Title

The Teaching Methodology and Assessment of Character Education in Indonesian English Curriculum: Teacher`s Perceptions

Author

Muhammad Ahkam Arifin

Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar

Bio-Profile:

Muhammad Ahkam Arifin is a teaching assistant at English Education Department, Teaching and Science Faculty of Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Alauddin Makassar (Alauddin State Islamic University of Makassar). He took his Master`s degree at MSc TESOL Programme at the University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom. He can be contacted via ahkam.arifin@gmail.com.

Abstract

To develop students` knowledge subjects (e.g., English) and character (e.g., honesty), the Ministry of Education of Indonesia in 2013 launched a new curriculum called *Kurikulum 2013*. All subjects in this curriculum were claimed to be fully integrated with character education (CE). Notwithstanding a growing body of research stressing the need for CE to be integrated into school curricula, empirical studies on teachers` perceptions regarding the implementation of CE "have made few inroads in high schools" (Leming, 2006, p. 84). Thus, the current research aimed to explore English teachers` perceptions in Indonesia regarding the teaching methodology and assessment of CE integrated into the English high school curriculum. It utilised semi-structured interviews with four English teachers as the respondents. Regarding the teaching methodology, the findings revealed that teachers (1) had little consensus on how moral values could be integrated into English teaching materials and methods, (2) employed different strategies in teaching values, and (3) faced challenges in implementing CE (e.g., lack of training). In terms of assessment, it was found that teachers

(1) mostly employed observation as the assessment tool, (2) claimed the invalidity of quantitative assessment, and (3) expressed concern over the validity of the assessment of students` behaviour.

Introduction

Context Information

In 2013, the Indonesian government (MONEC Number 59 Year 2014) launched a new curriculum called *Kurikulum 2013* (Curriculum 2013), wherein all subjects (e.g., Mathematics, English) were integrated with character education (henceforth CE). This means that all teachers, from elementary to high school, not only focused on improving students` academic achievement, but also on their moral development, by cultivating universal moral values (Kemendiknas, 2011). These goals appear to reflect the goals of Indonesian education as depicted in the Indonesian Government Regulations Number 20 Year 2003 about the National Standards of Education that any formal learning activities are required to focus upon the development of students` "faith, character (or morality), health, knowledge, creativity, independence, democracy and responsibility" (ibid, p. 5).

Theoretical Framework

The above goals of Indonesian education seem similar to what was addressed by Lickona (2000) that all schools, all over the world, "have always had two goals: the development of intellect and the development of character" (p. 59). The development of intellect refers to the knowledge subjects (e.g., Physics, Biology, English, Mathematics), while the development of character covers the teaching of character (or morality e.g., honesty, hard work, discipline). Lickona (ibid) claims that, of these two main goals of formal education, "character is the more important, because it provides the foundation for everything else" (p. 59). Among other approaches (values clarification, moral dilemma discussion), CE is an approach to moral education, by seeking to instil students with certain universal moral values (e.g., honesty, patriotism, hard work).

Relevant Studies and the Research Gap as the Rationale

Despite a growing body of research stressing the need for CE being integrated into school curricula (e.g., Jones et al., 1990; Troutman, 2014; Qoyyimah, 2015; Beachum et al.,

2013; Mathison, 1999), studies that have specifically focused on teachers` perceptions regarding CE in English classrooms could be said to be few in number. Howard et al. (2004) stated that the field of CE "suffers from having relatively few rigorous research findings" (p. 205). It is particularly so in high schools. Leming (2006) posited that CE efforts "have made few inroads in high schools" (p. 84), albeit "character education interventions have primarily targeted the elementary and middle developmental levels" (Davidson et al., 2014, p. 290). Albeit a number of studies (e.g., Jones et al., 1999; Donovan, 2000) have examined teachers` perceptions regarding the implementation of CE, apparently the only empirical studies that have focused on English teachers' perceptions regarding the implementation of CE are by Mambu (2014) and Qoyyimah (2015). Mambu (2015) also has specifically addressed some challenges in assessing CE.

Studies on teachers` perceptions regarding CE implementation have revealed some negative feedback including teachers` lack of training for CE (Jones et al., 1999; Troutman, 2014), the lack of consensus about what character education is and how it should be taught (Jones et al., 1999), the inconsistency in defining moral values (Donovan, 2000), teachers` low confidence in being a good role model (Donovan, 2000), being afraid of religious indoctrination (Mathison, 1999), the need for family, or homes, as the central role for CE (Leming & Yendol-Hoppey, 2004; Romanowski, 2005), the issue to quantify the assessment of CE (Romanowski, 2005) and the urgency to prepare students for academic standardised tests (Yandles, 2008).

Conversely, other studies have suggested positive findings. These findings include the perceptions that most teachers support and agree with the importance of CE being integrated into the school curriculum (e.g., Beachum et al., 2013; Mathison, 1999, Chang, & Muñoz, 2006; Jones et al, 1990; Troutman, 2014), that teachers are confident to cultivate values or are good role models (Mathison, 1999; Milson & Mehlig, 2002; Troutman, 2014), that religion needs to serve as a compelling framework for CE (Jones, 1999; Milson & Mehlig, 2002) and that teachers begin to know their students better (Leming & Yendol-Hoppey, 2004). Hence, this current research aims to contribute to this debate in the sense that the research questions will be formed based on these findings.

Specifically, on English teachers` perceptions in the implementation of CE in the English curriculum of Indonesia, Qoyyimah (2015) reported that all respondents, regardless of their religion, supported the integration of CE in the school curriculum, particularly in assisting students to become religious as one of the eighteen prescribed values by the

14

Indonesian government. (The eighteen moral values include religiosity, honesty, tolerance, discipline, hardworking, creativeness, independence, democratic, motivation to learn, patriotism, nationalism, supportive, love to read, peace maker, friendliness and communicativeness, environmental awareness, social awareness and responsibility Kemendiknas, 2011). Despite this support, however, some of the teachers failed to suggest evidence of the implementation of CE in their classroom, which was due to their lack of training. Nevertheless, those who had regular training "consistently modelled and explicitly taught the nominated values in classrooms" (ibid, p. 158).

However, another study, conducted to determine university teachers' perceptions regarding religiosity in English classrooms in Indonesia, indicated contradictory findings. Mambu (2014) reported that some teachers "felt awkward if they had to start classes with a prayer" (p. 97). Despite the fact that they did not "forbid the teaching of religiosity or spirituality" (p.100), they considered teaching students to be good language speakers is the main aim in their professions. In a more recent study, Mambu (2015) suggested the challenges in teaching and assessing the value of tolerance in English classrooms. One of the examples of this was the fact that students and teachers seemed to have a different way of defining the value of tolerance.

Research Aims, Questions and the Significance

Based on their empirical studies, both Qoyyimah (2015) and Mambu (2014; 2015) appeared to indicate contradictory findings, to the extent that, while Qoyyimah suggested teachers' positive support over the policy of teaching CE, Mambu indicated teachers' negative support. To contribute to this debate, the current research aimed to explore the perceptions of English high school teachers in Indonesia regarding how they teach and assess moral values while teaching English simultaneously, or, in other words, how they integrate CE into their ways of teaching English. The results of the study might provide useful information for the curriculum designers, or trainers, to make informed decisions in the future for improvements to the integration of CE into the English curriculum. Furthermore, the current paper employed interviews as the main instrument in that both studies above utilised interviews as one of the instruments for the data collection. More specifically, to address the research aims, the following research questions were formed:

1. *What are English teachers' perceptions regarding the teaching methodology of character education in the English high school curriculum in Indonesia?*

15

2. What are English teachers` perceptions regarding the assessment of character education in the English high school curriculum in Indonesia?

Methodology

Research Approach and Data-Gathering Tool

The above-mentioned research questions call for some kind of interpretation of teachers` attitudes or perceptions, and hence the current research can be considered to adopt the approach of interpretivism (Thomas, 2013; Bryman, 2012). More specifically, the current study adopted a phenomenological approach as the design frame (Gray, 2014; Starks & Trinidad, 2007). For the data-gathering tool, it utilised a semi-structured interview since it could allow more detailed responses from the participants by the use of probes, and they can be asked to clarify what they have said (Gray, 2014).

Participants

The current study used criterion sampling, a type of purposive sampling (Gray, 2014), in that the participants were selected based on three main criteria. Firstly, it was imperative that the teachers had been implementing character education (CE) in their classroom (and the school as well) for more than one semester. Secondly, it was crucial that the teachers were implementing the latest curriculum, Curriculum 2013. Thirdly, it was essential that they had undergone training in implementing CE, in order for them to provide a comprehensive understanding (Gray, 2014).

Table I. A summary of the participants` identities

Respondents	Sex	Age	Years of teaching experience
Respondent A	Male	36	Thirteen (13) years
Respondent B	Male	27	Four (4) years
Respondent C	Female	26	Three (3) years
Respondent D	Female	31	Six (6) years

Data Analysis

Regarding the data analysis, this research utilised the "constant comparative method" as recommended by Thomas (2013). The steps within this method affirmed the process of

data analysis as what Goulding (2005) mentioned. Firstly, all of the transcripts were read and re-read for the researcher to become familiar with the responses, and temporary constructs (or meaning units) were initiated. Consequently, the first stages were completed. The second reading resulted in second-order constructs, which were compared with the first constructs. Once the constructs were deemed exhaustive, they were then labelled as the themes of the data.

Procedure

For the procedure, after obtaining the consent form from the interviewees, the interviews were conducted. Each interview lasted sixty to ninety minutes, and the interviewees had been informed about the possible length of time prior to conducting the interview. Following the data analysis, member checking was conducted to elicit the participants` feedback on the analysis, in order to cross check interpretation.

Findings

How Teachers Teach Values and English Simultaneously

There are no specific strategies in integrating values into English teaching materials.

All of the respondents appeared to express the same concern, in that they had no specific strategies in teaching each of the (moral) values while teaching English. It is worth pointing out, however, that the government, under Curriculum 2013, had officially prescribed English teachers to implement a scientific approach. Nonetheless, teachers indicated that they could not effectively use this approach to specifically teach each of the values, while also teaching English.

Respondent A (RA) commented that "I don't know what methodology I use. It [scientific approach] makes my students bored". Respondent D (RD) claimed that "sometimes I cannot relate the teaching material with a value that should be taught [based on the syllabus]". Respondent C (RC) also reported that "I don't know the type of strategies I use. I tend to use a variety of teaching strategies and provide a varied task". Similarly, Respondent B (RB) mentioned, "I don't have [specific] strategies. The strategy is laid on the situation and condition [of] the classroom and what is the objective of the material or lesson to be taught".

Teachers integrate values into English materials, and not the reverse.

Furthermore, the above quotations from the four teachers seem to provide hints about the way they teach moral values while teaching English, that is, by integrating the values into

the English materials, or topics, that they would teach, and not the reverse. This means that the teachers had clear objectives of English lessons at the beginning and then attempted to find certain values that could be integrated into the lessons.

Teachers use varied strategies in promoting values.

Despite the above seemingly consensus that the teachers had no clear hints on specific strategies, they managed to mention some strategies that they had exercised in their classrooms. To teach the values of discipline, respect and confidence, RA mentioned that "students must attend [the class] on time [and wear] complete uniform. Consistently being on time is the product of proper planning; discipline [and] respect for other people`s time. Educative penalties such as presentation … is for training their confidence."

Teachers Teach and Assess Different Values.

When asked about whether he implemented all of the eighteen recommended values, RA mentioned that "only some of them. I just assess three values: discipline, creative, and hardworking". Similarly, RD also claimed that she promoted tolerance, honesty, discipline, hardworking and cooperation. Unlike RA and RD, RB claimed that "I taught most of the eighteen universal values". When asked whether she managed to integrate all the values, she mentioned that "no, I didn't. For example, when I try to use patriotism as [a] value in my teaching, I would be hard to find materials that [are suitable]".

Challenges in Promoting Moral Values

Lack of training

All of the respondents seemed to agree that not all moral values that were recommended by the government could be integrated into their English lessons. Seemingly, one of the reasons of this difficulty is due to the lack of training on how to integrate the values into English teaching materials. RD claimed that "we weren't trained to teach values when we`re still in the university". Moreover, RB reported that "[there was] no workshop or seminar before it [was] applied. We didn't have any clue about the lesson plan [and] syllabus. It [CE] can be applied after its socialisation [or trainings] has been comprehensively addressed to all teachers".

Lack of collaboration with students` parents

Regarding the issues in implementing CE, RA seemed to focus more on the difficulties in collaborating with students` parents. He commented that "there is no cooperation with the students` parents. Their parents think that go[ing] to school is just a

processing of getting certificates and they don't want to [be] involve[d] with that [their children`s character development".

Lack of confidence in teaching moral values (or as a role model)

The teachers were also asked whether they had confidence to promote values, or could become good role models for their students. RB indicated her low confidence in promoting values that "before build[ing] the students` characters, we as a teacher should build our character first. I only have a little confidence. Teaching values is a big responsibility."

However, RC and RD appeared to imply that they had confidence in promoting values and being role models for their students. RC claimed that "I feel appropriate to teach values because education [CE] is our responsibility as a teacher". She also mentioned that "if we haven't successfully applied it, it means we have to evaluate ourselves, our strategies in teaching". RD reported that "no need to wait ourselves to be perfect in order to teach good things [values]. And I consider it as a motivation for myself [to have good character]".

Teachers Support the Aims of Character Education.

Teaching English and promoting values are of the same importance.

Despite the aforementioned challenges, all teachers posited that they supported the government`s policy in developing students` moral character, notwithstanding each teacher put it in a different way. RA perceived improving students` characters to be his responsibility as a teacher, as he mentioned that "most of [my] students want to work or have some business. But the problem is their attitude. I try to prepare their attitude. As a teacher I have to educate them". When asked about which one he prioritised more in his classrooms, either teaching values or teaching English as a subject, he reported that "both should be integrated".

Teaching English is more important than promoting values.

Unlike RA, who perceived both teaching English and promoting values the same way, RB preferred to focus more on teaching English. She commented, "I prefer teaching English itself to values. Because as we know that teaching English is not easy. Many problems [are] faced when teaching the language. So, when teaching English and the value at once is too difficult for me". Nonetheless, she suggested her support over the policy of CE, when stating that "actually I support it but it should be minimize[d] by its assessment". Similarly, RC reported that "as an English teacher, I feel [it is] more important to teach English because this is [my] academic responsibility". She continued that "values in teaching and learning processes are only additional benefits that can be gained [in addition to English]".

Promoting values is more important than teaching English.

Unlike the others, RD considered teaching values more important to her compared to teaching English, as she claimed that "there is no use having students who are good at English but their behaviours are not good. Teaching English itself is [already] not easy. But we, educators, [must] play roles in developing future civilisation". She also mentioned that "I probably tend to say that teaching values is more important [than teaching English]. This country really need[s] people with good characters".

The Effectiveness of Character Education

Both RA and RD suggested the effectiveness of CE under Curriculum 2013. RA mentioned that "in my class, I implement it [CE] well". Upon the development of his students` discipline, he said that "better and better. They [students] start thinking that discipline is [an] important thing that can make them successful". He further gave examples that "most of them always submit assignments on time [and] they start paying attention on my class". Similarly, RD reported that "in general, they are more serious to study and do the tasks I assign". She continued that "I asked them to write paragraphs about their future visions. Many of them really want [that] there is no corruption in this country".

However, RB contradicted this claim, as she reported that "I think [there is] not really [improvement]". She further mentioned that there were still many students who violated the values being promoted, although teachers had implemented CE since 2013. Similarly, RC commented "[It is] not fully effective because in reality in my school every year [there are] students who did not pass to get to the higher class, caused by their naughtiness."

How Teachers Assess Character Education

Teachers use observation for assessment.

Notwithstanding the government provided three types of assessment of CE, most of the teachers within the current study indicated their preference to employing observation over self-assessment and peer assessment. When asked about the types of assessment she implemented, RD answered "[I use] observation. I do it when they [students] have examination and when I ask them to write paragraphs". Similarly, RA said that "I assess my students` behaviour from their activeness in my class" and "based on their daily behaviour".

Teachers do not use "numbers" for the assessment.

Although suggested by the government to use (descriptive or predicative) words for the assessment of spiritual and social attitude (CE), the teachers within the current study claimed that they used descriptive words to assess their students` behaviour rather than

numbers. Like RB, RC reported that "I assess [students' behaviour] by using words (descriptions), yet in the end it will be in the form of the scale of A to E". She continued that "using scores [numbers] makes me hard to identify [assess] students` attitude". Furthermore, RA mentioned that "I just assess [CE] [by the scale of] bad, fair, good, [and] very good".

Challenges in Assessing Character Education

Students` behaviour is dynamic.

As might also be indicated within the previous section, two teachers perceived that assessing students` behaviour, which always changed, might lead teachers to give invalid marks (or assessment scores) to students. For example, RB claimed that "assess[ing] students` behaviour is very complicated. Because we know that behaviour is always changing every time for every student". She also mentioned that "the condition of students is still unstable. Sometimes they show good behavior sometimes they show bad behavior". Moreover, RA appeared to support this phenomenon, as he said "Students` behaviour is always dynamic. Behaviour is not [to be] assessed but to be improved."

Assessing English and moral values simultaneously might be time consuming.

Three of the respondents suggested that assessing students` cognitive competence (English) and social and attitude competence (CE) were time-consuming. It is worth pointing out at the outset that the government officially required teachers, not only to assess these two types of competence, but also to assess skill competence (or objectives of English lessons). Quotations from RB indicated this phenomenon:

> The assessment covers three main points, [namely] affective [spiritual and social attitude], psychometric [skill], and cognitive [English]. The difficulties are [that] we should describe those points for every competence [every objective for each meeting] of the material. It [is] really a waste of time to assess the students."

Discussions

How Teachers Teach Values and English Simultaneously

In line with previous studies (Jones et al., 1999; Mathison, 1999), this section indicated overall teachers` little consensus on how values could be taught, as they reported utilising different strategies studies (Cheung & Lee; Richardson, et al., 2009) in teaching each of the moral values, albeit teaching the same values. As a result, it was difficult to specifically determine which strategies for which values. Regarding this, in reviewing seventy-eight empirical studies on fifty-four CE programs, Berkowitz and Bier (2007) argued

that "many of the research reports did not sufficiently elaborate on the content [or moral values] and pedagogical strategies of the program methods" and "most programs employ many strategies" (p. 5).

The respondents` claim that they integrated values into their English lessons, or, in other words, they started with English materials and methods first before selecting values for the integration and not the reverse, which is in line with previous studies (Troutman, 2014; Qoyyimah, 2015). While Troutman claimed that "teachers feel that academics come first and character gets fitted in and when time allows" (p. 88-89), Qoyyimah argued that "teachers should choose only the values relevant to EFL teaching materials and teaching activities" (p. 185).

Teachers Teach and Assess Different Values.

Despite the fact that the government recommended eighteen values to be promoted, the respondents indicated that they implemented different values in their classrooms. This appears to corroborate Berkowitz and Bier`s (2007) statement that CE programmes generally promote diverse values, albeit within the same programmes, as how it was disclosed within the current research. Moreover, the current findings also seem to endorse Qoyyimah`s (2015) findings that English teachers in Indonesia offer different values within their classrooms, as a result of the difficulties faced by teachers in the integration of values to their English materials and methods.

Challenges in Promoting Moral Values

As in previous research (Jones et al., 1999), teachers appeared to indicate difficulties in promoting values while teaching English as a result of the lack of training. Moreover, Mathison (1999) revealed that 71% of his participants (287 teachers) disagreed with the statement that "the topic of character education was addressed thoroughly in my teacher preparation program" (p. 33), while 16% were unsure.

The teachers within the current study claimed to be unable to integrate all the eighteen recommended values into their English materials and methods, supporting Qoyyimah`s (2015) findings that English teachers in Indonesia "could not freely nominate and model all 18 values". Qoyyimah claimed that despite teachers` routine in attending training for Curriculum 2013, they still faced the difficulty of integrating values. Perhaps this could be explained by RD`s statement that teachers attending training for Curriculum 2013 were not encouraged to focus on how values could be integrated into English teaching materials or methods.

Of the four respondents, only one indicated that she could not guarantee her character to be confident in promoting values to students. This could be said to contradict previous research by Donovan (2000), wherein, of the six teachers interviewed, only two suggested they were confident in promoting values and also as being a role model. This could be due to the fact that Donovan`s participants lacked knowledge of the framework of the CE programme in their context. However, the current research appears to confirm other studies (Mathison, 1999; Milson & Mehlig, 2002; Troutman, 2002) that the majority of teachers believe that they could become a role model to promote moral values to their students, and were confident to discuss issues of right and wrong (Mathison, 1999).

Additionally, endorsing previous research (Romanowski, 2005), the current study indicates teachers` challenges in having good collaboration with students` parents in monitoring the development of their children, particularly related to students` character (CE). Moreover, like Mathison`s (1999) study, teachers consider parents and close relatives to have the primary responsibility for CE, rather than teachers themselves.

Teachers Support the Aims of Character Education.

Overall, the findings within this section verified a number of previous studies (e.g., Jones et al., 1990; Troutman, 2014; Qoyyimah, 2015; Beachum et al., 2013; Mathison, 1999) that teachers, in general, perceive CE to be important and supported the idea of promoting values to students, despite teachers` facing challenges in integrating values to the lessons. Interestingly, the current research also disclosed that one of the respondents considered teaching values more important than teaching English, albeit her profession is an English teacher. However, two others contradicted this view, while the other perceived both teaching English and promoting values to be of the same importance.

The Effectiveness of Character Education

Two respondents claimed that the implementation of CE in their contexts indicated effectiveness, to the extent that they found some improvement in their students` behaviour development related to the values they were instilling. However, like Richardson et al. (2009), the current study only employed teacher interviews as the single type of measurement tools, which might influence the validity of the findings. There also appeared to be a variety of causes that might influence students` behaviour, such as "parental influences, individual student maturity, peer pressure, social class" and others (Romanowski, 2005, p. 10). For this reason, the claim should be interpreted with caution (Berkowitz & Bier, 2007). Nonetheless, inasmuch as other studies (Cheung & Lee, 2010; Dereli-Iman, 2014; Lee, 2014), with the use

of different data gathering tools, also pointed to the effectiveness of CE programs, this claim might be validated.

How Teachers Assess Character Education

Overall, the teachers within the current research seem to prefer employing observation to self-assessment and peer assessment, supporting previous research (Retnawati et al., 2016). Teachers found it impractical to utilise self-assessment and peer assessment, in that teachers would need to spend a great amount of money and time for printing and the distribution of the instruments to the students. Another difficulty was due to the lack of training in making the assessment rubrics. However, the current findings also contradict Retnawati et al. (ibid), to the extent that, in their study, some teachers implemented the self-assessment, or the combination of the three techniques, while all the participants within the current research only employed observation.

The teachers within the current study used the scale of A to E (excellent to bad), along with descriptive (or predicative) words, to assess their students' behaviour. This finding appeared to endorse Romanowski`s (2005) finding that "student behavior is extremely difficult to quantitatively assess" (p. 9). However, the CE programme under Romanowski`s study was different from the CE programme under the current research. While that of Romanowski required teachers to do quantitative assessment, the CE programme under the current study required teachers to employ qualitative assessment.

Challenges in Assessing Character Education

Validating previous research (Romanowski, 2005), the teachers claimed to have difficulties assessing students` behaviour, in that behaviour was not static. While the participants within the current study expressed concern over the validity of assessment scores, those of Romanowski`s were concerned with the belief that the changes might not be caused by the CE programme under implementation, but could be influenced by other factors, such as "parental influences, individual student maturity, peer pressure, social class" and others (ibid, p. 10).

Another challenge that the teachers under study were facing is related to the fact that they would need to spend much time to do the assessment, as required by Curriculum 2013. Teachers were required to carry out three types of assessment: (1) social and attitude assessment (CE), (2) subject knowledge assessment (English), and (3) skill assessment. Furthermore, each of these types of assessment required different ways of measurement tools. This phenomenon verified Retnawati et al.`s (2016) finding that "all of the teachers who had

been interviewed stated that the assessment system of Curriculum 2013 was complicated" (p. 39).

Lastly, the teachers suggested that they had difficulties in utilising three ways of assessing students` behaviour, as recommended by the government, and, as a result, they mostly utilised observation. This could be due to the fact that teachers find it demanding and impractical. It could also be due to the lack of training for the assessment process, which then might lead to the lack of understanding of such assessments (Retnawati et al., 2016).

Conclusion

The findings revealed that teachers seem to have little consensus on how moral values (or CE) could be integrated into English materials and teaching methods. It is also indicated that teachers, without consistency, implement different strategies in teaching moral values. This is, perhaps, caused by teachers` lack of training in integrating values into English teaching materials and methods.

Furthermore, in arranging their teaching materials, the teachers claim that they started with English teaching materials and methods before selecting certain values that were appropriate for the integration. In addition to the lack of training, teachers also mentioned two other challenges: (1) students` parents might not be cooperative in monitoring their children`s behaviour (or character), and even more so, they consider that it is merely teachers` responsibility to educate their children; and (2) some teachers might have low confidence in being role models, or as character educators. Despite the challenges, the teachers indicated their support over the policy of instilling moral values to students as integrated with the curriculum. Moreover, they also claim to find some improvement over their students` character after the implementation of CE in their classrooms.

Regarding the assessment, all teachers appeared to claim that they mostly utilise observation as the assessment tool, among other techniques (self-assessment and peer assessment), that are recommended by the government. Teachers provide the report for the assessment in the form of a scale of A to E (excellent to bad) along with the descriptions of students` behaviour (descriptive words), validating the difficulty for the quantitative assessment of CE.

References

Beachum, F., McCray, C., Yawn, C., & Obiakor, F. (2013). Support and importance of character education: Pre-service teacher perceptions. *Education*, *133*(4), 470-480.

Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2007). What works in character education? *Journal of Research in Character Education*, *5*(1), 29.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th edn). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Chang, F., & Muñoz, M. A. (2006). School personnel educating the whole child: Impact of character education on teachers' self-assessment and student development. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *19*(1-2), 35-49.

Cheung, C. K., & Lee, T. Y. (2010). Improving social competence through character education. *Evaluation and program planning*, *33*(3), 255-263.

Davidson, M., Lickona, T., & Khmelkov, V. (2014). Smart & Good Schools: A new paradigm for high school character education. *In L. Nucci, D. Narvaez, & T. Krettanauer (Eds.), Handbook of moral and character education (2nd ed., pp. 290-307). New York, NY: Routledge.*

Dereli-Iman, E. (2014). The effect of the values education programme on 5.5-6 year old children's social development: Social skills, psycho-social development and social problem solving skills. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *14*(1), 262-268.

Donovan, A. (2000). Moral Education and Teachers' Self-Perceptions: Novice Male Teachers in the Catholic High School. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *3*(4).

Goulding, C. (2005). Grounded theory, ethnography and phenomenology: A comparative analysis of three qualitative strategies for marketing research. *European journal of Marketing*, *39*(3/4), 294-308.

Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing Research in the Real World (3rd edn)*. London: Sage.

Howard, R. W., Berkowitz, M. W., & Schaeffer, E. F. (2004). Politics of character education. *Educational policy*, *18*(1), 188-215.

Jones, E. N., Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. (1999). Character Education & Teacher Education: How are Prospective Teachers Being Prepared to Foster Good Character in Students? *Action in Teacher Education*, *20*(4), 11-28.

Lee, A. (2014). Implementing character education program through music and integrated activities in early childhood settings in Taiwan. *International Journal of Music Education*, 0255761414563195.

Leming, J. (2006). Smart & good high schools: Integrating excellence and ethics for success in school, work, and beyond. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, *4*, 83-91.

Leming, J. S., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2004). Experiencing character education: Student and teacher voices. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, *2*(1), 1.

Lickona, T. (2000). Character Education: The Heart of School Reform. *Religion & Education*, *27*(1), 58-64.

Mambu, J. E. (2014). Negotiating the Place of Spirituality in English Language Teaching: A Case Study in an Indonesian EFL Teacher Education Program. (Dissertation). Arizona State University.

Mambu, J. E. (2015). Challenges in assessing character education in ELT: Implications from a case study in a Christian university. *TEFLIN Journal*, *26*(2), 183.

Mathison, C. (1999). How teachers feel about character education: A descriptive study. *Action in Teacher Education*, *20*(4), 29-38.

Milson, A. J., & Mehlig, L. M. (2002). Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy for character education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *96*(1), 47-53.

Qoyyimah, U. (2015). *EFL teachers' professional dilemmas with moral curriculum reform in Indonesia*. (Thesis). Queensland University of Technology.

Retnawati, H., Hadi, S., & Nugraha, A. C. (2016). Vocational High School Teachers' Difficulties in Implementing the Assessment in Curriculum 2013 in

Richardson, R. C., Tolson, H., Huang, T. Y., & Lee, Y. H. (2009). Character education: Lessons for teaching social and emotional competence. *Children & Schools*, *31*(2), 71-78.

Romanowski, M. H. (2005). Through the eyes of teachers: High school teachers' experiences with character education. *American Secondary Education*, 6-23.

Thomas, G. (2013). *How to Do Your Research Project: A Guide for Students in Education and Applied Social Sciences*. London: Sage Publications.

Troutman, P. R. (2014). *Teachers' perceptions of aspects of character education programming: Importance, efficacy, and practice*. Doctoral dissertation. Regent University.

Government Documents

MONEC (Ministry of Education and Culture) Number 59 Year 2014 regarding Curriculum 2013 for Senior High Schools [Peraturan Mentri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia No 59 Th 2014 tentang Kurikulum 2013 Sekolah Menengah Atas/Madrasah Aliyah].

The Indonesian Government Regulations Number 20 Year 2003 about the National Standards of Education [UU RI No 20 Th 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional].

Kemendiknas [*Indonesian Ministry of Education*] (2011). *Pedoman Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Karakter [character education handbook]*. Jakarta: Puskurbuk.