INTRODUCTION

"Earth provides enough to satisfy everyman’s need, but not everyman’s greed."

Mahatma Gandhi

In today’s world we face a range of environmental problem, such as global warming, ozone layer depletion, deforestation and reduction in biodiversity etc. The continuing deletion of natural resources, deforestation and extinction of many plant and animal species, rise in global temperature and environmental pollution are few examples of environmental degradation. The problems caused by the reduction of biodiversity are regarded as some of the greatest challenges facing humanity today.

Human is only one of the millions of species existing on earth. At the same time, human is exploiting species and the nature to the extent that nobody will escape from the harm caused out of the greedy grabbing. Human demands are never ending. Everyone is looking to fulfill his or her needs but most are fulfilling it at the cost of degradation of our nature. Even we are not thinking about the living beings living around us. We are fulfilling our endless needs meanwhile we are ignoring the right and wrong, good and bad about environment. The today’s good for us may convert the whole environment into bad in the future e.g. the extreme environmental PRALAYA of Uttarakhand. The good and bad, write and wrong are the major part of Philosophy and comes under ethics and if it is related with environment it is known as environmental ethics.

According to Bunnin and James (2003) Environmental ethics is theory and practice about appropriate concern for, values in, and duties regarding the natural world. By classical accounts, ethics is people relating to people in justice and love.

Environmental ethics is a diversified discourse. In modern society, it comprises four schools of thought: enlightened (or weak) anthropocentrism, animal liberation/rights theory, biocentrism and ecocentrism. Diversity implies divergence and difference.

Looking forward, only a synergistic environmental ethics that totally adopts and embraces these four environmental ethical ideas is promising. It should retain the necessary intensity and balance between anthropocentrism, animal liberation/rights theory, biocentrism and ecocentrism, and pay enough attention to the wisdom and limitations of each. The 1960s and 1970s witnessed an ecological crisis brought about by industrial civilization. This crisis was composed of environmental pollution (such as air pollution, water pollution, soil pollution, toxic chemical pollution, solid waste pollution), resource shortages (such as shortages of energy, cultivated land, minerals and fresh water) and ecological imbalances (such as the rapid decrease of forest and biodiversity, the rapid growth of population and the desertification of land the world over). The gloomy prospects of such a situation was a major concern for many people then. Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962) revealed the life-threatening nature of chemical pesticides and questioned the dominating concept of conquering nature. Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* (1968) brought to light the pressures that the population explosion put on nature. The series of reports documented by the Club of Rome, especially its first report, *Limits to Growth* (Meadows et al., 1972), sounded a warning against the myth of limitless growth. Earth Day was born in 1970, with more than two million people in the United States demonstrating against pollution and championing the earth. In the same year, Greenpeace launched its campaign against nuclear weapons and in favour of the environment. The first United Nations environmental conference was held in Stockholm in 1972, which symbolized the universal awakening of environmental consciousness worldwide. The pace of establishing national and international laws concerning environmental protection was dramatically accelerated during the years that followed. (Tongjin Young,2006)

These events paved the way for the birth of environmental ethics. Three pioneering papers on environmental ethics appeared in 1973. The Australian philosopher Richard Routley's paper, 'Is there a need for a new, an environmental ethic?', initiated the modern project of constructing environmental ethics. Peter Singer's 'Animal liberation' opened a new chapter of the animal ethics and animal rights movement. And the Norwegian deep ecologist Arne Naess's article, 'The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement', widened the scope of environmental ethics. With the publication of American philosopher Holmes Rolston’s milestone paper, ‘Is there an ecological ethic?’ in the mainstream academic journal *Ethics* in 1975, and the launching of the academic journal *Environmental Ethics* in 1979, environmental ethics as a sub-discipline of philosophy was firmly established. (Tongjin
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:
A Study of Environmental Ethics of Pupil Teachers of Self Finance Colleges.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:
Every human being has the right to decent life but today there are elements in our environment that tend to militate against the attainment and enjoyment of such a life. The exacurbation of the pollution of environment can cause untold misery. Unhappiness and suffering to human being crop up, simply because of our lack of concern for the common good and the absence of sense of responsibility and ethics for sustaining a balanced eco-system. If we are to aspire to a better quality of life – one which will ensure freedom from want, from disease and from fear itself, then we must all join hands to stem the increasing toxification of this earth.

What we need in order to defuse this environmental time bomb is immediate concerted action of all the people, but such needed action will come only if we reorient such citizenry values, i.e., imbibe them with proper attitudes and values (ethics), specifically those that will lead to a greater concern for preserving balance in the ecosystem, besides teaching them how to save the environment from further degradation, and to help, make it more healthful and progressive place to live in, springs from a strong sense of social responsibility. Hence, it becomes obligatory on the part of each individual citizen to develop environmental ethics that, while we aspire for the good life, we should not sacrifice the future of the generation to come.

Overcoming the global environmental crisis depends ultimately on how humankind’s values, attitudes and behaviours change. Education is the only medium to build values, proper attitude and behavioural changes. As at present time we all are facing a lot of environmental problems so it is very necessary to train our teachers with perfection of environmental values. Environmental ethics teachers bear a responsibility to propagate the ideas of environmental ethics in the growing siblings. It is extremely important to deepen teachers understanding of environmental issues and to improve their skills in teaching environmental ethics. So this study will not only help to know the level of environmental ethics of our pupil teachers, it will also help to develop a new insight about the environmental ethics and will focus on their weak areas related with environment. This will not be only to assess the existing social responsibility and environmental ethics of individual, but also to modify and develop the ethics in case of lack of concern and ethics towards environment among individuals and society collectively.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:
The major objectives of the present investigation were as under:-

- To compare the Environmental ethics of rural and urban pupil teachers.
- To compare the Environmental ethics of male and female pupil teachers.
- To compare the Environmental ethics of art and science stream pupil teachers.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES:
H1 There is no significant difference in environmental ethics of pupil teachers of self finance colleges on the bases of their social belongingness.

H2 There is no significant difference in environmental ethics of pupil teachers of self finance colleges on the bases of their gender.

H3 There is no significant difference in environmental ethics of pupil teachers of self finance colleges on the bases of their academic stream.

DEFINITION OF THE VARIABLES USED IN THE STUDY:
Environmental Ethics: Environmental ethics are rules of conduct or principles recognized in respect to treatment of our surroundings, especially natural environment.

Pupil Teachers: Pupil teachers are the students of teacher training colleges who takes training to be a teacher.

Self finance college: Colleges conducting courses with the help of their own finance management.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:
The problem was very vast and widespread. Because of some limitations like time, resource and labour etc. investigators had delimited it on specified area of investigation as:-

- The present study was conducted only in self finance teachers training institutes of Nainital district and in Udham Singh nagar district of Uttarakhand.
- The study was conducted on pupil teachers of academic session 2013 only.
- Only Environmental ethics was measured in present study.

RESEARCH METHOD:
In the present investigation the normative survey research method was used.

POPULATION:
All the pupil teachers studying in the self finance colleges of Nainital and Udham Singh Nagar districts of Uttarakhand were considered as population of the present study.

SAMPLING AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES:
Researcher adopted random sampling technique and selected four different B.Ed. colleges from Nainital and Udham Singh Nagar districts and total 244 pupil teachers were selected as sample from all four colleges.

RESEARCH TOOL:
Researcher selected Environmental ethics scale (EES) for this study developed by Dr. (Mrs.) Haseen Taj, Assistant Professor, Department Of Education, Bangalore University, Bangalde.

STATISTICAL DEVICE USED:
To analyse data, Mean, Median, Standard Deviation, Skewness, Kurtosis and t-test had been used.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:
The collected data were scored, tabulated and analyzed with the help of t-test in the light of the objectives of the study. The presentation is also made by hypothesis-wise in the preceding paragraph as under.

Table 1
Mean environmental ethics score of rural and urban pupil-teacher of self finance colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>119.50</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>121.10</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data mentioned in the table 1 show that the pupil-teachers of rural and urban areas studying in self-finance colleges did not differ significantly on their environmental ethics mean scores. Thus on the basis of rural and urban background both the sample groups were found almost similar in their environmental ethics mean scores (t-value = 1.46).

The rural and urban pupil-teachers studying in self-finance colleges were at least graduate in their academic stream and studied environmental education as a separate paper in graduation. This might helped them to develop an appropriate level of environmental ethics. That’s why they were found almost...
similar in their environmental ethics.

Thus the null hypothesis; H1 “There is no significant difference in environmental ethics of the pupil-teachers on the bases of their social belongingness” was accepted.

Table 2
Mean environmental ethics scores of male and female pupil-teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>120.86</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117.11</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data mentioned in the table 2 show that the female pupil teachers were found inferior to their environmental ethics mean scores than the male pupil teachers. The difference was found statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance (t-value =2.57).

The role of female is very different in our society in comparison to male human beings. They differ from males in their cultural aspects, social aspects, emotional aspects etc. These all aspects may come together and bring females to more closer and attached to their natural environment, e.g. water, land & forest (JAL, JAMEEN & JANGAL) in comparison to males. This kind of close association with their natural environment might helped them to develop more practical knowledge about environment and developed better level of environmental ethics. That’s why the female pupil-teachers were found almost higher in their mean environmental ethics score.

Thus the null hypothesis; H02 “There is no significant difference of environmental ethics in the pupil-teachers of self finance colleges on the basis of their gender” was rejected.

Table 3
Mean environmental ethics scores of art and science stream Pupil-teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>119.11</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>122.74</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented in the table reveal that science pupil-teachers were found superior in their mean environmental ethics score than art stream pupil-teachers. The difference was found statistically significant at 0.01 level of significance (t= 3.33).

Science stream pupil-teachers are might be very much attached with their environment because of their subjects like botany, zoology, geology, chemistry etc. and can understand the environmental phenomenon more perfectly than the art academic stream pupil-teachers. That’s why they were found superior in their mean environmental ethics score.

Thus the null hypothesis; H3 “There is no significant difference in environmental ethics of the pupil teachers of self finance colleges on the bases of their academic stream” was rejected.

5.1 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION:

In the present investigation investigators studied environmental ethics of pupil teachers of self finance colleges of Nainital and US Nagar districts on the bases some variables like gender, social belongingness and academic stream. The data were scored, tabulated, analyzed and hypotheses were tested. The statistical analysis of the data provided the following findings and conclusions-

Rural and urban pupil-teachers were found almost similar in their environmental ethics.

Female pupil-teachers were found superior in their environmental ethics than male pupil teachers.

Science pupil teachers were found very superior in their environmental ethics than art pupil teachers.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY:
The possible implications of this study are as follows-

1. For policy makers:- The findings of this study will help to policy makers of this field at various points:- (i)- In the development of curriculum. (ii)- To determine the focus area of teaching of environmental education in teacher training colleges.

2. For society:- In respect to the awareness about environmental ethics this study will be very helpful for the society.

3. For researchers:- Findings of this study will be very helpful for the researcher of this field specially in context of limiting the area of research and identifying the problem.

4. The findings of this study will help to teacher educators of teacher training colleges to maintain a balance of environmental ethics among pupil teachers.
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