ABSTRACT The degradation of morals among Indonesian young generation and the urgency of teaching both good competencies and strong characters to succeed in the 21st-century globally competitive society for them require all teachers including English teachers to incorporate character values into their classroom instructions as mandated in the 2013 curriculum. Given the fundamental roles teachers could serve in the success of promoting good character both outside and inside the classroom, it is critical to understand how they view such a program before they could bring it into the classroom. This qualitative case study scrutinizes how Indonesian English teachers perceive character education incorporation. Employing an interview, classroom observation, and lesson plan analysis, to two purposefully-selected English teachers from two different piloting schools, findings reveal that while they agree on the pivotal role they could serve toward students’ character development, they also emphasize the enhancement of some other factors, such as inspiring teachers, family, good leadership, the cohesiveness of school community members, media, and government supports for the success of character education reinforcement program in Indonesia.
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A. INTRODUCTION

Character education is considered as old as education itself in which through history people believe that education basically has two fundamental objectives: to assist people in becoming intelligent and to help them be good. Along with the history of character education, many experts have tried to formulate the notion and how it is effectively carried out as instilling values to children is believed to be a foundation in every society around the world (Berson & Oreg, 2016)

In the context of Indonesia, the degradation of morals and the urgency of instilling good competencies and strong characters to the young generation to support the emergence of a 21st-century globally competitive society have attracted government attention to reinforce the national curriculums for the past decades which could accommodate character education. The 1968 curriculum, for instance, was issued to emphasize the national ideology of Pancasila as the internalization of Pancasila’s five principles: belief in God; just and civilized humanitarianism; national unity; consensual democracy; and social justice for all Indonesians (Qoyyimah, 2015), continued with 1975 curriculum demanding children aged of six above to learn those five
principles and apply them in their lives. The reforms of the curriculum were more frequently carried out after 2004 with the 2004 competence curriculum; the 2006 school-based curriculum; the 2010 trialed character education curriculum, and the 2013 curriculum.

However, the problem of the character education reinforcement from those curriculums remains the same, which is not optimally carried out. Regardless of its political, bureaucracy, and probably economic agendas which might underlie the change of the education system (Qoyyimah, 2015), one of which is curriculum change, every policy made i.e. character education policy should be followed by a good follow-up by the government as the one designing it and is optimally spread out to the grassroots which are in this case, schools with teachers as the spearhead. Moreover, it could not also be argued that sometimes what the government expects through every policy they make is not in accordance with what teachers want. A good policy particularly related to teachers should at least involve teachers as the ones who would realize it in the process of teaching. As mentioned by Berson & Oreg (2016), teachers play a significant role in the process of value transmission.

In addition, it should also be admitted that for many years, the way to teach character at school is limited only on the surface but nothing is concrete enough. It is not difficult to find a school equipped with some posters with some moral messages written on it, hanging on the wall and in certain places at school. Since students learn more effectively through observing others and how they are treated by others around them (Berkowitz, 2014), those posters and proverbs are certainly not effective.

With respect to the 2013 curriculum, character-building becomes its main priority to be taught to address two essential issues: the degradation of moral and the urgency of teaching some competencies with soft skills such as the ability to be creative, innovative, critical, communicative, collaborative, and problem-solver and is based on strong characters to the youth to support the emergence of a 21st-century globally competitive society. As believed by Ansori (2019) that mastering such important skills, might help the young generation to survive in today’s challenging era.

The priority of building character then requires character education to be integrated into all parts of school activities. Following this curriculum, the government launched a program called *Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter* or PPK (Character Education Reinforcement) for primary and secondary school appointing 542 piloting schools: 250 elementary schools and 292 junior high schools from all provinces in Indonesia (Kemendikbud, 2017) which is expected to address the aforementioned issues. The program focuses on five core values such as religiosity,
nationalism, independence, teamwork, and integrity to be incorporated in three bases namely a class-based integration, school’s culture-based integration, and society-based integration.

In relation to the class-based integration, which is mainly conducted by teachers, the integration is expected to strengthen and infuse students’ knowledge of character values, instill their self-awareness of the importance of the values, and practice the values in their daily life (Kemendikbud, 2017). The process is carried out by incorporating character values in the teaching process in the classroom through three ways: curriculum integration, classroom management integration, and teaching methodology integration. However, the demand to integrate character education in the classroom is not followed by a clear direction on how to do it. Accordingly, many teachers including English teachers find it difficult to apply it in practice (Sanderse, 2012). Another dilemma teachers are facing is whether they should adjust their teaching materials and activities with those values, meaning that they have to find teaching materials and design activities which accommodate those values, or they could only adjust those values in their teaching materials and activities which means that the teachers only take certain values they think to fit into their teaching process.

Regarding English teachers, as the ones who are responsible for bringing foreign language into the classrooms, they certainly need to be encouraged to have an awareness that teaching English is not merely teaching about how to use English both spoken and written form with correct grammatical forms, but it should also emphasize on how to use it correctly and appropriately given other aspects such as target language’s culture, situation, and context. In other words, it is a must but challenging to introduce good values and habits from target language cultures from which the students could learn. On the other hand, however, English teachers should also be able to teach the students to respect and love their own culture. In other words, Indonesian English teachers are demanded to have the ability to help learners facilitate the cultural differences between national values originated from Pancasila as Indonesia ideology and the values from English in which the students are learning (Qoyyimah, 2016).

Given the fundamental role teachers could serve in the success of the character education reinforcement program, it is certainly critical to actively involve them in the program, not only because they are the ones who are responsible for applying it in their teaching process, but also because they are the ones who might be blamed if the program fails to achieve the objectives. Exploring how teachers perceive character education programs might be one of the first steps for such involvement. In ESL or EFL setting, although the issue of bringing character values into language classrooms has already been mentioned by some scholars for decades such as Brown (1997), Shaaban (2005), Abu Rass (2014) in Israel, Adeyemi, Moumakwa, and Adeyemi
(2009) in Botswana, Feng (2017) in Hong Kong, Tsui (2008) in Taiwan, Wang (2008) in China, and Zakaria and Liang (2013) in Malaysia context, research on the character education integration with teaching and learning process in EFL classroom particularly in the 2013 curriculum is limited despite government’s priority particularly in relation to teachers’ perceptions. Some of the research related to character education integration with teaching and learning process in EFL classroom were conducted by Anugrahwati and Agustien (2015), Islami (2016), and Qoyyimah (2016). Some other studies such as Izfadllillah (2014) focusing only on the teacher’s teaching plan while Mambu (2015) is concerned only with the character education assessment in the university context. Meanwhile, Hapsari (2013) emphasized character values internalization in English textbooks, and Welsh (2014) focused on the need to inculcate respect for difference in the teaching process. Among those researches, probably, only Qoyyimah (2016) was concerned with how English teachers perceived character education integration into teaching instructions. This research, then, is conducted as an attempt to scrutinize how Indonesian English teachers perceive character education incorporation into teaching and learning process in the classroom.

B. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Character education

Along with the history of character education, many experts have tried to formulate the notion of character education (Berkowitz, 2002; Lickona, 1991; Lapsley & Narvaes, 2005; Walker, Roberts, & Kristjánsson, 2015). Starting from the concept of character, Berkowitz (2002), for instance, argues that character is a complicated psychological concept which covers the ability to think and decide about what is right or wrong, to expertise moral emotions such as empathy, compassion and guilt, to deal with moral behaviors such as telling the truth and sharing to others, to believe in moral goods, to show a tendency of acting honestly and responsibly, and other characteristics which assist moral to function. Inline with that, Lee (2001) suggests that character is a word that defines a human being for it demonstrates the value of what a person is and a distinct virtue in people. Character, then, is the incorporation of social norms and moral values with the feeling of neutrality in someone's body to create his own personal system to commit and focus on certain ethical behaviors.

Further, Lickona (2001) explains that a person who is considered to have a good character should have three facets of his or her personality: moral knowing, moral feeling or attitudes, and moral behavior or action. He believes that those three good character components are basically the aims of character education. An individual might have the ability to judge what is
right and wrong toward an action. However, if he could not deeply care about them and could not do what was right in his daily life, he could not be considered to have good character. To have a good character, an individual should not only be able to know the right thing to do but also be able to show it through actions. Character education, eventually, is responsible for not only giving students an understanding and ability to judge what is right or wrong but also giving them awareness to take a moral action toward what they have judged and realize it as their habits. Character education, then, is a deliberate effort to build students' awareness of moral values and social norms as a guide to live their life which involves all parties in the educational institution community.

C. METHOD

This current study is a part of a larger study that is intended to explore Indonesian English teachers' perception of character education integration in their classroom and to figure out how they bring character values into their teaching instructions. To answer these research objectives, a qualitative case study approach is employed. This approach is expected to be able to gain an intensive and holistic description as well as in-depth analysis about character education integration in EFL classroom from Indonesian English teachers’ perspectives.

The Context of the Study

The data collection was undertaken at two Junior High Schools (JHS) in the province of Lampung, Indonesia, which have been assigned as the piloting schools for PPK program for almost five years and have implemented the 2013 Curriculum for eight years at the time the study was conducted. JHS Nusa (a pseudonym) was built in 1951 which made it become the oldest JHS in the city. Located in the centre of the city, the site is easy to reach with public transportation. According to the principal, this school is the best school in the city in terms of students’ achievements. The facilities and infrastructure of the school are also very complete after being re-built in 2006 since, in that year, the school was initially intended to be an international standardized school that the school was supported with good and complete facilities by the government. Meanwhile, JHS Bangsa (a pseudonym) was built in 1994 before it was then relocated to this current location in 2001. The school is located in a suburban area, around eight kilometres from the previously mentioned school. However, the location is quite difficult to access because there is no public transportation going through the location. Unlike JHS Nusa, this school is, unfortunately, not supported by good facilities and infrastructure which, according to the participant of this study, is challenging for teachers to facilitate the teaching process.
Participants

Two teachers from those two schools were purposefully selected considering their teaching experiences and the PPK training they ever follow. Sugi (a pseudonym) is a forty-year-old male teacher who has already been teaching for seventeen years in nine different schools. He also insists that he has faced different types of students that it helps him a lot to handle the students in the teaching process. At JHS Nusa, he has been teaching since 2014 along with two other public schools also in the same city. Throughout his career as a teacher, he has been awarded as one of the national best teachers twice. In 2010, he was also chosen as one of three best model teachers in a regency. Meanwhile, Heru (a pseudonym) was a forty-nine-year-old male teacher who had been teaching for more than twenty years at the time the study was conducted. Before he moved to this school fourteen years ago, he had been teaching in several schools in other regencies as an honorary teacher besides also working as a staff in a district office in which he worked there in the morning and taught English at a school in the afternoon. Besides teaching, he was several times elected as vice principal in those schools including this current school. At the time of interviewing, Sugi and Heru were responsible for teaching English for seventh-grade classes which consisted of around 25 to 30 students in each classroom.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data for this inquiry are drawn from a number of different resources, including a semi-structured interview, a classroom observation, and lesson plan analysis. However, due to space constraints, it is difficult to present this article with the data from all sources. Therefore, the data presented in this article were mainly gained from interview transcripts which were carried out in two stages to draw more reliable results: before and after classroom observations were conducted. All interviews took approximately 20 to 40 minutes for each participant. The first interview resembled more of an informal conversation. Besides exploring their teaching preparation before conducting the teaching process and their personal teaching background, this interview was also intended to lead to our familiarity with each other which could make them feel as comfortable as possible, as well as to minimize social discord when being observed later. In addition, although the participants are able to speak English as they are English teachers, Indonesian is preferred to use to minimize language barrier as well as to encourage them to be able to express their feelings and information more freely. With their permission, all interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed verbatim to get an accurate record of the conversation.
After the data from the interview was transcribed and translated, the interview transcripts were analysed using Miles and Huberman’s (1994) interactive model that comprises data reduction, data display, and conclusion. As the focus of the study is to how these participants view character education in Indonesian context, and what factors contribute to the success of the character education reinforcement program in Indonesia, the transcripts were reduced by coding and selecting the themes that appeared in the transcripts based on the research questions. Then, the data were displayed in the form of respondents’ interview excerpt to provide an explanation analysis. The analysis result was then displayed based on the themes and categories which emerged during the verification. The process of finding the meaning and the implications of the analysed data were categorized into the aforementioned study focus.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Character Education as the Solution to Moral Degradation

With respect to the demand to incorporate character values in the teaching and learning process in the classroom, these two teachers seem to share a similar point of view. Heru said:

The need to integrate character values in the teaching process? I totally agree with that. …because, you know, our condition (students) is very precarious. You see, They are smart. But is there anyone who respects the teacher? No, nobody. (Heru_post-Interview_p. 6).

The excerpt from Heru above indicates that he agrees to the program proposed by the government related to character education reinforcement. He highlights that many students in Indonesia lack respect for their teachers. Moreover, although many students are smart, they need to be emphasized on the character aspect which seems to be declining nowadays. Although his words stating that no students respect teachers nowadays look exaggerating, what he said is not totally wrong given many issues related to students’ lack of discipline, integrity, and respect in the school community in the Indonesian context.

Similar to Heru, Sugi believes that the reinforcement of character education, especially in the classroom, is needed. Referring to the future of the country, he narrates that the country in the future needs to have the young generation who will become the spearhead of a nation. The development of a country should start from the development of its young generation with good characters. Therefore, the development of the characters must be initiated by education. If the education system is good then all aspects will follow to be good in the end. In his words:
I totally agree with the need to integrate character values in the teaching process. Because, what is it? The strength of this country in the future, it is them (the students) who will be the spearhead, it is in their hands. When the characters are already developed, and it starts with education, I think the world of education is the heart of a country. If the education is good, then everything will be good. (Sugi_post-Interview_p. 5).

Heru and Sugi’s viewpoint regarding the importance of character education to be reinforced particularly in their classroom is in line with what Qoyyimah (2015) revealed in her study. Gaining the data from some English teachers of public and private Islamic schools focusing on School-based Curriculum, she found that all her participants seem to be enthusiastic about the program of instilling character education since they could not only play as a subject matter specialist but also play more role as ‘students' moral guardians'. They also seem to be very concerned with the moral decline among students in particular and the people of Indonesia in general which needs addressing. In other words, the PPK program which was launched by the government could be seen as a fundamental way for them to get involved in building students' morality.

Character Education: A Shared Responsibility

When asked more about the role of teachers in character education, Sugi and Heru believe that teachers could play a fundamental role in building students' character. However, they also insist that building students' character is not a one-man show and need other parties to be taken into account to have a success of character education reinforcement program. Failure of character education in Indonesia is believed to be influenced by the inability of the government to make those other factors to be actively involved both in and outside the school.

Inspiring Teacher

It is safe to say that teachers contribute a lot to building students' characters because students spend much of their time at school interacting with teachers, learning, and seeing what their teachers do at school. Regarding this, although these two teachers share similar points of view in terms of the importance of teachers for students, they believe that teachers should not only be able to transmit the knowledge but also be able to be inspiring. Heru, for instance, criticizes his colleagues at his school for their inability to show good character. In his account:

…because the teachers here lack discipline. … when the bell rings, we expect that our students are given a good example of how to be disciplined but in fact, the teachers do something else. They don't come to the class right away after the bell rings. The students,
for example, are asked not to litter, but the teachers themselves throw the cigarettes butts carelessly. That's not giving a good example. How can you teach good character if you don't give a good model? The students are forced to join the flag ceremony every Monday, but many teachers just stay in the teacher's room, chatting (Heru_post-Interview_p.7).

Based on this excerpt, he obviously criticizes his colleagues' lack of modelling to the students at his school. It is ironic to learn that while teachers want their students to have good characters but on the other hand, they do not show what good characters are like to the students. Heru mentions how his colleagues are not disciplined enough to come to the classroom on time. He also is disappointed to know that many teachers ask the students not to litter but on the other side, they even show their students to throw the garbage carelessly. For him, it would be useless to ask the students to always join flag ceremony while they, the teachers, are not trying to join the flag ceremony together with the students.

Heru’s viewpoint regarding teachers' effects on students’ behaviors is supported by Sugi. According to him, a teacher should be able to serve as a protagonist to the students.

…. I think the teachers who show good models for them are inspiring the students (to have good behavior). Then the quality of the teachers in this school, Mas. I acknowledge that I admire them. There is a teacher who has ever taught in Moscow for four years, two or three teachers have taught in Malaysia (Sugi_post-Interview_p. 4).

His short statement indicates that an inspiring teacher will lead to the change in students' behavior. The ability of the teachers in his school to show good modeling for the students gives a positive impact on the students' characters development. Moreover, the quality of the teachers in his school also contributes to the students' characters. For him, he even personally admires the quality and achievements of his colleagues as teachers. This certainly is able to inspire students to learn from those teachers.

Discussing how these two teachers highlighted the pivotal role of the teacher in building students' character is interesting. Since teachers directly interact with the students' activities both inside and outside the class, having inspiring teachers who could be models for the students is a must. Moreover, having a teacher with good behaviours and personality would lead to have not only students with good character but also with active engagement, positive attitude, and enjoyment in the classroom (Rahayu, 2018). Besides, As justified by Sizer and Sizer (2012), some parents might notice that children’s behavior which they bring home might be affected by what
their teachers do at school whereas teachers at school assume that students' behaviours are influenced by what their parents do at home. In other words, it is quite clear that students certainly learn through what they see either at home from their family or at school from their teachers. Therefore, it is imperative to have inspiring teachers who can not only explain what is good or bad but also, more importantly, show them what good behaviour looks like.

In the process of teaching and learning in the classroom, the role of teachers is even more vital to building students' characters. As mentioned by Lumpkin (2013), teachers' behaviour especially their integrity is always observed by students. They could basically evaluate their teachers' character based on how they are treated and taught at school and they would know how caring teachers are to them, as well as how trustworthy, honest, and respectful they are in their daily activities. What can be inferred from these statements is that telling the students about what is right or wrong is not adequate to build students' character. It should be followed by a day-to-day action in front of the students. When teachers make mistakes in front of the students, for instance, they should also be brave enough to admit them and would accept all consequences from what they do. This modelling would not only teach the students about moral valuing but also show them how to integrate moral values into teachers' daily actions.

**Family as the main actor to develop students’ good characters**

When asked about the most contributing factor to his students' behaviors, Heru insisted that family background be the main cause of students' behavior changes. In his words:

…they have a broken family background. I mean, it is not only because their parents get divorced, but also because of their fathers, sorry, mothers who take care of them alone while their fathers work out of town or work in foreign country. Some are working in Jakarta. Some of them go home only once a year. I think so, Mas. …but sometimes, some students honestly say that they want a thing that often does not meet what their parents want them to do. (Heru_post-Interview_p.5).

Based on his statement above, some students in his school are raised by single parents. For him, single parents refer to not only divorce but also work factors. Some fathers even only go home once a year which limits their interaction with the children at home. This lack of affection from parents could probably lead to the behavioral changes of the students which then make them draw attention from other people. More than that, their behavior could be possibly considered as their existence which needs to be heard and seen because they probably think that they do not receive it at home. Moreover, different points of view between students and
their parents also could not be neglected. On one side, the students want to do something which they think is good for them but on the other side, their parents, just like, perhaps, all parents in the world, have other plans for the best of their children.

Meanwhile, Although Sugi does not particularly mention problems in the family that could lead to students' bad behaviours, he seems to understand the importance of the involvement of parents in supervising their children. He stated:

> Often I get information from the class committee. When their parents are asked to have a class committee meeting at school, I told their parents about everything. We talk a lot about how their children live at home, how they socialize, their friends, and so on. (Sugi_post-interview_p. 9).

From this statement, it could be learned that family should be involved in maintaining students' characters since they are pivotal to keeping the students on right track. The inclusion of parents in the class committee program is interesting as this is one of the school ways in strengthening the role of parents in students' development not only related to academic aspects but also related to their behaviours at school and outside the school.

Analysed further, it could not be argued that for a long time the most influential factor underlying children behaviour is parents. Some extensive sociological literature has suggested that family structure and stability are associated with children's behaviours (Berkowitz, 2002; McLanahan, Tach, & Schneider, 2013). Berkowitz (2002), for instance, suggests that children character starts to develop at birth or even earlier and their character develops gradually over a period of time. In other words, the interaction between parents and children is the longest period since they are bound to each other particularly from the early years of their life. In another opportunity, Berkowitz (2002) argues that some variables could affect character formation such as parental affection, parenting consistency, parents' ability to cope with children's cues and signals, their ability to show good characters in front of their children or modelling, and how parents respect their children as well as the provision of open discussion at home. Questioning to what extent positive mother-father relationship quality influences children's outcomes, Golberg and Carlson (2014) discovered that good and quality parents’ relationship such as parents’ ability to love, give support and communicate with each other is critical for children’s behavioural problem.

In addition, the different points of view between children and parents mentioned by Heru is not a factor we could simply ignore since it might later influence how these children make a
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decision on important thing in the future for their life. As suggested by Lathrop and Foss in Sugirin (2011), often many parents and also teachers are found to be unfair regarding their expectation from children such as their future jobs and school choice for a worthwhile life. This high expectation might lead the students to obey what their parents want them to do but not what they really want to be based on their passion. It is easily found in Indonesia, for instance, in which many children have been already whispered to their ears to be the likes of a doctor, engineer, and other ‘top’ jobs for their future's occupation since they were kids. As a result, many children are burdened to meet their parents' expectations just to make them happy. It might be inevitable that sometimes these children particularly the ones with the lack of potential and confidence would do everything to pursue this expectation like getting a high score by cheating.

Therefore, parents' involvement in school program such as class committee as mentioned by Sugi in the aforementioned interview is also a point which needs to appreciate. It is not a secret that many parents blame the school for its inability to educate their children at school and many parents leave the responsibility to educate their children only at school. In other words, many parents thought that by bringing their children to school means their duty as parents are half-done. In fact, parents should bear in mind that educating their children is all in their hands with some support from others such as school. Therefore, involving parents at school program might not only help teachers to identify possible problems as early as possible but also help parents to know what their children do at school.

**Good School Leadership**

In addition to inspiring teachers and families, another factor which would lead to the success of character education is the support from the school principal. Sugi affirmed:

I think the previous leaders have done really well in creating a good academic climate and religiosity of this school. I see that the school totally supports the program for building students’ characters. What is it, in giving encouragement for both students and teachers (Sugi_post-Interview_p.19).

His words indicate that building students’ characters relies on how a leader could manage the school and create a good academic climate as well as religiosity aspect. A good leadership has been well carried out by the previous principals to the current principal. In other words, the continuity of good leadership also leads to the success of building students’ good characters. In addition, good leadership would also lead to the creation of good policy as a support for
character building in a school. Although it is not clear what kinds of policy he is referring to, his words clearly indicate that character education needs a good leadership in order to run optimally. The support provided by the school is not only by giving encouragement to all school’s members to be committed but also by preparing a good plan for the character education reinforcement.

Similar to Sugi's point of view, Heru also believes that support from school is significant to reinforce character education for students. However, he criticizes his school for its inability to create a good learning environment and a cohesiveness in building students’ characters. For him, all activities at school are basically related to the principal's leadership. In his words:

…yes, there is no follow up. The school principal does not even try to mobilize us, what should be done next and so on and so forth…yes, it relates to the school principal policy. … just make a policy, for example, every Monday during the flag ceremony, I always told the students to put on their hats and other attributes. But how can it be fair to the students if many teachers do not wear a complete official attributes in front of the students? (Heru_post-interview_p. 22).

His words indicate that the role of a principal in a school is fundamental. A principal could simply make a policy to all members of the schools which could mobilize them to work together because sometimes people need to be ‘forced' by a strict rule in order to get them to work. Accompanied by a good supervision and guidance by the school principal, he believes that all teachers would know what to do.

The fundamental role of a school principal is basically mentioned in one of eleven principles of effective character education. The role of a school principal could be in the form of taking responsibility for planning, implementation, and support (Character Education Partnership, 2015). In other words, a school leader should not only clearly state the goals and principles in supporting character education but also show a good model and good personal example to all school members. It should also be supported with good policies regarding character education reinforcement at school. In line with this, Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) believe that in order to be successful, leadership should at least practice three basic cores namely setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization (p. 8). Setting direction relates to the ability of a school leader to help his/her colleagues to develop shared understandings about the educational institution and the activities as well as the goals intended to achieve. Consistently evaluating and monitoring all school members' performances and developing effective communication are parts of this basic duty. Besides setting directions,
a school leader should also be able to develop people. This context refers to the ability of a school leader to provide teachers and other school members with the critical support and training to improve their competencies. Meanwhile, redesigning the organization is fundamental to facilitating the effective work of educational institution members. This could be done by, for instance, strengthening school cultures and developing the process of collaboration with the district in which the school is located to give incentives and encouragement to fully support the school's programs.

Given the aforementioned issues, training and workshop related to character education reinforcement should not only be burdened to teachers but should also be emphasized for all school members including principal and school staffs to have shared understanding and goals related to their duty to build students' character. A school principal, as the one who has the power to do that, should be able to create a good environment that supports the implementation of the program as what Sugi called a good academic climate and religiosity because the students are living under the school umbrella. It is the school leader who could create good routines in the school community to encourage all school members to support character education reinforcement program. More importantly, a school principal should also have a good character to be able to show people around him/her how to lead well.

The Cohesiveness of All School Members

In building character, similar perspectives among all parties in the school community are important. Heru, for instance, believes that different perceptions among teachers at his school contribute to the failure of character education. By his account:

There are so many challenges, one of which is there is no unity from the teachers here. ...If for example, we want to eradicate pests, we need to do it together. We can't only spray on certain parts of the fields. ...I once told all teachers in a meeting that we should teach them by heart. But when I talked to them, yes, they listened to me but nobody does that (laughter). ... That's why I questioned the moral support from my friends (teachers). (Heru_post-Interview_p.21).

Heru’s words affirm that he is trying so hard to remind the students to behave appropriately and to be disciplined but on the other hand, what he does is not followed by most of his colleagues. For him, if there are only one or two teachers who seem to care of what happens to the students, it would never succeed in practicing their discipline because educating character needs all parties to be involved and the involvement of all teachers is fundamental.
Highlighting Heru’s viewpoints, it is ironic to see that many teachers are still not aware of the fundamental influence they can offer to support the students to have good character. In fact, this problem is basically not a new issue in character education. As suggested by Davidson, Lickona, and Khmelkov (2008, p.371), many teachers seem to identify themselves as ‘subject matter specialists' who are only responsible for bringing academic knowledge to the students. In other words, they only focus on students' academic improvement without paying more attention to their character development. Given the fact, it is imperative to make all teachers understand the pivotal role they could play in building students’ character before they bring it into their teaching process.

**Government Support**

As the one who is responsible for making policy related to the PPK program, it could not be argued that the government should play more role in designing a follow-up program and supervising the PPK program implementation. However, according to these two teachers, this program lacks government support. Sugi mentioned: ‘I think the support from the government is not maximized yet. You see, not all teachers get the training on how to do that. Only some teachers’. (Sugi_post-Interview_p.17)

In line with Sugi’s affirmation, Heru criticizes the lack of government support in supervising the character education reinforcement program. By his account:

Not yet, only me and Ms. Ika (pseudonym) (who got training) but we can't share with other schools, only in teacher's forum here. … I mean, I hope, we got official task after having been trained by the government to spread this information to other teachers, the follow-up, etc…also lack of socialization from the government (Heru_post-Interview_p.9).

The support from the government they mentioned in their accounts could be in the form of assigning programs to train more teachers about how to integrate character education into the teaching process as well as to conduct more socialization about the program to other teachers and schools. After they received training, there was no follow-up activity from the government. Heru expected that after he got training, he should have been assigned to socialize his knowledge about PPK program in a formal community like, at least, MGMP (Community of practice for teachers of the same subjects) or assigned to talk in a workshop or training.
Internet: A dilemma

According to Heru, media is worth being mentioned as another factor influencing students’ characters development. Managing the use of the internet for students could lead to the success of the character education reinforcement program. In his words: ‘… you know, nowadays, media (Internet, television, etc.) is very influential to their character developments’. (Heru_Interview_p.5). From this statement it could not be argued that media particularly internet surround not only adults but also children and teenagers in the modern era. This might lead to a dilemma for parents regarding whether to let their children keep using internet for their positive educational and social advantages or to ban it for its negative impact, particularly on some content.

The effect of media on students' behavioural changes cannot be neglected. These issues have drawn attention from many scholars such as Dalbudak et al., (2013); and Festl and Quandt (2013). Dalbudak et al., (2013), for instance, highlights the relationship between internet addiction severity with depression, anxiety, and alexithymia. They also found the positive relationship between students' temperament and their character. Meanwhile, Festl and Quandt (2013) opt to highlight the phenomenon of cyberbullying and a person's social relations affected by the internet use.

All those aforementioned studies signify the strong relationship between a person's behaviour and internet use. Therefore, since the advancement of technology which already spreads to all parts around the world, including the students' houses, it is important to involve the school especially teachers to be able to teach the students how to use media wisely. In the classroom, a teacher should be able to teach them to be critical of any situations and information they read or see from the media. Besides emphasizing this aspect at school particularly in the classroom, the involvement of, once again, parents to supervise their children is also critical since they are the ones who are responsible for their children's interaction outside the school. However, albeit being fundamental, parents should be careful in selecting the most effective strategies in controlling their children' use of the internet without, for example, limiting their ‘freedom’ in using it.

E. CONCLUSION

This presented case study is an attempt to explore how EFL teachers view character education reinforcement program in the context of Indonesia. Inquiring the information from two experienced English teachers of two piloting schools in Lampung, the study indicates that both teachers agree that integration of character values in the teaching process is fundamental,
not only because it is one of the ways to build Indonesian students’ character that seems to be declining but also because those students would later become the spearheads of the development of this country. The involvement of teachers in helping to build students’ character starting from the classroom indicates that they could play a pivotal role not only as of the ‘subject matter specialists’ but also as ‘students’ moral guardians’. However, despite the fundamental role they could serve in students’ character development, they seem to refuse to take all responsibilities only on their shoulders. Other fundamental factors such as the active involvement of parents in character development both at home and school, inspiring teachers, school principal support, the similar perspectives among teachers regarding character education, a continuity of government supervision, and the effectiveness of managing the use of media particularly internet by parents, school, and government also need enhancement since it could definitely contribute more to the success of the character education reinforcement program in 2013 curriculum.

This study is acknowledged to face some limitations particularly in relation to the limited participants which then lead to its inability to generalize the result to different places and people. However, with the use of three types of instruments to get the data, this limitation could at least be reduced. Based on the limitation, it might be interesting to conduct another research that involves more schools and more teachers across provinces not only using qualitative approach but also quantitative data. This research will be able to dig richer information regarding character education implementation from many sources and more importantly, the results could be generalized.
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