



Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies

ISSN: 2321-8819 (Online)
2348-7186 (Print)

Impact Factor: 1.498
Vol. 5, Issue 1, January 2017

Religion, Gender, Course and Ethnic Differences in Students' Ethical Awareness

Azizan bin Had^{a*} and Starry Garijih^b

Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge, University Malaysia Sabah,
Labuan International Campus, Sabah, Malaysia

^bMaster in Business Administration,
University Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

ABSTRACT: *The research tries to answer the question of 'does religion, education and social surroundings play a role in developing student's ethical behavior?' To understand more on the topic, I have surveyed students at the Labuan branch of University Malaysia Sabah in Malaysia, a public university where most of the students are taking a first degree in Business and Computer Studies. Using a survey questionnaire, I test five important hypotheses: whether ethical attitudes are affected by religiosity, religion, social life, university education and by what happens around them at home. The objective of the survey is to determine whether their awareness of ethical conducts is based on their religion, courses taken at the university or other external factors. The result of the survey will show whether ethical awareness is determined by internal factors such as religion and home education, or by external factors such as university and school education, courses taken at the university or their social life.*

Keyword: Ethics, Awareness, Students, Labuan, Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

The word ethics comes from the Greek word 'ethos' that means character or customs. As a branch of philosophy under axiology ethics can be defined as 'a set of moral behavior that develop over the years' (MacKinnon 2001:3). MacKinnon further elaborates that 'although the values may initially come from one's family upbringing, they later result in one's own choice'. If we are to accept the definition given by MacKinnon, we are to accept two other distinct elements in his definition of ethics, the first being 'age/maturity as the determinant of ethical awareness' and secondly 'the social context which also plays an important role where ethical and moral values are dispersed. Recent researches in the ethical behavior of students show that there are indifferent findings to the question of what social context, age, religion and culture plays in determining a person's ethical behavior and awareness.

If we look back in history, we could see that there are many cases of unethical behavior in the local and international stage which draws much public attention. Cases of unethical behavior among large corporations in the international stage have received considerable attention from the corporate, academic, and public sectors over the past. In the last decade, the alleged behavior at Enron and Arthur Andersen (including shredding of subpoenaed documents and falsification of financial documents) as well as other highly publicized scandals (e.g., WorldCom) have come under close scrutiny and again brought the topic of business ethics to the public's attention. As these scandals make all too clear, unethical behavior is

costly to firms, their employees, and their investors (Conroy and Emerson 2004: 383).

In Malaysia, cases of criminal breach of trust (CBT) among employees and officials entrusted to do their work with honesty and trustworthy had shown a major increase. Most of the cases involve clerks, officers, lawyers and even politicians. One might question if the idea of misconduct started when a person is still at tender years of while studying in a school or university. Most researchers are in a disagreement with the findings of their research on the answer to this question. As a developing nation, Malaysia was also not spared from the adverse effects of globalization in which there are symptoms and social events that occurred as a result of the internet and peer influences that cause the symptoms such as this increasingly prevalent.

These symptomatic influences on teenagers is immense where between 2001 and 2010 there was a threefold increase in the cases of rape (statistics from the Malaysian Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development), the number of cases of abandoned babies recorded is 383. The number is increasing from year to year and most of those affected are youngster/teenagers, including students from schools and universities. Therefore, it is important for us to realize and investigate the cause of the social ills among students in order to understand the causes of such occurrences.

Over the last decade, studies have raised serious questions about the ethical value of students and their awareness of ethical issues. One such research, by Prior et. al (2002) surveys ethical attitudes of information systems personnel and

found out that younger (under 25 years old) respondents are more willing to do their work despite the fact that it is unethical compared to older and experienced respondents. The research also finds that employees feel that it is more unethical to take physical objects (even a paper clip) as opposed to using free resource such as their computer for playing games or other activities.

The objective of the research is to explain for the first time ethical awareness of students in a government university in Malaysia in the state of Sabah. One may ask why Labuan? The settings on this small island are considered as most appropriate for the study of ethical behavior since it is isolated from the mainland of Sabah and the Peninsula (West Malaysia). Students at the campus also come from various backgrounds, where some of them come from other big cities such as Kuching and Kota Kinabalu while some comes from Peninsula Malaysia from the city state of Kuala Lumpur, Shah Alam and other areas in the Peninsula. There are a small number of international students studying at the campus coming from China. Furthermore, the variety of students from different social and economic ladder proves that the selection of the location as most suitable for such research. Moreover, some cases of ethical behavior in previous research only focus on students in West Malaysia. There is no such research made based on cultural comparison between students from East and West Malaysia. The variety of students at the university within a confined area provided a good setting for the research.

SPECIFIC RESEARCH ISSUE AND LIMITATION

The following specific research questions were investigated in the study:

- (1) Do male and female students differ in their attitudes toward the ethical acceptability of behaviors in specific situations?
- (2) Are attitudes toward the ethical acceptability influenced by the religion of the individual exhibiting the behavior?
- (3) Do male and female students' attitudes toward the ethical acceptability of behavior depend on whether they understand and learn about ethics while in school?
- (4) Do business majors differ in their attitudes toward what constitutes ethical behavior from other academic majors?
- (5) Does the strength of spiritual/religious beliefs affect attitudes toward the acceptability of ethical behavior?
- (6) Does university education provide enough information to guide students in attaining an ethical academic behavior?

This paper does not claim to cover all ethical aspects and behaviour. The writers acknowledge

that the term ethics is a broad term that refers to a wide range of behaviour that include a wide range of professions. The paper only covers ethical behaviour that is considered unacceptable to Asian and Muslim community especially in Malaysia. For example, abortion is illegal in Malaysia but in other countries, the law is different. In this study, students have been informed that the question to be asked in the study only covers ethical issues such as abortion, dumping babies, euthanasia, academic and work ethics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review of the relationship between ethical behavior and religion, gender and culture can be divided into three areas. Firstly, is related to ethical behavior and method of teaching ethics, ethical behavior and students and ethical behavior of professionals.

Lam and Shi (2007) believes that there is a flaw in the current education system and needed improvement, so that the role of education especially in developing moral values could be reestablished. Therefore, they believe that it is wrong to conclude that education does indeed play no role in moral development. His view on ethical education was also supported by Aldughaiter (2012), who believes that teaching of ethics to students is important especially since the early years of their study. This is because the problems and dilemmas were faced by students as early as the first year. Therefore, he suggested studying the methods of instruction and contents of the subject to investigate the perspective of students on ethical subjects. Others, such as Lowry (2003) try to explain whether the method of teaching and the timing of such courses is important. This is due to the fact that in the United Kingdom, ethics courses are taught at postgraduate and final year undergraduate degree students.

As Nichols and Zimmer (1985) put it, the subject of ethics evolved like the history of mankind from savagery to civilize society. However, he believes that colleges are still struggling with the best way to teach ethics as a subject. "The powerful in government, commerce and religion spoke out loudly through their actions or lack of action. Ethical standards are living the values. They represent a vital and critical guiding force in the functioning of our society" (Nichols and Zimmer, 1985: 1786). Ruegger and King (1992) believe that more and more cases of unethical behavior among corporations and officers show that they are juggling between business and their social responsibility. Therefore, the public's concern over business ethics continues, schools of business will be expected to do a better job of teaching ethics in their undergraduate and graduate courses.

At the academic institutional level, Zapiatis and Kambia-Kapardis (2007) while explaining tertiary student's ethical judgement in Cyprus academic

environment finds that private university students are more tolerant in facing ethical issues related to computer such as sharing their work for individual assignments, copying files, music and apps from the internet and duplicating copyright e-books rather than ethical issues relevant with selfishness such as not paying much cooperation with group assignments, using bribe and obtaining preferential treatment with instructors and hiding books in library. Business and non-business students do not differ significantly on any of the ethical factors and students with high-Grade Point Average were less tolerant to issues relevant with selfishness.

Mc Lachlan (2015), Rettinger and Jordan (2005), Burks and Sellani (2008), Murdock (2005), Rawwas et. al (2006), Furman et al (2004), Kennedy and Lawton (1998) and Conroy and Emerson (2004) look for the answer by connecting ethical behavior with religion, beside age and education (Lam and Shi, 2007). To Rawwas, the answer to the relation between religion and ethics could help in assisting teachers in developing curriculum, assigning teaching materials, grading projects, proctoring exams and understanding the mindset of students, and will generally assist businesses in understanding the effect of religion on their employees, managers and customers. To Kennedy and Lawton, religion controls beliefs and behaviors by serving important purposes for societies and individuals. "Religion promotes social solidarity, partly by providing norms that reduce conflict and also by imposing sanctions against antisocial conduct" (Kennedy and Lawton 1998: 163). Others, such as Lau et al (2005) look at the attitude of workers and employees and look at how far their religiosity and spirituality affected their work. Beside religion, other researchers, such as Lam and Shi (2007) also relate socio demographic factors such as gender into the equation, by relating how far the socio demographic factors affect ethical behavior.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

At the moment, research regarding the ethical behavior and awareness among students in Sabah and cultural comparison between this area and in other areas in Peninsular Malaysia to form a cultural comparison has not been done.

Firstly, the researcher conducted a literature review to establish the lack of research in the area especially in Sabah (East Malaysia). A quantitative questionnaire was developed consisting of 50 questions was drafted for students to fill in. The question was drafted based on the Sociology of Knowledge (SoK) theory, the study of the relationship between human [thought](#) and the social context within which it arises, and of the effects prevailing ideas have on societies. The theory deals with broad fundamental questions about the extent and limits of social influences on individuals' lives and the social-cultural basics of our [knowledge](#) about the world. Among the thinker

who used the SoK are Karl Mannheim, Peter Berger and Syed Hussein Alatas. Out of the 50 questions, the researcher divided 32 questions into six sections using a Likert type scale to determine student's ethical behavior based on the students' social surroundings; ethics in school, religion, home, university education, social and academic.

The research population are first year students who had finished attending a general philosophy class (Introduction to Philosophy) which also includes a basic information on ethics, ethical behavior and important issues. The questionnaire was also pilot tested for reliability where some of the questionnaire was revised, mistakes corrected and negative statements were corrected to be analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher had also done an analysis of the data using descriptive and inferential statistics, reliability analysis (*Cronbach's Alpha*), exploratory factor analysis, independent sample *t*-test, paired sample *t*-test and one-way ANOVA with Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Test (*Turkey HSD*). All the process was done to test the reliability of the data as well as looking at the outcome of data processed for its significant and correlation between the variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The questionnaires were group-administered to 440 students at University Malaysia Sabah and 405 questionnaires were completed and returned to the researchers. Of those, 6 were incomplete, and thus excluded from the study, reducing the number of usable surveys to 399 and the overall response rate to 90.7%. Table I displays the demographic profile of the participants in relation to five different variables: gender, ethnic origin, year of study, discipline of studies and type of educational institution.

Factor Analysis

The researcher also conducted an exploratory factor analysis with the use of SPSS's Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation (*Kaiser Normalization*) to reduce the large number of variable to a smaller number of factors. Exploratory factor analysis is primarily used to reveal the factor structure of the data. The appropriateness of the factor model in the research was indicated by both Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (*KMO*) statistic value of 0.921, which confirmed its high sampling adequacy, and the significance ($\chi^2=5, 281; p<. 000$) of the Barlett's test of sphericity.

Principal component analysis with Varimax rotation factor analysis revealed six factors with eigenvalue of greater than 1.0. This six-factor solution explained satisfactory 57.42% of the total variance. It is important to note that factor loadings of less than 0.350 were excluded. All variables included in the factor analysis were tested for reliability with the utilization of Cronbach's Alpha; a reliability model of internal consistency

based on average inter-item correlation. Table II exhibits the results of the factor and descriptive analysis of our data. The six retained factors were named by the researcher as religion, social surroundings, home, ethics at university, academic ethics and school education. However, the question "I know at least one person in my community that have ethical problems" and "I always do something that is not against the norms of my social environment" was excluded because of low factor loading (less than 0.350)

Findings revealed that participating students believe that most of their ethical awareness of ethical issues are related to religion, suggesting that most students believe that religious teachings contain a clear ethical and moral code of conduct (mean 4.712) and the lowest towards academic related ethics (mean 2.88). Students seem to believe that religion also helps them in making a good decision (mean 4.564), helps them in controlling their daily attitude while they believe that religion also play an important role in providing the right code of conduct (mean 4.303).

The findings are in accordance with Rawwas et. al. (2006) findings regarding the relation between ethical beliefs and religion. The study, which examines student's ethical belief from religious and secular universities finds that even though students from that students of the Japanese secular university tended to score higher on achievement and humanism, and lower on theism and positivism than did students of the Japanese religious university. In addition, students of the Japanese secular university were somewhat more sensitive to academic dishonesty practices than were students of the Japanese religious university. Other findings by Lam and Shi (2008) in mainland China also find out that religion played an important role in affecting ethical attitudes, however, its effect varied with different types of religions; Christianity was found to be most favorable to higher ethical standards, but people of traditional Chinese religion had a higher acceptability of unethical behaviors involving social concerns compared to people with no religion.

On the other hand, students also believe that ethics related to academics, such as downloading music and apps using public Wi-Fi at the university as not an unethical behaviour (mean 2.163), sharing individual assignments with friends (mean 2.298), using the internet as a source of information and not giving credit to sources (mean 3.712).

The second ranked ethical behaviour, according to students are school ethics, where most students believe that the ethical subject and awareness should be taught in high school (mean 4.612). Students who participated also believes that their ethical awareness started when they are in high school (mean 4.053) while they also credit friends and family as their source of ethical issues (mean 4.018).

Independent sample t-test

The researcher also investigated whether significant statistical differences exist between the respondents according to their gender, marriage status, the course they took, result, understanding of ethics, smartphone used and known issues in ethics. As shown in Table III, independent sample t-test revealed that a number of differences exist between the respondents. It was found that women's awareness of ethical issues related to ethic in school and academic ethics are higher than men. Married students are more aware of ethical behaviour related to school and at home compared to men.

Non-business student is more aware of ethical behaviour related to academic, religion and home compared to their business counterpart. Moreover, students with better result with a high-Grade Point Average (between 3.01 and 4.00) are more aware of ethical behaviour related to academic and religion compared to students who compared to those with average or below academic performances (below 3.0) in the previous semester. However, students who are below academic performance are more aware of ethical behaviour in religion and their home. They also have a slightly higher awareness of ethical behaviour in their social life. This shows that students who get average result are more socially aware of what happens at home and social life compared to students who get better results than them.

Furthermore, students who admit that they understand the meaning of ethics and had known ethical issues while at school are more aware of ethical behaviour in the five out of the six factors analysed, religion, academic, school, home and in the university compared to students who admit that they don't understand the meaning of ethics and don't know any ethical issues while at school level. Finally, students who have smartphones are more aware of ethical behaviour in their social, home, university and religion compared to students who does not own a smartphone. However, the small number of students who doesn't own a smartphone are more aware of ethical behaviour in the academic field at the university and ethical behaviour in school.

One-way Analysis of Variant (ANOVA)

One-way ANOVA test was used to identify statistical differences between respondents and their age, previous qualification, race, original residence and area of residence. Out of the variables tested using ANOVA, only three variables show significant value: their race, original residence and area of residence. As shown in Table IV a that shows differences between respondent and their race, differences exist in three of the six ethical factors: university ethics, academic ethics and ethics in school. Once the existing differences among the means of the five groups were revealed,

Post-Hoc Multiple Comparison tests were utilized to determine which means differ. The Tukey Honestly Significant Difference test (HSD) (Table IV b) was used since it is a very conservative pairwise comparison test that minimizes the possibility for Type I errors. To sum it up Table IV c shows the relation between students' race and their awareness of ethical issues in different scenarios. In particular, Chinese are less aware of ethical issues while in school compared to other races. Furthermore, Chinese are also less aware of ethical behaviour related to religion compared to other races. International student is less aware of ethical behaviour at the university, in the academic world and in school. This is clearly shown in the lowest mean score of the international student compared to their local counterpart. Furthermore, students living in other areas than cities and outskirts tend to be less aware of ethical behaviour with regard to their religion compared to those living in cities and outskirt areas.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This present study was undertaken to investigate university students' ethical awareness on ethical issues related to their home surroundings, religion, academic behaviour at the university, in school and their social life. This is done at the University Malaysia Sabah, Labuan International campus where students from different cultural and religious background is populated in the hope to improve the social awareness. Findings revealed the following: (a) Most students agree that religion serves the basis of their ethical behaviour. (b) Most students believe that using the internet to download apps, music etc. Is not considered as unethical. (c) Female respondents' awareness of ethical issues related to ethic in school and academic ethics is higher than male respondent. (d) Married students are more aware of ethical behaviour related to school and at home compared to men. (e) Non-business student is more aware of ethical behaviour related to academic, religious and home compared to their business counterpart. (f) Moreover, students with better result with a high-Grade Point Average (between 3.01 and 4.00) are more aware of ethical behaviour related to academic and religion compared to those with average or below academic performances (below 3.0) in the previous semester. However, students who are below academic performance are more aware of ethical behaviour in religion and their home. They also have a slightly higher awareness of ethical behaviour in their social life.

Comparing the findings with similar studies conducted locally and abroad, we can identify both similarities and differences. The findings made here are aligned with (e.g. Lam et. al, 2008) in regards to the student's ethical behaviour and religion. It seems that in the 21st century religion still plays an important role in a person's ethical behaviour. Compared to those with no religion at

all, people with religion seems to be more concern with unethical behaviour compared to people with no religion at all. The research is also aligned with the study made by Rettinger and Jordan (2003) and Rawwas et al. (2006). Other findings, which are aligned with other researchers (Ramayah et al. 2009) is that the student's behaviour is also very closely related to internet piracy and sharing of applications over the internet. The study also revealed that affect and intention are significant mediators of Internet piracy behavior among students and should be controlled by universities. Furthermore, the result of this study also aligns with Aliyu et al (2010), Furthermore, the findings aligned with Aliyu (2010), Durwood and King (1995), Borkowski and Ugras (1998), Ritter (2006), Ameen et al. (1996) and Ahmad and Seet (2009) relating to gender where Aliyu finds that male students reported the highest level of computer security and ethics violations than their female counterparts.

But unlike the findings made by Burkowski and Ugras (1998) which found the relationship between undergraduate major in the ethical attitudes and behavior of business students a 'difficult to interpret' the study found out that there is a significant relation between courses undertaken by the student and their ethical awareness. Non-business students are more aware of ethical behaviour compared to business students. With regards to student's result (CGPA) the findings of this study align with similar studies by Zopiatis and Krambia-Kapardis (2007). Students with high-Grade Point Average are more aware of unethical behaviour compared to students with low-Grade Point Average.

Reflecting on the research findings, it is recommended that several actions will be taken by the relevant authority to instil awareness among students with regards to ethical behaviour especially in the academic field. There should be an awareness campaign, which focused on all students, especially first year student to develop awareness and reflect back to what they have learned in school on the values of being a university student that needs to be maintained. This is because some students were influenced by their peers into behaving unethically while at the university. Furthermore, students are also coerced into behaving unethically due to ill preparation especially during final examinations. Light punishments if they are caught is also one of the factors to led student into doing academic dishonesty. According to Zopiatis and Krambia-Kapardis (2007) education institutions should develop and implement a students' honour code, clarifying the ethical behaviour and attitudes within the academic environment. Such guideline should emphasize value such as academic integrity, honesty, trust and fairness; all of which are essential to the individual's personal and professional development (p. 660).

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Noor Hazlina; Seet, Pi-Shen, 2010, Gender Variations in Ethical and Socially Responsible Considerations among Sme Entrepreneurs in Malaysia in *International Journal of Business and Society* , Vol. 11, No. 1.
- Aldughaiter, Saud K., 2012, Student perspectives on a course on medical ethics in Saudi Arabia in *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences* 7(2), 113-117.
- Aliyu, M., Abdallah, N.A.O., Lasisi, N.A. and Diyar, D, 2010, [Information and Communication Technology for the Muslim World \(ICT4M\), proceeding of the 2010 International Conference on](#) Jakarta 13-14 Dec. 2010
- Ameen, [Elsie C.](#) , Guffey, [Daryl M.](#) , McMillan, [Jeffrey J.](#) , 1996, Gender differences in determining the ethical sensitivity of future accounting professionals in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 15, [Issue 5](#), pp 591-597
- [Barbara A. Ritter](#), 2006, Can Business Ethics be Trained? A Study of the Ethical Decision-making Process in Business Students in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 68, [Issue 2](#), pp 153-164
- Borkowski, Susan C. and Ugras, Yusuf J., 1998, Business Students and Ethics: A Meta-Analysis in *Journal of Business Ethics* **17**: 1117–1127.
- Burks, Bryan D., Sellani, Robert J., 2008, Ethics, Religiosity, and Moral Development of Business Students in *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*. 49-71.
- Conroy, Stephen J. and Emerson, Tisha L.N., 2004, Business Ethics and Religion: Religiosity as a Predictor of Ethical Awareness Among Students, in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 50, [Issue 4](#), pp 383-396
- Conroy, Stephen J. and Emerson, Tisha L.N., 2004. Business Ethics and Religion: Religiosity as a Predictor of Ethical Awareness Among Students, in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 50, [Issue 4](#), pp 383-396.
- Furman, Leola Dyrud, Benson, Perry W., Grimwood, Cordelia and Canda, Edward, 2004, Religion and Spirituality in Social Work Educator and Direct Practice at the Millenium: A Survey of UK Social Worker, in *British Journal of Social Work*, 34, pp. 767-792.
- Kennedy, Ellen J. and Lawton, Leigh, 1998, Religiousness and Business Ethics, in *Journal of Business Ethics* **17**: 163–175.
- Lam, Kit Chun, Shi, Guicheng, 2008, Factors Affecting Ethical Attitudes in Mainland China and Hong Kong, in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 77, [Issue 4](#), pp 463-479
- Lau, Linda K., Haug, James C. and Wright, Linda B., 2012, College Faculty and Administrators' Perception of Student Ethics in *Journal of Business Diversity* vol. 12(1), 107-121
- MacKinnon, Barbara, 2001. *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*, United States: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Mc Lachlan, H.V., 2008, The Religious Beliefs Of Students And The Teaching Of Medical Ethics: A Comment On Brassington in *Journal of Medical Ethics*, Vol34:396–398
- McNichols and Zimmerer, 1985, Situational Ethics: An empirical Study of Differentiators of Student Attitudes, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4, 175-180.
- McNichols and Zimmerer, 1985, Situational Ethics: An empirical Study of Differentiators of Student Attitudes, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4, 175-180.
- Murdock, Vicki, 2005, Guided by Ethics, *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 45:1-2, 131-154
- Prior, Mary, Rogerson, Simon, Fairweather, Ben, 2002, The Ethical Attitudes Of Information Systems Professionals: Outcomes Of An Initial Survey in *Telematics and Informatics*, 19 21-36
- Rawwas, Mohammed Y. A., Swaidan, Ziad and Al-Khatib, Jamal, 2006, Does Religion Matter? A Comparison Study of the Ethical Beliefs of Marketing Students of Religious and Secular Universities in Japan, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65: 69–86
- Rettinger, David A. and Jordan, Augustus E., 2005, The Relations Among Religion, Motivation, and College Cheating: A Natural Experiment in *Ethics & Behavior*, 15:2, 107-129
- Ruegger, D and King, EW, 1992, [A Study Of The Effect Of Age And Gender Upon Student Business Ethics](#) in *Journal of Business Ethics*,

Saud K. Aldughaiter, 2012, Student perspectives on a course on medical ethics in Saudi Arabia in *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences*, 7(2), 113-117.

Zopiatis, Anastasios A. and Krambia-Kapardis, Maria, 2008, Ethical Behaviour of Tertiary Education Studentin Cyprus in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 81, pp. 647-663.

TABLE I**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	96	24.1	24.1	24.1
	Female	303	75.9	75.9	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	100
Age	Below 19	18	4.5	4.5	4.5
	20-24	377	94.5	94.5	99.0
	25 and above	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Status	Single	396	99.2	99.2	99.2
	Married	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Course	FKAL	385	96.5	96.5	96.5
	FKI	14	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Qualification	None	46	11.5	11.5	11.5
	Diploma	287	71.9	71.9	83.5
	Certificate	66	16.5	16.5	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Race	Malay	186	46.6	46.6	46.6
	Chinese	69	17.3	17.3	63.9
	Indian	19	4.8	4.8	68.7
	Sabahan	112	28.1	28.1	96.7
	Sarawakian	13	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Origin	Peninsula Malaysia	218	54.6	54.6	54.6

	Sabah	150	37.6	37.6	92.2
	Sarawak	28	7.0	7.0	99.2
	International Student	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Region	City	218	54.6	54.6	54.6
	Outskirts	179	44.9	44.9	99.5
	Other	2	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Result	3.00 to 4.00	226	56.6	56.6	56.6
	Below 3.00	173	43.4	43.4	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Religion	Islam	282	70.7	70.7	70.7
	Christianity	46	11.5	11.5	82.2
	Hindu	15	3.8	3.8	86.0
	buddha	56	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	
Religious Beliefs	None	2	.5	.5	.5
	Religious	180	45.1	45.1	45.6
	Moderate	210	52.6	52.6	98.2
	Less Religious	7	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	399	100.0	100.0	

TABLE II

Factor and Descriptive Analysis								
Factor Items	Factor Analysis				Descriptive Analysis			
	Loading	Eigen Values	Percentage of explained variance	Reliability alpha (Cronbach)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Overall rank	Comments
Factor 1: Religion (5 items)		2.855	9.21	0.877	4.470	0.176	1	
Religious teachings control my daily attitude?	.661				4.491	0.776		
Religious teachings contain a clear ethical and moral code of conduct.	.714				4.712	0.626		
Religious teaching helps me in making a good and sound decision.	.710				4.564	0.730		
I understand clearly the ethical code of conduct in my religion.	.745				4.303	0.744		
My understandings of religious knowledge come from friends and family members.	.634				4.298	0.772		
Factor 2: School Education		9.006	29.052	0.774	4.053	0.362	2	
I already known about ethical issues since i was in school.]	.602				4.103	0.738		
I already read about the ethical subjects since i was in school.]	.598				3.917	0.780		
The ethical subject and awareness should be taught in schools.]	.563				4.612	0.670		
My understanding of ethical issues at school is comprehensive and enough.	.536				3.617	0.866		
My understanding of ethical issues is obtained from friends and family.]	.622				4.018	0.768		
Factor 3: Home		1.78	5.741	0.773	3.866	0.355	4	
The people around the place i live are aware of ethical issues.]	.604				3.434	0.913		
My family members always advise me to follow the rule of ethics.]	.730				4.436	0.716		

My friends at home are aware of ethical issues.]	.653				3.627	0.853		
Ethical issues are among the important issues discussed by the people in my community.]	.623				3.920	0.896		
Most of my understanding of ethical issues are influenced by friends and family.]	.608				4.055	0.849		
Factor 4: Ethics as University Subject		1.616	5.213	0.733	3.870	0.365	3	
Other than this subject, I had already taken other ethical subjects.]	.411				3.363	1.047		
The method of teachings of ethical subjects are clear and sufficient.]	.671				3.925	0.766		
My friends and family also thinks that ethical subjects are important.]	.734				4.231	0.728		
The mainframe of ethical subjects are compatible with the course that i took.]	.613				3.960	0.769		
Factor 5: Social Environment		1.295	4.177	0.768	3.655	0.195	5	
Social environment mostly influence my daily life.]	.757				3.952	0.930		
Most decision that i made is influenced by my social environment]	.759				3.471	1.017		
Sometimes i did something i dislike for the sake of social environment.]	.660				3.491	1.070		
The influence of social environment plays an important role in my life.]	.841				3.647	1.048		
Factor 6: Academic Ethics		1.193	3.847	0.667	3.178	0.926	6	
I know that I should not share my individual assignment with friends.	.463				2.298	1.254		
I give full attention to my group assignment.]	.674				4.263	0.904		

I never did anything unethical even though my friends did it.]	.724				4.018	0.978		
Most information i gathered for my assignments are from books.	.673				2.614	1.191		
I give full attention to using information I got for my assignment and give credits to the writer.	.737				3.712	1.077		
For me downloading music, apps etc. is an offence	.380				2.163	1.292		
Total scale reliability alpha (31 items)				0.858				
Total Percentage of explained variance			57.241					

Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy =0.901. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. The question "I known at least one									
person in my community that have ethical problems" and									
"I always do something that is not against the norms of my social environment" was excluded because of low factor loading (less than 0.350)									
Scale: 1- Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3- Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 4- Agree; 5- Strongly Agree									

TABLE III

Difference according to gender, marriage status, course, result, understanding of ethics, smartphone and known issues in ethics
Independent Sample t-test

Ethical Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std Deviation	t	Sig. (2 tailed)
ACADEMICNEW	Male	96	17.7917	5.04697	-3.013	0.003
	Female	303	19.4719	3.72281		
SCHOOLETHICS	Male	96	19.8438	2.9994	-1.711	0.088
	Female	303	20.3993	2.69822		
RELIGIONNEW	Male	96	22.0938	3.87455	-0.853	0.395
	Female	303	22.4554	2.6602		
ENVIRONMENTNEW	Male	96	23.1458	4.27226	-0.156	0.876
	Female	303	23.2112	3.31886		
UNIVERSITYNEW	Male	96	15.2708	3.059	-0.808	0.421
	Female	303	15.5446	2.29103		
SOCIALNEW	Male	96	18.9375	3.87655	2.094	0.037
	Female	303	18.066	3.44622		
ACADEMICNEW	Single	396	19.0505	4.14026	-0.952	0.342
	Married	3	21.3333	3.51188		
SCHOOLETHICS	Single	396	20.2626	2.78908	-0.25	0.802
	Married	3	20.6667	1.1547		
RELIGIONNEW	Single	396	22.3687	3.00302	0.02	0.984
	Married	3	22.3333	2.3094		
ENVIRONMENTNEW	Single	396	23.1894	3.57799	-0.392	0.695
	Married	3	24	1		
UNIVERSITYNEW	Single	396	15.4798	2.50409	0.101	0.92
	Married	3	15.3333	1.1547		
SOCIALNEW	Single	396	18.2753	3.5724	-0.028	0.978
	Married	3	18.3333	3.78594		
ACADEMICNEW	Finance	385	19.0286	4.18227	-1.621	0.125
	COMPUTER	14	20.1429	2.445		
SCHOOLETHICS	FINANCE	385	20.2701	2.80898	0.168	0.867
	COMPUTER	14	20.1429	1.87523		
RELIGIONNEW	FINANCE	385	22.3351	3.02583	-1.167	0.244
	COMPUTER	14	23.2857	1.85757		
ENVIRONMENTNEW	FINANCE	385	23.161	3.58382	-1.012	0.312
	COMPUTER	14	24.1429	2.98347		
UNIVERSITYNEW	FINANCE	385	15.4701	2.49265	-0.359	0.72
	COMPUTER	14	15.7143	2.67261		
SOCIAL	FINANCE	385	18.3299	3.55943	1.593	0.112
	COMPUTER	14	16.7857	3.64119		
ACADEMIC	3.00 to 4.00	226	19.5841	4.0425	2.864	0.004
	Below 3.00	173	18.3931	4.17305		
SCHOOLETHICS	3.00 to 4.00	226	20.115	2.82765	-1.245	0.214
	Below 3.00	173	20.4624	2.71195		
RELIGION	3.00 to 4.00	226	21.9336	3.13971	-3.356	0.001
	Below 3.00	173	22.9364	2.7026		
HOME	3.00 to 4.00	226	22.9115	3.58034	-1.824	0.069
	Below 3.00	173	23.5665	3.52275		

UNIVERSITY	3.00 to 4.00	226	15.1903	2.64392	-2.658	0.008
	Below 3.00	173	15.8555	2.24047		
SOCIAL	3.00 to 4.00	226	18.0664	3.75352	-1.34	0.181
	Below 3.00	173	18.5491	3.3033		
ACADEMIC	Understand Ethics	368	19.1766	4.07408	1.61	0.117
	Dont Understand Ethics	31	17.7742	4.70255		
SCHOOLETHICS	Understand Ethics	368	20.4592	2.68581	4.931	0
	Dont Understand Ethics	31	17.9677	2.89233		
RELIGION	Understand Ethics	368	22.4511	2.90312	1.905	0.057
	Dont Understand Ethics	31	21.3871	3.86158		
HOME	Understand Ethics	368	23.3071	3.43182	2.163	0.031
	Dont Understand Ethics	31	21.871	4.75915		
UNIVERSITY	Understand Ethics	368	15.5842	2.4099	2.938	0.003
	Dont Understand Ethics	31	14.2258	3.13804		
SOCIAL	Understand Ethics	368	18.3207	3.51337	0.867	0.387
	Dont Understand Ethics	31	17.7419	4.20292		
ACADEMIC	Have Smartphone	396	19.0227	4.10088	-2.51	0.012
	No Smartphone	3	25	5.56776		
SCHOOLETHICS	Have Smartphone	396	20.2727	2.77628	0.583	0.56
	No Smartphone	3	19.3333	3.78594		
RELIGION	Have Smartphone	396	22.4015	2.87334		
	No Smartphone	3	18	11.26943	0.676	0.569
HOME	Have Smartphone	396	23.2247	3.46447		
	No Smartphone	3	19.3333	11.71893	0.575	0.623
UNIVERSITY	Have Smartphone	396	15.5076	2.43549		
	No Smartphone	3	11.6667	6.80686	0.977	0.431
SOCIAL	Have Smartphone	396	18.3182	3.51269	2.755	0.006
	No Smartphone	3	12.6667	7.0946		
ACADEMIC	Know Ethical Issues at School	384	19.0755	4.13317	1.367	0.196
	Don't Know Ethical Issues at School	12	17.75	3.27872		
SCHOOLETHICS	Know Ethical Issues at School	384	20.3281	2.75485	2.471	0.014
	Don't Know Ethical Issues at School	12	18.3333	2.70801		
RELIGION	Know Ethical Issues at School	384	22.4766	2.83202	2.56	0.011
	Don't Know Ethical Issues at School	12	20.3333	3.57601		
HOME	Know Ethical Issues at School	384	23.2839	3.46412	1.101	0.272
	Don't Know Ethical Issues at School	12	22.1667	3.37998		
UNIVERSITY	Know Ethical Issues at School	384	15.5677	2.41202	2.445	0.015
	Don't Know Ethical Issues at School	12	13.8333	2.69118		
SOCIAL	Know Ethical Issues at School	384	18.2734	3.50691	-0.869	0.385
	Don't Know Ethical Issues at School	12	19.1667	3.51188		
Note: Equal variances assumed						

TABLE IV
 (a) Difference According to Student's Race
One way ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SCHOOL	Between Groups	94.158	4	23.539	3.111	.015
	Within Groups	2981.682	394	7.568		
	Total	3075.840	398			
RELIGION	Between Groups	517.070	4	129.268	16.667	.000
	Within Groups	4994.080	394	12.675		
	Total	5511.150	398			
HOME	Between Groups	66.672	4	16.668	1.315	.264
	Within Groups	4994.080	394	12.675		
	Total	5060.752	398			
UNIVERSITY	Between Groups	61.988	4	15.497	2.526	.040
	Within Groups	2417.581	394	6.136		
	Total	2479.569	398			
SOCIAL	Between Groups	23.627	4	5.907	.461	.764
	Within Groups	5046.047	394	12.807		
	Total	5069.674	398			
ACADEMIC	Between Groups	209.442	4	52.361	3.125	.015
	Within Groups	6601.731	394	16.756		
	Total	6811.173	398			

(b) Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Tests (Tukey HSD)

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
SCHOOL ETHICS	Malay	Chinese	.72020	.38777	.342
		Indian	-.75806	.66256	.783
		Sabahan	-.18664	.32902	.980
		Sarawakian	-1.83499	.78919	.139
	Chinese	Malay	-.72020	.38777	.342
		Indian	-1.47826	.71273	.233
		Sabahan	-.90683	.42101	.200
		Sarawakian	-2.55518*	.83175	.019
	Indian	Malay	.75806	.66256	.783
		Chinese	1.47826	.71273	.233
		Sabahan	.57143	.68255	.919
		Sarawakian	-1.07692	.99017	.813
	Sabahan	Malay	.18664	.32902	.980
		Chinese	.90683	.42101	.200
		Indian	-.57143	.68255	.919
		Sarawakian	-1.64835	.80604	.247
	Sarawakian	Malay	1.83499	.78919	.139
		Chinese	2.55518*	.83175	.019
		Indian	1.07692	.99017	.813
		Sabahan	1.64835	.80604	.247
RELIGION	Malay	Chinese	2.85951*	.39256	.000
		Indian	-.08404	.67074	1.000
		Sabahan	-.34015	.33308	.846
		Sarawakian	-.16501	.79893	1.000
	Chinese	Malay	-2.85951*	.39256	.000
		Indian	-2.94355*	.72153	.001
		Sabahan	-3.19966*	.42620	.000
		Sarawakian	-3.02453*	.84202	.003
	Indian	Malay	.08404	.67074	1.000
		Chinese	2.94355*	.72153	.001
		Sabahan	-.25611	.69097	.996
		Sarawakian	-.08097	1.00239	1.000
	Sabahan	Malay	.34015	.33308	.846
		Chinese	3.19966*	.42620	.000
		Indian	.25611	.69097	.996
		Sarawakian	.17514	.81599	1.000
	Sarawakian	Malay	.16501	.79893	1.000
		Chinese	3.02453*	.84202	.003
		Indian	.08097	1.00239	1.000

ENVIRONMENT	Malay	Sabahan	-.17514	.81599	1.000
		Chinese	.73048	.50184	.592
		Indian	-1.17799	.85748	.645
		Sabahan	.01891	.42582	1.000
	Chinese	Sarawakian	.75724	1.02136	.947
		Malay	-.73048	.50184	.592
		Indian	-1.90847	.92240	.236
		Sabahan	-.71157	.54486	.688
	Indian	Sarawakian	.02676	1.07644	1.000
		Malay	1.17799	.85748	.645
		Chinese	1.90847	.92240	.236
		Sabahan	1.19690	.88334	.657
	Sabahan	Sarawakian	1.93522	1.28146	.556
		Malay	-.01891	.42582	1.000
		Chinese	.71157	.54486	.688
		Indian	-1.19690	.88334	.657
	Sarawakian	Sarawakian	.73832	1.04317	.955
		Malay	-.75724	1.02136	.947
		Chinese	-.02676	1.07644	1.000
		Indian	-1.93522	1.28146	.556
UNIVERSITY	Malay	Sabahan	-.73832	1.04317	.955
		Chinese	.75760	.34917	.193
		Indian	-.32173	.59660	.983
		Sabahan	-.39833	.29627	.664
	Chinese	Sarawakian	-.45533	.71063	.968
		Malay	-.75760	.34917	.193
		Indian	-1.07933	.64177	.446
		Sabahan	-1.15593*	.37910	.021
	Indian	Sarawakian	-1.21293	.74895	.486
		Malay	.32173	.59660	.983
		Chinese	1.07933	.64177	.446
		Sabahan	-.07660	.61460	1.000
	Sabahan	Sarawakian	-.13360	.89160	1.000
		Malay	.39833	.29627	.664
		Chinese	1.15593*	.37910	.021
		Indian	.07660	.61460	1.000
	Sarawakian	Sarawakian	-.05701	.72580	1.000
		Malay	.45533	.71063	.968
		Chinese	1.21293	.74895	.486
		Indian	.13360	.89160	1.000
SOCIAL	Malay	Sabahan	.05701	.72580	1.000
		Chinese	-.11898	.50445	.999
		Indian	-1.04499	.86193	.744

ACADEMIC	Chinese	Sabahan	-.33353	.42803	.937
		Sarawakian	.03598	1.02666	1.000
	Chinese	Malay	.11898	.50445	.999
		Indian	-.92601	.92719	.856
	Indian	Sabahan	-.21454	.54769	.995
		Sarawakian	.15496	1.08203	1.000
		Malay	1.04499	.86193	.744
		Chinese	.92601	.92719	.856
	Sabahan	Sabahan	.71147	.88793	.930
		Sarawakian	1.08097	1.28811	.918
		Malay	.33353	.42803	.937
		Chinese	.21454	.54769	.995
	Sarawakian	Indian	-.71147	.88793	.930
		Sarawakian	.36951	1.04858	.997
		Malay	-.03598	1.02666	1.000
		Chinese	-.15496	1.08203	1.000
	Malay	Indian	-1.08097	1.28811	.918
		Sabahan	-.36951	1.04858	.997
		Chinese	-.37611	.57699	.966
		Indian	-2.86276*	.98588	.032
	Chinese	Sabahan	-.56154	.48958	.781
		Sarawakian	1.84574	1.17430	.516
		Malay	.37611	.57699	.966
		Indian	-2.48665	1.06052	.133
	Indian	Sabahan	-.18543	.62645	.998
		Sarawakian	2.22185	1.23763	.378
		Malay	2.86276*	.98588	.032
		Chinese	2.48665	1.06052	.133
	Sabahan	Sabahan	2.30122	1.01562	.158
		Sarawakian	4.70850*	1.47335	.013
		Malay	.56154	.48958	.781
		Chinese	.18543	.62645	.998
Sarawakian	Indian	-2.30122	1.01562	.158	
	Sarawakian	2.40728	1.19938	.264	
	Malay	-1.84574	1.17430	.516	
	Chinese	-2.22185	1.23763	.378	
Sabahan	Indian	-4.70850*	1.47335	.013	
	Sabahan	-2.40728	1.19938	.264	

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

(a) Summary of Post Hoc Multiple Compariosn Test

* indicates a significant difference between race and ethical awareness in school, university, religion and academic.

School Et	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Sabahan	Sarawakian
Malay					
Chinese				*	
Indian					
Sabahan					
Sarawakian		*			
Religion	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Sabahan	Sarawakian
Malay		*			
Chinese			*	*	*
Indian					
Sabahan		*			
Sarawakian		*			
University	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Sabahan	Sarawakian
Malay					
Chinese				*	
Indian					
Sabahan		*			
Sarawakian					
Academic	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Sabahan	Sarawakian
Malay			*		
Chinese					
Indian	*				*
Sabahan					
Sarawakian			*		