

Moral and Social Rules for Growing Children's: Social & Cultural Bioethics Issue for Next Generations

Fulya OZTAS¹ Ayşegül SARIKAYA¹ Ayşe ALPTEKİN¹ Haydar OZTAS*²,
1.Selçuk University, Vocational High School, Selçuklu, Konya/Turkey
2.Necmettin Erbakan University, A.K. Education Faculty, Meram /Konya/ Turkey

Abstract

The critical thinking over social and biological concepts mostly comes across with ethical and cultural issues. The Education in science teaching should also aim at deeper thinking skill about social issues such as ethical, social and religious subjects. Principally, the part of philosophy mainly focuses on the principals involved in making decisions about what is right and wrong is called ethics. Therefore bioethicists generally try to work out ethical concept and making in the context of biological information and technology. Bioethics in the real sense cannot function where there is no culture. In the present study, we discussed how a global bioethics can account for profound and constantly transforming sources of cultural differences. It is strongly advisable that the global bioethics requires the acknowledgement of different cultural realities in different communities. For this reason the cultures should therefore be respected without compromising key moral values.

Keywords: Bioethicists child development, cultural issues, values

1. Introduction

It has been shown that moral education is becoming an increasingly popular topic in the fields of psychology and education. Though not all of these social concerns are moral in nature, and most have complex origins, there is a growing trend towards linking the solutions to these and related social problems to the teaching of moral and social values. It is well known that philosophy at least partially focuses on the principals involved in making decisions about what is right and wrong is called ethics. Most of cultures are based on the principles of the "golden rules" do unto others what you will like them to do unto you. This is the basis for bioethics because bioethical judgments are value-based in nature (Aramesh, 2008).

Bioethicists try to work out ethical concept and making in the context of biological information and technology. It has been claimed that the bioethics has been used in the last centuries to describe the investigation and study of ways in which decisions in medicine and science touch upon our health and lives and our society and environment.

Bioethics has try to work out recently to describe the investigation and study of ways in which decisions in medicine and science touch upon our health and lives and our society and environment.

Of course, the individual of societies is important in moral deliberations, but references are made not only to the individual but also to the community. What are considered good are those things that enhance the welfare of the people in order to make more valued life style?

It has been suggested the bioethics principles and practice can be influenced by different cultural background of societies. There is globally accepted bioethics principles are often based on basic ethical codes such as; autonomy, beneficence, no maleficence justice. One of them the beneficence/no maleficence requires us to maximize possible benefits, while minimizing possible harms and consequently secure the well-being of others by refraining from harming them. Autonomy gives individuals the right to self-actualization and decision-making, while justice is concerned with the fair selection and distribution of the burdens and benefits of research among participants.

In this work we discussed what is the place of bioethics values the child education, after the examination of some theories of moral development. The societies individually define for them what is right or wrong. Therefore, moral is defined as right conducts as guided by or defined by the respective society.

2. Overview, Discussion and Conclusions

Piaget (1965) has been postulated that the characteristics of moral development as something that is "distinguished between heteronomous morality of younger children and the autonomous morality of older children" (Santrock1996). Piaget's formation of moral development is viewed through stages of life that begin with the most basic needs and continues into a formal operational thought process that extends into adolescent years. Freud investigates the development of self through the Id, Ego and Superego and the various conflicts that arise during early stages of a child's development (Steinberg, 1991).

The most noted theorists in moral development is Kohlberg with his work pertaining to levels of moral convention with influences from peers, cognitive development and conflict, as well as perspectives or the phenomenological approach of the child (Smetana, 1995). His social cognitive approach to moral development combines the approach by Bandura in that moral development is best understood through the context of social

situations, judgments and cognitive factors that pertain to self-control and perception of self within the social setting.

According to Black and Mooney (2002) the idea of community autonomy, is that the community's elected or appointed representative authority has the power to make choices. The community can draw upon its own values and goals in making decisions. In order to making a life and understand the importance of human values within which the society can live and operate in a harmonious state, every society has its own moral code that governs the action of individual in the community. A society without these moral indices will automatically slide down to the abyss of failure and total collapse.

Perhaps the most striking development in the study of ethics during the second half of the 20th century has been a growing interest among philosophers in applied ethics, and that includes the application of normative theories to practical moral issues such as racial and sexual equality, human rights, and justice and respect for human life. It is well known that bioethics is not traditionally a theory-based enterprise, rather the focus has been problem related.

According to Takala (1999) the introduction of the four ethical principles in the global perspective, has, however, become more important given way to probably the best known, theory of bioethics. This theory is known as the “four principles” or the “Georgetown mantra” approach or “mid-level principlism.” It is an attempt to create a global framework for bioethics on the four principles—autonomy, justice, beneficence, and no maleficence.

These bioethics principles are concerned with questions about basic human values such as the rights to life and health, and the rightness or wrongness of certain developments in healthcare institutions, life technology, medicine, the health professions and about society's responsibility for the life and health of its members.

Can there be a universal “global” bioethics?

How can a global bioethics account for profound and constantly transforming sources of cultural differences?

To what extent should cultural diversity be permitted to influence bioethical judgments in our society?

Another matter is that the bioethics issues cannot be universal because of the existence of different values/morals that vary from community to community and from different societies within the communities. It will therefore be difficult to globalize bioethics without considering cultural response to ethical issues because different cultures have different values and morals that guide them. For example “cause no harm” might mean different thing to different people.

While certain culture, especially the western world will encourage and legalize abortion, some others may look at it as grievous transgressions that must be resisted by all means. According to religious people foetus is beginning of personhood and any attempt to terminate the foetus at any stage is regarded as murder and will attract severe punishment. This is in contrast to Western culture where abortion is legalized. At present bioethics in its present form is rooted in and largely dominated by Western culture, which often brings conflict of interest especially when there is international collaborative biomedical research.

This is largely influenced by the Western technological advancement and creations of the developed world in comparison to the developing world. Global bioethics emphasis is on the autonomy, freedom, and moral inclination of the individual contrary to under developed countries conception.

The mainstream bioethical frameworks are not sufficiently sensitive to cultural realities in issues of health and health care in African setting. Unlike the Western world, in a cultural African setting, people do not just make their ethical decisions based on autonomy, justice beneficence, no maleficence, but also on cultural notions of personhood, health, illness, community, death, dying, and religious beliefs. But some multicultural countries, the peculiarities of culture, ethnicity, and language differences are what make biomedical care and ethics a unique experience for individual.

Educators, religious leaders, and parents must see themselves as moral models for children and they must behave accordingly. It therefore follows that adults in the society should live above board by living as good examples for the younger generation to follow. Educators, religious and parents must create a moral community in the classroom, home and religious centres, one in which children are involved in decision-making and the rights and responsibilities of all are upheld. In such an environment, moral discipline fosters fairness and opportunities for moral reasoning and self-control.

The moral dilemma—a critical thinking approach—acknowledges that preaching and lecturing won't work. In the early 1920's, John Dewey developed a theory of moral education, which emphasized reflective and critical thinking rather than didactic moral lessons. Dewey's theory has been developed in recent years by Kohlberg in the area of moral education. The theory holds that youngsters need training and directed practice in resolving moral dilemmas and that with the skills learned, young people will become more capable of applying these skills to real-life situations and choosing the appropriate path of behaviour. Consequently, the view in this connection is that bioethics should be, contextual, pluralistic and respect for cultural diversity. The four bioethics principles; autonomy, justice, beneficence, and no maleficence if followed and obeyed is good. Generally speaking

everybody will agree that autonomy is good, that justice is good, that it is good to do well, and that it is good not to inflict harm.

However, what constitutes the good in various circumstances cannot be universalized because communities have different understanding of what is “good” hence the need for each community’s bioethics framework and principles. The idea of community autonomy, according to Black and Mooney is that the community's elected or appointed representative authority has the power to make choices. The community can draw upon its own values and goals in making decisions. The individual is important in moral deliberations, but references are made not only to the individual but also to the community.

What are considered good are those things that enhance the welfare of the people. In other words, in issues concerning health research, the community, or its designated authority, determines the common needs and interests, what levels of morbidity and mortality are acceptable, and how to go about making public health changes.

This justice framework is often regarded as Solidarity, which is derived from Bentham's Principle of Utility which holds that in making ethical choices, the action taken should provide the greatest utility, in this case health, to the greatest number of people. The principle depends on the equity, community autonomy, and paternalism. Specifically, solidarity incorporates the notions of preventing bad health, promoting social justice, working with its community mandate.

The bioethics believes in the philosophy of “do good and cause no harm”. However, causing no harm may mean different thing to different society and people. While the use of stem cells or embryo for any form of clinical or research work is regarded as sin in most religious society, the western world may see no problem with that as far as the use is for the benefit to the society.

Some culture sees diseases and illness as spiritually determined while some see it, as a result, of unhealthy social interactions within our environment. Family values and communal living often deny individual ability to make a decision concerning his or her health matters. It is important to establish should have a bioethics framework that is internally consistent based on basic moral sense with reference to worldview that will embrace a middle-ground to accommodate the pluralistic society that we live in today.

The communal living respect for life, respect for personhood, solidarity and justice are the hallmark of bioethics that is bioethics of common morality and not individual morality. Consensus need not be substantive, individual should be fully aware of their responsibility and obligations not only towards the family and community in general but also to oneself.

Notwithstanding, it is a must to adapt a bioethics framework that takes cognizance of their cultural peculiarity and still become relevant in the global world. The global world should also not fail to recognize that the family and community are the most important aspects of one's social identity.

As a result, the global bioethics, therefore, requires the acknowledgement of different cultural realities seen in different communities. Culture should therefore be respected without compromising key moral values, while conception of bioethics as dialogue process and not as set of principles that must be followed should be maintained.

References

- Aramesh K. Cultural diversity and bioethics. A supplementary issue on Bioethics. *Iranian J Publ Health*. 2008;37:28–30.
- Black M, Mooney G. Equity in health care from a communitarian standpoint. *Health Care Anal*. 2002;10:193–208.
- Kohlberg L 1969. Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive Developmental Approach To Socialization. In: D Goslin (Ed.): *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. Skokie, Rand McNally, pp. 347-480.
- Takala T. The right to genetic ignorance confirmed. *Bioethics*. 1999;13:288–93.
- Piaget J 1965. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*, New York, Free Press. Santrock 1996)
- Smetana JG (1995) *Morality in Context: Abstractions, Ambiguities, And Applications*, In: R Vasta (Ed.): *Annals of Child Development*, 10: 83-130, London: Jessica Kinglsey.