

Discipline Problems among Secondary School Students in Johor Bahru, Malaysia

Azizi Yahaya

Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Jamaludin Ramli

Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Shahrin Hashim

Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Mohd. Ali Ibrahim

Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Raja Roslan Raja Abd Rahman

Universiti Teknikal Malaysia

Noordin Yahaya

Universiti Teknologi Mara (Melaka)

Abstract Background

The indiscipline problem in schools is ranked as a major problem among students of primary and secondary schools in Malaysia. Disruptive behavior is a concern to schools and parents and to fellow pupils, whose education may be adversely affected.

Objective: The objectives of this study were to identify the level of students discipline problems and dominant factors attributing to the students discipline problems among the secondary school students in Johor in Malaysia.

Material and Methods: The study was carried out to 90 discipline teachers from several secondary schools around Johor using questionnaires. The data collected were analyzed by Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS) in forms of frequency, percentage and mean value. The findings showed that the level of discipline problems among students was quite high especially for absenteeism problem.

Results and Discussion: The results also showed that the students with family problems, always hung out with friends and others faced high level of discipline problems compared to students with no such problems. Some of the students with records in discipline problems showed that they did not faced any difficulties in learning as they passed in their examinations and the discipline problems did not depend on parents' education background because it was not necessary for the students to have discipline

Conclusions: Lastly, some recommendations also had been put forward as guidance to the research organization and future researches.

Keywords: Peer group, family, teachers and school environment, truancy, absenteeism, stealing and fighting).

Introduction

Discipline is a rudimentary ingredient that plays a crucial role in school system, which insists on upholding the moral values of students. It comprises a wide spectrum of meaning, well from the negative or positive perspective. However, it is humans immune to always focus on the negative smell and that would be considered a popular issue if it involves an individual or a group that claims an intimate relationship within a society.

Schon, D. (1983) aptly states that every child has a need to attend school. Schools are seen as provider of education as education is an important process that each individual has to undergo in life today. This is even so in this digital age as the world is more globalized and information communication technology takes root in every aspect of our life. Thus, education is seen as the key to unlock the treasure- trove of knowledge.

Students' misbehavior is a prevailing problem affecting schools not only in Malaysia but also across the many nations around the world. Students' misconduct in the classroom interferes with teaching and learning and is thought to be precursor to later school dropout and similar negative social outcomes. Students' behavioral problems are also thought to be a leading contributor to teachers' stress and attrition. Serious breaches of school discipline policy can have profound negative effects on teachers. Teachers subjected to abuse or intimidation report experiencing fears for their safety, lack of sense of dignity at work, intense feelings of anger, humiliation or shame, isolation and depression. Some teenagers may never reveal the nature of the incident or its impact on them. In such cases, the confidence of the teacher has been undermined; his/her sense of personal safety violated and the perpetrator has not been sanctioned. Slavin, R.E. (2003).

One of the most widespread reasons for bad discipline however is usually a student's inability to cope with the tasks. The noisiest students will demonstrate their frustration by loud outbursts, disruptive behavior, while the rest of the class may remain passive (Sternberg, R.J. & Williams, W.W. (2002).

Basically, discipline problems occur when a student refuses to obey rules of the classroom or school. Rules that deal with human actions will eventually be broken and require some sort of punishment. The concept of matching the punishment with the rule violation requires that the rules be presented in written format and that the punishment for violations be specified. Rules must also relate to the stated function of education or the school process and, again, common sense must prevail in establishing disciplinary action for breaking a rule. Teachers, in making rules for individual classroom behavior, should constantly be reminded of this principle. Furthermore, all students must be aware and prudent of the rules before disciplinary action can be administered. Franken, R.E. (1998).

Parents and schools share the responsibility of promoting values and standards which we hope will help younger people to establish sound behavioral codes for their lives. It is important that parents work in-cooperate with their child's school, and not just leave the school alone in the dark. Discipline problems can be dealt with much more effectively if both parties could share the similar and ideal vision which, leads to prolific missions.

We are all part of the society and our behavior will reflect current values and mores. Young students are particularly impressionable and vulnerable if much of their behavior is learned and they will copy and act out what they observe to be fashionable and attractive (Feldman, R.F.S., 1996).

In schools where the head teacher's emphasized punishments rather more than rewards, pupils' progress tends to be inhibited; the greater the number of punishments listed, the more negative were the effects. In contrast, whenever the number of rewards exceeded the number of punishments, progress was greater (Duke & Canady, 1991); successful schools have high expectations of discipline, and promote good relationships between children and staff. They know that it is not just about how children behave currently in schools but it is about sound preparation for the later life.

Background of Study

The indiscipline problem in schools is ranked as a major problem among students of primary and secondary schools in Malaysia. Disruptive behavior is a concern to schools and parents and to fellow pupils, whose education may be adversely affected. So it can't be ignored, and schools must tailor a well understood sound behavior and discipline policy.

Some of the breaking news highlighted in the mass media has portrayed the school with students of misbehaving characters. Some even goes to the extent of considering the case of misbehaviors as criminal problem. Lim Kit Siang, the opposition leader in parliament quoted in New Straits Times on April 04, 2004 as "Truancy is a school and not criminal problem- Hishamuddin should not pass the buck to police on what is basically a test of the success of education system."

Furthermore, according to a report by New Straits Times on August 2005, an average of seven school children are arrested everyday and three of them on average of between 13 and 15 years. This numbers are almost to the level of juvenile delinquents who are school dropouts. Based on the report school children constituted almost half of all under 18 who were arrested for crimes since 2003 and were involved in almost one per-cent of all criminal cases in 2002 and 2003 (NUTP,2005).

Lok Yim Pheng, secretary-general of the National Union of Teaching Profession who attended the seminar on Malaysian teachers whip school girls to boost classroom discipline published in NST on 28 Nov 2007, said sometimes the girls are even more daring than the boys. It's high time to put these girls in order by caning them.

Serious breaches of school discipline policy include assault by students on teachers and other students, verbal abuse, offensive language against teachers and other students, sexual and other forms of harassment, threat and intimidation of teachers and other students, possessing offensive weapons, supplying or using illegal drugs, intrusions into the school or classrooms by adults with the intention of confronting teachers have become a case of study that needed immediate attention.

As the problem now is rather alarming and jeopardizing the administration of the secondary schools especially, I believe the findings of the study will emit some powerful rays of light to rectify the situation.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study is to identify the students discipline problems such as truancy, absenteeism, stealing and fighting among the secondary school students in Johor Bahru and Pasir Gudang district based on the perception of the discipline teachers.

Indiscipline in school is certainly a matter of immediate concern to the teaching profession. Ensuring discipline in schools should be the concern of everyone. It is important for the people to accept the fact that ensuring discipline is not the sole responsibility of teachers alone. Discipline problems in schools have been serious breaches of school discipline policy that had profound negative effects on the schools.

One of the salient factors that attributes to the problem is peer group influences. Negative attitude of their friends such as responsibilities, cooperation, time management, respecting adults, disobeying rules and regulations are some of the contributing factors from the peer-group for the prevailing problems.

Management problems in schools like dissatisfaction among teachers, pressure from the school PIBG and high expectation of the parents shouldn't reflect to poor education. It is very important that the school management should play a dominant role to ensure all the students perform well not only in academic but also in good behavior to avoid any negative impact.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To identify the level of students discipline problems such as truancy, absenteeism, stealing and fighting among the secondary school students in Johor Bahru and Pasir Gudang district based on the perception of the discipline teachers
2. To identify the dominant factors contributing to the students discipline problems such as peer group influence, family, teachers and school environment among the secondary school students in Johor Bahru and Pasir Gudang district based on the perception of discipline teachers
3. To identify the significant difference between students discipline problems among the secondary school students in Johor Bahru and Pasir Gudang district such as by peer group influence, family, teachers and school environment with the educational level of the parents
4. To identify the significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy, absenteeism, stealing and fighting among the secondary schools students in Johor Bahru and Pasir Gudang district with their academic achievement

Methodology

This research design is in the form of description and quantitative method. Research design is a technique to get data and solve the problems. This research is to identify the factors attributing to discipline problems in secondary schools in perception of the discipline teachers. The items in the questionnaire include the teacher's background, parent's educational level, student's academic achievement, and student's misbehaviors such as truancy, absenteeism, stealing, fighting and factors contributing to the discipline problems such as peer group influence, family, teachers and school environment. The data will be further analyzed under the quantitative method.

According to Azizi (2007), sampling size is important because it gives a good result for the purpose of research. The respondents are selected from different races such as Malays, Chinese and Indians. The respondents are divided into gender which is male and female. This research is based on cluster on cluster sampling. According to Azizi (2007), cluster on cluster sampling is relevant to be used when the population is big and the area of research is divided into two districts. For the purpose of this research, the researcher has selected a number of secondary schools at random. A total of 100 teachers have been selected. Fifty of them are from Johor Bahru district and another fifty are from Pasir Gudang district.

A Pilot Study was carried out in July 2008, in two Secondary Schools namely SMK Seri Alam in Pasir Gudang district and SMK Gelang Patah in Johor Bahru district. The aim of this study is to confirm the validity and reliability of the research instruments. In other words, the study too will provide feed back on whether the instrument could be comprehended by the subjects and measures on what should be measured. The data collected was entered into SPSS for Cronbach's alpha internal consistency test.

Research Findings

Parents' Education Level

Table 1: The frequencies and percentage of respondents by parents' education level

Parents' Education Level	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
University	1	1.1
College	6	6.7
Secondary school	43	47.8
Primary school	30	33.3
Do not go to school	10	11.1
Total	90	100.0

Table 1 shows the frequencies and percentage of respondents by parents' education level. Almost half of their parents had their education until secondary school which was 47.8 percent (43 respondents) followed by primary school with 33.3 percent (30 respondents). Mean while, 11.1 percent (10 respondents) had their parents' did not attend school, 6.7 percent (6 respondents) and 1.1 percent (1 respondent) had their parent' education level at colleges and university.

Students' Academic Performances

Table 2: The frequencies and percentage of respondents for students' academic performances

Students' Academic Performances	Passed		Failed	
UPSR	58	64.4%	32	35.6%

Table 2 shows the frequencies and percentages of respondents by students' academic performances. In UPSR, 64.4 percent (58 respondents) had passed their exams and whereas 35.6 percent (32 respondents) had failed their UPSR examination.

What is the level of students discipline problems such as truancy, absenteeism, stealing and fighting among the secondary school students.

Truancy

Table 3: The frequencies, percentage and mean of respondents by truancy (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
Students always hung out with their friends at the shopping mall	3 3.3%	6 6.7%	15 16.7%	47 52.2%	19 21.1%	3.81	0.96
Truancy was the most discipline problems happened at schools	1 1.1%	5 5.6%	12 13.3%	38 42.2%	34 37.8%	4.10	0.91
Most of the truancy problems happened to students from morning session	8 8.9%	18 20.0%	47 52.2%	15 16.7%	2 2.2%	2.83	0.91
Most of the truancy problems happened to students from afternoon session	5 5.6%	22 24.4%	43 47.8%	16 17.8%	4 4.4%	2.91	1.02
Truancy happened most to male students	4 4.4%	4 4.4%	21 23.3%	38 42.2%	23 25.6%	3.80	0.94
Truancy happened most to female students	6 6.7%	13 14.4%	54 60.0%	9 10.0%	8 8.9%	3.00	1.14
Schools had strategies in controlling the truancy problems among students	2 2.2%	14 15.6%	14 15.6%	39 43.3%	31 23.3%	3.70	1.10
Strict school rules encouraging the students in truancy	16 17.8%	20 22.2%	34 37.8%	11 12.2%	9 10.0%	2.74	1.13
Average						3.36	

Table 3 shows the frequencies, percents and mean of respondents by truancy. The highest mean value for truancy was 4.10 where most of the respondents agreed that truancy at schools covered most of the students' discipline problems. Mean while with mean value 3.81, the respondents agreed that students always hung out with their friends at the shopping malls.

Besides that, with mean values 3.80 and 3.70, most of the respondents believed that boys who always did truancy and schools had their own effective strategies in controlling the truancy problem at schools. With mean values 3.00 and 2.91, the respondents agreed that there were also girls that did the truancy and most of the truancy cases were happened at students in afternoon session.

Mean while, with mean values 2.83 and 2.74, the respondents agreed that most of the truancy cases were happened at students in morning session and strict rules that causing the students in truancy. The average mean value for the overall statements was 3.36, so it is in moderate level.

Absenteeism

Table 4: The frequencies, percents and mean of respondents by absenteeism (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
The students' attendance in class were not good	1 1.1%	11 12.2%	35 38.9%	31 34.4%	12 13.3%	3.47	0.74
The attendance of students from morning session were bad	4 4.4%	26 28.9%	27 30.0%	27 30.0%	6 6.7%	3.06	1.24
The attendance of students from afternoon session were bad	5 5.6%	11 12.2%	44 48.9%	24 26.7%	6 6.7%	3.17	1.09
The students' attendance to schools' activities were bad	-	10 11.1%	25 27.8%	45 50.0%	10 11.1%	3.61	1.03
Schools paid serious attention to absenteeism	-	6 6.7%	5 5.6%	45 50.0%	34 37.8%	4.19	0.89
Schools paid serious attention to absenteeism in schools' activities	-	6 6.7%	17 18.9%	41 45.6%	26 28.9%	3.97	0.91
Schools had strategies in controlling the absenteeism problems among students	1 1.1%	3 3.3%	26 28.9%	42 46.7%	18 20.0%	3.81	0.93
The absence of the students were reported to their parents or guardians	1 1.1%	1 1.1%	7 7.8%	52 57.8%	29 32.2%	4.19	0.83
Average						3.68	

Table 4 shows the frequencies, percents and mean value of respondents by absenteeism. With the highest mean value which was 4.19, majority of the respondents agreed that the absenteeism cases were reported to the parents and guardians and the problems were serious to the schools. Mean while with mean value 3.97 and 3.81, schools looked seriously at absenteeism of students at school activities and they also had strategies in overcoming the problems.

Besides, with mean value 3.61 and 3.47, most of the respondents agreed that the attendance of students in class activities was bad and it went the same for the attendance for core subjects' classes. Lastly, with mean value 3.17 and 3.06, the attendance of students in afternoon and morning sessions was bad. Overall, the average mean value for these statements was 3.68 so it is in high level.

Stealing

Table 5: The frequencies, percents and mean of respondents by stealing (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
The students liked to steal school's properties	13 14.4%	18 20.0%	29 32.2%	27 30.0%	3 3.3%	2.88	0.94
The students liked to steal other students' properties	9 10.0%	10 11.1%	22 24.4%	39 43.3%	10 11.1%	3.34	1.14
The students liked to steal valuables and teachers' money	14 15.6%	19 21.1%	34 37.8%	18 20.0%	5 5.6%	2.79	1.10
School was controlling the problems by certain procedures	5 5.6%	4 4.4%	14 15.6%	43 47.8%	24 26.7%	3.86	1.13
Many of the cases were recorded in the school's book of discipline	2 2.2%	9 10.0%	37 41.1%	29 32.2%	13 14.4%	3.47	1.04
Now, the stealing cases were decreasing	1 1.1%	6 6.7%	23 25.6%	50 55.6%	9 10.0%	3.67	1.05
Most of the cases were ignored by school	23 25.6%	27 30.0%	21 23.3%	10 11.1%	9 10.0%	2.50	1.15
Schools took actions to those involved in stealing	5 5.6%	6 6.7%	7 7.8%	37 41.1%	35 38.9%	4.01	1.14
Average						3.32	

Table 5 shows the frequencies, percents and mean value of respondents by stealing. The highest mean value for these statements was 4.01 where majority of the respondents agreed that schools took action to the students that involved in stealing. With mean value 3.86, the respondents agreed that school employed certain procedures in controlling stealing cases.

Mean while, with mean value 3.67 and 3.47, most of the respondents not sure if the stealing cases were decreasing and they also not so sure if the cases were recorded in the discipline book. Other than that, with mean value 3.34 and 2.88, the respondents agreed that the students like to steal others things and the school's properties.

Besides that, with mean value 2.79 and 2.50, the findings showed that the students liked to steal valuable things and teachers' money and most of the respondents disagreed that the cases were abandoned by the school. Overall, the average mean value for these statements was 3.32, so it is in moderate level.

Fighting

Table 6: The frequencies, percents and mean of respondents by fighting (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
Students always disturbing other students	2 2.2%	8 8.9%	15 16.7%	47 52.2%	18 20.0%	3.79	1.14
The students black mailed the others	11 12.2%	15 16.7%	21 23.3%	38 42.2%	5 5.6%	3.12	1.11
The students liked to fight with each others	5 5.6%	14 15.6%	34 37.8%	30 33.3%	7 7.8%	3.22	1.04
The students disobeyed the prefects	2 2.2%	20 22.2%	29 32.2%	36 40.0%	3 3.3%	3.20	0.89
Generally, the outsiders always dismissed the fighting	3 3.3%	7 7.8%	27 30.0%	36 40.0%	17 18.9%	3.63	0.99
Schools can control the fighting problems among students	2 2.2%	6 6.7%	13 14.4%	55 61.1%	14 15.6%	3.81	0.89
Many of the cases were recorded in the schools' book of discipline	1 1.1%	1 1.1%	9 10.0%	50 55.6%	29 32.2%	4.17	1.21
Dangerous fighting cases were reported to the police	2 2.2%	2 2.2%	6 6.7%	35 38.9%	45 50.0%	4.32	0.74
Average						3.66	

Table 6 shows the frequencies, percents and mean value of respondents by fighting. The highest mean value was 4.32 where majority of the respondents agreed that serious fighting cases that involving students will be reported to the police. With mean value 4.17, most of the fighting cases were recorded in the schools discipline book.

Mean while, with mean value 3.81 and 3.79, most of the respondents believed that school could control the problems and there were also other students that always disturbing their friends while in their classes. Besides, with mean value 3.63, the respondents agreed that the outsiders were involved in settling the fighting.

With mean value 3.22 and 3.20, majority of the respondents agreed that the students liked to fight with their friends in class and they also disobeyed to the prefects. Lastly, with mean value 3.12, the respondents also agreed that the students liked to bully their friends. Overall, the average mean value for the statements above was 3.66, so it is in moderate level.

What are the dominant factors attributing to the students discipline problems.

Peer Group Influence

Table 7: The frequencies, percents and mean of respondents by peer group influence (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
The students' friends pushed them to steal	6 6.7%	9 10.0%	14 15.6%	50 55.6%	11 12.2%	3.57	1.19
The students' friends pushed them to fight	6 6.7%	9 10.0%	14 15.6%	50 55.6%	11 12.2%	3.57	0.94
The students always spend their times with friends	-	3 3.3%	4 4.4%	60 66.7%	23 25.6%	4.14	0.95
Their friends liked to make noise in the class	1 1.1%	7 7.8%	15 16.7%	38 42.2%	29 32.2%	3.97	0.65
Their friends always helping them to solve problems	1 1.1%	6 6.7%	34 37.8%	37 41.1%	12 13.3%	03.59	0.95
When the students hung out with their friends, they felt free and can do anything they want	-	4 4.4%	18 20.0%	40 44.4%	28 31.1%	4.02	0.94
The students have many friends that do not go to schools	2 2.2%	8 8.8%	31 34.4%	36 40.0%	13 14.4%	3.56	0.79
The students seldom say 'no' to their friends' invitation	-	4 4.4%	27 30.0%	45 50.0%	14 15.6%	3.77	1.12
Average						3.77	

Table 7 shows the frequencies, percentage and mean values of respondents by peer group influence. With the highest mean value of 4.14, the respondents agreed that the students always wasting their time with friends. With mean value 4.02, the respondents agreed that the students felt free when they were with their friends.

Other than that, with mean value 3.97 and 3.77, the students liked to make noise and disturbed other students while teachers were teaching and they also seldom turned down their friends invitations. Mean while, with same mean value which was 3.57, the respondents agreed that the students were pushed to steal and fight with each other.

Lastly, with mean value 3.56, the students had many friends that were not attending to school. Overall, the average mean value for the statements above was 3.77 so it is in high level.

Family

Table 8: The frequencies, percentage and mean of respondents by family (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
The students' family facing financial problems causing them to ignore their children's education	7 7.8%	13 14.4%	26 28.9%	29 32.2%	15 16.7%	3.36	0.83
The parents always paid an attention if their children absent to school	9 10.0%	11 12.2%	32 35.6%	26 28.9%	12 13.3%	3.23	0.73
The students followed their family that liked to fight	8 8.9%	21 23.3%	29 32.2%	25 27.8%	7 7.8%	3.02	0.80
Their family's emphasize on good values in their daily lives	2 2.2%	8 8.9%	28 31.1%	28 31.1%	24 26.7%	3.71	1.12
Their parents always busy with their works outside and seldom spending times with their children	9 10.0%	3 3.3%	19 21.1%	44 48.9%	15 16.7%	3.59	1.15
The students loved their families	6 6.7%	3 3.3%	31 34. %	33 36.7%	17 18.9%	3.58	0.74
The parents compared them to the other siblings	9 10.0%	10 11.1%	41 45.6%	17 18.9%	13 14.4%	3.17	0.87
The parents seldom asking for the problems that they faced	7 7.8%	9 10.0%	20 22.2%	36 40.0%	18 20.0%	3.54	0.93
Average						3.40	

Table 8 shows the frequencies, percents and mean value of respondents by family. With mean value 3.71, the respondents agreed that the family took serious about good doings in their daily life and with mean value 3.59, most of the respondents agreed that the parents always busy with their job and less spending time with the children.

Mean while, with mean value 3.58 and 3.54, majority of the students loved their families but their parents seldom asked and took care about the problems they faced. Besides that, with mean value 3.36 and 3.23, the respondents agreed that the students' family gave an attention to the absenteeism among their children.

Lastly, with the lowest mean value which was 3.02, the respondents agreed that the parents always fighting and that's why they were fighting with each other. Overall, the average mean value for the statements above was 3.40, so it is in moderate level.

Teachers

Table 9: The frequencies, percentage and mean of respondents by teachers (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
The punishment from the teachers caused the students in truancy	13 14.4%	21 23.3%	33 36.7%	17 18.9%	6 6.7%	2.80	0.87
The students did not interested towards the learning caused them in truancy	6 6.7%	18 20.0%	31 34.4%	28 31.1%	7 7.8%	3.13	1.06
Fierce teachers caused the students to dislike his or her class	3 3.3%	15 16.7%	45 50.0%	21 23.3%	6 6.7%	3.13	1.19
The teachers always compared them to other students	16 17.8%	22 24.4%	25 27.8%	20 22.2%	7 7.8%	2.78	0.94
Cheerful teachers could give the students an opportunity in telling their problems	1 1.1%	3 3.3%	6 6.7%	59 65.5%	21 23.3%	4.07	0.95
The teachers always asked them if they were facing any problems	3 3.3%	1 1.1%	15 16.7%	58 64.4%	13 14.4%	3.86	0.65
The actions took by the teachers that were too much for their wrong doings caused them to oppose the teachers	9 10.0%	14 15.6%	32 35.6%	25 27.8%	10 11.1%	3.14	0.95
The homework was too much caused the students in truancy	17 18.9%	11 12.2%	34 37.8%	24 26.7%	4 4.4%	2.86	0.94
Average						3.22	

Table 9 shows the frequencies, percents and mean values of respondents by teachers. The highest mean value, 4.07 showed that most of the respondents agreed that teachers’ kindness gave the students chances to share their problems with them. While with mean value 3.86, their teachers always asked if the students got any problems that they could share.

Other than that, with mean value 3.14, there were some respondents agreed that the teachers actions towards their wrong doings were too much, so it caused the students to against the teachers. With mean value 3.13, the teaching in class was bored and not effective were the main cause of the students to absent in that class and the respondents agreed that fierce teachers made the students disliked to go to his or her class.

Besides that with mean value 2.86, the respondents agreed that the teachers were giving them too much homework causing them to absent in that class. Lastly, with the lowest mean value, 2.78, many of the respondents disagreed to say that the teachers were comparing them to other students. Overall the average mean value for all of the statements was 3.22, so it is in moderate level.

School Environment

Table 10: The frequencies, percentage and mean of respondents by school environment (n=90)

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Sd.
School environment was one of the factors that influencing discipline problems among students	1 1.1%	11 12.2%	22 24.4%	46 51.1%	10 11.1%	3.59	0.94
All of the students were encouraged to join co-curricular activities actively	3 3.3%	5 5.6%	12 13.3%	41 45.6%	29 32.2%	3.98	0.89
The students were happy to learn at this school	-	2 2.2%	28 31.1%	44 48.9%	16 17.8%	3.82	1.01
Weak security caused the students to steal at school	12 13.3%	16 17.8%	31 34.4%	17 18.9%	14 15.6%	3.06	1.02
The students were stressed by the strict rules	8 8.9%	20 22.2%	28 31.1%	25 27.8%	9 10.0%	3.08	1.06
Racial factors caused the students to fight with each other	2 2.2%	13 14.4%	27 30.0%	34 37.8%	14 15.6%	3.50	1.02
The numbers of student in class were too big caused the teachers difficult in handling them	1 1.1%	6 6.7%	16 17.8%	38 42.2%	29 32.2%	3.98	0.99
Cheerful school environment and building could stimulate the students to go to school	1 1.1%	7 7.8%	12 13.3%	38 42.2%	32 35.6%	4.03	1.08
Average						3.63	

Table 10 shows the frequencies, percents and mean values of respondents by school environment. With the highest mean value which was 4.03, most of the respondents agreed that cheerful building and school area could stimulate their interest to school. With mean value 3.98, the respondents also agreed that too much students in a class could caused teachers unable to control them. With the same mean value, the respondents agreed that all of the students were encouraged to get active in co-curricular activities at school.

Mean while, with mean value 3.82, the respondents said that the students were happy to learn at this school and with mean value 3.59, majority of the respondents agreed that school environment was one of the factor that could influenced students’ discipline problems.

Besides that, with mean value 3.50, the respondents agreed that racial factor caused the students to fight with each other. Other than that, with mean value 3.08 and 3.06, the respondents also agreed that the students were pressured with the strict rules at school and the area that was not controlled caused them to steal. Overall, the average mean value for the statements above was 3.63, so it is in moderate level.

Level of Acceptance

Table 11: Level of Acceptance (1) – Discipline Problems

Statement	Low	Mid	High	Mean
	(1.00 – 2.33)	(2.34 – 3.67)	(3.68 – 5.00)	
Truancy	15 16.7%	35 38.9%	40 44.4%	3.36
Absenteeism	12 13.3%	40 44.4%	38 42.2%	3.68
Fighting	20 22.2%	32 35.6%	38 42.2%	3.65
Stealing	15 16.7%	40 44.4%	35 38.9%	3.32
Average				3.50

Table 12: Level of Acceptance (2) - Factors

Statement	Low	Mid	High	Mean
	(1.00 – 2.33)	(2.34 – 3.67)	(3.68 – 5.00)	
Peer Group Influence	13 14.4%	30 33.3%	47 52.2%	3.77
Family	22 24.4%	36 40.0%	32 44.4%	3.40
Teachers	26 28.9%	32 35.6%	32 35.6%	3.22
School Environment	24 26.7%	43 47.8%	23 25.6%	3.63
Average				3.44

Table 11 and 12 show the level of acceptance of respondents towards the factors that influencing students in discipline problems. Overall, the average level of acceptance towards those factors was at medium level with average percentage as much as 47.8 % and mean value as much as 3.50. With the highest mean value which was 3.77, most of the respondents agreed with the peer group influence where 47 respondents (52.2%) at the high level, 30 respondents (33.3%) at the medium level and at the low level are 13 respondents (14.4%). Following with the mean 3.68 where the respondents agreed with absenteeism where about 38 respondent (42.2%) at the high level, 40 respondents (44.4%) at the medium level and 12 respondents at the high level.

Mean while, the lowest with mean value 3.22 with the teachers. Where about 26 respondents (28.9%) at the low level, 32 respondents (35.6%) at the medium level and also 32 respondents (35.6%) at the high level.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as by peer group influence, family, teachers and school environment with parent’s education level

Table 13: Annova test

	Sum of Squares	F	Sig.	Hypothesis
Peer group influence	Between Groups = 3.576 Within Groups = 34.444	2.206	0.075	Accepted
Family	Between Groups = 1.953 Within Groups = 20.864	1.989	0.103	Accepted
Teachers	Between Groups = 2.122 Within Groups = 15.796	2.854	0.028	Rejected
School Environment	Between Groups = 1.352 Within Groups = 17.496	1.642	0.171	Accepted

$\alpha = 0.05$

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as peer group influence with parent's education level

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as peer group influence with parent's education level; the significant value is 0.075 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant between students discipline problems such as peer group influence with parent's education level. The hypothesis states that there is no significant between students discipline problems such as peer group influence with parent's education level is accepted. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as peer group influence with parent's education level.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as family with parent's education level

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as family with parent's education level. The significant value is 0.103 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as family with parent's education level. The hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as family with parent's education level is therefore accepted. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as family with parent's education level.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as by teachers with parent's education level

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as teachers with parent's education level; the significant value is 0.028 which is less than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is significant between students discipline problems such as teachers with parent's education level. The hypothesis states that there is no significant between students discipline problems such as teachers with parent's education level and therefore it is rejected. In this study, we can assure that there is significant between students discipline problems such as teachers with parent's education level.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as by school environment with parent's education level

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as school environment with parent's education level, where the significant value is 0.171 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as school environment with parent's education level. The hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as school environment with parent's education level and therefore it is accepted.. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as school environment with parent's education level.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy, absenteeism, stealing and fighting with their academic achievement

Table 14: T – test

Discipline Problems	UPSR Mean	F	Sig.	Hypothesis
Truancy	Passed = 3.68 Failed = 3.81	0.643	0.425	Accepted
Absenteeism	Passed = 3.29 Failed = 3.33	0.190	0.664	Accepted
Stealing	Passed = 3.70 Failed = 3.74	0.187	0.667	Accepted
Fighting	Passed = 3.63 Failed = 3.68	0.002	0.967	Accepted

$\alpha = 0.05$

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy with their academic achievement

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy with their academic achievement, where the significant value is 0.425 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy with their academic achievement. The hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy with their academic achievement is therefore accepted. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as truancy with their academic achievement.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as absenteeism with their academic achievement

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as absenteeism with their academic achievement, where the significant value is 0.664 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as absenteeism with their academic achievement. The hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as absenteeism with their academic achievement is therefore accepted. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as absenteeism with their academic achievement.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as stealing with their academic achievement

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as stealing with their academic achievement, where the significant value is 0.667 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as stealing with their academic achievement. The hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as stealing with their academic achievement is therefore accepted. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as stealing with their academic achievement.

There is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as fighting their academic achievement

Based on analysis, for the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as fighting with their academic achievement, where the significant value is 0.967 which is more than the level of significant 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as fighting with their academic achievement. The hypothesis state that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as fighting with their

academic achievement is therefore accepted. In this study, we can assure that there is no significant difference between students discipline problems such as fighting with their academic achievement.

Conclusion

Unlike other research, this study showed that the male respondents are more than female respondents. This shows that they are more suitable to this task as discipline teachers. Male teachers in general are much stricter but at the same time, they understood the nature and attitude of the troublemakers as they had the experience in mingling with this group of students.

Most of the respondents were 40 years old and below so they did not have much experience in handling these kinds of students but as time passing by, they had gained their knowledge and experience as discipline teachers. Overall, the results showed that the students' academic performances were at the medium level where the number of students who passed the examinations was much more similar to the number of students who failed. It showed that not all the problematic students at school could not have good academic performance because some of the students are clever but they did not put their effort in studying.

The findings showed that peer group influence was the dominant factor attributing to discipline problems among students. It was due to the students who like to spend their times with their friends. The students generally tend to do something which is unhealthy rather than doing things that benefit themselves and others. They also tend to be influenced by bad things from the outside world.

From the results, the respondents also noted that the students were pushed by their friends to fight and steal. This can lead to other major problems such as murder, robbing, vandalism and others. In this case, the students were blackmailed by the other students to do such things. If they resist, the student's fear of something bad will happen to them.

The conclusions that can be made from this research, all the objectives of this research that have been highlighted in Chapter 1 were achieved. Firstly, the level of students discipline problems among the secondary school students in Johor has been identified. The findings showed that the level of discipline problems among these students is high. Secondly, the dominant factor attributing to the students discipline problems is peer group influence. Thirdly, educational level of parents does not have any significant differences in discipline problems among these students where the students with discipline problems come from various family backgrounds. Lastly, academic achievement cannot ensure the students from avoiding the students get into discipline problems where students who are in high track classes also could be involved in these problems.

References

- [1] Azizi Yahaya. et.al. (2005). *Social Psychology of Adoloscet* Pahang: PTS Publication & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.
- [2] Azizi Yahaya. et.al. (2007). *Mastering in Research Method*. Pahang: PTS Publication & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.
- [3] Bandura, A. (1986). *Sosial Foundations of Thought and Action. A Social Cognitive Theory*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- [4] Duke, D.L and R.L. Canady (1991), *School Policy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- [5] Feldman, R.F.S. (1996). *Understanding Psychology* (4th. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- [6] Franken, R.E. (1998). *Human Motivation* (4th. ed.). Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- [7] Gallup, G.H. (1980) The 12th Annual Gallup Poll of the public Attitudes towards the Public School Phi Delta Kappan.
- [8] Gottfredson, D.C., Mc Neil, R.J, and Gottfredson G.D. (1991). Social are influences On delinquency: Amultilerd analysis, *Journal of Research in Crime and delinquency*, 28(2), 197-226
- [9] Hyman, I.A. & Snook, P.A. (1999). *Dangerous schools: What we can do about the physical and emotional abuse of our children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Blass Inc.
- [10] Knowles, J.G., Cole, A.L. & Pressword, C.S. (1994) *Through Preservice Teacher's Eyes: Exploring Field Experiences through Narrative and Inquiry*. New York: Merill.
- [11] Krejcie. R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Detemining sample size for research*. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 30,607-610
- [12] Lumsden, L.S. (1994). *Student Motivation to Learn*. ERIC Digest 92. <http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest092.html>.
- [13] Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed) New York: Harper & Row.
- [14] Mok Soon Sang (1992). *Pedagogi 2: Strategi Pengajaran-Pembelajaran. Pengajaran Mikro dan Persediaan Untuk Pengajaran Praktik*. Edisi Baru. Kuala Lumpur: Kumpulan Budiman Sdn.Bhd. New Straits Times (04 April 2004)
- [15] Portney L.G & Walkins M.R. (1993). *Foundation of Clinical research: Applications To pratice*. East Norwalk, Conn: Appleton and Lang.
- [16] Schon, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- [17] Shoba (2007) *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kemerosotan disiplin di kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah di Johor*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: Tesis Sarjana
- [18] Slavin, R.E. (2003). *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice* (7th. ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- [19] Sternberg, R.J. & Williams, W.W. (2002). *Educational Psychology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- [20] Stiggins, RichardJ, (1997) *Student Centered Classroom Measurement*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [21] Zulaiha Bt. Chik (2001). *Persepsi pelajar terhadap beberapa aspek guru dalam membentuk disiplin di dalam bilik darjah*. Tesis Sarjana Muda yang tidak diterbitkan. Februari 2001.