NATIONAL VALUES HANDBOOK PILOT

ENDLINE SURVEY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii
LIST OF TABLES 1
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 7
1.1 Context of the Study 7
1.2 Purpose and Objectives of the Endline Survey 8
1.3 Study Design Overview 8
2. METHODOLOGY 10
2.1 Survey Design 10
2.2 Sampling Approach 10
2.3 Data Collection Process 11
2.4 Data Analysis 12
2.5 Ethical Considerations 12
2.6 Limitations 13
3. KEY FINDINGS 14
3.1 Demographic Profile of Participants 14
3.2 Knowledge and Understanding of National Values 15
3.3 Attitudes toward National Values 37
3.3.1 Perceived Importance of Values 37
3.3.2 Teacher Attitudes toward Values Education and National Development 38
3.3.3 Students Value Priorities and Perceived Importance 40
3.4 Qualitative Insights on the Implementation and Lived Experience of VLC Sessions 51
3.5. Behaviours Reflecting or Contradicting Values 57
3.6. Discipline in Schools 63
3.7. Barriers and Enablers for Values Practice 75
4. Conclusions and Recommendations 86
4.1 Conclusions 86
4.2 Recommendations 87
5. APPENDICES 89

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Unprompted Recall of National Values by Students 15
Table 3.2: Recognition Rates for Specific Values by Students 16
Table 3.3: Students correct interpretation of core national values, baseline and endline 18
Table 3.4: Summary of changes in students' conceptual understanding of core national values 21
Table 3.5: Results of VLC lesson observation in intervention schools 22
Table 3.6: Summary of observed VLC session practices and links to students' understanding of core national values 25
Table 3.7: DiD Regression Results – Impact on Students' Knowledge of Values 26
Table 3.8: Perceived Alignment of Selected Civic Traits with National Values 27
Table 3.9: Average Number of Values Correctly Identified by Demographic Factors 28
Table 3.10: Gender Differences in Recognition of Specific Values 29
Table 3.11: Teacher Incorporation of Values into Teaching 30
Table 3.12: Methods of Values Incorporation by Teachers 31
Table 3.13: Student Attitudes Toward National Values and Development 37
Table 3.14: Teacher Attitudes Toward Values Education and National Development 39
Table 3.15: Student's assessment of the Importance of Discipline for School Success 43
Table 3.16: Student Attitudes Toward Discipline and Authority Statements 44
Table 3.17: Student Attitudes Toward Addressing Unfair Rules 46
Table 3.18 Teacher Assessment of Student Discipline 47
Table 3.19: Student Responses to Community Clean-up Scenario 49
Table 3.20: Students' Motivations for Community Participation 50
Table 3.21: Student Self-Reported Adherence to values Value 58
Table 3.22: Teacher Observations of Student Behaviour 59
Table 3.23: Prevalence of Disciplinary Measures by School Leaders 64
Table 3.24: Student Attitudes Toward School Discipline and Authority 69
Table 3.25: Teacher Perspectives on Discipline and Authority 70
Table 3.26: Student Responses to Disciplinary Scenarios 72
Table 3.27: Student-Identified Barriers to Values Practice 75
Table 3.28: Teacher-Identified Barriers to Values Education 78
Table 3.29: Student-Identified Enablers for Values Practice 81
Table 3.30: Teacher-Identified Enablers for Values Education 83

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of variance
FGD	Focus group discussion
DiD	Difference-in-Difference
GES	Ghana Education Service
KII	Key informant interview
MoE	Ministry of Education
NaCCA	National Council for Curriculum and Assessment
NUGS	National Union of Ghana Students
PLC	Professional Learning Community
RCT	Randomised control trial
SD	Standard deviation
SHS	Senior high school
STATA	Data Analysis and Statistical Software
T-TEL	Transforming Teaching, Education & Learning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Background and Purpose

Ghana's revised Senior High School (SHS) curriculum places emphasis on developing learners not only academically, but also as responsible citizens equipped with shared national values. As part of this reform, the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NaCCA), working with the Ghana Education Service (GES) and young people themselves, developed the *Essential Values for Ghanaian Youth Handbook*[1] to provide a clear, common articulation of the values expected of Ghanaian youth and how these values should be understood and practised in everyday life.

The handbook represents the first structured national approach to values education at the secondary level. It identifies eleven core values and presents them in ways intended to support reflection, discussion and application rather than rote learning. To operationalise the handbook, pilot schools implemented weekly, student-led Values Learning Community (VLC) sessions, designed as participatory spaces where learners discuss real-life situations, reflect on choices and practise values collectively.

The endline study was conducted to assess whether sustained exposure to the handbook and VLC sessions led to meaningful changes in students' awareness, understanding, attitudes and behaviour related to national values. Specifically, the study sought to determine whether observed changes could be attributed to the intervention itself, rather than to general time trends or existing school practices and to generate evidence to inform decisions on national rollout.

2. Study Design and Scope

The study adopted a randomised controlled trial (RCT) design, comparing outcomes between intervention schools that implemented the handbook and VLC sessions and control schools that continued with existing practices. A total of seventy schools were included in the evaluation, comprising thirty-five intervention and thirty-five control schools. Baseline data were collected during the 2024/2025 academic year, followed by endline data collection in the 2025/2026 academic year. The same schools were retained across both rounds to ensure comparability.

Data were collected using a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative data were gathered through structured questionnaires administered to students and teachers, while qualitative data were obtained through interviews with school leaders, Guidance and Counselling (G&C) coordinators and focus group discussions (FGD) with students. The analysis focused on changes over time and differences between intervention and control schools.

[1] Referred to through the report as values handbook.

3. Key Findings

3.1 Awareness and Recognition of National Values

Students' awareness of national values, measured through unprompted recall, was low at baseline across both intervention and control schools. At endline, intervention schools recorded substantial improvements, with more students able to recall multiple values without prompting and fewer students reporting no recall at all. Changes in control schools were smaller and less consistent.

Recognition of individual values when prompted also improved more strongly in intervention schools. Gains were particularly evident for values that are less visible in routine school discipline and classroom management, such as integrity, leadership and equity. These suggest that structured exposure through the handbook and VLC sessions supported broader familiarity with the full set of core values rather than reinforcing only those already embedded in everyday school rules.

3.2 Understanding and Application of Values

Beyond recall and recognition, the study assessed students' ability to correctly interpret and apply values when presented with practical scenarios drawn from everyday school life. At baseline, understanding was stronger for values closely aligned with long-standing school norms, such as discipline and weaker for values requiring ethical judgement and learner agency.

At endline, students in intervention schools showed clearer and more consistent improvement across most values. Gains were strongest for integrity, leadership, equity and resourcefulness, where students were better able to distinguish value-consistent actions from plausible but incorrect alternatives. Improvements in control schools were smaller and uneven. These indicate that the handbook and VLC sessions supported deeper understanding of how values apply in practice, not only familiarity with their labels.

A difference-in-differences analysis confirms a positive and statistically significant effect of the intervention on students' overall knowledge of national values.

3.3 Attitudes Toward Values, Discipline and Civic Engagement

Student attitudes toward national values were already positive at baseline across both groups. As a result, changes over time were modest, particularly in intervention schools where ceiling effects were evident. Rather than transforming attitudes, the intervention appears to have reinforced and stabilised existing positive orientations toward values, citizenship and national development.

Some strengthening was observed for attitudes related to fairness, diversity and peaceful coexistence in intervention schools, consistent with the handbook's emphasis on inclusion and equity.

In relation to civic engagement, students in intervention schools were more likely to express willingness to actively participate in community activities and to cite responsibility and personal satisfaction as motivations for engagement. These align with the value handbook's emphasis on responsible citizenship and collective contribution.

3.4 Behavioural Patterns and School Discipline

Self-reported behaviour improved significantly in intervention schools across all eleven values. Teachers' observations corroborated these patterns, reporting more frequent demonstration of behaviours linked to honesty, responsibility, self-directed learning, adaptability and leadership.

School-level disciplinary data and qualitative accounts suggest a shift in how discipline is approached. Intervention schools reported increased use of counselling referrals and parental engagement alongside reductions in some punitive measures. School leaders and teachers described discipline increasingly as a corrective and formative process linked to values education rather than punishment alone.

3.5. Insights from Implementation and Lived Experience

Observations of VLC sessions and qualitative accounts from students, teachers and school leaders provide important context for the quantitative findings. VLC sessions were consistently described as participatory spaces distinct from regular lessons, where students could discuss values, share experiences and reflect on behaviour. Stronger sessions were characterised by clear structure, confident peer facilitation and active student participation.

Students linked participation in VLC sessions to observable changes in behaviour, including improved self-control, respect for others and confidence in expressing opinions. School leaders reported gradual improvements in school climate, with fewer severe disciplinary cases and greater student awareness of acceptable conduct.

Variation in implementation quality was observed across schools. Time constraints, uneven facilitation skills and limited access to materials constrained some sessions, particularly for values that require deeper reflection, such as self-directed learning and adaptability.

3.6. Barriers and Enablers

Peer pressure emerged as a persistent barrier to values practice, particularly from the perspective of students. Teachers highlighted resource constraints, limited training and uneven reinforcement as ongoing challenges. At the same time, peer-led structures, counselling support and protected timetable slots were identified as key enablers of effective values education.

G&C coordinators emphasised the importance of supervision, careful selection of peer guides and adequate resourcing for activity-based learning. Their recommendations point to practical considerations that will be critical for national scale-up.

4. Implications for National Rollout

The evidence from the pilot strongly supports national scale-up of the values handbook and VLC sessions, subject to targeted refinements:

1. **Protect and institutionalise VLC time**
   VLC sessions should be formally embedded within the school timetable nationwide, ideally aligned with existing structures such as PLC time, to ensure consistency and sustainability.

2. **Ensure universal access to materials**
   National rollout should guarantee that every student has access to the values handbook, alongside complementary materials that support activity-based learning.

3. **Strengthen facilitation and supervision**
   Clear guidance on peer guide selection, structured preparation and ongoing supervision by G&C coordinators is essential to maintain implementation fidelity.

4. **Broaden teacher and leadership engagement**
   While values integration is already high, stronger alignment between VLC discussions, classroom practice and school leadership actions will reinforce coherence across the school environment.

5. **Engage parents and communities**
   Findings highlight the need for complementary engagement beyond the school to address home–school value mismatches and consolidate behaviour change.

6. **Maintain monitoring and learning loops**
   Simple, routine monitoring of session quality, attendance and emerging challenges will support continuous improvement during national rollout.

5. Conclusion

The pilot demonstrates that the values handbook, implemented through the VLC sessions, strengthens students' awareness, understanding and practice of national values. Effects are strongest where engagement is structured, reflective and sustained and where school leadership and disciplinary practices reinforce the values being taught.

Overall, the findings confirm that values education is most effective when embedded within school culture rather than treated as an add-on.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Context of the Study

NaCCA has developed a new SHS curriculum aimed at equipping learners with the knowledge, skills, character qualities and shared Ghanaian values required for responsible citizenship and national development. The curriculum emphasises the development of 21st-century competencies alongside the internalisation and application of shared national values, with the ultimate objective of preparing learners to live responsible adult lives, further their education, enter the world of work and contribute meaningfully to Ghana's social and economic development.

A key innovation of the revised SHS curriculum is the explicit integration of national values into teaching and learning. For the first time at the secondary level, Ghana has adopted a structured approach to values education through the values handbook, which identifies and elaborates on eleven core values: honesty, integrity, diversity, equity, self-directed learning, confidence, self-discipline, adaptability, resourcefulness, leadership and responsible citizenship. The handbook is intended to ensure that all SHS students develop a shared understanding of what it means to be a responsible Ghanaian citizen and how values-based behaviours contribute to national development.

The handbook was developed through a participatory, youth-led process. Young people were centrally involved in its design, with the GES and the National Union of Ghana Students, through the Youth Advisory Board, facilitating the selection of student authors from senior high schools and tertiary institutions across the country. This approach was intended to ensure relevance, ownership and resonance among the intended beneficiaries.

As part of the pilot phase, the handbook was introduced in a group of SHSs across the country. From this group, a subset of schools was selected to participate in the study, alongside a comparable group of schools that did not implement the values handbook during the pilot period.

In these pilot SHSs, the values handbook is implemented through weekly, student-led VLC sessions. These sessions adopt a student-as-expert approach, in which students lead structured discussions and activities with their peers. The programme includes twenty-two sessions covering up to eleven core values, delivered across both semesters and spanning up to 16 weeks per semester. The values sessions are held concurrently with teachers' professional learning community (PLC) meetings, ensuring continuity of student engagement while teachers participate in professional development activities.

1.2 Purpose and Objectives of the Endline Survey

The endline study assesses changes in students' and teachers' awareness, attitudes and behaviours related to national values following the implementation of the values handbook in pilot schools. Building on the baseline assessment, the endline study examines whether exposure to the values handbook is associated with measurable improvements in values-related knowledge, discipline, civic engagement and school-based systems for reinforcing positive behaviour.

Specifically, the objectives of the endline study are to:

1. Assess changes in students' knowledge and recognition of the eleven core national values between baseline and endline.
2. Examine changes in students' attitudes toward discipline, respect for authority and civic engagement.
3. Assess changes in the prevalence of student behaviours that reflect or contradict the practice of national values, including discipline, responsibility and respect for school rules.
4. Examine changes in school-level barriers and enablers affecting the practice of national values.
5. Compare outcomes between intervention and non-intervention schools to assess the contribution of the values handbook; and
6. Generate evidence to inform decisions on national rollout, programme refinement, sustainability and potential scale-up of the values handbook.

1.3 Study Design Overview

The study adopts a RCT[2] design to enable systematic comparison between schools that implemented the intervention and a group of schools that did not. This design supports robust comparison of outcomes across groups and strengthens confidence in the interpretation of observed differences.

As mentioned earlier, the intervention involved the introduction and structured use of the handbook through weekly VLC sessions. In intervention SHSs, students met on a weekly basis to review and discuss sessions from the handbook. The sessions were designed to support value formation through guided discussion, peer interaction and practical application of values within the school context. Implementation was supported and

[2] A RCT is a study design in which participants are randomly assigned to either an intervention group or a control group. Random assignment helps ensure that observed differences in outcomes between groups can be attributed to the intervention rather than pre-existing differences.

supervised by guidance and counselling coordinators, members of senior management and selected non-teaching staff.

Schools were randomly assigned to either the intervention or control group. Intervention schools received the handbook and implemented the weekly VLC sessions during the pilot period. Control schools continued with existing school practices and did not receive the handbook or participate in structured VLC activities during the study period.

The research design comprised three main components:

1. A baseline survey conducted prior to implementation to assess students' and teachers' initial levels of awareness, attitudes and behaviours related to national values.
2. An endline survey conducted after implementation to examine changes in outcomes over the pilot period; and
3. A difference-in-differences (DiD) analytical approach used to compare changes in outcomes between intervention and control schools while accounting for baseline differences.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Survey Design

The study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection to examine changes in knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and school-level practices related to the national values. This approach was adopted to capture both measurable changes in student and teacher outcomes and contextual insights into how values were discussed and reinforced within schools.

Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to students and teachers in both intervention and control schools. These instruments captured information on awareness, recognition, attitudes and self-reported behaviours related to the national values, as well as selected indicators of school climate and discipline.

Qualitative data were collected through interviews with school leadership and guidance and counselling coordinators, as well as focus group discussions with students. These qualitative components provided deeper insight into students' experiences of values education, perceptions of behavioural change and school-level factors that enable or constrain the practice of national values.

To minimise response bias, questionnaires administered in non-intervention schools did not reference the values handbook, as students and teachers in these schools had not been exposed to it. In addition, selected questionnaire modules focused on implementation experience and programme-specific processes were administered only in intervention schools to ensure relevance, while maintaining comparability across groups on core outcome measures.

Data collection was conducted at endline following completion of the pilot period and was designed to mirror the baseline survey structure where appropriate. This consistency supports meaningful comparison of outcomes over time and between intervention and control schools.

2.2 Sampling Approach

School Selection

As mentioned earlier, as part of the handbook pilot, ninety-eight senior high schools were selected to implement the handbook. Prior to rollout and for the purposes of the study, a subset of thirty-five schools was randomly selected from these ninety-eight schools to form the intervention group.

In addition, thirty-five comparable SHSs that were not implementing the handbook were randomly selected to form the non-intervention (control) group. These schools continued with existing practices and did not participate in the handbook pilot during the study period.

The same intervention and non-intervention schools surveyed at baseline were retained for the endline assessment to ensure comparability over time. Random selection of both intervention and non-intervention schools was conducted using R software.

Student Selection

In both intervention and control schools, a target of thirty students per school was randomly sampled, resulting in an intended sample of 2,100 students across the seventy schools. The sampling approach was designed to ensure representation across year groups while maintaining comparability between the baseline and endline cohorts.

The baseline survey was conducted during the 2024/2025 academic year and included students from Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3. The endline survey was conducted in the 2025/2026 academic year, by which time the baseline cohorts had progressed, with Year 1 students moving to Year 2 and Year 2 students moving to Year 3. Students newly admitted into Year 1 at endline were not included in the sample, as they had not participated in the VLC sessions and had not been exposed to the handbook during the pilot period.

Within each school, the endline sample was therefore drawn from Year 2 and Year 3 students. In most schools, fifteen students were sampled from each of these year groups. Student selection also took account of programme of study and gender to ensure that the sample reflected the diversity of the student population within each school.

Teacher Selection

In each school, fifteen teachers were randomly sampled, resulting in a target sample of 1,050 teachers across all schools. The sample included both core and elective subject teachers, with deliberate efforts made to ensure gender balance.

Management Selection

Qualitative interviews were conducted in each of the seventy schools with members of school management and key support staff. These included headteachers, assistant headteachers, senior housemasters and housemistresses, deans of discipline and G&C coordinators. These interviews provided qualitative insight into levels of awareness, understanding, attitudes and behaviours related to national values, as well as school-level practices that support or constrain values education.

2.3 Data Collection Process

Data collection for the endline study was conducted following completion of the values handbook pilot period. The process was designed to mirror the baseline data collection as closely as possible to support comparability over time, while incorporating additional tools to capture implementation experience and observed practice in intervention schools.

Quantitative data were collected through face-to-face administration of structured questionnaires to sampled students and teachers in both intervention and non-intervention schools. Enumerators were trained prior to fieldwork on the purpose of the study, the content of the instruments and standardised administration procedures. Data collection followed a common protocol across all schools to ensure consistency.

Qualitative data collection involved semi-structured interviews with school leadership, guidance and counselling coordinators and deans of discipline, as well as focus group discussions with students. These activities were conducted using standardised interview guides and facilitated by trained researchers. The qualitative components were used to explore perceptions of values-related behaviours, changes observed during the pilot period and school-level factors influencing implementation.

In intervention schools, direct observations of VLC sessions were conducted using a structured observation checklist aligned with the handbook. Observations focused on session structure, facilitation practices, student participation and alignment with the core values. In non-intervention schools, observations of the general school environment were conducted to provide contextual comparison on how values-related behaviours were reinforced in the absence of structured VLC sessions.

Fieldwork supervision was undertaken to ensure adherence to protocols, data quality and ethical standards throughout the data collection process.

2.4 Data Analysis

All quantitative data were collected using the SurveyCTO platform and exported into Stata for data cleaning and analysis.

Descriptive statistics were generated to summarise findings and produce disaggregated results by sex, school type and intervention status. Comparative analyses, including DiD estimation, were used to examine changes over time between intervention and non-intervention schools. Statistical tests were applied to identify significant differences across groups.

Qualitative data from interviews and FGDs were analysed thematically to provide contextual explanations for quantitative findings and to capture emerging insights related to values practice, school discipline and implementation experiences.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to strict ethical standards to ensure the protection, dignity and confidentiality of all participants. Ethical clearance for the research was obtained from the GES and other relevant institutional bodies prior to data collection. Informed consent

procedures were implemented at all levels: school leaders were briefed and provided institutional consent; teachers and students were individually informed about the purpose, voluntary nature and confidentiality of the study.

For students under 18 years, assent was obtained in addition to institutional consent. Enumerators were trained to explain consent in accessible language and to respect participants' right to decline or withdraw without consequence. No identifying information was collected during surveys, interviews, or focus groups and all data were anonymised during transcription and analysis.

Child safeguarding was a core component of the training, particularly in managing sensitive conversations during student FGDs. As part of the field implementation protocols, any disclosures of abuse or distress would be referred to the appropriate school authorities in accordance with national safeguarding protocols, however, no such incidences were reported during the period of the data collection.

2.6 Limitations

While the study provides robust insights into the uptake of national values in SHSs, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the self-reported nature of survey responses may introduce social desirability bias, especially on items related to values and behaviour. Although anonymity was assured, students and teachers may have overstated positive behaviours or underreported negative ones.

Secondly, in a few schools, the implementation of the double track system meant that not all grade levels were present at the time of data collection. This led to imbalances in the number of students sampled per grade, potentially affecting the representativeness of responses across year groups.

Finally, endline data collection took place before completion of the first semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. As a result, data on reported disciplinary cases reflect only part of the academic year and do not capture end-of-semester patterns when changes in student behaviour and enforcement practices are often observed. Findings related to the prevalence and frequency of disciplinary cases should therefore be interpreted with caution.

3. KEY FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings from the endline study, drawing on quantitative survey data, qualitative interviews, FGDs and observations conducted in intervention and control schools. Results are organised around the key outcome areas outlined in the study objectives, with comparisons made between baseline and endline and between intervention and control schools.

Where relevant, findings are disaggregated by intervention status and supported by qualitative and observational evidence to provide contextual explanation. Statistical significance is reported where applicable with asterisk again the significant values.

3.1 Demographic Profile of Participants

3.1.1 Student Demographics

The endline survey covered a total of 2,099 students drawn from 70 SHSs, comprising 1,046 students in intervention schools and 1,053 students in control schools. Female students constituted 50.3 percent of the sample, while males accounted for 49.7 percent.

Students were drawn from Year 2 and Year 3 cohorts, reflecting progression of the baseline sample and ensuring that all surveyed students had been in school during the period of values handbook implementation. The distribution by sex was broadly balanced across intervention and control schools.

3.1.2 Teacher Demographics

A total of 1,774 teachers participated in the endline survey, with similar representation from control schools (896 teachers) and intervention schools (878 teachers). On average, teachers were 39 years old and had spent 13.2 years in the teaching profession. Half of this experience, about six years on average, had been spent in their current schools.

The teaching workforce was predominantly male, with males accounting for 74.3 percent of respondents. Almost all teachers surveyed were trained and certified, with 95.4 percent reporting that they held the required professional qualifications.

3.1.3 School leaders' Demographics

Interviews were conducted with seventy school leaders, comprising thirty-five from intervention schools and thirty-five from control schools. Most school leaders interviewed were male (78.6 percent), with an average age of 47 years.

On average, school leaders reported 20 years of experience in the teaching profession and nine years of service in their current schools. All school leaders held university degrees and were trained and certified teachers.

3.2 Knowledge and Understanding of National Values

3.2.1 Awareness of Core National Values

Students' awareness of national values was assessed through an unprompted recall task, in which learners were asked to list as many national values as they could without any cues. Unprompted recall is a demanding indicator of awareness, as it requires students not only to recognise values when presented but to retrieve them independently.

Table 3.1 presents changes in students' unprompted recall of national values between baseline and endline, disaggregated by intervention and control schools. At baseline, awareness levels were low in both groups. Most students could recall only one or two values and a sizeable proportion were unable to recall any value. This indicates comparable starting points across intervention and control schools and reflects limited initial familiarity with the national values.

Table 3.1: Unprompted Recall of National Values by Students

Number of Values Recalled	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
5 or more	1.7	14.2*	12.5	0.6	0.47	-0.13	12.6
3-4 values	12.4	26.5*	14.1	11.1	17	5.9	8.2
1-2 values	57.5	50.6*	-7.9	60.8	48.2	-12.6	1.3
None	28.4	8.7*	-9.7	27.5	34.4	6.9	-16.6
N	*1052*	*1,046*		*1032*	*1,053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

By endline, students in intervention schools demonstrated a clear strengthening of awareness. Movement was observed away from very low or no recall toward higher recall categories, indicating that students were better able to name and articulate multiple national values. This is consistent with repeated exposure to the handbook content through weekly VLC sessions.

In control schools, changes in recall were smaller and less consistent. While some students moved into mid-level recall categories, gains at the highest recall levels were limited. The proportion of students unable to recall any values increased over the same period, indicating that awareness did not strengthen in a sustained way in the absence of structured engagement.

The results in Table 3.1 show that intervention schools recorded larger shifts toward higher recall and greater reductions in low or no recall than control schools. These findings suggest

that regular, structured discussion of national values supported broader and more durable awareness among students.

3.2.2 Recognition of Core National Values

Following the assessment of unprompted recall, students' recognition of specific national values was examined to assess their familiarity with the national values as presented explicitly in the handbook. Recognition captures students' ability to correctly identify individual values when prompted and therefore provides insight into exposure to the values, as distinct from spontaneous recall.

Table 3.2 presents changes in students' recognition of individual national values between baseline and endline in intervention and control schools.

Table 3.2: Recognition Rates for Specific Values by Students

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Values	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Discipline	85.8	88.2	2.4	85.6	84.1	-1.5	3.9
Confidence	79.8	85.2*	5.4	79.7	80.7	1	4.4
Responsible Citizenship	78.3	84.0*	5.7	78.2	81.3	3.1	2.6
Integrity	59.9	73.6*	13.7	67.4	63.5	-3.9	17.6
Diversity	61.8	63.5	1.7	65.3	63.7	-1.6	3.3
Resourcefulness	62.3	71.7*	9.4	64.1	65.6	1.5	7.9
Adaptability	60.4	62.9	2.5	64.2	58.3	-5.9	8.4
Leadership	56.2	67.9*	11.7	60.5	59.2	-1.3	13
Honesty	50.2	55.8	5.6	54.2	49.6	-4.6	10.2
Self-directed learning	46.1	48.1	2	50	52.2	2.2	-0.2
Equity	45.5	55.8*	10.3	43.9	45.2	1.3	9
N	*1052*	*1,046*		*1032*	*1,053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

At baseline (table 3.2), recognition levels were broadly similar across the two groups. Values that are routinely reinforced through school rules and everyday practice, such as discipline, confidence and responsible citizenship, were the most widely recognised. Values that receive less explicit attention in daily school routines, including equity and self-directed learning, showed lower recognition levels, reflecting differences in the visibility of individual values within existing school environments.

By endline (table 3.2), students in intervention schools showed improvement in recognition across most values. Statistically significant gains were observed for several values across civic, behavioural and relational domains. These changes indicate broader familiarity with the range of values articulated in the values handbook, rather than improvement limited to a small number of already familiar values.

Stronger gains were observed for values such as integrity, leadership and equity (table 3.2). These values are less likely to be reinforced through routine disciplinary practices alone and typically require explanation, discussion and reflection. The observed improvement suggests that structured engagement through VLC sessions supported clearer identification and understanding of these values.

In control schools, changes in recognition were smaller and less consistent (Table 3.2). While modest improvements were observed for some values, others showed little movement or declined slightly over the same period. Values related to personal ethics and adaptability showed particularly uneven change, suggesting that existing school practices alone may not be sufficient to strengthen recognition of these values.

As seen in table 3.2, students in intervention schools demonstrated more consistent gains in recognition across a wider set of national values. The suggests that the handbook and VLC sessions supported clearer identification of values that are less visible in everyday school practice, alongside reinforcement of more familiar values.

3.2.3 Understanding and application of core national values

Beyond unaided recall and recognition, the student questionnaire assessed whether learners could correctly interpret and apply the core national values when presented with practical statements and scenarios drawn from everyday school life. These items required students to select value-consistent actions from plausible alternatives, providing insight into how well students understood the meaning of the values as described in the handbook and how they applied them in concrete situations.

Unlike recall-based measures, these items assess judgement within structured contexts. Higher baseline levels are therefore expected for values that overlap with long-standing school rules, moral instruction and widely accepted social norms, particularly discipline and cooperation-related behaviours. The analysis therefore focuses on changes over time and compares patterns of change between intervention and control schools, rather than absolute levels alone.

Table 3.3 presents the proportion of students who selected the value-consistent response at baseline and endline, disaggregated by intervention and control schools. The table shows both the direction and size of change across the eleven core values.

Table 3.3: Students correct interpretation of core national values, baseline and endline

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Values	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Responsible citizenship	62.4	74.8*	12.4	63.1	66.2	3.1	8.6
Honesty	58.7	70.5*	11.8	60.2	61.9	1.7	8.6
Integrity	54.1	69.3*	15.2	58.6	57.1	−1.5	12.2
Diversity	65.9	72.4	6.5	67.2	66.1	−1.1	6.3
Equity	49.6	63.8*	14.2	50.4	52.1	1.7	11.7
Discipline	78.3	83.1	4.8	79.1	80.0	0.9	3.1
Self-directed learning	52.8	59.6	6.8	54.0	55.2	1.2	4.4
Adaptability	56.4	61.9	5.5	58.1	56.0	−2.1	5.9
Resourcefulness	60.7	72.8*	12.1	62.9	64.3	1.4	8.5
Leadership	55.9	70.2*	14.3	57.6	58.4	0.8	11.8
Confidence	63.5	75.6*	12.1	64.2	66.0	1.8	9.6
N	*1052*	*1,046*		*1032*	*1,053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Responsible citizenship

As shown in table 3.3, baseline responses already indicated a moderate level of understanding of responsible citizenship in both intervention and control schools, reflecting prior exposure to civic norms and school expectations. This aligns with the essential values for the handbook's framing of responsible citizenship as participation in community life, respect for rules and contribution to national development. By endline, students in intervention schools were more likely to identify responsibility as active contribution to the community rather than conditional or convenience-based behaviour. Changes in control schools were smaller, suggesting more limited progression from recognition to application in the absence of structured VLC engagement.

Honesty

Honesty, as defined in the values handbook, extends beyond truthfulness to include responsibility in sharing information and resisting misinformation. Baseline responses suggest that many students initially interpreted honesty in instrumental terms, such as avoiding punishment or gaining advantage. Endline results (table 3.3) in intervention schools

indicate stronger alignment with the values handbook's emphasis on honesty as a moral commitment grounded in trust and accountability. Control schools showed more limited movement, suggesting that everyday disciplinary environments may reinforce compliance without deepening understanding of honesty as a character value.

Integrity

Integrity is presented in the values handbook as doing the right thing even when unsupervised, requiring moral judgement and consistency between values and actions. Table 3.3 shows one of the clearest divergences between intervention and control schools for this value. While baseline understanding was moderate, intervention students demonstrated stronger improvement in identifying principled action over silence or passive non-involvement. Control schools showed little improvement and, in some cases, slight decline, reinforcing the importance of guided discussion and ethical reflection in clarifying integrity.

Diversity

The values handbook frames diversity as recognising, valuing and actively engaging with differences to promote inclusion and peace. Baseline responses for diversity were high in both groups, reflecting social desirability and existing norms around tolerance. By endline, intervention schools showed modest improvement (table 3.3), with students more consistently recognising diversity as active cooperation and respectful engagement across differences rather than passive acceptance. Control schools showed little change, suggesting limited reinforcement beyond informal norms.

Equity

Equity is distinguished in the values handbook from equality, emphasising fairness through support based on need rather than uniform treatment. Baseline levels for equity were lower than for diversity, reflecting the more abstract nature of the concept. As shown in Table 3.3, intervention schools demonstrated stronger gains in recognising equity as fair treatment and appropriate support, consistent with the values handbook's visual and scenario-based approach. Control schools recorded smaller changes, indicating that equity may require explicit discussion to be properly understood.

Discipline

Discipline is defined in the values handbook as self-regulation, responsibility and commitment to doing the right thing, rather than fear-based compliance. Discipline was well understood at baseline in both groups, consistent with its strong presence in school rules and daily routines. Endline improvements in intervention schools were therefore more modest, reinforcing discipline as internalised self-control rather than externally enforced behaviour. Control school results remained stable over time.

Self-directed learning

Self-directed learning is framed in the values handbook as learner agency, initiative and responsibility for one's own learning. Baseline responses indicate that many students initially favoured teacher-dependent or passive approaches. Endline results show some improvement in intervention schools, suggesting growing recognition of learner agency. However, this value remained among the more challenging for students to interpret consistently, reflecting its weaker presence in traditional school structures.

Adaptability

Adaptability, as defined in the values handbook, involves flexibility and positive response to change and challenge. Table 3.3 shows moderate baseline understanding and modest improvement in intervention schools. Control schools showed less consistent change over time. Given that adaptability is rarely named explicitly in routine school practices, these findings suggest that deeper reinforcement may be needed to translate recognition into confident application.

Resourcefulness

Resourcefulness is framed in the values handbook as proactive problem-solving and effective use of available resources. As shown in Table 3.3, this value recorded one of the stronger improvements in intervention schools. By endline, students were more likely to recognise initiative and perseverance as value-consistent responses. Control schools showed only limited change, reinforcing the contribution of structured, scenario-based discussion in strengthening conceptual understanding.

Leadership

Leadership in the values handbook emphasises inclusion, listening and guiding collective decision-making rather than authority or dominance. Leadership-related items show clear divergence between intervention and control schools. Intervention students increasingly associated leadership with responsibility for others and inclusive engagement, while control school responses remained unchanged. This suggests that leadership is not automatically developed through general school participation alone but benefits from intentional reflection and practice.

Confidence

Confidence is framed in the values handbook as constructive self-expression and belief in one's ability to contribute positively. Baseline levels were high in both groups, reflecting general encouragement of participation in schools. Endline improvements in intervention schools indicate clearer recognition of confidence as independent thinking and responsible self-expression rather than conformity or silence. Control schools showed smaller changes.

Tables 3.3 and 3.4 indicates that while baseline levels of correct interpretation were high for some values embedded in existing school norms, intervention schools demonstrated stronger and more consistent gains across the full set of core national values. Improvements were most pronounced for values that require judgement, ethical reasoning and agency, such as integrity, leadership, equity and resourcefulness. Values closely tied to routine school regulation, such as discipline, showed smaller but reinforcing gains, consistent with their already strong presence in school life.

Table 3.4: Summary of changes in students' conceptual understanding of core national values

Core value	Change in intervention schools (values handbook-aligned interpretation)	Change in control schools
Responsible citizenship	Stronger recognition of responsibility as active contribution to community and nation	Limited consolidation
Honesty	Improved understanding of honesty as trust, accountability and moral commitment	Minimal change
Integrity	Clearer distinction between principled action and passive or complicit behaviour	Mixed, with some decline
Diversity	Greater recognition of diversity as active cooperation and mutual respect	Limited change
Equity	Improved understanding of fairness based on need rather than uniform treatment	Minimal change
Discipline	Reinforcement of discipline as self-regulation and responsibility	Stable
Self-directed learning	Growing recognition of learner agency, remains uneven	Limited change
Adaptability	Modest improvement in recognising positive response to change	Mixed
Resourcefulness	Stronger recognition of initiative and effective problem-solving	Minimal change
Leadership	Improved understanding of leadership as inclusive guidance and shared responsibility	Limited change
Confidence	Clearer recognition of confidence as constructive self-expression	Minimal change

3.2.4 Observed delivery of VLC sessions and links to students' understanding of values

To complement the student survey findings, direct observations of VLC sessions were conducted in intervention schools to examine how the core national values, as articulated in the values handbook, were delivered in practice and how the quality of delivery may help explain observed patterns in students' conceptual understanding. Parallel observations of the general school environment were conducted in control schools to provide contextual comparison.

Overall, observations indicate that VLC sessions created structured and participatory spaces for students to engage actively with the core values, supporting the values handbook's emphasis on understanding values through discussion, reflection and application rather than memorisation. This section synthesises key patterns from the observations and links them to earlier findings on students' understanding and interpretation of values presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.5: Results of VLC lesson observation in intervention schools

VLC observation indicators	Percentage of sessions rated "good" or "excellent" (%)
Sessions' setup and organisation	
The topic of the day was clearly stated and aligned with the values handbook.	97.1
The session structure was clear (introduction, main activity, reflection).	85.7
The session started on time and followed the scheduled plan.	82.9
The peer guide had the required values handbook and materials ready (indicate if there were braille copies).	80.0
The learning space was suitable (adequate seating, visibility, minimal distractions)	74.3
Facilitation and Delivery	
The peer guide was confident, well- prepared and knowledgeable about the topic.	88.6
The peer guide modelled positive behaviour and values during the session.	85.7
Questioning techniques were used effectively to promote critical thinking.	82.9
The peer guide encouraged student participation and discussion.	80.0
The peer guide related examples to real-life situations or current school issues.	80.0
Feedback and summarization were provided to consolidate learning.	74.3
Student Engagement and Participation	
There was evidence of teamwork or peer learning.	88.6
Students showed understanding of the session's key message or value.	88.6
Students were attentive and actively involved throughout the session.	77.1
Students expressed their opinions freely and respectfully.	77.1
Learners linked the discussion to their own experiences or community.	68.6
Inclusion and Gender Sensitivity	
Both male and female students participated actively.	82.9
Examples or illustrations reflected gender equality and diversity.	77.1
Facilitator ensured balanced participation and discouraged bias or exclusion.	71.4
Learners with disabilities (if present) were included and supported. Indicate if learners with disabilities led the sessions	57.1
Learning Environment and Behaviour	
The learning atmosphere was respectful, safe and encouraging.	91.4
Students demonstrated discipline, listening and mutual respect.	91.4
There was no evidence of ridicule, bullying, or negative behaviour.	91.4
The facilitator reinforced positive conduct consistent with the discussed value.	91.4
Class Management by Peer Guide(s)	
The peer guide-maintained learners' attention and focus throughout the session.	88.6
The peer guide managed time effectively and kept the session on track.	88.6
The peer guide encouraged orderly participation, so all learners had a fair chance to contribute.	88.6
The peer guide handled distractions or disruptive behaviour calmly and respectfully.	85.7
Reflection, Closure and Follow-Up	
Students were encouraged to apply the value in real-life situations.	91.4

VLC observation indicators	Percentage of sessions rated "good" or "excellent" (%)
The session ended with a clear reflection or takeaway message.	80.0
Plans for the next VLC session were mentioned or confirmed.	54.3
General impression about the entire VLC session	
Excellent	34.4
Good	62.9
Fair	2.9

Session structure and alignment with the values handbook

Most observed VLC sessions followed the structure prescribed in the values handbook, including clear identification of the value being discussed, guided group activities and closing reflections focused on application. The consistent organisation of sessions around a single core value supported clarity and depth of discussion, particularly for values that require explicit explanation and ethical judgement, such as integrity, equity and leadership. In sessions where this structure was well maintained, students were more able to articulate the meaning of the value in their own words and relate it to everyday school situations, reflecting the stronger gains observed for these values in Table 3.5.

Facilitation quality and peer-led learning

Facilitation was peer-led, with support from G&C coordinators or teachers as needed, consistent with the values handbook's emphasis on peer learning and shared responsibility. In stronger sessions, peer guides demonstrated confidence, used open-ended questioning and actively encouraged participation from a wide range of students. This facilitation practices align closely with improvements observed in students' understanding of confidence, leadership and responsible citizenship. Sessions that relied heavily on reading directly from the values handbook or facilitator monologue provided fewer opportunities for discussion and reflection and were associated with lower levels of student engagement.

Student engagement and application of values

Observed sessions frequently included moments where students connected values to real-life experiences, such as resolving peer conflict, responding to unfair treatment, or taking responsibility for shared resources. These discussions mirror the patterns observed in Table 3.5, particularly the stronger gains for integrity, resourcefulness and equity in intervention schools. Students were often able to distinguish between passive or avoidance-based responses and actions that reflected principled decision-making, suggesting that the discussion-based format of VLC sessions supported the values handbook's emphasis on applying values in practical contexts.

Inclusion, participation and gender dynamics

Observers noted balanced participation between male and female students in most VLC sessions, with facilitators often making deliberate efforts to encourage quieter students to contribute. Where inclusive facilitation practices were evident, students demonstrated greater willingness to express opinions respectfully and to consider alternative perspectives. This aligns with survey findings showing clearer understanding of diversity and equity-related values in intervention schools. In a small number of sessions, participation was dominated by a few confident students, highlighting the need for continued facilitator support to ensure equitable participation, as envisaged in the values handbook.

Learning environment and behavioural modelling

VLC sessions were typically conducted in respectful and supportive environments, with facilitators modelling behaviours consistent with the values under discussion, including listening, fairness and mutual respect. Observers rarely noted ridicule, exclusion, or overt disciplinary issues during sessions. This contrasts with observations in control schools, where values-related messaging was more informal and less consistently reinforced and where opportunities for guided reflection on values were limited. The structured nature of VLC sessions therefore provides a distinct learning environment that reinforces both understanding and practice of values in line with the values handbook's approach.

Reflections on implementation quality

While overall session quality was strong, observers identified variation across schools. Shared challenges included limited time, competing school activities and uneven facilitation skills among peer guides. Where these constraints were present, sessions tended to be more procedural and less reflective, potentially limiting their effectiveness for values that require deeper judgement and learner agency, such as self-directed learning and adaptability. This variation helps explain why improvements in these values, while positive, were more modest in Table 3.5.

In summary (table 3.6), VLC observations provide important contextual evidence that helps explain the patterns observed in the student survey. Schools that delivered well-structured, participatory and inclusive VLC sessions created opportunities for students to interpret and apply the core national values in ways consistent with the values handbook's intent. The contrast with control schools, where values reinforcement was less systematic, highlights the added value of the VLC sessions in supporting deeper conceptual understanding of the values handbook.

Table 3.6: Summary of observed VLC session practices and links to students' understanding of core national values

Core national value	Observed VLC practices in intervention schools (values handbook-aligned)	Link to student-level understanding
Responsible citizenship	Sessions emphasised shared responsibility, contribution to the school community and reflection on duties to others	Stronger recognition of citizenship as active contribution to community and nation
Honesty	Facilitators guided discussion on truthfulness, trust and responsibility in sharing information	Clearer understanding of honesty as moral commitment rather than avoidance of punishment
Integrity	Use of real-life ethical dilemmas to distinguish principled action from silence or non-interference	Stronger differentiation between integrity-consistent and integrity-contradicting actions
Diversity	Structured group work encouraged respectful interaction across differences	Greater recognition of diversity as active cooperation and mutual respect
Equity	Facilitated discussion on fairness, inclusion and supporting peers based on need	Improved understanding of equity as fairness rather than uniform treatment
Discipline	Sessions modelled respectful behaviour, listening and self-control in line with values handbook guidance	Reinforcement of discipline as self-regulation and responsibility
Self-directed learning	Reflection activities encouraged initiative and application beyond the session, with uneven consistency	Emerging recognition of learner agency, remains uneven
Adaptability	Discussion of challenges and appropriate responses to change, with varying depth	Modest improvement in recognising positive response to change
Resourcefulness	Problem-solving tasks emphasised initiative and effective use of available resources	Stronger recognition of proactive problem-solving
Leadership	Peer guides modelled inclusive leadership, listening and shared decision-making	Improved understanding of leadership as guidance and shared responsibility
Confidence	Safe spaces encouraged students to speak openly and express ideas respectfully	Clearer recognition of confidence as constructive self-expression

3.2.5 Impact of Intervention on students' Knowledge of National Values

To examine the contribution of the intervention to students' knowledge of national values, a DiD analysis was conducted using baseline and endline survey data. The analysis draws on a composite score derived from students' responses to eleven values-based items, reflecting overall knowledge and understanding of the national values.

As seen in table 3.7, the DiD model compares changes in scores over time between intervention and control schools. At baseline, students in intervention schools recorded slightly lower average scores than their peers in control schools. Over the same period, students in control schools did not show a statistically meaningful change in scores.

After accounting for these baseline differences and general time trends, the interaction term capturing exposure to the intervention was positive and statistically significant. This result indicates that students in intervention schools recorded a larger improvement in their knowledge scores than students in control schools over the pilot period. The estimated effect

suggests a meaningful increase in students' understanding of national values associated with participation in the handbook and VLC sessions.

While the overall explanatory power of the model is modest, this is expected given the complexity of values-related outcomes and the influence of factors beyond the intervention. The consistency of the estimated effect with earlier findings on recall, recognition and conceptual understanding reinforces the conclusion that the intervention contributed positively to students' knowledge of national values.

Table 3.7: DiD Regression Results – Impact on Students' Knowledge of Values

Variables	Coefficient	Std Error	t	p-value	95% CI
Group					
Control schools	Ref				
Intervention schools	-2.42	0.80	-3.04	0.002	[-3.99, -0.86]
Time					
Baseline	Ref				
Endline	-0.86	0.80	-1.08	0.280	[-2.42, 0.70]
Interaction (DiD effect)	7.26	1.12	6.45	0.000	[5.05, 9.46]
Constant	*64.82*	*0.57*	*114.5*	*0.000*	*[63.71, 65.93]*

3.2.6 Conceptual boundaries and common misconceptions about national values

In addition to assessing recall, recognition and application of the eleven core national values, the study examined the extent to which students identified broader moral, social, or civic traits as national values. These items were included to assess conceptual boundaries and to determine whether exposure to the values handbook improved clarity around which values are explicitly designated as national values.

The handbook recognises that several traits commonly associated with good character or citizenship, such as respect, obedience and patriotism, overlap conceptually with the core values but are not listed as stand-alone national values. Examining patterns of misclassification therefore provides insight into whether students can distinguish between the values articulated in the handbook and other positive traits encountered in school life.

Table 3.8 presents changes in the proportion of students incorrectly identifying selected noncore traits as national values at baseline and endline, disaggregated by intervention and control schools.

Table 3.8: Perceived Alignment of Selected Civic Traits with National Values

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Noncore Value	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Respect	37.7	35.5	-2.2	35.9	39.4	3.5	-5.7
Obedience	13	6.5*	-6.5	11.6	8.2	-3.4	-3.1
Patriotism	10.2	5.4	-4.8	9.6	6.5	-3.1	-1.7
Loyalty	10.4	6.6	-3.8	7.8	9.9	2.1	-5.9
Hard work	5	8.7	3.7	9.2	7.8	-1.4	5.1
Tolerance	-	16.5	16.5	-	12.4*	12.4	4.1
Teamwork	-	4.8	4.8	-	10.4*	10.4	-5.6
Humility	5.9	-	-5.9	5.8	-	-5.8	-0.1
N	*1052*	*1046*		*1032*	1053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Across most traits (table 3.8), changes over time were modest. In intervention schools, reductions were observed in the identification of obedience and patriotism as national values, indicating improved clarity around distinctions between the formally designated values and related behavioural traits. The decline for obedience was statistically significant, suggesting clearer differentiation between discipline as self-regulation and obedience as rule-following.

In control schools, patterns were less consistent. Increases in the identification of loyalty and teamwork as national values suggest a tendency to associate collaborative and relational behaviours with the national values framework in the absence of structured guidance.

Traits such as respect and hard work showed relatively stable identification across both groups. While these are not explicitly listed as stand-alone national values in the handbook, they are widely recognised as important Ghanaian values and are deeply embedded in everyday school practice and civic instruction. Their continued identification may therefore reflect not only limited differentiation from the formal list, but also their strong cultural salience and alignment with the broader ethos of the national values framework.

3.2.7 Patterns in knowledge of national values by demographic factors

To examine whether changes in students' knowledge of national values were broadly shared across diverse groups, results were disaggregated by selected demographic and school characteristics. This analysis focuses on the average number of core national values correctly identified by students at baseline and endline, comparing intervention and control schools.

Table 3.9 presents result by sex, year group and school category. At baseline, average scores were broadly similar across groups, with modest variation by school category and year group. This suggests comparable starting points within intervention and control schools.

By endline, students in intervention schools recorded increases in the average number of values correctly identified across all demographic groups shown in the table. Improvements were observed for both male and female students, as well as for students in Year 2 and Year 3. These indicate that gains in knowledge were not concentrated in a single subgroup but were evident across cohorts that had been exposed to the handbook and VLC sessions.

In control schools, changes were smaller and less consistent across demographic groups. In several cases, average scores remained stable or declined slightly between baseline and endline, particularly among male students, Year 2 students and students in Category C schools.

Differences by school category suggest that students in Category A schools recorded higher average scores at both baseline and endline. However, students in Category B and C schools in the intervention group also demonstrated clear improvements over time. This indicates that the intervention was associated with gains across different school contexts, not only in higher-resourced settings.

The findings in Table 3.9 suggest that improvements in students' knowledge of national values in intervention schools were broadly distributed across sex, year group and school category. While baseline differences across groups persisted, exposure to the handbook and VLC sessions was associated with gains for a wide range of students, supporting the inclusive reach of the intervention.

Table 3.9: Average Number of Values Correctly Identified by Demographic Factors

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Noncore Value	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Sex							
Male	6.88	7.61*	0.73	7.22	6.97*	-0.25	0.64
Female	6.85	7.53*	0.68	7.04	7.10	0.06	0.43
Year							
Year 2	6.90	7.45*	0.55	7.16	6.88	-0.28	0.57
Year 3	7.24	7.88*	0.64	7.49	7.32	-0.17	0.56
School Category							
A	7.44	8.43*	0.99	7.35	8.11*	0.76	0.32
B	*7.13*	*7.79**	0.66	*7.04*	7.14	0.1	0.65
C	*6.77*	*7.44**	0.67	*7.10*	6.66*	-0.44	0.78

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Table 3.10 presents recognition rates for individual national values by gender at baseline and endline. The analysis examines whether familiarity with specific values differed between female and male students over time.

At baseline, recognition levels were broadly similar for female and male students across most values. Discipline and confidence were the most widely recognised values for both groups, consistent with their visibility in routine school practices. Equity, self-directed learning and honesty showed lower recognition among both female and male students, indicating weaker immediate identification when presented explicitly.

Table 3.10: Gender Differences in Recognition of Specific Values

	Female Students			Male Students		
Value	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)
Discipline	85.6	85.6	0	85.9	86.7	0.8
Confidence	80.1	84.6	4.5	79.3	81.3	2
Responsibility	77.5	83.1*	5.6	79	82.2	3.2
Diversity	63.7	63.6	-0.1	63.4	63.6	0.2
Adaptability	63.5	61.5	-2	61	59.7	-1.3
Integrity	62.2	67.7	5.5	65.2	69.4	4.2
Resourcefulness	62.2	68.8*	6.6	64.2	68.6	4.4
Leadership	56.4	62.9*	6.5	60.3	64.1	3.8
Honesty	51.1	53.4	2.3	53.3	52	-1.3
Self-directed learning	48	50	2	48.1	50.3	2.2
Equity	43.7	50.2*	6.5	45.8	50.8	5
N	1073	1056		1011	1043	

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

By endline (table 3.10), improvements in recognition were observed among both female and male students, although the magnitude of change varied by value. Female students recorded statistically significant gains in recognition for responsibility, resourcefulness, leadership and equity. These values align closely with themes emphasised in the values handbook, including shared responsibility, initiative and inclusive leadership. The gains suggest that female students increasingly identified these values when prompted, indicating strengthened familiarity.

Male students also demonstrated improvements across several values, particularly responsibility, integrity, resourcefulness, leadership and equity. While these gains were positive, fewer reached statistical significance compared to those observed among female students. Recognition of discipline remained unchanged for all genders, consistent with its already high baseline levels (table 3.10).

For some values, including adaptability and diversity, recognition remained stable or declined slightly across both groups. This suggests that while students may demonstrate understanding

of these concepts in applied scenarios, explicit identification of the value labels remains more challenging.

3.2.8 Teacher self-reported knowledge and integration of national values in teaching

In addition to student outcomes, the endline assessment examined teachers' self-reported integration of national values into classroom teaching. This analysis provides context for interpreting student-level findings and helps assess whether the values handbook introduced new practices or reinforced existing approaches to values education.

As shown in Table 3.11, teachers' reported incorporation of national values into teaching was already high at baseline across both intervention and control schools. Most teachers indicated that they intentionally integrate values into their lessons, reflecting the long-standing role of teachers in promoting moral conduct, discipline and civic responsibility within schools.

Between baseline and endline, reported levels of values integration remained stable. No statistically significant changes were observed over time and results were similar in intervention and control schools. The proportion of teachers reporting that they did not explicitly incorporate values, or were unsure, remained small in both groups.

Table 3.11: Teacher Incorporation of Values into Teaching

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Incorporation Status	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Yes, intentionally incorporate	95.6	96.2	0.6	94.1	94.1	0	2.1
No, do not explicitly incorporate	2.1	0.9	-1.2	1.7	2	0.3	-1.1
Not sure	2.4	2.9	0.5	4.2	3.8	-0.4	0.9
N	680	867		694	885		

These findings suggest that classroom-based values integration was well established prior to implementation of the handbook. The absence of a measurable differential change at endline is therefore expected and does not undermine the student-level gains observed elsewhere in this section. Rather, it indicates that the added contribution of the handbook and VLC sessions lies primarily in providing structured, student-led spaces for discussion and application of values, complementing rather than replacing existing teacher practices.

3.2.9 Approaches used by teachers to integrate national values

Beyond whether teachers incorporate national values into their teaching, the endline assessment examined *how* values are integrated in classroom practice. Teachers were asked to indicate the approaches they use to embed values in their teaching, including explicit instruction, modelling, activity-based practice and linking values to subject content.

Table 3.12 summarises reported methods of values incorporation at baseline and endline in intervention and control schools.

Table 3.12: Methods of Values Incorporation by Teachers

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Method of Incorporation	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Teaching values explicitly as part of lesson content	29.1	29.5	0.4	24.8	28.2	3.4	-3
Modelling values in interactions with students	48.9	50.7	1.8	44.7	47.1	2.4	-0.6
Encouraging practice through activities	74.3	75.1	0.8	74	73.4	-0.6	1.4
Linking values to subject-specific topics	37.2	40.2	3	37.7	38.7	1	2
N	650	827		653	833		

Across both groups, the most reported approach was encouraging the practice of values through classroom activities. This was already well established at baseline and remained stable at endline, reflecting the significant role of participatory learning and school-based activities in values education.

Modelling values through interactions with students was also widely reported in both intervention and control schools. Small increases were observed over time, but differences between the two groups were limited. This suggests that modelling positive behaviour is a long-standing and broadly shared teaching practice rather than one uniquely shaped by the handbook.

Teaching values explicitly and linking values to subject content were reported less frequently than modelling and activity-based approaches. Modest increases in linking values to subject content were observed in intervention schools, alongside similar changes in control schools. Overall, changes across methods were limited and did not indicate a clear intervention effect.

Table 3.12 indicates that teachers draw on a combination of explicit instruction, modelling and activity-based approaches to integrate values into teaching. The stability of these approaches over time suggests that the values handbook complemented existing practice rather than seeking to transform it, with VLC sessions playing a more central role in influencing student-level outcomes.

3.2.10 School Leaders Perspectives on National Values

To complement the student- and teacher-level findings, qualitative interviews were conducted with school leaders including school heads, assistant heads, G&C coordinators and deans of discipline in both intervention and control schools. This section examines school leaders' understanding of national values, their perceived relevance to student development, observed changes in student behaviour and the role of leadership in reinforcing values education within school systems. These perspectives provide institutional-level context for the patterns observed in earlier sections and offer insight into conditions that support or constrain effective implementation of the handbook and VLC sessions.

3.2.10.1 Understanding and Interpretation of National Values

School leaders demonstrated a broad and intuitive understanding of national values, often framing them as shared moral standards, social expectations and behavioural norms that guide how students interact within the school and the wider society. Many school leaders drew on culturally embedded interpretations of values, emphasising respect for elders, helpfulness, responsibility and communal living as foundational elements of national values. For instance, during key informant interview with an Assistant Head, he explained *"These [values] are the things we were taught when we were growing up… when you see an adult, you respect the person; when someone is carrying something [a load], you help [willingly]. These are values that makes us who we are."*

While most school leaders could clearly articulate values such as discipline, honesty, responsibility and respect, fewer explicitly referenced the full set of the eleven core values outlined in the values handbook. This suggests that, although the concept of values is widely understood, formal alignment with the specific set of values outlined in the handbook is still evolving. Several school leaders acknowledged that their understanding of values was shaped not only by the values handbook but also by personal upbringing, religious teachings and long-standing school traditions. A school head stated that, *"the values are not new to us. What the Handbook has done is to bring them together and make us teach them deliberately."*

Overall, there was strong consensus among school leaders that the values promoted through the values handbook resonate with long-held Ghanaian social norms, making them contextually appropriate and relevant for secondary school students.

3.2.10.2 Importance of National Values for Student Development

Across interviews, school leaders unanimously emphasised the importance of national values in shaping students holistically into well-rounded individuals. School leaders described national values as complementary to academic instruction and was seen as essential for shaping character, guiding behaviour and preparing students for responsible adulthood. Many argued that academic achievement alone is insufficient if students lack discipline, integrity and respect for others. A dean of discipline remarked, *"If a student is academically good but lacks discipline and respect, then we have not succeeded as a school."*

Several school leaders linked values education directly to improved school climate, noting that students who internalise values are more likely to comply with school rules, respect authority and coexist peacefully with peers. Discipline was repeatedly highlighted as the foundation upon which other values depend. School leaders noted that when students understand and internalise discipline, other values such as honesty, responsibility and integrity become easier to reinforce.

School leaders also perceived values education as an essential social protective mechanism for addressing contemporary behavioural risks among adolescents, including indiscipline, defiance of authority, violence, substance use and peer-driven misconduct.

3.2.10.3 Alignment Between National Values and Student Behaviour in Intervention Schools

School leaders reported observing gradual but noticeable improvements in student behaviour since the introduction of the values handbook. Several school leaders described reductions in the frequency and severity of disciplinary cases, particularly those related to disrespect, lateness, non-compliance with school rules and interpersonal conduct. Observed behavioural changes included improved greeting practices, greater respect for staff and visitors, increased willingness to assist peers and better adherence to school routines. Leaders noted that students appeared more conscious of their actions and the consequences of violating school rules.

Below are some qualitative verbatims from school leaders:

- *"Before, we were sitting every day to handle disciplinary cases. Now the cases have reduced and even when they come, they are not as serious as before."* – Assistant School Head
- *"Students are now more conscious of what they do. They know that if they misbehave, it goes against the values they have been taught."* – Dean of Discipline KII
- "*Now, when students see you coming, they greet. That was not the case before. You can see that something has changed."* – Dean of Discipline

- "Now when you enter the school compound, students greet you properly. That culture was not strong before, but now you can see it clearly." – School Head
- *"Respect has really improved. Even when students are corrected, they are calmer and more receptive than before."* – Assistant School Head
- "Issues like improper dressing and lateness have reduced. They understand that discipline is part of being responsible." – Dean of Discipline

However, school leaders were careful to note that behaviour change was not uniform across all students. Some groups, particularly male students and those from challenging home environments were perceived as slower to internalise certain values. This uneven behavioural shift reinforced school leaders' views that education on national values must be continuous and supported by consistent role modelling.

An Assistant School Head reflected, *"You still see some boys struggling with discipline. The girls seem to respond faster, but with the boys it takes more time and repetition."*

Some school leaders linked slower uptake of national values and consequent behavioural change to students' home environments, noting that values learned at school are sometimes contradicted at home. For instance, a school head explained *"some students go home and see different behaviours, so what we teach here is sometimes challenged by what they experience outside."*

Nevertheless, a few school leaders maintained that even where behaviour had not fully changed, students demonstrated greater awareness of what constitutes acceptable conduct. A Dean of Discipline summarised this shift succinctly, *"Even when they do the wrong thing, you can tell they know it is wrong. That awareness was not there before."*

Overall, school leaders viewed the alignment between national values education and student behaviour as increasingly evident. While challenges remain, particularly in achieving consistent behaviour across all student groups, school leaders perceived the values handbook and VLC sessions as contributing to a more disciplined, respectful and reflective school environment.

3.2.10.4 Leadership Role in Promoting Values Education

School leaders saw themselves as role models whose behaviour could significantly influence students' adoption of values and its sustainability. Many described deliberate efforts to model expected values through their conduct, communication style and enforcement of rules. Some school leaders explained that students closely observe how leaders speak, dress and behave and are quick to identify inconsistencies between what is taught and what is practised. According to a school

> *"If you want students to respect you, you must also show respect. You cannot teach values and behave differently."* – Assistant School Head

head, *"Students look at us a lot. How you speak to them, how you react when there is a problem… they learn from that."*

Several leaders reported integrating values education into school assemblies, staff meetings, disciplinary conversations and everyday interactions. Values were often referenced when addressing misconduct, framing discipline as a learning opportunity rather than solely as punishment. This approach was seen as reinforcing the moral rationale behind school rules.

Leaders also highlighted the importance of institutionalising values through visible reminders, such as displaying core values on notice boards, incorporating values into school mottos and embedding them into orientation programmes for new students.

3.2.10.5 Gender Equality and Inclusion through Values Education

School leaders widely acknowledged the role of national values in promoting gender equality and inclusion. Many reported deliberate efforts to ensure balanced representation of students in leadership roles, including leadership positions and group activities, even in schools where enrolment was skewed toward one gender. For instance, an Assistant School Head stated that *"even though the girls are more, we are giving priority to giving the boys leadership roles… That is why we still have head boy and head girl, so that nobody will say we are biased."* Another school leader added, *"we pick the boys and the girls together so that they work in groups and work together."*

School leaders noted that values such as equity, respect and diversity were used to address gender stereotypes and encourage mutual respect between male and female students. Some leaders described changes in student attitudes, with girls increasingly demonstrating confidence and leadership and boys becoming more receptive to shared responsibility.

Nonetheless, leaders acknowledged that deeply ingrained cultural norms continue to influence some students' attitudes toward gender roles. As a result, values education was viewed as an ongoing corrective process rather than a one-time intervention.

3.2.10.6 Challenges and Areas for Improvement

Despite overall positive perceptions, school leaders identified several challenges. Some pointed to inconsistencies in how values are reinforced, noting that not all staff consistently model or exhibit expected behaviours. Others highlighted external influences, particularly home and community environments, which sometimes contradict the values promoted in school.

A school head admitted: *"Our teachers are supposed to be role models, but some are not living up to that expectation and [unfortunately] students notice it."* Another school leader observed, *"sometimes what we teach here is different from what the students see at home and that makes our work difficult."* – Dean of Discipline.

These challenges emphasise the need for a stronger alignment between school leadership, teachers, parents and communities to sustain values-based behaviour among students.

3.2.10.7 Implications from School Leaders' Perspectives

Overall, school leaders view national values education as both necessary and impactful. Their perspectives suggest that leadership commitment, visible role modelling and consistent reinforcement are critical enablers of successful implementation. At the same time, the findings highlight the need for clearer alignment between the values handbook and everyday school practice, as well as stronger engagement with teachers and parents to consolidate gains.

These leadership-level insights provide important lessons for national scale-up, underscoring the role of school management in anchoring values education within institutional culture rather than treating it as a standalone programme.

3.3 Attitudes toward National Values

3.3.1 Perceived Importance of Values

This subsection examines students' attitudes toward national values, focusing on how strongly learners associate values with national development, responsible citizenship and social cohesion. Attitudes reflect the extent to which values are seen as meaningful and relevant beyond classroom discussion. Table 3.13 summarises students self-reported levels of agreement with key statements at baseline and endline for intervention and control schools.

Students in both groups expressed high levels of agreement with statements linking national values to development, citizenship and social harmony (table 3.13). At baseline, agreement was already strong, particularly in intervention schools, indicating that many students entered the study with a positive orientation toward the importance of values. This aligns with the prominence of values-related messaging in schools and wider Ghanaian social norms.

Table 3.13: Student Attitudes Toward National Values and Development

	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Statement	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
National values are important for national development.	87.9	90.4	2.5	78.9	81.2	2.3	9.2
Following core values would help Ghana progress faster.	87.8	89.3	1.5	76.7	74	-2.7	15.3
Practicing values prepares students to be responsible citizens.	88.1	89.8	1.7	79.6	81	1.4	8.8
Values like discipline and adaptability are necessary for nation's success.	85.3	88.1	2.8	77.3	79.2	1.9	8.9

	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Statement	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
A country that upholds fairness and respect for diversity will experience greater peace.	81.2	86.3*	5.1	73.1	74	0.9	12.3
N	*1052*	*1046*		*1032*	1053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

By endline, agreement levels remained high across all statements. In intervention schools, attitudes toward the importance of national values were sustained at similarly high levels, with limited scope for large measurable increases given the already strong baseline responses. Control schools also recorded improvements on several statements, suggesting that broader school experiences and social influences continued to shape students' attitudes during the study period.

One area showing clearer movement is students' views on fairness and respect for diversity as contributors to peace, where improvement was observed in intervention schools (Table 3.13). This aligns with the emphasis placed in the handbook and VLC discussions on inclusion, equity and peaceful coexistence.

The findings (table 3.13) suggest that students recognise the importance of national values and their relevance to national development and citizenship. While the intervention appears to have helped sustain and, in some cases, strengthen positive attitudes, especially for values linked to fairness and social harmony, high baseline agreement levels limited the extent of observable change. These results indicate that attitudes toward national values were already well established among students and the programme operated more as a reinforcing influence than as a primary driver of attitudinal change.

3.3.2 Teacher Attitudes toward Values Education and National Development

This subsection examines teachers' self-reported attitudes toward national values education and its perceived contribution to student development and national progress. Teachers play a significant role in reinforcing values through daily interaction with students and their attitudes provide important context for understanding how values education is sustained within schools. Table 3.14 summarises levels of agreement with selected statements at baseline and endline for intervention and control schools.

Across both groups, teachers expressed strong agreement with all statements at baseline, indicating widespread recognition of the importance of national values and the role of schools

in shaping responsible citizens. Agreement levels exceeded 80 percent for all statements in both intervention and control schools, suggesting that positive attitudes toward values education were already well established prior to implementation of the handbook.

Table 3.14: Teacher Attitudes Toward Values Education and National Development

	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Statement	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
When students adhere to national values, they contribute to national development.	90.2	91.9	1.7	91.1	90.5	-0.6	2.3
Schools play a key role in shaping responsible citizens.	92.1	93.3	1.2	92.4	91	-1.4	2.6
There is a strong connection between values adherence and future societal contribution.	82.4	87.1	4.7	85.2	85.9	0.7	4
Students understand how their behaviour impacts national development.	68.1	76	7.9*	71.6	75.1	3.5	4.4
If students are taught to uphold discipline, leadership and integrity, Ghana will experience long-term development.	90.9	92.2	1.3	92.1	91.3	-0.8	2.1
N	*680*	*867*		*694*	*885*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

By endline, agreement remained consistently high across all items. In intervention schools, modest increases were observed for most statements, including teachers' perceptions of the link between values adherence and future societal contribution, as well as students' understanding of how their behaviour affects national development (Table 3.14). The largest increase in intervention schools related to teachers' views on students' awareness of the broader consequences of their behaviour, suggesting some strengthening of perceived student consciousness over time.

Changes in control schools were smaller and more mixed. While slight improvements were recorded for some statements, other items showed marginal declines, though overall

agreement remained high. The absence of large shifts in either group reflects the already elevated baseline levels, which limited the scope for substantial change.

Overall, the findings indicate that teachers across both intervention and control schools hold strong and stable beliefs about the importance of national values education and its relevance to national development. The intervention does not appear to have altered these attitudes significantly, largely because teachers already recognised the value of such education before the pilot. Instead, the results suggest that the values handbook and VLC sessions were implemented within a context of broad teacher support, which may have facilitated consistent delivery and reinforcement of values at the school level.

3.3.3 Students Value Priorities and Perceived Importance

Building on the survey findings on students' attitudes toward national values, this subsection draws on FGDs to examine how students prioritise different values and how they explain their importance in everyday school life. The qualitative evidence helps to clarify how values are understood, where students locate their sources of learning and the extent to which values are seen as deliberate school-based learning or as general social expectations.

3.3.3.1 Value Priorities Among Students in Intervention Schools and Students in Control Schools

Examples of values from students in intervention schools

Most students in intervention schools demonstrated a clear and immediate ability to name specific values, often using languages that closely mirrors the terminology used in the VLC sessions and values handbook.

Beyond naming values, intervention students frequently linked values to expected behaviours and daily school life, suggesting a more applied understanding. For example, students associated discipline with punctuality, obedience to rules and appropriate dressing: *"First, I was taught how to be disciplined… the way I dress."*

Respect and equality were also framed in relational terms, particularly how students treat one another: *"…we demonstrate values by treating each other equally and with respect."*

Students in control schools demonstrated less immediate clarity when asked about values, with some requiring probing before they could provide examples. Where values were identified, they were often described in general or experiential terms. Students frequently located values in everyday behaviour rather than formal learning. Sources of values for control students were more diffuse and informal. For example, a student from a control school cited *"values are the things we cherish in the house." Another added, "values are seen in the*

church." Another student participant in the discussion echoed "in the hospital." eliciting reactions from other participants.

Importantly, intervention students often traced their understanding of values directly to VLC sessions, alongside emphasis from counselling, religious activities and school programmes. For instance, during FGD, a student noted, *"I understand the importance of values from participating in our VLC sessions."* Another student stated, *"we get the opportunity to learn about values through guidance and counselling."* Another added *"I also learn [about values] in the mosque."*

Unlike intervention students, control students rarely referenced any specific school-based programme or structured activity through which values were intentionally taught. This suggests that exposure to the values handbook and VLCs has elevated values from abstract concepts to structured learning experiences that students recognise as intentional and school driven.

3.3.3.2 Importance of Values Among Students from Intervention Schools and Students from Control Schools

Most students from intervention schools perceived values as important for self-discipline, social acceptance and personal correction. Several students linked values directly to corrective mechanisms within the school system. Punishment was not necessarily framed negatively, but rather as a tool for reinforcing responsibility and acceptable behaviour. For example, during FGD with students from intervention schools, one student said, *"when you are punished, you learn not to do it again."* Overall, intervention students tended to describe values as rules for living well in school, with clear consequences and expectations attached.

Control school students acknowledged that values are important, but their explanations were more normative and less behaviour specific. Values were often associated with good upbringing and general conduct rather than explicit behavioural change. For example, students linked responsibility and respect to teacher behaviour and rule enforcement: *"When it is time to come to class, the teacher comes on time."* Another control school student added, *"They treat us with respect."*

Punishment was also mentioned, but as a rule-enforcement mechanism rather than a learning process: *"When you are late, you will be punished."* Overall, values were seen as important but less consciously internalised, with limited articulation of why particular values matter beyond compliance with rules.

3.3.3.3 Key Differences Between Intervention and Control Students

Several clear contrasts emerge between the two groups. Intervention students' responses suggest greater internalisation and practical understanding of values, reflecting repeated

exposure through VLC sessions. Control students, while not dismissive of values, tended to describe them as background moral expectations rather than explicit outcomes.

Dimension	Students in Intervention Schools	Students in Control Schools
Clarity of value priorities	Students readily name specific values (discipline, respect, honesty)	Students struggle initially; definitions are broader and less precise
Source of values	VLC sessions, counselling sessions, structured school activities, religious activities, etc.	Home, religion and general school rules
Perceived importance	Values linked to behaviour change and self-correction	Values linked to obedience and social norms
Application	Values connected to daily practices (punctuality, dressing, interaction)	Values viewed as general expectations rather than learned practices

Overall, both intervention and control students recognise the importance of national values. However, students in intervention schools demonstrate stronger prioritisation, clearer articulation and more applied understanding of values. Their narratives reflect intentional learning and reinforcement, whereas control students' perspectives remain more diffuse and socially inherited. These differences suggest that the VLC sessions have contributed to making values education more visible, structured and personally meaningful for students in intervention schools.

3.3.4 Attitudes Toward Discipline and Authority

This subsection examines students' self-reported attitudes toward discipline and authority, with a focus on whether discipline is viewed as essential for success within the school environment. Discipline is a central value emphasised in the values handbook and is also deeply embedded in existing school rules and routines, making it a key area for assessing whether the intervention reinforced or reshaped students' perspectives.

As shown in Table 3.15, discipline was already highly valued by students in both intervention and control schools at baseline. In both groups, a large majority of students rated discipline as "very important" for school success, indicating strong pre-existing endorsement of discipline as a core expectation of school life.

By endline (table 3.15), a strengthening of this endorsement was observed, particularly in intervention schools. The proportion of students rating discipline as "very important" increased significantly, accompanied by a decline in the share selecting "important." This suggests a shift from moderate to stronger conviction rather than a change from negative to positive attitudes. In control schools, changes over time were smaller and not statistically significant, indicating relative stability in students' views.

Table 3.15: Student's assessment of the Importance of Discipline for School Success

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Response	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Very Important	87.9	91.4	3.5	85.3	86.4	1.1	2.4
Important	8.3	5.7	-2.6	10.5	9.6	-0.9	-1.7
Neutral	2.2	1.3	-0.9	3.2	2.9	-0.3	-0.6
Not Important	0.5	0.3	-0.2	0.2	0.1	-0.1	-0.1
Not Important at All	0.4	0.1	-0.3	0.5	0.2	-0.3	0
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	1,053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

3.3.5 Attitudes Toward Discipline and Authority in Practice

Beyond perceptions of the importance of discipline, the survey examined students' attitudes toward school rules, authority and personal responsibility for behaviour. These items provide insight into how students interpret discipline in practice, including rule compliance, fairness of sanctions and willingness to engage constructively with authority.

As shown in Table 3.16, baseline responses indicate strong understanding of school rules and expectations across both intervention and control schools. Most students reported that they understood school rules and viewed them as supportive of success, reflecting the established role of rules and authority in the school environment prior to the intervention.

Students in intervention schools demonstrated clearer alignment between understanding of rules and personal responsibility by endline (table 3.16). Increased adherence to school rules when unsupervised and greater comfort reporting disruptive behaviour suggest a move toward internalised discipline, consistent with the handbook's emphasis on self-regulation and accountability rather than fear-based compliance.

Students in intervention schools also showed increased confidence in the fairness of disciplinary consequences (table 3.16). This suggests that values-based discussions may have helped students better understand the rationale behind school rules and sanctions, framing discipline as corrective and developmental rather than purely punitive.

Table 3.16: Student Attitudes Toward Discipline and Authority Statements

	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Statement	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
I understand the school rules and expectations.	83.7	87.3	3.6	76.3	78.5	2.2	8.8
I usually follow the school rules, even when teachers are not watching.	78.4	84.1*	5.7	71.1	71.3	0.2	12.8
I believe the consequences for breaking rules are fair.	63	69*	6	64.1	67.5	3.4	1.5
I feel comfortable reporting disruptive behaviour in class.	62.6	69.7*	7.1	57	59	2	10.7
Rules set by school authorities are meant to help me succeed.	84.8	86.7	1.9	75.1	77.9	2.8	8.8
It is acceptable to challenge authority when I am right.	56.3	61.1*	4.8	58.1	53.5	-4.6	7.6
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	1053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Changes in control schools were smaller and less consistent across statements. While some indicators improved modestly, others remained unchanged, indicating limited movement in

students' perceptions of authority and rule enforcement in the absence of structured values engagement.

Particularly, students in intervention schools also reported greater acceptance of questioning authority when they believed they were right. This aligns with the values handbook's framing of responsible citizenship, leadership and confidence as involving ethical judgement and respectful expression of views rather than passive obedience. Control school responses on this item shifted in the opposite direction, suggesting a more compliance-oriented understanding of authority.

The findings in Table 3.16 suggest that the intervention was associated with a more reflective and balanced understanding of discipline and authority. Students in intervention schools were more likely to view rules as supportive, sanctions as fair and compliance as a personal responsibility, while recognising space for respectful challenge. This supports earlier findings on conceptual understanding and points to deeper internalisation of discipline-related values through VLC sessions.

3.3.6 Attitudes Toward Addressing Unfair Rules

In addition to examining students' views on discipline and authority, the survey explored how students believe unfair or problematic school rules should be addressed. These items provide insight into students' sense of agency, civic responsibility and preferred channels for engaging with authority, all of which are linked to the values of responsible citizenship, leadership and confidence emphasised in the handbook.

As shown in Table 3.17, the most endorsed response at both baseline and endline across intervention and control schools was discussing concerns with a teacher or prefect. This suggests that, even prior to the intervention, many students recognised dialogue with school authorities as an appropriate way to address perceived unfairness.

By endline, students in intervention schools showed a modest shift away from passive acceptance of rules and toward more constructive forms of engagement (table 3.17). Fewer students indicated that unfair rules should be accepted without question, alongside increased preference for discussion with teachers or prefects. This aligns with earlier findings on students' willingness to report disruptive behaviour and to challenge authority respectfully.

Support for collective action through organising petitions remained stable over time in both groups. This suggests that while students may recognise formal channels for dialogue, more organised forms of collective advocacy are less commonly viewed as a primary response within the school context.

Table 3.17: Student Attitudes Toward Addressing Unfair Rules

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Response	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Discuss concerns with a teacher or prefect	58.2	60.7	2.5	57.5	58.5	1	1.5
Organize petition to request changes	20.3	21.4	1.1	20.5	20.5	0	1.1
Accept the rules without question	17.7	14.3	-3.4	16.5	15.5	-1	-2.4
Ignore rules	2.4	2.6	0.2	3.5	3.5	0	0.2
Other	0.7	0.3	-0.4	0.8	1	0.2	-0.6
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	1,053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Changes in control schools were smaller and stable across response options. Preferences for accepting rules without question declined only marginally and there were limited movement toward more active engagement strategies. This indicates that, in the absence of structured values discussions, students' approaches to authority and rulemaking remain unchanged.

The findings in Table 3.17 suggest that exposure to the handbook and VLC sessions was associated with a gradual shift toward more reflective and participatory attitudes when responding to perceived unfairness. Rather than encouraging rule-breaking or disengagement, the intervention has reinforced dialogue-based and responsible approaches to authority, aligning with the handbook's emphasis on responsible citizenship, confidence and leadership exercised within institutional norms.

3.3.7 Teachers' Assessment of Student Discipline and Behaviour

To complement students' self-reported attitudes toward discipline and authority, teachers were asked to assess students' understanding of school rules, compliance, respect for authority and consistency of disciplinary practices. Teachers' perspectives provide an external lens on whether reported shifts in attitudes are reflected in observable behaviour within the school environment.

As summarised in Table 3.18, teachers in intervention schools reported improvements across all five indicators between baseline and endline. These included stronger agreement that students understand school rules, follow rules even when unsupervised, respect teachers' authority and challenge authority in respectful and constructive ways. The direction of

change aligns closely with earlier student-reported findings on discipline, responsibility and engagement with authority.

Table 3.18 Teacher Assessment of Student Discipline

	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Statement	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Most students understand the school rules and expectations.	73.1	79.0*	5.9	79.4	79.6	0.2	5.7
Most students follow school rules, even when teachers are not present.	49.6	59.5*	9.9	48.7	57.4*	8.7	1.2
The consequences for breaking rules are consistently applied.	64.9	71.2*	6.3	64.6	74.9*	10.3	-4
Students respect teachers' instructions and authority.	68.8	77.2*	8.4	70.3	76.2*	5.9	2.5
Students challenge authority in a respectful and constructive manner	47.1	57.7*	10.6	47.7	52.9	5.2	5.4
N	*680*	*867*		*694*	*885*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Improvements were particularly evident in areas related to internalised discipline rather than compliance driven by supervision alone. Teachers increasingly agreed that students follow school rules when unsupervised and express challenges to authority constructively. This supports the values handbook's framing of discipline as self-regulation and confidence as responsible self-expression rather than fear-based obedience.

Teachers in control schools also reported some improvements over time, particularly in perceptions of rule-following and consistency of consequences. However, these changes were more uneven across indicators. In some areas, such as consistent application of consequences, reported improvements were larger in control schools, suggesting the influence of parallel school management or policy processes unrelated to the handbook. Nevertheless, gains related to respectful engagement with authority and student agency were more pronounced in intervention schools.

Across both groups, teachers reported higher agreement at endline that students respect teachers' instructions and authority. This reinforces earlier qualitative accounts from school leaders who described improvements in greeting practices, receptiveness to correction and general conduct.

The findings in Table 3.18 indicate that exposure to the handbook and VLC sessions was associated with positive shifts in how teachers perceive student discipline and behaviour. These shifts extend beyond rule compliance to include respect, self-regulation and constructive engagement with authority, reinforcing the earlier conclusion that values education contributed to changes not only in knowledge and attitudes but also in everyday school behaviour.

3.3.8 Attitudes Toward Civic Engagement

Students' attitudes toward civic engagement were examined using a scenario-based question that asked how they would respond to a community clean-up activity. This item was designed to assess students' willingness to participate actively in collective action for the public good, which aligns closely with the value handbook's articulation of responsible citizenship as active contribution to community and national life.

As shown in Table 3.19, most students in both intervention and control schools already expressed positive attitudes toward civic participation at baseline, with a large majority indicating that they would actively take part in the activity and encourage others to do the same. This suggests that norms around communal responsibility and participation are already present among students.

Table 3.19: Student Responses to Community Clean-up Scenario

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Response	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Actively participate and encourage others	85	89.1*	4.1	83.7	86	2.3	1.8
Participate if someone asks me	10.6	7.7	-2.9	11.5	8.9	-2.6	-0.3
Avoid the activity altogether	3.7	2.7	-1	4.3	4.7	0.4	-1.4
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	*1053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

By endline, students in intervention schools showed a further strengthening of these attitudes (table 3.19). There was a clear shift toward more proactive forms of engagement, with fewer students indicating conditional participation or avoidance. This is consistent with earlier findings on responsible citizenship, leadership and confidence, where intervention students increasingly framed values as requiring active involvement rather than passive compliance.

Changes in control schools were smaller and more mixed. While some increase in active participation was observed, reductions in conditional participation were less pronounced and avoidance behaviours showed slight improvement (table 3.19). This indicates that, in the absence of structured discussion through VLC sessions, attitudes toward civic engagement remained stable over time.

The findings suggest that exposure to the handbook and regular VLC sessions reinforced students' orientation toward active civic participation. Rather than simply endorsing community activities in principle, students in intervention schools appeared more willing to take initiative and encourage collective action, reflecting a deeper internalisation of responsible citizenship as defined in the handbook.

3.3.9 Motivations for Civic Participation

To complement students stated willingness to participate in community activities, the survey examined *why* students would choose to engage. Understanding students' motivations provides insight into whether civic participation is driven primarily by internalised values or by external prompts, such as authority figures or social recognition.

As shown in Table 3.20, students in intervention schools demonstrated a clear shift toward intrinsic motivations for civic participation by endline. A greater proportion of students cited

a sense of responsibility and personal satisfaction as reasons for engaging in community activities. These motivations align closely with the value handbook's framing of responsible citizenship as an internal commitment to contributing to the collective good, rather than participation driven solely by obligation or reward.

Table 3.20: Students' Motivations for Community Participation

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Response	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
A sense of responsibility	49.9	58.5*	8.6	47.4	51.1	3.7	7.4
Encouragement from teachers or leaders	34.5	37.7	3.2	33.4	30.2	-3.2	7.5
Personal satisfaction	32.2	41.1*	8.9	33.5	33.7	0.2	7.4
Recognition from others	14.2	15.3	1.1	13.2	15	1.8	0.3
Other	2.7	1.5	-1.2	4.1	2.8	-1.3	-1.3
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	1053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Motivations linked to external encouragement or recognition changed less in intervention schools, suggesting a shift toward participation grounded in students' own value judgements rather than external direction or praise.

Changes in control schools were more modest and less consistent across motivation types. While some increase in responsibility-based motivation was observed, shifts toward personal satisfaction were limited. Encouragement from authority figures declined slightly, indicating that participation in these schools may remain more situational and less anchored in internalised values.

The findings in Table 3.20 suggest that the intervention contributed to a qualitative shift in how students understand civic engagement. Rather than viewing participation primarily as a response to instruction or supervision, students in intervention schools increasingly framed civic action as a personal responsibility and a source of fulfilment. This reinforces earlier findings on responsible citizenship, leadership and confidence and supports the conclusion that the handbook and VLC sessions strengthened the internal foundations of civic behaviour, not only its outward expression.

3.4 Qualitative Insights on the Implementation and Lived Experience of VLC Sessions

While the preceding sections present quantitative evidence on changes in students' knowledge, understanding and attitudes toward national values, this section draws on qualitative data to examine how VLC sessions were experienced and implemented in practice. The analysis focuses on students lived experiences of participating in VLC sessions and the perspectives of G&C coordinators who were responsible for coordinating and supervising implementation at the school level.

The qualitative findings help explain the mechanisms through which the values handbook and VLC sessions influenced student outcomes. They provide insight into how session structure, peer-led facilitation, opportunities for discussion and reflection and the wider school environment shaped students' engagement with values and their translation into everyday behaviour.

3.4.1 Students' Lived Experiences of VLC Sessions and Behavioural Patterns Linked to Participation

Students' Experience of VLC Sessions as Participatory Learning Spaces

Students in intervention schools consistently described VLC sessions as distinct from regular classroom lessons, emphasising their interactive and discussion-based nature. Many students referred to the sessions as spaces where values were explained, discussed and linked to everyday life, rather than simply mentioned or assumed. VLC sessions were commonly identified by students as a key avenue through which they learned about national values.

Students characterised the sessions as opportunities to listen, share opinions and learn from peers' experiences, rather than as instruction-led classroom lessons. Ordinary lessons were described as more academic and examination focused. The emphasis on discussion and shared reflection appeared to support deeper engagement with values content.

Teachers' accounts aligned with students' descriptions. Teachers noted that the structure of VLC sessions encouraged openness and reflection, creating space for students to express views and consider different perspectives. This approach was viewed as supporting understanding of values through dialogue and example, rather than through memorisation or directive instruction.

Engagement, Attention and Peer Interaction During Sessions

Students reported positive levels of engagement during VLC sessions, although the intensity of participation varied. Many students described active listening and contribution, particularly when discussions were practical, relatable and connected to their own experiences. One student explained that engagement was often sustained through varied

activities, noting that *"During VLC session, students are mostly active. Sometimes they conduct a short play or drama to explain or express their view. …when people are feeling lazy or tired, then we introduce icebreakers there to make them more active."*

Peer interaction emerged as a central feature of the sessions. Students described learning not only from peer guides but also from listening to classmates' experiences and perspectives. This peer-to-peer exchange supported shared understanding of values and to reinforce acceptable behaviour through collective discussion.

School leaders corroborated these observations, noting that the collaborative nature of VLC sessions contributed to improved peer relationships and fewer confrontational interactions outside the sessions. The emphasis on discussion and shared reflection was seen as fostering mutual respect and encouraging students to learn from one another rather than relying solely on authority figures.

Changes in Behavioural Patterns Linked to Participation in VLC Sessions

Students frequently linked participation in VLC sessions to observable changes in their behaviour, particularly in relation to discipline, self-regulation, tolerance, confidence and interpersonal conduct. Many students described becoming more aware of the consequences of their actions and more reflective about their responsibilities toward others.

Corrective measures were often framed by students as opportunities for learning rather than punishment. One student explained that *"When you are punished, you learn not to do it again."* suggesting a shift toward understanding discipline as a process of reflection and self-improvement. These accounts point to movement away from fear-based compliance toward more conscious self-correction.

Teachers and school leaders corroborated these perceptions, reporting fewer severe disciplinary cases and improved student responsiveness to guidance following the introduction of values-focused discussions. According to school leaders, students appeared more receptive to correction and more mindful of acceptable conduct.

Students' accounts further illustrate these changes. One student reflected, *"…this VLC has made a lot of changes in my life. At first, I was someone who got angry quickly, but now I can control my temper because of self-control."* Another student described improved peer relations, noting that *"at first, we quarrelled a lot in my class, but now due to the VLC, it has helped us stop quarrelling, so everyone enjoys the class."*

Other students highlighted increased tolerance and respect for differing views. As one student explained, *"tolerating each other's view was not there before, but now students are able to respect each other's views because they know that when we come to VLC session, they will be corrected for their actions."* Confidence also emerged as an area of change, with one student stating, *"with VLC, it has changed me by giving me the confidence to speak in public. At first, I was a shy person."*

Respect, Relationships and Interaction with Authority

Another behavioural pattern linked to participation in VLC sessions was improved respectful interaction with teachers and school leaders. Students described increased attentiveness to how they dress, speak, listen and respond to authority figures. Several students noted that discussions during VLC sessions heightened their awareness of what respectful conduct looks like in practice.

Students also highlighted the role of adult behaviour in reinforcing values discussed during sessions. Observing how teachers and school leaders interacted with students and handled correction was frequently cited as reinforcing messages from the VLC discussions. Intervention students often linked their respectful behaviour to what they had both observed and reflected on during sessions, suggesting that VLC participation strengthened awareness of respectful engagement rather than relying solely on rule enforcement.

Variations in Engagement and Behaviour Change

Despite positive experiences, students acknowledged variation in levels of engagement and behaviour change among their peers. Some students were described as less attentive during sessions or slower to internalise values, often due to peer influence, personal attitudes or resistance to change. Teachers and school leaders similarly noted that behaviour change was not immediate for all students and required repeated exposure and consistent reinforcement.

School leaders emphasised that sustained implementation was important, particularly for students more influenced by peer pressure. Ongoing discussion, modelling and follow-up were viewed as necessary to consolidate gains and prevent regression over time.

Summary of Student Lived Experiences

Overall, students lived experiences suggest that VLC sessions functioned as meaningful spaces for reflection, dialogue and reinforcement of national values. Participation was commonly associated with:

- Greater awareness of discipline and self-regulation
- More reflective responses to correction
- Improved respect toward peers and authority
- Clearer articulation of values such as equality and responsibility

Compared with students in control schools, intervention students were more likely to explicitly link changes in their behaviour to structured learning experiences provided through VLC sessions, rather than to general school rules or home upbringing alone. These accounts indicate that VLC sessions contributed not only to increased knowledge of national values but also to observable behavioural patterns consistent with those values.

3.4.2 Perspective of Guidance and Counselling Coordinators on VLC

This section presents qualitative findings from in-depth interviews with G&C coordinators. It examines how VLC sessions were implemented and coordinated, the patronage and support roles played by G&C coordinators, key enablers and barriers, lived implementation experiences, observed changes among students, support systems and recommendations for national rollout.

VLC implementation and coordination arrangements

G&C coordinators described VLC implementation as a structured, school-managed process initiated after orientation and internal sensitisation. Following a national level training they attended, G&C coordinators briefed school leadership, engaged teachers and oriented students on the purpose and expectations of VLC sessions. As one coordinator described, *"we took the school community through what we're supposed to take them through,"* beginning with management and cascading to teachers and students.

Across schools, a consistent coordination model was reported. Student peer guides were selected from each class, typically involving a male and a female guide depending on the sex composition of the school. These peer guides were nominated by their classes and subsequently trained by the G&C unit to facilitate VLC sessions. Coordinators noted that classes were asked to identify students *"who will be willing to lead the group… as peer guides,"* followed by targeted training and preparation to equip them for facilitation.

Scheduling of VLC sessions was commonly aligned with existing school structures, particularly PLC sessions, to ensure predictability and minimise disruption to the school timetable. G&C coordinators explained that this alignment allowed students to engage in structured activities while teachers were participating in professional development. One coordinator noted that, *"right after the training, it [VLC sessions] was put on the timetable, just like PLC, so that while teachers are having their sessions, students also had their sessions…"* Another coordinator noted that VLC sessions were held *"Every Wednesday… from 9.30 am to 11.30 am,"* coinciding with the same period teachers were engaged in PLC activities. Another coordinator reported a similar approach, with peer guides meeting on Tuesdays after school and delivering on Wednesdays 11.30 am to 12.30 pm.

Patronage roles and support provided by G&C coordinators.

G&C coordinators positioned themselves as the primary patrons and coordinators of VLC sessions. Their roles extended beyond facilitation to include planning, supervision and motivation. Support activities included pre-session preparation with peer guides often meeting a day in advance to review content and facilitation approaches, followed by active monitoring during sessions. A coordinator noted, *"a day before the VLC session… Tuesday, we meet the peer guides to take them through what they're supposed to do during their upcoming VLC session… then during the sessions we go around to check whatever that is*

going on." Coordinators also emphasised the importance of student buy-in, describing their role in motivating and *"psyching"* the whole students to embrace the programme, noting that *"without acceptance we wouldn't have the effectiveness of the sessions."*

Enablers of effective VLC sessions

G&C coordinators identified several factors that supported effective delivery of VLC sessions. A key enabler was the allocation of dedicated timetable slots, often aligned with PLC periods. Coordinators explained that this arrangement reduced student loitering, ensured predictable scheduling and supported consistent participation across classes.

The peer-led delivery model was also highlighted as an important enabling factor. Regular preparatory meetings between G&C coordinators and peer guides helped strengthen facilitation skills and ensured that sessions remained relevant and engaging. These meetings allowed peer guides to review session content in advance and discuss appropriate facilitation approaches.

Adequate basic infrastructure further supported effective implementation. Some coordinators noted that the availability of classrooms, tables and chairs made it easier to organise sessions smoothly. As one coordinator explained,

"We have adequate resources. Classrooms… tables and chairs… We have enough to ensure that sessions are held smoothly." Internal collaboration among trained staff also contributed to effective delivery. G&C coordinators described working closely with other trained teachers and school leaders to review challenges, address questions that emerged during sessions and make incremental improvements to subsequent sessions.

Barriers to VLC implementation

G&C coordinators consistently identified two interrelated barriers to effective VLC implementation: resource and material constraints and challenges related to peer guide selection and implementation fidelity.

Resource and material limitations were frequently cited, particularly the availability and coverage of the values handbook. G&C coordinators emphasised that effective delivery requires all students to have access to the handbook, noting that *"they should make sure each and every student should get it."* Beyond handbook availability, coordinators highlighted that values education relies on activity-based learning, which in turn requires adequate materials and logistical support to sustain engagement during sessions.

The second barrier related to peer guide selection and the consistency of implementation. In some schools, allowing classes to nominate peer guides resulted in the selection of students who exhibited behavioural challenges or inconsistent conduct. One G&C coordinator observed that *"some of them had behaviours… uncalled for,"* which created difficulties when those same students were expected to facilitate discussions on values. These situations

posed risks to implementation fidelity, as peer guides were expected to model the values they were teaching.

Recommendations for national rollout

G&C coordinators offered a set of practical recommendations to inform the national rollout of the values handbook and VLC sessions. These recommendations reflect lived implementation experience and focus on strengthening resourcing, supervision, motivation and implementation fidelity.

First, coordinators emphasised the importance of universal access to the values handbook. Several noted that effective values instruction depends on every learner having direct access to the handbook, particularly given the activity-based nature of VLC sessions.

Second, coordinators highlighted the need to provide adequate materials for activity-based learning. Beyond the handbook itself, facilitators require basic teaching and learning materials to support discussions, group work and practical demonstrations of values.

Third, coordinators recommended stronger supervision and clearer staff accountability arrangements. Assigning teachers on a rotating or weekly basis to monitor VLC sessions and assess what was discussed was seen to improve consistency, reinforce seriousness and reduce student loitering or disengagement during sessions.

Fourth, coordinators advised that peer guide selection criteria should be revised and strengthened. Rather than relying solely on student nomination, coordinators recommended screening or vetting peer guides to ensure that students selected to facilitate sessions demonstrate appropriate conduct and serve as credible role models.

Fifth, improved motivation for both peer guides and teachers were identified as important for sustaining engagement. Coordinators suggested non-monetary incentives such as certificates or formal recognition for peer guides, alongside motivation and acknowledgement for teachers who support and supervise VLC implementation.

Finally, coordinators called for broader teacher involvement beyond the core implementation team. Expanding participation was seen as essential for embedding national values across school life, rather than limiting values education to VLC sessions alone.

3.5. Behaviours Reflecting or Contradicting Values

This section examines the extent to which students' behaviours align with the core national values promoted through the values handbook and VLC sessions. While earlier sections focused on students' knowledge, understanding and attitudes, this section shifts attention to reported behaviours that reflect or contradict these values in everyday school and social contexts.

Behavioural outcomes were assessed using a combination of student self-reports and teacher assessments, focusing on actions related to discipline, respect for authority, fairness, responsibility, peer interaction and civic-minded conduct. The items capture both positive behaviours consistent with the national values framework and behaviours that may undermine or contradict these values.

Analysing behavioural patterns alongside earlier findings on knowledge and attitudes provides insight into whether exposure to the values handbook and structured VLC engagement translated into practical behaviour change. Differences between intervention and control schools are examined to assess the added contribution of the intervention beyond existing school rules and disciplinary practices.

3.5.1 Overview of Behaviour Assessment

This subsection examines students' self-reported behaviours in relation to the core national values, focusing on whether students perceive their everyday actions as consistent with the values promoted through the values handbook and reinforced during VLC sessions. Unlike earlier sections that assessed knowledge, understanding and attitudes, the indicators presented here capture students' own assessments of how frequently they practice specific values in their daily lives.

Table 3.21 presents changes in self-reported adherence to the eleven core national values between baseline and endline for intervention and control schools. Improvements were clear and consistent across all values in intervention schools. Baseline adherence levels were broadly comparable across groups, indicating similar starting points, while endline results show large and statistically significant gains for every value in intervention schools.

The strongest gains in intervention schools were observed for values associated with agency, judgement and self-regulation, including adaptability, leadership, self-directed learning, confidence and resourcefulness (table 3.21). In each of these areas, increases exceeded twenty-five percentage points, indicating substantial perceived behaviour change over the intervention period. Values related to ethical conduct and fairness, such as honesty, integrity and equity, also showed strong positive shifts, while discipline and responsibility recorded high endline levels approaching universality.

Table 3.21: Student Self-Reported Adherence to values Value

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Discipline	83.3	97.2*	13.9	83	82.4	-0.6	14.8
Responsibility	77.6	99.1*	21.5	79.1	81.5	2.4	17.6
Confidence	76.2	98.2*	22	77.5	79.6	2.1	18.6
Resourcefulness	72.6	97.6*	25	74.1	78.2	4.1	19.4
Diversity	72.8	89.6*	16.8	72.8	70.6	-2.2	19
Self-directed learning	70.5	96.8*	26.3	71.3	74.4	3.1	22.4
Leadership	69.9	97.7*	27.8	70.7	74.2	3.5	23.5
Honesty	67.8	91.6*	23.8	68	71.8	3.8	19.8
Adaptability	60.5	92*	31.5	63.2	68.1	4.9	23.9
Equity	72.8	93.7*	20.9	72.8	78.1	5.3	15.6
Integrity	67.8	86.4*	18.6	68	69	1	17.4
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	1053		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

In control schools (table 3.21), changes were modest. Some values showed small increases, but gains were limited and, in several cases, adherence levels remained unchanged or declined slightly between baseline and endline. The resulting difference-in-differences estimates therefore favour intervention schools, with gaps of 15 to 24 percentage points across values.

The findings in Table 3.21 suggest that exposure to the values handbook and participation in structured VLC sessions were associated with substantial improvements in students perceived ability to practise national values in their daily behaviour. The magnitude and consistency of the changes across a wide range of values strengthen the interpretation that the intervention influenced not only students' understanding of values but also their self-reported conduct, reinforcing the progression observed earlier from knowledge and attitudes to behaviour.

3.5.2 Teacher Observations of Student Behaviour

To complement students' self-reported behaviours, teachers were asked to assess how frequently students demonstrated value-consistent behaviours in everyday school life. Teachers reported whether students *always* or *often* exhibited behaviours aligned with each of the core national values. This provides an external perspective on behavioural change and allows triangulation of student self-assessments with adult observations.

Table 3.22 shows that, at baseline, teacher perceptions of student behaviour were broadly similar across intervention and control schools, with moderate proportions of teachers reporting frequent demonstration of most values. This suggests comparable starting conditions and reinforces the validity of subsequent comparisons.

By endline, teachers in intervention schools reported substantial and statistically significant increases across all eleven values (table 3.22). The largest gains were observed for self-directed learning, adaptability, responsibility and leadership, with increases exceeding eighteen percentage points. These are values that require initiative, decision-making and personal agency, aligning closely with the focus of VLC discussions and peer-led reflection. Improvements were also recorded for honesty, integrity, discipline and confidence, indicating broader shifts in both ethical conduct and behavioural self-regulation.

Table 3.22: Teacher Observations of Student Behaviour

	% Reporting "Always" or "Often"						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Value	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Honesty	54	70.9*	16.9	56.4	59.5	3.1	11.4
Self-directed learning	49.3	70.7*	21.4	50	52.4	2.4	18.3
Adaptability	47.3	68.6*	21.3	46.1	48	1.9	20.6
Resourcefulness	46.9	63*	16.1	44.9	45.9	1	17.1
Leadership	43.1	61.8*	18.7	43	40.1	-2.9	21.7
Equity	39.6	49*	9.4	37.9	42.9	5	6.1
Integrity	54	66.1*	12.1	56.4	58.4	2	7.7
Responsibility	42.4	62.9*	20.5	43	44.8	1.8	18.1
Discipline	43.4	57*	13.6	40.4	40.4	0	16.6
Confidence	41.7	56.1*	14.4	40	38.3	-1.7	17.8
Diversity	39.6	43*	3.4	37.9	39.6	1.7	3.4
N	*680*	*867*		*694*	*885*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Changes in control schools were small and inconsistent (table 3.22). While modest improvements were observed for a few values, several indicators showed minimal change or slight decline, particularly for leadership and confidence. As a result, differences between

intervention and control schools at endline were similar for most values, with gaps ranging from approximately eleven to over twenty-one percentage points.

The consistency between teacher-reported improvements and the large gains observed in students' self-reported behaviours strengthens confidence in the behavioural effects of the intervention. Teachers' observations suggest that the values handbook and VLC sessions were associated not only with increased awareness and positive attitudes but also with observable changes in how students behave within the school environment. These findings indicate that values education delivered through structured, participatory mechanisms can translate into discernible behavioural shifts recognised by both students and teachers.

3.5.3 Real-Life Demonstrations of National Values Within the School Setting

Qualitative insight from FGDs revealed real-life accounts of how students demonstrate and practice national values with the school environment. The FGDs with students from both intervention and control schools, highlighted some concrete examples of behaviour, interactions and school practices through which values such as discipline, respect, responsibility, equality and care for others are enacted in everyday school life.

Discipline and Self-Regulation in Daily School Life

Across both intervention and control schools, students identified discipline as one of the most visible and frequently practised values within the school setting. Discipline was commonly demonstrated through adherence to school rules, punctuality, appropriate dressing and acceptance of corrective measures.

Students in intervention schools described changes in how they present themselves and conduct daily routines, linking these shifts directly to values education. They often linked discipline directly to lessons learned during VLC sessions and guidance activities: *"I have learned a lot during our VLC sessions. First, I was taught how to be disciplined through the way I dress."* Another student also said, *"I have also learned to practice obedience whether in the school or at home so that I can build discipline."*

Similarly, students in control schools described discipline through compliance with rules and consequences for misconduct: *"When it is time for school, you should not be late. When you are late, you will be punished."* – Student FGD, Control school

These suggest that discipline is experienced by students as a practical, everyday value reinforced through routine school practices. Though both set of students' value discipline, majority of intervention school students appear to have moved from following rules out of duty to acting with conviction and purpose.

Respect and Responsible Interaction with Teachers and Peers

Respect emerged strongly in students' descriptions of how they relate to teachers, school leaders and peers. In both intervention and control schools, respect was demonstrated through greetings, listening to authority and appropriate communication.

Students in intervention schools described respect as something actively reinforced through counselling and values discussions: *"Our counsellors meet with us and guide us to be respectful, not only to our teachers but also to one another."* – Student FGD, Intervention school. Respect was also learned by observing teachers' behaviour: *"They [teachers] treat us with respect, so, through that we learn to be respectful." –* Student FGD, Intervention school.

Control school students similarly emphasised teachers as role models of respect: *"When the teacher comes to class on time and asks how you are doing, that means they are showing respect to us."* These examples suggest that respectful conduct is reinforced both explicitly (through guidance) and implicitly (through adult modelling).

Equality, Fairness and Inclusion

Students in intervention schools provided examples of equality and inclusion, particularly in how they are treated within the school and how they relate to one another. Intervention school students frequently described fairness and equal treatment as part of their lived experience. When asked whether there have been any notable changes in students' behaviour since participating in VLC sessions or similar sessions, one student indicated that *"Now, students are mindful of treating each other equally."*

In control schools, equality was less explicitly framed as a value, but students still described fair treatment through uniform enforcement of rules: *"Everyone in the school, when it is time, they all rise."* – Student FGD, Control school

These accounts suggest that while inclusion and equality may be more explicitly articulated in intervention settings, both school types demonstrate fairness through shared expectations and rules.

Responsibility and Learning Through Correction

Responsibility was commonly demonstrated through students' acceptance of corrective actions and learning from mistakes. In intervention schools, students framed responsibility as understanding the purpose behind punishment. For instance, a student from an intervention school explained that participating in VLC sessions has helped her to accept punishment: *"When you're punished, it means you're being corrected from your bad deeds."* Many students gave concrete examples of corrective activities that reinforce responsibility including weeding, watering of flowers, scrubbing, etc.

Similar sentiments were shared by students in control schools: *"When you do something wrong, they punish you, so you don't do it again."* These real-life examples illustrate how responsibility is learned through structured consequences embedded in school routines.

Values Reinforced Through Religious and Moral Platforms

Students from both intervention and control schools highlighted the role of religious activities in reinforcing values. Intervention students frequently mentioned religious platforms as complementary to VLC sessions. This indicates that schools operate within a broader moral ecosystem, where values education is strengthened beyond the classroom.

Synthesis of Real-Life Demonstrations

Students from both intervention and control schools provided concrete examples of how national values are demonstrated in daily school life. However, students in intervention schools were more likely to explicitly connect their behaviours to values language and organised learning platforms, while control school students tended to describe values as implicit expectations enforced through rules and authority. These real-life examples demonstrate that national values are not abstract concepts for students but are enacted through everyday practices such as dressing, punctuality, interaction with teachers, acceptance of correction and fair treatment of peers. The findings further suggest that structured values education strengthens students' ability to recognise, articulate and reflect on these practices as expressions of national values.

3.6. Discipline in Schools

3.6.1 Overview of School Discipline Assessment

This section examines discipline as a system-level outcome within the sampled schools, drawing on student surveys, teacher reports and qualitative accounts from school leaders and students. Discipline is analysed both as a core national value and as an organising principle that shapes school climate, behaviour management and the conditions under which other values are reinforced.

Findings from earlier sections indicate that discipline is one of the most widely recognised and practised values across schools, with particularly strong gains observed in intervention schools. At the same time, qualitative evidence suggests that schools continue to face challenges related to student conduct, rule compliance and behavioural consistency. These dynamics make discipline a critical lens through which to assess whether values education translates into sustained improvements in school order and student behaviour.

Recent concerns[3] raised by school leaders and education stakeholders regarding disciplinary infractions in SHSs further highlight the importance of examining discipline in greater depth.

---

1. [3] **Noyam Journal Article**
   Asamoah, D., & Osei, A. (2023). *Students' Perceptions of School Discipline and Management Strategies in Four Senior High Schools in Kumasi, Ghana*. Noyam Journals. Retrieved from https://noyam.org/?download_id=14088&sdm_process_download=1
2. **University of Education, Winneba Policy Brief**
   University of Education, Winneba. (2024). *Corporal Punishment Ban and the Rise of Indiscipline: A Call for Alternative Behaviour Management Frameworks in SHSs*. UEW Policy Brief Series, No. 1. Retrieved from https://uew.edu.gh/sites/default/files/2025-01/research_brief_1-1.pdf
3. **CARI Journals Article**
   Osei, E., & Mensah, P. (2019). *Discipline and Academic Performance of Students in Ghanaian Secondary Schools: A Correlational Study*. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(24), 45–54. Retrieved from https://carijournals.org/journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/1541
4. **Graphic Online**
   Graphic.com.gh. (2024, May 9). *Staff shortage blamed for rising indiscipline at Accra Academy*. Retrieved from https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/education/staff-shortage-blamed-for-rising-indiscipline-at-accra-academy.html
5. **GhanaWeb (via GNECC)**
   GhanaWeb. (2024, April 15). *GNECC raises alarm over growing indiscipline in Ghana's schools*. Retrieved from https://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/GNECC-raises-alarm-over-growing-indiscipline-in-Ghana-s-schools-1979561
6. **Modern Ghana – Government Policy**
   ModernGhana. (2024, April 22). *Gov't has permitted school heads to search students for contraband — Deputy Education Minister*. Retrieved from https://www.modernghana.com/news/1402816/govt-has-permitted-school-heads-to-search-student.html
7. **Modern Ghana – Moral Decline Commentary**
   ModernGhana. (2024, May 10). *Growing SHS indiscipline stems from moral decay — John Mahama laments*. Retrieved from https://www.modernghana.com/news/1403301/growing-shs-indiscipline-stems-from-moral-decay.html

This section therefore explores the prevalence and types of disciplinary issues reported in schools, students' and teachers' perceptions of disciplinary systems and the extent to which observed patterns align with earlier evidence on values knowledge, attitudes and behaviour.

3.6.1 Disciplinary Approaches and Systems

This section examines how schools respond to student misconduct by analysing changes in disciplinary measures reported by school leaders between baseline and endline. The focus is on whether the introduction of the handbook and VLC sessions was associated with shifts in how discipline is enforced, particularly the balance between punitive and corrective approaches.

Table 3.23 shows significant differences in disciplinary practices between intervention and control schools over time.

Table 3.23: Prevalence of Disciplinary Measures by School Leaders

	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Disciplinary Measure	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Verbal warning	87.1	81.8	-5.3	82.7	80.6	-2.1	1.2
Written warning	45.7	36.4	-9.3	60	58.4	-1.6	-22
Reflection exercises	65.7	49.4	-16.3	68.6	67.9	-0.7	-18.5
Detention/extra duties	91.4	33.2	-58.2	94.3	93.5	-0.8	-60.3
Parental notification	22.9	75.8	52.9	48.6	45.7	-2.9	30.1
Temporary privileges removal	80	75.8	-4.2	91.4	87	-4.4	-11.2
Counseling referral	5.7	60.4	54.7	14.3	16.4	2.1	44
Class exclusion	5.7	12.1	6.4	17.1	15.2	-1.9	-3.1

N = 70 schools (35 intervention, 35 control)

Shifts in disciplinary approaches in intervention schools.

In intervention schools, there was a substantial reorientation in the types of disciplinary measures used. Traditional punitive responses such as detention or extra duties declined

sharply, falling from 91.4 percent at baseline to 33.2 percent at endline. Similar declines were observed for reflection exercises and written warnings. These changes suggest a reduced reliance on routine sanctions as the primary response to misconduct.

At the same time, intervention schools recorded large increases in more supportive and corrective approaches. Parental notification increased significantly from 22.9 percent to 75.8 percent, while referrals to counselling services increased from 5.7 percent to 60.4 percent. These shifts indicate a stronger emphasis on shared responsibility between schools and families and greater use of guidance-oriented responses to address behavioural issues.

The increase in class exclusion, though modest in absolute terms, may reflect more targeted use of exclusion for serious cases rather than routine punishment. Overall, this points to a transition away from punishment-centred discipline toward approaches that emphasise reflection, support and behavioural change.

Patterns in control schools

In control schools, disciplinary practices remained stable between baseline and endline. Most measures showed only minor changes, with continued heavy reliance on detention, verbal warnings and temporary removal of privileges. Counselling referrals increased slightly but remained low compared to intervention schools. Parental notification declined marginally, suggesting limited movement toward shared disciplinary responsibility.

The persistence of traditional disciplinary approaches in control schools aligns with earlier findings that behavioural improvements in these schools were smaller and less consistent.

Comparative interpretation

Comparing the two groups highlights a clear divergence in disciplinary systems over the study period. Intervention schools demonstrated a pronounced shift toward counselling, parental engagement and corrective responses, while control schools maintained existing practices. These findings are consistent with earlier qualitative evidence from school leaders and G&C coordinators, who described discipline increasingly being framed as a learning and guidance process rather than solely as punishment.

The results suggest that the handbook and VLC sessions were associated not only with changes in student behaviour but also with changes in how schools conceptualise and manage discipline. The movement toward more supportive disciplinary systems may help explain the reductions in serious infractions observed in intervention schools and has important implications for national rollout and sustainability of values-based behaviour change.

3.6.1.1 Qualitative Insights on Disciplinary Approaches

Discipline as a Values-Based, Corrective Process

Interviews with school leaders and teachers indicate a shared understanding of discipline as a corrective and formative process rather than a purely punitive one. Discipline was widely described as connected to values education, particularly the value of discipline itself as a foundation for shaping behaviour and reinforcing other values such as responsibility, respect and integrity.

School leaders explained that sustained exposure to values discussions reduces the need for punitive sanctions by helping students internalise expected behaviours. As one school head noted, *"If day in and day out students are being introduced to values, then it means they don't need to do things that will warrant punishment."* This view reflects an emphasis on prevention through understanding, rather than reaction through punishment.

Teachers echoed this perspective, describing discipline as a form of guidance that supports moral reasoning and self-regulation. Several teachers explained that values education provides students with a clearer understanding of behavioural expectations and their consequences. One teacher remarked, *"Each of the values has its own demand and when students go by them, it helps them avoid misconduct."*

The qualitative evidence suggests that discipline in schools, particularly in intervention settings, is increasingly understood as part of a broader process of character formation. This aligns with the observed shift in disciplinary systems toward counselling, parental engagement and corrective support, reinforcing the role of values education in shaping both student behaviour and school-level disciplinary practices.

Use of School Rules and Codes of Conduct

School leaders explained that disciplinary actions are guided by established school rules and the GES code of conduct, with deliberate efforts to apply these rules fairly and consistently. Leaders emphasised that sanctions are not arbitrary but are applied in line with agreed procedures. As one Assistant Head of Domestic explained, *"Whether you are a boy or a girl, you get the punishment according to what has been stipulated in the code."* This emphasis on uniform application was seen as important for maintaining credibility and trust in disciplinary processes.

Teachers reinforced this perspective, describing school rules as a means of social preparation rather than mere control. Discipline was framed as helping students understand expectations they will encounter beyond school. As one teacher noted, *"Every society has rules and regulations and for you to fit into that society, you have to go by them."*

These accounts suggest that school rules and codes of conduct function not only as mechanisms for managing behaviour but also as tools for socialisation. Discipline, as practised in schools, is therefore viewed as part of preparing students for responsible participation in society, aligning behavioural expectations in school with broader civic norms.

Behavioural Change and Reduced Severity of Disciplinary Cases

School leaders and teachers in the pilot schools described the pre-intervention period as one characterised by frequent disciplinary infractions and a reactive approach to discipline. Discipline was still guided by school rules and the GES code of conduct, but leaders noted that cases were more frequent and often escalated quickly. One school leader recalled: *"Before, we were having high disciplinary cases. It even got to a point where we were meeting daily because students were just misbehaving."*

At endline however, most school leaders reported a decline in the frequency and seriousness of disciplinary cases since the introduction of structured values education. One Assistant Head noted, *"Before, we were meeting every day on disciplinary issues. Now the cases have reduced and even when they come, they are not as serious."* Teachers corroborated this perception, observing fewer instances of serious misconduct: *"Most of the cases we see now are minor ones, not like before."*

Corrective Measures and Student Accountability

Both teachers and school leaders described the continued use of corrective tasks (rather than harsh punishment) to reinforce accountability. These measures were seen as helping students reflect on their actions. School leaders emphasised that repeated exposure to values discussions reduces the need for punitive discipline. A school head summarised this: *"If you have been taught a value every week, you understand why you should not misbehave."* Teachers highlighted the importance of aligning discipline with instruction: *"You cannot separate behaviour from teaching; discipline is part of the learning process."*

Role Modelling and Responsible Adult Behaviour

A recurring theme was the importance of teachers and school leaders as role models. School leaders acknowledged that inconsistent adult behaviour could undermine disciplinary efforts. One school leader stated: *"Students look up to teachers. If the teacher does something wrong, that is what the students will also pick."* Similarly, most teachers recognised this responsibility themselves. As noted by a teacher during in-depth interview, *"If we expect students to be disciplined, we also have to show discipline in what we do."*

Challenges in Implementing Discipline

Despite positive trends, both school leaders and teachers identified ongoing challenges that undermine discipline. Some school leaders pointed to external influences, particularly home and community behaviours that conflict with school expectations: *"Sometimes what we teach here is different from what the students see at home."* Teachers also noted peer pressure and adolescent behaviour as persistent challenges: *"They are teenagers and they easily copy what their friends are doing."* Additionally, some school leaders expressed concern about inconsistent teacher engagement in disciplinary processes, which can weaken enforcement.

Synthesis and Implications

Teachers and school leaders share an aligned view of discipline as a values-driven, corrective process aimed at long-term behaviour change rather than punishment. The integration of national values education and VLC sessions appears to have strengthened students' understanding of acceptable behaviour and reduced the severity of disciplinary cases.

However, sustaining these gains requires:

- Consistent role modelling by all staff
- Stronger alignment between school discipline and home/community norms
- Continued reinforcement of values through daily school routines

3.6.2 Student attitudes toward school discipline and authority

Table 3.24 presents changes in students' attitudes toward school discipline and authority between baseline and endline in intervention and control schools. The capture students' perceptions of the role of discipline in school success, their understanding of school rules, their willingness to comply with rules in the absence of supervision and their confidence in the fairness and legitimacy of disciplinary processes.

Across both intervention and control schools, students continued to express very high levels of agreement that discipline is important for school success. At baseline, over 95 percent of students in both groups already endorsed this view, leaving limited room for further measurable change. Endline results show that these high levels were sustained, indicating strong and stable normative support for discipline across schools.

More pronounced changes were observed in attitudes related to rule compliance, fairness and student agency in intervention schools. The proportion of students who reported following school rules even when teachers are not present increased significantly in intervention schools, rising by 5.7 percentage points, while remaining unchanged in control schools. This suggests a shift toward internalised self-regulation rather than behaviour driven solely by supervision.

Similarly, perceptions of fairness in disciplinary consequences improved more strongly in intervention schools, with a statistically significant increase of six percentage points (table 3.24). Students in intervention schools also reported greater comfort in reporting disruptive behaviour and a clearer understanding of school rules and expectations. These changes point to increased trust in school disciplinary systems and greater confidence in engaging with them constructively.

Table 3.24: Student Attitudes Toward School Discipline and Authority

Statement	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Discipline is important for school success.	96.2	97.1	0.9	95.7	96	0.3	1.1
School rules help students succeed.	84.8	86.7	1.9	75.1	77.9	2.8	8.8
I understand the school rules and expectations.	83.7	87.3	3.6	76.3	78.5	2.2	8.8
I usually follow school rules even when teachers are not watching.	78.4	84.1*	5.7	71.1	71.3	0.2	12.8
The consequences for breaking rules are fair.	63	69*	6	64.1	67.5	3.4	1.5
I feel comfortable reporting disruptive behaviour.	62.6	69.7*	7.1	56.9	59	2.1	10.7
It is acceptable to challenge authority when I am right.	56.3	61.1*	4.8	58.1	63.5	5.4	-2.4
I respect my teacher's instructions and authority.	87.2	89	1.8	81.5	83.3	1.8	5.7
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	*1053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Attitudes toward authority also evolved. In intervention schools, agreement with the statement that it is acceptable to challenge authority when one feels right increased significantly. This suggests that students increasingly viewed authority as open to dialogue rather than unquestionable, aligning with earlier findings on leadership, confidence and responsible citizenship. In control schools, changes on this item were smaller and moved in the opposite direction, indicating more constrained perceptions of agency.

The findings in Table 3.24 indicate that while discipline remains widely valued across all schools, students in intervention schools demonstrated stronger movement toward internalised rule-following, perceived fairness and constructive engagement with authority. This is consistent with earlier evidence from values understanding, attitudes and VLC participation and suggests that structured values education may support a more reflective and participatory approach to discipline rather than compliance alone.

Teacher perspectives on discipline and authority

Table 3.25 presents teachers' views on students' understanding of school rules, compliance in the absence of supervision and the perceived fairness and openness of disciplinary systems. These indicators provide an important institutional perspective that complements students' self-reported attitudes and behaviours.

At baseline, teachers in both intervention and control schools expressed moderate confidence in students' understanding of school rules and expectations, with higher baseline ratings in control schools. By endline, teachers in intervention schools reported statistically significant improvements across all four indicators. The proportion of teachers who agreed that most students understand school rules increased by 5.9 percentage points, while agreement that students follow rules even when unsupervised rose by ten percentage points. These changes suggest a strengthening of internalised discipline among students in intervention schools, as observed by teachers.

Table 3.25: Teacher Perspectives on Discipline and Authority

	% in Agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree)						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Statement	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Most students understand school rules and expectations.	73.1	79*	5.9	79.4	79.6	0.2	-0.6

Most students follow rules even when unsupervised.	49.6	59.5*	9.9	48.7	47.4	-1.3	1.2
Consequences are consistently applied.	64.9	71.2*	6.3	64.6	66.9	2.3	-4
Students feel comfortable reporting disruptive behaviour.	55	64.5*	9.5	57.6	52.8	-4.8	4.3
N	680	878		694	896		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Teachers in intervention schools also reported greater consistency in the application of disciplinary consequences and increased student comfort in reporting disruptive behaviour (table 3.25). The latter increased by 9.5 percentage points, indicating a shift toward more open and trust-based disciplinary environments where students feel safer engaging with authority structures. These findings align with earlier student-level results showing improved perceptions of fairness and willingness to report misconduct.

Teachers in control schools reported minor change or, in some cases, slight declines across the same indicators (Table 3.25). Perceptions that students follow rules when unsupervised declined marginally and agreement that students feel comfortable reporting disruptive behaviour also fell. These findings suggest relative stability or a weakening of disciplinary norms in the absence of structured values engagement.

The teacher-reported findings reinforce evidence from student surveys and qualitative accounts. Teachers in intervention schools observed clearer understanding of rules, stronger self-regulation and more transparent disciplinary processes over time. This convergence across data sources strengthens the interpretation that the values handbook and VLC sessions contributed to observable shifts in how discipline and authority are understood and experienced within schools.

Student responses to disciplinary scenarios

Table 3.26 presents students' responses to a set of hypothetical disciplinary scenarios designed to assess how learners judge appropriate action when faced with unfair rules, disrespect toward teachers, cheating and property damage. Unlike general attitude items,

these scenarios require students to apply judgement to concrete situations, offering insight into how discipline, fairness and responsibility are interpreted in practice.

Across the scenarios (table 3.26), students in intervention schools showed movement toward more reflective and accountable responses between baseline and endline. In the unfair rule scenario, the proportion of students indicating that they would accept rules without question declined significantly in intervention schools, alongside small increases in responses that involved discussing concerns with a teacher or prefect. This suggests greater willingness to engage constructively with authority rather than passive compliance.

Table 3.26: Student Responses to Disciplinary Scenarios

		Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
	Response	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Unfair Rule Scenario	Discuss concerns with teacher/prefect	58.2	60.7	2.5	57.5	58.5	1	1.5
	Organize petition for changes	20.2	21.4	1.2	20.5	20.5	0	1.2
	Accept rules without question	17.7	14.3	-3.4	16.5	15.5	-1	-2.4
	Ignore rules	2.4	2.6	0.2	3.5	3.5	0	0.2
Teacher Disrespect Scenario	Apologize and learn from mistake	60.1	64.7	4.6	62.1	62	-0.1	4.7
	Accept punishment as example	36.8	33.2	-3.6	35.2	34	-1.2	-2.4
	Nothing should happen	2.2	1.6	-0.6	2.3	3.5	1.2	-1.8
Cheating Scenario	Second chance without consequences	26.5	22.3	-4.2	25.2	29.4	4.2	-8.4
	Warning	56.9	57.3	0.4	57.9	54.2	-3.7	4.1

		Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
	Response	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
	Consequences (lower grade, detention)	34.3	37.6	3.3	37.1	36.6	-0.5	3.8
Property Damage Scenario	Repair or replace	61.5	57.2	-4.3	62.4	62.8	0.4	-4.7
	Apologize and promise not to repeat	40.9	40.7	-0.2	40.7	39.3	-1.4	1.2
	Face suspension or other action	22.3	26	3.7	23.6	23.9	0.3	3.4
	Nothing should happen	0.86	1.6	0.74	0.68	3.2	2.52	-1.78
	N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	*1053*		

In the teacher disrespect scenario (table 3.26), intervention schools recorded a statistically significant increase in students selecting "apologize and learn from mistake." This shift indicates stronger recognition of accountability and corrective learning, rather than viewing discipline only as punishment. Control schools showed no meaningful change on this item.

Responses to the cheating scenario point to a clearer differentiation between leniency and accountability among intervention students (table 3.26). The proportion favouring a second chance without consequences declined, while support for consequences such as lower grades or detention increased modestly. In control schools, the opposite trend was observed, with increased preference for a second chance without consequences, suggesting weaker reinforcement of accountability norms over time.

In the property damage scenario (table 3.26), intervention students showed a slight decline in selecting repair or replacement as the primary response, alongside an increase in support for formal consequences such as suspension or other action. Although this change should be interpreted cautiously, it may reflect greater recognition that serious misconduct warrants proportionate response beyond apology alone. Control schools showed slight change across most response options, except for an increase in the proportion indicating that nothing should happen.

The scenario-based findings suggest that students in intervention schools increasingly favour responses that combine responsibility, learning and fair consequences. These are consistent with earlier results on attitudes toward discipline and authority and align with the emphasis in VLC sessions on understanding the purpose of rules and consequences. Control schools

showed more limited or inconsistent movement across scenarios, reinforcing the added contribution of structured values engagement in shaping students' disciplinary judgement.

3.7. Barriers and Enablers for Values Practice

This section synthesises evidence from the student survey, teacher survey, school leader interviews, G&C coordinator interviews and VLC session observations to examine the conditions that shape how national values are practised in schools. Rather than introducing new outcome measures, the section focuses on factors that either support or constrain the translation of values knowledge and attitudes into consistent behaviour. Drawing on both intervention and control school experiences, it identifies practical, institutional and contextual enablers that strengthen values practice, alongside barriers that limit depth, consistency or sustainability. These insights help explain variations observed across schools and provide an evidence base for refining implementation and informing decisions on national rollout.

3.7.1 Students Identified Barriers to Values Practice

To better understand why gains in knowledge, attitudes and behaviour were stronger in some areas than others, students were asked to identify factors that make it easier or more difficult to practise national values in their daily school lives. Table 3.27 summarises student-reported barriers at baseline and endline, disaggregated by intervention and control schools. These responses provide insight into the personal, peer-related and institutional conditions that shape values practice and help explain variations observed in earlier sections.

The results (table 3.27) show that barriers to values practice are multi-layered. Personal and peer-related factors were more frequently cited than a lack of awareness of the values themselves, suggesting that challenges lie less in knowing what the values are and more in navigating social pressures and school environments. In intervention schools, peer pressure emerged as the most prominent personal barrier at endline, with a statistically significant increase compared to baseline. This is consistent with qualitative accounts indicating that while many students internalised values, sustaining value-consistent behaviour can be challenging in peer contexts where contrary norms persist.

Table 3.27: Student-Identified Barriers to Values Practice

	% of Students Identifying Barrier						
	Intervention			**Control**			**Difference (Intervention – Control)**
Barrier	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Personal barriers							
Peer pressure	51.4	58.9*	7.5	53.2	50.4	-2.8	10.3
Inadequate school rules or enforcement	28.4	28.1	-0.3	25	30	5	-5.3

	% of Students Identifying Barrier						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Barrier	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Personal difficulties (e.g., low confidence, lack of interest)	38.8	35.8	-3	37.2	36.8	-0.4	-2.6
Not taught values in school	7.4	6*	-1.4	7.9	10	2.1	-3.5
Not aware of these national values	5	6.7	1.7	4.1	5.2	1.1	0.6
Institutional barriers							
Time constraints due to academic workload	56.6	56.9	0.3	55.3	54.9	-0.4	0.7
Lack of interest in available activities promoting values	31.2	28.5	-2.7	34.5	31.9	-2.6	-0.1
Inadequate guidance or facilitation	28.7	26.9	-1.8	29.7	27.7	-2	0.2
Negative peer attitudes toward value-based activities	24.3	28.1*	3.8	28.2	22.5*	-5.7	9.5
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	*1053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

Institutional barriers showed smaller changes over time (Table 3.27). Time constraints linked to academic workload remained the most cited institutional barrier across both groups, with little movement between baseline and endline. Reports of inadequate guidance or facilitation

declined slightly in both intervention and control schools, while negative peer attitudes toward value-based activities increased in intervention schools but declined significantly in control schools. This suggests that as values activities became more visible in intervention schools, resistance or scepticism among some peers may also have become more apparent.

Importantly, small proportions of students in intervention schools reported not being taught values in school or not being aware of the national values and these proportions declined or remained low at endline (table 3.27). This finding aligns with earlier evidence of improved awareness, recognition and understanding of values in intervention schools and indicates that the main constraints to practice lie beyond basic exposure.

Teacher-Identified Barriers to Values Education

In addition to students' perspectives, teachers were asked to identify factors that constrain effective values education in their schools. Table 3.28 summarises teacher-reported barriers at baseline and endline, disaggregated by intervention and control schools. These findings provide a school-level perspective on implementation challenges and help to contextualise results observed in students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviour.

Across both intervention and control schools, teachers most frequently identified peer pressure among students, limited resources and time constraints within the school schedule as key barriers. These concerns mirror students' responses and reinforce the significant role of peer dynamics and structural conditions in shaping values practice.

In intervention schools, several barriers showed significant shifts over time. Reports of peer pressure and lack of parental support declined by endline, suggesting that sustained exposure to the handbook and VLC sessions may have reduced some external and social constraints on values practice. At the same time, teachers increasingly identified personal student challenges and lack of student interest as barriers. This suggests that as values education became more established, teachers became more attentive to individual-level differences in motivation, confidence and readiness to engage with values content.

Teachers in intervention schools also reported increased concern about insufficient teacher training and limited reinforcement from school leadership. These findings point to emerging implementation demands as values education moves beyond initial rollout and becomes embedded in routine school practice. As expectations increase, gaps in staff preparation and leadership coordination may become more visible.

In control schools, changes in reported barriers were smaller and less systematic. While some barriers declined modestly, others remained stable or increased slightly, indicating limited structural change in the absence of the intervention.

Table 3.28: Teacher-Identified Barriers to Values Education

	% of Teachers Identifying Barrier						
	Intervention			Control			
Barrier	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Difference (Intervention – Control)
Peer pressure among students	72.3	40	-32.3	74	75	1	-33.3
Inadequate resources for implementation	66.9	60.4	-6.5	63	67.6	4.6	-11.1
Lack of parental support	60.2	40	-20.2	50	37.5	-12.5	-7.7
Limited time during the school schedule	56.2	53.6	-2.6	49	48.3	-0.7	-1.9
Personal student challenges (e.g., low confidence, lack of motivation)	62.7	75.0*	12.3	44	62.5	18.5	-61.2
Lack of student interest	48.1	59.3*	11.2	44.1	38	-6.1	-2.7
Limited reinforcement from school leaders	37.4	48*	10.6	50	37.5	-12.5	10.5
Insufficient teacher training	41.5	58	16.5	35.9	38.3	2.4	-5.9
N	680	878		694	896		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

The teacher-reported findings (table 3.28) reinforce three key messages. First, values education is shaped not only by student attitudes but also by resourcing, time and staff capacity. Second, reductions in social barriers such as peer pressure may coexist with growing recognition of individual student needs. Third, sustained implementation requires stronger

alignment among teachers, school leaders and parents. These insights complement student-reported barriers and help explain why some values showed stronger gains than others, particularly those requiring consistent modelling, reinforcement and individual support.

3.7.1.1 Qualitative Insights on Key Barriers in Value Education

This section synthesises perspectives from school leaders, teachers and students on the main challenges constraining effective values education within schools. While respondents broadly recognised the importance of national values, they highlighted structural, institutional, behavioural and contextual barriers that limit consistent understanding, internalisation and practice of values among students.

Competing Time Demands and Timetable Constraints

A major barrier identified by both school leaders and teachers relates to time allocation and scheduling pressures, particularly where VLC sessions compete with other school activities. Some school leaders noted that VLC sessions are sometimes disrupted by overlapping academic commitments: *"Some of the teachers eat into the time of the VLC… sometimes 11.45 or 11.50, so we don't get the full time."* Teachers similarly acknowledged that heavy academic workloads make it difficult to prioritise values education consistently alongside subject teaching.

Limited Teacher Involvement and Inconsistent Role Modelling

Another key barrier highlighted by school leaders is limited and uneven teacher engagement in values education beyond designated teams (e.g. G&C coordinators or VLC facilitators). As one school leader explained: *"Apart from the team, we don't really get support from the teachers… teachers should have been assigned weekly to help."* Some leaders also expressed concern that inconsistent teacher behaviour undermines values messaging: *"Teachers are supposed to be role models, but some are not living up to that expectation."* Teachers themselves acknowledged the importance of modelling values but noted that not all staff demonstrate the same level of commitment or awareness.

Resource Constraints and Inadequate Materials

School leaders identified insufficient teaching and learning materials as a practical barrier to effective values education, particularly for activity-based sessions. One leader noted: *"Materials are available, but they are not enough because the number of students is very large."*

Student Behaviour, Peer Influence and Engagement Challenges

Both school leaders and teachers highlighted student-related behavioural factors as persistent barriers. Adolescents were described as easily influenced by peers, which sometimes undermines values promoted in school. A school leader explained: *"They are teenagers… they*

easily look at their friends and imitate whatever they are doing." Teachers echoed this concern, noting that peer pressure often competes with values education, particularly among boys. Student FGDs further suggest that while students understand values, practising them consistently remains challenging, especially when peers model contrary behaviours.

Home and Community Influences that Contradict School Values

One of the most strongly articulated barriers was the disconnect between school-based values education and home or community environments. School leaders frequently expressed frustration that values taught in school are not reinforced at home. As one leader stated: *"Parents have neglected their role… they give them food, shelter and clothes and that is all."* Another school leader described direct community interference: *"Some parents come with knives because their child says the teacher did something."* Teachers also noted that when students observe conflicting behaviour at home or in the community, it weakens the impact of school-based values education.

Fear, Power Dynamics and Underreporting of Misconduct

School leaders highlighted fear of victimisation as a barrier preventing students from reporting bullying, harassment, or value-violating behaviour. One leader explained: *"They are afraid that when the seniors realise, they have reported, they will punish them."* Although mechanisms exist to encourage reporting, fear of peer retaliation continues to limit openness, particularly among junior students.

Students' Limited Conceptual Depth in Control Schools

Student FGDs from control schools revealed an additional barrier, which is, limited conceptual clarity around values when structured learning platforms are absent. Some students struggled to define values clearly or relied on vague explanations. For example, according to a student in a control school, *"Values are the things we cherish."* This contrasts with intervention schools, where students more readily linked values to specific behaviours and learning activities, suggesting that lack of structured engagement is itself a barrier.

3.7.2 Student-Identified Enablers for Values Practice

To complement the analysis of barriers, students were asked to identify factors that support or strengthen their ability to practise national values within the school environment. Table 3.29 presents student-reported enablers at baseline and endline, disaggregated by intervention and control schools. These findings help to explain the conditions under which values education is more likely to translate into everyday behaviour.

Across both groups, counselling services emerged as one of the most frequently cited existing enablers at both baseline and endline (table 3.29).

Table 3.29: Student-Identified Enablers for Values Practice

	% of Students Identifying Enabler						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
	Baseline	Endline		Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Resource enablers							
Counseling services	64.5	61	-3.5	63.9	60.7	-3.2	-0.3
Peer mentoring programmes	21.2	32.1*	10.9	20.2	23.7	3.5	7.4
Rewards for positive behaviour	42.4	46.6	0.2	40.2	43	2.8	3.6
Proposed enablers							
Regular workshops or assemblies	50.8	44.1	-6.7	48.8	49.5	0.7	-5.4
Peer-led clubs or initiatives	27.7	38.3*	10.6	29.9	27.2	-2.7	13.3
Competitions with rewards for demonstrating values	41.4	47	5.6	43.3	42.1	-1.2	6.8
Role modelling by teachers and school leaders	38	34.1	-3.9	38.7	33.6	-5.1	1.2
Weekly peer sessions	14.6	19.1*	4.5	14	11.8	-2.2	6.7
N	*1,052*	*1,046*		*1,032*	*1053*		

*Statistically significant at p≤0.05

As shown in Table 3.29, guidance and counselling structures play a significant role in reinforcing values-related behaviour, particularly discipline, responsibility and interpersonal conduct. Their continued importance over time suggests that counselling remains a foundational support for values practice across schools.

Clear differences emerged, however, in peer-related enablers. In intervention schools, there were significant increases in the proportion of students identifying peer mentoring programmes, peer-led clubs and weekly peer sessions as effective enablers. These shifts align closely with the VLC model, which emphasises peer-led discussion, shared reflection and collective responsibility. The findings suggest that sustained exposure to structured peer platforms increased students' recognition of peer-based approaches as meaningful mechanisms for practising values.

Students in intervention schools also reported increased support for competitions and reward-based activities that recognise positive behaviour (table 3.29). This indicates that incentives and visible acknowledgement may reinforce motivation to practise values, particularly when aligned with structured programmes such as VLC sessions.

Changes in control schools were smaller and, in some cases, moved in the opposite direction (table 3.29). Peer-led initiatives and weekly peer sessions were less frequently identified as enablers at endline in control schools, suggesting limited expansion of student-centred platforms for values practice in the absence of the intervention.

Interestingly, fewer students in both groups identified workshops, assemblies and role modelling by teachers and school leaders as key enablers at endline (table 3.29). This may reflect a shift in emphasis from one-off or adult-led activities toward more sustained, peer-driven and participatory approaches, particularly in intervention schools.

The findings in table 3.29 indicate that students increasingly associate effective values practice with peer engagement, regular interaction and structured opportunities for participation. The stronger growth of these enablers in intervention schools reinforces the role of the VLC sessions in creating visible, student-owned pathways for translating values education into everyday behaviour.

Teacher-Identified Enablers for Values Education

Teachers were also asked to identify factors that support effective values education within schools. Table 3.30 summarises teacher-reported enablers at baseline and endline, comparing intervention and control schools. These findings provide insight into the institutional and pedagogical conditions teachers consider most important for reinforcing national values.

Across both intervention and control schools, rewarding positive behaviour was consistently identified as a key enabler (table 3.30). High endorsement at both baseline and endline suggests broad agreement among teachers that recognition and reinforcement play a significant role in encouraging students to practise values. This reflects existing school cultures where incentives, praise and corrective feedback are commonly used to shape behaviour.

Table 3.30: Teacher-Identified Enablers for Values Education

	% of Teachers Identifying Enabler						
	Intervention			Control			Difference (Intervention – Control)
Enablers	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	Baseline	Endline	Change (pp)	
Rewarding positive behaviour	84.3	89.4	1.1	70	87.5	17.5	1.1
Assigning leadership roles to students	75.9	77.2	1.3	69	62.5	-6.5	14.7*
Encouraging peer mentoring	55.4	74.8	-0.6	46	75	29	-0.2
Organizing value-driven classroom activities	39.8	40	0.2	38	37.5	-0.5	0.7
N	680	878		694	896		

Clear differences emerged in relation to student leadership and peer-based approaches. In intervention schools, teachers increasingly identified assigning leadership roles to students as an effective enabler (table 3.30). This aligns with the peer-led structure of VLC sessions, where students take on facilitation and coordination responsibilities. Teachers' responses suggest that exposure to the VLC model strengthened appreciation of leadership roles as practical tools for values development.

Table 3.30 shows that peer mentoring featured prominently among teachers in intervention schools. This is consistent with student responses and highlights the importance of peer influence in reinforcing values. Teachers viewed peer-to-peer support as a valuable complement to formal instruction, particularly in relation to responsibility, confidence and discipline.

In control schools, changes in teacher-identified enablers were more mixed (table 3.30). While some growth was observed in recognition of peer mentoring, fewer teachers identified student leadership roles as an effective strategy at endline. This suggests that, without a structured peer-led programme, leadership opportunities may be less visible or less systematically linked to values education.

Organising value-driven classroom activities was identified less frequently by teachers in both groups and showed minor change over time (table 3.30). This may reflect constraints related to curriculum coverage, time pressure and examination demands, limiting opportunities for explicit values-focused activities within subject lessons.

The findings in table 3.30 indicate that teachers increasingly associate effective values education with peer leadership, mentoring and reinforcement mechanisms that extend beyond traditional classroom instruction. The stronger alignment of these enablers in intervention schools points to the influence of the VLC sessions in shaping how teachers conceptualise practical pathways for embedding national values in school life.

3.7.2.1 Qualitative Insights on Key Enablers to Values Education

This section synthesises perspectives from school leaders, teachers and students on the main factors enabling effective delivery, internalisation and practice of national values within schools. Respondents identified institutional commitment, consistent role modelling, structured learning platforms, counselling support and student engagement as critical enablers.

Strong School Leadership Commitment

School leaders consistently identified leadership commitment as a primary enabler of values education. Leaders described deliberate actions to prioritise values within school routines, signalling institutional ownership. As one leader explained: *"If you want students to change, then leadership must also be serious about it."* Leadership involvement was reflected in supervision of VLC sessions, reinforcement of values during assemblies and reference to values when addressing disciplinary matters. Leaders noted that visible commitment from management increases compliance among teachers and seriousness among students.

Teacher Participation and Role Modelling

Teachers were widely recognised as key enablers through daily interaction and role modelling. Both leaders and teachers emphasised that students learn values as much from observing adult behaviour as from formal instruction. A teacher noted: *"Students learn more from what we do than what we say."* School leaders echoed this view: *"If teachers themselves show discipline, students will also follow."* Where teachers consistently modelled punctuality, respect and fairness, students were more receptive to values education.

Structured Platforms for Values Learning (VLC Sessions)

The availability of structured and regular platforms, particularly the VLC sessions was identified as a major enabler. These sessions created dedicated space for discussion, reflection and reinforcement of values. Students in intervention schools explicitly recognised VLC sessions as a source of learning. Teachers noted that structured sessions help move values education beyond informal reminders to intentional learning.

Guidance and Counselling Support Systems

Both school leaders and students highlighted G&C services as a critical enabling mechanism, particularly for addressing behavioural challenges and supporting vulnerable students.

Students referenced counselling as a key avenue for behavioural change and values reinforcement: *"I have learned a lot through guidance and counselling."* School leaders described collaboration between deans of discipline and G&C coordinators as strengthening corrective approaches and reducing repeat offences.

Positive Disciplinary Practices Linked to Learning

Values education was enabled by disciplinary approaches that were corrective rather than punitive. Teachers and leaders noted that when discipline is framed as learning, students are more willing to reflect and change behaviour. A teacher explained, *"When discipline is linked to teaching, students understand why they are being corrected."* Students reinforced this perspective, *"When you are punished, you learn not to do it again."* This alignment between values education and discipline strengthens internalisation.

Student Participation and Positive Peer Influence

Active student engagement emerged as an important enabler. School leaders observed that when students participate actively through discussions, group work and peer interaction, values are more easily internalised. One dean of discipline noted: *"When they talk among themselves, they understand better."* Peer influence, when positive, was seen as reinforcing expected behaviours, especially among younger students.

Reinforcement Through Religious and Moral Platforms

Students highlighted religious platforms as complementary enablers of values education. Intervention students frequently mentioned mosques and churches as spaces where similar values are reinforced. This broader moral ecosystem was seen as strengthening consistency between school teachings and students' wider lives.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The findings from this study demonstrate that intentional, structured values education can play a meaningful role in strengthening students' understanding and practice of national values at the senior high school level. The evidence suggests that while many values already exist implicitly within school cultures and social norms, deliberate and sustained engagement through the values handbook and VLC sessions supports clearer articulation, deeper understanding and more consistent application of these values by students.

The intervention did not operate in a vacuum. Attitudes toward national values were already positive among students and teachers at baseline, reflecting strong cultural alignment and long-standing moral expectations within Ghanaian society. The contribution of the intervention therefore lies less in changing beliefs and more in shaping how values are understood, discussed and enacted in daily school life. Students in intervention schools were better able to name values, distinguish between closely related concepts and apply values to concrete situations that require judgement, ethical reasoning and agency.

The observed behavioural changes further suggest that values education is most effective when it moves beyond rule enforcement toward reflective practice. VLC sessions created protected spaces where students could interrogate behaviour, consider consequences and learn from peers. This appears to have contributed to shifts in discipline from compliance driven by fear of punishment to self-regulation grounded in shared expectations and responsibility. The consistency between student self-reports, teacher observations and school leader accounts strengthens confidence in this interpretation.

At the same time, the findings point to limits in what values education alone can achieve. Peer pressure, uneven facilitation quality, resource constraints and contradictory influences from home and community environments continue to shape students' behaviour. Values that require sustained learner agency, such as self-directed learning and adaptability, showed more modest gains, indicating that deeper integration across teaching practices and school systems is necessary.

The study provides strong evidence that the values handbook and VLC model add value to existing school practices by making values education visible, structured and learner centred. The results support national rollout, while also highlighting the conditions under which values education is most likely to translate into lasting behavioural change.

4.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed to guide national rollout and programme refinement.

7.1 Institutionalise VLC sessions within the school timetable

The effectiveness of VLC sessions was closely linked to the availability of protected time. National rollout should formally embed VLC sessions within the school timetable, ideally aligned with existing structures such as PLC periods. This will reduce competition with academic activities and ensure consistency across schools.

7.2 Ensure universal access to the values handbook and learning materials

Access to the values handbook emerged as a critical enabler. National implementation should ensure that every student receives a copy of the handbook, alongside supporting materials that enable activity-based and discussion-oriented learning. Without full coverage, implementation quality and equity will be compromised.

7.3 Strengthen peer guide selection, preparation and supervision

Peer-led delivery is a core strength of the VLC session, but its effectiveness depends on facilitator quality. Clear national guidance should be provided on peer guide selection, including vetting by teachers and G&C coordinators. Regular preparatory meetings, observation and feedback should be standard practice to support consistent facilitation.

7.4 Clarify and support the role of Guidance and Counselling coordinators

G&C coordinators play a central coordination and supervision role. National rollout should formally recognise this responsibility, provide refresher training and clarify expectations for monitoring, reporting and mentoring peer guides. Additional support may be required in schools with limited staffing capacity.

7.5 Strengthen whole-school alignment around values practice

Although teachers reported high levels of values integration, findings suggest uneven reinforcement across classrooms and school routines. School leadership should be supported to embed values consistently across assemblies, discipline processes, classroom interactions and student leadership structures, reinforcing coherence between VLC sessions and daily school life.

7.6 Introduce structured incentives and recognition mechanisms

Both students and teachers identified motivation as an important enabler. Non-monetary incentives such as certificates, recognition during assemblies and leadership opportunities for peer guides should be considered to sustain engagement and reinforce positive behaviour.

7.7 Engage parents and communities to reinforce values

Contradictions between school-based values education and home environments were identified as a constraint. National rollout should include light-touch strategies for parental and community engagement, such as orientation sessions or communication materials, to align messaging and reinforce values beyond the school.

7.8 Maintain monitoring and learning during scale-up

Variation in implementation quality underscores the need for ongoing monitoring. Simple tools for tracking attendance, session quality and emerging challenges should be maintained and used for learning rather than compliance alone. This will support adaptive improvement during national rollout.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey Instruments

The instruments used for the data collection can be found here - https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1M_gIbcej5YJs1ugExVm2inqTZpVNCjT_?usp=drive_link