

THE MORAL DIMENSIONS OF TEACHER STUDENT INTERACTIONS IN MALAYSIAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Thomas Barone (PhD.)
Northern Illinois University

Abstrak *Kajian ini bertujuan melihat pandangan pelajar di sekolah menengah di Malaysia terhadap nilai yang diterima masyarakat. Satu soal selidik telah diedarkan kepada 400 orang remaja untuk mengukur tahap penerimaan pelajar terhadap nilai yang diterima umum. Hasil kajian menunjukkan pelajar memang mengikut norma yang ditentukan masyarakat. Untuk meningkatkan pemahaman terhadap dimensi moral di sekolah, kaedah temubual juga dibuat dengan guru-guru dan pelajar. Hasil kajian keseluruhannya menunjukkan bahawa pelajar-pelajar mempunyai pandangan bahawa undang-undang yang ketat di sekolah tidak membantu pihak sekolah dalam membentuk nilai-nilai moral yang hendak diketengahkan. Kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa nilai-nilai seperti hormat menghormati dan keadilan adalah penting di dalam membina hubungan antara pelajar dan guru di Malaysia. Oleh yang demikian penggubal dasar perlu menitik beratkan peranan pelajar sebagai agen pembentuk nilai.*

INTRODUCTION

The centralized Malaysian educational system teaches values throughout primary and secondary schools to non-muslim students through Moral Education classes and to muslim students through Islamic Education classes. In addition to Moral Education and Islamic Education classes, values are taught across the curriculum and promoted in school activities and assemblies. Given the increase and severity of incidents of school vandalism in Malaysia in recent years (e.g.- fires set at schools by students), there have been calls by educational policymakers for schools to do more in terms of discipline and teaching moral values. This is similar to calls made by character educators in the United States to increase the moral influence schools have in education (Lickona, 1991).

This study addresses several issues regarding the moral dimensions of schooling in Malaysia including the adherence to social norms by Malaysian secondary school students and the ways that students and teachers perceive rule following in school. Furthermore, students were interviewed to gain insight into their perceptions of moral education class, the teacher's role as moral agent and influences in moral dilemma situations. By focusing on the perceptions of teachers and students, this study provides data on a neglected area of moral education research in Malaysia. The need to interview teachers has been addressed by Hayhoe who states that "what bears study is the perceptions of teachers about their responsibilities towards students in the arena of fostering values, the pedagogies and relationships they develop in order to carry out their task, and the difficulties they face as they build bridges between the relatively safe and sheltered world of the classroom and that of the wider society" (Hayhoe, 1997:108). In addition, the perceptions of adolescents regarding the moral implications of rule following and their views on the moral dimensions of schooling show students as active constructors of moral meaning.

Like Youniss & Yates (1999), this study disagrees with early socialization studies that viewed teachers as passive transmitters of values and students as passive receptors. In contrast, this study gives "voice" to students and teachers as moral agents and attempts to discover how teachers view their roles as moral agents and how students actively construct meaning in their interaction with teachers. In addition to discussing student perceptions of moral education class and teacher's as moral agents, this study attempts to depict features of the

hidden curriculum especially the implicit elements of rules, conduct and values that operate in teacher/student interactions. The hidden curriculum of moral education is essential since value laden verbal exchanges and the elements of classroom interaction where students "learn" ideas of fairness and justice (Purpel & Ryan, 1976). This study has implications for Malaysian educators and policymakers when they think of ways to foster internalization of values and ways to improve educational policy.

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study was collected in 1996 via semi-structured interviews conducted with three Form IV teachers and six Form IV students in three coeducational, racially diverse public schools in Kuala Lumpur (1 male and 1 female student for each of the three major races in Malaysia). To ensure comprehensibility, interviews were conducted in English with students identified by teachers and/or administrators as above average in English ability.

In addition to the interviews, a values/behavior questionnaire was given to approximately 400 students in the three schools. It was designed to measure elements of adolescent moral socialization especially student adherence to social norms and was adapted from Ban and Cummings (1997; 1999) by Barone (1998). However, this study extends the work of Ban (1995) and Ban and Cummings (1997; 1999) by incorporating new questionnaire items and qualitative data on rule following and the views Malaysian adolescents have of the moral aspects of schooling. In order to ensure comprehension of the questionnaire, two officers from the Ministry of Education translated it independently into Malay and these translations checked for accuracy. The interview data and student questionnaire data provided valuable insights into the teacher's role as values educator, rule following, and influences on students in moral decision-making.¹

RESULTS

A. MORAL EDUCATION CLASS & THE TEACHER'S ROLE AS VALUES EDUCATOR

In recent years, Moral Education has become a subject that is tested during the school year and students must sit for a national Moral Education exam at the end of Form V. According to Ministry of Education guidelines, all teachers *should* be teaching the prescribed values across the curriculum. The Form IV students interviewed had definite ideas about Moral Education class and two major themes arose from the data. Moral Education class was seen as useful since students said it was important to know right from wrong in daily life. However, two students thought Moral Education class was boring since they claimed to have learned the same thing since primary school.

One Moral Education teacher, Ms. Tong, said that she liked teaching Moral Education and understood its importance:

Ms. Tong: I hope the students will kind of build up their values so that when they do things they do it morally according to our values. They don't go against the school rule, for example. Most of all is how they behave in their daily life. That is more important than passing an examination.

The students spoke of this dichotomy conflict directly.

Michael: Basically we have the moral paper (SPM) here in Malaysia, so if this student does not behave himself but he wishes to pass his exam, so no matter what, he has to lie on the paper.

¹Malaysian data is part of a larger study of Malaysian and American students conducted by Barone (1998)

Raj: Students who score 100 in the subject may not be behaving and get into trouble...It's not what you think, you're thinking about what they want.

Malaysian teachers also felt that infusing moral values across the curriculum was part of their role although in practice this was not always done. Two teachers taught values directly as part of their curriculum while a third said that she did not due to a perceived lack of time and a stress on exam preparation in the Malaysian system. The Social Studies teacher, Mr. Nair, explained how he actively taught the values by using Malaysian heroes.

Mr. Nair: In history, responsibility like the first Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, he had the responsibility to gain independence...he gave the impetus to be self-reliant and have respect for the country. So we respect our elders, through history we learn that...Indirectly through the historical events...the values we're trying to put the values in all the subjects.

The Moral Education teacher seemed to fully grasp the significance and difficulty of what she was trying to do and stressed the following as crucial:

Ms. Tong: If you have the character only you can teach. The teacher has to set examples of proper behaviour...I think the most important thing is the teacher has to show the example. I mean all teachers have to be examples.

Without a proper relationship between student and teacher in the classroom, the teaching of values is fraught with difficulties. Ms. Kok stated that even though she said she had no time to teach values directly due to curricular constraints, she believed she had an informal role to play.

Ms. Kok: I think that what we can do is treat the student like a friend...I've got a good relationship between me and students because the last two years, I've handled a good class...so I've got a good relationship with them so they don't treat me as a teacher, they treat me as a friend.... This is the chance and the way that the teachers can teach them moral education...we can advise them like that as a friend and not as a teacher, so that maybe they can accept.

Similarly, Ms. Tong believed that this informal role was vital for breaking down the distance between teacher and student.

Ms. Tong: That's why I always like to walk in the class and be with the students rather than standing in front of them...when they do their work, I like to join them... I like them to treat me as someone older than them trying to share something with them like a sister.

B. VIEWS OF GOOD AND BAD TEACHING

Students were also concerned about the manner of the teacher as a critical factor in school life and good teaching was viewed as implicit values education. Students seemed to be concerned about the quality of their teachers and gave examples of good teachers.

Raj: OK, my former teacher, she understands more about the students, what the students like to do and how they want to do it, more group work.

Tracy: What I mean is that the previous teacher maybe she is experienced a lot and she tells us something, we usually don't get confused... She follows what we have to learn like after an exam, she knows what we're weak in and she'll explain it to us.

Bad teaching also has moral implications and students talked of the manner of teachers who did not respect them as individuals or listen to their comments about class.

Raj: The new teacher she goes on only but she doesn't ask our opinion about how the class should be, what are the things we like to do in our Moral Education class... Last year there was a problem in this school where the students didn't like a teacher and they complained...for the first two months the teacher would be always coming in and scolding us, saying we're egoistic and we think we're the smartest guys in school.

1. Justice and Fairness

Finally, the students (like many adolescents) seemed to be very aware of issues of justice and fairness. However, infractions by teachers were viewed by these students as serious breaches in conduct by teachers that in turn undermined their moral influence and the trust students had in them.

Michael: Some teachers, let's say, this student is smart. Some teachers will only like that particular student...even if the student does something wrong, the teacher will forgive him easily...Most of the teachers are treating fair but some of them are not.

Tracy: For the bad students, when they try to change...they say this student must have copied their homework from the good students. They don't put trust in the students.

For example, one student seemed to be having problems with one teacher in particular and, in her view, fairness was at the root of the problem.

DY: Like she's done a mistake in my attendance book, but I still keep quiet. I went to see her and she says she'll do something...but she still hasn't done anything...I don't trust teachers at all. They can do whatever they want; they misuse their power... Some strict teachers like you're not cheating but she suspects you're cheating. She doesn't bother to check you...she'll minus ten points on the paper.

2. Friendly vs. Strict Teachers/ Praising vs. Scolding

Fairness was also related to the idea of the teacher's manner and how students perceived their teachers. Students highly regarded teachers that they perceive were fair, praised students, and were friendly. Due to the heavy emphasis on rule following, students were clearly "looking for" friendly teachers and ones they felt they could relate to personally. In contrast, students did not seem to like strict teachers who used too much scolding.

Raj: Someone who could really talk to the students, who could get in touch with their problems...if they could interact with students, they would be a better teacher.

Michael: Well, I think it's better to be friendly, to understand the students rather than to be strict and to force them to do something that they do not like to do.

Tracy: When the strict teacher goes into class everyone will keep their mouth shut and pay attention but it must be forced. But when a friendly teacher goes in we can chat with the teacher and they're not afraid they can ask any question. So with the subjects you can understand more.

DY: I loved his teaching. I mean he doesn't scold us all the time. He comes and shakes hands with you and says very good. I mean he praises you.

Although teacher praise was stressed in the interviews, according to the values/behavior questionnaire results, it seems that Malaysian students are neither praised nor scolded very much. In responding to the frequency of scolding and praising in the last week, "not even once" was the dominant answer for both questions (praising-N=377; scolding-N=391).

Teachers were concerned with their day to day relationships they had with their students and the Moral Education teacher especially saw scolding as something that interfered with the class atmosphere she wanted saying that "it kind of builds up a gap between the students and the teacher, I don't like that to happen in my class". She elaborated on how she deals with behavior problems.

Ms. Tong: There are students who try to do other work in the class, so I don't shout at them. What I do is go near them at the time...I prefer that way rather than when you take up ten minutes scolding them.

Ms. Kok seemed like two different people when talking about two different classes and her relationship with them.

Ms. Kok: I've got a good relationship between me and students because the last two years I've handled a good class...they don't treat me as a teacher, they treat me as a friend...this is the chance and the way that the teacher can teach moral education.

However, when describing the behaviour of "weak" students in class she seemed to change dramatically.

Ms. Kok: When we are teaching the class, what they are doing, they are sleeping, they are talking to each other...what is the responsibility of them, they have to study hard or respect teachers, no.

C. RULE COMPLIANCE IN SCHOOL

The values/behaviour questionnaire also examined other aspects of the teacher's role as a moral influence (see appendix, table A). One question dealt with the amount that teachers "taught" morality through class exhortations on proper behaviour. In examining the overall data, more than sixty percent of students answered always or often to 10 of the 12 statements. These statements show that teachers overall in Malaysia are concerned with inculcating rule following behaviour by teaching the values of self-reliance, respect, responsibility, cooperation, honesty, and diligence. However, there seems to be less stress placed on listening when another student is talking and accepting the differences of others.

The Malaysian schools studied stressed conformity to rules and the penalties for breaking rules were similar in the three schools. Students knew if they broke a formal rule there would be consequences based on the severity of the infraction. Punishments for breaking minor school rules (e.g.-coming late to school, uniform violations) ranged from getting demerits to taking extra classes while the penalty for breaking major rules (e.g.-smoking) was more serious. However, students could also get merits if they did something well in the school or helped the teacher. A major concern among administrators seemed to be violations in school uniforms. This was explained by an Assistant Principal as discouraging individualism and encouraging conformity among the students.

The primary question dealing with adherence to value based social norms was question 12 from the values/behaviour questionnaire (see appendix, Table B). The question was composed of school social norms based on eleven of the values found in the moral education syllabus (items approved of by officers at Institut Aminuddin Baki). First, the data supports the idea that the majority of the values identified above are "accepted" by Malaysian students in that they indicate a high level of agreement with positive norms and a low level of

agreement with negative norms. Specifically, the strongest results in terms of conformity were found to be associated with the following values: respect, love, justice, courage, honesty, cooperation, rationality and public spiritedness. On the other hand, the social norms associated with the values of diligence, compassion, and self-reliance was not strongly supported by the data.

The prefect system uses exemplary students to serve as class leaders and help enforce the rules of the school. Two of the prefects interviewed described their role as follows:

Michael: *Well, basically I have to make sure that everybody follows the school rules, keep up with them, and see how they actually behave.*

Raj: *As a prefect, I'm supposed to take care of the discipline of the school especially a certain group.*

Prefects generally reported infractions to the discipline teacher who would either send the student for counseling or administer a prescribed punishment. According to Michael, discipline teachers "are supposed to take action for students that did something wrong and does not obey the school rules". The Malay students also stressed the importance of following religious rules that are a part of their school and home socialization. The Moral Education teacher stressed the importance of the home environment.

Ms. Tong: *There's not much difference whether it's art or science stream...if the student's background is very stable, they have caring parents and so on, they kind of follow the rules very well.*

The students interviewed could clearly state the various rules that were broken by students from skipping class to smoking and fighting. However, since they seldom reported breaking rules, they speculated on why others broke rules.

Raj: *I don't understand why they want to do such things, but they find something, I don't know what in breaking the rules. They just like to break the rules.*

DY: *Some of them are proud to get in trouble... I mean they don't want to get in trouble but once they are in trouble they think they're superior to the others...oh, like you're so good!*

Finally, the Malaysian students interviewed felt a great deal of pressure to do well in school. Although Moral Education teaches honesty as one of the values, some students still cheated on exams. When asked why students cheat on exams, DY replied "they want to pass, that's all". Overall, it was difficult to gauge the extent of cheating since students and teachers disagreed on this issue.

D. MORAL DILEMMAS/SOURCES OF MORAL INFLUENCE

Another question on the values/behaviour questionnaire was where students go for advice when faced with a moral dilemma (this term was explained to ensure comprehension). Specifically, like Coles and Genevie (1990) in their American study, I was interested in where students went for advice when they had a problem and were not sure what was the right thing to do (see appendix, Table C).

What seems clear from these results is that "peer influence" does not seem to be a major influence with "sometimes" being the dominant answer. However, this contradicts the interview data; so it may be that this item does not adequately express the concept "peer influence". Also, Malaysian students seemed to be influenced by their teachers when making personal moral decisions. Based on the interviews, it seemed that certain good

teachers were sought out for advice on moral decisions while others were avoided. Finally, what appeared to be the major influence on issues involving questions of right and wrong were parents and religion.

A concern among educators interested in values education is student thinking when faced with a moral dilemma and what people in their lives are influences in moral decision-making. Specifically, I was concerned with whether or not peers or significant adults were more important influences when students were faced with personal problems. Malaysian schools set up structures that encourage students to seek help including peer counseling and counseling teachers. From the student data, there seemed to be a clear reluctance to go to teachers for advice about personal problems, but students said that they would approach teachers about school problems. Students said they normally go to their friends for advice, but some students also indicated a significant parental influence.

Michael: *I talk to my friends and normally my friends would counsel me.*

Maria: *I talk to my friends and my parents.*

Jeffri: *My parents...It depends what the problem is, if our friends can solve the problem for us, maybe.*

Raj: *I talk to my family, my teachers.*

DY: *Normally, I figure it out myself. I put the right and the wrong and the possibility of falling into trouble or not.... Then I go to my sister and ask her to help me out, then I'll go to my Mom.*

In order to further tap into the students' views on moral dilemmas, I asked them in situations involving moral problems how do they know what was the right thing to do. Malaysian adolescents seemed sophisticated in thinking about these issues and many of the students indicated that they were confident enough in some instances to make their own decisions although clearly they still looked to others if they had trouble making a decision.

Jeffri: *Maybe I will ask my parents, not only my parents, my Ugama teacher and ask them how to solve the problem I have. Maybe I will make my own decision if what they say is not suitable to me.*

Raj: *Normally I see what my choices are and I figure out what is best for me, the best for the situation and if I couldn't do that I go for help.*

Tracy: *I try to sort it out myself and then if I'm still confused I usually will tell my parents... I think of responsibility...sometimes when we do things we have to take it up ourselves, we can't rely on somebody and say that's not my fault*

E. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Students and teachers interviewed discussed their perceptions of the teacher's role as values educator, their views on good teaching, values and moral education. Regarding Moral Education, students and teachers felt that the class was useful for teaching core values and reinforcing concepts of right and wrong conduct. However, both students and teachers admitted that it was easy for the subject to be boring for students and that doing well

in Moral Education was different from behaving morally in life. Regarding values across the curriculum, some teachers infused values into their class lessons while others argued that they had no time to infuse values into lessons. The Moral Education teacher especially made it a point to try to break down barriers between student and teacher, disliked scolding students, and was aware she was a role model for students. It is critical for teachers to model appropriate behaviour since students learn ethical principles by imitating ethical principles (Mohd Noordin, 1995; 1996). Jackson (1986) refers to the teacher as role model as part of the transformative tradition in education.

Since teaching is characterized by unequal power relations, by accepting responsibility over education, teachers assume a moral responsibility (Daveney, 1973; Nyberg, 1990; Tom, 1984). Students characterized good teachers as having a mastery of craft, praising students, and treating students with justice and fairness. Fenstermacher (1992) describes this moral influence as the teacher's manner and the Form IV students interviewed seemed as concerned with teacher manner as with the formal curriculum. The students' emphasis on the implicit values of fairness and respect mirrors the findings of other researchers like Metz (1978) and Taylor (1996) who also found that these values were paramount in teacher/student interactions. Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen (1993) found that teachers and students are expected to be truthful and deal with issues of justice. Psychological research has shown that a teacher who is a positive role model can increase prosocial behavior more than the direct teaching of values (Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977). Likewise, Rutter et al (1979) in a study of British secondary schools has shown that a teacher who is a positive role model, sets high expectations and uses substantial praise can positively influence behavior. Finally, Malaysian students interviewed also agreed with the characteristics of good teachers cited in a literature review by Hargreaves (1972: 163) especially in regards to the dimensions of discipline, personality and instruction.

TEACHERS LIKED BY STUDENTS	
DISCIPLINE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Keeps good control- Fair- Gives no extreme punishments
INSTRUCTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Explains and helps- Gives interesting lessons
PERSONALITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Friendly- Takes an interest in pupils as individuals- Sense of humour

Rule following is essential for education but often the views of adolescents regarding rules are not examined; yet this issue has been shown to be a major concern of adolescents (Damon, 1983). Adolescence is a major concern of adolescents and this age is critical since students either achieve or withdraw and possibly fail by being alienated. Cotterell (1996) has found that school commitment for adolescents occurs when they identify with school groups and have positive perceptions of teachers and students. Lipsitz (1983) found in studies of successful secondary schools a concern with school as a caring community and the school structure as one that establishes continuity in adult child relations.

Many students interviewed (especially prefects) indicated that rules were important and had to be followed. The students expressed the conflict some students had about rules in that, despite the punishments, breaking rules could sometimes generate peer admiration. According to the results of the values/behaviour questionnaire, students felt that they were generally neither praised nor scolded much by teachers. Students also reported that teachers always or often express value-laden statements focusing on correct school behaviour. Finally, students reported a high level of conformity to social norms especially those related to the values of respect, love, justice, honesty, cooperation, rationality, and public spiritedness.

Another key theme from the student interviews was the idea that rules should be legitimate and not excessive. This is a potential area of concern for educators in that many students felt that there were too many conventional rules and some of them were viewed by students as unfair (esp. uniform policies). In their study on adolescents' conceptions of teacher authority, Smetana and Bitz (1996) found that students agreed that moral, conventional, and prudential issues were within the scope of teacher authority while personal issues were outside of this authority and more peer influenced. Leming (1985) in his review of research found that school environments that are authoritarian and undemocratic may increase student alienation. Furthermore, Malaysian studies conducted by Marimuthu (1986) and Amin Hussin (1978) found that excessive strictness and too many rigid school rules led to student indiscipline and truancy (cited in Nair, 1997).

Much school conformity has been viewed by researchers as instrumental and not necessarily due to internalization of norms and values (Hammersley & Tumer, 1980). However, judgment of what one "ought" to do can often create pressure to act in a certain way and influence behavior (Nisan, 1992). Therefore, compliance to school norms & values is also affected by the presence of external reinforcements and not only the internalization of values (a stated goal of Malaysian moral education). Furthermore, conformity without internalization can cause behavior accompanied by resentment or alienation (Etzioni, 1988). This type of internalized conformity results when a person accepts norms as their own and conformity is based on a belief that the behavior is right (Biddle, 1986). Discipline methods can help foster internalization by establishing behavioral expectations and helping students become sensitive to the effects of actions on others (Aronfreed, 1976; Hoffman, 1970). Although a detailed analysis of factors leading to internalization is beyond the scope of this research, student and teacher comments from this study and the literature seem to indicate that an autonomy supportive environment is beneficial and provides a context that encourages internalization. An autonomy supportive environment is one that treats students as human beings, provides a rationale for dull activities and emphasizes student choice. These conditions can make it possible for students to feel connected with others, satisfy the need for relatedness and be inclined to accept the values and rules of immediate groups and society (Deci, 1995).

A major study on the moral life of American students found that American school children act on moral beliefs, but not in a uniform way. In a national survey of moral values, 4th-12th grade children responded to over 90 questions dealing with moral issues. The results show that there are substantial differences in how children think about right and wrong. As children get older, there is an increase in utilitarian thinking and a decrease in reliance on traditional authorities. In his research, Coles found that many children turn away from adults as the primary source of advice on moral issues (58% of high school students rely on peers for moral guidance). In addition, the survey showed a willingness of children to cheat in school (65% of high school students said they would) (Coles & Genevie, 1990). Regarding moral dilemmas, 38% rely on traditional authorities while "the rest rely on either what makes them feel good, what works for them, or what would be the best for everybody involved" (Coles & Genevie, 1990:49).

Based on the results of the values/behaviour questionnaire, parents, religion, and teachers were major influences when students were faced with a moral dilemma. This differs from Coles & Genevie's work on American adolescents in that religion was less influential for American youth (due probably to the societal prominence of religion in Malaysia). Malaysian students interviewed stated that they would go to family and friends for advice on personal problems but also indicated the moral role of teachers. Over 75 percent said on the values/behaviour questionnaire that they thought of what their teachers had taught them about right and wrong in moral dilemma situations. Clearly, the formal nature of moral education plays a role in students' thinking of teachers as moral agents.

The prescriptive nature of moral education in Malaysia certainly creates a strong awareness of the importance of moral education among teachers and students. However, there are problems in its implication in that teachers indicate a lack of time to foster values across the curriculum, conventional school rules are viewed as too rigid by many students and the teaching and curriculum of moral education needs improvement. Overall, students indicate a high degree of conformity to values based social norms but seem concerned with student teacher interactions. Teachers were an influence in moral situations (although parents and religion were seen as more critical), but could do more to develop caring classroom situations (like the moral education teacher). Finally, the clear indication by students was that teachers were expected to conform to high standards of behaviour and the implicit values of fairness and respect were deemed most important in teacher/student interactions.

APPENDIX

Table A: Teacher's Role as Values Educator (%), N=392

	Always	Often	Sometimes
a. You should listen to your teachers	48.21	29.34	20.41
b. You should listen when another student is talking	23.39	25.45	37.28
c. You should take care of school property	48.08	29.92	17.39
d. You should be prepared for classes	39.29	30.10	23.21
e. You should be on time	43.40	25.89	24.62
f. You should work cooperatively with others	28.35	33.51	29.90
g. You should respect others	58.93	25.00	13.52
h. You should be responsible	59.03	26.46	11.96
i. You should be honest with others	45.99	27.91	21.71
j. You should accept the differences of others	21.82	24.42	36.10
k. You should do your best in school	38.14	27.32	28.09
l. You should turn in all assignments on time	51.65	31.81	12.47

Table B: Social Norms Based on Values (%), N=392

VALUE	Normative behavior	Always/ Often	Sometimes/ Never
Compassion	a. I like to learn about others' beliefs (+)	35.8	64.2
	cc. It is important to think of yourself (-)	79.7	20.3
Self-reliance	b. I come prepared for class with appropriate materials (+)	71.7	28.3
	bb. I decide on things myself and don't ask others advice (+)	33	67
Diligence	e. I talk to friends during class (-)	53.6	46.4
	g. I study hard for tests (+)	65.4	34.6
	r. I complete school work on time (+)	57	43
	s. I pass notes during class (-)	20	80
Respect	n. I feel I can contribute something positive (+)	71.2	28.8
	o. I behave politely to teachers (+)	81	19
	p. I am punctual in arriving to school and class (+)	81.1	18.9
	dd. I treat others as I would like to be treated (+)	69.5	30.5

Love	j. I am kind to other students (+)	75.3	24.7
	m. I am uncomfortable with people (-)	36.4	63.6
	aa. I take advantage of others (-)	11.1	88.9
Justice	k. I think all student should be treated equally (+)	80.7	19.3
	l. I follow school rules (+)	72.8	27.2
Courage	z. I am responsible for my actions (+)	86.2	13.8
	ee. I have the right to stand up for myself (+)	79.1	20.9
Honesty	d. I try to tell the truth (+)	79.5	20.5
	x. I copy from others during a test (-)	8.2	91.8
Cooperation	c. I do not work well with classmates (-)	33.2	66.8
	f. I prefer working by myself (-)	36.7	63.3
	t. I cooperate with others (+)	67.9	32.1
	u. I fight with peers in school (-)	18	82
Rationality	h. School rules should be explained to students (+)	68.7	31.3
	w. I feel that discussion of ideas is important (+)	65.1	34.9
	y. I like to go along with the group (-)	57.8	42.2
Public Spiritedness	l. I am proud of my school (+)	64.5	35.5
	v. It is important to take care of school property (+)	79.5	20.5

Table C: Moral Dilemmas Results (N=393)

Question	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. I think of what my friends would do in a similar situation	15.58	28.05	48.83	7.53
b. I think of what my teacher has taught me to be right	45.8	30.53	22.14	1.53
c. I think of the values learned in school and how to apply them	25.84	31.01	33.85	9.3
d. I think of what my parents have taught me to be right	57.44	23.85	17.44	1.28
e. I think of what my religion has taught me to be right	64.78	16.2	15.94	3.08

REFERENCES

- Aronfreed, J. (1976). Moral development from the standpoint of a general psychological theory. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behaviour* (54-69). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ban, T. (1995). The characteristic features of moral socialization: A comparison of Japanese and Australian children. *International Review of Education* 41(1-2), 73-96.
- Ban, T. and Cummings, W. (1997). Influential factors on moral behaviours of Japanese and American children. In *Patterns of Value Socialization in US Primary Schools: A Comparative Study*. Osaka: Osaka University.
- Ban, T. and Cummings, W. (1999). Moral orientations of schoolchildren in the United States and Japan. *Comparative Education Review* 43(1), 64-85.
- Barone, T. (1998). A comparative study of value perceptions and normative rule compliance of Malaysian and American secondary school students. (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 59(09): 3397A.
- Biddle, B. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 12, 67-92.
- Coles, R. and Genevie, L. (1990). The moral life of America's schoolchildren. *Teacher Magazine* 1(6), 42-49.
- Cotterell, J. (1996). *Social networks and social influences in adolescence*. Routledge: London.
- Damon, W. (1983). *Social and personality development*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Daveney, T.F. (1973). Education-A moral concept. In G. Langford and D.J. O'Connor (Eds.), *New Essays in the Philosophy of Education* (79-95). London: Robert Kreiger.
- Deci, E. (1995). *Why we do what we do?* New York: Grosset/Putnam.
- Etzioni, A. (1988). *The moral dimension*. New York: The Free Press.
- Fenstermacher, G. 1992. The concepts of method and manner in teaching. In F. Oser, A. Dick, and J. Patry (Eds.), *Effective and Responsible Teaching: The New Synthesis* (95-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hammersley, M. and Turner, R. (1980). Conformist pupils? In P. Woods (Ed.), *Pupil strategies* (29-49). London: Croom Helm.
- Hargreaves, A. (1972). *Interpersonal relations and education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hayhoe, R. (1997). Education as communication. In J. Montgomery (Ed.), *Values in education: Social capital formation in Asia and the Pacific* (93-111). Hollis, NH: Hollis Publishing Co.
- Hoffman, M. (1970). Conscience, personality, and socialization techniques. *Human Development* 13, 90-126.
- Jackson, P. (1986). *The practice of teaching*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Jackson, P., Boostrom, R., and Hansen, D. (1993). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Leming, J. (1985). School curriculum and social development in early adolescence. *Childhood Education*, 61 (4), 257-262.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Education for character: How schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Lipsitz, J. (1983). *Successful schools for young adolescents*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Metz, M.H. (1978). *Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mohd Noordin, W.Z. (1995, September). *An overview of values and ethics education*. Paper presented at the Regional Seminar on the Teaching of Values and Ethics in Schools for Asia and the Pacific: Realities, Reflections, and Expectations, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

- Mohd Noordin, W.Z. (1996, July). "Demoralising" moral education. Paper presented at APNIEVE Experts Meeting to Design Values Education at Teacher Training Level, Malacca, Malaysia.
- Mussen, P. and Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1977). *Roots of caring, sharing and helping: The development of prosocial behaviour in children*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Nair, M.V. (1997). *The perceptions of form IV students regarding factors thought to affect truant behaviour in secondary schools*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Houston-Institut Aminuddin Baki Twinning Program, Houston, Texas.
- Nisan, M. (1992). Beyond intrinsic motivation: Cultivating a "sense of the desirable". In F. Oser, A. Dick, and J. Patry (Eds.), *Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis* (126-138). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nyberg, D.A. (1990, Summer). Teaching values in school: The mirror and the lamp. *Teachers College Record* 91(4), 595-611.
- Purpel, D. and Ryan, K. (1976). It comes with the territory: The inevitability of moral education in the schools. In D. Purpel and K. Ryan (Eds.), *Moral education...It comes with the territory*. (44-54). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., and Ouston, J. (1979). *Fifteen Thousand Hours*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Smetana, J. and Bitz, B. (1996, June). Adolescents conceptions of teachers' authority and their relations to rule violations in school. *Child Development* 67: 1153-1172.
- Taylor, M. (1996). Voicing their values: Pupils' moral and cultural experience. In J.M. Halstead and M. Taylor (Eds.), *Values in education and education in values* (121-142). London: Falmer Press.
- Tom, A. (1984). *Teaching as a moral craft*. New York: Longman.
- Youniss, M. and Yates, J. (1999). *Roots of civic identity: International perspectives on community service and activism in youth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.