

College life vs

Business



When looking at morality several factors come into play. Foremost the definition that is applicable worldwide defines morality in the context of the character, behavior or manners. Morality is viewed in the perspective of the actions undertaken by individual(s) in the way that distinguishes the decisions, the motives and the conduct between those perceived to be good or right and wrong or bad (Superson, 126; 129; 133). The moral code can be viewed in the context of the philosophical, cultural or religious way and the moral can be any teaching, believes and practices within or defined in the moral code.

Open opposition to the moral code is believed to result in immorality whereas ignorance or lack of awareness, the disbelief on nay moral principles and codes results in amorality. The moral code is categorically guided by two broad principles meanings. In the descriptive sense morality can be looked at as the cultural or individual (personal) values, social mores or the code of contact that differentiates between wrong and right in a given society (Superson, 144; 147). In this context, when one attempts to describe wrong or right, it should not be objective but it should stick to what is referred to by the people in that set up as right or wrong actions. Though the clear boundary of right and wrong cannot be demarcated easily, the bases of such belives are based on hatred, prejudice or potential ignorance (Albrecht, 277). And such kind of meanings can only be addressed well in the bigger case of descriptive ethics.

The normative sense of morality distinguishes clearly what is right and wrong directly without taking into account another person`s opinion. This can be looked as the ideal situation in moral terms in a given situation. The

definite nature of this argument makes it a more commanding terminology especially when one is to make a ruling or offer his judgment in a given situation whether an act is morally right or morally unacceptable. The argument gets backing from moral realism and often resisted by the moral skepticism believers. In moral realism there is belief and acceptance of truth is acceptable.

The case in hand is the moral code of our institution that required that all students stay in school dormitory during the freshman year. Though a lot of debate worldwide has tried to challenge the basis of such an incidence, I found it more humiliating situation to go through such a system. In any system there are rules and regulation and most of the old school institution are believed to still operate under the iron hand regulation that was mainly aimed at streamlining those who may have a different opinion about certain things in the system. Most organizations subscribe to an information system that minimizes resistance. It is a well documented argument that most of the old establishments and institutions can be described to be closed systems in such a way that they rarely open up to challenges that time and age brings along. In fact the advent of information technology and the rate at which information flows has led most of this institutions tightening the regulations to ensure their code of contact is protected.

Having an open system allows the organization or institutional set up to be open to the dynamism that the changes in the global sector bring about. Though protecting ones core values may be considered essential, an absolute closed mindset may likely to limit the possibilities that the individuals or the society can explore in its attempt to serve the people`s

<https://assignbuster.com/college-life-vs/>

interest or the individual interest. The aspect of globalization has challenged the individual ideology to look beyond the boundary of self. The religious, economic and even educational boundaries have to be able to leave in harmony in now ever reducing boundaries as the world strive to attain the global village. Education system that is basing the argument of the moral code on the believes of the founders of the institutions may find it challenging to operate in current age and time (Chapouthier, 187). Most of the founders may have their own believes and norms that they hoped to pass on to the generation after them.

The same argument can be seen as the basis where renowned institutions such as Yale still insist that the freshman must stay in the university dormitory during their first year. The basis for such may be justified then which would probably be to ensure that the students are accustomed to the norms and believes of the institution. The moral code might have had a good foundation but the loop holes that such a system exposes the students to may not be justifiable now and especially after the outcry by most of the graduates of the institution. In one of the responds to the editor of one of the newspaper in 2007, Richard H. Brodhead the dean of the college in Yale gave the following as the justification for the rule he stated that the requirement was aimed at embodying the institutional belief to students that will enable them live with others and be able to work together in their education. The dean also argued that allowing students to live away from the other college mates will be like robbing other students the chance to learn who they are and the need for respecting their conviction.

Though the reactions offer some valid arguments, the issue of changes result in developments in almost all aspects of human life will not be hold constant at this case. By the time the student gets to the undergraduate level, it is assumed that he or she must be mature enough to make concrete choices on what he or she really wants. They are also assumed to be able to make judgments on what they want in life. Such stringent rules are not only seen as obsolete but they are to an extent seen as an infringement onto ones rights. It is essential for the institution to look for ways to be able to maintain and achieve the initial goals of the institution without locking the students with no options to exercise their fundamental right of making concrete choices and decisions that they can be accountable for in the present and the future. Though the moral code is well defined on the outside, the experiences reported by those who have been through the system bemoan of the reverse roles.

Each individual has his or her own obligation in what they want in life. The set up practiced in institutions such as Yale is likely to expose the innocent minds into trauma that is likely to change their life forever. Taking an example of an “innocent” kind fresh from high that can pass the test of moral uprightness. The kid is lucky to join the school and possible ends up having a roommate who has been wishing for the chance to enjoy the freedom of being alone. The morally upright kid is most likely to be affected by the acts of a roommate who will do all kinds of things in the name of freedom.

In this camps and times is when the first se escapade is reported. This is the time the kids have a chance to experiment on all kind of nasty things they

<https://assignbuster.com/college-life-vs/>

have been hearing or have been considered in the compound of their parents. This is the avenue where the cult minds are developed and nurtured. These camps help in breeding and promoted some unethical manners that can only be kept as a secret with an attempt to protect the members or the institution. I am of the opinion that the institution may be right on its demand but the system in place is overwhelmed by the challenges that the repercussions resultants from certain behaviors may yield.

It will be prudent for the systems to explore other merit able mechanism such as training the students on the moral responsibility and the essentials of choices rather than attempting to lockup the trouble in the locker. Though it is argued that we are social beings, there are limitations to which we can constructively learn and share with one another. The difference in humanity can never be reconciled neither do we expects the possibility of the individuals to accommodate the varying views of all the people in the system