



The Effect of Character Teaching on College Student Social-Emotional Character Development: A Case in Indonesia

Rianawati^{ID}

Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies, INDONESIA

Imron Muttaqin^{ID}

Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies, INDONESIA

Saifuddin Herlambang^{ID}

Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies, INDONESIA

Wahab^{ID}

Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies, INDONESIA

Mawardi^{ID}

University of Muhammadiyah Pontianak, INDONESIA

Received: September 24, 2022 • Revised: January 6, 2023 • Accepted: February 10, 2023

Abstract: This study aimed to investigate the effect of character teaching on college student socioemotional character development. The study was conducted at IAIN Pontianak, Universitas Tanjungpura and Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak. The sample was 1284 students, 388 male and 896 female. Partial least square-structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) data analysis using SmartPLS was used. The findings reveal that character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student honesty, prosociality, respect at home, respect at school, self-control, and self-development. This study suggests that colleges/universities ensure that lecturers supervise student assignments, seriousness and discipline, check students' attendance strictly, give course assessment samples, and grade their assignments on schedule. At the end of the conclusion, implications and suggestions are given.

Keywords: *Character teaching, college student, socioemotional development.*

To cite this article: Rianawati, Muttaqin, I., Herlambang, S., Wahab, & Mawardi. (2023). The effect of character teaching on college student social-emotional character development: A case in Indonesia. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 12(2), 1179-1193. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.2.1179>

Introduction

Indonesia has a national policy master plan stating that the ethical values in the nation's life and state have shifted, and awareness of the nation's cultural values has faded on Parent Book Character Development the National Policy 2010-2025 (Nasional, 2010). Character education is an effort to encourage people to grow and develop well. Therefore, investigating character teaching is important for several reasons. First, previous studies suggest improving character-based education (Berkowitz, 2011). Second, character education is important for integration with humanists, intelligence, skills, independence, discipline, and nobility and needs to be integrated into the higher education curriculum (Tanis, 2013). Third, character education is essential for a person; good or bad behavior is also determined by the character.

This study uses college students as participants for several reasons. First, previous studies indicate that character is a more important criterion for student entrance selection, although less important for academic success (Kern & Bowling III, 2015). Second, other studies also indicate that character education contributes to the professional identity of students (Guo et al., 2018). Third, the educational role is not only a transfer of knowledge but also a place to develop attitudes, behavior, leadership, and student character (Rokhman et al., 2014). College is an educational institution that plays an important role in developing students' potential, resources, and character (Alazmi & Alazmi, 2020); the role is undoubted with the support of stakeholders, parents, and administrative sections who also play a vital role in character education (Singh, 2019).

Regarding students' perception of character teaching, there is a significant positive relationship between students' perception of the school's sense of belonging and the strengthening of character (Lee & Huang, 2021); in essence, character can be supported and developed. Another previous study also showed that students believe that teachers can change their character (Arthur, 2011). This means that the teacher has a role in changing students' character. A study of 920 students in secondary schools in Hong Kong also showed that character education affects students' social

* Corresponding author:

Rianawati, Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies, Indonesia. ✉ rianawatipsga@gmail.com

competence (Cheung & Lee, 2010). Studies in the Philippines have also shown that the strength of characters such as gratitude, fairness, hope, and love of learning influences positive emotions and academic self-efficacy (Datu & Mateo, 2020). There are also studies that suggest that student performance improves if they receive character education during study (Isdaryanti et al., 2020). A character is an attribute that contributes to an individual's identity. Character education is a conscious and deliberate attempt to cultivate virtue in oneself effort involves all related parties, such as parents, schools, the environment, and society.

Previous studies revealed that character education positively impacts students' character values in the form of religious importance, personality, and social and competitive attitudes (Zurqoni et al., 2018). (Zurqoni et al., 2018) Therefore, education needs to facilitate character building, design good character development programs, provide models, interventions, consistent habituation, and character strengthening.

Internalization is imagination deepening and mastery achieved through coaching, guidance, and so on (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Online, n.d.). Thoha (1996) states that internalization is a technique in value education whose goal is to own values that are fused with personality (Thoha, 1996). In learning, teacher knowledge about character education must be integrated with the curriculum to support character education (Citra, 2012). Therefore, it is necessary to continue to remind teachers and lecturers to internalize values in the learning process. Integration of character teaching in lectures can be realized by thoroughly including character values in the syllabus and learning implementation plan, teaching materials and media, classroom implementation, assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of activities (Winarni, 2013). Some of the important characters that need to be developed are gratitude, hope, justice, and love of learning (Datu & Mateo, 2020).

Religious education and learning affect the ethics of student behavior (Halim Tamuri et al., 2013), so it is interesting to study whether there is an influence of character teaching in college with socioemotional student character. Internalization can be implemented through character mingling, character examples, character models, value integration in learning (Hidayati et al., 2020), and modeling and control/supervision (Ulwan, 1995). The character model is important in shaping the student's character; they obtain the model directly from their teacher/lecturer. The model is important in character education (Prasetyo et al., 2019), and the character model is one of the character education methods (Munawwaroh, 2019). Other studies also reveal that the teacher model boosts character education (Wardhani & Wahono, 2017).

Specifically, character teaching in this study is seen as a process of internalizing values and character through education. Therefore, this study uses the theory of internalization of values/characters consisting of character transformation, character transactions, and transinternalization (Muhaimin, 2008). Character teaching is hypothesized to influence socioemotional development because it is useful for students. Previous research has revealed the influence of socioemotional well-being and student achievement (Berger et al., 2011). Social-emotional development is the ability to manage and express emotions completely, both positive and negative, while interacting with others around them and actively learning by exploring their environment (Breastfeeding, 2005). The good character that needs to be developed is honesty, which is based on being trusted in words, actions, and work (Gunawan & Sari, 2019).

Among the universities that clearly have character education programs are IAIN Pontianak, Tanjungpura University and Muhammadiyah University of Pontianak. Character teaching in IAIN Pontianak is done through *Ma'had Al-Jami'ah* (Islamic boarding school). *Ma'had's* flagship programs are *qiroatul kutub* (reading Islamic books), *tahfidz* (recitation), *muhadharah* (public speaking), and *sholawatan* (prayer song). Character education is a priority for *Ma'had Al-jami'ah*, where the vision is to be the center of guidance for *mahasantri* (Islamic boarding school students) in the fields of morality, worship, language, literature studies and *tahfidz*. The purpose of *Ma'had* is to implement *mahasantri* in worship and develop good manners in conjunction (Adminwpmahad, 2021). Meanwhile, Tanjungpura Pontianak University has a program called "*pendikar*" (character education), which is a Pancasila-based character education program (Pendikar Pancasila Untan, 2022). The "*pendikar*" program is a character education program that can be interpreted as universal character development that can be extracted from the character values in Pancasila. The 5 main values are religious, nationalist, mutual cooperation, integrity and independence.

Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak implements character internalization through the al-Islam Kemuhadiyah (AIK) program. The program is added into the curriculum and taught for 4 semesters. The three campuses have similarities in character education, namely, the habit of reading the Quran, understanding the contents of the Quran, moral guidance, faith and jurisprudence. Lecturers teach character with constant guidance, example and habituation.

The current study was approved by the ethical committee of The Teacher Training and Education Faculty (Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan), Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies (Institut Agama Islam Negeri Pontianak) protocol number 349/KOMET/FTIK/2022. This study was also approved by the Institute for Research and Community Service (Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat) Pontianak State Institute for Islamic Studies (Institut Agama Islam Negeri Pontianak), West Kalimantan Indonesia (protocol number: B-147/In.15/LP2M/HM.01/03/2022).

Regarding the research question, we proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student prosociality.

Hypothesis 2. Character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student honesty.

Hypothesis 3. Character teaching has a significant and positive effect on student self-development.

Hypothesis 4. Character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student self-control.

Hypothesis 5. Character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student respect at school/college.

Hypothesis 6. Character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student respect at home.

Methodology

Research Design

This study used a survey design and the data were collected using questionnaires distributed online. A survey was chosen because this study had the following purposes: 1) to collect data on student opinions about character instruction and socio-emotional development, 2) to generalize through a representative sample, 3) to determine the influence of variables on other variables in a natural setting, 4) to test predetermined hypotheses, and 5) to eliminate doubt about the influence of the variables used.

We started by asking for permission from the management board of *Mahad aljamiah*, the management board of the Character Education (Pendikar) of Tanjungpura University and Rector of the Muhammadiyah University to conduct research on campus. We had discussions with the three universities related to this study. After we got permission, we had discussion with the lecturers/instructors to inform how character instruction was used. We provided instructions on teaching character using several dimensions; character transformation, character transaction, character trans-internalization, character habituation, character model and character control. Character transformation dimension was implemented using the following steps; providing instructions on character instruction using character transformation, character transaction, character trans-internalization, character habituation, character model, and character control. Character transformation dimension was implemented using the following steps: 1) motivating students to continue to learn, 2) motivating students to use their time as efficiently as possible to attend lectures, organizations, courses, skill development, and trainings, 3) collecting assignments on time, 4) motivating them to continue to pursue achievements, and 5) giving messages to build good character.

Character Transaction was done through the following steps: 1) correcting student mistakes, 2) providing opportunities to correct mistakes made by students, 3) providing learning contracts, 4) giving reprimands to the guilty, and 5) reminding students of their tasks. Furthermore, the character of trans-internalization was implemented through the following steps: 1) delivering the material politely, 2) accompanying passive students, 3) connecting the material course with the real-life context, 4) teaching in a friendly and communicative way, and 5) delivering the material passionately. With regard to teaching character habituation, the lecturers who teach the subject were given directions for implementation to; 1) set examples by saying Greetings, 2) pray at the beginning and end of the lesson, 3) get used to speaking politely, 4) create cooperative learning models, 5) create discovery learning models.

The next character instruction was done through the character model; this teaching and learning were implemented by; 1) setting examples of dressing neatly and clean, 2) setting examples of good way of walking, 3) setting examples of timely task processing, 4) setting examples of simple appearance and 6) setting examples of careful examination of tasks. Furthermore, character control was implemented by; 1) supervising the seriousness of students' learning activities, 2) checking notebooks, 3) supervising students' discipline, 4) paying attention to student neatness and cleanliness, and 5) checking assignments and giving grades on time.

We also provided: 1) instructions for students to follow the material about character instruction. 2) reciting the Qur'an and praying on time, 3) habituation to prayer in congregation, 4) studying the Qur'an thoroughly. Students were also required to take notes during character instruction, join prayers in congregation, recite the Qur'an, and learn together. We also involved the teachers in carrying out and controlling student activities. We used our material on character building as well as the materials from each campus, but we used our the teaching methods.

Sample and Data Collection

The population of this study consisted of students of the State Institute of Islamic Studies (IAIN) Pontianak, Tanjungpura University, and Muhammadiyah University of Pontianak. The study was conducted with a simple random sampling technique. The sample of this study was 1,284 college students, 388 male and 896 female. All participating students were given a link to the survey through Google Forms with permission from their colleges. A Likert scale was used with the following five options: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.

The college student sample came from 16 departments: Islamic Education (408), Islamic Business (97), Islamic Family Law (86), Mathematics Education (17), Arabic Language (29), PGMI [Elementary School teacher Education] (39), PIAUD [Early Childhood Education] (29), Islamic Banking (89), PPG [Teacher Profession Education] (76), Islamic Psychology (25), Statistics (11), Islamic Counseling (109), Islamic Accounting (65), Islamic Economics (137) and Public

Administration (33). The present study was carried out over seven months from June 2021 to December 2021 in West Kalimantan Province. The population of this study was students of the State Institute of Islamic Studies [IAIN] Pontianak, Tanjungpura University, and the Muhammadiyah University of Pontianak.

A character instructional instrument adapted from Muhaimin's theory consisting of character transformation, character transactions, and character trans-internalization (Muhaimin, 2008) was used. All character indicators were placed in one construct because they were a set of the character teaching process. Nonetheless, all indicators were created with different codes to distinguish their constructs. There were 5 character transformation indicators (CT1 to CT5), 6 character transaction indicators (CT6 to CT11), and 5 character trans-internalization indicators (CT12 to CT16). Furthermore, this study used Ulwan's (1995) basic character habituation, character model, and character supervision. There were 5 indicators of character habituation (CT17 to CT21), 6 indicators of character model (CT22 to CT27), and 5 indicators of character supervision (CT28 to CT32) that we created. The socio-emotional character development instrument from Peter Ji, David L. DuBois, and Brian R. Flay (Ji et al., 2021) was used. This instrument consists of prosocial indicators, honesty, respect at school, respect at home, self-development, and self-control. Prosocial dimensions have 5 indicators (PS1-PS5), honesty has 5 indicators (H1-H5), respect at school has 5 indicators (RaS1-RaS5), respect at home has 4 indicators, self-development has 4 indicators, and self-control has 4 indicators.

Data Analysis

Partial least square (PLS) structural equation modeling (SEM) data analysis using SmartPLS was used. This software was used due to its ability to predict construct effects for small samples and because it is easy to use. The validity and reliability of the model were measured, and the structural model was examined using collinearity, coefficient of determination, effect size, predictive relevance, variant inflation factors and path coefficient.

Analysis of Data

Partial least square (PLS) structural equation modeling (SEM) data analysis using SmartPLS was used. This software was used due to its ability to predict construct effects for small samples and because it is easy to use. The validity and reliability of the model was measured, and the structural model was assessed by collinearity, coefficient of determination, effect size, predictive relevance, variant inflation factors and path coefficient.

Findings/Results

The present study aims to determine the effect of character teaching on honesty, prosociality, respect at home, respect at school, self-control and self-development using a model and structural measurement. Model measurements are performed by calculating the validity and reliability of the instrument. The indicator was assessed with three measurements: 1) indicator loading and internal consistency reliability, 2) convergent validity, and 3) discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2019).




Figure 1. Hypothetical Model

Measurement models

The measurement model was assessed with three measures: 1) indicator loading and internal consistency, 2) convergent validity and 3) discriminant validity. The indicator loading value was used to inspect indicator validity. If the indicator loading value is more than 0.7, the indicator is ideal for assessing the construct. Indicators with scores less than 0.7 are excluded from the model because they do not match the minimum criteria (Hair et al., 2019). Table 1 shows the details of the loading indicators of all constructs. Cronbach's alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) were reported for instrument internal consistency reliability. This study implemented the threshold set; Cronbach's alpha (α) should be $> .600$ (Ghozali, 2014), and CR should be $> .708$. Constructs that obtain composite reliability values $\geq .7$ have high reliability. SmartPLS output showed that prosociality received a value of 0.83, honesty received a score of 0.88, respect at home received a value of 0.88, respect at school received a value of 0.91, self-development received a value of 0.86, self-control received a value of 0.82 and character teaching received a value of 0.91. These numbers show that the instrument is reliable.

Convergent validity is a degree of conformity between the measurement attributes of the measuring instrument and its theoretical concepts. Discriminant validity testing of this study is based on the value of AVE (average of variance extracted). Convergent validity is intended to determine the relationship between indicator measures in the same construct. Convergent validity is met if the AVE value is $\geq .500$ (Henseler et al., 2009).

Table 1. Reflective Indicator Loadings and Internal Consistency

Construct	Item	Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Consideration
Character teaching	CT24	0.717	0.857	0.862	0.898	0.638	Valid and reliable
	CT28	0.800					
	CT30	0.842					
	CT31	0.810					
	CT32	0.819					

Table 1. Continued

Construct	Item	Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Consideration
Honesty	H1	0.717	0.823	0.830	0.876	0.586	Valid and reliable
	H2	0.800					
	H3	0.800					
	H4	0.713					
	H5	0.792					
PS	PS1	0.774	0.688	0.698	0.828	0.616	Valid and reliable
	PS2	0.841					
	PS4	0.736					
Respect at home	RaH1	0.793	0.813	0.812	0.877	0.640	Valid and reliable
	RaH2	0.838					
	RaH3	0.812					
	RaH4	0.755					
Respect at school/ university	RaS1	0.742	0.873	0.880	0.908	0.665	Valid and reliable
	RaS2	0.886					
	RaS3	0.864					
	RaS4	0.767					
	RaS5	0.808					
SC	SC1	0.727	0.666	0.671	0.817	0.599	Valid and reliable
	SC2	0.810					
	SC3	0.783					
SD	SD1	0.739	0.789	0.795	0.863	0.612	Valid and reliable
	SD2	0.790					
	SD3	0.813					
	SD4	0.785					

Discriminant validity is indicated by a discrepancy between attributes that should not be measured by a measuring instrument with a theoretical concept of the variable. The discriminant validity of reflective indicator measurements is calculated based on the cross-loading value of the variable manifested against each latent variable. If the correlation between latent variables with each indicator is more significant than the correlation with other variables, then the latent variable can predict the indicator better than other latent variables. Table 2 shows the details of the Fornell-Larcker criterion.

Table 2. Fornell-Larcker Cross Loading

	CT	H	P	RaH	RaS	SC	SD
Character Teaching	0.799						
Honesty	0.413	0.765					
Prosociality	0.436	0.527	0.785				
Respect at Home	0.339	0.487	0.400	0.800			
Respect at School	0.361	0.495	0.471	0.627	0.815		
Self-Control	0.379	0.536	0.429	0.399	0.422	0.774	
Self-Development	0.406	0.488	0.444	0.456	0.533	0.414	0.782

Discriminant validity also appears when constructs are above 0.9. All construct values must be lower than 0.9. Henseler et al. (2009) suggest values not greater than .0 for testing the validity of the discriminant, which suggests that all indicators based on the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio are valid. Discriminant validity also appears when the HTMT value of the indicator is higher than .900. Table 3 indicates that all construct HTMT values were lower than 0.900.

Table 3. Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) Values

	CT	H	P	RaH	RaS	SC	SD
Character Teaching							
Honesty	0.487						
Prosociality	0.562	0.702					
Respect at Home	0.400	0.601	0.531				
Respect at School	0.412	0.589	0.602	0.748			
Self-Control	0.500	0.733	0.640	0.551	0.568		
Self-Development	0.487	0.610	0.605	0.570	0.646	0.582	




Figure 2. Final Model

Structural Model Assessments

Structural model measurements using 1) collinearity, 2) coefficient of determination (r^2), 3) effect size (f^2), 4) predictive relevance (q^2) using blindfolding procedure, and 5) path coefficient. First, a collinearity test was used to test whether this model is worth using. An instrument is eligible to proceed to the following process if the VIF value is less than 3 for the inner model and smaller than 10 for the outer model (Sarstedt et al., 2016). Character education is a predictor of prosociality, honesty, self-development, self-control, respect at school/college and respect at home. Character teaching is a predictor of prosociality (VIF = 1.000), honesty (VIF = 1.000), self-development (VIF = 1.000), self-control, (VIF = 1.000), respect at school/college (VIF = 1.000), and respect at home (VIF = 1.000). Table 4 shows the VIF value.

Table 4. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) Value

	H	P	RaH	RaS	SC	SD
Character Teaching	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Second is the coefficient of determination (r^2). The goodness of fit (GoF) testing is seen from the r^2 value. The coefficient of determination is a variant of proportions on endogenous variables that exogenous variables can predict. Values range from 0 to 1; 0.75 is substantial, 0.50 moderate and 0.25 weak (Chin, 1998). The construct r^2 values are honesty 0.170 (weak), prosociality 0.189 (weak), self-development 0.164 (weak), self-control 0.143 (weak), respect at school 0.130 (weak), and respect at home 0.114 (weak). The values obtained by each construct can be seen in detail in Table 5.

Table 5. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Honesty	0.171	0.170
Prosociality	0.190	0.189
Respect at Home	0.115	0.114
Respect at School	0.130	0.130
Self-Control	0.144	0.143
Self-Development	0.165	0.164

Third, effect size (f^2) measurement is performed by looking at changes in coefficient of determination (r^2) values. This change in value is used to see the effect of exogenous latent variables on endogenous variables and whether they have a substantive influence (Ghozali, 2014). The same f^2 achievement recommended by (Cohen, 1988), which is 0.02, has little effect; 0.15 has a moderate influence, and 0.35 means it has a significant influence on the structural level (Chin, 1998).

Table 6. Effect Size (F^2)

	H	P	RaH	RaS	SC	SD
Character Teaching	0.206	0.235	0.130	0.150	0.168	0.197

Fourth is predictive relevance. The Stone-Geisser (Q_2) test is a statistical test to measure how well the model and the resulting parameters produce the observation value (predictive relevance). If the Q_2 value is greater than 0, then the model has predictive relevance, while if it is less than 0, it means that the model has no predictive relevance (Ghozali, 2014). If Q_2 is greater than 0, exogen constructs are predictively relevant to endogenous constructs. The relevant predictive value criteria are 0.02 (small predictive), 0.15 (medium) and 0.35 (large). Table 7 shows the predictive relevance value.

Table 7. Predictive Relevance

	SSO	SSE	$Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)$
Character Teaching	6420.000	6420.000	
Honesty	6420.000	5787.621	0.099
Prosociality	3852.000	3407.601	0.115
Respect at Home	5136.000	4769.135	0.071
Respect at School	6420.000	5875.925	0.085
Self-Control	3852.000	3529.389	0.084
Self-Development	5136.000	4625.840	0.099

Fifth is the path coefficient. The calculation of the path coefficient between endogenous and exogenous constructs was performed with 5000 bootstraps applying a 5% (one tailed) significance level (Figure 2). Character education is a significant predictor of prosociality ($\beta=0.426$; $t=15,386$, $p=0.000$), honesty ($\beta=0.407$; $t=14,624$, $p=0.000$), self-development ($\beta=0.401$; $t=14,970$, $p=0.000$), self-control ($\beta=0.356$; $t=12,624$, $p=0.000$), respect at school ($\beta=0.360$; $t=12,362$, $p=0.000$), and respect at home ($\beta=0.338$; $t=11,200$, $p=0.000$). Table 6 shows the path coefficient.

Table 8. Path Coefficient

	β	Sample Mean	Standard Deviation	t Statistics (O/STDEV)	p Values
Character Teaching -> Honesty	0.413	0.415	0.028	14.875	0.000
Character Teaching -> Prosociality	0.436	0.438	0.027	15.991	0.000
Character Teaching -> Respect at Home	0.339	0.341	0.030	11.363	0.000
Character Teaching -> Respect at School	0.361	0.362	0.029	12.487	0.000
Character Teaching -> Self-Control	0.379	0.381	0.028	13.689	0.000
Character Teaching -> Self-Development	0.406	0.407	0.027	14.964	0.000

Discussion

The 1st hypothesis (character teaching has a significant positive effect on prosocial college students) was accepted. The output of SmartPLS provided a β of 0,436, a t-statistic of 15,991 (greater than 1.96), and a p value of .000 (below .05). This means that the effect is significant. The R^2 value was 0.190, and the R-square adjusted was 0.189, indicating that character education had a weak effect on the prosocial construct. The result of the blindfolding calculation is 0.115, which indicates the presence of a medium predictive relevance and shows that exogenous constructs are a relevant predictor of endogenous constructs.

Character teaching by lecturers provides a model of being disciplined by entering the classroom on time (CT24), monitoring student assignments to foster honest character (CT28), using discipline (CT30), exhibiting neatness and cleanliness (CT31), grading and assigning work in a lively and timely manner (CT32), all of which affect students' prosociality. Prosocial behavior is a behavior that benefits others; it has positive social consequences and connects to the psychological well-being of others. Prosocial indicators are play nicely with others (PS1), do things that are good for the group (PS2), and I treat my friends the way I like to be treated (PS4). Prosociality is an act of helping others without providing a direct benefit to the person who performs the act, and it can even harm the person who helps (Baron & Byrne, 2004). Prosocial behavioral aspects are sharing, helping, donating, cooperating, and honesty (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989).

These indicators also affect tolerance ability as one of the prosocial elements. These findings are consistent with character education affecting student tolerance (Fahmi et al., 2021). When lecturers give assignments and assess each group of students carefully, it leads to attitudes of honesty and cooperating with others well in students, especially in one group. It also gives rise to a positive attitude in students despite being in a group with friends who are different from them. This finding is also consistent with a previous study showing that the older a person gets, the more prosocial the person is (Mayr & Freund, 2020).

Although the effect is weak, this study proves the influence of character education on prosociality, in accordance with Arthur's study, which indicates that the model and mentorship of teachers affect students' prosociality (Arthur, 2011). When the teacher gives an example of discipline and corrects student tasks on time and objectively, it will have an influence on the student's prosociality. Normative moral and personal character does affect prosocial students (Lin & Shek, 2022).

The 2nd hypothesis, character teaching has a significant and positive effect on honesty, was accepted based on the results of the analysis of hypothesis data received because it obtained value β ; 0,413, t-statistic 14.875 and P Values .000 (below .05), which means the effect is significant. The value of R^2 is 0.171, and the R-square adjusted value is 0.170. This output shows that character education influences honesty even though it is weak. The result of blindfolding calculations is 0.096, indicating weak predictive relevance and that exogenous constructs can be used as relevant predictors of endogenous constructs. Lecturers need to carry out their duties well to educate, train, teach and evaluate their students (Irawati & Idrus, 2019). Lecturers who grade the majority of tasks and provide assessments objectively influence honesty, an important trait for the younger generation (James, 1933). Honesty is one of the core characteristics that needs attention (Pala, 2011).

Until now, there have been no studies that can confirm with certainty that the teaching of character does not affect the honesty of students. Character teaching has a positive impact on a person's attitude and behavior, including honesty, respect, self-control and self-development. Character teaching can help a person understand important moral and ethical values such as honesty and prosociality. On the other hand, character teaching is also not always effective in influencing a person because many other variables contribute, such as social environment and cultural influences and personality.

Regarding the 3rd hypothesis, the hypothesis that character teaching has a significant and positive effect on self-development was accepted. SmartPLS output provided β ; 0,406, t-statistic; 14,964, and p values .000 (below .05), which means that the effect is significant. The hypothesis was accepted because the t-statistic was greater than 1.96. The R^2 value was 0.165, and the R-square adjusted was 0.164, showing that character education has a weak influence on self-development. The blindfolding calculation was 0.099, indicating predictive relevance at the weak level and showing that exogenous constructs are a relevant predictor of endogenous constructs. Although the effect is weak, in this study, we find support for the effect of character education on self-development. By controlling the seriousness and thoroughness of student tasks, lecturers motivate students to develop themselves automatically (Lumbantobing, 2020), and this motivation also affects students' academic achievement (Kusumajati et al., 2017). Therefore, this character education has an influence on SECD.

The 4th hypothesis regarding the effect of character teaching on self-control was accepted, as it obtains a statistical result; β ; 0,406, t-statistic; 14,904, and p values .000 (below .05), which means the effect is positive and significant. The value of R^2 is 0.166, and the R-square adjusted value is 0.165. This result shows that character education has a weak effect on self-control. The blindfolding calculation was 0.084, which indicates the presence of predictive relevance at the weak level and shows that exogenous constructs are a relevant predictor of endogenous constructs. These findings are consistent with previous research revealing the influence of morals on students' self-control (Hidayah, 2021). Values and morals are the main elements of character, and if this element has been fused in a person, then there will be strong self-control based on values and morals, especially when college students receive lecturers' attention for their assignments, discipline, seriousness and their grade in a timely manner.

The 5th hypothesis that character teaching has a significant and positive effect on respect at school/college was accepted. SmartPLS output provided β ; 0,361, t-statistic; 12.487, and p values .000 (was below .05). The t-statistic was greater than 1.96. This means that the effect is significant. The R^2 was 0.130, and the adjusted R-square was 0.130. This shows that character education had a weak effect on respect at school. The result of blindfolding calculations was 0.085. This finding indicates that exogenous constructs are a relevant predictor of endogenous constructs, although with weak predictive relevance. However, the discipline of lecturers/teachers is also not fully able to increase students' responsibilities because lecturers/teachers impose discipline rather than use productive and creative solutions to increase student responsibility (Lewis, 2001). These findings support previous research indicating that student trust will grow and students will be more motivated (Hernández-López et al., 2016).

Entering the classroom on time (CT24), control and monitoring of the seriousness of student learning (CT28), student discipline (CT30), neatness and cleanliness of students (CT31), and grading and assigning work in a lively and timely manner (CT32) are part of teachers' professional and pedagogical competence. This competence affects the character of students who are characterized by speaking politely to lecturers (RaS1), obeying lecturers (RaS2), following the directions of teachers/lecturers (RaS3), and listening to lecturers without disturbing them (RaS4). Lecturers who grade

student assignments on time and objectively will affect student confidence (Pachler et al., 2019). This belief can increase respect at school/college, and students' perception of lecturers' ability also increases students' competence (Hernández-López et al., 2016).

In addition, the performance of lecturers who carry out their duties well also increases student learning motivation so that this construct is positively related to the construct of respect at school (Anra & Yamin, 2017).

Regarding the 6th hypothesis of the present study, the smartPLS output provided a β of 0,339, a t-statistic of 11,363, and p values of .000 (below .05). The hypothesis was accepted because the t-statistic was greater than 1.96. The R^2 was .115, and the R-square adjusted was .114. This indicated that character teaching had a weak effect on respect at home. Nevertheless, this study reveals the effect of character teaching on respect at home. The result of the blindfolding calculation is 0.071, which indicates the presence of predictive relevance, although weak, and indicates that exogenous constructs are a relevant predictor of endogenous constructs. In the COVID-19 era, students learn from their homes. Therefore, they interact more with family at home. Parents can learn about lecturers' tasks, control and monitoring at home so that positive interactions are built. Students speak politely at home, obeying parents, listening to advice, and inevitability following the rules at home; understanding and support of parents while students' study at home will affect their character and motivation. Parents have an important role in developing character (Mansir, 2021) and they can give direction and guidance directly at home. Character strength is the basic foundation of lifelong character attached to a person (Park & Peterson, 2009); good character toward parents and siblings at home, parental support, and the role of lecturers who teach in college play an important role in the development of student character.

In addition, the findings of this study are consistent with those of a previous study showing that pedagogical competence is the most influential competence on student character (Rahmah & Fadhli, 2021), and lecturers' ability to create assignments, correct assignments, and pay attention to the character and discipline of students are factors contributing to student character. In general, the results of this study are consistent with the study (Azhari, 2017), which revealed that a lecturer is tasked with educating, teaching, training, guiding, and evaluating. Lecturers should grade the assignments given to students carefully, and supervise their learning, seriousness, neatness, activeness, and the timeliness of students in collecting assignments.

Regarding the influence of character teaching on prosociality, honesty, self-development, self-control, respect at school, and respect at home, although it has a weak effect, character supervision positively affects all constructs. Universities should maximize student boarding schools to intensify character education further because *pesantren* are a place of total character internalization (Baharun & Maryam, 2018) so that in the future, students become superior human resources because they have good character (Tyas et al., 2020). The study also shows that socioemotional character development (SECD) is essential at the student level (Elias, 2009). SECD can also be used at the college student level, not just for elementary (Wang et al., 2015) and middle school (Coelho et al., 2015) students.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion in the previous chapter, this study shows the following: 1) character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student prosociality, 2) character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student honesty, 3) character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student self-development, 4) character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student self-control, 5) character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student respect at school/college, and 6) character teaching has a significant and positive effect on college student respect at home. Although the influence is weak, the results of this study prove that character education has a positive influence on prosociality, honesty, self-development, self-control and respect at home.

Recommendations

Based on these findings, future research may focus on national character teaching and other good character development. Future studies can also contribute to other variables that influence socioemotional character development. Researchers can also conduct studies with this character teaching dimension and indicators of the socioemotional development of students on a larger sample. This research is also expected to be used as a material suggestion for other researchers to conduct similar research with other constructs and methods. The important issues related to character that can continue to be studied are related to the purpose of character education, the psychological component of character, the content of character education, the approach and how the campus prepares character educators (Lickona, 1999).

Limitations

This study has some limitations; the socio-emotional character development of the participants was unknown before the study, so it could be that the existing character was formed via previous character education. Therefore, a more in-depth study that includes students' previous character teaching is needed. This study also has limitations in that only the character teaching variable was used as a predictor. Many factors affect students' socioemotional character development, such as parental role, society, and psychology.

Authorship contribution statement

Rianawati; conceptualization, research design. Imron Muttaqin; data analysis. Saifuddin Herlambang; Writing/drafting manuscript. Wahab; editing/reviewing. Mawardi; translating

References

- Adminwpmahad. (2021, November 10). Profil ma'had al-jami'ah [Islamic boarding school profile]. <http://bit.ly/3nOuREn>
- Alazmi, M. S., & Alazmi, A. A. (2020). The role of administration and faculty in developing character education within public and private universities in Kuwait. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(4), 664-676. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2019-0231>
- Anra, Y., & Yamin, M. (2017). Relationships between lecturer performance, organizational culture, leadership, and achievement motivation. *Journal of the National Research University Higher School of Economics*, 11(2), 92-97. <http://bit.ly/3mwsfdV>
- Arthur, J. (2011). Personal character and tomorrow's citizens: Student expectations of their teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 184-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2011.07.001>
- Azhari, D. S. (2017). Peran dosen dalam mengembangkan karakter mahasiswa [Lecturer role in developing student's character]. *Jurnal Pelangi*, 9(2), 88-97. <https://doi.org/10.22202/jp.2017.v9i2.1856>
- Baharun, H., & Maryam, S. (2018). Building character education using three Matra of Hasan Al-Banna's perspective in Pesantren. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2), 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v4i2.2422>
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (2004). *Psikologi sosial* [Social psychology] (R. Djuwita, Trans., 10th ed.). Erlangga. (Original work published 1999)
- Berger, C., Alcalay, L., Torretti, A., & Milicic, N. (2011). Socio-emotional well-being and academic achievement: Evidence from a multilevel approach. *Psicologia: Reflexao e Critica*, 24, 344-351. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722011000200016>
- Berkowitz, M. W. (2011). Leading schools of character. In A. M. Blankstein & P. D. Houston (Eds.), *The soul of educational leadership series: Leadership for social and democracy in our schools* (Vol.9, pp. 93-121). Corwin.
- Breastfeeding and the use of human milk. (2005). *Pediatrics*, 115(2), 496-506. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2004-2491>
- Cheung, C.-K., & Lee, T.-Y. (2010). Improving social competence through character education. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 33(3), 255-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.08.006>
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In G. A. Morcoulides (Ed.), *Modern methods for business research* (pp. 295-336). Psychology Press.
- Citra, Y. (2012). Pelaksanaan pendidikan karakter dalam pembelajaran [Implementation of character education in learning]. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Khusus*, 1(1), 237-249. <http://bit.ly/3KxFCE1>
- Coelho, V. A., Marchante, M., & Sousa, V. (2015). "Positive Attitude": A multilevel model analysis of the effectiveness of a social and emotional learning program for Portuguese middle school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 43(1), 29-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.05.009>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Datu, J. A. D., & Mateo, N. J. (2020). Character strengths, academic self-efficacy, and well-being outcomes in the Philippines: A longitudinal study. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, Article 105649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105649>
- Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. H. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behavior in children*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511571121>
- Elias, M. J. (2009). Social-emotional and character development and academics as a dual focus of educational policy. *Educational Policy*, 23(6), 831-846. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808330167>
- Fahmi, E. N., Mujahidin, E., & Rahman, I. K. (2021). Development of religious tolerance of high school levels. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(01), 163-196. <https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v10i01.861>
- Ghozali, I. (2014). *SEM metode alternatif dengan menggunakan Partial Least Squares (PLS)* [SEM alternative method with Partial Least Square (PLS)]. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro Semarang.

- Gunawan, I., & Sari, D. N. (2019). Validity and reliability of character education Internalization instruments. In I. Bafadal et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Education and Management (COEMA 2019)* (pp.245-249). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/coema-19.2019.50>
- Guo, Y.-J., Yang, L., Ji, H.-X., & Zhao, Q. (2018). Caring characters and professional identity among graduate nursing students in China-A cross sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 65, 150-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.02.039>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2-24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Halim Tamuri, A., Yusof Othman, M., Dakir, J., Munawar Ismail, A., & Stapa, Z. (2013). Religious education and ethical attitude of Muslim adolescents in Malaysia. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 7(4), 257-274. <http://bit.ly/3ZERTVa>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. In R. R. Sinkovics & P. N. Ghauri (Ed.), *New challenges to international marketing* (Vol. 20, pp. 277-319). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979\(2009\)0000020014](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979(2009)0000020014)
- Hernández-López, L., García-Almeida, D. J., Ballesteros-Rodríguez, J. L., & De Saá-Pérez, P. (2016). Students' perceptions of the lecturer's role in management education: Knowledge acquisition and competence development. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 14(3), 411-421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2016.10.001>
- Hidayah, R. (2021). Students' self-adjustment, self-control, and morality. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 12(1), 174-193. <http://bit.ly/3Kvnrie>
- Hidayati, N. A., Waluyo, H. J., & Winarni, R. (2020). Exploring the implementation of local wisdom-based character education among Indonesian higher education students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 179-198. https://www.e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji_2020_2_13.pdf
- Irawati, S., & Idrus, I. (2019). Peran dosen dalam mengembangkan karakter mahasiswa [Lecturer role at student character building]. *Talenta Conference Series: Science and Technology (ST)*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.32734/st.v2i2.550>
- Isdaryanti, B., Ahmadi, F., Wulandari, D., & Sulistyorini, S. (2020). The influence of online learning in improving the literacy competence of primary teacher education (PGSD) students in Universitas Negeri Semarang during the epidemic crisis. *Journal of Research and Educational Research Evaluation*, 9(1), 15-21. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jere.v9i1.40778>
- James, H. W. (1933). Honesty as a character trait among young people. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 26(8), 572-578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1933.10880346>
- Ji, P., DuBois, D. L., & Flay, B. R. (2021). Social-emotional and character development scale: Validation with urban middle school students. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 127, Article 106124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106124>
- Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Online [Big Indonesian Dictionary Online]. (n.d.). Internalization. In *kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id dictionary*. Retrieved January 18, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Kern, M. L., & Bowling, D. S. (2015). Character strengths and academic performance in law students. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 55, 25-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JRP.2014.12.003>
- Kusumajati, D. A., Ruman, Y. S., & Oktriono, K. (2017). The influence of lecturers' competencies towards students' performance motivation: a case study at higher education. In F. L. Wang, O. Au, K. K. Ng, J. Shang & R. Kwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2017 International Symposium on Educational Technology (ISET 2017)* (pp. 173-176). IEEE Computer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISET.2017.47>
- Lee, C.-K. J., & Huang, J. (2021). The relations between students' sense of school belonging, perceptions of school kindness and character strength of kindness. *Journal of School Psychology*, 84, 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.12.001>
- Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(3), 307-319. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00059-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00059-7)
- Lickona, T. (1999). Character education: seven crucial issues. *Action in Teacher Education*, 20(4), 77-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1999.10462937>
- Lin, L., & Shek, D. T. (2022). Association of normative moral character and prosocial behavior—Moderators of personal moral character and sociodemographic factors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 187, Article 111400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111400>

- Lumbantobing, R. (2020). The relationship between self-concept and emotional intelligence. In E. Sihombing, L. Waruwu, B. Panjaitan, J. S. Sihotang, W. F. Sihombing, F. R. Naibaho & L. Samosir (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Education, Society, Economy, Humanity and Environment (ICESHE 2019)* (pp. 69-74). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200311.014>
- Mansir, F. (2021). The leadership of parent and teacher in 21st century education. In A. K. Paksi, Suryanto & C. S. Ramadhan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHES 2021)* (pp. 110-115). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211227.019>
- Mayr, U., & Freund, A. M. (2020). Do we become more prosocial as we age, and if so, why? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(3), 248-254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420910811>
- Muhaimin. (2008). *Paradigma pendidikan agama Islam: Upaya untuk mengefektifkan pendidikan Islam di sekolah* [Paradigm of Islamic education: Effort to make Islamic education effective in school]. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Munawwaroh, A. (2019). *Keteladanan sebagai metode pendidikan karakter* [Exemplary as character education methods]. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Islam*, 7(2), 141-156. <https://doi.org/10.36667/jppi.v7i2.363>
- Nasional, K. P. (2010). Buku induk kebijakan nasional pembangunan karakter bangsa 2010-2025 [Parent book character development the national policy 2010-2025]. Puskur.
- Pachler, D., Kuonath, A., & Frey, D. (2019). How transformational lecturers promote students' engagement, creativity, and task performance: The mediating role of trust in lecturer and self-efficacy. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 69, 162-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.12.004>
- Pala, A. (2011). The need for character education. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 3(2), 23-32. <http://bit.ly/3Un97eV>
- Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2009). Character strengths: Research and practice. *Journal of College and Character*, 10(4), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1042>
- Pendidik Pancasila Untan. (2022, December 28). Sejarah singkat [Short history]. <http://bit.ly/40DGYTc>
- Prasetyo, D., Marzuki, M., & Riyanti, D. (2019). *Pentingnya pendidikan karakter melalui keteladanan guru* [The importance of character education through exemplary]. *Harmony: Jurnal Pembelajaran IPS dan PKN*, 4(1), 19-32. <http://bit.ly/3GooKgv>
- Rahmah, S., & Fadhlil, M. (2021). Character Education in Islamic education Institutions: A Study on the Impact of Lecturer Competence at IAIN Lhokseumawe. *MIQOT: Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Keislaman*, 45(1), 87-103. <https://doi.org/10.30821/miqot.v45i1.771>
- Rokhman, F., Hum, M., & Syaifudin, A. (2014). Character education for golden generation 2045 (national character building for Indonesian golden years). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 1161-1165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.197>
- Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., Thiele, K. O., & Gudergan, S. P. (2016). Estimation issues with PLS and CBSEM: Where the bias lies! *Journal of Business Research*, 69(10), 3998-4010. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.06.007>
- Singh, B. (2019). Character education in the 21st century. *Journal of Social Studies*, 15(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jss.v15i1.25226>
- Tanis, H. (2013). *Pentingnya pendidikan character building dalam membentuk kepribadian mahasiswa* [Character education importance at student university personality building]. *Humaniora*, 4(2), 1212-1219. <https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v4i2.3564>
- Thoha, H. M. C. (1996). *Kapita selekta pendidikan Islam* [Capita selecta of Islamic education] (1st ed.). Pustaka Pelajar. <https://catalogue.nla.gov.au/Record/2933>
- Tyas, E. H., Sunarto, S., & Naibaho, L. (2020). Building superior human resources through character education. *TEST Engineering & Management*, 83, 11864-11873.
- Ulwan, A. N. (1995). *Pendidikan anak dalam Islam* [Children education in Islam]. Pustaka Amani.
- Wang, J., Hilliard, L. J., Hershberg, R. M., Bowers, E. P., Chase, P. A., Champine, R. B., Buckingham, M. H., Braun, D. A., Gelgoot, E. S., & Lerner, R. M. (2015). Character in childhood and early adolescence: Models and measurement. *Journal of Moral Education*, 44(2), 165-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2015.1040381>
- Wardhani, N. W., & Wahono, M. (2017). *Keteladanan guru sebagai penguat proses pendidikan karakter* [Teacher example as strengtening of character education process]. *Untirta Civic Education Journal*, 2(1), 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.30870/ucej.v2i1.2801>

- Winarni, S. (2013). *Integrasi pendidikan karakter dalam perkuliahan* [Character education integration in lectures]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 4(1), 95-107. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpk.v0i1.1291>
- Zurqoni, R., Apino, E., & Anazifa, R. D. (2018). Impact of character education implementation: A goal-free evaluation. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 76(6), 881-889. <https://bit.ly/CEEOL1>

Appendix

Valid Instrument

Dimension	Code	statement
Character teaching	CT24	My lecture supervise my assignments
	CT28	My lecture pay attention for seriousness and discipline
	CT30	My lecture check students' attendance strictly
	CT31	My lecture give course assessment samples
	CT32	My lecture grade assignments on schedule
Honesty	H1	I apologize when I have done something wrong
	H2	I tell the truth when I have done something wrong
	H3	I tell others the truth
	H4	I keep promises I make to others
	H5	I admit my mistakes
Prosocial	PS1	I play nicely with others
	PS2	I do things that are good for the group
	PS4	I am nice to friends who are different from me
Respect at home	RaH1	I speak politely to my parents
	RaH2	I obey my parents
	RaH3	I listen (without interrupting) to my parents
	RaH4	I follow the rules at home
Respect at school/ university	RaS1	I speak politely to my teacher and other adults at university
	RaS2	I obey my teacher/lecturer and other adults at university
	RaS3	I follow the directions of my lecturer and other friend
	RaS4	I listen (without interrupting) to my teacher and other friends at university
	RaS5	I follow university rules
Self control	SC1	I wait my turn in line patiently
	SC2	I keep my temper when I have an argument with other friends
	SC3	I follow the rules even when they tease me or call me bad names
Self development	SD1	I make myself a better person
	SD2	I keep trying at something until I succeed
	SD3	I set goals for myself (make plan for the future)
	SD4	I try to be my best