

# Role of Value Education in Quality Teaching

Dr. Qurat-ul-Ain Shah

Lecturer, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir-190006

**Abstract:** Value is a set of rules that set the standard of conduct. Value education is compulsory in today's time in order to meet the requirements of quality teaching. The social, emotional, mental, physical, and cognitive development of each student, regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or location, is the focus of a quality education. It does more than just prepare the child for tests. Children's learning capacity and the degree to which their education leads to a variety of personal, social, and developmental advantages are both influenced by quality. This paper makes an attempt to examine the function of value-based education and quality teaching in society; it goes into great detail regarding the implications of developing quality teaching as a basis for value education.

**Key words:** Quality teaching, values, value education, knowledge etc.

## Values and Value Education- Introduction

Principles, fundamental convictions, and ideals—standards of living—that serves as a general guide for behavior or as a point of reference when making decisions are known as values. Belief about what is right and wrong and what matters most in life are called values. In its literal sense, value refers to something that is pricey, valuable, and worth sacrificing for. It is a set of rules that set the standard of conduct. Values are valued and sought after. By playing a central role in a person's life, they strengthen their character. It reveals one's thoughts, choices, judgments, relationships, aspirations, and vision.

According to John Dewey (1966), "Value education means primarily to prize, to esteem, to appraise, holding it dear and also the act of passing judgment upon the nature and amount of its value as compared to something else," Mahatma Gandhi discovered that moral decay is widespread in society. The following are the primary causes of moral decay:

- A disregard for the sacredness of human life.
- Breakdown of parental control of kids in families.
- Absence of regard for power, seen through the audacious overstepping of the law and all out negligence for rules and guidelines.
- Wrongdoing and defilement.
- Maltreatment of liquor and medications.
- Maltreatment of ladies and youngsters, and other weak citizenry.
- Disrespect for property and other people.

It is therefore, necessary to comprehend the primary causes of these issues in order to resolve them. Children are future citizens; the children of today will have a prosperous future if they receive a high-quality education. According to Gandhiji, education is the answer to all problems. This is the twenty-first century. Assuming that we use science and innovation in the legitimate manner it is easy as far as we're concerned to tackle every one of the issues of the non-moral and worth things.

## Value Education: Historical background in India

Since ancient times, India has placed a high score on value education. The child not only acquired reading and archery skills at the Gurukul stage, but also a philosophy of life and its impermanence. As a result,

education in India was found on the idea that everyone should be able to experience the absolute as a spark of the divine, and that doing one's duty should go hand in hand with learning new information. Value education was referred to as moral education or moral science in the modern educational system. The British has valued education and maintained a policy of total neutrality regarding religion. CABE emphasized spiritual and moral education from 1943 to 1946. Home and community had to take care of it. The Committee on Emotional Integration stated in 1961 that science students should have some humanities background; it suggested that a paper on India's cultural heritage should be required. Moral, social, and spiritual values were recommended at all levels by the Education Commission. In 1972, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was of the opinion that the educational system ought to promote the values of world peace, international understanding, and humanity's unity. In order to make education a powerful tool for instilling social and moral values, the National Policy on Education (NPE) of 1986 proposed curriculum adjustments; to eradicate fatalism, obscurantism, fanaticism, and superstition. A national education system based on a National Curricular Framework with a common core and other flexible components is envisioned by the National Policy on Education (NPE) of 1986. The history of India's freedom movement, the responsibilities outlined in the constitution, and other content that fosters national identity are all included in the common core. Etiquette, egalitarianism, democracy, and secularism, equality of the sexes, environmental protection, removing social barriers, adhering to the small family norm, and instilling a scientific temper are just some of the values that these components will promote across subject areas.

### **Quality Teaching: Background**

The ability of instructors and formal education in general to change students' lives has been called into question by educational studies from the 1990s and beyond. In the United States, highly interventionist research (Newmann 1996, Darling-Hammond, 1997) was done to see whether a particular method of teaching and schooling could overcome the disadvantage effect. The specific method of instructing and educating is known by many names, but it is most frequently referred to as "quality teaching," which includes the efforts of both individual instructors in classrooms and, ideally, whole-school teaching regimes.

### **Quality Teaching and Values Education**

Additionally, new studies appear to support the notion that there is a direct connection between the caliber of a teacher and the environment's strong moral foundation. According to a recent Australian survey, care and trust were the most important teacher attributes listed by pupils who excel in school, according to Rowe (2004). While the more expected indicators of demonstrable subject matter expertise and engaging teaching practices were as evident as one might expect, they rarely stood alone and seemed to be related to the greater indicator of student confidence in the teacher's reliability and concern for their best interests. Similar to this, Loudon et al. (2004) found it challenging to identify likely student effects from straightforward teacher practise observation. One may caricature the study's findings by claiming that the relationship between an elder and a younger person was far more significant than the relationship between an educator and a student. For certain exceptional instances, the findings would seem to conclude that better student outcomes may come from circumstances in which teacher practises were debatable in terms of the most recent material and pedagogy but, in opposition to this, where a healthy communication between teachers and students prevailed.

Comparable to something like this, recent research by Hattie (2004) places "respect for students" at the top of the list of qualities that distinguish demonstrably skilled teachers, and Brady's (2005) work has demonstrated that "relationship between teacher and student" is at least as important as technical proficiency in helping teachers enhance the best in their pupils. By concentrating teacher and system attention on those aspects of their professional practise that have the greatest impact, namely the

relationship of due care, mutual respect, fairness, and positive modelling established with the student and, in turn, the network of systemic "relational trust," values education has the potential to go to the very heart of the power of quality teaching.

### **Knowledge Systems and Values Education**

Many years later, one is brought back to the eminent John Dewey's warning against instrumentalist educational systems in the early years of public education. According to him, relying too much on methodology and topic knowledge is detrimental to education's long-term success. Instead, he discussed the need for teachers to develop an attitude that was both self-reflective and geared toward developing in students a capacity for reflection, inquiry, and moral prudence (cf. Dewey, 1964). The results of the recent research mentioned above would not at all surprise Dewey. He would also feel vindicated, in my opinion, by the current emphasis placed on values education in the expansive and all-encompassing manner in which it is being conceptualised.

Jurgen Habermas is a different, more contemporary but nonetheless significant thinker who merits addressing in this context (1972; 1974; 1984; 1987; 1990). Many of the ideas that educationists have grabbed upon in an effort to expand our understanding of learning and challenge preconceived notions of what it means to be a teacher have their roots in Habermas' theory of knowing. When it was completely out of fashion, Habermas spoke of the more authentic and challenging learning of historical-hermeneutic or "communicative knowledge," which he defined as "knowing and understanding that results from engagement and interrelationship with others," and "critical knowing" or "self-reflectivity," which he defined as "knowing and understanding that comes from critique of all one's sources of knowledge and ultimately from critique of one's own self or, in Habermas' terms, from knowing oneself. This, according to Habermas, was the ultimate knowledge at which a person reached the point where they were human. He could be mocked for saying, "There is no knowing without knowing the knower," and the knower is oneself. The ultimate goal of the learning game, in a sense, is getting to know oneself and changing one's beliefs and behavior as a result. Habermas refers to this shift as "praxis," which he defines as "a practical or communicative action designed to right the wrongs in one's environment."

### **The Values Education's Dual Role**

Using Dewey's and Habermas' comprehensive views of knowledge and the role of education, we can see that Values Education has two responsibilities. To use a Habermasian phrase, the first step is to create an atmosphere of respect, trust, and care that, before a word is said, challenges the preconceived notions and behaviors that many people will bring from their heritage and the wider cultural "life-world." Ideally, students will observe people they may have come to view as unworthy of respect being respected by the entire school community as a result of this. The most important lesson of all is this one. Research indicates that belief and behavior shifts are more likely to occur when a school embraces this modeling.

However, teachers are trained to be explicit about the learning they engage in, going beyond the implicit. The next step is to make it clear why this environment of respect, trust, and acceptance is so important to the human community once it has been established. This is the instructing or educational plan part of Values Schooling and, at anything age, its fundamental center should be to bring up those issues which portray Habermas' basic and self-intelligent approach to knowing. Its purpose is to guarantee that the facts, figures, and conversations of real people provide the most comprehensive and difficult evidence. In the end, its goal is to encourage students to develop self-reflectivity, a self-awareness that frees them from the shadow of their upbringing and cultural heritage and forces them to question not only their preconceived beliefs and actions, but also their own deeply ingrained comfort zone of beliefs and actions. To put it another way, the task is to change. It is to do exactly the opposite of what Christopher Jencks believed to

be the school's truth in 1972. Its purpose is to transform the output from the children who are entering. It is impossible to overstate the significance of school-based Values Education in completing this task. Change is hard at any stage of life, but it gets harder the longer you stay in your comfort zone.

Changing convictions and conduct doesn't mean overwhelming an alternate arrangement of convictions and values on understudies than those they came in with. Forcing another person's usual range of familiarity would be a logical inconsistency of everything inferred by basic and self-intelligent knowing. However, it does require students to be challenged to recognize that the beliefs and values they brought with them are just one set, one life-world, and to take into account the lives of others. This is the essence of what Habermas teaches (1984; 1987) refers to as "communicative capacity" and "communicative action" above and beyond that. When a self-reflective knower realizes that their own lifeworld is just one that needs to function in a variety of lifeworlds, they have communicative capacity, or communicative capacity. In a way, this is a formula for the modern, intercultural communicator with global competence. Past this, notwithstanding, is the idea of informative activity. Because one's newfound self, one's own integrity, is at stake here, the self-reflective knower goes beyond mere tolerance to stand up for justice and for oneself. Personal commitment, dependability, and trustworthiness spill over into "praxis," or practical action that makes a difference, as Habermas calls it. It is the kind of action that can only come from the well of self-reflectivity, from someone who knows who they are, values the integrity of being authentic, and is committed to creating the kinds of caring and trusting relationships that produce the best results from human interaction.

### **Values grounded in schools are crucial Education**

In many ways, it goes against the conventional wisdom to say that school is the best place for this to happen. This is important to say. This is not meant to pit the school against the home, peers, religion, media, etc., but To add to the feeling that "we've got it right!", it is to boldly assert that, for the majority of people, these agencies tend to make lifeworlds smaller and put pressure on people to conform to those lifeworlds. The school's bolder job ought to be to extend the solace suggested by this and to receptive outlooks to the expansiveness of lifeworlds. Although one should not be surprised if there are occasionally tensions between the school's role and that of the other agencies, this should ideally be done carefully and with the support of other agencies, particularly the home. The school's function is distinct from that of the other agencies, and a comprehensive Values Education endeavor provides much of its substance.

Dewey's and Habermas' points of view shed light on the reasons why trust, care, respect, and acceptance are so important for Quality Teaching to be effective (cf. 2002, Bryk and Schneider; Loudon and other, 2004; Rowe, 2004). In addition, these points of view highlight the reason why teachers, schools, and systems need to see the Values Education goal as central to their efforts rather than as an afterthought. It is important to reiterate the main idea of this paper, which is that Values Education has the potential to get right to the heart of what teachers, schools, and educational systems are all about. It certainly has the potential to provide Quality Teaching with the missing link.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, we are in a time when our understanding of the teacher's role and Values Education's power are coming together. Never again is Values Training on the outskirts of an educational plan that reverses the focal jobs to be played by the educator and the school in our general public. It is fundamental to these roles. Values Education, in contrast to the presumptions that appear to underpin many of our concerns regarding structures, curriculum, and resources, is based on the teacher's ability to make a difference. The focus is on what Hattie (2003) refers to as "... the greatest source of variance that can make a difference, (namely the teacher)," but the artifacts of structure, curriculum, and resources are not discounted. In the case of Values Education, the belief is based on the teacher's ability to make a difference by involving students in complex and life-changing moral development education. One famous child psychologist,

Haim G. Ginott, once said: A teacher must win a child's heart before they can reach their mind. A child can only think right if he feels right. (1969, Ginott).

I suggest that the way Values Education is structured and designed has the potential to refocus the attention of teachers and their systems on the most important component of any effective teaching, the teacher themselves. This includes, of course, the quality of the teacher's knowledge, content, and pedagogy, but more importantly, the teacher's capacity to form relationships of care and trust, thereby establishing an environment that is filled with values, teaching about those values, encouraging students to commit to living by those values, and building a society where Quality education and values education are in sync. Values Schooling without Quality Instructing is a confusing expression, obviously, yet Quality Educating without Values Training can possibly experience the ill effects of the missing connection that vows to fortify and finish it.

## References

1. Brady, L. (2005). Dimensions of teaching. *Curriculum and Teaching*, 20: 5-14.
2. Bryk, A. & Schneider, B. (1996). *Social trust: A moral resource for school improvement*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
3. Bryk, A. & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
4. Carnegie (1994). Every child can learn <http://www.carnegie.org/sub/pubs/execsum.html>
5. Darling-Hammond, L. (1997) *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Dewey, J. (1964). *John Dewey on education: Selected writings*. New York: Modern Library.
7. Farrer, F. (2000). *A quiet revolution: Encouraging positive values in our children*. London: Random House.
8. Ginott, H. (1969). *Between parent and child*. London: Staples.
9. Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests*. (tr. J. Shapiro) London: Heinemann.
10. Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice*. (tr. J. Viertel) London: Heinemann.
11. Habermas, J (1984). *Theory of communicative action*. (tr. T. McCarthy) (vol. I) Boston: Beacon Press.
12. Habermas, J (1987). *Theory of communicative action*. (tr. T. McCarthy) (vol. II) Boston: Beacon Press.
13. Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. (tr. C. Lenhardt & S. Nicholson) Cambridge, MASS: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
14. Harris, J. & Bereznicki, B. (2006). *Values education project advisory committee meeting 3, 24/2/06*. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation and Department of Education Science and Training.
15. Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* Invited address at the Australian Council for Educational Research conference, Melbourne.
16. Hattie, J. (2004). It's official: Teachers make a difference. *Educare News*, 144: 24-31.
17. Jencks, C. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
18. LVE (2005). *Living values education*. <http://www.livingvalues.net> (accessed 19 September, 2005)
19. Louden, W., Rohl, M., Barrat-Hugh, C., Brown, C., Cairney, T., Elderfield, J., House, H., Meiers, M., Rivaland, J. & Rowe, K.J. (2004). *In teachers' hands: Effective literacy teaching practices in the early years of schooling*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training.
20. Newmann, F. & associates (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

21. Parsons, T. & Bales, R. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.
22. Qld (1999). *Report of the Queensland school reform longitudinal study*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.
23. Rowe, K.J. (2004). In good hands? The importance of teacher quality. *Educare News*, 149:4-14.
24. Scheerens, J., Vermeulen, C. & Pelgrum, W. (1989). Generalizability of instructional and school effectiveness indicators across nations. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13: 789-799.
25. Willms, J. (2000). Monitoring school performance for standards-based reform. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 14: 237-253.