APPRAISING THE NECESSARY PLACE OF ETHICS IN THE DIFFERENT DOMAINS OF EDUCATION

UMAR MOHAMMED KANI
School of Education
Aminu Saleh College of Education Azare
Bauchi State, Nigeria
E_MIL: umarmkani@gmail.com

RABIATUL-ADAWIAH AHMAD RASHID
School of Educational Studies
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Penang, Malaysia
E_Mail: r_adawiah@usm.my

Abstract

This paper appraised the necessary place of ethics in education. It analyses issues of ethical concern in the key areas of education. Ethics, the moral philosophy, deals with issues and problems to do with the nature of morality, and the principles that underlie moral judgement in every action of an agent with compelling responsibility. Education being a task, achievement, process, concept and attendant practice necessarily requires the intervention of ethics to rid it of unacceptable properties for prudence and sanity. Every aspect of education practice is ethics bound, although the connection is tacit in some cases. However, argued are inherent ethical issues in the right to educate between state and learners, the right of parents and society in public education, the rightness of educational organisation, the interest of educational philosophies, queries about educational research, suitability of curriculum content and aptness of educational processes particularly teaching, training, drill, conditioning, coaching, indoctrination, initiation and imitation. It is concluded that education and ethics are necessarily related, and none of the contextual areas of education is free from ethical questions for its social and appetitive feature; hence the necessity of applying ethical apparatus.

Introduction

In this treatise, the relevance of ethics in the various domains of education is examined, to bring to attention a significant component that is unnoticed or ignored in the practice of education, particularly when naivety and or impropriety on the side of educators prevail. The moral justification of any action or undertaking qualifies it to stand accepted in the face of criticism, majorly upon satisfying the moral demands in it. Those ethical demands could be glaring or latent in the various domains since not every practitioner may have the second-order or higher-order insights of moral constituents, however, responding to them is an indispensable criterion for education to be the case.

Education and ethics are two different concepts but inescapably related, stemming from the purpose they serve. Ethics has a stake in educational matters, such that certain actions and or inactions of agents are measured under the ambit of moral properties. The main interest of the relationship is the main appraisal of ethical

principles as they apply to various parts of education, on the supposition that every action has to be free from moral insufficiency to fulfil suitability requirements. The obvious purpose is protecting the integrity and interest of the stakeholders for the avoidance of moral injury, because morality is one of the major aims of education, and therefore it should not be lacking in the process and components. This is despite the theory that (public) education itself as an enterprise has some ethical questions to answer.

Concept of Ethics

Ethics is the branch of philosophy that deals with issues and problems of morality, in other words, moral philosophy. The term ethics was in the view of Thompson (1976) derived from the Greek word *ethos* which literally means 'habit', alternatively called 'character'. According to Bunnin and Yu (2004), the term ethics has a Greek origin from the word *'ethikos'* which literally means 'something' connected to Greek *ethos,* which literally means character, social custom, manner and or habit. But the Latin word *'moralis'* is said to be used by Cicero to translate the Greek *ethos* of the same meaning, hence the congruency between ethics and morality. Ethics deals with problems of human sentiment for the common good, how we morally ought (in all senses) to live and how we morally ought (in all senses) to act; by implication, living and acting between the lines of moral rightness and moral wrongness, moral goodness and moral badness, all on the ambit of right and obligation but without disregard to privilege.

It is the principles for judging actions and characters as morally acceptable or unacceptable in one's dealing with self and the world, basically seen by Socrates as inherent for the rational soul, determining which is neither theological nor social (Plato, trans. 1953; Plato, trans. 1956). The basic problem of ethics with moral philosophers and other critics (Singer, 1985) is the basis on which to judge the goodness or badness of an action. Factors like religion, culture, social convention, law, humane and kinship can be yardsticks but the relativity and subjectivity in them deny universal paradigm. By this, commonsense, egoism, intrinsic emotions and similar factors are already carpeted because they are subject to human bias. With all the debate among philosophers on the ground moral judgement of actions, Kant (1785) proffers the categorical imperative dictum, that, actors act only according to that maxim by which they can at the same time will that it should become a universal law. This is not also safe from weaknesses of the other moral grounds, some people may wish maxims promoting morally "bad" acts to be universal.

As logically observed by Bernard (1985) and Bunnin and Yu (2004), ethics primarily concerns addressing two broad questions: *'how should a person live'* and *'how should a person act'* doing away with the border of a place, time and circumstance. In the words of Irwin (1995), the central questions that ethics respond to are "*how we ought to live?"* and *"how can we know how we ought to live?"* This encompasses broader issues of personal and interpersonal relationships for the societal common good. Ethics therefore as a concept has been and is still being approached in different forms by almost all moral philosophers, but maintaining a common component, 'character' or 'conduct' thread. It is safe to conclude that all conceptions contain at least the precipitates of morality as the subject concerning self and the world, dealing with which denotes the concept.

Concept of Education

Education being the process of inculcating worthwhile knowledge, skills, values and attitudes could be put as purposeful pursuance for positive and useful capacity building in all dimensions within a morally defensible scope to enable an individual to do what he could not before. The summary of it as put by Aristotle is the creation of a sound mind in a sound body which is synonymous with training the mind and the body. The aggregate of the activities involved in doing so could still answer the name education, the practice perspective. With less attention to criticism, the positions of Peters (1966) and Akinpelu (1981) suggest that education has to be an intentional effort to change its recipient positively, involve a body of knowledge and the process of doing all these has to be morally defensible. Education could take different dimensions: a purposeful *task* engaged in by educators and learners, an *achievement* acquired after successful completion of a structured educational course, the *process* of doing so and formalised operational *system* that coordinates and controls all. These sum up the concept of education.

The practice of education as a whole has survived millennia of changes from antiquity to the present era through the classical period, middle age, renaissance and enlightenment (Gutek, 2001). Public education usually comes to mind whenever education is mentioned, controlled and supervised by the state, which suffers criticism on account of the 'right to educate' bordering on state, learners, parents and normative society. What follows the criticism advanced by some radical thoughts has diverse faces, but the major critique education suffers is invariably related to the authority of state and educators plus the liberty of subjects regarding their natural rights. However, with undisputable justification or not, education remains acceptable and praiseworthy, at least because the alternative to education may be doing nothing, which may not be healthy to human societies, meanwhile, the ethical queries still linger.

Conceptual Relation of Ethics and Education

Ethics and education are inescapably related, so much that the former makes and mars the latter. Education, with all the components that make it different from otherwise, has at least one moral question to answer. However, exploring the exact areas or issues that relate to the duo is striving as they are interwoven so much that identifying unaffected parts may not be easy if at all possible.

The attempts of Peters (1966), Rich (1984) and, Levinson and Fay (2016) to discuss the territory of ethics in education insinuate some of its areas of concern and coverage. Issues raised include obligations, rights and privileges, individuality, personal relationship, motivation, equality by remedying actual inequalities and social inequalities, pleasure and pain, interests, liberty (paradox of), freedom (of the learners, parents and educators), respect for the human person, fraternity, authority (formal and actual), punishment, responsibility (elimination and justification), democracy, the democratisation of education, education for democracy, ethical use of test and testing, research with human subjects, conflicts of interests, honesty, merit standards, nepotism rules, industrial tussle, conduct, teachers' relations with parents, enforcement of ethical codes and grounds for actions or inactions in the contexts. These would not be the only issues of ethics in education, as Levinson and Fay (2016)

insist that marking and grading are issues of ethics too. In the words of Jarvis (1997), assessment and evaluation of students' achievement through grading have ethical implications because they determine the fate of students. In extension, it goes a long way in motivation which Adewole (2011) justifies the intrinsic and achievement dimensions as they derive from within individual self of learners, in other words, education for its own sake. On the contrary, extrinsic motivation has some moral questions being acquired from some material benefits normatively attached to education outside the very self of learners, which pushes them towards it with or without passion. Besides, Adewole (1989) has it that societal needs and public interest in deciding educational priorities are aspects of ethical disquiet because they often interfere with the rights and interests of other stakeholders.

To buttress, depicted in the following paragraphs are issues of ethical interest in major areas of education as contextual cases.

Organisational Structure

The administrative structure of education requires balance in terms of all components of ethics for a healthy function. This involves policy, administration, sponsorship and supervision. Ethical considerations are paramount for fairness. Principally, addressing technocratic and democratic features of administration, the rational flow of service delivery, fair distribution of authority and responsibility, organisational culture, rights and privileges, discipline and welfare, censor and control among other issues. As observed by Kumar and Mitchell (2004), failure to observe ethical principles amounts to serious injury to the educational system that works only with the mutual and reciprocal function of the various constituents. Apart from supervising and partner agencies, the diverse settings and mandate of educational institutions would not allow them to be organised and run in the same way, even if they all belong to the same proprietor. The non-uniform type and resultant treatment plus professional regulations are all defined by ethics.

Like every other organisation, educational institutions have administration at the centre of their operation. The administrative system drives the institutions towards their mission and vision. As Strike, Haller and Soltis (2005) note, the potency and integrity of educational institutions largely depends on the moral excellence of its administration, adequately defined by moral reasoning, freedom of expression, personal liberty, equal respect, moral judgement, friendliness, honesty, confidentiality, loyalty, accountability, merit and due process. Most times materialism causes failure to work with the mentioned attributes, but the initial cause is likely caused by another chain of internal and or external causalities also, hence the case for ethics. Other issues of ethical concern include commission and repercussion of impropriety at policy and administrative levels, and, the actors responsible for that concerning deontological or utilitarian measures. Besides, the style of administration has to be morally justified to maintain virtues according to the demands of the administrative unit at hand. Ethics cannot be divorced from the features of successful leadership. In fact, the success of every school administration lies with the observance of ethical principles.

The Right to Educate

Right to educate is an interesting area of ethics. Deciding to pursue public education, modality of doing it, content to learn, the time and duration are issues of ethical interest. The right in public education is shared between the state, learners (and their parents in case of children) and the society at large. Learners ought to be entitled to the right of choice, to choose to educate or not, to choose what to study (content), how to study and when to study.

Education warrants a process of implementing a curriculum designed by society, with dictates of what the learner should become, and the teacher ensures that. The problem is, teachers are humans with equal or greater imperfections and weaknesses of humanness, but given the authority to shape people into a predesigned form. As Bereiter (1973) argues, educating warrants delegating parental authority to a teacher to decide children's fate in the favour of society while becoming a member of any society is just a bio-geographical coincidence. The sanctity of living a life is naturally gotten not socially or politically given, the state itself is a product of the same natural phenomenon. The mindset that people should not be allowed to make mistakes is used only to justify keeping them slaves of which their educational choice is made by the state, but people have the right to make mistakes so long as it does not affect others. Besides, a mistake is a relative and subjective term.

The quarrel Freire (1972) has with public education is what he calls the 'banking' concept of which makes students like empty accounts to be filled by the teacher, thereby subjecting them to receiving objects of whatever the teacher brings. It is such that the education of others is to be decided by the representatives of society or state, an equal probability of doing the 'right' thing or 'wrong'. On this note, Illich (1971) opines that education is made public by certain forces to suit the interest of some selected few who answer the name experts, those that decide the intellectual direction of society. The institutionalisation of education makes schools force people to depend on and unwillingly patronise them for the monopoly of fate attached to certification and other strings of benefits, which should in the interest of freedom be not so. Design of education right from the beginning up the last point is somebody's invention based on what he thinks is 'right'.

Those arguments may not be enough to reject public education but could induce the quest for the intervention of ethics to justify the questioned practices.

Philosophical Perspectives of Education

Major philosophies of education are ethics oriented. To be more explicit, their formulation was derived from an ethical context. The commencement of public education by sophists around the middle of third century B.C. in the ancient Greek state of Athens was with financial attachment to the side of the 'teachers', but that was seen and vehemently rejected by Socrates as unethical when he was teaching even though he was believed to have been influenced by them (Meyer, 1975). His ground for the criticism was ethical, questioning the commercialisation of education as a commodity and resultant effect as regards the competence and epistemic authority of the teacher, a threat to the moral soundness expected in education. In his understanding, back then when the world was relatively less materialistic than the

present days, Socrates attacked the sophists' moral indices in their trading of education which sidelined the less privileged and had the potentialities of destroying the students' virtue of immaterialism among other things. The Socratic paradigm of the status of teacher and learner would later see twists and subsequently propound theories as philosophies of education, primarily stressing aim, content and method.

Balbuena (2014) maintains that each of the five major philosophies of education namely 'Behaviourism', 'Essentialism", 'Existentialism', 'Perennialism' and 'Progressivism' carries with it aims of education, curriculum content and method. These five are in a way inconsistent with the submission of Cohen (1999) which he calls 'philosophical perspectives in education', thus; 'Essentialism', 'Perennialism' 'Progressivism' and 'Reconstructionism'. The gap is only on the concepts, but there is no disagreement over the provisions of the philosophies. Behaviourists base their method on the stimuli-response relationship, that learners should be exposed to an arranged environment so that they can accordingly respond to the stimuli. This includes a well-managed classroom using incentives and interest catching conditions for the students to willingly learn. Essentialists believe in essential and core knowledge to be transmitted to learners as in traditional thesis, the basis for life and rich in morality and discipline, primarily the basic R's (reading, writing and arithmetic) and additional subjects. Learners under this conservative philosophy must be disciplined and respect the authority of the teacher. Existentialists have the notion that education should promote the uniqueness of students as individuals to reflect their existence, therefore varieties should be made available for every student to choose and learn at individual self-pace, being responsible for one's actions. Hence the placement of the teacher as supervising coordinator of learning and less judgemental. For perennialists, learners should acquire knowledge on the essentials of life and ideas composed in great books of modern civilisation based on human reason. Students have to learn universally following the dictates of the teacher. Progressivists (pragmatists and experimentalists) theorise that learners need to be guided for growth to full humans as citizens of a democratic society, to be taught so they may acquire the knowledge and experiences that respond to changing needs of their personal lives. Therefore, teachers should only guide the students to learn by exposing them to interact with the world in due consideration to their developmental stages through problem-solving. Similarly, reconstructionists base education on social reform and reconstruction from a devastating human condition, hence centring the educational process on the learner to inquire and invent with the supervising help of the teacher.

Deductively, the methods of progressivists, existentialists, behaviourists and reconstructionists give the domination power of the process to learners while essentialists and perennialists make teachers authoritative and disciplinarian. The major conflict, therefore, roots from ethical grounds between right and interest on one hand, and authority on the other. All the questions are revolving around whose interest should education base on, students or parents or teachers or society? Or who else? Natural justice, right, autonomy, authority and interest are the major issues here. Where to place them with priorities? Whatever position taken amounts to difficulties because it necessarily calls for justification, which would not be safe from further attacks. However, only when decided then that content would be determined and subsequently method. On the methods that directly involve the learners, centring the activities of the process on teacher or learners makes the topic of the major discrepancy, learner-centred or teacher-centred. Judgement on who should dominate

classroom activities and other things that go in the process may not be safe for its implications on learners' rights and interests, and as well teachers' authority. To base curriculum and method in the interest of the learners while directing aims towards the society may not be adequate to be learner-centred. It would be belittling learners to prepare them only as citizens, not individuals living a unique life as emphasised by existentialists and progressives, although the latter makes society the end receiver. Lynch (2016) insists that existentialism, progressivism and reconstructionism are all student-centred approaches in their method, behaviourism is one though. Our interest in the philosophies is the ethical dimension of their methods which go in parallel with their aim of education. There is glaringly no many differences in their curriculum which virtually reflects the aim, rather some emphasis to suit the original motive.

Educational Research

Educational research is much conscious of ethics in its conduct, to accord the subjects a sort of benefit more than just a discussion time with a researcher, because the credit reaped at the end mostly goes to the researcher alone and or some affiliates (Bodgan & Biklen 1998). The point is that educational research that serves as a tool for decision making and a solution to an established problem gets the quality of its findings affected by inconsideration to ethics, a standard that ought to moderate how the research should be conducted for a viable result to depend on which is free from moral insufficiencies. It is on the same basis that honesty is emphasised which guides researchers' urge to follow the due process with religious compliance even in an atmosphere that favours doing the other way round, sticking to the moral requirements at all costs. In support of this, honesty and integrity are emphasised among the many issues of research, which ultimately affect the quality of every research. The ethical consideration cuts across not only falsification of data, misconduct, deliberate refusal to cite contradicting data and hesitation to publicise one's data (Klumper, 2016).

One of the many ethical issues in educational research that interests philosophers are the subjects' susceptibility to coercion from the researcher especially if he happens to have authority over them, in most cases when the subjects are students of the researcher or in a school selected as a sample and consented by the principal. Such students particularly under the authoritarian system have very much less or zero choice than to succumb to the rigours of the research with or without interest. Such is the problem Dalziel (1996) shows concern about, as the compulsion of students to participate in research in favour of the educational value of the practice is an infringement into their right, insisting that their right of choice ought not to be discarded or surrendered for the value of the result to obtain at the end of the task. He is less utilitarian in this case by reducing the end to incapable of justifying the means. Impliedly, the quality of educational research can be affected by ethics, at least, at the process level. Although not all educational researches require the participation of students and not only students' liberty is the interest moral principles, yet, Dalziel and others with similar opinion deserve a salute for the boldness in addressing the issue. However, the bottom line is improving the standard of the research in a way that its results will be safe from deficiencies.

Curriculum Content

The curriculum has to pass through a level of censor lest it may be inappropriate for the learners. In every curriculum design, there must be ethical consideration in selecting the content as determined by aims, at least from the angles of desirability, suitability, utility and moral defensibility; what to teach and what not to teach, what to learn and what not to learn (Dewey, 1902; Kelly, 2009).

There can hardly be any curriculum design without cognisance of norms and defined social order, thoroughly considering whether or not is good to include this or that, whether the established normative good can accept or reject, whether it is proper to teach the item(s) to the learners or not, whether the necessary method and tools to use while teaching the content(s) can be morally defended or not. It may be illogical if, at all practical in deciding educational content not to think of the 'ideal' using different parameters including ethics, that is likely why every curriculum design necessarily needs educational philosopher to take care of such problem right from the very first stage to avoid the risk of falling into catastrophe. According to Looker and Lim (2013), ethics has to be integrated with the curriculum, not just take care of it. This assertion upholds the mandate of ethics in deciding curriculum contents, which appeal to moral justification. Besides, all the remaining components in education necessarily deserve the same caution to protect the humanness of all stakeholders and the safety of the receiving agent, the society.

Processes of Education

Education like every other task has the process, which involves teaching and learning and all that accompanies them to warrant the achievement dimension of it. The sequence of the order in which Bruner (1960) arranges the process of education giving adequate consideration to 'interest' among other themes. This may be the same line along which Peters (1966) includes moral defensibility among the criteria he sets for every process to be labelled educational. It does not stop only at what goes on in the classroom between the teacher and the learners or what goes on within the premises of a school, but the process has to be rid of any moral dent. It is very doubtful to have an educational system process of which permits inducing learners to drink liquor just to know how it intoxicates, or touch a naked electric wire to have firsthand knowledge of how electric shock feels or wound someone among them to do practical stitching. It requires moral justification for every process to be educational. The way, time and manner in which learners should attend class and other curricular activities must be in tune with the moral guidelines of society. Whether directly or indirectly, public interest and perception mostly defined by normative values determine the right and wrong labels in every bit of the educational process. Thus, societal ethics stands in a balancing position for the educational process, in due course for doing the right thing at the right time for the right purpose.

Teaching

There is difficulty in separating teaching from other processes of education and vice versa. Teaching is a process on its own, different from others, with distinct features. Teaching is distinct for liberality as it allows learners to ask questions, observe, suggest, criticise and even disagree with the teacher. Unlike indoctrination which is

contrary, or other processes that bend on stereotypes. This problem amounts to making teaching a general process in education while other processes are being regarded as subordinates (Angough, 2011). There may be unlimited words used to describe the many concepts referring to a particular 'method' in the instructional process, all of which can answer the general name teaching. However, the difference between teaching, training, instruction, drill, indoctrination, imitation, coaching, initiation and the likes is not only in the subject areas they fit most or their procedural requirement but also the moral implication in them. They are indeed applicable in different contextual situations in education, yet serving at least a similar purpose of educating, the best logical reason for labelling them is simply branches of teaching as they can all fit within. Their major conflict is the inward effect with an ethical tune, in which case the freedom of the learners stands the central problem.

As put by Schofield (1972), Winch and Gingell (2008) and, Kani and Sa'ad (2015), there are ethical problems associated with the processes of education, defending which seems much difficult. Teaching applies mainly but not only to subject areas with abstract contents, those that appeal more to the cognitive domain of education, which have a less physical appeal. This goes parallel to other processes like training which is often synonymous with the education itself, however, it is used to refer to the educating with observable competence, mostly with physical abilities, the affective domain of education. Or drill, with stereotyped attributes like the military, as instruction concerning practical skills like laboratory works and workshop machinery operation. Same with coaching as in sports, imitation as in martial arts and initiation as in rituals. The common argument held in this regard is the supremacy of teaching above others, being subordinates or at most supplementing teaching. It may be logical, going by the fact that in every specific task the term teaching can be adequately used to refer to transmitting the required ideas and skills to the receiver in whatever form. Everything the superior person does in the educational process can equally be called teaching, be it discussing, explaining, writing, drawing, calculating, instructing, demonstrating, correcting or commending; whether in a classroom, workshop, field, laboratory, office or anywhere connected to the schooling. The defining characteristics of the processes have implications of morality and personality, which are the underlying problems for their defensibility before thinking of their plausibility. What most ethicists take seriously is the suitability of moral phenomena, to temper not with the person of the learners in the course of educating them.

For teaching, regardless of its status inclination with the other processes, its problem associated with ethics is the intention dictum, which serves as a criterion for an activity to be labelled teaching. Despite the rivalry between causal theory supported by Dewey and non-implicative theory supported by Israel Scheffler on whether or not teaching must result in learning as a condition for which they theorise in affirmative and rejection respectively (Bagudo, 2004), both theses uphold that intention has to be on the side of both the teacher and learner. The concern here links with the interest of the learner, on the materials to be taught and how it should be. The point of Freeman (1973) on the ethical justification of teaching warrants putting the learner's person at the centre, to satisfy the ethical requirements of not infringing on his personal liberty. The same submission ethicists put according to Winch and Gingell (2008), that teaching is an exercise of moral implication which is situated between the character

burden of learners and societal moral demands. Whatever teaching may hold as a practice in the educational enterprise, ethics unavoidably defines it.

Training

Another process of education with the ethical tie is training, which according to Winch and Gingell (2008) is regarded as a synonym of education for its wholeness. This assumption considers training strictly as a process of public and formal education, which conceptually contrasts with the training a company gives to its staff for induction or on the job. It is often spoken of someone who passed through a formal educational process, say, a trained pilot, a trained doctor, a trained teacher. This thread makes it occasionally take the status of education as a whole, probably justifying Plato's construal of education as training(Meyer, 1975). The substances involved in training suggest comparing it with *drill*, *conditioning* and *coaching*, all of which have common features, relating to skills and physical abilities in addition to the cognitive stuff; or, equipping one with the knowledge that must have a bearing with a real-life situation to exhibit. Such is the basis for considering training as relevant in vocational aspects. Along with the said similar concepts in education, training warrants building the mind and limbs of the learners in coordinate synergy to create abilities which cannot otherwise be harvested, hence the necessity of repetitive process to achieve a behavioural result, just like it is to train animals on how to walk by the roadside or behave differently in a certain situation or respond exclusively to certain stimuli. Sniffer dogs, police horses and similar pets are trained in the same manner to achieve the desired behaviour in them. Monkeys are trained to behave in a show strictly upon the command of their human master, in the same way, eagles are trained to hunt for their human master or pigeons trained to deliver letter messages. It might not be completely the same way such creatures are trained with students, but there are similar features in the process. As a must, uniqueness is evident in the only task they can perform which is the sole result of the training, the mind must be set before the body executes accordingly. This does not mean that animals can be educated, they can only be trained or conditioned.

The problem with training and similar concepts is that the process is ethically questionable for its conditioning traits to be applied to humans which is incompatible with autonomy, and the disproportionate distributive authority between the trainer and trainees in favour of the former. In such a process, the trainee is more of a passive receiver while the trainer gives the restricted stuff for the learner to take, constrained to less or no autonomy in the activity. As Luntley (2008) widens, the concept of training suffers attack as a process of education, basically on ethical grounds.

Indoctrination

Indoctrination, much identical with conditioning also, is the most attacked concept among the processes of education. Bagudo (2004) says it falls short to be educational for its use of force instead of evidence, hence denouncing the freedom requirement in educating. Despite the many interpretations it has from philosophers, there is still a common thread with which it is identified; and that is blocking learners' critical thinking and verification, mostly through the use of propaganda as one-sided information to infuse belief into learners while dodging evidence and rationality (White, 1970). Teaching with less or no evidence and academic freedom of

questioning to establish rationality amounts to indoctrination. Many teachers ignorantly indoctrinate their learners, when the latter is not in any way free to question or rationalise. The assertion of Bagudo (2004) can be justified because the absence of learners' introduction to evidence in educating them is compatible with forcing them to accept whatever is given to them without weighing the truth in it, this rules out rationality in the process. This is one of the reasons for Ivan Illich's advocacy for deschooling to run away from the risk of usurping the freedom and thought of learners, which he sees as detestable and unethical. The problem of indoctrination is overly ethical, even the fallacy of its chances to educate is much associated with the ethical phenomenon.

Tan (2004) maintains that associating indoctrination with rationality and evidence has been long among philosophers, that is why a lot of them later make the duo, 'evidence and rationality' as the focal points of argument in discussing indoctrination, which led to recognising them as defining characteristics. At this juncture, it would be proper to ask the question posed by advocates of indoctrination; 'is it necessarily bad then?' Answering this question in affirmative or rejection would require a long discourse with ethical justification, unless if one is to approach the problem by eliminativism or agnosticism. Can someone educate without in any way indoctrinating? Is education itself not indoctrination? Can religious, cultural and socio-political beliefs be transmitted in a non-indoctrinating method? Catom and citizenship education run free from indoctrination? Can authoritarianism cease by proving all theories and experiments to learners in order to avoid indoctrinating them? Questions like these may be difficult to answer in the affirmative, if at all possible. The fact that not all learners are matured and experienced enough to judge things for themselves coupled with teachers' authority of competence are reasons for educating learners on the script of society which the teachers represent. However it is viewed, major issues with indoctrination require ethical justification.

Initiation

Initiation as a process of education was made to the attention of philosophers after Peters (1964) equates it with education in a sense, or, conceptualising it to explain education. In his thesis *education as initiation*, Peters puts that education is the initiation of a child into learning activities, bodies of knowledge and membership of the learning community. Education is not only for children though. The two dimensions of 'tradition' and 'liberality' involved in the initiation expose the subject to a vague status of either a passive member or active participant in the tasks initiated into (Cotter, 2013). The mutual interdependency and dynamic relationship between the individual and community here need to be justified on many grounds including a moral one. Initiating a person into a particular activity or community insinuates changing the person unilaterally by the initiator, a question of natural justice. At least, voluntariness is required as a requisite to justify it. There is in the concept a sense of cleverly forcing on the initiate or dirty procedure as it is in the initiation of new members of a cult group, which indeed education is not. The concept is so scary in education that it resembles rituals, which does away with moral considerations. This factor pushes philosophers like Smeyers and Burbules (2006) to extend wider thought on what the concept means in education and its implications, thus scrutinising the alternative possibilities and the ways to arrive at the results of the initiation, hence the opener for another topic of debate that concerns conservative and reproductive

conceptions of what initiation may mean and lead to. For Luntley (2009), a moral question need to be answered on the justification of engaging a learner into what he does not understand by experience let alone to decide on desire and willingness. He emphasises prior rudiments which will give a decision power to the learner in the enterprise. He admits that education ought to be transformative and Peters understands that too, but the latter under-places the initiate for that the process has the tendency of cajoling and tricking. Whether or not initiation can stand criticism as a process of education despite its subjection traits, the argument is largely on its vulnerability to moral indefensibility majoring in the individuals' voluntariness and natural justice of choice.

Imitation

Imitation, of teachers by their students, assumes the status of a process of education towards the end of the twentieth century. It has been in practice for quite a long time, but it was recognised much later. As Warnick (2009) opines, imitation is jointly connected with ritual, although the latter clears the ground for the former. It was brought to the attention of philosophers by a work of Peters in which he insists that imitation can stand an educational process especially in practise based materials where the imitator (student) does like the demonstrator in an observable way. But Fridland and Moore (2015) see imitation from a psychological point of view, that, it is a learning tool, distinguished from emulation and mimicry. Learning is indeed a part of the educational process, but it is only the task of the student while talking of educational process means all that involved attaining the achievement dimension of education. Learning too could be a process or achievement, but it is in this context attributed to what the learner does as a component to make a whole of education. Unlike the causal theory of teaching which insists that it must result in learning, the process of education here is isolated from all ties of any result, it may not be subjected to the verification of the end, although that is the goal. In their argument, Fridland and Moore (2015) modified the conceptual definition of imitation by adding 'goal orientation of the demonstrator' and 'intention plus interest of the imitator'. All criticisms may lie to rest with the last condition, ruling out coercion, but there is still much to consider ethically. A question to ask is, does the imitator have voluntary decision power on whether or not to imitate? In a formal educational setting, instructional contents are prescribed, sometimes even the method. Besides, what to imitate is another factor requiring ethical justification. What, if immature students of basic technology are 'made' to imitate their experienced specialist demonstrator in handling electric circuits? Whatever the case may be, the problem of imitation as a process of education revolves around its ethical satisfactoriness.

As different terms are being used to refer to processes of education depending on the purpose and content among other considerations, scepticism is still in place. Philosophers generally agree that whatever method education should go by has to be morally acceptable, devoid of any dent and harm. It is on this thesis that all processes of education become subjects of moral judgement.

Conclusion

Having assumed process, achievement, task, system and practice labels, education construes attitudinal phenomenon among other defining characteristics. One of the

criteria that qualify its worthiness is moral defensibility of design, philosophy, policy, content and processes. Inductively from the above discourse, the primary realms of education as both system and practice are captured by ethical claws, and could not escape subjection to ethical filter for judiciousness. None of the realms is safe from involving 'others', and failing to respect its accompanying moral considerations is synonymous with spoiling its overall purpose since the utility of its end may not supersede the protection of others' interests. Education is not a moral enterprise, it is a morality oriented reality; also an altruistic venture operated by multiple parties with varying interests, hence the call for ethical cautions to preserve the boundaries of rights and obligations. Elements of ethics pervade all portions of the educational domains in an impartial form which need to be observed prudently to fine-tune the all-important enterprise and rid it of moral stains. With less hesitation, therefore, it could be concluded that ethics apply necessarily in education, in stripes and a general sense of it. The admitted difficulty in the whole thesis is the latency of some ethical problems so not easily noticed by novice or negligent actors, yet still must not be ignored. In any case, ethics has an undoubted relevance in the spectrums of education analysed thus far. It is then required that ethics be given high regard in education, and the issues raised be considerably observed by educators and other stakeholders.

References

Adewole, M. A. (1989). *Ethics and the Educational Community.* Jos, Nigeria: Fab Education Books.

Adewole, M. A. (2011). *Motivation and education.* Unpublished Lecture Notes for M.Ed Students, University of Jos, Nigeria.

Akinpelu, J. A. (1981). *An introduction to philosophy education.* London: Macmillan.

Angough, A. U. (2011). *Conceptual Analysis.* Katsina-Ala, Nigeria: Celerity Prints.

Bagudo, A. A. (2004). *Philosophical analysis of educational concepts.* Ibadan, Nigeria: Sam Bookman Publishers.

Balbuena, S. E. (2014). *Philosophies of Education.* Retrieved from https://www.slideshare.net/sherwinbalbuena/philosophies-of-education-35587809

Bereiter, C. (1973). *Must we educate?* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bernard, W. (1985). *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bodgan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *Process of education.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bunnin, N. and Yu, J. (2004). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Cohen, L. M. (1999). *Philosophical Perspectives in Education.* Retrieved fromhttps://oregonstate.edu/instruct/ed416/PP3.html

Cotter, R. (2013). Peters' concept of 'education as initiation': communitarian or individualist? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, **45** (2): 178-181.

Crittenden, B. (1988). *Parents, the State and the Right to Educate* (pp. 103-37). Melbourne.

Dazliel, J. R. (1996). Students as research subjects: ethical and educational issues. *Australian Psychologist*, **31** (2): 119-123.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, H. (1973). The concept of teaching. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* **7**: 7–38.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Fridland, E. & Moore, R. (2015). Imitation reconsidered. *Philosophical Psychology, 28*(6), 856-880.

Gough, N. (2002). Moral outrage in education. *Science education*, *86*(4), 596-599.

Gutek, G. L. (2001). *Historical and philosophical foundations of education: a biographical introduction, third edition.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling the society.* New York: Harper and Row.

Irwin, T. (1995). *Plato's ethics*. Oxford University Press.

Jarvis, P (1997). *Ethics and education for adults in a late modern society.* Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education.

Kani, U. M. & Sa'ad, T. U. (2015). Drill as a process of education. *European Journal of Business and Management,* **7** (21): 175-178.

Kant, I. (1785). *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals.* (Abbott, T. K. Trans). Mineola: Dover Publications, Inc.

Kelly, A.V. (2009). *The curriculum: theory and practice.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Klumper, J. (2016). In Louët, S. (Ed.). *Can Ethics Training Improve the Quality of Research?* Retrieved from http://www.euroscientist.com/can-ethics-training-improve-quality-research/

Kumar, R., & Mitchell, C. (2004). What happens to educational administration when organization trumps ethics? *McGill Journal of Education*, **39** (2): 127-144.

Levinson, M. & Fay, J. (2016). *Dilemmas of educational ethics: cases and commentaries.* Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.

Looker, P/ & Lim, C. (2013). Ethics in education. *Journal of the NUS Teaching Academy,* **3** (3): 81-84.

Luntley, M. (2009). On education and initiation. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* **43** (1): 41–56.

Lynch, M. (2016). *Philosophies of education: 3 types of student-centred philosophies.* Retrieved from http://www.theedadvocate.org/philosophies-education-3-types-student-centered-philosophies/

Meyer, A. E. (1975). *Grandmasters of educational thought.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Peters, R. S. (1964). *Education as initiation*. G. Harrap.

Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Plato. (1953). *Charmides.* (B. Jowett, Trans.). Princeton University Press.

Plato. (1956). *Protagoras. (*W. K. C. Guthrie, Trans.). Princeton University Press.

Rich, J. M. (1984). *Professional ethics in education.* Springfield, USA: Charles C. Thomas.

Schofield, H. (1972). *The philosophy of education: an introduction*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Singer, P. (1985). *Ethics.* Encyclopaedia Britannica. Retrieved from www.utilitarian.net/singer/by/1985----,htm

Smeyers, P. and Burbules, N. C. (2006), Education as initiation into practice. *Educational Theory,* **56** (4): 439–449.

Strike, K. A., Haller, E. J., & Soltis, J. F. (2005). *The ethics of school administration.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Tan, C. (2004), Michael Hand, indoctrination and the inculcation of belief. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* **38**: 257–267.

Thompson, J. A. K. (1976). *The Ethics of Aristotle.* London: Penguin Books.

Warnick, B. R. (2009). Ritual, imitation and education in R. S. Peters. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* **43** (1): 57–74.

White, J. P. (1970). Indoctrination. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 4, 107–120.

Winch, C. & Gingell, J. (2008). *Philosophy of education: the key concepts, second edition.* New York: Routledge.