to him, was the structure of modern society itself. Durkheim argued that a contemporary moral education needed to take sociology into consideration. He urged passionately for secular agents to give moral education considerable consideration. He stated that religion had dominated this field, but that it was frequently merely the medium through which fundamental societal needs had to be satisfied. As science invalidated religion and the latter's influence waned, it became imperative to reconsider how to sustain the system of ideas, customs, and emotions that society required. It was likely that some of these were the same as those defended by religion, but it was also feasible that as society progressed, new characteristics had to be introduced. Durkheim emphasises the significance of education in the formation of society norms and conduct.

New socialisation agencies, such as schools, must fill the hole left by the demise of conventional moral and value development organisations. According to Durkheim, we should discover universally held values and teach them in schools. The search for a new moral education necessitated the discovery of universal elements. In order for society to agree that the moral system was just and legitimate, it had to coincide with the establishment of a just society. Durkheim continued to ask what may be universal to the moral education of all cultures as the fundamental conditions that must be learned for societies to exist in and of themselves. He thinks that discipline, learning to function within a group, and autonomy are three fundamental ideals that should be shared by everyone. The first of these three is discipline, which entails acquiring specific behaviours through self-control. Without some degree of order and dependability, social existence would be impossible. The second is learning how to function inside a group. The concept of discipline instantly prompted the questions of how and why one could believe in a certain discipline. Through learning to be a member of a group, an individual's moral order was generated. The third fundamental concept was autonomy, or the capacity of individuals to act and reflect independently of external pressure. Different civilizations would have varying levels of pressure and autonomy development. The group in a mediaeval civilization could be an estate or a feudal class. In industrialised cultures, its nature may vary significantly. For Durkheim, the country was the most important group in his own day, and he strongly endorsed it as a means of overcoming country strife and disputes. The characteristics of autonomy would vary by historical period and society. Thus while emphasising the significance of group membership, Durkheim also encourages autonomy. In order for society as a whole to function, he promotes ideals of freedom with few limits. Therefore, according to Durkheim, morality is necessary for the normal functioning of society.

SUMMARY

This research paper aims to provide a theoretical framework that demonstrates how values development is viewed from philosophical and sociological background. Starting with two major branches of ethics are meta-ethics and normative ethics are discussed. Then in normative ethics seven major philosophical positions that espouse key arguments surrounding the question of whether it is possible to educate children to be virtuous, all these are discussed in this paper. Finally I discussed about Sociological background of value education especially the contribution of Durkheim in moral domain. Apart from discussing these major philosophical and sociological theories, I also discuss their critique given by various experts in field. This is done so to provide comprehensive picture of values education.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahuja, R. (2000). Value oriented education in India. In R. Modi (Ed.), Human values and social change. Rawat Publications.

[2] Allen , K. N., , & Friedman , B. D. (2010). Affective learning: A taxonomy for teaching social values. Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 7(2):, 1-–12.

[3] Althof, W., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2006). Moral education and character education: Their relationship and roles in citizenship education. Journal of Moral Education, 35(4), 495–518. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240601012204.

[4] Berkowitz, M. W. & , & Gibbs, J. C. (1983). Measuring the developmental features of moral discussion. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29, 399–410.

[5] Berkowitz, M. W. (2011). What works in values education. International Journal of Educational Research, 50(3), 153-–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.ijer.2011. 07.003.

[6] Carr, D. (2009). Virtues, mixed emotions and moral ambivalence. Philosophy, 84(1), 31-–46. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031819109000023.

[7] Carr, D., Arthur, J., & Kristjánsson, K. (2017). Varieties of virtue ethics: Introduction. In Varieties of virtue ethics (pp. 1-13). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

[8] Clement & , & K. Dally, K. (Eds.),. Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach (pp. 135-–155). Sydney: David Barlow Publishing.

[9] Durkheim, É. (1961). Moral education: A study in theory and application of the sociology of education. Free Press.

[10] Giroux, H. (1992). Border crossings. Cultural Workers and the politics of education. Rout ledge. New York.

[11] Giroux, H. (2003). The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[12] Gulati, S., , & Pant, D. (coord.Coords.). (2012). Education for Values in School – A Framework. Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations of Education, National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi.

[13] Gupta, K. M. (1984). Moral development of school children. In M. B. Buch (Ed.), Fourth Survey of Research in Education [Doctoral Dissertation], Gujarat University. NCERT.

[14] Hall, R. (1979). Moral Education: A handbook for teachers. Insights and practical strategies for helping adolescents to become more caring, thoughtful, and responsible persons. Winston Press. Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Affect and moral development. New directions for child developmentNew Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 1982(16), 83– 103. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219821605.

[15] Joshi, K. (2002). Philosophy of value oriented education: Theory and practice. ICRA.

[16] Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on moral development:, Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development. San Francisco:. Harper & Row.

[17] Kristjánsson, K. (2013). Ten myths about character, virtue and virtue education–plus three well-founded misgivings. British Journal of Educational Studies, 61(3), 269-–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.778386.

[18] Lickona, T. (2004). Character matters: How to help our children develop good judgment, integrity, and other essential virtues. Simon and& Schuster.

[19] Lickona, T. (2009). Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility. Bantam Press.

[20] Lovat, T. J., & Clement, N. D. (2008). The pedagogical imperative of values education. Journal of Beliefs and Values, 29(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 13617670802465821

[21] Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008). Quality teaching and values education: Coalescing for effective learning. Journal of moral education, 37(1), 1-16.

[22] Madhu, Kapani. (2000) . Education in Human Values. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.

[23] Mukhopadhyay, M. (2004). Value development in higher education. Viva Book Private Limited.

[24] Narvaez, D. (2006). Integrative ethical education. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), Handbook of moral development (pp. 703–732). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

[25] Narvaez, D. (2014). Neurobiology and the development of human morality: Evolution, culture and wisdom. New York: Norton.

[26] Noddings, N. (1995). Philosophy of Education. Stanford University: West View Press, A Member of Perseus Books, L.L.C. Published in United States of America.

[27] Nucci, L. (2006). Education for moral development. In Handbook of moral development (pp. 675-–700). Psychology Press.

[28] Piaget, J. (1960). The Moral Judgment of the child. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.

[29] Tappan, M. B., & Brown, L. M. (1996). Envisioning a postmodern moral pedagogy. Journal of Moral Education, 25(1), 101-109.

[30] White, B. (2015). Scapegoat: John Dewey and the character education crisis. Journal of Moral Education, 44(2), 127–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2015. 1028911

[31] Young, M. (1971). Knowledge and control. Collier-Macmillan.