Principals' transformational leadership in strengthening character education at senior high school level (SMA) in Indonesia

Yulius Rustan Effendi [iD] **and Pieter Sahertian** [iD]
Department of Masters in Management and Social Sciences, PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang, East Java, Indonesia
efenrust@unikama.ac.id

Character education reinforcement in secondary schools is one of the educational programmes aimed at anticipating the tendency of moral perversion as a result of moral decadence. Various forms of moral deviations that occur among high school students result in them being alienated from life because they conflict with cultural norms, school discipline, and life ethics in society. In this article we aim to discuss the relation of character value reinforcement and the principal's transformational leadership strategy to shape students' characters in a descriptive-critical manner. The objective of this study was investigating school strategies for optimising the implementation of character education reinforcement. In this research we used a qualitative method with a case study design. The data validity measurement was based on the levels of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The results emphasise the importance of shaping student character as an anticipatory step to minimise moral distortions among high school students, and the effectiveness of the principal's transformational leadership role in optimising the implementation of education programmes for the strengthening of students' characters in schools.

Keywords: principal; strengthening character education; transformational leadership

Introduction

The application of education is always mentioned in conjunction with the phenomena of humanity. Education is a process of humanization, creating individuals with character (Danim, 2006). Self-actualization in humans requires that human ideals be realized, which is done through stages of educational consciousness (Westheimer, 2011). Education is the foundation for building human values through a process of change, from "hominization", or becoming aware of one's own potential, to "humanization", or becoming aware of real activities (Aloni, 2011; Waddock, 2016). At the level of humanization, education tries to get people out of subhuman situations and into human ones.

Education in Indonesia is not yet competitive due to the impact of humanization on the ownership of abilities to replicate people's work. In this aspect, it is difficult for Indonesians to compete with international employees. In addition, the presence of foreign cultures weakens the existence of native culture, resulting in cultural shock among the Indonesian people (Kasali, 2017). Giddens' (2003) view that progress should be seen as a way to make things more equal and not criticized for making things more unequal means that this problem needs to be fixed. In this way, education in the global age is the process of developing life quality, values, and rules. This is true from one generation to the next, even though there is a lot of competition (Giddens, 2003; Lovvorn & Chen, 2011).

This era has been named the century of knowledge enlightenment by futurists (Cook, Smith, Lan & Carpenter, 2016; Li, 2013). The major force that propels humanity into a competitive paradigm is knowledge. In this context, knowledge is derived from a combination of scientific theory and real-world experience gained through reason, the senses, and intuition. In the contemporary era of competition, education must be revitalized and transformed in order to cultivate robust, resilient, and competitive individuals (Solomon, Watson, Delucchi, Schaps & Battistich, 1988). According to Endah (2012), Koesoema (2015), and the Ministry of Education and Culture (2016), character education in schools is critical due to a growing societal problem, specifically the rise in juvenile delinquency among middle school (high school) students. Students' brawls, drug abuse, promiscuity, fading honesty values (cheating, stealing), declining ethical values and good manners in communication, violence and anarchism by peer groups, a worsening work ethic, and a tendency to not respect oneself are all examples of these delinquencies (free sex, suicide, extortion).

The empirical evidence of moral deviation suggests that schools, parents, and communities have failed to educate the youth of Indonesia for the future. There are some reasons for the ineffective implementation of character education. The limits of instructors incorporating character qualities into learning come first. Second, the curriculum and lesson plans do not align with national standards. Thirdly, education is focused on cognitive components and does not address concerns of attitude and conduct (Mutrofin, 2007).

Furthermore, character education in schools is confined to the introduction of norms or ideas, rather than being internalized through behavior. In other words, character education has not yet made a big difference in the way students act. In response to this fact, schools need to change the new paradigm of educational goals, such as by putting more emphasis on acculturating students' values and building their character. Law No. 20 of 2003, Article 3 (Republic of Indonesia, 2003) and Ministry of Education and Culture publications highlight this requirement (2017). The essence of education's affirmation is that "national education functions to develop capabilities, shape the character and dignity of the nation, and produce people who believe in God Almighty,

have good character, are healthy, knowledgeable, intelligent, creative, independent, democratic, and accountable."

The implementation of Law No. 20 of 2003, Article 3 (Republic of Indonesia, 2003), and Ministry of Education and Culture documents (2017) depends on Government Regulation (GR) Number 17 of 2010, Article 12. Its content emphasises that "implementing Elementary Education (SD), including Junior High Schools (SMP), and High Schools (SMA) aim to develop potential human beings, such as, (a) having faith and devotion to Allah, (b) having good character and noble personality, (c) knowledgeable, intelligent, critical, creative and innovative, (d) healthy, independent and confident, (e) tolerant, socially sensitive, democratic, and responsible."

In this case, the goal of education at all levels, even senior high school, is to build character (SMA). In the face of moral decline, it is up to schools to fix the school's reputation and to build the character of students. As a result, it is critical and urgent to redesign school-based character education methods. Schools are accountable for fostering the spiritual and religious values of students. The personal spiritual integrity of students is expressed in three relational dimensions: interpersonal interactions with God (homo religious) (Erikson, 1963; Hegel, 1807/1979), social relationships with people (homo social) (Tony, 2015), and personal relationships with the natural environment (homo natural) (Solomon et al., 1988). The three spiritual meanings as relational dimensions are woven within the concept of a personal human character as a transformative and adaptive being (homo concerns) (Erikson, 1963; Hegel, 1807/1979). Religious values should be implemented through redesigning religion-based learning. It is necessary to condition the school environment to convey exemplary attitudes of peace, love, and tolerance with religious, ethnic and cultural differences to fight for justice and the rights of small people, doing charity and visiting orphans (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017) to students. In this situation, the responsibility of schools is to educate, instruct, train, and impart the principles of honesty, love, truth, loyalty, moral consistency, justice, compassion, and opposition to corruption (Lickona, 2012). Therefore, as a professional educator, it is the teacher's responsibility to incorporate character education into co-curricular, extracurricular, and regular curricular activities. In addition, the teacher's exemplary behavior might serve as a model for pupils' character development (Schaps, Battistich & Solomon, 2004).

The classroom is a good place to show patriotism or nationalism (respect for unity without a narrow, primordial attitude, maintaining integrity to create an Indonesia that is more tolerant,

independent, disciplined, ethical, thinking, upholds moral values, promotes loyalty, responsibility, and mutual care). At this level, it is the job of all school parts, including teachers, staff, the government, and society, to create a peaceful, law-abiding school environment (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016; Wahyudin, 2018).

In addition to teachers, employees, parents, and the community, the principal's presence as a leader is essential for the success of school programs in which students' character is shaped through integrated habituation activities. The principal's role in motivating, coordinating, encouraging, and influencing all school components to develop character education programs is crucial to the school's success (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017; Wibowo, 2015). Principals are in charge of figuring out what the core values of school character are and coming up with tools, models, and ways to measure character growth. Second, the principal builds good working relationships by creating a pleasant place to work and helping people feel confident in themselves. In addition, the administrator stimulates teachers to work more successfully, avoids the tendency of blaming teachers, but corrects teachers' errors; and develops a work environment in which teachers feel comfortable, so that all school elements desire to contribute ideally without coercion. Lastly, the principal makes sure that schools, the government, and the community all work together so that school activities can be evaluated as a whole.

Literature Review
Strengthening character education in the global era
Globalization is the process of linking the world through ways of thinking, communicating, and acting that are unrestricted by time and distance in order to affect changes in many spheres of life (Cook et al., 2016; Li, 2013). People see changes in education as a sign of the maturation of life quality, which is measured not only by intelligence but also by how well each generation understands true values and norms (Reeves, 2006; Stromquist, 2002; Wibowo, 2015).

In the framework of character education, globalization of education is a process of increasing students' self-awareness (Zubaidi, 2011). According to Shor and Freire (1987), conscientisation is an educational paradigm that emphasizes students' critical and imaginative evaluations of themselves and their surroundings. According to the view of Solomon et al. (1988), the meaning of ontological, epistemological, and axiological philosophy is critical and creative thought. In the context of education, ontological, epistemological, and axiological implications depict individuals who not only exist in the world but also coexist with it. Education transforms into a

dialogic-emancipatory place that enhances the life quality of pupils. Shor and Freire (1987) assert that character education is a way to form students' spiritual potential, personality, intelligence, skills, and self-control (Menzies & Baron, 2014; Southworth, 2002).

Heenan (2009) suggests that learners in South Africa need to be able to control themselves in order to say no to drugs, alcohol, sex, gangs, and other bad things. To stop students' morals from getting worse, Ellison (2011) and Rens (2005) talk about how important it is for South African institutions to have character-building programs. In particular, they talk about how important honesty and self-respect are as ways to keep students from getting worse and help them become good citizens. The Indonesian Ministry of Education has put the same idea into schools by taking practical, all-encompassing, and long-term steps. Students in South Africa and Indonesia must have access to character education in schools to anticipate and minimize the negative effects of progress. The negative influence of advancement can cause millennial students to lose their sense of self. Thomas Hobbes (De Waal, 2006) referred to the negative impact of progress as homo homini lupus, which means that progress that does not build character might morph into a wolf that destroys human life.

Character education, like learning the order of values so that each student's actions can be judged, is needed to prepare students for the threat of dehumanization that comes with competition in the global age (Berkowitz & Bustamante, 2013; Helterbran & Strahler, 2013). In a time of advancement, human limits can produce confusion and discord within oneself. Character education teaches students to think critically and carefully so they can turn chaos into order based on their values. Also, students must have access to facts and ideas that push the limits of those who do not have a lot of personal freedom. Thus, anxiety, fear, and a lack of self-confidence come up, so it is important to come up with a set of clear, practical moral guidelines for life. Students also need to be able to do things on their own. Autonomy is the ability to be one's own person. Character education helps people become independent and able to make their own decisions. Students want to know that decisions are based on principles and that people are committed to them. This is a form of behavior participation, while commitment is respect for the decision that was made.

Principals' transformational leadership in strengthening character education

Lead can mean "to move", "to direct", "to guide", "to protect", "to foster", "to set an example", "to encourage", "to help", and "to encourage and assist", among other things in the context of organizational activity (Leithwood, 1992; Robbins,

2002). A leader has implemented a transformational leadership paradigm if he or she is able to convert energy resources (Avolio, Waldman & Yammarino, 1991; Leithwood, 1992). Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) argue that modern school reform initiatives necessitate transformational leaders who are attuned to issues like team building, creating a shared vision, decentralizing authority, and establishing a positive school culture. The presence of transformational leaders in organizations is crucial for managing change - not because of the leaders' behaviors toward others, but because of the leaders' activities in collaboration with others (Colbert, Nicholson & Kurucz, 2018). This leader supports the relationship and dialogue between himself and his followers in a number of ways: followers find meaning and vision at work, persuasive communication, participation and autonomy, fair treatment, constructive feedback, the development of personal and organizational goals, and a role model (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Styron & Styron, 2011).

Many school principals in Indonesia are not effective, and the same condition also occurs in South Africa. The following are some of the reasons for principals' ineffectiveness: a) principals are not empowered; b) the appointment of school principals is not based on a strict and professional selection process; c) principals' low professionalism (not creative and innovative), and d) principals who only wait for orders from superiors (Head of the Education Office) (Ndhlovu, Bertram, Mthiyane & Avery, 1999). This condition results in an unequal education system that poses a threat to the existence, sustainability, competitiveness, and progress of the quality of education (Department of Education, South Africa, 1996; Mutrofin, 2007), resulting in a poor perception of the functions of principals. The best way to deal with this pessimism is to switch from a traditional approach to a transformative one. This will help improve the quality of education and lead to success. After apartheid ended, South Africa started a democratic education system, a system for lifelong learning, and equality of human dignity and social justice (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016).

In order to improve character education in Indonesia and South Africa, the principal's role as a transformational leader is meant to be a good example of how to run an organization in a way that benefits both the followers and the organization as a whole (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Department of Education, South Africa, 1996; Koesoema, 2015; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Thus, leaders work in a way that is democratic and includes everyone. Second, it wants to motivate and inspire followers by showing empathy and

optimism and giving members chances to put character-building programs into action. These programs include activities for personal development, activities for learning about character, activities for the school environment, and activities for the community. Third, it tries to keep people's minds active by making sure leaders and members get along well and by encouraging people to come up with new ways to solve problems in the school system. Fourth, it tries to make people care about each other by making people appreciate and respect individual differences (equality), getting people to follow by giving them responsibilities, and talking to each person to understand their different needs, skills, and goals.

Methodology
In this study, a qualitative, analytical, descriptive research design was utilized. The data were collected orally or in writing and were organized into sentences based on interviews with informants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014). The objective of this qualitative descriptive research was to characterize the school's approach, specifically the role of the principal's transformational leadership in optimizing the execution of character education building programs. Involving school administrators as factors of the performance of school programs, the research findings contribute to the implementation of national character education programs.

Participants
This study was done with the help of five principals and three senior teachers from each of five schools in Malang City, East Java, Central Indonesia, and East Nusa Tenggara, East Indonesia. The goal of choosing five school administrators and three senior teachers from each location was to learn more about how an advanced character education reinforcement program could be put into place in Java. The 10 principals were also chosen because they had done a good job with a program to help schools teach good character. The idea behind choosing three senior teachers from each school was to learn more about how the principals act in their roles.

In this study, we constructed a transformational leadership-based case study on the role of the principal's leadership. In accordance with ethical considerations, we utilized pseudonyms to refer to the participants so as to safeguard the schools' and informants' identity. We answered the research objectives by considering the following two questions:
1) How is the implementation of character education reinforcement program in Indonesia evaluated?

2) How does the principal play the leadership role to optimize the application of character education reinforcement in schools?

Data Collection
We conducted in-depth interviews with the school principals in order to gather data regarding their evaluations of the difficulties in implementing character education reinforcement programs in Indonesia. During the interviews, the principals were questioned about their leadership techniques for optimizing the execution of character education reinforcement programs. In addition, we asked information from the principals regarding the senior teachers to be interviewed in order to acquire more precise information regarding the role of school leadership. Six months were used to collect data from the five schools in Malang City and the five schools in the East Nusa Tenggara region. After collecting field data in written and spoken form, we analyzed the gathered information (Altheide & Johnson, 2000; Miles et al., 2014; Yin, 2017).

Data Analysis
During an ongoing interview session, we analyzed the significance of all acquired data (Patton, 1987). We obtained slightly different responses from the informants during the initial interpretation phase; therefore, we reprocessed the data to match their submissions, and the changes we made were accepted by the informants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). We used credibility criteria as data validity. The goal of data credibility is to demonstrate the compatibility of the data with the study's facts. Transferability was achieved by meticulous research reports that related to the research's topic. In the meantime, dependency was finished to verify or assess the accuracy of the researchers' constant data conceptualization. Confirmability was achieved through testing to evaluate the research results pertaining mostly to the description of the research findings and the analysis of the research results (Creswell, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles et al., 2014; Yin, 2017).

Findings and Discussion
Implementation of Character Education Reinforcement in Indonesia
Saneca, a philosopher who lived in the third century before Christ, asserted in his philosophical statement non scholae sed vitae disc Imus, "We do not learn for school, but for life", that education is a basic action that changes and determines human life by touching its foundation. Human life is valued if it possesses admirable character. Education not only influences but also creates moral character (Endah, 2012). Character education constitutes the practice of a worthwhile existence and becomes a crucial competitive advantage in the

global era (Berkowitz & Bustamante, 2013).

Character education is not yet fully established in Indonesia. Character education is not yet implemented at Indonesian universities, as stated by Koesoema (2015) and the Ministry of Education and Culture (2017). The ability of parents to instill moral values in their children is hampered by issues like antisocial conduct in schools and on playgrounds, disobedience to rules, and violence among students, just as they are in South Africa (Helterbran & Strahler, 2013). Given the relative ease with which character education reinforcement programs can be implemented in schools, it is important to perform tracing studies to discover and evaluate viable alternatives. Althof and Berkowitz (2006) and Bulach (2002), for example, concluded that schools required to construct character education that was readily understood, not confusing, and gave practical guidance for carrying out activities and instructions for assessment.

Anderson (1998) claims that the core of character values cannot be taught; rather, they must be integrated into the curriculum material, extracurricular and regular academic activities, and a conducive learning environment (school and home). High schools in South Africa and Indonesia do not yet show signs of this problem (Ndhlovu et al., 1999). Budimansyah (2010), Freeks (2007), Koesoema (2015), Lapsley and Narvaez (2006), Raharjo (2010), and Zubaidi (2011) assert that certain constraints limit the development of such learning environments. First, schools lack organizational frameworks and standards for character instruction. Consequently, character education implementation is not monitored. Second, character education implementation is not reported by schools. Thirdly, schools lack a quality assurance framework for education. Fourthly, schools lack planning, implementation, and evaluation guidelines for character education programs. In fifth position, schools have not identified the values that define their character and brand. The sixth-grade teachers have not incorporated character principles into the curriculum. In the seventh instance, teachers are less capable of constructing learning aids with character-based material for recreational and academic activities. Educators lack the training necessary to effectively introduce character education into the classroom. In the worst-case situation, both teachers and parents fail to guide their children.

Barriers to the implementation of character education reinforcement have been overcome by some senior high schools in Indonesia. Schools should follow the framework developed by Bulach (2002), Campbell (2003), DeRoche and Williams (1998), Kohn (1997), Lave and Wenger (1991), Lickona (2012), Liontos (1992), Nash (1997) and Roberts, (1998) to overcome the barriers to the implementation of character education. First and foremost, schools must comprehend global moral ideals. Second, schools must establish criteria for their core principles (benchmarking). All teachers should conduct character evaluations of their students. The outcomes of this review should be coordinately communicated to all parties. Observation and behavioral records should be used to evaluate three areas of the character evaluation criteria, namely, behavior, crafts, and neatness, both within and outside the classroom. Thirdly, schools must integrate physical (sport), intellectual (thoughts), aesthetic (feelings), and ethical and spiritual (heart processing) growth into character education. Fourthly, schools must incorporate character education program enhancements into their core curriculum in order to administer character education effectively. In the fifth situation, it is important for schools to have input from a wide range of people to reach consensus on the core ideals of character education, taking into account factors like available resources and proposed strategies for implementing them. Sixth, local diversity-based expertise should be prioritized and responded to by schools such that it has contextual importance and helps establish students' identities. The seventh most important thing is for them to learn how to learn, through activities like critical thinking, social sensitivity, cultural competences, foreign language fluency, and the discovery of learning models. Justice, nondiscrimination, a lack of sectarianism, acceptance of a wide range of perspectives (inclusivity), and a reverence for the inherent worth of every individual should all be emphasized in the classroom. They should modify their methods to best suit the developing needs of the student in terms of their biology, psychology, and socialization in order to increase the likelihood of their success. Schools should also advance according to observable, quantifiable principles so that their procedures and outcomes can be monitored and understood objectively.

Schools must therefore set criteria for the creation and evaluation of character education programs and ensure the availability of resources. To modify student behavior, evaluation and follow-up are required in the following step. If pupils breach school rules, parents must be involved in resolving the issue. The school's daily duty teachers should be involved in regulating student conduct and improving the ethos and examples set by all members of the school's community. Educators that show their pupils genuine care and treat them with integrity will earn their students' admiration. Further, educational options provided by institutions of higher learning should be easily understood and implemented. The situations and environments of their kids necessitate that teachers

employ creative, innovative, and competitive classroom management strategies. Therefore, different types of injustice, cheating, lying, and discrimination should be eliminated in the educational setting. Finally, school regulations should be flexible, considering the individuality of kids and encouraging tolerance and respect for diversity.

Principals' Transformational Leadership Strategies in the Application of Strengthening Character Education in Indonesia

Schools as formal organizations are locations of collaboration between a collection of individuals (principals, teachers, staff, students, school committees, and communities) in order to accomplish the intended goals (Gamage & Pang, 2003; Valentine & Prater, 2011). Different types of organizations, including schools, require leaders who apply tactics to fulfill their leadership responsibilities (Wahab, 2008). As an example, a transformational leader might do the following: (1) act on the basis of what is right and important; (2) work toward a shared goal for the benefit of the school; (3) maximize performance in a way that places a premium on character; (4) encourage subordinates to act in a moral and ethical manner at the workplace; (5) implement collaborative learning by giving the entire school community a voice; (6) redefine the school's vision and mission, renewing commitment, and reshaping the institution; (7) change behaviour as a moral agent; (8) commit to a code of ethics as a shared ethical standard; (9) consider the good achieved through faith and highest satisfaction value changes; (10) help followers maintain a positive school culture; and (11) establish the competency of followers to solve problems effectively (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Brubacher, Case & Reagan, 1994; Leithwood, 1992; Liontos, 1992).

According to the Ministry of Education and Culture (2017), Sumaryani (2009) and Versland (2013), the transformational leadership methods of Indonesian principals in executing the improvement of character education consisted of numerous strategic measures. The first is giving subordinates chances to take part in the change process of the school organization. This can be done in several ways, such as by letting all school parts, school committees, and the community help come up with the school's vision and mission, and by letting all stakeholders choose and decide on the values that define the school's character. According to the Character Education Partnership (CEP) (Lickona, Schaps & Lewis, n.d.), principals should organize meetings with stakeholders to affirm the basic values and set character-related goals. This strategy also includes involving all stakeholders in creating a clear organizational structure and dividing up tasks, as well as integrating and

implementing program socialization in a way that works well with the education office, school supervisors, school principals, teachers, staff, and school committees. Developing guidelines for character education can be done in collaboration with teachers, employees, school committees, and stakeholders. The CEP (2010) emphasizes this technique by stating that schools must develop programs to promote character education in the classroom, school environment, and community. In the meantime, the government must urge schools to assess the creation of student character through limited socialization and instruction. Finally, schools must submit periodic evaluation reports on the program's implementation.

The formation of a vision and goal for the institution that includes character education is among the goals that have been met. Second, to foster the growth of the school's core principles as they work toward their mission. This goal is in line with the CEP's (2010) anticipation that the school community will promote fundamental ethical concepts and performance. Third, the school has a formal organizational framework for character education with clearly delineated responsibilities. Fourth, formal education meets the requirements of the modern labor market. Fifthly, character education initiatives should be included into school branding efforts. To integrate character education, the 2013 curriculum, and full day/half-day schooling into a unified set of curricular, extracurricular, and co-curricular offerings in the sixth instance. Implement a character education reinforcement program based on Core Competencies (CC) and Basic Competencies (BC) in curriculum topic standards. This objective is congruent with the CEP's (Lickona et al., n.d.) assertion that schools employ a complete, purposeful, and proactive character development strategy. To have defined work guidelines for the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of activities and follow-up programs.

By implementing (1) socialization and training opportunities for teachers and employees to formulate and teach character in continuous teaching and (2) building commitment in behavior as a form of theory internalization in accordance with the school's vision and mission, leaders can encourage their followers to work together in fighting for change. Goals should include bolstering educator skills so that character education can be effectively implemented and developed and so that students can learn the necessary character traits. Teachers should set an example by acting in ways that are compatible with the ideals they are trying to instill in their students. Finally, the program will include character education upgrading. As you'll see in the next paragraphs, this activity is best carried out with a large group of people.

Principal

Principal strategies include getting teachers to know each other and train them through verb-selection exercises used to make teaching indicators; stepping up the activities of the Teacher Subject Meeting (TSM) to create learning tools (syllabi, lesson plans (LP), questions, evaluations, and follow-up plans); and making rules for how students should act that involve all parts of the school. putting together a schedule for daily or weekly activities that help build character; Changing the school's curriculum, especially the morning and afternoon activities listed in school curriculum documents; putting together a schedule for strengthening character education (SCE) activities and adapting them to the school's academic calendar; getting commitments from all parties to support and implement SCE as planned.

The targets achieved are as follows. Firstly, there is the development of the main character values of the school which are integrated into the syllabus indicators and the learning implementation plan (LIP). Secondly, the use of operational verbs that are effective and in accordance with the achievement of the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective aspects specified in the Education Unit Level Curriculum (EULC). Thirdly, indicators of character values are formulated according to the achievement of cognitive, psychomotor, and affective aspects. Fourthly, formulate indicators of character values according to operational verbs for the achievement of aspects of attitude (spiritual and social), aspects of knowledge, and aspects of skills in accordance with the 2013 curriculum guidelines (C13). In the fifth instance, there are similarities in the syllabus format, LIP, learning methods, learning evaluation, and follow-up program plans. The sixth objective is to establish a uniform standard for the core character values and primary learning steps. Seventh, codify student disciplinary standards, which allow for rewards and punishments and are continually examined and revised in response to changes in student violations. In the eighth instance, providing teachers with Internet access and other reading materials and counseling support.

Teacher (educator)

The following are strategies involving teachers. Developing a school culture that supports the implementation of the SCE program is the first step. As a manifestation of the execution of character education reinforcement, setting an example for the entire school community is the second step. Thirdly, constructing a LIP, an evaluation that incorporates the reinforcing of character education's core values. Fourthly, employing learning strategies that foster critical, creative, communicative, and collaborative thinking. Providing examples to the entire school community as a manifestation of the implementation of a program to promote character education ranks fifth.

In the sixth instance, encouraging the development of positive relationships between teachers, students, and the entire school community outside of the classroom. In the seventh instance, create a learning atmosphere in which the uniqueness of each student is valued and acknowledged. Optimizing the function of Teacher Working Groups (TWG) and Subject Teachers' Meetings (STM) for the growth of learning based on the reinforcement of character education is the eighth priority. In ninth place, designing curriculum-based character education reinforcing activities. Implementing extracurricular programs that support character education Optimizing the function of advice and counselling in the implementation of character education strengthening programs and monitoring and evaluating the implementation of character education strengthening programs are the final objectives.

Educational staff

As part of the execution of a program to promote character education, one of the employee-based techniques consists of serving as a role model for the entire school community, encouraging the development of positive relationships between education professionals, instructors, students, and the entire school community within the educational environment, as well as supporting the implementation of intra-curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities that are based on the improvement of character education.

School committee

As a manifestation of the implementation of the character education reinforcement program, the first strategy involving the school committee is exemplary behavior throughout the entire school community. The second is promoting the execution of character education programs through cooperation that is mutually beneficial. The school committee can then endorse the execution of intra-curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities based on the reinforcement of character education. Finally, they should support the establishment of a 5-day school week policy and review and monitor the execution of character education initiatives.

Communities and professional organisations

As a manifestation of the execution of the SCE program, strategies involving the community and professional organizations are embodying behavior to the entire school community. The community can then assist educational institutions in implementing character education enhancing

programs. In accordance with their various talents and professions, they may also participate as partners and volunteers in the implementation of programs designed to strengthen education. In addition, community and professional organizations should monitor and evaluate the implementation of character education.

Hermino (2016), Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), Lickona (2012), Maehr and Anderman (1993), Maehr and Fyans (1989), The Ministry of Education and Culture (2016), and Wahjosumidjo (1999) argue that the following summarizes the transformational leadership roles of principals in the reinforcement of character education at the senior high school level in Indonesia. First, principals use their expertise to create a positive and motivating school climate, which helps students overcome current and future challenges. Student enthusiasm and accomplishment, increased inter-teacher collaboration, and new perspectives on teaching are all linked to a positive and inspiring school culture. Positive teacher attributes include being agents of change, being adaptable in thought and action, and fostering the trust of teachers, staff, and students to advance the school. Teachers should also behave according to a system of moral values, cope with complex, ambiguous, and uncertain situations, have a vision for the future, and be open to new ideas and methods of problem-solving.

The second function is character development through rational, expressive, and passionate thought (Deal & Peterson, 1992). The principal should be a planner, coordinator, supervisor, official, legal expert, gatekeeper, and empowering individual. Principals in symbolic roles are viewed as historians, detectives, anthropologists, visionaries, symbolists, poets, actors, and leaders (Fullan, 1996; Narvaez, 2006). An openness to involvement, variety, disagreement, reflection, and making mistakes are all qualities that Deal and Peterson (1992) argue are essential in a leader.

The third role is that of a change agent; a society without disagreements is doomed to stagnation because progress always begins with conflict (Champy, 1995). It requires guts on the part of the principal to deconstruct the obstruction to change. In addition to their primary responsibilities, principals should also take on management roles, as good principals recognize the value of good management. The principal's duties are spread amongst a larger group of people under a school-based management system, where teachers and administrators work together to create educational policies and agendas for schools. Fifth, principals play a crucial role in providing inclusive education that helps students from all backgrounds connect with one another. Joint meetings, orientation events, bulletin boards, newspapers, and school handbooks are all ways in which the principal can help teachers, parents, students, and school committees better grasp the reality of the school community.

Conclusion
With SCE as a foundation, educational policy and development initiatives may be mapped out with precision. To achieve this goal, the policy supporting the national education system places an emphasis on character education in schools, with the explicit goal of helping pupils become independent, well-informed, and morally upright.

It is commonly held that a person has fully realized their identity when they present themselves as a God-fearing, moral, rational thinker who acts on their own will and as an independent, whole humanism. The focus is on the real-life reinforcement of character education that each student must experience and use. Therefore, teaching good character becomes an important part of the core curriculum in schools, both in terms of ideas and actions. This is important because the curriculum and ways of learning are important ways to socialize and learn norm- and morality-based values for living. As such, students need to be strong and resilient to meet the challenges of an increasingly competitive time.

The principle's approach to transformative leadership for bolstering character education in secondary schools (SMA) includes: allowing subordinates to take part in the change process of the school organization through a variety of character-building activities and then encouraging subordinates to form TWGs and support one another in the change process through a number of joint activities to form character schools. Character education should be a part of classroom instruction and extracurricular activities. Having a plan in place for classroom management and literacy education is essential. Moreover, leadership strategies include the introduction of counseling and mentoring activities, as well as the development of a unique school environment.

Authors' Contributions
This article was conceptualised, drafted and written by Yulius Rustan Effendi, supported by Pieter Sahertian. Both authors reviewed the final article.

References

Aloni N 2011. Humanistic education: From theory to practice. In W Veugelers (ed). *Education and humanism: Linking autonomy and humanity*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-577-2_3

Altheide DL & Johnson JM 2000. Criteria for assessing the validity of interpretation in qualitative research. In NK Denzin & YS Lincoln (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Althof W & Berkowitz MW 2006. Moral education and character education: Their relationship and their roles in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(4):495–518. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240601012204

Anderson SM 1998. *Service-learning: A national strategy for youth development*. Washington, DC: Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies, George Washington University.

Avolio BJ, Waldman DA & Yammarino FJ 1991. Leading in the 1990s: The four i's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4):9–16. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090599110143366

Bass BM & Steidlmeier P 1999. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2):181–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8

Berkowitz MW & Bustamante A 2013. Using research to set priorities for character education in schools: A global perspective [Special issue]. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*:7–20. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maurice-Elias/publication/226167538_Building_Educational_Opportunity/links/5a52855eaca2725638c600c4/Building-Educational-Opportunity.pdf#page=11. Accessed 31 May 2022.

Brubacher JW, Case CW & Reagan TG 1994. *Becoming a reflective educator: How to build a culture of inquiry in the schools*. Thousand Oaks,CA: Corwin Press.

Budimansyah D 2010. *Character education*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alphabet.

Bulach CR 2002. Implementing a character education curriculum and assessing its impact on student behavior. *The Clearing House*, 76(2):79–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650209604954

Campbell E 2003. *The ethical teacher*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Champy JB 1995. *Reengineering management: The mandate for new leadership*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Character Education Partnership 2010. *Leading a national call to character*. Available at http://www.character.org/2010Forum. Accessed 18 February 2020.

Colbert BA, Nicholson J & Kurucz EC 2018. Humanistic leadership for sustainable transformation. In SL Steffen, J Rezmovits, S Trevenna & S Rappaport (eds). *Evolving leadership for collective wellbeing*: *Lessons for implementing the United Nations sustainable developmental goals*. Bingley, England: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Cook LA, Smith WS, Lan WY & Carpenter D 2016. The development of global competencies and global mindedness through global education experiences. *International Journal of Global Education*, 5(2):1–16. Available at http://ijge.net/index.php/ijge/article/view/12/12. Accessed 31 May 2022.

Creswell JW 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Danim S 2006. *Educational innovation in efforts to increase professionalism*. Bandung, Indonesia: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Deal T & Peterson K 1992. *The leadership paradox*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin NK & Lincoln YS (eds.) 2000. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Education, South Africa 1996. *Changing management to manage change in education* (Report of the Task Team on Education Management Development*)*. Pretoria: Author.

DeRoche E & Williams MM 1998. *Educating hearts and minds: A comprehensive character education framework* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

De Waal F 2006. *Primates and philosophers: How morality evolved*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ellison L 2011. Moral reasoning of chronically disruptive pre-adolescent African-American males in an urban elementary school setting. EdD dissertation. Rochester, NY: St John Fisher College. Available at https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1032&context=education_etd. Accessed 15 October 2019.

Endah S 2012. *Implementation of the character education curriculum*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Citra Aji Parama.

Erikson EH 1963. *Childhood and society* (2nd ed). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Freeks FE 2007. 'n Karakterbouprogram vir verdere onderwys en opleidingskolleges. PhD tesis. Potchefstroom, Suid-Afrika: Noordwes-Universiteit. Beskikbaar te http://dspace.nwu.ac.za/handle/10394/1579. Geraadpleeg 15 Oktober 2019.

Fullan M 1996. Leadership for change. In K Leithwood, J Chapman, D Corson, P Hallinger & A Hart (eds). *International handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Gamage DT & Pang NSK 2003. *Leadership and management in education*. Hongkong, China: Chinese University Press.

Giddens A 2003. *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Government Regulation (GR) Number 17 of 2010, Concerning Management and Implementation of National Education. Jakarta, Indonesia: Secretary of State.

Heenan J 2009. *Making sense of values*. Available at http://www.teachingvalues.com/valuesense.html. Accessed 15 October 2019.

Hegel G 1807/1979. *Phenomenology of spirit*. Translated by AV Miller. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Helterbran VR & Strahler BR 2013. Children as global

citizens: A Socratic approach to teaching character. *Childhood Education*, 89(5):310–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2013.830902

Hermino A 2016. Asian economic community in the perspective of transformational leadership in school. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(4):401–416. Available at http://www.ijern.com/journal/2016/June-2016/35.pdf. Accessed 18 February 2020.

Kasali R 2017. *Disruption: Nothing can be changed before it is faced, motivation is not enough*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Koesoema DA 2015. *Character education strategy, mental revolution in educational institutions*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Kanisius.

Kohn A 1997. How not to teach values: A critical look at character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78:428–439.

Lapsley DK & Narvaez D 2006. Character education. In KA Renninger & IE Sigel (Vol. eds.), W Damon & RM Lerner (Editors-in-Chief). *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., Vol. 4). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Lave J & Wenger E 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Leithwood K & Jantzi D 2006. Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2):201–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829

Leithwood KA 1992. The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5):8–12.

Li Y 2013. Cultivating student global competence: A pilot experimental study. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 11(1):125–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4609.2012.00371.x

Lickona T 2012. *Education for character: Educating for character shaping*. Translated by JA Wamaungo. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Bumi Aksara.

Liçkona T, Schaps E & Lewis C n.d. *Eleven principles of effective character education*. Arlington, VA: Character Education Partnership. Available at https://www.educationalimpact.com/resources/TeachChar/pdf/eleven_principles.pdf. Accessed 18 February 2020.

Lincoln YS & Guba EG 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Liontos LB 1992.Transformational Leadership. *ERIC Digest*, 72. Available at https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED347636.pdf. Accessed 25 March 2020.

Lovvorn AS & Chen JS 2011. Developing a global mindset: The relationship between an international assignment and cultural intelligence [Special issue]. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(9):275–283.

Maehr ML & Anderman EM 1993. Reinventing schools for early adolescents: Emphasizing task goals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93(5):593–610. https://doi.org/10.1086/461742

Maehr ML & Fyans LJ, Jr 1989. School culture, motivation, and achievement. In ML Maehr & C Ames (eds). *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 6). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Menzies JL & Baron K 2014. International postgraduate student transition experiences: The importance of student societies and friends. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 51(1):84–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.771972

Miles MB, Huberman AM & Saldaña J 2014. *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mutrofin 2007. *Autocritical education; Evaluative ideas*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: LaksBang PRESSindo.

Narvaez D 2006. Integrative ethical education. In M Killen & J Smetana (eds). *Handbook of moral development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nash RJ 1997. *Answering the "virtuecrats": A moral conversation on character education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ndhlovu T, Bertram C, Mthiyane N & Avery N 1999. *Creating people-centered schools: School organization and change in South Africa. Learning guide*. Braamfontein, South Africa: South African Institue for Distance Education (Saide). Available at https://www.oerafrica.org/system/files/8862/section-three-new-contexts-new-policies-new-schools_0.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=8862. Accessed 31 May 2022.

Patton MQ 1987. *Qualitative evaluation methods* (8th ed). London, England: Sage.

Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Moorman RH & Fetter R 1990. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on their followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2):107–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

Raharjo SB 2010. Character education as an effort to create noble morals. *Journal of Education and Culture*, 16(3):229–238.

Reeves DB 2006. *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rens JA 2005. Riglyne vir waarde-opvoeding in Suid-Afrikaanse skole. PhD tesis. Potchefstroom, Suid-Afrika: Noordwes-Universiteit. Beskikbaar te http://dspace.nwu.ac.za/handle/10394/524. Geraadpleeg 15 Oktober 2019.

Republic of Indonesia 2003. Act of the Republic of Indonesia, Number 20, Year 2003 on national education system. *National Gazette*, 78.

Robbins I 2002. *From the Academy of Management's August 5, 2003, Management, Spirituality, and Religion Interest Group's proposed minutes*.

Roberts JK 1998. *Thurstone's method of equal-appearing intervals in measuring attitudes: An old method that is not forgotten*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, 4 November. Available at https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED426085.pdf. Accessed 25 March 2020.

Schaps E, Battistich V & Solomon D 2004. Community in school as key to student growth: Findings from the Child Development Project. In JE Zins, RP Weissberg, MC Wang & HJ Walberg (eds).

Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say? New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shor I & Freire P 1987. *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Solomon D, Watson MS, Delucchi KL, Schaps E & Battistich V 1988. Enhancing children's prosocial behavior in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(4):527–554. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312025004527

Southworth G 2002. Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management*, 22(1):73–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430220143042

Stromquist NP 2002. *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Styron RA, Jr & Styron JL 2011. Critical issues facing school principals. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 8(5):1–10. https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v8i5.8158

Sumaryani C 2009. *Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional kepala sekolah dan iklim organisasi sekolah terhadap produktivitas sekolah* [The effect of principal transformational leadership and school organization climate on school productivity]. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta.

The Ministry of Education and Culture 2016. *Guidelines for strengthening character education*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Secretariat Team for Strengthening Character Education.

The Ministry of Education and Culture 2017. *Strengthening character education; Training module for principals*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Secretariat Team Strengthening Character Education.

Tony K 2015. *God and human freedom: A Kierkegaardian perspective*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Valentine JW & Prater M 2011. Instructional, transformational, and managerial leadership and student achievement: High school principals make a difference. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1):5–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636511404062

Versland TM 2013. Principal efficacy: Implications for rural 'grow your own' leadership programs. *The Rural Educator*, 35(1). https://doi.org/10.35608/ruraled.v35i1.361

Waddock S 2016. Developing humanistic leadership education. *Humanist Management Journal*, 1:57–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-016-0003-5

Wahab AA 2008. *Anatomi organisasi dan kepemimpinan pendidikan* [Anatomy of educational organizations and leadership]. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta.

Wahjosumidjo 1999. *Kepemimpinan kepala sekolah: Tinjauan teoritis dan masalah* [Principal leadership: Theoretical review, and problems]. Jakarta, Indonesia: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Wahyudin D 2018. Peace education curriculum in the context of education sustainable development (ESD). *Journal of Sustainable Development Education and Research*, 2(1):21–32. https://doi.org/10.17509/jsder.v2i1.12354

Westheimer J 2011. Practicing democracy. In W Veugelers (ed). *Education and humanism: Linking autonomy and humanity*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-577-2_7

Wibowo A 2015. *Management of character education in schools*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Pustaka Pelajar.

Yin RK 2017. *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed). London, England: Sage.

Zubaidi 2011. *Conception character education: Design and application in educational institutions*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kencana.