

Received : Feb 28, 2021
Revised : Apr 12, 2021
Accepted: May 11, 2021
Published: May 31, 2021

Character Building Values in Student Teacher's Lesson Plans: A Content Analysis

Farhana Nurhayya

*English Language Education Study Program
Universitas Negeri Jakarta
Jakarta, Indonesia
farhananurhayya@gmail.com*

Ellis Tamela

*English Language Education Study Program
Universitas Negeri Jakarta
Jakarta, Indonesia
ellistamela@unj.ac.id*

Abstract

Character-building which has become one of the major concerns in the Indonesian national educational system should be addressed by the education stakeholders in various ways, one of which is via academic documents such as curriculum, syllabus, and lesson plan. Many researchers have conducted studies regarding character-building values that are revealed in EFL teacher's lesson plans. However, they have not addressed character-building values in student teacher's lesson plans. This study aimed to investigate character-building values in student teacher's lesson plans using content analysis. Five lesson plans designed by 15 student teachers were analyzed based on character-building values by the Ministry of Education and Culture. The findings showed that 5 character-building values were inserted in the student teacher's lesson plans such as being religious, hard work, responsible, collaborative, and communicative. The most frequent character-building values were being communicative, while the less frequent character-building values were being religious.

Keywords: *character building values, lesson plan*

INTRODUCTION

Character-building values are expected to play an important role in addressing such issues of the educational system as cheating, dropping out of school, free sex, teen pregnancy, bullying, using drugs, and alcohol (Kurniasih, Utari, & Akhmadi, 2018). Some experts have explained character building in different definitions. Berkowitz and Bier (2005) defined character building as the effort by schools to teach their students ethical values such as kindness, generosity, courage, freedom, equality, and respect for self and others. The goal is to promote students to become self-disciplined and responsible citizens. Another definition was proposed by Lickona, Schaps, and Lewis (1996), stating that character building promotes core ethical values such as honesty, fairness, caring, responsibility, and respect for self and others along with supportive performance values such as diligence, perseverance, and a good ethic as the foundation of good character.

Indonesia also has long stressed the importance of character building by issuing National Education System Law No. 20 years 2003 Article 3 (Silvia, 2012), which explained that education in Indonesia is not only to develop students' academic achievement but also students' character (Zurqoni, Retnawati, Apino, & Anazifa, 2018). The Ministry of National Education also declared in 2010 National Action Plan (RAN) on

character building which included 18 values (Kemendikbud, 2017). Back then in the era of President Joko Widodo and Jusuf Kalla, one of the points in Nawacita 8 was about Mental Revolutionary National Movement (Gerakan Nasional Revolusi Mental or GNRM), meaning that good characters should be encouraged in real actions. The government also included character building in the National Long-Term Development Plan (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional or RPJPN) 2014-2019 (Kemendikbud, 2017). Furthermore, the Ministry of Education and Culture launched The Strengthening of Character Education (Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter or PPK) in 2016. As mentioned in the Regulation of the President of the Republic of Indonesia No.87/2017, PPK was the education movement under the responsibility of the education unit to strengthen the student's characters through harmonizing the heart, thought, taste and body in collaboration with education units, parents, and communities as a part of Mental Revolutionary National Movement (GNRM).

Character building gives a positive impact on developing students' characters in school (Zurqoni, Retnawati, Apino, & Anazifa, 2018). The argument is in line with the finding of a study by Agboola and Tsai (2012) that character building in schools gave positive outcomes, decreased the number of drop out of school and negative behavior. Dodds (2016) found that character building increased students' understanding of the values. Zurqoni, et al (2018) stated that character building helped to promote students' religiosity, self-confidence, responsibility, collaboration, and respect. They proved that students were more disciplined in practicing daily prayers, more confident to share their opinions, more disciplined in tasks' completion, more collaborative with one another through intra-curricular and extracurricular activities, and more respectful to their teachers and friends.

Character building also has a relationship with academic achievement. It was proved by Benninga, et al (2001) who examined the relationship between character-building values and academic achievement in California elementary schools and they found that schools that scored higher on implementation of a variety of character-building values also gained higher achievement scores. Higher scores were more consistently related to such four aspects of character-building values as parent and teacher modeling, quality opportunities for students to engage in activities, a caring community and positive social relationship, and a clean and safe physical environment. Hence, character building should be addressed by education stakeholders in various ways, in academic documents such as curriculum, syllabus, and lesson plan (Ratnasari, 2018) as well as in practices.

In primary and secondary education, character building is included in curriculum 2013, which is the newest curriculum by the government (Nova, 2017). The planning component is considered a key factor in the success of character building, in accordance with the statement by Lee (2009) and Zurqoni, Retnawati, Arlinwibowo, and Apino (2018). Character-building planning in the classroom is usually designed by teachers based on curriculum and then realized in the lesson plan for practice. Besides containing systematic delivery of the material, a lesson plan should also consider the character-building values in the process of knowledge transfer (Zurqoni, Retnawati, Apino, & Anazifa, 2018). To do so, teachers need to add and modify the indicators, learning materials, teaching activities, and assessments (Hidayati, Zaim, Rukun, & Darmansyah, 2014) to enable achieving goals at ease (Faiziyah & Fachrurrazy, 2013).

Some previous studies revealed the character-building values available in the lesson plans. For example, Ratih (2017) analyzed character-building values in the English lessons at SMP Negeri 1 Banjar. From the analysis of the lesson plan, character-building values were available in the pre-teaching activities to encourage religiosity and discipline, in the while-teaching activities to encourage hard work, curiosity, honesty, independence, creativity, and responsibility, and in the post-teaching activities to appreciate the achievement. Character-building values were also integrated in indicators, learning materials, and assessments in their lesson plans. Another study conducted by Faiziyah and Fachrurrazy (2013) found 12 character-building values in 6 lesson plans of the EFL teachers, and the most frequent character-building value was confidence, while the least frequent character-building values were being friendly or communicative, tolerant, and disciplined.

Although many researchers addressed character-building values in lesson plans, none of them investigated character-building values in the student teacher's lesson plans. Character building in teacher education programs is important for another reason, and student teachers need to be prepared for this responsibility (Munson, 2000). Teacher education programs should move away from such outdated teaching

and learning to be appropriate with the 21st century learning (Lovat, Clement, Dally, & Toomey, 2011). The role of the teachers in the 21st century moves from who is all-knowing to who is continually learning, reflective, and self-aware. Teachers are now expected to involve their students in critical thinking, thoughtful reflection, increased self-confidence, and responsibility (Mergler & Spooner-Lane, 2012). Teachers, no matter what their grade levels and disciplines are, and how long their experience is, need information and guidance on how to teach character building. Experts agree that the best way to train teachers in teaching character-building values is to train them before they ever get into the real classroom (Marshall J. , 2011).

Viewing its necessity, investigating character-building values integration in the lesson plans becomes useful for student teachers to be aware of developing more appropriate and desirable lesson plans. This study, thus, aimed to investigate character-building values in the student teacher's lesson plans.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used a qualitative method which is a flexible research design to use unstructured data, to point out the role of subjectivity in the research process, to analyze a number of natural cases in detail, and to use verbal rather than statistical forms. Qualitative research provides a detailed understanding of meanings, actions, phenomena, attitudes, and behaviors, and these are well served by naturalistic inquiry. Qualitative research obtains verbal, aural, observational, olfactory, and gustatory information from a range of sources including documents, film, audio, and pictures (Cohen, Manion, & Morisson, 2018). Document or content analysis was applied because it allows systematic procedures for the strict analysis, examination, verification, and replication of the written data. Content analysis can be undertaken with any written material from documents to interviews. Content analysis involves coding, categorizing (making meaningful categories into the units of analysis such as words, phrases, sentences, etc.), comparing (categorizing and making links between them), and drawing conclusions (Cohen, Manion, & Morisson, 2018).

The data of this study were sentences that represented character-building values in the lesson plan components, including objective, indicator, teaching activity (pre-teaching, while-teaching, and post-teaching), and assessment. The data source of this study was 5 lesson plans designed by 15 student teachers in the microteaching course of the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) of Universitas Negeri Jakarta. Furthermore, the researcher applied convenience sampling which is a sampling that is easily accessible to the researcher. The students in the researcher's institution were the main example of convenience sampling (Dornyei, 2007).

In collecting the data, the researcher took the following steps (Cohen, Manion, & Morisson 2018; Mayring, 2014):

1. Finding the lesson plans from the student teachers of the ELESP, then named LP 1, LP 2, LP 3, LP 4, and LP 5.
2. Constructing table of analysis that includes the indicators of character-building values and lesson plan components.
3. Reading and selecting the data in the lesson plan that contained character-building values.
4. Retyping or copying the data from the lesson plan into the table.
5. Classifying the data on the table of analysis for character-building values in lesson plan components.

There are four steps involving qualitative data analysis (Cohen, Manion, & Morisson 2018; Newby, 2010; Creswell, 2012; Gibbs, 2012; Marshall and Rossman, 2016):

1. Preparing and organizing the data
2. Analyzing the data: Investigating what character-building values are available in the student teacher's lesson plan components including objective, indicator, teaching activity (pre-teaching, while-teaching, post-teaching) and assessment in the table by using indicators of character-building values by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia as its framework.
3. Interpreting the data: Interpreting character-building values in the student teachers' lesson plan components.
4. Drawing conclusions based on the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

Data collection and analysis process revealed that 5 character-building values appeared in all 5 student teacher's lesson plans, which were being religious, hardworking, responsible, collaborative, and communicative. The most frequent character-building value was being communicative while the least frequent character-building value was being religious. Four (4) character-building values were revealed in LP1, which were being religious, hard work, collaborative, and communicative. Three (3) character-building values which were being responsible, collaborative, and communicative were available in LP2. LP3 incorporated 2 character-building values, they were being responsible and communicative. There were 4 character-building values available in LP4, which were being religious, responsible, collaborative, and communicative. Lastly, 3 character-building values which were being hardworking, collaborative, and communicative were found in LP5.

In terms of each character value, 2 lesson plans (LP1 and LP4) applied the value of being religious which were implemented in pre-teaching revealed in the sentences "*guru menyapa siswa*", "*guru bertegur sapa dengan siswa*", and the question "*How are you today?*". The value of hard work was revealed in 3 lesson plans (LP1, LP2, and LP5) indicated from the sentences "*siswa dapat menjawab pertanyaan dengan ketepatan 100%*", "*siswa dapat mengidentifikasi dengan tepat*", "*siswa dapat mengelompokkan dengan tepat*", and "*siswa dapat melengkapi teks percakapan tersebut dengan ketepatan 100%*". The sentences implied that the teachers expected the students to complete the task as well as possible, and this showed the effort of hard work.

Responsibility was revealed in LP2 and LP4 in the teaching activity (while-teaching) in the sentences such as "*siswa diberi waktu selama 5 menit untuk menyelesaikan tugas tersebut*", "*siswa diberi waktu selama 10 menit untuk menyelesaikan tugas tersebut*", "*guru memberi waktu selama 10 menit*", and "*siswa diminta melengkapi table serupa dengan merujuk pada label yang sebelumnya disediakan selama 10 menit*". The student teachers gave students time to complete their tasks, thus they should be responsible in completing them on time. The value of responsibility was also revealed in the sentence "*guru membagikan worksheet yang berisi label makanan dan label minuman yang harus diisi oleh peserta didik secara individual*". The words "*secara individual*" implied that the students should be responsible to complete their own task individually and confidently, not relying on others. The students could ask their friends or their teachers, but they are expected to do their work independently.

Collaboration value was revealed in LP1, LP2, LP4, and LP5, specifically incorporated in the indicator and while-teaching activities (while-teaching) in LP 1, and in teaching activity (while-teaching) in LP2, LP4, and LP5. The value of collaboration were revealed in such sentences as "*diberikan situasi dalam sebuah kelompok terdiri dari 4 orang, guru akan membagi kelas dalam beberapa kelompok, siswa dengan nomor yang sama berarti termasuk dalam satu kelompok, latihan dikerjakan dalam bentuk diskusi berpasangan, and guru meminta siswa secara berpasangan untuk membuat satu buah dialog sederhana*". These sentences show the collaboration values because the student teachers provided opportunity for the student to complete the task in pair or group discussion.

The value of communication could be found in all lesson plans, integrated in different lesson plan components. The communication values were available in the teaching activity (pre-teaching, while-teaching, and post-teaching) and assessment in LP1. In LP2, the values of communication were revealed in the teaching activities (pre-teaching, while-teaching, and post-teaching). LP3 integrated the values of communication in the teaching activity (pre-teaching and while-teaching) and assessment. In LP4, the communication values appeared in the objective, indicator, teaching activity (pre-teaching and post-teaching), and assessment. Lastly, LP5 included the values of communication in the teaching activities (pre-teaching and post-teaching). The following sentences showed the values: "*guru bertanya kepada siswa, guru memberi tahu siswa, guru memberi contoh, guru memberi kesimpulan, guru menjelaskan, guru membahas kembali, and guru memberi informasi*", all of which were when the student teachers gave information to the students. The communication values were also revealed from such sentences as "*pada akhir pembelajaran peserta didik dapat menjelaskan setiap bagian dalam label tersebut dengan kalimat yang sesuai dengan konteks and peserta didik dapat memberikan informasi secara tertulis komponen-komponen pada label*".

produk minuman, makanan, dan obat, when the student teachers wanted the students to give information. Furthermore, in the assessment, the student teachers required the students to give their opinion on the questions given by the teachers.

The communication values became the most frequent character-building values in student teacher's lesson plans with frequency of 54 times in total or 76%, appearing in objective, indicator, teaching activity (pre-teaching, while-teaching, post-teaching), and assessment. The second highest occurrence was responsibility in the teaching activity (while-teaching) with the total percentage of 8% or 6 times. The collaboration values were revealed 5 times in the indicator and teaching activity (while-teaching) with a total percentage of 7%. Hard work was revealed 4 times in the indicator with a total percentage of 6%. Being religious became the least frequent character-building values in the student teacher's lesson plans with a total percentage of 3% or 2 times, appearing in the teaching activity (pre-teaching). It was also found that character-building values were most frequently integrated in the teaching activity (pre-teaching) with a total occurrence of 20 times. On the other hand, the values of tolerance, love of homeland, the spirit of nationality, environmental care, curiosity, friendliness, firmness, honesty, and discipline were not available in the student teacher's lesson plans.

B. Discussion

Through the analysis, five character-building values were revealed in five student teacher's lesson plans: they were being religious (LP1 and LP4), hardworking (LP1 and LP5), responsible (LP2, LP3, and LP4), collaborative (LP1, LP2, LP4, and LP5), and communicative (LP1, LP2, LP3, LP4, and LP5).

First, the values of being religious were revealed in such sentences as *guru menyapa siswa* and *guru bertegur sapa dengan siswa*, which showed that the student teachers greeted their students before they started the class and the student teachers also asked the students' condition by saying 'How are you today?'. In the previous study by Putri (2013), the values of being religious were also found in the greeting and praying before and after the class and asking the students about their condition.

Second, the values of hard work were implied in such sentences as *siswa dapat menjawab pertanyaan dengan ketepatan 100%*, *siswa dapat mengidentifikasi dengan tepat*, *siswa dapat mengelompokkan dengan tepat*, and *siswa dapat melengkapi teks percakapan tersebut dengan ketepatan 100%*. It meant that the student teachers expected the students to show their efforts to complete the tasks the best they could, proving that they were hardworking. The previous study by Wardani, Tasnim, and Eko (2019) revealed that the values of hard work were integrated in the speaking script about a father who asked his son to study for the examination and he also suggested his son to study hard if he wanted to pass the examination. This showed hard work of a student.

Third, responsibility values could be observed in such sentences as *siswa diberi waktu selama 5 menit untuk menyelesaikan tugas tersebut*, *siswa diberi waktu selama 10 menit untuk menyelesaikan tugas tersebut*, *guru memberi waktu selama 10 menit*, and *siswa diminta melengkapi table serupa dengan merujuk pada label yang sebelumnya disediakan selama 10 menit*. The student teachers gave students time to complete their task, thus the students should be responsible to complete their task on time. This values were also revealed in the sentence *guru membagikan worksheet yang berisi label makanan dan label minuman yang harus diisi oleh peserta didik secara individual*. This trained the students to become more responsible, confident, and independent. A previous study by Wardani, Tasnim, and Eko (2019) revealed that the same values appeared in the speaking script in the English textbook for the twelfth grade in which two students had a discussion to complete their report of their visit to Lake Toba on time, requiring their responsibility to complete the task on their own on time. The values of responsibility were also revealed in the English teaching and learning process in which the teacher stated directly that the students should not depend on others in doing the task (Putri, 2013).

Fourth, the values of collaboration were clearly stated in the sentences *diberikan situasi dalam sebuah kelompok terdiri dari 4 orang*, *guru akan membagi kelas dalam beberapa kelompok*, *siswa dengan nomor yang sama berarti termasuk dalam satu kelompok*, *latihan dikerjakan dalam bentuk diskusi berpasangan*, and *guru meminta siswa secara berpasangan untuk membuat satu buah dialog sederhana*. These sentences highlighted the opportunity for the student to complete the task in pair or group discussion. Being collaborative meant that the students were able to work together to complete a task, find solution of a

problem, and/or create a product. This ability is important in English language learning because it encouraged even the average students to participate actively in the tasks (Rao, 2019). Zurqoni, et al (2018) also stated problem-based learning models such as collaborative learning was used by teachers as alternatives to teach character building, this is to enhance the students' active participation in learning.

Last, such sentences as *guru bertanya kepada siswa*, *guru memberi tahu siswa*, *guru memberi contoh*, *guru memberi kesimpulan*, *guru menjelaskan*, *guru membahas kembali*, and *guru memberi informasi* showed communication values because there was an exchange of information between the student teachers and their students. Encouraging students to become communicative meant that the teachers created activities that facilitate real communication between teachers and students or between one student and another student to engage them with the language in use (Farid, 2017). This value was also beneficial for the teachers not only for effective communication as teachers in the classroom but also for effective promotion to student's learning (Ling, Chong, & Ellis, 2014). The values of communication were also implied in the sentences *pada akhir pembelajaran peserta didik dapat menjelaskan setiap bagian dalam label tersebut dengan kalimat yang sesuai dengan konteks* and *peserta didik dapat memberikan informasi secara tertulis komponen-komponen pada label produk minuman, makanan, dan obat*. Furthermore, it was also identified in the assessment in which the student teachers wanted the students to give their opinion on the questions given by the teacher. These proofs showed that communication could focus on the students who would produce more sentences. In the previous study by Putri (2013), the values of communication were revealed in activities that required students to be communicative or at least to participate in using English, for example when the teachers asked the students to answer some questions about the learning materials.

Based on the analysis, the values of communication became the most frequent character-building values in the student teacher's lesson plans occurred 54 times in objective, indicator, teaching activity (pre-teaching, while-teaching, post-teaching), and assessment, with a total percentage of 76%. It is so because communication is the key in foreign language teaching, which is an efficient way of teaching language not only for English, but also for other languages (Seker & Aydin, 2011).

The least frequent character-building values were religiosity occurred 2 times in teaching activity (pre-teaching) with a total percentage of 3%. This result was in line with that of Permana, Inderawati, and Vianty's (2018) and Aslamiyah's (2012), revealing that being religious was the least frequent character-building values in the textbooks. Moreover, no mentions are available related to tolerance towards different religious beliefs and practices, and living in peace with them, which are stated by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Permana, Inderawati, & Vianty, 2018). Therefore, student teachers should include the values of being religious since people in Indonesia live in diversity, for example doing habitual activities such as greeting and praying before starting and ending the class, reminding the students to participate in religious activities, reminding the students to respect their friends of different religious beliefs, and working together despite the different religious beliefs.

There are character-building values that are not found in student teacher's lesson plans such as tolerance, love of homeland, spirit of nationality, environmental care, curiosity, friendliness, firmness, honesty, and discipline. In fact, as discussed previously, students need to embrace tolerance and respect towards different religious beliefs, ethnicities, races, genders, cultures, norms, and even opinions. Other values are also essential to enable them to live harmoniously in the society and environment.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

It can be concluded that the character-building values available in the five student teacher's lesson plans encouraged the students to become religious, hardworking, responsible, collaborative, and communicative. The most frequent character-building values were being communicative while the least frequent were being religious. Furthermore, it was also found that character-building values were most frequently found in the teaching activity (pre-teaching), which was similar to the study by Putri (2013), stating that teaching activity was one of the lesson plan components with the greatest number of inclusions of character-building values. To add, the values of tolerance, love of homeland, the spirit of nationality, environmental care, curiosity, friendliness, firmness, honesty, and discipline could not be found in the student teacher's lesson plans. Thus, more attention should be paid on those values when preparing a lesson plan.

Based on the conclusions, the researcher proposes the following suggestions:

1. Because this research is limited only on the lesson plans made by student teachers of the English Language Education Study Program, future researchers are suggested to investigate the character-building values in the lesson plans of student teachers with different backgrounds.
2. Future researchers are encouraged to investigate character-building values in other educational levels such as primary and secondary education.
3. To compare the findings of this research, future researchers are also suggested to investigate character-building values in other academic documents such as curriculum, syllabus, learning materials, and textbooks.

REFERENCES

- Agboola, A., & Tsai, K. C. (2012). Bring Character Education into Classroom. *European Journal of Education Research*, 163-170.
- Benninga, J., Sparks, R. K., Salomon, D., Battistich, V. A., Delucchi, K. L., Sandoval, R., et al. (2001). Effects of Two Contrasting School Task and Incentive Structures on Children's Social Development. *The Elementary School Journal*, 149-166.
- Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2005). *What Works in Character Education: A Research-Driven Guide for Education*. Washington DC: Character Education Partnership.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morisson, K. (2018). *Research Method in Education Eighth Edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design Qualitative Quantitative, Mixed Methods Approaches (Fourth Edition)*. United State of America: SAGE Publications.
- Dodds, D. M. (2016). The Effects of Character Education on Social-Emotional Behavioral. *Master of Arts in Education Action Research Paper*.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Faiziyah, N., & Fachrurazy. (2013). The Implementation of Character-building in English Subject at Junior High School 3 Malang.
- Farid, A. (2017). Communicative Language Teaching: Implications for the Communicative Classroom. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra, IV(1)*, 47-56.
- Gibbs, G. R. (2012). Software and Qualitative Data Analysis. In A. J, R. Waring, C. R., & H. L.V (Eds.), *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education* (p. 251). London: Sage.
- Hidayati, A., Zaim, M., Rukun, K., & Darmansyah. (2014). The Development of Character Education Curriculum for Elementary Students in West Sumatera. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(6).
- Kemendikbud. (2017). *Konsep dan Pedoman Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter*. Jakarta: Pusat Analisis dan Sinkronisasi Kebijakan Sekretariat Jenderal Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Kurniasih, H., Utari, V. Y., & Akhmadi. (2018). Character Education Policy and Its Implications for Learning in Indonesia's Education System. *Research on Improving Systems of Education*.
- Lee, & Chi-Ming. (2009). The Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Character-Based School Culture Project in Taiwan. *Journal of Moral Education*, 38(2), 165-184.
- Lickona, T., Schaps, E., & Lewis, C. (1996). *Eleven Principles of Effective Character Education*. Washington DC: Character Education Partnership.
- Ling, L. E., Chong, S., & Ellis, M. (2014, September). Teachers' English Communication Skills: Using IELTS to Measure Competence of Graduating Teachers from a Singaporean Teacher Education Programme. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(10).
- Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2011). Values Pedagogy and Teacher Education: Re-Conceiving the Foundations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 31-44.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing Qualitative Research Sixth Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, J. (2011). Character Education in Preservice Education: One Institution's Response. *Journal of College and Character*.

- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative Content Analysis Theoretical Foundation, Basic Procedures, and Software Solution*. Klagenfurt, Austria.
- Mergler, A. G., & Spooner-Lane, R. (2012). What Pre-Service Teachers need to know to be Effective at Values-based Education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(8).
- Munson, B. R. (2000). *Character Education: The Missing Ingredient of Pre-Service Teacher Education Programs*. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).
- Newby, P. (2010). *Research Methods for Education*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Nova, M. (2017). Character Education in Indonesian EFL Classroom: Implementation and Obstacles. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter, Tahun VII, Nomor 2*.
- Permana, D. R., Inderawati, R., & Vianty, M. (2018). Portraying Character Education in Junior High School Textbooks of the 2013 Curriculum. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 245-258.
- Permendikbud. (2017). *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 87 Tahun 2017 Tentang Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter*. Jakarta.
- Putri, W. S. (2013). The Character Values Found in the English Teaching and Learning Process for the 5th Grade Students in SD N Krapyak Wetan Bantul for the Academic Year of 2012/2013. *Thesis*.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). Collaborative Learning in English Language Learning Environment. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)*, 7(1), 330-339.
- Ratih, I. A. (2017). The Analysis of Classroom Character Education in English Lessons Based on the 2013 Curriculum. *Journal of Psychology and Instruction*, 1(2), 97-105.
- Ratnasari, W. (2018). Character-building in Education: A Proposed Theory for STAI'S Economic Syari'ah Program. *Jurnal Al-Muqayyad STAI AU Tembilahan*, 25-39.
- Seker, E., & Aydin, I. (2011). Communicative Approach as an English Language Teaching Method: Van Ataturk Anatolian High School Sample. *Thesis*, 39-49.
- Silvia, A. (2012). A Closer Look at Character Education in Indonesia: What Every Educator Should Know. *Academia Journal*.
- Wardani, E. A., Tasnim, Z., & Eko, W. (2019). Analysis of Character Education Values in the English Textbook for the Twelfth Grade Senior High School Students: Bahasa Inggris SMA/SMK. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*.
- Zurqoni, Retnawati, H., Apino, E., & Anazifa, R. D. (2018). Impact of Character Education Implementation: A Goal-free Evaluation. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 881-899.