

Analysis of Meta-Ethical Relationships Between Instructors and Students

Kamal Dean Parhizgar
Texas A&M International University

Fuzhan F. Parhizgar
Texas Tech Medical School

Abstract

One of the most prominent aspects of educational relationships between instructors and students in school systems is related to observation of meta-ethics. This article has investigated the impact of perceptual consequential end results on students' learning synergy in a dysfunctional society. Instructors and school authorities need to synergize their intellectual power with meta-ethical principles in order to solve students' societal misbehavior and connect them with the current trends of socialization. Specifically, this article has analyzed five models of educational relationships between instructors and students: (1) parental educational model, (2) architectural engineering educational model, (3) priestly humanitarian educational model, (4) collegial educational social model, and (5) contractual covenant educational model.

Introduction

The meta-ethical models that have been analyzed in this article have multiple phases and resolutions. They involve several interrelated and interdependent consequential phases. First, instructors should carry out a careful analysis of their environmental information concerning how to educate students. Second, they should precisely define historical and traditional aspirations of educational freedom, liberty, and justice within the context of critical thinking for their students. Third, it should be a rational formulation concerning defining boundaries of instructors and students' natural rights and civil rights in relationship with academic freedom in schooling systems. Fourth, we need to identify and analyze inherent professional responsibilities and accountabilities of instructors to their professions, to their students, to students' parents, and to humanity at large. Each of the above strategic elements and their characteristics in academic decision-making processes possesses its own norms that will be analyzed in more depth in the strategic modeling of this article. Specifically, this article has analyzed five models of educational relationships between instructors and students: (1) parental educational model, (2) architectural engineering educational model, (3) priestly humanitarian educational model, (4) collegial educational social model, and (5) contractual covenant educational model (Veatch, 1972: 52).

School authorities and instructors during selection of strategic modeling of their curriculum plans should consider moral, ethical, and legal liabilities to their students and parents. Instructors on the basis of their professional ethical and moral values and commitments make their mind how scientifically utilize their knowledge through designing and implementing curriculum plans. Therefore, their deliberated contributions should be based on professional commitments to serve students along the path of personality development. They should make it clear what they perceive

their mission to have positive impressions to deal with students. This means that what they should and shouldn't notice? How educational institutional operations and academic functional areas work or not? These outcome assessments and understandings influence the decisions that school authorities and instructors make. In the educational community, these decisions are the basic assumptions for strategies that instructors formulate, in turn, influence academic operational performance and determine whether they are succeeding or failing their institutional objectives.

In recent years, it has become commonplace for one discipline to borrow terminology and models from another. Mechanical, biological, and ecological frameworks have cross-fertilized scientific endeavors in most of the social sciences. The concept of modeling relationships between instructors and students has similarly spanned and germinated across disciplines such as political science, organizational theory, military sciences, and educational policy. Researchers were using strategic modeling long before the term model became a key word in the educational leadership practices.

The strategic modeling relationships between instructors and students can best be studied and applied using models. Every model represents some kind of priority of achievable objectives. Some are political-economic oriented, while others are business oriented, and the rest are professional. Nevertheless, each selected model without knowing environmental forces does not guarantee success, but it does represent a clear and practical approach for conceptualizing, formulating, implementing, and evaluating the effectiveness of educational services rendered to students.

The models we are referring to in this article are the highlighted behavior of educational philosophies along with their existing aspirations, visions, missions, objectives, and strategies. The matter of developing models for educational leadership practices is not a simple one. There are too many complexities within these models. Educational leadership practices today are facing tremendous changes and revisions of policies and procedures that make strategic educational administrative operations more difficult and more complex than ever.

School authorities and instructors' relationships with students vary in the processing of the use of strategic relationship models. Many of the concepts and strategic models that deal with long-range educational planning have been developed and used successfully in the United States and abroad. Usually, models have their own characteristics and objectives that should be completely comprehensive to the users. Gorry (1971) in his research indicated that general characteristics of a model are as following:

- Good models are hard to find. Convincing models that include the professional's role variables and control containing direct implications for actions are relatively difficult to build, particularly in the area of great concern about educational services and their outcome assessments.
- Good parameterization is even harder than the selection of the right models. Measurements and data should be gathered in such a way to be effectively relevant to the strategic outcome assessments. They require high quality work at the design stage and often very expensive to be carried out.
- Models should be understood and comprehended by the users. Usually, people tend to reject models when they do not understand them.
- The model has to capture the basic dynamic behavior of professionals in order to explain all of the intangible forces in complexities of dynamic forces within the educational system.

Parental Educational Model

Historically, educational institutions for the Twentieth century have made several progressive challenges to educate global citizens. Each nation according to their sociocultural, politico-economical, and religious zealous promoted something very crucial for educating their citizens. Meanwhile, all of these challenges put families to question how parents as educators actually go about making decisions ethically and morally to bring up their children? With what aspirations and prosperous objectives? With what educational philosophy and strategy? Since all parents are not highly educated, then they had to delegate their parental responsibilities to school authorities and instructors in order to make the right decisions on behalf of them concerning education of their children. Because of such a transition, families found that instructors' status has been viewed as spiritual parents of their students.

The parental relationships between instructors and students traced back to the old Macedonian's educational system. Aristotle's (384-322 B.C.) father, Nichomachus, a student of natural history and an eminent physician, held the post of physician to Amnytas II, King of Macedonia, father of Philip the Great, until his death in Aristotle's eighteenth year. At his father's death, Aristotle, who had been brought up in an atmosphere of science and scholarship, went to Athens to study philosophy under Plato. Plato became Aristotle's spiritual father. While Aristotle was unquestionably Plato's most talented student, he was by no means his most devoted disciple. He stated: "Dear is Plato, but dearer still is truth." In 343 B.C. Aristotle was selected as the tutor to Alexander, the King of Macedonia. There is no evidence that Aristotle, in his three years as a tutor, modified the influence of father upon son or in any way affected the subsequent thoughts and deeds of Alexander; neither the evidence that Aristotle ever recognized the significance of Alexander's goal of political unity. Nevertheless, a bond of friendship was found between instructor and student (Albert, Denise and Peterfreund, 1984: 29).

Within such a historical contextual boundary, for many centuries instructors' ethics rediscovered and reconstructed itself in classrooms. At least two factors have contributed to widening the focus of students' morality and ethicality by instructors. First, the parental relationships with their children will map the degree and quality of ethical and moral behavior of students. Because of this interest in the family, it is a concern with significant relationships that surround the students; the family is described in terms of closeness, not biology. Therefore, parents have found that instructors are viewed as closed surrogate parents of their children. This way of describing the family is commonplace in meta-ethics and is a meritorious convention. Second, there has been a general revival communitarian rhetoric that of course brings the role of social relationships of instructors and school authorities to the forefront of an educational institution. Similarly, we should not underestimate the influence of instructors' behavior on students. If instructors and school authorities neglect students' ethical and moral well being, they have defaulted their professional social responsibilities. Consequently, we now have a process in which students have been deprived from many natural rights, civil rights, and human rights, because of the support and resource allocations necessarily neglected students of having a chance to promote ethics and morality as intellectual parents perceive them. Choosing the right instructor for students is as important as individuals choose their spouses.

Consider the process of buying a safe and secure shelter for your family. Parents go to an open house and look around to see a property. They come back a few times to look the house over some more. Family members look it over and give their thoughts for buying or not buying that house. Parents shop around for location, location, and location including educational reputation of the school district's effectiveness. Parents shop around and inquire documents to be reviewed by

probably a dozen experts before signing the deed in the closing date. Now consider the process of making educational decisions and choices about children. Do parents spend sufficient time to visit schools, sitting in classrooms, and inquire the educational effectiveness of instructors? The answer could be negative because parents are exposed to a schooling system in all residential areas that have been tailored with the philosophy of mass education; making one size of shoe for all. Therefore, ordinary people cannot afford to pay high tuition for the quality of educational endeavor.

The parental educational model is under an assumption that decision-making processes in school systems reflect how they make major decisions in which parents take into account how to take in information, process it, weigh it, seek counsel from those they trust, reconsider information in light of such counsel, ask for clarification from experts and reconsider it again for the children's personality development. At this point it is important to mention a fair common source of confusion. The terms of incompetent instructors and inability of educational administrative systems in examining parental choices in choosing appropriate schools for their children would be a major issue for parents. Maybe incompetent and inability tending to be used interchangeably in educational processes, but they do not mean the same thing. Lack of professional competence in a schooling system means having untrained and incompetent instructors to be cheaply employed by a school district and expect them to teach students with a high level of qualitative educational aspiration. Instructors should be paid according to their qualifications and descent expected compensatory life earnings. Ability, on the other hand, is a type of professional educational leadership solely for administrative processes. On the surface of educational institutional social responsibilities any such presumptions would appear to be morally and ethically outrageous, especially the idea that all students in a nation possess similar potential to be qualitatively educated. Such an assumption is the basic right for parental behavior. Minimally, parentalism is a principle to accept at face value the choices, wishes or actions of parents who are presumed to be autonomous and self-determined in a society. When the presumption of liberty and self-determination is lacking, then moral and ethical problems become exacerbated. What is important here is that not only the right of a citizen is to hold specific beliefs and values and be respected but also that the expectations of parents from instructors and school authorities with regard to the fulfillment of those beliefs and values must be understood and appreciated by power brokers in a society. Who are power brokers? They are politicians who reflect their ideological objectives through governmental agencies (e.g., the state educational commissioners).

Liberty, freedom, justice, and choice in enrolling students in a desirable specific school district are fundamental rights of citizens in a democratic nation. Furthermore, parental choices must be understood not only as a principle right that one must protect but also as an obligation that one must fulfill. Within this context, parents should have a choice to register their children in any school districts as they wish. The state and/or federal government should provide them vouchers to support them. This is the real meaning of civil liberty. According to the voucher system school districts try to compete with each other in order to maintain competitive educational edge to efficiently and effectively educate students.

The ethical and moral questions concerning the parental educational relationships between instructors and students are crucial for understanding what can occur in a school system. What does occur and what ought to be would be a matter of choice? There are several objections concerning delegation of parental authorities to instructors. First, deontologically, parents need to establish moral and ethical ground for reasoning and justification of such a transformation. The main issue is

related to the legitimacy of delegation of parental authority to instructors. Isn't it breaking the moral and ethical rule when instructors treat students parentally? Principally, parents possess a covenant natural duty and responsibility diligently to take care of their children by not letting them suffer or be harmed. Delegation of parental authority to instructors may jeopardize the values and desires of parental affection and minimize the degree of conscience accountability. Nevertheless, physical or mental suffering and harm is not sufficient warrant for such a delegation. Moral beneficence for children cannot be invoked as a justification for parental delegation of authority to instructors. In addition, teleologically, if this argument is itself justifiable, then the consequence of parental delegation of authority to instructors is that no parental act that has sole consequential purposive end for the promotion of the well being of children be warranted. Defining the justification of parental obligations should recognize the values of beneficence. Beneficence cannot be invoked as a justification for parentalism. If this moral and ethical argument is justifiable, then the consequences will not be clear. What parents and schools need is to establish a close cooperating and coordinating effort for the welfare of students.

Architectural Educational Engineering Model

The architectural educational engineering model is viewed as the most moral model for educational intervention. Parents believe that children are directly exposed to daily behavioral patterns of instructors as role models. This model assumes that instructors and school authorities play the role of applied scientists. They, as educational providers, are architectures of the future personality and lifestyle of students on the basis of their scientific knowledge and pragmatic skills. According to this educational model, school authorities and instructors view their profession as redesigning and rebuilding an individual's psychosocial condition and/or recreating new environmental conditions for creation of new societal life with educational innovation. This model eliminates all considerations from instructors' decision-making processes on the basis of their emotional and sensational bindings. Nevertheless, within the process of education, if careful considerations of personal moral faith, ethical values, and cultural beliefs were simply set aside, where would the wrong occur? Answering to this question arises several issues as following:

- First, school authorities and instructors should orient their mind and behavior with rigorous body of scientific knowledge regardless of their sensational and emotional bindings with probability rules. They, via pragmatic knowledge, try to establish rigorous knowledge and understanding in students with certainty rules. They need to remove any bias and prejudice with regard to one's own and the students' preferences. That exactly is viewed as common sense. Instructors and school authorities need to yield their instructional plans and administrative operations to mechanistic and pragmatic characteristics of students' capacity and ability. No child should be left behind. This is the exact objective of educational massification by the federal financial supporting policy. In a democratic society, adequately educating children by capable professional instructors should be a national policy. Public schools should be the appropriate competitive place for all citizens to have equal opportunities for educating their children regardless of the economically depressed zones of local school districts. Such a preference can yield instructional effectiveness to find appropriate rational choices for the workability of their opinions and operations in educating students.
- Second, assessment of certainty rule provides possibility of rational choices according to personality characteristics of students of what can be done to develop and enhance curiosity and interests of students in learning.

- Third, if instructors and school authorities do not know what certain positive consequences may occur during instructional process, then performance of instructors in classrooms will be morally and ethically outrageous. In this case, both instructors and students will expose to self-deception.

In the architectural engineering educational relationship model, instructors and school authorities pace through scientific academic procedures and assess the mechanism of instruction. The problem of this model is inherent to the possible oversight of teaching plans and/or instructional structures. Ethically and morally, within this context, what instructors and/or school authorities do not know may indeed have severe negative consequences on students' learning endeavor.

Every year there are numerous skillful and unskillful instructors and teachers' aids hired by school districts. In all cases, instructors and school authorities need to observe the integrity of the livelihood of students. School authorities and instructors should not physically and/or mentally harm students. It is ethical and moral commitments of instructors to do professionally everything for students in order to help make them grow. Nevertheless, curriculum designs, instructional plans, and teaching strategies must be conceived to serve students' holistic livelihood. Moreover, in architectural engineering educational model certainly the most empirical phase of learning effectiveness resides in instructors' abilities to assess their own professional knowledge and skills in delivering knowledge and match them with the needs of students.

What are inherent moral and ethical objectives in architectural educational engineering model? There could be four types of objectives in formulation and implementation of instructional plans: (1) students' personality growth, (2) development of students' cognitive enhancement, (3) eradication of ignorance and negligence in students' behavioral attitudes, and (4) to train students for being familiar with socialization, multiculturalization, occupationalization, ethicalization, and globalization. Nevertheless, preserving and promoting enhanced intellectual ability and critical thinking is the objective of most architectural educational engineering educational model.

Priestly Humanitarian Educational Model

A type of reciprocity characterizes the priestly humanitarian model of students and instructors relationships. Reciprocity means creation of intellectual relationships between instructors and students on the basis of the value to a principle of beneficence. This is a paternalistic relationship between them. Fatherhood has traditionally been a personalistic metaphor for God and for the priest in the Catholic faith. God, as the universal supreme power, never has disclosed His plan for the existence to humanity. It is the natural mystery for survival. However, according to God's good intention by reasonable planning He makes decisions towards goodness. If humans discover God's mystery of normal life, it would be inappropriate to worry about their life span. If humans know their genetic weaknesses, they may shake the deepest foundations of their self-regard and life plans. Therefore, the priestly philosophical educational humanitarian model is based upon altruistic nature of instructors' good faith and goodwill to do something good only for the students' welfare. From such a philosophical point of view, it might be reasonable that instructors should not disclose all personal personality problems and weaknesses of students to their students because self-alienation may affect students' self-determination. It may also disappoint them for improvement and progress in learning.

The priestly humanitarian educational model is a classical educational philosophy, which considered that instructors stood in the best position from which to judge the overall likelihood impact of education on students' personality development. This assertion exemplifies educational paternalism. It is a position that instructors could and indeed ought always to do what they judge to be in students' best interest regardless of those students' own preferences.

The priestly humanitarian educational model reserves the responsibility of instructors not to disclose all hidden psychological problems of students to their parents and/or to other social authorities. The reasons to avoid the truth in such circumstances seem clear. The instructors' objectives are to minimize psychological harm and maximize benefit to their students and parents. The priesthood humanitarian educational model should avoid harming, and abusing children for the self-interest of instructors.

Inherently, there are several questionable issues concerning the benefit of students as following according to the priestly educational model:

- Why should instructors worry so much about being truthful in instructional and behavioral relationships that are based on an altruistic intention?
- Why not simply make a careful consideration on the overall best courses of instruction and learning in practices?
- Why not professionally weighing the benefits and burdens as instructors do in virtually every area of instructional decision-making processes as legitimized authorities?

To answer to all of these questions and others, we as educators need to follow our conscious integrity in the field of education to respect students' dignity and integrity. The beneficial intention and action of having goodness requires that instructors and school authorities with the most expertise be the prime decision-makers since a less knowledgeable person is likely to unintentionally produce harm to oneself or another member of the moral community. For example, students may lack capacity of intellectual ability in critical thinking because of severe impairment, to such an extent that they pose a clear threat to themselves or others. It is the responsibility of instructors to take care of such a type of students with cooperation and coordination with other school authorities and experts.

Students are innocent people who need to be helped by intellectual people to relieve them from pain and suffering of ignorance through their wisdom and experiences. Low self-esteem, poverty, lack of family cohesiveness, and other causes can lead students to a paralysis of decision-making processes and deviate them from moral and ethical convictions. In a liberal society like the United States of America, having lost self can cause students not to exercise self-realization and self-actualization in any meaningful way. Students deserve to be treated with respect and dignity whenever possible by instructors and school authorities without bias, prejudice, discrimination, favoritism, and nepotism.

One of the major reasons for promoting priestly humanitarian educational model is based upon a fact that students who are innocent and ignorant creatures need help to be educated. Hopefulness, powerfulness, and helpfulness are the major ingredients in the priestly humanitarian relationships between instructors and students. Whereas students who are ignorant and urgently desire to learn need help to provide them with honest advises how to live safely and successfully. Ignorance, negligence, and carelessness change human's mind and convert people into emotional and sensational anguish. Instructors as role models professionally are responsible to make appropriate choices with uniformity of rationality on behalf of parents to educate students.

The deontological philosophical assumptions attached to the priestly humanitarian educational model are based upon expertise, beliefs, trust, and beneficence. Instructors' speculative understanding of the right things through their good faith, goodwill, and good deed on behalf of students is a moral and ethical mandate. In the field of schooling system for example, what we need to do better both as parents and school authorities is a better job of recognizing the warning signs before a student is hurt. That means noticing instructors who are too close to kids, who may be touching them in an inappropriate manner, inviting them over to their homes for different purposes, calling them at their homes at night, calling them into their offices alone under closed doors, giving the rides to their homes, flattering them with inappropriate unethical and immoral conversations, and above all desiring having sex with them. These kinds of penetration of minor boundary violations usually are a sign that something inappropriate is going on. Parents and school authorities need to establish an ethical and moral training program for instructors to prevent such abusive and exploitative misbehavior by instructors in the school districts. For example, CNN.com (2006), reported:

A Delaware school instructor with 28 counts of raping a minor after she allegedly engaged in weeklong sexual relationship with a 13-year-old student... She allowed a 12-year-old friend of the victim to watch them having sex at her home, and that she gave both boys beer... The school instructor and the 13-year-old had sex 28 times between March 24 and March 31 (everyday 4 times).

The priestly humanitarian educational model of relationships between students and instructors are based upon emotional and sensational bindings with the intention of goodness; not lust, passion, and selfishness. This is about the trust parents give instructors and school authorities when they send their children to school. Instructors like priests should not abuse and exploit children for the sake of their individual's pleasure and enjoyment. Those are the kinds of issues we should be aware of ill fated consequences, instead of preaching and dwelling on the lurid details. In conclusion, according to the priestly educational model instructors, play the holistic roles of teachers, counselors, advisors, coaches, and mentors.

Collegial Societal Educational Model

The collegial social educational model is another type of relationship between students and instructors. This model is based on eliminating negative side effects of other previous models. While one tries to overcome ethical and moral deficiencies of the parental, architectural engineering, and priestly educational models, especially those caused by students, to playing a subordinated role in classrooms. With parental educational model, we may find that in theory instructors should be involved with all aspects of life-styles of students' behavior in order to educate them appropriately. However, in practice, this model promotes the philosophy of mass education regardless of individual's self interest. Therefore, there is dubious debate concerning application of this model in the classroom.

With the architectural engineering educational model the instructor becomes a plumber without any moral integrity. With the priestly model the instructor's moral authority so dominates that the students' freedom, liberty, and dignity are extinguished. They need to be obedient to higher authorities. In the effort to develop a more proper balance which would permit the other fundamental values and obligations to be preserved, some have suggested that the instructors and school authorities should perceive their roles in a school setting as colleagues pursuing the

common good of eliminating the ignorance and promoting critical thinking in students; the instructor is the students' pal.

What the social educational collegial model does bring to light is the need for a principle of reciprocity to operating joint venturing partnership among parents, students, instructors, school authorities and other social entities in society. Reciprocal respect and consideration between students and instructors represents an ideal of mutual participation in teaching and learning endeavor with a sense of professional obligation to foster students' participation through honest information exchanging and dialoguing. Ethically, valid relationships between students and instructors is a process of shared decision-making based upon mutual respect and application, not a ritual to be equated with reciting the contents of a form that details the risks of a particular mode of behavior. Innovativeness and creativity in critical thinking and expression of opinions and ideas by students are viewed as the fundamental principles of dialectic discussions in classrooms. Respect for and tolerance of others' opinions and ideas in the educational circles are fundamental keys for coexistence.

Students and instructors should be familiar with free speech and expression of ideas in a democratic society. Instructors should not brain wash students with their own personal taste. Instructors are viewed as influential and effective medium for self-understanding and comprehension of the environment that they live in and deal with.

Within the contextual boundary of the social collegial educational relationships is, the promotion of principles of autonomy and choice for students' well being, often called beneficence. Sometimes it is an assessment of some good or a duty to provide a fair distribution of benefits and burdens in a school system. They are also central tenets in teaching and learning processes. Instructors are guided by a central professional commitment to apply their knowledge and skills to evaluate students' potential for interventions that can be of benefit. This may be seen as incoherent within the parameters of choice legitimacy in an ethical community.

What the social educational collegial model does bring to light is the need for the values of reciprocal trust and commitments between instructors and students. Dealing seriously among instructors, students, parents, school authorities, and community at large creates expectations, reliance, and trust. Where each party acknowledges not only that this conduct causes expectations to arise in his/her counterpart, but also acknowledges that these expectations are socially justifiable when all involved parties ratify all moral and ethical mandates. Before we assume trust and commitments of instructors and students to each other, we should perceive autonomy and rights of students and then we analyze the inherent characteristics and relationships between instructors and students.

Autonomy stems from the Greek *auto* and *nomos*; literally means self-law. Professionally, instructors are committed to be accountable to the protection of students' rights to self-law in relationship to their own self-due-care right processes. Nevertheless, when students participate in an educational institution for learning, they express their urgent needs to get help. Sometimes, students' demands for educational enhancement will be based upon necessitated and urgent needs and other times will be upon their wishes and desires to change their societal status. In these situations, instructors are bounded with curriculum requirements to cover all assigned tasks in their instructional process. However, instructors need to assess validity and vitality of these urgent and desirable students' demands with possibility and availability of allocation of resources. Finally, instructors and school authorities are in trust to perform their duties on the basis of meta-ethical professional mandates.

Covenant Contractual Educational Model

Multicultural societies like America pose a challenge to instructors and school authorities in establishing professional relationships with students with conditions of sociopolitical legitimacy. Since immigrants have come from around the world with all types of ethnicity, gender, color, national origin, religious faith, age, and classes of wealth, the issue is not just what are the ground and methods of moral and ethical professional thoughts and behavior. The major issue is what methods can be used to justify instructors' conduct that could be fit to serve a multiculturally oriented society? Since multiculturalism is a social-intellectual deliberation that promotes the values of diversified people as the core principle in pluralistic socialization of people, it mandates people to treat each other with respect and as equals in their civil rights, freedom, and liberty. Caution around societal dynamic groups is built into democratized political institutions and celebrated as checks and balances. Such a mandate has created justice on the basis of pluralistic negotiating contractual agreements among various layers of federalism such as municipalities, states, regions, counties, and professional associations (e.g., American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, American Bar Association, American Association of University Professors). Each entity with its own governmental body and fragmented activities functions in a number of democratic and professional ways. Civil rights and legal mandates concerning professional relationships among instructors and students must be addressed at all above stages. It pays careful consideration to problems of formal and distributive justice. This model needs to have the ability to preserve loyalty to respect academic freedom, individual's autonomy, and to maintain a sense of justice and a balance of ethical authenticity.

There are several ethical and moral arguments concerning covenant contractual educational relationships between instructors and students. In a general ethical and moral term, sociocultural and politico-economical institutions like school systems are themselves proper subjects for moral and ethical assessments. The covenant contractual educational ethicists like Rawls insisted that social ethicality is neither merely a matter of personal morality nor of institutional efficiency. However, in his approach to social and normative problems, Rawls (1958: 164) followed the tradition of Hobbes (1839), and Kant (1898). That is known as the tradition of social-contract theories. All of these philosophers believe that the ultimate point in social activities is based on a set of tacit agreements among people. Hobbes insisted that it is solely because of our self-serving desire for security that we agree to subordinate ourselves completely to an absolute sovereign power. In other words, if there is no fear of retaliation, there is no obligation. Therefore, the covenant contractual relationships among people must be such that they are acceptable in perpetuity.

Within the covenant contractual educational model of relationships between instructors and students two individuals or groups are interacting in a way where there are obligations and expected benefits for both parties. The obligations and benefits are limited in scope, though, even if they are expressed in somewhat vague terms. The basic norms of freedom, dignity, truth telling, promise keeping, and justice are essential to a contractual relationship. The premise is trust and confidence even though it is recognized that there is not a full mutuality of interests. Societal legal sanctions institutionalize and stand behind the relationships, in case there is a violation of the contract, but for the most part the assumption is that there will be a faithful fulfillment of the obligation. Therefore, the covenant contractual educational relationships between instructors and students are more leaned toward legal bindings in a society.

The performance of teaching in a multicultural democratic society is centered in reciprocal contractual agreements between families and school systems. This approach is usually identified with a contractual covenant method of resolving the possible conflicting interests and consequential values of different parties. The covenant contractual model has something in common with other models that is related to the maintenance of the integrity of professional relationships between instructors and students.

Within the context of covenant contractual educational relationships model, there are two major perceptions concerning educational services to be provided for students as following:

- Reflective professionalism equilibrium: This means to be committed to altruistic goodness for students within the context of specialized and skilled academic preparation and performance.
- Customer-centered: This means charging fees for services. This democratic wish has been pursued in a wide variety of contexts across the generations. The reflective professional equilibrium is known as covenantal relationships. The covenantal relationships focus on the rights of each party and relationships between instructors and students in terms to be governed by reciprocity and not by self-interest.

The concept of covenant contract has two further advantages for defining the professional relationships. It reminds the professional community that it is important for the whole educational institution to keep covenant with those who seek assistance and sanctuary. Thus, the concept of covenant contractual relationships between instructors and students and between schools and families permits a certain broadening of accountability beyond personal agency. At the same time, however, the notion of covenant also permits one to set professional responsibility for the human goodness within social limit.

The actual operation of covenant educational contractual model commits instructors and school authorities to take responsibility for all purely technical educational decisions, of the sort which one is specifically prepared by instructors training. The families would retain control over decisions that involve personal moral values or life-style preferences.

Within the free market economy, families have choices if they can afford to enroll their children in private schools. Nevertheless, the educational delivery is balanced by demand and supply and/or tuition cost and prosperous benefit analysis. Instructors and school authorities view their responsibilities on the basis of balancing cost and benefit; as a business owner does. In return, families view their educational needs on the basis of their consumerable needs. Instructors and school authorities are viewed as educational providers or sellers of knowledge and skills come to agreements with parents as buyers for their children's educational needs dispositions. Both parties with reciprocal agreements walk away with their own objective fulfillments. In other words, instructors and school authorities as providers look at the marketplace to sell their knowledge, experience, skills, and expertise for the benefit of students with receiving agreed monetary rewards and students as buyers and/or consumers are looking for enhancing their intellectual capability and personality development, and job's marketability with fees for services. Those parties who fulfill their contracts will enjoy legitimate outcomes. This creates heavy competition in the educational marketplace. Consequently, instructors and school authorities face the toughest competition and qualitative educational services will be more competitive in years to come.

According to the covenant educational contractual model, instructors and school authorities view their students as their customers. They need to satisfy them in order to establish customer loyalty. They can go about winning customers and outperforming competitors through satisfying customers' needs on the basis of their monetary purchase power. For example, there are educational indexes that parents use to evaluate schools' educational effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity. These are average scores of students by taking annual SAT and ACT exams. These scores are crucial for admission of students into high qualitative and repudiated well known colleges and universities.

Many moralists and ethicists are drawn to this structural feature of utilitarianism, the greatest benefits for the greatest number of population. Within the covenant educational contractual model a single principle, like the principle of utility, will rule between instructors and students. Therefore, the application of morality and ethicality will be converted into legality with a well-defined method, often called cost-benefit analysis and/or fees for services. This outlook attracted many instructors according to the Kantian categorical imperative. What makes the categorical imperative logically different from the principle of utility is that it cannot be applied without substantive evaluative judgments along the way to the effective conclusions. Whereas the principle of utility in the field of economy requires only conventional factual and mathematical judgments for its applicability, Kantian categorical imperative in more than one way, has created the famous version of the principle of professional globalization.

Instructors and school authorities to govern ordination on their own moral and ethical conduct to prevail the professional processes of educating students base the professional globalization of educational services upon self-constraints. Finally, Timko (2001: 55) indicated: "When all is said and done, the 'covenantal' relationship seems to bring together the best qualities of many different models."

Conclusion

This article has analyzed five models of educational relationships between instructors and students: (1) parental educational model, (2) architectural engineering educational model, (3) priestly humanitarian educational model, (4) collegial societal educational model, and (5) contractual educational covenant model. Each nation according to their sociocultural, politico-economical, and religious zealous promotes something very crucial for educating their citizens. Meanwhile all of these challenges put families to question how parents as educators actually go about making decisions ethically and morally to bring up their children. With what aspirations and prosperous objectives? With what educational philosophy and strategy? Since all parents are not highly educated, then they have to delegate their parental responsibilities to school authorities and instructors in order to make the right decisions on behalf of them concerning education of their children. Because of such a transition, families found that instructors' status has been viewed as spiritual parents of their students. Some parents have found that instructors are viewed as close surrogate parents. Furthermore, parental choices must be understood not only as a principle right that one must protect but also as an obligation that one must fulfill. The parental educational model is under an assumption that decision-making processes in school systems reflect how they make major decisions in which parents take into account how to take in information, process it, weigh it, seek counsel from those they trust, reconsider information in light of such counsel, ask for clarification from experts and reconsider it again for the children's personality development.

References

- Albert, E. M., Denise, T. C., and Peterfreund, S. P. (1984). *Great Traditions in Ethics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, P. 29.
- CNN.com (2006). "Teacher Charged With Raping Student 28 Times." <http://www.cnn.com/2006/LAW/04/04/teacher.sex/index.html>.
- Gorry, G.A. (1971). "The Development of Managerial Models." *Sloan Management Review*. (Winter), Vol. 12, No. 2, PP. 1-15.
- Hobbes, T. (1839). *Leviathan and Philosophical Rudiments, from The English Works of Thomas Hobbes, Vols. II and III. Sir William Molesworth, (Ed.)*. London, John Bohn.
- Kant, I. (1898). *Fundamental Principles of Metaphysics of Morals. Translated by T. K. Abbott, from Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*. London: Longmans, Green.
- Rawls, J. (1958). "Justice as Fairness." *Philosophical Review*, Vol. 67 PP. 164-194.
- Timko, R. M. (2001). *Clinical Ethics: Due Care and the Principle of Nonmaleficence*. New York: University Press of America, Inc., P. 49-59.
- Veatch, R. M. (1972). "Models for Ethical Medicine in Revolutionary Age." In Arras, J. and Rhoden, N. (Eds.). (1989). *Clinical Ethics: Theory and Practice*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., PP. 52-55.