

BALANCED DEVELOPMENT IN MALAYSIA: THE ROLE OF VALUES AND RELIGION

**Dr. Mohd. Aslam Haneef
Dr. Selamah Abdullah Yusof
Dr. Ruzita Mohd. Amin
Department of Economics
International Islamic University Malaysia
Jalan Gombak, Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia**

**Dr. Hazizan Md. Noon
Department of Sociology
International Islamic University Malaysia
Jalan Gombak, Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia**

Abstract

Malaysia is cited as one of the most economically successful Muslim countries in the last two decades. Nevertheless, due partly to the pace of economic change, especially in the nineties, Malaysia has undergone a tremendous social transformation that has affected many of its traditional/religious values and norms. This may hinder the achievement of a balanced development that is aspired by the country. A society and a workforce based on high moral values are necessary to ensure a meaningful development. This paper investigates the values of teenagers who will form the future workforce of the country. It is based on the works of al-Ghazali in which values are divided into two categories, i.e., terminal and instrumental. al-Ghazali's classification of the various 'goods' (*fada'il*) needed to achieve 'happiness' (*sa'adah*) or ultimate success (*falah*) is used as categories of terminal values and his discussion on 'character and qualities of the soul' reflects the instrumental values. It is found that the inculcation and internalization of good moral and ethical values, as well as religion in the society are necessary to achieve a balanced development in Malaysia.

1. Introduction

Malaysia has made remarkable progress in transforming its economy and raising the standards of living of its people since independence in 1957. While material economic development was the focus of early development plans in the sixties and seventies, the 1980s saw a clear move to complement economic development with 'value-based policies' such as the *Look East Policy* and the *Inculcation of Islamic Values Policy*.¹ The *Sixth Malaysia Plan* (1991-1995), as part of the *National Development Policy* (NDP, 1991-2000), stated very clearly that "the objective of the NDP is to attain balanced development in order to create a more united and just society" (p. 4) requiring a Malaysian society with high moral values and ethics (p. 53).

The emphasis on balanced development was reiterated in the *Seventh Malaysia Plan* 1996-2000, that emphasized 'religions, customs and traditions' (p. 28) as the basis for moral and ethical values. The *National Vision Policy* (NVP), 2001-2010 continues this emphasis by

¹ See Mohamed Aslam Haneef (2001).

highlighting the need to ‘develop a generation of resilient youths’ (*Third Outline Perspective Plan, 2001-2010*: 26), who are equipped with appropriate skills and knowledge *as well as the right values*. This distinction between providing knowledge and skills and having ‘good values’ is very relevant to the topic of this study. It is our contention that good and correct values are part of the ‘social capital’ which have implications on the effectiveness of any developmental effort.

The Malaysian experience provides an opportunity to study values *from an Islamic perspective*. If religion is still considered to be an important institution in society, as maintained in the Malaysian context, benchmarks or standards need to be developed to reflect religious perspectives. Since no such framework is currently available, this study tries to develop one that suits the Malaysian context. Even though the Malaysian society is plural in nature, this study uses primarily the works of al-Ghazali (as found in Abul Quasem, 1976) who has a major influence on Islam in Malaysia, to develop a framework that represents universal values found in all major religions. In addition, we apply Rokeach’s (1973: 7) categorization of values in the measurement of values. This paper also analyzes the link between values and religion, which plays an important role in instilling good values. The study focuses on the values of teenagers, in particular, since the direction and continuing success of the country depends very much on the future generation that will emerge from the youths of today.

2. Values and Value Systems²

While conventional studies on values and value systems are important, these need to be modified to take into account the religions, cultures and environment in Malaysia. The study by Rokeach (1973: 5) for instance, takes value to mean “... an enduring belief that is personally or socially preferable ... values are preferences as well as a conception of the preferable”. Values in turn can, and are, organized into value systems where these values can, and are, ordered or prioritized. This value system is determined by a host of factors including personal, religious, societal and cultural factors.

Values are multifaceted standards that guide conduct in a variety of ways (Rokeach, 1973: 13) and can generally be divided into two categories, i.e., instrumental and terminal. We can have values that are ‘means to the ends’ (instrumental values) and values that are ‘the ends’ themselves (terminal values) (Rokeach, 1973: 7). If human beings behave in all the ways prescribed by their mean/instrumental values, they will be rewarded with all the end states specified by their terminal values. If there is a clear understanding of the end goals (which are in many ways less prone to change), then it would be possible to prescribe the relevant instrumental values (including actions), which would lead to the end goals.

In societies where religion is still a strong component that directs and guides life, not only must the ends be valid, but equally important is the principle that the means must also be correct and proper. The ends certainly cannot justify the means. This is the case in Islam. If it is found that individuals and society are possessing instrumental values that are not conducive to the attainment of the end values, then remedial action need to be taken. If it is found that individuals and society do not possess the end values that are prescribed, this must first be addressed.

² See also Mohamed Aslam Haneef et al. (2002: 60-67).

2.1 Provisions to Attain Happiness-Terminal Values

To attain happiness or success in this world and the next (*falah*) which should be the end goal for a Muslim, al-Ghazali identifies four groups or categories of ‘goods’ or means (*wasail*). These ‘goods’ are considered terminal values in this study. Not all these categories are equally important. Just as values “predispose us to favor one particular position over another” (Rokeach, 1973: 13), the Islamic view as put forward by al-Ghazali (Muhammad Abul Quasem, 1976: 58-64) rightly prioritizes three of the four categories, which are:

- i. goods of the soul (*al-fada'il al-nafsiyyah*)
- ii. goods of the body (*al-fada'il al-jismiyyah*)
- iii. external goods (*al-fada'il al-khariyyah*)

Goods of the Soul (*al-Fada'il al-Nafsiyyah*) is the most important of the categories and has been ‘reduced’ by al-Ghazali to two factors, faith or knowledge and good character. The latter refers to having all the good qualities of the soul and is only attainable through good actions. Goods of the Body (*al-Fada'il al-Jismiyyah*) is essential but lower in rank to the first and consists of health, strength, long life, beauty, etc. These goods are seen to be physiological means that helps one to attain knowledge and do good actions. External Goods (*al-Fada'il al-Khariyyah*) are not essential but useful for the attainment of happiness and include wealth, influence, family and noble birth. Wealth, for instance, is useful to attain good health, which in turn is important in performing our acts of *ibadah*.

The fourth category, Goods of Divine Grace (*al-Fada'il al-Tawfiyyah*), is not included in the list of prioritization because it does not lie in the hands of man, but is given by God to whom He pleases. The goods in this category include divine guidance (*hidayah*), divine direction (*rushd*), divine leadership (*tasdid*) and divine strengthening (*ta'id*). Therefore, it is important for man to perform his obligations with correct knowledge, intention and in the correct way, while always in hope for God’s divine grace.³

2.2 Faculties of the Soul-Instrumental Values

The starting point of talking about behavior (and attitudes and values) is man. While man has a physical body, the essence of man in the Islamic framework, is the soul. The soul is given the body as a ‘vehicle’ so that it may acquire provisions for this world, but *ultimately for the eternal afterlife*. al-Ghazali states that there are four faculties or powers of the soul (Muhammad Abul Quasem, 1976: 81-86). These faculties are *desire*, *anger*, *knowledge* and *justice*. The first two faculties are often referred to as passion (*hawa*) or sometimes called the carnal soul (*nafs*). Man is to control these two faculties, using the faculty of reason (*knowledge*) and the *Shari'ah*. The faculty of *justice* is the enforcer and if successful, the virtue of *justice* is established in the soul. A summary of these faculties are given below.

³ The correct ranking of the categories for a person to attain happiness would be *goods of the soul* as the highest priority followed by *goods of the body* and *external goods*. It must be stressed that this does not mean Islam disregards the importance of *bodily* or *external goods*. The Islamic position and ordering of priorities does not support the neglect of the body and the shunning of worldly activities. Islam has a very clear position that Muslims (and all human beings) are obliged to strive for their betterment in the world. The issue here is that, the way we satisfy our bodily and external needs has to be guided by the framework set out in Islam.

Table 1: The Means and Extremes of Faculties

Faculty	Deficient	Mean	Excess
Faculty of Knowledge -wisdom is a state of the soul which enables a man to distinguish right from wrong in all voluntary actions	Stupidity -foolishness -little experience in affairs -insanity	Wisdom -soundness of mgmt -rightness of opinion -awareness of the subtle actions & hidden evils of the soul	Wickedness -slyness -deceit -trickery -cunning
Faculty of Anger -courage is a state of the soul in which the faculty of anger is always obedient to reason.	Cowardice -small-mindedness -lack of self-respect -impatience -aversion from receiving rights	Courage -self-control -repression of anger -forbearance -dignity	Rashness -boastfulness -arrogance/rudeness -fury -pride -conceit
Faculty of Desire -temperance is a state of the soul in which the faculty of desire is disciplined under the commands of reason and the Shari'a.	Annihilation -miserliness -self-humiliation	Temperance -generosity -modesty -patience -contentment -piety -kindness -helpfulness -wit -lack of covetousness	Greed -shamelessness -impurity -extravagance -tendency to defame the character of others -boldness -preoccupation with useless activities -envy -rejoicing in others' misfortune
Faculty of Justice -justice in respect of bodily members consists in using them in proper ways -justice in conduct towards others is giving each man his due and in not harming any one in any way.	Injustice	Justice	Injustice

The excess, deficiency and mean of each of the three faculties of the soul (*faculties of knowledge, anger and desire*) as discussed above are considered as instrumental values in this study. The mean of each of the three faculties of the soul are necessary to achieve the terminal value of happiness in the hereafter. The fourth faculty of the soul, the *faculty of justice*, is not included in the analysis of instrumental values since it is the 'enforcer' to establish the virtue of justice in the soul (i.e., the mean position of the three faculties). Since the mean of the faculties are virtues, while the extremes (excess and deficiency) are considered as vices, in this study, the presence of the mean of the faculties in teenagers is preferred, while the presence of the extremes is not.

3. Methodology and Measurement of Variables

The sample in this study consisted of 2869 randomly selected Forms 1, 3 and 5 students⁴ from 10 secondary schools in the state of Johor.⁵ Both urban and rural schools were included, and the students were chosen from *above average*, *average* and *below average* classes. This was done to capture the heterogeneity of the population with respect to age, academic ability, ethnic group,⁶ and other factors. Written questionnaires were used as sampling instruments to obtain information from students. The questionnaire consisted of questions to elicit information about the students' socioeconomic background, peers, media exposure, religiosity and values.

3.1 Terminal Values

Terminal values are described as the “desirable end-states of existence” (Rokeach, 1973: 7) or “goals in life” (Cohen and Cohen, 1996: 8). In this study, the items on terminal values included are based on al-Ghazali's description of the means to happiness, as mentioned in the previous section i.e., *goods of the soul*, *goods of the body* and *external goods*.

Several items were selected to be included in the questionnaire to reflect each category of goods. They are strong faith, wisdom and good moral conduct for *goods of the soul*; health, long-life and physical strength for *goods of the body*; and wealth, influence/power and reverence/respect for *external goods*. These items were listed in random order, and respondents were required to rank the items from the most to the least desirable to them. The average ranking of the items in each category of goods was then computed to determine the overall ranking of the three categories.

3.2 Instrumental Values

The measurement of instrumental values was based on al-Ghazali's faculties or powers of the soul. These faculties are desire, anger, knowledge and justice. Each of these faculties, except for justice, was considered as a category for the measurement of instrumental values.

For the category of desire, we determined if respondents have the following values: *excess of desire*, *deficient in desire*, or *mean of desire*. A similar approach was adopted for the categories of anger and knowledge. A list of statements that were considered to be reflective of each of the values was formulated and included in the questionnaire. Respondents were required to indicate their extent of agreement (*strongly disagree*, *disagree*, *indifferent*, *agree* and *strongly agree*) to each of the statements.

⁴ The Malaysian education system consists of 6 years of primary education (6—12 years old) and continues with 5 to 6 years of secondary education. Form 1 students consist of those aged 13, Form 3 students are those aged 15, and Form 5 students are those aged 17, on the average.

⁵ This study is part of a bigger research project funded by the Johor State Government to determine the relationship between values and social problems in Johor. The state of Johor is situated at the southern tip of mainland Asia, and is Peninsular Malaysia's third largest state made up of eight districts with an area of 19,984 square km. Information about the state of Johor is available online at <http://www.johor.com.my/johor/second.html>.

⁶ Ethnic group is included as one of the factors because Malaysia is a multi-racial country with Malays and other indigenous constituting 58 per cent, Chinese 26 per cent, Indians 7 per cent, and other races 9 per cent of the population (<http://www.tradeport.org/ts/countries/malaysia/wofact.html>).

Factor analysis was carried out to determine if the statements that were constructed fall in the appropriate categories specified *a priori* and to check the validity of these items in measuring the instrumental values. In addition, factor analysis was also used to obtain measurements (scores) for each of the categories. The scores range from 1 to 4, where 1 implies having a minimal amount of the instrumental value and 4 indicates a great amount of that value.

3.3 Religiosity

Many studies have attempted to characterize an individual's religiosity by a single measure (McGuire, 1992) such as religious affiliation or preference. However, we believe that a comprehensive measure of religiosity should not be uni-dimensional but rather should be multi-dimensional. Renzetti and Curran (1998) suggest that one's religiosity can be measured from the five dimensions of religion, namely *ritualistic*, *experiential*, *ideological*, *consequential* and *intellectual*.⁷ As the term suggests, *ritualistic* religiosity looks at the religious rites observed by a person such as attendance in mosque, church or temple. *Experiential* religiosity measures how strongly a person feels attached to his or her religion. *Ideological* religiosity concerns with the degree of commitment to religious doctrine or teachings. The extent to which religion affects the way a person conducts his or her daily life is best described as *consequential* religiosity, and *intellectual* religiosity measures a person's knowledge of the history and teaching of his or her religion.

For this study, we rely heavily on the framework for measuring religiosity used by Renzetti and Curran (1998) which is complemented by Quazi Shamsuddin's view (Quazi Shamsuddin Md. Ilyas, n.d.) to incorporate the Islamic framework in the research. Five aspects of religiosity were considered—*ritualistic*, *experiential*, *ideological*, *consequential* and *intellectual*. For each of these aspects, one or two questions were formulated to measure the level of that aspect of religiosity, with certain differences between Muslims and non-Muslims.⁸

For the overall level of religiosity for both Muslims and non-Muslims, we used the mean value of only four aspects of religiosity, namely, *ritualistic*, *experiential*, *consequential* and *intellectual*. For the Muslims, we also computed the mean value of all the five aspects of religiosity, including *ideological*. Thus Muslim respondents had two measures of overall religiosity, while the non-Muslim respondents had one. Both of these measures are based on a scale of 0 to 3 of which values closer to 3 indicate high religiosity, and values near 0 denote low religiosity.

⁷ Renzetti and Curran's (1998) suggestion seems to have been taken from Charles Y. Glock's original idea as indicated in McGuire (1992: 102-4).

⁸ It must be noted here that *ideological* religiosity was measured for Muslim respondents only. The questions related to this were on the number of times the respondents pray a day, and the number of days they missed fasting without valid/permissible reasons in the month of Ramadan in the previous year. Their responses on these two statements were measured against the benchmark values, which are 5 and 0, respectively. Although similar questions were given to non-Muslim respondents, their responses could not be used to compute their level of *ideological* religiosity since there were no benchmarks to compare to. Due to this, the responses from Muslim and non-Muslim respondents on ideological religiosity are not comparable.

3.4 Limitations of Measurements

Being a pioneering empirical work on values from an Islamic perspective, this study is not free from limitations. In the measurement of values, one of the problems that we encountered was in formulating statements that correctly reflect the various components of instrumental values. The responses to some of the statements might not have reflected the students' true values, rather, they might have given responses that were expected of them. In addition, the number of statements constructed may not be adequate to better represent each component of instrumental values. This is also the case in the measurement of religiosity, where more questions could have been added to obtain a more accurate measure. In addition, using only the five dimensions (as discussed earlier) in measuring religiosity can be argued to be still imprecise. Nevertheless, these problems are not uncommon in studies that attempt to quantify abstract concepts. Despite these weaknesses, these measures are generally valid and there were no conflicting or inconsistent results found in the analysis.

4. Findings

The description of the sample is given in Table 2. About 49.3 per cent females and 50.7 per cent males from various ethnic and religious groups made up the sample.

4.1 Terminal Values

We obtained the mean ranking for each category of goods, and determined the order of desirability by comparing the mean values using *t*-tests. The results indicate that *goods of the soul* (strong faith, wisdom and good moral character) were ranked the most desirable in life compared to the other two groups. *Bodily goods* (health, long-life and physical strength) were ranked second and *external goods* (wealth, influence/power and reverence/respect) were the least desirable. The rankings are consistent with the preferable order of priority.

Table 2: Sample Description of Respondents

		Gender					
		Female		Male		Total	
Ethnic groups	Malay	964	(68.2)	987	(67.9)	1951	(68.1)
	Chinese	381	(27.0)	391	(26.9)	772	(26.9)
	Indian	66	(4.7)	69	(4.7)	135	(4.7)
	Others	2	(0.1)	7	(0.5)	9	(0.3)
Form	One	453	(32.1)	517	(35.6)	970	(33.9)
	Three	474	(33.5)	488	(33.6)	962	(33.6)
	Five	486	(34.4)	446	(30.7)	932	(32.5)
Religion	Islam	964	(68.6)	993	(68.6)	1957	(68.6)
	Christianity	25	(1.8)	41	(2.8)	66	(2.3)
	Hinduism	60	(4.3)	61	(4.2)	121	(4.2)
	Buddhism	352	(25.0)	338	(23.3)	690	(24.2)
	Others	5	(0.4)	15	(1.0)	20	(0.7)
Type of school	Rural	925	(65.4)	808	(55.5)	1733	(60.4)
	Urban	489	(34.6)	647	(44.5)	1136	(39.6)
Total		1414	(49.3)	1455	(50.7)	2869	(100)

Notes: Percentages in parentheses.

The sum of the items in each category may not add up to the total number of male and female respondents due to missing values (i.e., non-response to certain parts of the questionnaire).

Table 3: Terminal Values: Ranking of Desirability

		Goods of the soul (strong faith, wisdom, good moral character)	Bodily goods (health, long-life, physical strength)	External goods (wealth, influence/power, reverence/respect)
All		1	2	3
Gender	Male	1	2	3
	Female	1	2	3
Form	1	1	2	3
	3	1	2	3
	5	1	2	3
Ethnic	Malay	1	2	3
	Chinese	2	1	3
	Indian	1	2	3
Religion	Islam	1	2	3
	Christianity	1.5	1.5	3
	Hinduism	1.5	1.5	3
	Buddhism	2	1	3
School	Urban	1	2	3
	Rural	1	2	3
Class	Below average	1	2	3
	Average	1	2	3
	Above average	1	2	3

Note: A ranking of 1 indicates most desirable; 2 second most desirable; and 3 least desirable.

There were no differences in rankings between male and female students, and between students from urban and rural schools. The order of rankings of these terminal values also remains the same for students in different forms (age group) and classes. However, there were differences in ranking across ethnic groups. Malay and Indian students ranked *goods of the soul* as the most desirable, *bodily goods* as the second most desirable, and *external goods* as the least desirable in their life. Chinese students, on the other hand, placed the highest desirability on *bodily goods* over *soul* and *external goods* (refer to Table 3).

Similar distinctions were also found across religious groups. *Goods of the soul* are the most desirable to Muslims compared to *bodily* and *external goods*. Hindus and Christians found *bodily* and *soul goods* equally desirable, while Buddhist students preferred *bodily goods* to *soul goods*. The results suggest that values differ among teenagers of different ethnic or religious background.

4.2 Instrumental Values

Factor analysis using principal components with varimax rotation was conducted in analyzing instrumental values. Four factors were identified on which 13 of the 23 items yield significant loadings. Based on the *a priori* expectations about the categories each item should fall into, we further omitted 3 items to have “cleaner” groupings. The four factor

groupings are *deficient in anger*, *excess of desire*, *mean of knowledge and anger*, and *mean of desire*. Factor “scores” were computed by taking the average of the scores on those items. *t*-tests were applied to determine whether the instrumental values exist or do not exist among the students. Specifically, we tested if the average score is above or below 2.5.⁹ Table 4 presents the mean scores for the categories of instrumental values.

In general, it is found that students had the *mean of knowledge and anger* and *mean of desire*. The results also indicate that *excess of desire* and *deficient in anger* were absent among the students. We conducted similar analyses to determine the absence or presence of the values for specific groups. Comparisons were made for individuals according to gender, form, ethnicity and religion. The findings were somewhat similar to those obtained in general. The only differences were found for *mean of desire*. Teenagers in form 5 lacked *mean of desire*, while the results were indeterminate for Chinese, and Christian and Buddhist teenagers. Since form is a proxy for age, this implies that teenagers seem not to have the *mean of desire*, but rather tend to have *excess of desire* as they grow older.¹⁰

Table 4: Mean Scores of Instrumental Values

		Instrumental Values			
		<i>Deficient in anger</i>	<i>Excess of desire</i>	<i>Mean of desire</i>	<i>Mean of knowledge and anger</i>
All		2.0206	2.2564	2.5803	2.9128
Gender	Male	2.0805	2.3495	2.5927	2.9063
	Female	1.9594	2.1611	2.5677	2.9195
Form	1	2.1601	2.2565	2.7483	2.9374
	3	1.9896	2.2612	2.5601	2.8911
	5	1.9154	2.2690	2.4276	2.9095
Ethnic	Malay	1.9754	2.2931	2.6003	2.9847
	Chinese	2.1525	2.1893	2.5007	2.7068
	Indian	1.9394	2.0684	2.7520	2.9828
Religion	Islam	1.8755	2.2912	2.6003	2.9861
	Christianity	2.2143	2.2318	2.4590	2.9464
	Hinduism	1.9514	2.0863	2.7477	2.9903
	Buddhism	2.1363	2.1747	2.5297	2.6924
School	Rural	2.0159	2.2312	2.6057	2.8721
	Urban	2.0276	2.3030	2.5412	2.9736
Class	Below average	2.1838	2.3562	2.6381	2.8669
	Average	1.9785	2.2439	2.6027	2.9164
	Above average	1.9285	2.1803	2.5050	2.9411

⁹ Note that for each of the statements included in the categories of the instrumental values, respondents were required to indicate their level of agreement— 1 corresponds to totally disagree, 2 disagree, 3 agree, and 4 totally agree. The average scores for the four instrumental values are continuous variables, of which the values lie between 1 and 4. Thus 2.5 will be the cut-off point where a score of less than 2.5 indicate absence, and a score greater than 2.5 implies presence of that value. If the score is no different from 2.5, then the result is indeterminate.

¹⁰ The mean score for *excess of desire*, although less than 2.5, is lowest for form 1 and highest for form 5 students.

The findings for type of school and class also produce similar results. Teenagers in the different groups did not have *deficient in anger* and *excess of desire*, and had the *mean of desire* as well as *mean of knowledge and anger*. However, the same conclusion cannot be drawn for teenagers in urban schools, as well as in above average classes, for which the results are indeterminate.

4.3 Religiosity and Values

As has been discussed in the earlier section, we use 2 measures of overall religiosity, one excluded the ideological aspect of religiosity (this is computed for all respondents) and the other included all 5 aspects of religiosity (this applies only to Muslim respondents). We denote the first measure as R1 (exclude ideological religiosity) and the second, R2 (include ideological religiosity).

In the analysis of religiosity and terminal values, we find that higher religiosity relates to higher desirability for *goods of the soul*, and lower desirability for *external and bodily goods* (Table 5). This means that those who were more religious desire more of good moral character, wisdom and strong faith relative to wealth, reverence/respect and influence compared to those who were less religious.

Table 5: Correlation Coefficients of Terminal Values and Religiosity

Terminal Values	Religiosity	
	R1 (exclude ideological)	R2 (include ideological)-Muslims only
Bodily goods (health, physical strength, long-live)	-.143***	-.063***
External goods (wealth, power, reverence/respect)	-.334***	-.172***
Soul goods (good moral character, wisdom, strong faith)	.416***	.222***
Instrumental Values		
Deficient in anger	-.137***	-.139***
<i>Excess of desire</i>	-.091***	-.236***
<i>Mean of desire</i>	.060***	.008
<i>Mean of knowledge and anger</i>	.201***	.187***

Note: *** significant at 1 percent level.

With respect to instrumental values, low religiosity is associated with higher scores for *deficient in anger* and *excess of desire*. On the other hand, high religiosity is positively correlated with high levels of *mean of desire*, and *mean of knowledge and anger*. In other words, students who were less religious were also those who were *deficient in anger* and had *excess in desire*, while those who were more religious had the *mean of desire*, and *mean of knowledge and anger*.

5. Conclusion

This study finds that in general, teenagers had good instrumental and terminal values, with variations among ethnic groups. Religion is found to be an essential determinant in nurturing good values. It is found that higher religiosity levels corresponded with good terminal and instrumental values. This finding refutes some views that see religion as a hindrance to development.

Based on the findings above, religion should be emphasized to develop a balanced and moral society as envisaged in Vision 2020. One of the most important ways is through education and all levels of society, i.e. schools, teachers, families, peers and media must play their role to achieve this objective. It is important to stress that any goal of achieving a balanced and sustainable development cannot afford to overlook the inculcation and internalization of good moral and ethical values and must be directed towards developing individuals and hence a society with high moral standards and conduct, and to create a workforce imbued with the right values. It is hoped that measures taken will succeed in controlling the negative influences from various sources, and in developing an inner strength in individuals as a built-in protection mechanism.

References

Cohen, P. and J. Cohen. 1996. *Life Values and Adolescent Mental Health*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Malaysia. 1991. *Sixth Malaysia Plan, 1991-1995*. Kuala Lumpur: Government of Malaysia.

Malaysia. 1991. *The Second Outline Perspective Plan, 1991-2000*. Kuala Lumpur: Government of Malaysia.

Malaysia. 1996. *Seventh Malaysia Plan, 1996-2000*. Kuala Lumpur: Government of Malaysia.

Malaysia. 2001. *The Third Outline Perspective Plan, 2001-2010*. Kuala Lumpur: Government of Malaysia.

McGuire, M. 1992. *Religion: The Social Context*. 3rd Ed. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Inc.

Mohamed Aslam Haneef. 2001. "Islam and Economic Development in Malaysia: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Vol. 12 No. 3.

Mohamed Aslam Haneef, Selamah Abdullah Yusof, Ruzita Mohd. Amin, and Hazizan Md. Noon. 2002. "Values and Their Relationship to Social Problems in Malaysia: An Islamic Framework," *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, Vol. 19 No. 3.

Muhammad Abul Quasem. 1976. *The Ethics of al-Ghazali: A Composite Ethics in Islam*. Petaling Jaya, Malaysia.

Quazi Shamsuddin Md. Ilyas. n.d. "Dimensions of Muslim Religiosity: Measurement Considerations." In *Qur'anic Concepts of Human Psyche*, edited by Zafar Afaq Ansari, Islamabad: Institute of Islamic Culture.

Renzetti, C., and D. Curran. 1998. *Living Sociology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Rokeach, J. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York, NY: The Free Press.