English Students' Character Reflected in Teaching and Learning of Seminar on Linguistics Course

Sri Haryanti✉, Ana Setyandari

Universitas Widya Dharma Klaten, Indonesia

Info Articles	Abstract
	This study aims to describe the students' character reflected in Seminar on Linguistics course. The students' character is limited to seven (7) types, namely: respect, honesty, courage, confident, communicative, curious, and cooperative. This course must be taken by VII semester students of the English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Widya Dharma Klaten. This course was attended by eighteen (18) students and guided by one (1) lecturer who became the source of research data. The research data are in the form of the results of notes on the teaching and learning process of Seminar on Linguistics which were collected by directly observing the teaching and learning process of Seminar on Linguistics. The collected data were analyzed by statistical method especially the mean value. The students' character is measured by the rubric. The result of the analysis shows that the students' character reflected in Seminar on Linguistics course is very good with a mean value of 17.

✉ Address correspondence:
Email: yanti.unwidha@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Character is one of educational essences which is also meant the development of life skills. This term has been very familiar in teaching and learning processes. Even in curriculum 2013 each language skill should relate to character. It can be realized that human being wherever he is needs to manifest it in every aspect of life, such as economic, political, social, cultural and educational problems. It was said by (Fitriasari, 2011) that good character is not formed automatically; it is developed over time through a sustained process of teaching, example, learning and practice. It is developed through character education.

Character education aims at improving students' kindness, namely to be young people who are smart, care, and give priority to good values in their actions (Battistich, 2010). Character education is value, character, moral, noble character educations that aim to develop students' ability to make good and bad decisions, maintain what is good and realize that goodness in everyday life wholeheartedly (Balitbang, 2011). The strategy of character education can be through three pillars, namely curriculum, model, and learning method (Rahayu, 2012). Education aim in relation to spiritual competences is developing students' potencies to be the persons who believe in God and obey His rules and have excellent attitude/behaviour; in relation to personal competences is developing students' potencies to be democratic and responsible persons. These characters become the focus in creating Indonesian personals. Democratic and responsible characters for higher education, especially in English education study program can be trained or practised in seminar sessions. English education study program in University of Widya Dharma Klaten has two kinds of seminar courses, namely seminar on language teaching and seminar on linguistics. Seminar is as a means for the students to share their knowledge. It is in line with the pedagogical and intellectual competencies that aim at developing students' potencies to have knowledge, to be smart, creative and independent. (Leuven, 2019) stated that practically seminar or tutorial is not only the transfer of knowledge, but also students' active involvement. Whether it is about exercises, feedback on a seminar or practising skills. It is also based on the statement that teacher professional development should provide an opportunity for in-service English teachers to explore their teaching practice and to critically evaluate themselves as professionals (Richards & Lockhart, 1994); (Wallace, 1991). There is a belief that professional development constitutes an important part of being a teacher (Cirkovic-Miladinovic, 2014). Seminar sessions may not provide panaceas but may contribute to a continuous process of learning and improving teaching skills (Cirkovic-Miladinovic, 2016).

Every student has certain characters. Gillespie and Becker said that family members and the places we grew up are often important catalysts for reconstructing and understanding ourselves (Gillespie, 2013). Betty Friedan said that "family" is not just a buzz word for reactionaries; for women, as for men, it is the symbol of the last area where one has any hope of control over one's destiny, of meeting one's most basic human needs, of nourishing that core of personhood, threatened now by vast impersonal institutions and uncontrollable corporate and government bureaucracies (Gillespie, 2013).

People who want to communicate and to convey their meaning correctly must study one of the linguistic aspects which is usually called grammar. In addition, linguistics is very much needed in developing students' language skills. In speaking skill the students need phonetics which studies how to produce English vowels and consonants and combine them to be word(s). In writing skill the students need morphology, syntax, and semantics which guide the students to construct words and constructions having clear and understandable meanings.

Based on the statements above, it is better for students to pay attention to the factors above in conducting a seminar. The students and their lecturer need to have a commitment that in teaching and learning of seminar on linguistics, both of them apply their good characters. It is because seminar needs a conducive academic situations where the students can express their ideas freely either orally or written. Although the seminar is intended to train a student to make a paper, present it before his/her friends, answer

questions, give argument, and to accept suggestion/ideas, he/she should act as in the real seminar. Seminars advocate and support experiential learning where students are contributors in finding truth and forming their own perspective of the truth through experience (Aubrey & Riley, 2016); Piaget & Vygotsky as cited in (Passarelli & Kolb, 2011).

The writers' reasons for choosing the topic are that the writers are interested in identifying students' characters in seminar on linguistics course because they are inherent in their daily lives. It is in line with (Dost & Hafshejani, 2017) statement that recent studies in the field of language learning and teaching point out that many learning style theories, teaching and learning activities are linked to personality (Hohn, 1995). The systematic study of the role of personality in second language acquisition can lead to a better perception of language learning processes and the development of effective teaching methods. It was also stated by Cook (1993:3) in (Lestari, Sada, & Suhartono, 2015) "there are three reasons for being interested in personality, namely to gain scientific understanding, to access people and to change people". For Cook, to gain scientific understanding of a person's personality concerns with or involves the theory of a personality; while the second reasons means that personality can be as an access to understand a person behaviour and attitude, then could change a person, the two reasons are relevant and can be applied in real life situation. There are also assumptions that students bring to the classroom not only their cognitive abilities, but also effective states which influence the way they acquire the language.

Based on the statements above, the writers carried out the research related to personality, but in this case they focus on character. The students' characters are very important in creating the situation and condition of the seminar. The teaching and learning of seminar will be interesting and alive when the students can keep their good characters.

The problem concerning with this study can be formulated into the following question: How is the students' character reflected in seminar on linguistics course? This study is limited to the students of English Education Study Program,

Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Widya Dharma Klaten in academic year 2018/2019 in Seminar on Linguistics course.

By this study it is hoped that it will be useful for the development of English teaching in general and the application of students' character in seminar on linguistics course. Besides, the students can reflect their good characters in seminar on linguistics course, especially in delivering the material of the discussion, giving arguments, asking the questions, giving and accepting suggestions and criticisms.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Character applies to the aggregate of moral qualities by which a person is judged apart from intelligence, competence, or special talents. *Character* comes ultimately from the Greek *charaktēr* ("mark, distinctive quality"), which passed through Latin and French before landing in English. The Greek noun itself is derived from the verb *charassein*, meaning "to sharpen, cut in furrows, or engrave." (Webster, 2019) proposes 20 essential traits of good character as follows: integrity, honesty, loyalty, respectfulness, responsibility, humility, compassion, fairness, forgiveness, authenticity, courageousness, generosity, perseverance, politeness, kindness, lovingness, optimism, reliability, conscientiousness, self-discipline.

Character discussion is usually directly related to character education. According to (Agboola & Tsai, 2012), character education is a growing discipline with the deliberate attempt to optimize students' ethical behavior. The outcome of character education has always been encouraging, solidly, and continually preparing the leader of tomorrow.

Lecturer should guide the students to make them aware of the character education that appears in the teaching and learning process of seminar on linguistics. The characters that often appear in it are respectful, honest, brave, confident, communicative, curious and cooperative with other individuals. Based on the statement above, the researchers want to know whether or not those characters can be found in the teaching and learning process of seminar on linguistics.

Lauren Bryant stated that in the last twenty to thirty years, Starkey notes, broader interest in character traits—fostering good ones, avoiding bad ones—has surged. Amid this resurgence of interest—"Responsibility. Courage. Compassion. Honesty. Friendship. Persistence. Faith. Everyone recognizes these traits as essentials of good character," "Everyone" may agree on which traits are good and which are bad, but according to Starkey, there has been little analysis which led Starkey to undertake his "basic research" on character traits. Starkey's goal is to develop a robust new theory about character traits—their components and their relationship to human thought, feeling, and action.

In Starkey's view, character traits are deeply rooted in and determined by values and our specific character traits are a product of which values come to the fore and drive our behavior. In Starkey's theory, values can, and do, change. "Character traits are tied to values, but values are not static things. "The perceived importance of a value is not fixed. Values have a force in our lives, but a value's force can diminish." (Lauren J. Bryant in (Glimpse, 2019).

The teaching and learning process of Seminar on Linguistics cannot be separated from student's learning styles. According to Brown the way we learn things in general and the particular attack we make on a problem seem to hinge on a rather amorphous link between personality and cognition: this link is referred to as cognitive style. When cognitive styles are specifically related to an educational context, where affective and physiological factors are intermingled, they are usually more generally referred to as learning styles (Brown, 1994). Learning styles mediate between emotion and cognition. People's styles are determined by the way they internalize their total environment, and since that internalization process is not strictly cognitive, we find that physical, affective, and cognitive domains merge in learning styles (Brown, 1994).

According to (Brown, 1994), there are two kinds of styles, field-independent style and field-dependent style. Field- independent style is the ability to perceive a particular item or factor in a field of distracting items. Field-dependent style is the tendency to be dependent on the total field so

that the parts embedded within the field are not easily perceived, though that total field is perceived more clearly as a unified whole. Based on theories above the students' learning styles can be seen in their product in the form of articles. Their articles are concerned with their cognitive domain; their ways of delivering the contents of articles, answering the questions, accepting suggestions are concerned with physiological and affective domains. The students' field-independent style and field-dependent style can also been seen in seminar on linguistics course.

In joining Seminar on Linguistics course the student needs communicative competence. "The term "communicative competence" according to Savignon (1983:9) in (Brown, 1994) is relative, and absolute, and depends on the cooperation of all the participants involved. There are four different components or subcategories of communicative competence: grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence (Brown, 1994). In this study the writers focus on grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence. Their grammatical competence is shown in the structures of phrases and sentences. It will show how the students express their ideas through words combined in correct and acceptable constructions. Their sociolinguistic competence is shown in the presenters' way to communicate with the participants of the seminar and their choice on the appropriate language function.

There are four particularly common types of oral classroom communication (Pollard & Triggs, 1997), they are expositions, question-and-answer exchanges, discussions and listening. In expositions the speaker describes, informs, instructs, or explains; question-and-answer exchanges are used to test and check purposes where there is often one right answer as well as to encourage thinking, speculation, to develop understanding; during discussions the participants (whole class or small group) explore ideas and feelings together; in listening the receiver hears and responds to the other people's speech.

In seminar sessions, the four types of classroom communication above are used. Every communicative situation is at least a two-way process, we need to consider the speakers as well as

the listeners. In an exposition situation the listeners are not likely to participate verbally very much. The listeners must listen, must be able to react and show if understanding has taken place, or if not must be able to ask for clarification. In addition, the listeners may also want to respond more actively. Hence expositions can sometimes become discussions.

The seminar method is the most modern and advanced method of teaching. It is an instructional technique, involves generating a situation for a group to have a guided interaction among themselves on a theme, and refers to a structured group discussion what usually follows a formal lecture or lectures often in the form of an essay or a paper presentation on a theme (Madhavan, 2019). The majority of students perceived seminars as a good method of teaching that engaged them actively in critical thinking by raising questions on literary texts, sharing ideas and improving their communication and presentation skills (Pala, 2016).

According to Ruhr seminar will give people with different mathematical backgrounds

the opportunity to present their favourite mathematical topic in a relaxed and informal ambient. Either a research result or a general introduction of an area of interest are welcomed as subject. The talk should be presented in a simple way so that as many people as possible can understand it. The style of the presentation is left to the speaker. It can be either a beamer or blackboard presentation of about 60 min. This can be followed by questions and discussions in a relaxed atmosphere, supported by coffee, cookies etc. (Ruhr, 2019).

The idea of seminar is to present, in each lecture, a short introduction to some basic mathematical concept. The aim is not for the audience to become experts on the subject but rather to develop a better understanding and gain some working knowledge of the concepts presented (Ruhr, 2019).

The seminar method is utilized to realize the higher objectives of cognitive and affective domains. Cognitive objectives covers to develop higher cognitive abilities, to develop the ability of responding in this manner would involve higher cognitive actions, to develop the ability of keen observation of experience, feelings and to develop the ability to seek clarification and defend the ideas of others effectively. Affective objectives covers to develop the feeling of tolerance to the opposite ideas of others, to develop the feelings of co-operation without her colleagues and respect of the ideas and feelings of others, to develop the emotional ability among the participants of the seminar, and to acquire the good manners of putting questions and answering the questions of others effectively. According to Singh there are also two objectives of seminar: cognitive and affective (Singh, 2013).

Usually a seminar has been conducted with the following team of organizing body: Chairperson or President/Convener of Seminar, Organizing Secretary of Seminar, Chairperson of the Technical Session of seminar, Speaker of Seminar, Participants/Paper presenters of seminar (Madhavan, 2019).

METHOD

The strategy used in this study is quantitative. Descriptive method is also used in this study. It tries to solve problems that exist in the present, which is actual in nature. In this study, the data are the results of observation to the teaching and learning process of seminar on linguistics followed by the seventh semester students of English education study program. It involves students' presenting their paper, asking questions, answering questions, giving and responding arguments, giving and accepting suggestions. The number of the students is eighteen (18) that became the sources of the data because they take seminar on linguistics course.

In this study, the writers use 'observation method' to collect the data of the students' activities during seminar. They observed the students' characters mentioned before then took notes all of them. Having been collected, the data were analyzed by using statistical method in the form of mean score. It is implemented in the form of the rubrics scoring which was used as the bases to make the description of the data. Besides, the writers also applied qualitative analysis. Seliger and Shohamy stated that qualitative research is a research which is concerned with providing

description of phenomena that occurs naturally, without the intervention of an experiment or an artificially contrived treatment (Seliger, 1989).

To know the students' character the writers needed score. The scoring rubric that was used to assess the students' character can be seen as follows:

Table 1. The Scoring Rubric of Character

Category	Range of 'Yes' Option
Very good	15 – 21
Good	8 - 14
Fair	1 - 7

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The students' characters in this research are focused on seven kinds namely respectful, honest, brave, confident, communicative, curious, and cooperative. Each character is then subdivided into three items as follows.

1. Respectful
   a. Respect to lecturer's rules,
   b. Respect to discussants' question, suggestion, idea, criticism,
   c. Respect to presenter's explanation, answer, argument.
2. Honest
   a. Mention/write reference of quotation,
   b. Express explicitly when not knowing the answer of question,
   c. Express explicitly when not knowing the content of material.
3. Brave
   a. Present the material without trembling/nervous,
   b. Ask question without being chosen/spontaneously,
   c. Express his own ideas/not only based on theories.
4. Confident
   a. Consult draft of the paper to lecturer,
   b. Express ideas openly,
   c. Answer question in a short time/immediately.
5. Communicative
   a. Ask some ideas and suggestions to lecturer,
   b. Ask question when not understanding the paper content,
   c. Explain the material clearly.
6. Curious
   a. Take theories from books, journals, and other references,
   b. Ask question in detail,
   c. Always be active to take part in a discussion.
7. Cooperative
   a. Make a date with lecturer to consult draft of the paper,
   b. Consult to lecturer for the revised paper,
   c. Deliver the material/ideas by paying attention to the listener/participant.

In analyzing students' character, the writers apply two options only, 'Yes' and 'No'. 'Yes' means that the student reflects that kind of character in Seminar on Linguistics course, and 'No' means that the student does not reflect it. There are three items for each aspect, so the total is twenty one items (21). From the number of it the writers can count the number of character being reflected. The students' character, its classification and percentage can be seen on table 2 below.

Table 2. The Students' Character and its Classification

Students' Code	Number of 'Yes' option	Percentage	Category
AR	21	100%	Very good
ES	21	100%	Very good
HP	21	100%	Very good
FM	21	100%	Very good
PA	15	71.42%	Very good
DN	19	90.47%	Very good
NK	19	90.47%	Very good
QA	15	71.42%	Very good
SI	20	95.23%	Very good
IF	20	95.23%	Very good
LM	7	33.33%	Fair
AW	7	33.33%	Fair
RR	17	80.95%	Very good
NL	3	14.28%	Fair
HR	20	95.23%	Very good
AN	19	90.47%	Very good
AV	20	95.23%	Very good
NN	19	90.47%	Very good
Σ	304	80.42%	

The total number of students' character is 304 resulting the mean as follows:

$$M = \underline{X} \times 100\%$$
$$ N$$
$$= \underline{304} \times 100\%$$
$$ 18$$

$$= 16.88 \text{ rounded into } 17$$

It can be stated that the students' character reflected in Seminar on Linguistics course is very good.

From each item of character identified, the writers can describe it in detail. During the seminar nearly most of presenters and participants respected each other. When the presenter delivers his/her material, the discussants paid much attention to the explanation, accepted the answer of question and argument. In the reverse, when the discussants asked questions, gave suggestions, ideas, criticism, the presenter was also very respectful. However, from the way the students' preparation of the paper, the lecturer was rather disappointed because they did not take the chance given by the lecturer well. They tended to consult their draft of paper in a short time, mostly three (3) days before the schedule of presentation. Based on the rule the students who will present their paper in one following week, they should finish their paper and give it to principal discussants at least two (2) days before the seminar.

Concerning the execution of seminar, the lecturer applies two kinds of discussants, principal and general discussants. Principal discussants have responsibility to review the paper concerning with its organization, language, and content. Besides that they can also ask some questions, add some theories, or give suggestion or criticism. General discussants can also do what principal discussants do after the principal discussants.

Honest character shows that the students are accustomed to mentioning the writers of the books, journals, and other references when they take their ideas or opinions. Before consulting to lecturer, when they took the statements from experts they did not give the limit of quotation. As the result, the reader did not know which sentences expressed by the expert and which sentences expressed by the writer of paper. Sometimes they did not write the source of quotation resulting as if the statements were their own sentences. Therefore, consulting draft of paper to lecturer gives them some benefits. They can know where they should put the name of expert, year when the book/journal was written, and page where sentences are expressed. They also know when they use the words *according to, state that, in line with, etc.*

The students expressed explicitly when not knowing the answer of question. It can be seen from the sentences *If you are not satisfied with my answer, we can ask to our lecturer; Is my answer correct mom?; I think I cannot answer your question clearly, maybe our lecturer is willing to give a correct and clear answer.*

The students also expressed explicitly when not knowing the content of material. When they consulted to lecturer about the material, there were some students asking the content of material, even they asked lecturer to explain it in Indonesian language. It is because the presentation is delivered in English.

Seen from Brave character most of the students (12 students) were still nervous when they presented their ideas in front of their friends. According to the writers, it is usual because of some factors, such as there was their lecturer in the classroom who watched their all activities, they used English during seminar both in presenting the contents of paper and answering questions from participants, the lecturer also asked the presenter some questions.

Principal discussant had an obligation to review the paper. Thus, they asked questions. Whereas, general discussants could either or not ask questions. Although the lecturer had informed that the student would get additional point when he/she asked question, only a few of them used the chance. Some students asked questions just based on the task. Moreover, the students still expressed the theories most of the presentation. There were still a few students (5 students) who were not brave enough to express their own ideas or sentences.

In Confident character fifteen (15) students consulted draft of the paper to the lecturer. As the result, they felt very confident to express their ideas. In measuring the time the students answered the question, lecturer gave the range of 1 minute to five minutes. If the student answered more than that, she classified it in answering question not in a

short time or he/she could not answer the question immediately.

Concerning Communicative character only three (3) students did not ask some ideas and suggestions to lecturer before presenting their paper. Actually they had much time to do so because they got their turn in the middle session. Their friends who got their turn in the beginning session had taken their chance to ask ideas and suggestion concerning with the organization, content, and many others. However, those three students did not take the good chance. When the students did not know exactly the content of the paper, especially the principal discussants, they asked more explanation to the presenter. It can be shown from their statements such as *I cannot understand what you explain, would you give me more explanation about it?; Can you show me again slide 4?; Would you please explain again the concept of derivation?, etc.*

Curious character involves taking theories from books, journals, and other references, asking question in detail, and always being active to take part in a discussion. The writers got information from the lecturer that most students took the material of paper from e-books. The lecturer obliged the students to take the material from at least two (2) journals either national or international journal. It was not more than three years from the year of seminar.

Many students asked in detail about the materials delivered by presenters although they had been discussed in previous semesters in Linguistics courses namely phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics/pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and psycholinguistics. In seminar there was a new material which was not given in Linguistics courses, namely discourse analysis. The students who got this field were very enthusiastic in finding out references and asking some questions to the lecturer.

Fourteen (14) students were active in following seminar. It can be seen from their curiosity and interest in the materials. They asked questions related to the topics discussed. Both principal and general discussants took part and chance given by moderator of seminar. The moderator was chosen spontaneously by the lecturer before seminar. The consideration of it was

he/she had been present in lecture, he/she had been fluent in speaking English, and he/she was hoped to be able to handle the discussion.

Cooperative character is reflected in the way the student cooperates with the lecturer. Before presenting the paper the student should consult his/her preparation or draft of the paper to the lecturer concerning with such as the title whether it is suitable with the linguistics field or not, the content, the organization, and references. 83.33% of students took this chance. Before consulting, the student made a date in order that he/she could meet face to face. Since the student prepared the material well, he/she delivered it well and the listener/participant paid attention to him/her. Unfortunately, only few students consulted their presented paper (33.34%).

Discussion of Finding

Based on the result of analysis, the writers can give their ideas as follows. From respectful character item 1, three (3) students did not obey the lecturer's rules. They did not consult their paper to the lecturer before presentation. As the result, their paper did not fulfill the criteria, such as the title did not relate to linguistics so the content was also not related. For item 2 only one (1) student did not respect to the discussants' question, it was because she did not know it, so she just neglected it. In item 3, all of students did it.

In general the students' respectful character is very good on the average of 16.66 (92.59%). It is in line with Rhon's statement that with respectfulness character trait you treat yourself and others with courtesy, kindness, deference, dignity, and civility. You offer basic respect as a sign of your value for the worth of all people and your ability to accept the inherent flaws we all possess (Rhon, 2016).

Concerning honest character, the students reflect their character through their having written some experts whose ideas were quoted by them and expressed their not understanding of the material yet. Their honest character is good on the average of 13.66 (75.92%). According to (Rhon, 2016) honesty is a character trait that is more than telling the truth. It's living the truth. It is being straightforward and trustworthy in all of your interactions, relationships, and thoughts.

Brave character is reflected in students' bravery in presenting their paper, clarifying complex aspects of the theme, asking questions spontaneously because they have knowledge about the theme of seminar and have skill in questioning, and expressing their own ideas which were relevant to the discussion held in the seminar. The students' brave character is good on the average of 12.33 (70.51%).

Students' confident character is reflected in their independence in expressing ideas, in their competitiveness in answering question in a short time, and in their self-confidence in delivering opinion to the lecturer. It is also appropriate with the statement that from affective aspect persons who are more predominantly field-independent tend to be generally more independent, competitive, and self-confident (Brown, 1994). Having been counted, the students' confident character is very good on the average of 15 (83.33%).

The students' communicative character is very good on the average of 15.66 (87.03%). It can be seen from how the students ask some ideas and suggestions to the lecturer, ask question when not understanding the paper content, and explain the material clearly. This finding is related to the term "communicative competence" proposed by Savignon (1983:9) in (Brown, 1994), which is relative, and absolute, and depends on the cooperation of all the participants involved. This competence is limited to grammatical competence as the aspect of communicative competence that encompasses knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology (Canale and Swain 1980:29 in (Brown, 1994) and sociolinguistic competence as the knowledge of the sociocultural rules of language and of discourse, which requires an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction.

The students' curiosity character is very good on the average of 14.66 (81.47%). Students' curiosity was reflected in taking theories from books, journals, and other references, asking question in detail, and always being active to take part in a discussion. This finding is suitable with

theory that the idea behind the seminar system is to familiarize students more extensively with the methodology of their chosen subject and also to allow them to interact with examples of the practical problems that always occur during research work (Wikipedia, 2019).

The students' cooperative character is good on the average of 13 (72.22%). Cooperative character is measured by students' making a date with lecturer to consult draft of the paper, consulting to lecturer for the revised/presented paper, and delivering the material/ideas by paying attention to the listener/participant.

CONCLUSION

Analyzing the data, the writers can give the conclusion of the research. The mean is 17 which is categorized into very good. Thus, English students' character reflected in the process of teaching and learning Seminar on Linguistics is very good. During joining seminar sessions the students are respectful, honest, brave, confident, communicative, curious, and cooperative. The very good category is on respectful, confident, communicative, and curious characters. While, good category is on honest, brave, and cooperative characters.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Agboola, A., & Tsai, K. C. (2012). Bring Character Education into Classroom. [Electronic version]. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *1*(2), 163–170.

Aubrey, K., & Riley, A. (2016). *Understanding and Using Educational Theories*. London: Sage publications.

Balitbang, K. (2011). *Pedoman Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Karakter*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan.

Battistich, V. (2010). Character Education, Prevention, and Positive Youth Development. Retrieved from

http://www.rucharacter.org/file/Battistich Paper.pdf.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Cirkovic-Miladinovic, I. (2014). Language learning strategies used by adult learners: benefits for the teacher as a researcher. *Andragogical Studies Journal for the Study of Adult Education and Learning*, *I*, 171–190.

Cirkovic-Miladinovic, I. (2016). In What Ways Do In-Service Seminars Help English Language Teaching Practice In Serbia? *Journal Plus Education*, *XIV*(1), 186–213.

Dost, E. N., & Hafshejani, N. K. (2017). The Impact of Teachers' Personality on Senior High School EFL Learners' General English Achievement. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, *2*(3).

Fitriasari, S. (2011). *Memanusiakan Manusia Melalui Pendidikan Karakter. Dalam: Pendidikan Karakter: Nilai Inti Bagi Upaya Pembinaan Kepribadian Bangsa*. (D. Budimansyah & K. Komalasari, Eds.). Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia Bandung Press.

Gillespie, S. and R. B. (2013). *Across Cultures, A Reader For Writers* (Sixth Edit). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Glimpse. (2019). What is character and how do we get it? Retrieved from http://glimpse.clemson.edu/what-is-character-and-how-do-we-get-it/

Lestari, A., Sada, C., & Suhartono, L. (2015). Analysis on the Relationship of Extrovert – Introvert Personality and Students' Speaking Performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, *4*(3), 2.

Leuven, K. (2019). Lectures and Examinations:Different Kinds of Lectures. Retrieved from https://www.kuleuven.be/english/students ervices/studyadviceservice/brochure/lecture s_examinations/b1.html

Madhavan, T. (2019). Lecture Notes on Methodology. Retrieved from https://jtmadhavan.files.wordpress.com/20 09/11/seminar-method.pdf

Pala, A. (2016). The Need for Character Education. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/ 267824613_THE_NEED_FOR_CHARACT ER_EDUCATION

Passarelli, A., & Kolb, D. (2011). Using Experiential Learning Theory to Promote Student Learning and Development in Programmes of Education Abroad, , University Cleveland. Retrieved from https://weatherhead.case.edu/departments/ organizational-behavior/workingPapers/WP-11-03.pdf

Pollard, A., & Triggs, P. (1997). *Reflective Teaching in Secondary Education, A Handbook for Schools and Colleges*. London: Cassell.

Rahayu. (2012). *Pendidikan Karakter*. Surabaya: Unesa.

Rhon. (2016). 6 Essential Traits of Good Character. Retrieved from https://www.success.com/rohn-6-essential-traits-of-good-character/%0A

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruhr. (2019). Basic Notion Seminar. Retrieved from https://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/ffm/Lehrstuehle/Algebra/Basic NotionSeminar.html

Seliger, H. W. and E. S. (1989). *Second Language Research Method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Singh, N. (2013). Seminar. Retrieved from https://www.slideshare.net/NavjyotSinghC houdhary/seminar17057703

Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training Foreign Language Teachers*. California: Cambridge University Press.

Webster, M.-. (2019). Definition of Character. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/character.

Wikipedia. (2019). Seminar. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seminar