RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Teachers' and Student Teachers' Perception and Self-Efficacy on Character Education

Sukidin[1], Linda Fajarwati[2], David Imamyartha[3*], Fuad Hasan[4], Erfan Yudianto[5], Wiwin Hartanto[6], Senny W. D. Saputri[7]

[1-7]Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Jember, Jl. Kalimantan 37, Jember, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The ministry of education of Indonesia has issued several provisos concerning the virtues integral to school curricula, framed as character education. Teachers and, assumedly, student teachers, shoulder fundamental roles in embracing these values into school intra- and extra- curricular designs. These designs encompass primarily lesson plans and instructional materials. Notwithstanding, the current discussions have highlighted gapping void between the aspirations toward which teachers and students are expected to march and the education by which they prepare their future character education. The present study delves into teachers and student teachers' perceptions and self-efficacy on character education. It employs descriptive quantitative design to portray the general voices among teachers and student teachers with regard to character education. The research data are collected through online survey distributed to 134 participants of diverse educational as well as professional profiles. The findings highlight the harmony among participants with regard to the urgency of embracing character education, yet ambivalence prevails when dealing with the efficacy of shouldering the task. Implications on current character education and suggestions future character education are proposed. In Indonesian setting, despite the stirrings within teacher community to give character education higher prominence, most of the participants are still doubtful about how much they can accrue positive changes in students' characters.

 Keywords: Character education, curriculum, teachers, student teachers, self-efficacy, virtues.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with such influential philosophers as Dewey, Plato, Kant, and Aristotle, character education plays pivotal role in society (Heslep, 1995). It has been widely known that educators voice the substantial values associated with character education across educational levels (McClellan, 1992). Character education is generally defined as the initiative to build in students the commitment as well as the understanding to behaving in coherence with the focal ethical virtues. Previous studies have acknowledged the prominence of character education, particularly because it substantiates the enterprise aimed at addressing behavioural issues at schools and prevent students from embracing bad morale fiber demonstrated by their friends (Wilhelm and Firmin, 2008).

Prior to the emergence of 2013 curriculum in Indonesia, school-based curriculum characterized most educational initiatives at schools. The shift has brought about the hope for surmounting national conflicts, moral decline particularly among young generations, and omnipresent corruptions. Curricular amendment was at that time viewed as the right avenue to emerge social change. In line with the other countries in Asia, the education system in Indonesia has highlighted the idea of communitarianism characterized by Pancasila ideology into its framework (Huat, 1993). Pancasila, to date, has become integral element at schools with two specific approaches, by establishing policy regarding character education and enacting moral education. The former is related to the nationally enforced values and moralities embraced within school subjects, while the latter is actualized in the inclusion of Pancasila and Citizenship subject (PPKN).

In coherence with these two approaches, teachers play substantial roles in character education as they shoulder the objective of not only integrating specific virtues into both intra and extracurricular areas, but also including a specific set of values into their instructional praxis. These values are issued and enforced by the Ministry of Education and Culture, with the core features derived from Pancasila (Five Principles), Indonesian cultures, religions, and the objectives of Indonesian education (Kemendiknas, 2011). These virtues are pertinent to "nationalism", "tolerance", "love to read", "honesty", "peace maker", "hard working", "being friendly", "religiosity", "discipline", "curiosity", "creative", "appreciative", "environment awareness", "social awareness" "independence", "democracy", "patriotism", and "responsibility". Albeit the issuance of diverse values, many schools are endowed with the freedom to determine which values are deemed relevant

to their very teaching context (Kemendiknas, 2011, p.8). The instruction of these virtues are justified under the regulation of separate ministries, Ministry of Religious Affairs and Ministry of Education and Culture. The former copes with the religious schools (madrasah and schools of certain religions), and the latter manages secular schools.

Striving at the forefront of both ministries, teachers may play positive role model in order to support the reflection upon moral issues in respective curricular framework, create moral classroom climate, and maintain the opportunities for students to practice fine moral fiber (DeRoche and Williamns, 1998; Lickona, 1991; Ryan and Bohlin, 1999). The other issue regarding character education is the dearth of consent with regard to the curriculum and the instructional frameworks required to meet the task. Findings from diverse contexts have shown that teacher education is derailed from the very objective of moral education (Jones, Ryan, and Bohlin, 1998; and Williams and Schaps, 1999). This portrait shows the discrepancy between teachers' responsibility as character educators and the educational experiences they have had. Since 1990s, albeit the proposals for character education, the goal has not achieved its traction in teacher education curriculum. One exception is the schools claiming character education as the fundamental goal. Generally these schools are bound to religious affiliations, manifest in their tailored program aimed at characters, such as admission policies, honor codes, ceremonies, and community services (Milson and Mehlig, 2002).

This study is projected to close the gapping void in the studies concerning teacher and student teachers in the area of character education in Asian context. The authors hold the view that character education, as a result from the contrasting aspirations and support to teachers, has been in ambivalence among character educators. This is manifest in the current discussion which is dominated by studies in contexts beyond Asia, be it empirical (e.g. Wilhelm and Firmin, 2008; Kirschenbaum et al, 1977, Wagner and Ruch, 2015; Karani et al, 2021) or theoretical (e.g. Kristjánsson, 2016, and Bates, 2019 for example) in American and European countries. Surveying both terrains of teachers and student teachers, this study investigates their perceptions and self-efficacy on character education. This objective is atomized into the following research questions:

a. What are the general perceptions of teachers on character education? and what are the general perceptions of student teachers on character education?

b. What do teachers and student teachers view as their professional responsibilities in the realm of character education?

c. What are the profiles of personal and general teaching efficacy of teachers and student teachers on character education?

Each of the research questions involves pertinent analysis on possible differences between occupations and genders. In this vein, reported differences are then elaborated and documented accordingly in the findings and discussion session.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Character Strengths and Character Education

Character strengths and character education play vital roles in both adolescents and children. Character strengths substantially relate to positive outcomes. They are also pertinent to the inner force of good life, such as virtue, which is actualized by external ones, including justice, education, health, and safety. The conjunction between the two has been widely confirmed to lead to individual personal well-being across cultures (Wagner and Ruch, 2015).

The nexus between individual properties and academic achievement have also been widely investigated. Poropat (2014) has unearthed that conscientiousness manifests the most bearing factor, while the links between extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, and openness with school achievement have been rather shaky. The connections are separated from intelligence (Poropat, 2009) and it is affirmed that individual traits are equally crucial in predicting academic attainment, as is the case of intelligence, when the properties are self-assessed and, more importantly, have been found discovered to be more significant predictors when rated by others (Poropat, 2014). Previous works which employ meta-analysis have discovered the connection between academic achievement and individual traits across diverse settings, which include university education (Poropat, 2009), primary education (Poropat, 2014), and post-secondary education (McAbee and Oswald, 2013). The investigation at primary education has acknowledged that the conscientiousness and openness are proven to be the most influential factors to academic achievement.

The other bearing factor to character strengths is their values on positive classroom atmosphere. Both self- and teacher-rated character strengths are discovered to showcase moderate convergence (Park and Peterson, 2006). Nevertheless, it seems that particular character strengths are more dominant in class than are the others. One particular exemplification is phasic strengths, which is commonly only manifest when required, such as bravery. That makes it more arduous to assess than tonic strengths which are evident in most contexts, such as Kindness (Peterson and Seligman, 2004). Albeit diverse frequency of emergence, character strengths are shown through overt behavioral traits, which conclude that they lead positive behaviors in class.

A study by Wagner and Ruch (2015) encompasses numerous literatures regarding character strengths noticeable

in classroom setting, which relates to social intelligence, love of learning, temperance strengths, and perseverance. Their work highlights the role of positive classroom behavior which connects character strengths and school achievement. These character strengths pose certain impacts on students' behaviors in class, which is actualized in their conflict mediation, self-regulation, learning autonomy and collaboration. Weber and Ruch (2012) delve into the relationship between positive behavior and character strengths by deploying Classroom Behavior Rating Scale (CBRS) and have found out that 25% of variance in positive behavior rated by teacher is accounted for by 24 character strengths. Their study also underscores the vital correlations between positive behavior and the aggregate of prudence, love of learning, and perseverance. Investigating how character strengths affect adults and children will be valuable to teachers in extracting particular character strengths and embracing them in their regular instructional praxis. This is even more so with burgeoning studies which highlight the advantage of negative emotionality in relation to character education.

Coherent with the multidimensional natures of character, character education has been addressed through numerous strategies. The current discussion has highlighted the direct explicit strategies and implicit strategies. Narvaez and Lapsley (2008) point out the maximalist and minimalist approach to character education. The maximalist approach views the mastery of specific tool kits bound to carrying out instruction toward character education lied at the core of curricular objective. To contrast, the minimalist approach emphasizes on making overt the objectives of character education. This view discounts the need for specific instructional intervention toward character education inasmuch as fine character stems from satisfactory learning experience.

In the same vein, Lickona (1999) highlights one attempt known as comprehensive approach to character education, related to emotional, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions. The approach comprises of twelve supportive strategies, divided into nine strategies at classroom level and three strategies at school level. These strategies have direct and explicit properties (e.g. explaining and studying relevant virtues) and indirect implicit features (e.g. showing fine examples and establishing fine moral environment allowing students to gain direct experience to good characters. The comprehensive approach attends to both adults and children's roles within character education. In this case, adults are seen to play vital roles in their moral authority and leadership. In the same wavelength, children are required to be responsible for developing their own good characters. Subsequently it encourages the initiation to transmitting fine virtues, while concomitantly preparing the students with the self-regulation to apply these virtues in order to satisfy future moral challenges.

The Roles of Character Educators

Albeit varied concepts of character education, the main features of such educational framework hold the same core. Lickona (1996) foregrounds the general principles to which character education is geared as the following:

1. Character education brings into focus ethical values as the core of character education.
2. It is necessary to establish comprehensive definition of "character", which involves affective, behavioral, and cognitive traits of students.
3. Effective character education requires intentional, comprehensive, and proactive framework to grow character values across different life stages at schools.
4. School has to play role as caring community.
5. Effective character education is evident in challenging yet meaningful curriculum which appreciates and propels students' success.
6. Character education is aimed at empowering students intrinsic motivation.
7. School staffs need to shoulder the role as learning and moral community in which everybody is deemed responsible for character education and strives to maintain the same core virtues paving students' learning.
8. Character education values moral leadership from both students and teachers.
9. Schools need to invite parents and community members to collaborate in character education.
10. The evaluation of character education scrutinizes the character of school, staffs, and the extent to which students demonstrate the virtues.

The abovementioned principles highlight teachers' fundamental demand and responsibility and, by implication, student teachers and teacher education institutions. Character education, which calls for encompassing concept of humanistic education not only within but also beyond school, requires all parties to build the understanding of, willingness in, and the self-regulation in educating and living core ethical values prevail in different phases in character education at school. Recent studies have highlighted that few teachers are sufficiently prepared to shoulder the task, albeit the general consent upon the objective of education geared to making students better human beings as individual and better community member (Jones, Ryan, and Bohlin, 1999).

In addition to the dearth of curricular consensus, teachers have to be motivated for reaching the goals of character education. Teachers' persistence and motivation have been found to be linked to the concept of teacher efficacy. Gibson and Dembo (1984) explain that teachers with high amount of efficacy tend to show higher intensity in their pedagogical praxis and maintain this praxis during hard times. Empirics have demonstrated that teacher efficacy in character education

is rather low in consideration of the widely researched psychological construct of teaching efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy, 1998). To that end, precise understanding on which area of character education contributes to teacher efficacy is essential in developing character education for teacher (Mathison, 1999).

To that goal, teacher education plays pivotal role since it decide the extent to which teachers and student teachers are prepared in addressing the challenges in character education. It is no doubt that the question of which virtues to teach and how the teacher education should best prepare teachers and student teachers to carry the responsibility remain an enigma, despite the fact that education is character-laden in itself (Narvaez and Lapslep, 2008).

Teaching Efficacy on Character Education

The concept of teacher efficacy is fairly varied in that it is germane to, yet not limited to, personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). In the same vein, Milson (2002) highlights that internal factor (i.e. teacher's ability) and external factor pose driving factors to teacher efficacy. The idea of personal teaching efficacy, in accordance with Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy concept, denotes teacher's belief about the ability as teacher. The other construct, which is general teaching efficacy, is grounded on the definition of outcome expectancy (Bandura, 1977), refers to individual belief with regard to the extent to which the environment is put under control. In other words, it describes the degree to which students can be engaged in learning despite such factors as IQ, family background, and school conditions (Gibson and Dembo, 1984, p.570). Therefore, teacher efficacy belief denotes the aggregate of perceptions of individual influence and perceptions of how external factors affect classroom praxis. These facets of efficacy are relevant for understanding teacher's approach to character education. Teacher with high motivation and persistence on character education is more likely to hold firm belief in his or her own ability to develop students' character and the ability of teachers to tackle negative influences outside the class.

The concepts of general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy have taken their traction in current discussion. Guskey and Passaro (1994) delved into the impact of internal and external factors toward teacher efficacy scale (TES) designed by Gibson and Dembo (1984) and adapted by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990). The internal items use the first-person reference and were aimed at measuring PTE, while the external items applied the third-person reference "teachers" and were developed to gauge GTE. These researchers implied that, different to previous works, they revealed no strong evidence to justify the distinction between the two facets of efficacy. Furthermore, their study demonstrated that the difference more related to internal versus external factors.

In the same vein, Bandura (1997) argued that teacher efficacy is pertinent to pedagogic task and subject matter. A teacher, for instance, may feel efficacious upon teaching grammar but not when required to shoulder the task of character education. Attending to this line of reasoning, Deemer and Minke (1999) scrutinized the TES referred as global instrument which decontextualizes efficacy measure and fall short in the correlation to specific teaching contexts. They further point out that instruments which assess teachers' perceptions separately in particular domains of teaching may tap upon the variations in efficacy judgment and raise the explanatory power of teacher efficacy. Following this rationale, several versions of TES have been developed with respect to specific contexts, such as special education (Coladarci and Breton, 1997) and science teaching (Riggs and Enochs, 1990). This study aims at applying context-specific TES in the light of measuring teachers and students' teachers self-efficacy toward character education.

METHOD

Context & Participants

This study recruited participants from different backgrounds, including student teachers and teachers in service. They were recruited through random sampling, which resulted in diverse backgrounds with regard to ages, genders, subject matter, affiliation, and years of teaching experience. That allows for researchers to generate fresh lines of understanding into array of believes and efficacy of in-service teachers and future

Table 1: Demographic Data of Research Participants

Variables		%	N
Sex	Male	20.9	28
	Female	79.1	106
Ages	<20	67.5	66
	21-25	27.8	38
	26-50	24.3	30
Occupation	Student teachers	58.2	78
	In-service Teachers	41.8	56
Teaching experience	0 year	65.7	88
	1-5 years	17.17	23
	6-10 years	5.97	8
	11-30 years	11.20	15
Place of Work (teachers only, N=56)	Urban area	51.78	29
	Sub-urban area	48.22	27
Education Levels (teachers only, N=56)	Kindergarten	12.5	7
	Elementary school	25	14
	Junior high school	33.92	19
	Senior high school	28.57	16

teachers. These participants were contacted via email and then they were requested to fill in questionnaire administered through Google Form. The study amassed responses from 134 participants. Below is the respondents' demographic.

Data Collection and Analysis

The study adopted two main instruments for the data collection. The survey items measuring teachers' perspectives regarding character education designed by Mathison (1999) and Milson and Mehlig's (2002) instrument for teachers' self-efficacy for character education were translated into Bahasa Indonesia. This aimed at ascertaining accurate understanding and response to the study queries. The translated instruments were trialed to 40 student-teachers, resulting in α 0.791. The study employed descriptive statistics and ANOVA for data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The sub-sections below point out the research findings regarding three questions aforementioned. The responses are grouped in relation to each query. The analysis also delves into any possible significant differences between occupations and genders are reported accordingly. The data are presented with regard to the responses including SD (strong disagreement), D (disagreement), U (uncertainty), A (agreement), and SA (strong agreement).

RQ 1 What are the general perceptions of teachers on character education? and what are the general perceptions of student teachers on character education?

The findings demonstrate that student teachers and teachers confirm the essential of character education since most of them strongly agree with the value of character education (83.1%). What is more, 73.1% participants acknowledge that the primary context of character education reside in homes. Teachers and student teachers, across distinctive education levels, begin to vary with regard to where character education matters more.

Half of the participants, 26.1% and 24.6% for both strong agreement and agreement respectively are in coherence with the notion that elementary school plays more pivotal part in character education than do higher-level educations. Nevertheless, it is surprising to note that 26.9% are uncertain whether or not character education plays more essential role at lower education levels.

Albeit the recent pressure on public schools, the majority acknowledge that character education needs to be put at main priority. This is accentuated by the fact that 43.3% report disagreement and another 31.3% voicing disagreement with respect to character education being a peripheral matter. Further positive views are expressed by 4.5% participants reporting agreement and 9% reporting strong agreement.

As the analysis taps upon teaching character education, the study reveals that half of the participants acknowledge disagreement. In reality, both student teachers and teachers vary in large part in the very area. The participants are not yet firm with regard to how character education needs to be taught at its best, as demonstrated by most participants reporting uncertainty at 28.4%.

Similar voices are also evident in the importance of character education from peers' outlooks. Majority of participants are uncertain of its importance, 31.3%. By contrast, to small extent, 21.6% agreement coupled with 14.9% strong agreement are indicators of the views that character education receives little interest among teachers and student teachers.

Between student teachers and teachers, marked difference is found in question #17 and #18. In the former, teachers (M=2.64, SD=1.24) perceive that embracing character education in their day-to-day instruction is essential, rather than seeing it as distinctive part apart from their teaching duty. This explains that every teaching needs to breach into the mere transfer of knowledge, skills, and competence. Within Indonesian context, as required by the national curriculum, character education plays integral part to syllabus and lesson design, instruction, and evaluation. Simply put, student teachers (M=3.21, SD=1.23), by implication, need to prepare themselves to develop their instruction to meet future challenges in character education.

Table 2: General Perceptions on Character Education

Survey item	Responses (%)				
	SD	D	U	A	SA
Character education needs to be part of public school education.	0.70	1.50	3.00	13.40	81.30
The main responsibility for character education resides in parents and/or relatives.	_	2.20	9.00	15.70	73.10
Character education is more important in elementary school than in junior and senior high schools.	6.70	15.70	26.90	24.60	26.10
With all the pressures in public schools, I don't think character education as a priority.	43.30	31.30	11.90	4.50	9.00
*) Character education is a separate part from teaching duty that is mostly taught by itself	12.70	26.10	28.40	16.40	16.40
*) Character education is of little interest to majority of teachers	12.70	19.40	31.30	21.60	14.90

*) significant difference (p<0.05) detected.

With regard to question #18, it is surprising to note that student teachers (M=3.32, SD=1.17) opine that most teachers do not pay serious attention to character education. In large part, this explains how the students are treated and taught during their education, ranging from the elementary education to university education. This finding is starkly different from teachers' perceptions (M=2.71, SD=1.23), who voice disagreement with the statement. Even though teachers voice substantial attention to character education, it seems that the education has not yet taken into full consideration in their teaching praxis. From student teachers' viewpoints, representing their experience from elementary to tertiary education, their previous teachers assumedly had yet to demonstrate the essentials of character education throughout their praxis.

RQ 2 What do teachers and student teachers see as their professional responsibilities in the realm of character education?

It seems that character education raise internal ambivalence to both student teachers and teachers inasmuch as more than half of the participants, 35.1%, demonstrate the agreement to talk about issues related to what is right or wrong in their respective class. In addition, 16.4% participants report strong agreement toward embracing subjects on moral values in their class. Significant number of the participants, 37.3%, are uncertain whether including topics of moral values in their instruction is normal routine. Small number of subjects, 8.2%, are reluctant to foreground the topics regarding moral values in their classroom.

The previous findings are also coherent with the other data showing that when participants are asked about their feeling toward being contradictive generally accepted moral principles. More than half of the subjects, 54.4%, show strong disagreement with the notion of going against generally accepted moral values. In addition, 18.7%% report disagreement on the same regard. On the whole, small percentages of participants feel comfortable in highlighting the ideas that may violate these moral values, as evinced by 5.2% strong agreement and 6.7% agreement.

The willingness to introduce topics related to character education is in ambivalence to the teachers and student teachers' belief on the roles teachers shoulder in character education. 56% subjects demonstrate strong agreement on the idea that teachers play crucial roles in character education. This finding is accentuated by 29.1% reporting agreement. Small number of participants, 13.4%, are uncertain with regard to teachers' roles in embracing character education.

Coherent with most of the participants who voice agreement on teachers' important roles in character education, the other data show that 32.1% participants agree that it is not only the sole job of teachers to shoulder character education. What is more, 26.99% participants opt for strong agreement on the idea that teachers are irresponsible for character education. Approximately quarter of participants, 27.6%, are doubtful as to who are actually deemed responsible for character education.

With regard to the reluctance in embracing character education, the findings also underscore marked difference between two groups. Student teachers voice higher unwillingness than teachers. These groups demonstrate disagreement regarding the idea of character education deemed incoherent with teachers' responsibility. Having been involved in years of teaching praxis coupled with the challenges in character education, teachers (M=2.01, SD=0.98), acknowledge the idea of character education being integral part of their teaching duty. By contrast, student teachers (M=2.50, SD=1.11), albeit indifferent attitude, show lower rate of disagreement, implying that stronger unwillingness to take charge of character education. The dearth of willingness appears to accentuate the paucity of training and conversation regarding the character education in the current teacher education. These students, being future teacher candidates, need to scaffold their competence, build strong understanding, and exercise their skills pertinent to character education. This portray of initial teacher education will direct to what extent student teachers are open to conducting character education and how well they are likely to accomplish the task. Simply put, the students have insufficient control over that responsibility.

Table 3. Views on Professional Responsibility in Character Education

Survey item	Responses (%)				
	SD	D	U	A	SA
In my classroom, discussion about what is right and wrong is a normal routine in instruction.	3.00	8.20	37.30	35.10	16.40
I am comfortable speaking up when actions and/or words in my classrooms violate generally accepted moral values.	54.50	18.70	14.90	6.70	5.20
I believe teachers shoulder an important role in the character education for young people.	_	1.50	13.40	29.10	56.00
*) I don't feel it is my place as a teacher to discuss issues of right and wrong with my students.	26.99	32.10	27.60	9.70	3.70

*) significant difference (p<0.05) detected.

Previous works have highlighted that teacher education program has been too profoundly oriented to the instruction of subject matter, which is not relevant any longer to the existing Indonesian curriculum. The findings have resonated with these previous studies, by implication.

RQ 3 What are the profiles of personal and general teaching efficacy of teachers and student teachers on character education?

The current discussion on character education highlights teachers as vital role in developing moral fibers in youth. The present study suggests that teachers and student teachers believe they are able to address the task. The participants are confident that they can play role as key model and discuss the issues of what is right and wrong in their class. They also mention that they are pedagogically prepared to use instructional strategies for positive changes on students. The same thing also applies to their belief in accruing such positive characters as responsibility, courtesy, respect, and compassion.

The data demonstrate that both teachers and student teachers have strong efficacy in their competence in shouldering the role in character education. The participants clearly confirm that they agree with the idea of discussing issues related to what is right or wrong in their class, as shown by 38.8% participants voicing agreement. This is corroborated by 41.00% subjects indicating strong agreement.

The willingness and comfort of bringing into focus such issues are also in line with their confidence in their ability to be fine role model, as 51.50% reporting agreement and 23.10% showing strong agreement. Another important thing to note is that 22.40% are doubtful whether they are able to carry out the task. That belief in their ability is also supported with the efficacy in their pedagogical competence in designing strategies to bring about positive changes in the class, 50.70% participants indicate agreement over that area, coupled with 21.60% demonstrating strong agreement. However, similar uncertainty surfaces as 23.90% are not sure whether they can embrace character education in their teaching praxis. When asked about the contribution to creating positive impact on character education, despite little direction from homes, 50.70% participants report agreement and 28.40% show strong agreement. Upon dealing with lies, 47.00% participants agree with the idea that they can convince their students to stop lying. This is also supported with the other 21.60% subjects who opt for strong agreement. Over a quarter of them, 26.10%, have yet to be sure if they can deal with that. The participants also indicate agreement as to their efficacy in impacting on students' character stemming from having good role model. In the same vein, 16.40% participants show strong agreement. When character education is in focus, 29.10% participants are doubtful whether they are able to portray good role model for the students. 42.50% participants agree with the idea that

Table 4: Personal Teaching Efficacy

Survey item	Responses (%)				
	SD	D	U	A	SA
#1. I am usually comfortable discussing issues of right and wrong with my students.	2.20	2.20	15.70	38.80	41.0
#2. When a student has been exposed to negative influences at home, I do not believe that I can do much to impact that child's character.	19.40	27.60	32.80	14.20	6.0
#3. I am confident in my ability to be a good role model.	7.00	2.20	22.40	51.50	23.10
#4. I am usually at a loss as to how to help a student be more responsible.	31.30	39.60	20.10	7.50	1.50
#5. I know how to use strategies that might lead to positive changes in students' character.	7.00	3.00	23.90	50.70	21.60
#6. I am not sure that I can teach my students to be honest.	33.60	34.3	20.10	8.20	3.70
#7. I am able to positively influence the character development of a child who has had little direction from parents.	0.00	2.20	18.70	50.70	28.40
#8. When I have a student who lies regularly, I can usually convince him/her to stop lying to me.	7.00	4.50	26.10	47.00	21.60
#9. I often find it difficult to persuade a student that respect for others is important.	12.70	29.90	30.60	19.40	7.50
#10. I will be able to influence the character of students because I am a good role model.	7.00	6.70	29.10	47.00	16.40
#11. I sometimes don't know what to do to help students become more compassionate.	11.90	27.60	34.30	22.40	3.70
#12. I am continually finding better ways to develop the character of my students.	0.00	3.00	13.40	42.50	41.00

they sustain their teaching by continually researching better methods for accruing character education. Even more, 41.00% participants report strong agreement over this element.

The other set of data particularly on the low-efficacy statements also resonate with the above findings. With respect to item 2, majority of the participants demonstrate disagreement, as shown by 19.40% strong disagreement and 27.60% disagreement. Similar uncertainty also surfaces since 32.80% participants voice doubt about this. Even stronger disagreement is evident of item 4, on which 31.30% subjects voice strong disagreement and 39.60% demonstrate disagreement. Another high efficacy is also recorded as 33.60% participants strongly disagree with the fact that they are uncertain about the ability to teach honesty, coupled with 34.30% participants' disagreement. The participants strongly disagree with the idea that they find it difficult to persuade their students to respect each other, as shown by 12.70% strong disagreement and 29.90% disagreement. Dominant uncertainty is evident in item 11. 34.30% participants are doubtful whether they can help their students to be compassionate, while 27.60% report disagreement and 11.90% report strong disagreement.

The data indicates that teachers and student teachers are open to discussion moral values and issues germane to what is right or wrong in their class. This has been in line with previous works which show positive voices over the values of character education both within Indonesian setting and in Indonesia itself. To large extent, this has sheds positive clues about whether the current and future teachers are willing to shoulder the task of character education. The participants, however, still pay serious concern with students' education at homes. They doubt their competence to address character education when students receive negative exposure at homes. This implies that teachers need parents' supports and therefore mutual understanding as to what character traits are important and how these traits are supposed to be exercised in tandem. Strong individual efficacy is also marked with regard to their ability and knowledge of pedagogical frameworks relevant to supporting character education. Teachers and student teachers may have been given certain extent of preparation in their respective teacher education with regard to character education, particularly as they voice strong efficacy in these two areas. The findings also demonstrate that the participants do not differentiate their stance toward specific trait of character issues, such as honesty and responsibility. They report fairly similar efficacy on teaching several distinctive traits of character. That implies that all traits of character education are of prominence to tap upon in teaching praxis.

Table 5: General Teaching Efficacy

Survey item	Responses (%)				
	SD	D	U	A	SA
#13. Teachers are usually not responsible when a child becomes more courteous.	31.30	27.60	27.60	9.00	4.50
#14. When a student shows greater respect for others, it is usually because teachers have effectively modeled that trait.	0.00	3.00	13.40	41.00	42.50
#15. When students demonstrate diligence it is often because teachers have encouraged the students to persist with tasks.	7.00	6.00	15.70	40.30	37.30
#16. Teachers who spend time encouraging students to be respectful of others will see little change in students' social interaction.	4.50	6.00	25.10	41.80	21.60
*) #17. If parents notice that their children are more responsible, it is likely that teachers have fostered this trait at school.	7.00	1.50	26.10	49.30	22.40
#18. Some students will not become more respectful even if they have had teachers who promote respect.	20.90	31.30	38.30	6.7	2.20
#19. If students are inconsiderate, it is often because teachers have not sufficiently modeled this trait.	4.50	17.20	38.10	32.10	8.20
#20. If responsibility is not encouraged in a child's home, teachers will have little success teaching this trait at school.	3.00	17.20	30.60	31.30	17.90
#21. When a student becomes more compassionate, it is usually because teachers have created caring classroom environments.	0.00	2.20	20.90	53.00	23.90
#22. Teaching students what honesty is results in students who are more honest.	7.00	2.20	12.70	32.10	52.20
#23. Teachers are often at fault when students are dishonest.	16.40	17.90	44.00	14.20	7.50
#24. Teachers who encourage responsibility at school can influence students' level of responsibility outside of school.	7.00	3.00	15.70	37.30	43.30

*) significant difference (p<0.05) detected.

Both teachers and student teachers hold strong belief in their ability to deal with the task, despite different character traits need encouragement and possible negative exposure and little direction from parents. As we ran ANOVA, significant difference were marked between teachers (M=3.25, SD=0.34) and student teachers (M=3.42, SD=0.44), as corroborated by p=0.016 and F=5.97. Student teachers demonstrate significantly higher individual teaching efficacy toward character education than do teachers presumably because they have yet to experience actual challenges of carrying out the task in real classroom. This implies that teachers, after years of experience, may have faced students of different character traits which may need specific guidance. The wider array of character issues certainly calls forth more distinctive encouragement and modeling in long-term basis if teachers are meant to make positive changes lasting not only within but also beyond schools.

The findings also portray high efficacy with respect to general teaching ability among participants. The participants acknowledge strong GTE toward character education. Notwithstanding, there appear to be some sources of uncertainty as to whether teachers and student teachers can deal with the failure in character education, particularly due to challenges stemming from poor direction parents.

The findings on GTE also resonate with those on PTE. The participants voice strong disagreement, 31.30%. This is coupled with 27.60% demonstrate disagreement, which is equal to uncertainty at 27.60%. The participants value the importance of teacher being good role model since 41.00% show agreement and 42.50% report strong agreement. The role of teacher's encouragement is presumed to be vital on shaping students' diligence, as shown by 40.30% agreement and 37.30% strong agreement. The nature of students' change with regard to their character is seen to be dissimilar to their social interaction since 41.80% demonstrate agreement. The belief on teacher's role in fostering students' responsibility is also acknowledged by 49.30% agreement and 22.40% strong agreement. Significant difference is marked in this area (F=6.32, p=0.013). Student teachers (M=4.05, SD=0.73) show higher efficacy than teachers (M=3.71, SD=0.80). The participants acknowledged the importance of teachers in modeling respect as 31.30% participants show disagreement and 20.90% participants mark strong disagreement. This finding is also in congruence with the idea of teachers' being good role model in encouraging students to be considerate. 32.10% participants show agreement while more participants, 38.10%, are doubtful about it. Similar rate of uncertainty also comes to surface as majority of participants, 30.60%, indicate doubt on the role of teaching of responsibility. However, still more participants, 31.30%, report agreement on the idea that teacher needs to teach responsibility to make sure students perform the same trait at home. More than half of the participants, 53.00% agree

with the idea of creating caring classroom environments to foster compassion among students, which is supported with 23.90% strong agreement. The participants also voice the same rate of agreement, 32.10%, on the idea of teaching what honesty is to ensure that students showcase the same trait. Even more, 52.50% participants are in strong agreement with this concept. The other finding shows that when teachers encourage responsibility at school this will affects the students to maintain their responsibility outside school as shown by 37.30% agreement and 43.30% strong agreement. However, 44.00% participants are uncertain whether teachers are the one to blame when students are dishonest.

Generally, the findings demonstrate positive trends toward strong self-efficacy for character education. Notwithstanding, the present study unravels several sources of doubt among teachers and student teachers. The data demonstrate that item 18, 19, and 20. These items are found to be marked with substantial uncertainty among the participants. This highlights some intriguing queries. Do teachers and student teachers are in favor of the belief that students are to some extent hopeless? Or do they merely doubt their own ability to tap upon students' characters? Do they feel doubtful about the impact of maintaining respect in class? These items, being GTE in nature, might imply that the participants doubt their ability in general in promoting respect in ways which address the dearth of respect shown in some students, but not themselves as individual teacher or future teacher. ANOVA revealed significant difference with respect to the average GTE between teachers (M=3.35, SD=0.37) and student teachers (M=3.60, SD=0.44). This is demonstrated by p=0.034 and F=4.58. This difference again underscores the importance of having first-hand experience of conducting character education. Student teachers need to be better prepared to address the task during their pre-service practicum in order to gain fine-tuned views on how character education needs to be conducted accordingly with respect to diverse teaching contexts to diverse traits among students.

Conclusion

Several statements can be brought forward from the findings. First, it is obvious that teachers and student teachers are in agreement with the idea that character education should play crucial part in teaching moral values to students at any levels of education. This outlook is clearly in congruent with the formal curricular requirements in Indonesia. The willingness and openness to teaching virtuous characters determines the extent to which teachers and student teachers will carry out the duty. Although the present findings may have demonstrated that teachers and student teachers are capable of conducting character education, they still voice some uncertainty upon addressing challenges stemming from that task, particularly due to the lack of specific preparation in character education. This resonates findings from previous

work by Ryan and Bohlin (1999) stating that few educators have gained preparation for character education. In Indonesian setting, despite the stirrings within teacher community to give character education higher prominence, most of the participants are still doubtful about how much they can accrue positive changes in students' characters. This finding clearly acknowledges the urgency to transform the current teacher education curriculum that can better address the challenges in character education at all levels of instruction, ranging from curriculum level to instruction level in the class. To this end, sustainable collaboration between teachers and students on how character education is implemented in connection to the curriculum aspiration needs to be underway.

There are some limitations in this study that future research need to address. The reported doubts on character education need to be brought into focus through more qualitative research paradigm to gain more fine-grained understandings as to the teachers and student-teachers voices. In addition, the small-scale nature of this study calls forth careful attention, implying the transfer to a wider number of participant involvement for more robust findings.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215.

Bates, A. (2019). Character education and the 'priority of recognition', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *49(6)* 1-16. DOI:10.1080/0305764X.2019.1590529

Coladarci, T., & Breton, W. (1997). Teacher efficacy, supervision, and the special education resource-room teacher. *The Journal of Educational Research 90*(4):230-239. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1997.10544577

Deemer, S. A., & Minke, K. M. (1999). An investigation of the factor structure of the Teacher Efficacy Scale. *The Journal of Educational Research, 93(1)*. 3-10. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220679909597624

DeRoche, E. F., & Willimi, M. M. (1998). *Educating hearts and minds: A comprehensive character education framework*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. El. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(4),* 569-582. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569

Guskey. T. R., & Passaro, F. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal, 31(3),* 627-643. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163230

Heslep, R. D. (1995). *Moral education for Americans*. Westport, CT Praeger.

Huat, C. B. (1993). Looking for democratization in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *Contemporary South East Asia, 15(*2), 131–160. DOI: 10.1355/CS15-2A

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, https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1999.10462931

Karani, A., Miriam, K. N., & Mironga, J.(2021). Teaching competence-based agriculture subject in primary schools in Kenya: a review of institutional preparedness. International Journal of Education, Technology and Science (IJETS), 1(1), 14–30.

Kemendiknas. (2011). Pedoman pelaksanaan pendidikan karakter [handbook for character education]. Jakarta: Jakarta Puskurbuk

Kristjánsson, K. (2016). Aristotelian character education: A response to commentators, Journal of Moral Education,45(4), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2016.1244050

Kirschenbaum, H. (1977). In support of values clarification. Social Education, 1(4), 41, 398-402

Lickona, T. (1996). Eleven principles of effective character education. Journal of Moral Education, 25(1), 93-100, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724960250110

Lickona, T. (1999). Character education: Seven crucial issues. Action in Teacher Education, 20(4), 77-84, https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1999.10462937

Mathison, C. (1999). How teachers feel about character education: A descriptive study, Action in Teacher Education, 20(4), 29-38, https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1999.10462932

McAbee, S. T., and Oswald, F. L. (2013). The criterion-related validity of personalitymeasures for predicting GPA: a meta-analytic validity competition. Psychological Assessment, 25(2), 532–544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031748

McClellan, B. E. (I992). Schools and the shaping of character: Moral education in America, 1607-present. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearing- house for Social Studied Social Science Education.

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, https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670209598790

Narvaez, D. and Lapsley, D. K. (2008). Teaching moral character: two moral alternatives for teacher education. The Teacher Educator, 43(2), 156-172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08878730701838983

Park, N., and Peterson, C. (2006). Moral competence and character strengths among adolescents: the development and validation of the values in action inventory of strengths for youth. Journal of Adolescence, 29(6), 891–909. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2006.04.011

Peterson, C., and Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(2), 322–338. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0014996

Poropat, A. E. (2014b). A meta-analysis of adult-rated child personality and academic performance in primary education. British Journal of Educational Psychologyy, 84(2), 239–252. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12019

Riggs. I. M., & Enochs, L. G. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teacher's science teaching efficacy belief instrument. Science Education, 74(6), 625-638. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730740605

Ryan, K. A,, & Bohlin, K. E. (1999). Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of

Educational Research, 68(2), 202-248. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202

Wilhelm, G. M. & Firmin, M. W. (2008). Character education: Christian education perspectives. Journal of Research on Christian Education, 17(2), 182–198, https://doi.org/10.1080/10656210802433384

Weber, M., and Ruch, W. (2012). The role of a good character in 12-year-old school children: do character strengths matter in the classroom? Child Indicators Research, 5(2), 317–334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12187-011-9128-0

Wagner, L. & Ruch, W. (2015). Good character at school: positive classroom behavior mediates the link between character strengths and school achievement. Frontiers in Psychology, 6(610), http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00610

Williams, M. M., & Schaps, E. (1999). Character education: The foundation for teacher education. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense. of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 81-91. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.81