Research Paper

Peer Role Model in Values Education in Government University in Guangdong Province in China

Dehou Guo

Adamson University

Abstract *The aim of this study is intends to determine the relationship of the level of Values Education Process(VP) and Effectiveness of Values Education (EV) at Huizhou University.It is also to analyze whether the level of Values Education Process(VP) and Effectiveness of Values Education (EV) differ according to sex and year level.The study take 376 students respondents at Huizhou University in the school year 2022-2023. Questionnaires adapted from Xu&Ren(2016) was used as research instrument in gathering information.Scale is a likert-type measure of 42 items.The reliability of the scale is 0.977.As a result of the study,it was determined that there is positive relationship between Values Educational Process(VP) and Effectiveness of Values Education (EV).In addition,sex and year level stayed a partial difference on the level of Values Education Process(VP) and Effectiveness of Values Education (EV).*
Keywords: *Peer Role Model,Values Education,Huizhou University*

I. Introduction

Peer role model promote young students to respect, emulate and learn because of its rich role of infection, motivation and guidance, unique personality charm and strong behavior driving force. Peer role models have great influences on the formation and shaping of young students' morality and good behavior. Students need proper role models whose words, actions and deeds are both consistent and good personal example. (Yazici,Aslan,2011)

Current studies on role models are mainly based on Bandura's social learning theory. Bandura believes that learning is a process in which individuals obtain some new behavioral responses or modify existing behavioral responses by observing others' behaviors and their reinforcement results. Social learning theory explains that one of the goals of learning is to stimulate self-efficacy which is the conviction that one can successfully execute the desired behavior required to produce an outcome (Bandura,1982).When an individual is convinced that he is capable of carrying out an activity, he will have a high sense of 'self-efficacy' and make efforts to carry out the activity.Bandura contended that role model influence occurs primarily through mastery of experiences (repeated performance accomplishments),observational learning (observing rather than direct involvement), and social persuasion (convincing that tasks can be performed)(Van Auken& Fry,2006).

This research is based on the research on the process and effectiveness of school values education. Xu&Ren(2016) explained the process of values education mainly includes the characteristics of peer role models, publicity and education methods, and student participation. At the same time, he summarized the effectiveness of values education results into two aspects: the effectiveness of thought leading effect and the effectiveness of personal career development. Different from the traditional curriculum in which teachers' teaching is used as a means of value education, peer models have promoted the realization of the effect of value education in the form of school spirit in value education. Therefore, it is feasible that Xu&Ren(2016) does not include teachers as the research object in the process of values education. At the same time, this study also believes that the effectiveness of values education should not only show the maturity of morality, but also show the promotion of personal growth and career development.

In this study,the Values Education Process(VP) mainly includes three elements:Student Engagement(SE), Model Features(MF), and Educational Methods(EM).The Effectiveness of Values Education(EV) can be divided into the Moral Effectiveness(ME) and Performance Effectiveness(PE). This study intends to determine the relationship of level of Values Education Process(VP) and the Effectiveness of Values

Education (EV) at Huizhou University for the school year 2022-2023.

This study assumes that: the Values Educational Process(VP) of Peer Role Model is positively correlated with the Effectiveness of Values Education (EV).Specifically, there are three hypotheses and this study will test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

H1:There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on the level of Values Education Process(VP) when they are grouped according to the profile variables.

H2: There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on the level of the Effectiveness of Values Education (EV) when they are grouped according to the profile variables.

H3:There is no significant relationship on the Values Educational Process(VP) and the Effectiveness of Values Education (EV).

II.   Method

2.1 Research Design

To achieve the main goal of this paper, quantitative methods would be used, and the data would be processed using the SPSS software.Questionnaires adapted from Xu&Ren(2016) would be used as research instrument in gathering information.T-test and ANOVA would be also used to get the difference on the effectiveness of values education when the respondents are grouped according to Sex and year level.Pearson correlation coefficient would be used to determine the significant relationship between the Values Education Process and the effectiveness of Values Education.

2.2 Participants

This study was conducted in Huizhou University and take undergraduate students as respondents.The researcher will use non-random sampling at 95% confidence level using the 5% margin of error with the aid of Qualtrics calculator for Sample Size. The researcher used at least 376 students respondents from the total of 16,325.

2.3 Instrument

Questionnaire from Xu&Ren(2016) would be adapted. In the Likert-type evaluation of the scale, 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree,   and 4 = Strongly Agree. This study will expand the questionnaire items to 42 questions and each variable will be measured by 8 to 9 questions.Specifically,Item number A1 to number A8 is for measuring student education (SE), Item number B1 to number B9 is for measuring model features (MF), Item number C1 to number C9 is for measuring educational methods (EM), Item number D1 to number D8   is for measuring Moral Effectiveness，and Item number E1 to number E8 is for measuring Performance Effectiveness.

The following describes the descriptions corresponding to the four--point scale:

Table 1   4-point Scale for Interpretation of Data

Scale Weight	Range of Means Values	Descriptive Rating
4	3. 51- 4. 00	Strongly Agree
3	2. 51- 3. 50	Agree
2	1. 51- 2. 50	Disagree
1	1. 00- 1. 50	Strongly Disagree

2.4 Analysis of Instrument Reliability and Validity

After all questionnaires have been duly-answered by the respondents, tallied and properly documented, the data was forwarded to a statistician for data analysis with the aid of the software SPSS. According to the reliability coefficient, Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items is 0.977, indicating that the overall reliability of the questionnaire is very high.

Table 2 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.976	0.977	42

The coefficient result of KMO test is 0.963, and the coefficient range of KMO test is 0-1. The closer to 1, the better the structural validity.According to the significance of the spherical test, the significance of this test is infinitely close to zero. So the questionnaire has good validity.

Table 3   KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.963
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	16128.700
	df	861

	Sig.	.000

III. Results

3.1 Descriptive Analysis

3.1.1 Sex

Table 4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by Sex.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Sex

Sex	f	(%)
Male	131	34.8
Female	245	65.2
Total	**376**	**100**

Legend:f=frequency;%=percentage

As shown in Table 4,of the three hundred seventy six(376) respondents,one hundred thirty one(131) or 34.8% are male and two hundred forty five(245) or 65.2% are female.This means that majority of the respondents are female and is roughly equivalent to the distribution of male and female students in the entire university.

3.1.2 Year Level

Table 5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by Year Level.Year level of the respondents was grouped into 4 categories.Of the three hundred seventy six(376) respondents,ninety two(92) or 24.5% are Freshman,ninety five(95) or 25.3% are sophomore,ninety seven(97) or 25.8% are Junior and ninety two(92) or 24.5% are Senior.This means that the number of student respondents from each year level is approximately the same, consistent with the number of samples designed for the study.

Table 5
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Year Level

Year Level	f	(%)
Freshman	92	24.5
Sophomore	95	25.3
Junior	97	25.8
Senior	92	24.5
Total	**376**	**100**

3.2 Difference at the level of Values Education Process(VP) when students are grouped by gender and year level

3.2.1 Gender

Table 6
Gender differences in Values Education Process(VP)

variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
Student Engagement （SE）	Male	131	24.672	5.3385	1.631	0.104
	Female	245	23.784	4.3999		
Model Features(MF)	Male	131	30.206	4.2926	-0.097	0.923
	Female	245	30.249	3.9927		
Educational Methods(EM)	Male	131	27.802	6.3844	2.503	0.013
	Female	245	26.151	5.929		

According to the results of independent sample t-test shown in Table 6, we can see the gender differences of each dimension.

The significance test of gender difference in Student Engagement (SE) is 0.104, which is significantly greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no difference between students of different genders in the dimension of Student Engagement (SE). The significance test of gender difference of Model Features (MF) is 0.923, which is significantly greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no difference in the dimension of Model Features (MF) between students of different genders.

However, the significance test of educational methods (EM) in gender is 0.013, and there is significant statistical difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that there are differences between male students and female students in the dimension of educational methods (EM).

3.2.2 Year Level

Table 7
Year level differences in Values Education Process(VP)

Variable	Year Level	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Sig	Multiple comparison
Student Engagement（SE）	Freshman	92	24.793	5.0154	2.273	0.08	/
	Sophomore	95	24.558	3.9023			
	Junior	97	23.165	4.8898			
	Senior	92	23.891	5.0567			
Model Features(MF)	Freshman	92	31.391	4.2606	3.507	0.016	1>2,1>3，1>4
	Sophomore	95	30.116	3.981			
	Junior	97	29.773	3.9038			
	Senior	92	29.685	4.0706			
Educational Methods(EM)	Freshman	92	28.217	5.8944	5.055	0.002	1>3,1>4，2>3
	Sophomore	95	27.589	5.0413			
	Junior	97	25.227	6.2458			
	Senior	92	25.924	6.8424			

Legend：1=Freshman，2=Sophomore，3=Junior，4=Senior

According to the results of one-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests in Table 7, among the three dimensions of Values Education Process (VP), only Model Features (MF) and Educational Methods (EM) have differences in Year Level, because the significance test results are 0.016 and 0.002, respectively, which are significantly less than 0.05.

The results of multiple comparisons show that Model Features (MF) have significant differences in Year Level: Freshman is bigger than Sophomore, Freshman is bigger than Junior, Freshman is bigger than Senior. Similarly, Educational Methods (EM) also have significant differences in Year Level: Freshman is bigger than Junior, Freshman is bigger than Senior, and Sophomore is bigger than Junior.

Based on the analysis described above, the hypothesis H1'There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on the level of Values Education Process(VP) when they are grouped according to the profile variables' is partially rejected.

3.3 Difference at the level of Effectiveness of Values Education (EV) when students are grouped by gender and year level

3.3.1 Gender

Table 8
Gender differences in Effectiveness of Values Education (EV)

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
Moral Effectiveness(ME)	Male	131	25.412	4.794	1.306	0.193
	Female	245	24.767	4.089		
Performance Effectiveness(PE)	Male	131	26.435	4.4447	0.593	0.553
	Female	245	26.163	3.8044		

According to the results of independent sample t-test shown in Table 8, we can see the gender differences of each dimension.

The significance test of the difference in gender of Moral Effectiveness (ME) is 0.193, which is significantly greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no difference in the dimension of Moral Effectiveness (ME) between students of different genders. The difference significance test of performance effectiveness (PE) in gender is 0.553, which is significantly greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no difference in performance effectiveness (PE) between students of different sexes.

3.3.2 Year Level

Table 9
Year level differences in Effectiveness of Values Education (EV)

Variable	Year Level	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Sig	Multiple comparison
Moral Effectiveness(ME)	Freshman	92	26.022	4.214	4.538	0.004	1>3,1>4，2>3
	Sophomore	95	25.516	3.7555			
	Junior	97	23.938	4.4036			
	Senior	92	24.533	4.745			
Performance Effectiveness(PE)	Freshman	92	27.174	4.094	2.539	0.056	/
	Sophomore	95	26.337	3.5748			
	Junior	97	25.742	3.9981			
	Senior	92	25.804	4.3507			

Legend：1=Freshman，2=Sophomore，3=Junior，4=Senior

According to the results of one-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests in Table 9, among the two dimensions of Effectiveness of Values Education (EV), only the Moral Effectiveness (ME) has a difference on the Year Level, because the significance test result is 0.004, which is significantly less than 0.05.

From the results of multiple comparisons, it can be seen that there is a significant difference in the Year Level of Moral Effectiveness (ME): Freshman is bigger than Junior, Freshman is bigger than Senior, and Sophomore is bigger than Junior.

Based on the analysis described above, the hypothesis H2 'There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on the level of the Effectiveness of Values Education (EV) when they are grouped according to the profile variables' is partially rejected.

3.4 Correlation Analysis

According to the correlation analysis results in Table 10, each variable has significant correlation at the 99% significant level, and the correlation coefficient is greater than 0, so it is positive correlation.

For example, the correlation coefficient between Moral Effect (ME) and Performance Effect (PE) is 0.806, which is a positive correlation. By analogy, the correlation of all other variables can be explained.

Table 10
Correlation analysis between various dimensions

Variable	Correlation	Student Engagement(SE)	Model Features(MF)	Educational Methods(EM)	Moral Effectiveness(ME)	Performance Effectiveness（PE）
Student Engagement (SE)	Pearson Correlation	1				
Model Features (MF)	Pearson Correlation	.612**	1			
Educational Methods (EM)	Pearson Correlation	.772**	.539**	1		
Moral Effectiveness (ME)	Pearson Correlation	.787**	.635**	.877**	1	
Performance Effectiveness (PE)	Pearson Correlation	.660**	.709**	.683**	.806**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This indicate that there is positive relationship between Values Educational Process(VP) and Effectiveness of Values Education (EV).**Based on the analysis described above, the hypothesis H3 'There is no significant relationship on the Values Educational Process(VP) and the Effectiveness of Values Education (EV)'is rejected.**

IV. Discussion

Based from the foregoing findings,the following conclusions are presented:

1.The respondents chosen for this study were credible enough to provide pertinent information about this study.Supported by their gender ,year level in the University,the perceptions they shared served as the basis for the researcher to analyze the factors of Values Educational Process and Effectiveness of Values Education in the study.

2. There exist a positive relationship between Values Educational Process and Effectiveness of Values Education.This is very significant because increased the level of Values Educational Process,resulting in better level of the Effectiveness of Values Education.

3.Among the three factors in the value education process, the mean value of Student Engagement (SE) (composite mean 3.01) and Educational Methods (EM) (composite mean 2.97) ranks the last two which result indicates that it is necessary for school authorities to take some improvement measures on these two variables in order to enhance the effectiveness of value education .

4.Model Features(MF), Educational Methods(EM) and Moral Effectiveness (ME) have differences on the Year Level ,and analysis above shows the students in lower year level have higher evaluation than those students in higher year level.So school authorities should pay attention to values education of high year level students.

As a result of this study,the following recommendations are presented:

1.School authorities should increase students' participation in the formulation and revision of peer role model selection rules, and seek their opinions and suggestions through student associations to ensure that students have sufficient opportunities and channels to express themselves.

2. School community should increase the promotion of peer role models on poster,campus radio and television to ensure that students can easily obtain sufficient relevant information on campus. At the same time, it is necessary to improve the publishing of peer role models' information through Internet channels such as websites, emails, and Twitter to make it more acceptable to students.

3.Teachers should be given sufficient information and training on peer role models to enable them to accurately convey the information and value of peer role models when communicating with students.

4.Given that there is no difference in performance effectiveness among different year level, and that the level of moral effectiveness decreased as year level increased, schools as a whole should focus on value education in students in low year level, as students in high year level are more likely to encounter social value shocks due to job seeking reasons and are more difficult to accept the effects of school education.

References

[1]. Bandura,A(1977).Social Learning Theory.Englewood Cliffs,N.J.:Prentice Hall;Toronto:Prentice-Hall of Canada.
[2]. Bandura,A(1982).Social Foundations of Thought and Action:A Social Cognitive Theory.Prentice Hall.
[3]. Eksi, Halil; Kaya, Çinar. (2021).Values Education Processes in Turkish Elementary Schools: A Multiple Case Study.International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies, v8 n1 p1-13.
[4]. Gündogdu, Kerim; Üstündag, Nurtaç; Altin, Mehmet.(2019).Teachers' Views on Character/Values Education in Schools.International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences, v8 n3 14-28.
[5]. Hakam, Kama Abdul. (2018).Tradition of Value Education Implementation in Indonesian Primary Schools.Journal of Social Studies Education Research, v9 (n4)295-318.
[6]. Hatipoğlu, Recep.(2017).The opinions of the principals about the effectiveness of values education and their suggestions about how to teach them.Proceedings of the Multidisciplinary Academic Conference, 1-17.
[7]. Herrmann, Sarah D.; Adelman, Robert Mark; Bodford, Jessica E.. Grantee Submission.(2016).The Effects of a Female Role Model on Academic Performance and Persistence of Women in STEM Courses.Basic and Applied Social Psychology ,v38 (n5) 258-268 .
[8]. İlyas Görgüt.(2018).Values Education and Physical Education in Turkey. International Education Studies, v11 (n3)18-28.
[9]. Iscan,Canay.(2015).Views on values education:from teacher candidates to experienced teachers. Winter2015, Vol. 136 Issue 2, 192-210.
[10]. Katılmış, Ahmet. (2017). Values Education as Perceived by Social Studies Teachers in Objective and Practice Dimensions.Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice., Vol. 17 Issue 4, p1231-1254.
[11]. Sahin, Ümran. (2019).Values and Values Education as Perceived by Primary School Teacher Candidates.International Journal of Progressive Education, v15 n3 p74-90.
[12]. Turan, Mehmet; Bozkurt, Eyüp. (2017).Values Education in 4th Grade Social Science Courses from the Perspectives of Teachers.Journal of Education and Training Studies, v5 n12 p21-29 Dec 2017.
[13]. Van Auken,Howard; Fry,Fred L;Stephens,Paul. (2006).The influence of role models on entrepreneurial intentions.Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, Vol. 11 Issue 2, p157-167.
[14]. Xu Zhanlu;Ren Shaobo(2016).The effectiveness of Peer Model Approach in Ideological and Political Education :A Survey of Students from Nine Universitie in Hangzhou,Fudan Education Forum ,V14,P49-P54.

[15]. Yazici, Sedat; Aslan, Mecnun. (2011).Using Heroes as Role Models in Values Education: A Comparison between Social Studies Textbooks and Prospective Teachers' Choice of Hero or Heroines.Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, v11(n4) 2184-2188 .

[16]. ZhouPeng．(Nov 9, 2021).Research progress and hot spot analysis of socialist core values in China．Journal of Chongqing University. https://kns.cnki.net/kcms/detail/50.1023.c.20201120.1435.002.html