Research Article

Towards a Moral Community: Moral Education Strategies in Indonesian Schools

Peter G Waterworth

Deakin University, Australia

Abstract.
Moral education is a foundational yet contestable matter in any society. Debates about moral education help to define the parameters of true and right conduct in a society. The contestable nature of moral education curricula in Indonesia perhaps indicates the critical importance of character development in national and cultural formation and in the continuous creation and recreation of national identity. This study of the nature of moral education in junior secondary schools in the Yogyakarta region used a qualitative focus group approach. Teachers, lecturers, and trainee teachers were selected to be formed into five focus groups designed to provide a deeper analysis of the conflicting understandings of the nature of morality and of the expression of that morality in the curriculum. The findings showed several areas of contradiction and confusion in moral education in schools, including differences in religious and secular conceptualizations of morality and differences between those who wanted to promote or exclude intercultural understandings of morality within the state.

Keywords: moral education, character education, morality, Pancasila, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Peter G
Waterworth; email:
pewaterworth@yahoo.com.au

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study

The values that are taught or reinforced in school programs are deliberately chosen because they embody the desires, aspirations, values, preferences and motivations of all kinds of thought and action within the community. The values of the school system should mirror the values of the community that births and nutures that system. Yet the moral agreements that are held within a society are modified, refreshed, abandoned and reconstituted in different forms as the community evolves and transforms. Multicultural or multifaith societies like Indonesia contain an immense range of subgroups, with each subgroup promoting its own collection of values. Community morality is constantly contested in the public space as subgroups jostle to promote their own particular brand of morality. Within democratic countries, the debate over national morality is conducted within the public space, codified by the parliament and implemented by the

How to cite this article: Peter G Waterworth, (2022), "Towards a Moral Community: Moral Education Strategies in Indonesian Schools" in *International Conference on Learning Innovation and Research in Basic Education*, KnE Life Sciences, pages 166–185. DOI 10.18502/kss.v8i8.13294

Page 166

government. The set of moral values that are shared within a nation are written into law, reinforced through the justice system, implemented through authority structures and placed in a central place within the curriculum. The moral values that are represented in the curriculum, therefore, are based upon the most commonly held values within the community and are decided upon through the political processes of consultation, negotiation and compromise. Yet it is teachers who give life and meaning to those values in the way they present those values to the students.

Elihami [1] argues that the Muslim values of a large proportion of the Indonesian population are strongly represented in the school curriculum, even though as many as 80 percent of the school population attends government schools. The Indonesian state is secular and democratic, but the presence of a strong Muslim majority in the population has a powerful influence upon the development of moral education programs within schools. This project was based upon the assumption, backed up by evidence from schools and the community, that the moral education curriculum and teaching strategies used in teaching morals within schools were often contested, sometimes confused, regularly debated within schools and in the community and constantly under review in the mass media. A research question was devised to focus the investigation and it was: What issues do teachers in Junior Secondary Schools face in teaching moral education and what are they doing to address these issues? The project sought to explore the nature of the debate among key stakeholders in the teaching of morality in schools, to discern the kinds of divisions that existed between subgroups within the school and within the community itself and to suggest how the moral education curriculum and its teaching strategies might be improved.

The project described in this paper emanated out of a research project initiated by a research team at Ahmad Dahlan University and which is soon to be published in a more comprehensive report. This paper explores the nature of the research project as it relates to the analysis of the problem, the selection and development of the research methodology and the processes for drawing a conclusion. The research team was made up of academics with a strongly religious bias including those with Islamic and non-Islamic perspectives. The team attempted to retain an objective and rational view of the subject matter, although it recognised that much of the literature in the topic area asserted exclusivist biases unwilling.

1.2. Statement of the problem

There have been claims that the moral education program in schools is firstly, in crisis and secondly, largely ineffective and the project sought to test whether such perceptions were true. Focus Group research was chosen, and the participants were drawn from populations that were committed professionally to the moral education program within the Junior Secondary School, Years 7-9 or Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP) – the final few years of free basic eduction in Indonesia.

In the research process, a series of ideas and opinions were collected about the nature of morality, the nature of the school curriculum in moral education, the differentiation between the religious bases of morality taught in the various strains of Religious Education or Pendidikan Agama (PA) and the secular or citizenship bases of morality taught in Pancasila and Citizenship Education or Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (PPKn), the motivations for teaching morality in schools and the teaching strategies being employed to teach moral ideas. The impact of Islamic ideas of various kinds upon the curriculum was regarded as significant in both moral education subjects taught compulsorily in schools as was the importance and interrelationships between the major socializing agencies of family, school, mosque/temple/church and mass media.

1.3. Literature review

Is there a crisis in morality in Indonesia? One of the best measures of the success of a moral education program may be seen in the behavioural patterns observed within the community. If there is a seeming increase in unlawful behaviour or in behaviours of particular kinds especially among young people [2], [3], [5], [6], [7], then the media draws attention to it in sensationalist ways, often suggestion that young people display a loss of moral character. Whether there is sufficient objective evidence of a decline in moral standards is questionable, but the reports keep appearing. Acts of racial or religious intolerance, of which some have been reported [4], [8], [9] may be an indication of the failure of the moral education program but from a different perspective. Acts of intolerance indicate a failure of a program to imbue a sense of religious tolerance for people who hold divergent views from one's own.

It is difficult to assert that random acts of lawlessness constitute sufficient evidence of the inadequacies of a moral education program in schools. It may be that schools become a convenient scapegoat in discussions of this kind. Nord and Haynes suggest

that schools adopt a particular moral and ethical position which indicates the character of the organisation as well as the curriculum which it teaches [10]. Other assert that schools stand in an invidious position in juggling the traditional moral values they proclaim with the ever-increasing demand for technological and market related curricula which may require different moral and ethical standards [11]. It is difficult for schools to be winners in these kinds of debates regarding their responsibilities to teach the community's values.

The literature on the theories of values education is burgeoning [12] as nations try to come to terms with rapidly evolving national and international values systems. Contemporary theory is based largely on Piagetian [13] [14] and Kholbergian [15] [16] [17] theories of moral development in children and young people. Moral awareness grows within the emotions and consciousness of children, and it becomes important, therefore, for educators to target teaching and learning strategies to suit the stage of growth of their learners. The basic assumption underlying such theories is that the moral education being introduced to learners must be suited to the emerging social and emotional capabilities of the learners rather than be developed around the structure of the moral codes being taught. Piaget argued that children do not have the capacity to make moral choices on the basis of reason because the capability to reason logically does not occur until after the ages of 11 or 12 [13]. Kholberg argued that maturation in intellectual capacity is mirrored in maturation in moral awareness. The development of moral awareness occurs at a different pace within different children and is affected by a variety of factors such as intellectual and emotional development, family background, peer influences, physical health and the economic circumstances of children's upbringing [18] [19] [20] [21] [22] [23].

Moral understandings vary from culture to culture. Pluralist, secular societies develop moral codes of behaviour on the basis of negotiation between the prominent interest groups that make up their societies. It is likely that the moral understandings that develop in democratic societies eventually become very similar to the understandings in other secular democracies. Countries that have a religious majority tend to favour the moral foundations of that majority, even though they explicitly state that their moral codes are non-discrimatory and non-favouring of any single religious group. In Indonesia, the Pancasila (a nationally sanctioned set of beliefs that reinforce the country's pluralist [24] and Islamic foundations [25]) is a doctrine of philosophical compromise [26] which is meant to unite the disparate religious segments in the population. Its value is hotly debated, particularly by religious elements in the country [4] [27].

The national curriculum at junior high school level has two subjects that contain the focus upon moral education, as shown in Table 1 below. While one is specifically based on religious studies, the other is also unquestionably based on religious thought in its design and delivery [28] [29].

TABLE 1: Formal Studies in Moral Education in State Junior Secondary Schools (Years 7-9), Indonesia, 2018

Subject			Hours per week	Compulsory	National Exam
Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan	Pancasila and Citizenship Education	PPKn	2	Yes	No
Pendidikan Agama	Religious Education*	PA	3	Yes	No

*Religious Education is taught in State Schools in six religions, namely, Islam, Protestant Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Hinduism and Kepercayaan (Traditional Religion) with an approved curriculum in each. Schools offer Religious Education in non-Islamic religions where there is a sufficient demand for such curricula.

The imperative for the teaching of morality from a religious perspective has been reinforced several times in Muslim thought [29] [30]. Within Indonesia, the practice of basing moral education upon Islamic foundations has been defended among Muslim groups because: true moral behaviour (virtue) is seen to be necessarilty linked to true faith [31] [32], moral values are displayed in religious observances [33], The Prophet best exemplifies the highest moral behaviours [34] [35], morality should be taught expicitly within a Qurʾānic context [29], Muslim parents have an obligation to teach their children Islamic based values [29], moral values should be taught within a context of community agencies (school, home, church/temple/mosque, community) that are individually and collectively based on faith [1] [29] and schools themselves have a moral obligation to teach and reinforce values based on religion [36].

The teaching of Islamic values in Indonesian schools has been regarded by some Muslim groups as a nation building exercise. Some have seen it as an overdue and necessary correction to the immorality of Western non-Islamic colonisation which, it has been argued, sought to neutralise the perpetuation of Islamic values in the school system [37] [38] [39]. This study sought to address the question of the basis or purpose of the moral education programs in schools, to test the proposition that a renewed moral education program is an antidote to the seeming moral crisis facing the country, to assess whether contemporary learning theories about values teaching have dominated instructional processes, to examine the impact of the majority Muslim culture upon the conceptualisation and delivery of moral education programs, to analyse the interrelation

of the two subjects in the compulsory curriculum in moral education, and to investigate the role of partner agencies of socialisation in presenting the moral education program. It has been argued that the constant public clamour for a better moral education program is the result of an increasing plea from Muslim organisations, which is, in reality, a plea for a greater level of piety in the population as a whole [29] [37].

1.4. Research approach

The focii of this research were the processes of curriculum analysis and review, the conceptualisation of a curriculum program, the study of community demands for a particular emphasis in the curriculum, the assessment of teaching strategies and learning activities in a curriculum and the assessment of the effectiveness of a curriculum program. It therefore became necessary for the study to draw data from the stakeholders in the development and delivery of that program, including those studying the program (at master's level), those presenting curriculum studies in that program for pre-service teachers and from those teaching the program in schools.

2. METHOD

2.1. Project design

The project was limited to the consideration of the views and opinions of the practitioners who deliver moral education programs in schools, not the policy writers or curriculum developers, nor textbook providers. This choice was made because the researchers wanted to gain insight into the practical decisions that were made by teachers 'at the coalface' (perhaps influenced by other key stakeholders in the education process) in delivering a sound moral education program. Moreover, the major content of this research was to be the expression of points of view, the investigation of hotly contested and avidly put arguments and the assembling of a range of views, beliefs and commitments within politico-cultural and religio-philosphical spheres about elements of the curriculum that exist mainly in the affective domain of learning. It was therefore decided to use a qualitative approach which would maximise the verbal nature of the data to be collected.

A Focus Group research process was chosen, and several procedures were followed to ensure the accurate collection of useful data. Focus Group research is well suited to short term, short scale projects with small budgets but that afford the collection of

high-quality data. The research team devised focus questions intended to extract data on opinions on moral education approaches from a series of different perspectives as shown in Table 2. Focus questions were shaped in a general enough fashion to allow the focus groups to devote sufficient attention to the central research question yet allow divergence from the main theme if the group thought it worthwhile and the moderator allowed the discussion to proceed along those lines. The master's student group (Group 4) was not asked about teaching and learning processes in a direct way because they had not experienced them firsthand. They were instead asked their opinions on the societal need for moral education in schools and the role moral education played in the community. It was possible for other groups to discuss the same issue if the dynamic processes of their discussions allowed it. Data from the discussions was recorded manually and verified twice by each individual participant in each group as discussed below, to increase the chances that the agreed statements from groups was valid and reliable. Data were then sorted and analysed for patterns, tendencies and themes.

There were five focus groups and they ranged in size from 10 to 13 participants as shown in the table.

TABLE 2: Focus Groups.

	Focus Group	Number of Participants	Focus Group Question
1.	Lecturers in Education	13	Is the moral education taught in schools adequate and is there a need to change it?
2.	Teachers of Pancasila and Citizenship Education in Junior Secondary Schools	12	Is the moral education taught in schools adequate and is there a need to change it?
3.	Junior Secondary School Teachers (6 from government schools, 5 from Islamic schools and 1 from a Catholic school)	12	What are the best ways to teach morals to school students?
4.	Master's Students in Guidance and Counselling (Teacher Trainees) (9 from UAD and 1 from another university)	10	What is morality and is it the responsibility of schools to teach it?
5.	Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary Schools (5 from government schools, 5 from Islamic schools and 2 from Christian schools)	12	How should a national curriculum in moral education be developed in a multi faith society?
Total		59	

Upon agreeing to participate in a Focus Group, the participants were sent a formal written invitation which included the Focus Question for their group. Participants were served a meal before the discussion. They were not paid in any way for participating in

the project. The purpose of the research project and the nature of Focus Group research were explained. Most members of the research team attended each Focus Group, one serving as moderator at each session, another as scribe and the others as observers. In the discussion itself, the moderator introduced the Focus Question and encouraged thoughtful responses from individual participants and the whole group [41] [42]. All responses at this stage of the meeting were written on a whiteboard and the wording of responses was confirmed and negotiated with the participants. After all ideas were recorded, the moderator sought to reword all the major ideas from the group so that there was general consent from the group on each item. Each major idea was presented as one complete sentence or series of sentences. The moderator sought the approval of every member of the Focus Group for each statement. Those statements that were not ageed by every member of the group were rejected. The approved statements were written in a document that was circulated to every participant the day following the Focus Group discussion and participants were requested to sign their agreement to each statement. Only those statements that were approved by all members of the Focus Group became the data for that group. Data were collected in the same way from all five Focus Groups.

2.2. Participants

Participants were associated in some way with Universitas Ahmad Dahlan in Yojyakarta and were invited to join Focus Groups for this research process. They were chosen because they each had extensive experience in the education system and/or direct teaching experience in either citizenship education or religious education, they were representative of particular segments of the educational environment with different roles, professional statuses and religious or philosophical background or statuses and they were recognised as opinion makers or influencers, were articulate and were convincing in the opinions they expressed.

3. RESULTS

3.1. The need for quality moral education programs in schools

A major emphasis in the Focus Question was the adequacy of moral education programs in schools and the data from these highly experienced educators suggested that there was a strong need for better moral education programs. A series of responses from the

Focus Groups demonstrated this concern – also implying that a good moral education program would be a sufficient antidote for the moral failures in Indonesian social life.

1. The existing curriculum is good but in practice, moral values are not adequately implemented in student behaviour.

Pancasila and Citizenship Education Lecturers Focus Group

2. There is indeed moral education in schools, but it is only limited to the knowledge dimension and therefore is not internalised well by students. Morally correct behaviour needs to become habitual in students.

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary School Focus Group

3. The curriculum should be implemented by each school or school system so that it represents the special beliefs that characterise their respective schools. In Mummadiyah schools there is a code of belief called ISMUBA (Al-Islam and Kemuhan-nadiyahan) and in Catholic schools there is the umbrella code of love.

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary Schools Focus Group

4. Although we have constant changes in the national curriculum in moral education, there's little evidence of changes in student behaviour (such as violence). So actually, who is to be blamed?

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary School Focus Group

5. There is a need for improvement in the children in understanding ethics in language and in manners. Children are now seemingly unable to speak politely to older people ... The noble values of our ancestors need to be preserved and be adjusted to the times.

Pancasila and Citizenship Education Lecturers Focus Group

6. There are substantial difficulties in teaching morality in our schools. Both religious and moral education curricula deal only with cognitive understandings and do not touch affective and psychomotor understandings.

Psychology Lecturers and School Psychologists Focus Group

The failure of the existing moral education programs was thought to be demonstrated by lack of morally acceptable student behaviour (Statements 1, 2, 5 and 6), a lack of better student outcomes with the latest revisions to the curriculum (4) and a lack of better instructional strategies across the two subjects (PPKn and PA) delivering the moral education program (6).

However, these data also reveal the perceptions the participants had about the nature of morality, the way it should be taught and the responsibilities of schools in teaching morality. Amongst these were the understandings that moral behaviour is

'implemented' (1), is obligatory or 'correct' (2), should become 'habitual' (2) and that it should be patterned upon the 'noble' behaviours of previous generations (5). Moral behaviour was not seen as being *developed* in children or that moral behaviours should be *chosen* by children based upon the tools children are given to enable them to make moral choices. In a sense, morality was conceived as a pattern of acceptable behaviours which children should be taught (3), that they should practise (2) and that they should demonstrate (1, 2, 3 and 5). The crisis in moral education was indeed seen as a breakdown in the education process because teachers (4) were unable to move instruction away from the knowledge domain (2 and 6) and into the affective (6).

3.2. Contemporary learning theories as a guide to instructional processes

Contemporary learning theories in values education focus attention upon the needs of the learners. The processes in the development of moral awareness in young learners necessitates the creation of instructional techniques suited to the moral awareness of the learners rather than the logical structure of the codes of belief being taught. The instructional role of teachers should therefore account for the stages of moral awareness in their students. The awareness in teachers of their instructional role was observed in some but not all of the responses.

7. Teachers do not care enough (about the outcomes of their teaching of moral education). They tend to teach only.

Psychology Lecturers and School Psychologists Focus Group

8. Teachers in state schools tend to ignore the needs and concerns of the students (perhaps through ignorance of good teaching techniques) although some do a fine job.

Teacher Trainees Focus Group

9. The teaching (of moral education) is adequate, but teachers need 'uswatun hasanah' (quoting the Q'uran) to show a good example, as also do schools, parents and the community. Words alone are insufficient.

Pancasila and Citizenship Education Lecturers Focus Group

10. There are still many teachers who just do their teaching, not providing a good model of moral behaviour to their students. The same applies to parents.

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary School Focus Group

A number of statements highlighted the differences between the seemingly limited 'knowledge' elements of the curriculum as observed in the concepts of 'words alone' (9), 'just… teaching' (10) and 'teach only' and the 'model' of moral behaviour provided by the teacher observed in the concepts of 'show a good example' (9), 'a good model of moral behaviour' (10) and 'teachers do not care' (7). The model of moral behaviour in the teacher was regarded as supreme and the knowledge content of the curriculum came second to it.

Along the same lines, the instructional techniques of teachers received criticism as people who 'do not care enough' (7), 'tend to ignore the needs and concerns of students' (8), 'ignorance of good teaching techniques' (8) and whose 'teaching … is adequate' (9). Teachers were seen in these statements as letting down the moral education program because they simply did not care. Their role in the array of socializing agencies charged with teaching morality may have been regarded as obligatory, in much the same way as the content was obligatory, and their natural enthusiasm for teaching it had dissipated. Or rather, the religious teaching conducted in church, temple or mosque may have been focused on the repetitive learning of precepts and creeds which depended upon the lower levels of Bloom's taxonomy at the 'knowledge' or 'memory' level and this technique of teaching and learning may have been translated to the school classroom. Moreover, the holy texts might have been traditionally in classical foreign languages such as Latin, Pāli or Arabic. Textual complexity may be an additional hurdle for children to understand moral precepts, especially in those children struggling with aspects of language learning. The adaptation of content to suit the stages of moral awareness and intellectual development in children was completely absent from such teaching patterns as also shown by others [43] [44].

3.3. Impact of majority Muslim culture upon conceptualisation and delivery of programs

The question of the impact of the majority religion upon the teaching of morality was addressed in many statements from the Focus Groups although most statements regarding the connection between religious belief and the codification of a moral education curriculum did not make a direct reference to Islam.

11. Moral education in schools needs to embrace elements from value sources including religion, society and culture and the family. Religious-based schools provide better opportunities for moral education.

Psychology Lecturers and School Psychologists Focus Group

12. A pesantren school (Islamic boarding school) has the chance to teach a morality which is inseparable from religion.

Junior Secondary School Teachers Focus Group

13. (In Religious Education) the curriculum should emphasise the things that are centred on faith because faith is what will direct human life. Students can learn that they are the servants of God so that they will not become arrogant. Students must have the attitude of 'tasamuh' (cooperation) implanted in them. The curriculum should focus on the practice of worship because it is worship that will bring the student to righteousness.

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary School Focus Group

There was a shared view that moral education was indisputably linked to religious belief as expressed in terms such as 'embrace elements from value sources including religion' (11), 'morality … inseparable from religion' (12), 'centred on faith' (13) and 'moral education… sharpened by religious teachers' in (20) as seen below. These were, in most cases, referring to studies in religion (PA), although the terms may have applied to both PPKn and PA within the moral education curriculum. There was also a sense that religious observance was an essential element of moral behaviour (13 and 16 below), particularly in Islam, since moral education could be more successfully taught in a religious environment – 'religious-based schools provide better opportunities for moral education' (11) and even better, within 'a pesantren school… to [learn] morality which is inseparable from religion' (12). It should be remembered that Focus Group 5, which consisted of teachers of religion, contained non-Muslim members and they consented to these remarks. The monopoly control of the morals curriculum by a religious majority (not necessarily or exclusively Muslim) would afford little chance of revision or renewal within the nation as a whole.

3.4. Interrelationships between PPKn and PA

The current division of the moral education curriculum into two subject areas was considered acceptable and unnecessary of change by teachers both of Religious Education or Pendidikan Agama (PA) and Pancasila and Citizenship Education or Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (PPKn) as shown in the following statements.

14. The study of Citizenship and Pancasila Education has an appropriate place in the curriculum. The curricular materials are adequate but not all teachers use them effectively. The TV and mass media provide contradictory messages to the lessons in

the school and there are numerous examples of the moral corruptness of public figures in the news. We need a moral revolution in all aspects from the top to the bottom.

Pancasila and Citizenship Education Lecturers Focus Group

15. There needs to be a stronger cooperation between all staff (in the teaching of moral education), especially between teachers of Pancasila and Citizenship Education and Religious Education.

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary Schools Focus Group

Studies in PA referred to the moral but religiously constrained choices student must make in life just as studies in PPKn referred to the religious bases for moral behaviour or good citizenship. However, it must be remembered that the curriculum in PPKn is a compulsory study for all students whereas PA is a curriculum based on each of the major religions in Indonesia so that students of each religion receive a PA curriculum devised to suit their religion. The overlap or duplication of content in the two studies was regarded as a problem (15) and the contradictions in moral standards apparent in Indonesian society were regarded as an impediment to the proper study of good citizenship (14). Both studies were regarded as significant in renewing and strengthening Indonesian national life, so there was a need for 'stronger cooperation' (15) and a 'moral revolution' (14) to turn the tide.

3.5. Importance of partner agents of socialisation

The development and propagation of moral values was said to be a shared community responsibility (16).

16. Morals are devised by the community and are taught to us within appropriate social settings such as within the family, the community and the school. We internalise moral values to enable us to abide by the rules (or norms) of the society so that we may live peacefully and in harmony with others.

Teacher Trainees Focus Group

17. The education system is not the major or sole agency for promoting moral education and its success in promoting moral values may be compromised by the systems outside the school which may not be supportive... In general, the teaching of morality is not implemented holistically.

Psychology Lecturers and School Psychologists Focus Group

18. Moral education is the shared responsibility of schools, government, parents, the community, mosques, churches and other foci of belief and the mass media.

Psychology Lecturers and School Psychologists Focus Group

19. Moral education is the responsibility of the school because the school is the place for education. However, the state is also a major contributor. Parents and the community are also very decisive.

Teacher Trainees Focus Group

20. There should be collaboration between three education centres: school, neighbourhood and family, for full impact upon students. Moral education must be sharpened by religious teachers and other teachers will also contribute.

Teachers of Religion at Junior Secondary School Focus Group

The agents of socialisation shared the responsibility to see that children were inducted into the 'right' behaviours expected by the community. These agencies included the family (16, 18, 19 and 20), the school (16, 17, 18, 19 and 20), the neighbourhood (16, 18, 19 and 20), religious institutions (18 and 20), the state (18 and 19) and the mass media (18) as shown below. There was a strong belief that the collaborative efforts of these agents of socialization were necessary to reinforce acceptable behaviour in students and that the lack of community unity on the values that needed to be taught would detract from the process and render the moral education as somehow inferior or defective (17, 19 and 20). For example, the failure of the mass media to present a consistent story on the acceptable moral values of the community was thought to detract from the efforts of the other agencies (16, 17 and 18). Such a view may be a challenge to the freedom of the press and to the acceptance of open public debate on values within the state and the community.

4. DISCUSSION

Morality, in most contemporary secular democratic states, is developed within state institutions and consists within socially acceptable conventions. In most societies, even in secular states, codes of moral behaviour have foundations that may have arisen out of historical faith traditions [45] [47]. Aspects of morality are often being contested in vigorous democracies and usually the conflict emanates from subsections of the community that defend or advance a religious or philosophical framework of belief. The clarification of moral values in non-faith, multi-faith or majority-faith based societies differ widely because of the differences that exist between these different cultural formations. Indonesia has declared itself to be a multicultural or pluralist nation [24] [26] [46] with an agreed multi-faith state doctrine (the Pancasila), yet religious debates [4] [27] about

morality are constant, so that, many have concluded that there is a moral crisis which is being fanned by inadequate moral education in schools [3]. Such a view was confirmed in this project.

The morality of a religious majority within a nation tends to dominate the moral codes of that nation and, therefore, of the moral education programs of that nation's schools [1]. This appears to be the case in this study. Even so, there is an increasing level of unease about the success of schools in Indonesia to teach a sound and successful moral education program [2] [3] [5] [6] that results in a more cooperative, law abiding, peaceful, respectful and therefore, prosperous population. Where there is an increased contestation of the moral education program in schools, it tends to indicate that there is either a lack of maturity or finality [4] [8] [9] in the formation of national identity or that the nation is experiencing a period of transition in the development of national identity.

Uncertainty in the development of a clear national moral code can lead to disagreements about the secularity of society [11]. This may be displayed in the questioning of the balance between the secular and religious elements that define the nation [4] [26] [27]. This project found that participants believed that morality, and therefore moral education programs, should be based on religious codes of belief, that moral values should best be taught within integrated religious environments such as religious schools or religious boarding schools and that moral values should be taught within the context of a society that has unified beliefs that are supported across all the agencies of socialization (confirmed by Maftukhah [48]). These views seemed to be opposed to the secular or community conception, development and inculcation of values across all faith systems or even non-faith-based systems of nationhood as also suggested by Dewey [49], Al Hamdani [50] and Liu [51]. The views also contradict the multicultural and multifaith aspects on the state doctrine – the Pancasila [52].

Uncertainty in the development of a clear national moral code can be associated with a common belief that society is in a moral crisis [37] [38] [39] which may best be overcome by an increase in religious piety [3] [29] [37]. This may be evident in demands for an increased observance of religious rituals. In this study, the Focus Groups claimed that morality is demonstrated in the performance of religious rituals. Uncertainty about the moral code within a country may be associated with difficulty in separating civic and religious codes of behaviour and a reversion to more traditional teaching strategies in moral education [?]. The study showed that Focus Group participants thought that schools, as one of the socializing agencies, have a moral obligation to teach values based on religious precepts.

5. CONCLUSION

This research project concluded that there is uncertainty among the education community about the nature and form of moral education in schools and this reflected the need for a more unified societal agreement on the nature of national identity. While on one hand the participants claimed that the nation was founded and operated as a multicultural state with high levels of tolerance necessary to sustain a harmonious and integrated state, on the other, they insisted upon the religious foundations of morality and the futility of secular approaches to moral education programs. They considered that truly moral ('noble') conduct could not be achieved within a secular environment.

The redevelopment of both Religious Education and Pancasila and Citizenship Education curricula needed to be attempted with a renewed emphasis upon the intercultural nature of society, the need for acceptance and tolerance for the unfamiliar and a better understanding of the multifaith foundations of Indonesian civic life. It is necessary that curriculum revision take better account of contemporary child development principles in shaping children's understanding of morality.

All national curricula emanate from the ideological principles of the state that creates and endorses them. The desire to create a truly moral community must focus upon what unites the diverse elements of a society around a common history, and values each member of the community regardless of their religious or philosophical inclination.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

References

[1] Elihami. "The challenge of religious education in Indonesian Multiculturalism." J Educ Hum Dev. 2016;5(4):211-221. https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v5n4a20

[2] Al Hamdani, Djaswidi. "Character education in islamic education: Viewpoint." Jurnal Pendidikan Islam. 2014;1(1):98-109. http://journal.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/jpi/article/view/614

[3] Arnis S. "A closer look at character education in Indonesia: What every educator should know." 2016. https://www.academia.edu/2344305/A_CLOSER_LOOK_AT_CHARACTER_EDUCATION_IN

[4] Lyn P. "Commitment and inconsistency in teaching tolerance: The New Curriculum in Indonesia." In: Yun-Kyung C, Seung-Hwan H, Moonsung L, editors. Routledge international handbook of multicultural education research in Asia Pacific. Abingdon: Routledge; 2018.

[5] Human Rights Watch. In Religion's Name: Abuses against religious minorities in Indonesia. 2013. https://www.refworld.org/docid/513085c22.html

[6] Edward A, Greg F. "Introduction: Decentralisation, democratisation and the rise of the local." In: Edward A, Greg F. editors. Local power and politics in Indonesia: Decentralisation and democratisation. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies; 2003. p. 1-11.

[7] Serata Institute. "West Java had Highest Number of Religious Freedom Violations in 2017, Jakarta close behind: Setara Institute". 2018. http://setara-institute.org/en/west-java-had-highest-number-of-religious-freedom-violations-in-2017-jakarta-close-behind-setara-institute/

[8] Ian DW. "As long as it's halal: Islamic preman in Jakarta." In: Greg F, Sally W, editors. Expressing Islam: Religious life and politics in Indonesia. Singapore: ISEAS; 2008.

[9] Ismail H, Bonar TN. The faces of Islam 'Defenders'. Jakarta: Setara Institute; 2011.

[10] Warren AN, Charles CH. Taking religion seriously across the curriculum. 1998. http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/198190.aspx

[11] Jo C. "Morals, ethics and citizenship in contemporary teaching." In: Roy G, Jo C, Denis L, editors. Education for Values: Morals, Ethics and Citizenship in Contemporary Teaching. 2000. London: Kogan; 2000. p. 6-23.

[12] Melanie K, Judith GS. "Introduction," In Killen M, Julie GS, editors. Handbook of moral development. New Jersey: Erlbaum; 2008. p. 1-4.

[13] Jean P. The moral judgement of the child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; 1932.

[14] Jean P. Genetic Epistemology. New York: Norton; 1970.

[15] Lawrence K. "The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: 1. Sequence in the development of moral thought." Vita Humana. 1963;6:11-33.

[16] Lawrence K. "The child as a moral philosopher." Psychology Today. 1968;2:25-30.

[17] Lawrence K. "Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization." In Goslin DA, editor. Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally; 1969. p. 347-480.

[18] Elliot T. The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press. 2002. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/60d2/2c8aadbbae6c44add13be08516da1c3d25a5.pdf

[19] Elliot T. "The development of morality." In Eisenberg N, Damon W, Lerner RM, editors. Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2006. p. 789-857.

[20] Daniel KL. "Moral stage theory." In Melanie K, Judith GS, Editors. Handbook of moral development. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2006. p. 37-66.

[21] Judith GS. "Social-cognitive development: Domain distinctions and coordinations." Dev Rev. 1983;3:131-147.

[22] Gene HB, David RS. "Contributions of parents and peers to children's moral socialization." Dev Rev. 1982;2:31-72.

[23] Donna RW, Elliot T. "Act-rule relations: Children's concept of social rules." Dev Psychol. 1980;16:417-424.

[24] Samsul H, Moh TC. "Character education and the strategy of building independent learners." Educ: J Educ. 2017;2(2):163-174. http://ejournal.staimnglawak.ac.id/index.php/educatio/article/view/12

[25] Martha CB, Irawan. "Islam, Pancasila and Value systems of Indonesian National Education." Jurnal Pendidikan Islam. 2014;1(1):1-23. http://journal.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/jpi/article/view/610/585

[26] Robert MF. "Moral education in Indonesia: A preliminary study." Educación y Ciencia. 1990;1(1): 45–50.

[27] Uswatun Q. "Theories of moral education and implementation in Indonesia: Reenergising cultural identity and addressing future challenges." Paper presented at the International Conference on Educational Research and Development, Surabaya; 2015. p. 1-11. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/93220/3/93220.pdf

[28] Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, Nomor 64 Tahun 2013. Tentang Standar Isi Pendidikan Dasar dan menengah. 2013.

[29] Muh S. "Historical study of the changes of religious and moral education in Indonesia." J Indonesian Islam. 2014;8(1):39-57.

[30] Muslim H. Saḥīḥ Muslim; being traditions of the sayings and doings of the prophet Muhammad as narrated by his companions and compiled under the title al-Jāmi-us-saḥīḥ Sh. Muhammad Ashraf. 1971.

[31] Mark HJ. "Editorial: Islamic values: A distinctive framework for moral education?" J Moral Educ. 2007;36(3):283–296.

[32] Ismail S. "Character education based on religious values: An Islamic perspective." J Islamic Educ. 2016;21(1):41-58. jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/tadib/article/download/744/pdf/

[33] Walid AS. The formation of the classical "tafsīr" tradition: The Qurʾān commentary of al-Thaꟷlabī. Leiden: Brill; 2004. https://www.worldcat.org/title/formation-of-the-classical-tafsir-tradition-the-quran-commentary-of-al-thalabi-d-4271035/oclc/884356190?referer=&ht=edition

[34] Adhil SM. Muhammad, man and Prophet: A complete study of the life of the Prophet of Islam. New York: Kube Publishing Ltd.;2010.

[35] Christopher B. Indonesian education: Teachers, schools, and central bureaucracy. Abingdon: Routledge; 2005.

[36] Benjamin CF. "Islamic morality in Late Ottoman 'secular' schools." Int J Middle East Studies. 2000;32(3):369-393.

[37] Nasr SVR. "European colonialism and the emergence of modern Muslim states." In: Esposita JL, editors. The Oxford History of Islam. Oxford Islamic Studies Online. 2019. http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/book/islam-9780195107999/islam-9780195107999-chapter-13

[38] Lukens-Bull, Ronald A. "Teaching morality: Javanese Islamic education in a globalizing era."J Arabic and Islamic Studies. 2000;3:26-47. https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/jais/volume/docs/vol3/3_026-47_LUKENS1jun24a.pdf

[39] Piers G. "Current issues in Indonesian Islam: Analysing the 2005 Council of Indonesian Ulama Fatwa No. 7 Opposing Pluralism, Liberalism and Secularism." J Islamic Stud. 2007;18(2):202-240.

[40] Astridya P, Lusi K. Teknik Focus Group Discussion Dalam Penelitian Kualitatif (Focus Group Discussion Tehnique in Qualitative Research). Buletin Penelitian Sistem Kesehatan. 2013;16(2).

[41] Gundumogula M. Importance of focus groups in qualitative research. Int J Hum Soc Sci (IJHSS). 2020 Nov 25;8(11):299-302.

[42] Cecilia W. "Moral development in culture: Diversity, tolerance, and justice." In Killen M, Judith GS, editors. Handbook of moral development. New Jersey: Erlbaum; 2008. p. 211-22.

[43] Unni W. Generous betrayal: Politics of culture in the New Europe. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[44] Larry PN, Elliot T. "God's word, religious rules and their relation to Christian and Jewish Children's Concepts of Morality." Child Dev. 2002;64:1485-1491.

[45] Hujair AHS. "The role of religious education in forming tolerant individuals." Indonesian J Interdiscip Islam Stud. 2017;1(1):77-89. https://journal.uii.ac.id/IJIIS/issue/view/1005

[46] Hartono, Yudi, Haryanto, Samsi, Asrowi, "Character education in the perspective of humanistic theory: A case study in Indonesia." EDUCARE: Int J Educ Stud. 2018;10(2):95-108. http://journals.mindamas.com/index.php/educare/article/view/948/856/

[47] Awalina M. "Value education and character in textbook of PAI and character in junior high school." Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Islam. 2017;9(2):163-187. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323338860_Value_education_and_character_in_textbook_of_PAI_and_Character_on_jun

[48] John D. Theory of Moral Life. (1932; repr.). New York: Irvington Publishers; 1996.

[49] Al Hamdani, Djaswidi. "Character education in Islamic education: Viewpoint." Jurnal Pendidikan Islam. 2014;1(1):98-109. http://journal.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/jpi/article/view/614

[50] Xiangdong L. "The problem of character education and Kohlberg's moral education: Critique from Dewey's moral deliberation." Philos Stud Educ. 2014;45:136-145. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1043685

[51] Ahmad MD, Peter GW. "Teaching the faith: Case studies from Indonesia and Australia." J Religious Educ. 2012;60(1):59-69.

[52] Fattah H, Peter GW. "Applying critical thinking to values education." Pendidikan Nilai (Values in Education). 2004;11(2):1-14.