INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE HUMANITY & MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

ISSN (print) 2833-2172, ISSN (online) 2833-2180 Volume 02 Issue 04 April 2023 DOI:10.58806/ijsshmr.2023.v2i4n05 Page No. 223-231

# The Effectiveness of Tolerant Character Development in Local Wisdom Based-Social Science

# Dr. Rasimin, M.Pd

Universitas Islam Negeri Salatiga, Indonesia

**ABSTRACT:** This study aims to improve tolerant character through the application of a tolerant character development model based on local wisdom in social studies learning. The approach used in this study is mix methods. The model will be tested for effectiveness using the quasi-experiment method. The t-test is used to see the effectiveness of using this character development model. The respondents in this study were 353 students who were taken using purposive sampling and quota sampling techniques. The results showed that there was a significant mean difference between the control and experimental classes (sig.2-tailed=0.014<0.05). The effectiveness of this model is also confirmed by the competence of teachers who can generally deliver social studies learning using this tolerant character development model. The effectiveness of this model is shown markedly through an increase in the achievement of student learning outcomes and a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to fun for students during learning. The conducive classroom atmosphere reflects that the implementation of learning using this model falls into the category of excellent. The advantage of this model is that it makes the affective aspect the main target, the cognitive aspect and the psychomotor aspect become supporting factors

KEYWORDS: character, tolerant, social, local wisdom

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the condition of society, nation and state in Indonesia is very apprehensive [1]. Social problems between citizens can endanger the unity and integrity of Indonesia if there is no preventive solution [2]. In general, these social problems occur as a result of mutual imposition of will between individuals which have impact on sharpening differences amongst groups caused by varied opinions [3]. This condition can lead to social conflict [4]. The mentioned conflict illustrates that the moral-nationalism attitude taught in schools is not optimal in growing students' awareness [5]. This happens as the learning that is presented still focuses on the cognitive domain, while the affective aspects have not received attention [6]. The values of local wisdom that respect humanity, democracy and tolerance seem not to be used as a source. Thus, social science has a duty to contribute the growing of moral respectful awareness through the development of a tolerant character [7].

Through social studies education, moral tolerance in the midst of ethnic-cultural diversity in Indonesia can be grown [8]. Meanwhile, local wisdom approach is a reference in understanding and interpreting tolerance in Indonesia [9]. The life of a multicultural society runs harmoniously and is strong if every member of the community respects and upholds the cultural values. This social study education has an active role in fortifying youth from cultural that do not meet the spirit of Indonesia [10]. Contextually, local wisdom can help the millenials in understading the concept of social studies [11]. The studies can generate a more meaningful learning motivation for this generation that fits in their daily basis [12].

The National Education System Law No. 20 of 2003 states that education is a conscious and planned effort to create a learning atmosphere and process so that students actively develop their potential to have religious spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and the skills needed by all citizens [13]. Thence, social studies education aims at developing a tolerant character to have a harmonious life for Indonesians [10].

Social studies learning is based on a post-positivistic paradigm, while the development of a tolerant character is developed with the philosophy of perennialism and reconstructionism [14]. To note, perennial philosophy is used to develop students' intellectual abilities, such as: truth, beauty, and love of goodness. Meanwhile, the philosophy of reconstructionism perceives that the future of a nation should be governed democratically [15]. From these problems and theories, this research will develop tolerant learning, namely Developing a tolerant character in social studies learning based on local wisdom aims to achieve optimal learning.

The focus of this research is digging: 1) Which kind of tolerant character development design is effective in social studies learning based on local wisdom for fifth grade students of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (an Islamic based elementary school) in Salatiga?; 2) Can the development of the tolerant character developed in social studies learning based on local wisdom increase the tolerance

awareness of fifth grade students at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah in Salatiga?; and 3) How high is the effectiveness of tolerant character development in social studies learning based on local wisdom in increasing tolerance awareness of the fifth grade students at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah in Salatiga?

# II. METHODS

The approach used in this research is Research and Development (R&D) [16]. To test the effectiveness of the model, the experiment method is applied. Meanwhile, a qualitative descriptive method is used to interpret the effectiveness of the model and the quality of social science learning. The advantage of this research approach lies on its work procedure, because it pays close attention to real needs and conditions, and it is systematic and cyclical in nature.

The product of the effectiveness test in this study is a tolerant character development model design. The model that has been tested for its effectiveness has been carried out: (1) Preliminary Study Phase by conducting a literature review and needs analysis activities with the aim of finding a specific model. The findings of the preliminary study are used as a reference for the preparation of a product model for the development of tolerant character in social studies learning based on local wisdom; and (2) while at the study stage the model development is basicly designed on learning theory. Next, arrange learning tools is developed as model instruments. A collaborative design between researchers and teachers is made to test the models that have been designed.

The next stage is planning a number of experiment classes and control classes. To see the effectiveness of the developed model, the research experiments on the model [17]. The experiment design used is Quasi Experiment as the researcher does not have full power in forming both the control class and experiment class. It is merely because True Experiment design is difficult to implement. The Quasi Experiment form used in this research is [18].

Nonequivalent Control Group design.

| 01 | Х | O2 |
|----|---|----|
| 03 |   | O4 |

Figure 1. Nonequivalent Control Group

#### **Design Model**

There are 6 experiment and 6 control groups taken from 6 schools. The chosen design is purposive sampling technique. This research is carried out in all Madrasah Ibtidaiyah in Salatiga with the total number of participants are 353 students, where 164 students are in control class and the rest 189 are in experiment class. Respondents in this study are taken using purposive and quota techniques. The samples in control and experiment classes are taken from normally distributed populations.

Data collection techniques used in this study are taken from primary and secondary procedures. The primary data collections are taken from interview, observation, questionnaire and test. While the research instruments used are interview guides, observation sheets, tolerance questionnaires, and tests. Interview techniques are used to collect teacher and student response data in social studies learning using a tolerant character development model based on local wisdom. Observation techniques are used to see the percentage of learning implementation. Questionnaire techniques are used to analyze the needs and constraints encountered during the implementation of learning [19]. Technical tests are used to measure students' knowledge, attitudes, and skills.

Meanwhile, the secondary data is from documentation in field. Documentation techniques are used to retrieve data sources in the form of social studies curriculum documents containing local wisdom, social studies learning documents based on local wisdom, and the real conditions of students in urban and suburban areas[20].

#### III. LIMITED APPLICABILITY TEST OF THE MODEL PHASE I

The implementation of the phase I applicability test is in rural school areas. Rural school locations are assumed to represent the applicability test of the Phase I model which will then be developed for the Phase II model applicability test at urban school locations.

| School Code | <b>Total students Control</b> | Experiment |
|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1/A         | 35                            | 36         |
| 2/B         | 39                            | 26         |
| 3/C         | 21                            | 35         |
| 4/D         | 22                            | 34         |
| 5/E         | 23                            | 32         |
| 6/F         | 24                            | 26         |

Table 1. Data on the Number of Students in Rural Schools

From the data in the table, it can be seen that the average number of students in rural schools is 30 students in each class from the total 6 classes involved in the study (at least 21 and at most 39 students). The results of the test of the applicability of the learning model in rural schools are clearly seen in the table below.

| School | Pretest score | Posttest score | Average increase |            |         |            |
|--------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------|---------|------------|
| cide   | Control       | Experiment     | KControl         | Experiment | Control | Experiment |
| 1/A    | 61            | 66.22          | 80.05            | 82.39      | 19.05   | 16.17      |
| 2/B    | 50.36         | 51.42          | 59.08            | 89.27      | 8.72    | 37.85      |
| 3/C    | 57.81         | 68.86          | 64.71            | 80         | 6.9     | 11.14      |
| 4/D    | 72.18         | 74.29          | 75.41            | 71.62      | 3.23    | 0          |
| 5/E    | 57.81         | 68.86          | 64.71            | 80         | 6.9     | 11.14      |
| 6/F    | 56.81         | 67.86          | 63.71            | 79         | 6.7     | 10.14      |

| Table 2  | Average   | Learning | Outcomes | in | Rural | Schools |
|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----|-------|---------|
| Table 2. | Average 1 | Learning | Outcomes | ш  | Rurai | Schools |

From table 1 and 2, it indicates that the average pre-test vale in the control class is under the experiment class (control < experiment). The difference is not that sharp, except for the control class at 57.81 and the experiment class is at 64.71. Sharp differences in class are possible and acceptable because students at these two schools have relatively different qualifications from the students' background. This is corroborated by the increase in the average student achievement of two schools during the posttest, where the control class is still lower than the experiment class, namely in the control class the average increase is at 6.9 lower than the experiment class with an average increase at 11.14 (see table 2). Overall, the number of students in 6 classes involve in the study do not differ significantly from the results of the pre-test. If the average pre-test scores in the control class and the experiment class do not have a significant difference (see table 2), then these 8 classes can be considered appropriate in implementing the learning model.

The average increase of the post test from both the control class and the experiment class has increased. The pre-test score of the experiment class at 74.29 had a abetter result than its post-test at 71.62. thus, it can be inferred that the increase in the experiment class is 0 (see Table 2). However, the learning outcomes in this experiment class are still in the good category because the results are above the standard at 70. This means that even though there is one experiment class which learning achievement decreased, the overall average achievement of student learning outcomes in the control class is below the learning outcomes in the experiment class. It can be interpreted that the experiment class has proven its success in implementing the social studies learning model based on local wisdom as shown by the average score of learning outcomes in the post-test score which is higher than the pre-test one.

Table 1 illustrates the difference in the level of increase in each control class and experiment class. It seems clear that all of 6 classes involved in the study have show an increase in learning achievement. This means that not all teachers in the experiment class are able to carry out the learning process using the learning model according to research expectations or not all students in the experiment class can accept the learning model that has been conveyed by the teachers. It can also be interpreted that the learning model can be implemented optimally by the teacher though the students cannot get maximum learning results. Regarding the evaluation by the supervisor (validator) of the teacher when implementing the learning model and how the teacher evaluates the learning device has illustrated that one or two teachers in a certain learning component are not able to implement optimally in assessing the learning tools prepared by researchers. However, this feature is considered normal (less meaningful for teachers).

From the description above, it can be interpreted that the average student achievement in the experiment class is better than the student outcome in the control class. The difference in the number of students has no effect on learning outcomes with the developed model (Table 2). Table 2 has depicted that the experiment class had the highest increase in learning achievement (37.85) from a total of 26 students. Meanwhile, respectively from 36 students in the experiment class's achievement is at 16.17 and from a total of 35 students the achievement is at 11.14. Surprisingly, the lowest achievement at 0 is experienced by the experiment class with 34 students.

The results of a high pre-test average score do not necessarily have a direct impact on the high achievement of the average post-test score. For example, it can be seen that in the experiment class where the lowest pre-test average score is 51.42 while the highest score is 89.27. Different figure is seen from the experiment class where the highest pre-test average score is 74.29 and does not experience an increase in learning outcomes when the post-test is carried out instead decreased araound 4 at 71.62. The decrease in post-test scores compared to pre-test in the experiment class is possible because the teachers in the experiment class did not participate in the dissemination. The teacher came when the event had just closed so they only had time to receive all the learning tools and only received outline directions containing technical implementation of existing learning tools. It is predicted that students would not understand what the teacher has explained. The explanation seems different from the experiment class as the tacherrs in this class participated in the dissemination. Student confusion was understandable, because the teacher in delivering learning material (possibly) did not follow what procedures should be done with the model being developed. This was evidenced by the results of the responses of the instrument given to students in rural areas. In a suburban school there were 34 students from 4

experiment classes of this developed model. In general, students were happy with the subject matter given by the teacher, there were 30 students (88.24%); 31 students (91.18%) were happy with the students worksheet (LKS) used; happy with the learning atmosphere created (82.35% of 28 students); and happy with the way the teacher taught (82.35% of 228 students). Generally students found new things in the lessons conveyed by the teacher. In detail, there were 29 students (85.40%) of the subject matter; on students worksheet (LKS) there were 30 students (88.23%); on the learning atmosphere in class there were 28 (82.35%); and how to teach the teacher there were 28 students (82.35%) said it was new.

It can be concluded that teachers in rural schools got the largest response from 6 students (17.65%) who said they were not happy with the learning atmosphere in class and were not happy with the teaching of the teacher taught. They said that the learning atmosphere was not new. The reason for these students indicates that the way the teacher conveys learning was still conventional even though all the developed model learning tools were new. The proof was that, in general, students in the experiment rural school class said they were happy with the developed subject model (above 80%). The conventional way of teaching is possible because the experiment class teacher did not participate in the dissemination. Experiment class students' pre-tests answers were done without any interference and better than the control class. It could be said that this learning model in stage I proved to be effective in increasing student learning achievement. The effectiveness of the learning model had been proven to be achievable so that it was feasible to test its applicability in stage II.

#### IV. LIMITED APPLICABILITY TEST OF MODEL PHASE II

In the results of the second phase of the applicability test, it will be explained how much the increasing average in learning outcomes is. At this stage the schools involved in the study are urban schools.

| School Code | <b>Total students Control</b> | Experiment |
|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1/A         | 41                            | 26         |
| 2/B         | 30                            | 28         |
| 3/C         | 22                            | 19         |
| 4/D         | 21                            | 27         |
| 5/E         | 20                            | 29         |
| 6/F         | 23                            | 13         |

Table 3. Data on the Number of Students in Urban Schools

From the data above, it is known that the number of students between one class and another varies greatly. Most of the number of students in urban schools with a parallel class consist of 41 students. Meanwhile, the least number of students was in the urban class was 13 students. The average number of each class was around 22 students from 6 schools involved in the research. Student learning outcomes in phase II applicability test will be able to describe more broadly on the level of effectiveness of the model because the applicability test was extended to schools in urban areas. The description of the level of effectiveness of the model was inseparable from the data on student learning outcomes in the classes involved in the research. To make it easy to understand, below will display student learning outcomes in the form of a table of average pre-test and post-test scores in urban schools.

Table 4. Pre-test and post-test average scores in urban schools

| School Code | Pretest score Control | Rata-rata kenaika | Post-test Score Control | Eksperiment |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|             |                       | Experiment        |                         |             |
| 1/A         | 68.57                 | 66.19             | 74.07                   | 73.74       |
| 2/B         | 63.57                 | 63.61             | 91.7                    | 88.54       |
| 3/C         | 45.77                 | 62.5              | 48.36                   | 78.7        |
| 4/D         | 68.62                 | 49.07             | 78.48                   | 77.04       |
| 5/E         | 67.35                 | 49.03             | 86.25                   | 73.03       |
| 6/F         | 60.52                 | 61.62             | 66.3                    | 83.15       |

From the data shown above, it is used to make clearer differences in the average pre-test scores between the control class and the experiment class in urban schools.

Looking at the data shown in the table above, it can be seen that the average results of the pre-test scores in the control class in urban schools are not much different from the experiment control class. It can be inferred that the result was relatively the same. In urban schools, all control classes scored above 50 to close to 70.

It means that, there is no significant difference between the experiment class and the control class in urban schools. Similarly, there was no difference in learning achievement in urban schools from the overall pre-test average scores between the control class and the experiment class. The lowest average values are 63.61 and 64.12 in the experiment class while the lowest average values 49.03 and 49.07 in the control class. The highest average values are of he experiment class in urban schools are 65.08 and 66.19 (see Table 4).

The difference that appears in the average pre-test scores, especially in the experiment class, actually reinforces the assumption that urban schools generally have better facilities and more adequate access to education. Meanwhile, in the control class the average pre-test scores are relatively the same. It can be seen that in urban schools the lowest average pre-test scores are 50.8 and 61.63. In urban schools, the highest average pre-test scores are 63.57 and 68.57 (see Table 4). That is, that the learning achievements of the control and experiment classes can match their learning achievements.

It can be interpreted that in schools that have limited facilities and access to education, it is possible that their learning achievement is equal to or exceeds that of schools that already have more facilities and sufficient access to education if they get adequate learning opportunities. It is important to find out the comparison of learning outcomes in the control class and the experiment class.

From the average post-test scores in the control class and the experiment class as a whole the results are relatively the same in urban schools. For the control class in urban schools, the highest post-test average scores are 74.07 and 91.7. Meanwhile, in the experiment class in urban schools the lowest average post-test scores are 71.54 and 73.74. The highest mean post-test scores in urban schools are 75.2 and 88.54. (see Table 4). It shows that both the control class and the experiment class show an increase in learning outcomes. The average value of the urban school experiment class is shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Urban School Experiment Class Average Score

| Pretest score | Posttest score | Average score increase |
|---------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 65.08 (D)     | 75.2 (E)       | 9.4                    |
| 64.12 (E)     | 71.54 (F)      | 7.42                   |
| 66.19 (F)     | 73.74 (G)      | 7.55                   |

Table 5 above provides an explanation that learning outcomes in the experiment class are better than the control class. Almost all experiment classes experienced better achievement increases. However, the increase in the control class did not reduce the general meaning that the average experiment class experienced a better increase. It can be interpreted that the average learning outcomes in the control class strengthens the research hypothesis i.e. the experiment class's learning achievement increases better than the control class.

| Table 6. Pre-test and | post-test average score in | 12 control classes | of applicability test |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                       |                            |                    |                       |

| Control class | Pretest | Posttest |
|---------------|---------|----------|
| 1/A           | 61      | 80.05    |
| 2/B           | 50.36   | 59.08    |
| 3/C           | 57.81   | 64.71    |
| 4/D           | 72.18   | 75.41    |
| 5/E           | 50.8    | 59       |
| 6/F           | 61.63   | 67.63    |
| 7/G           | 68.57   | 74.07    |
| 8/H           | 63.97   | 91.7     |
| 9/I           | 45.77   | 48.36    |
| 10/J          | 68.62   | 78.48    |
| 11/K          | 67.35   | 86.25    |
| 12/L          | 60.52   | 66.3     |

from table 6 it can be seen that the average pre-test score in 24 classes shows that the control class average pre-test score is lower than the post-test average score.

Table 7. Average Score of Pre-Test Control Class and Experiment Class in Rural and Urban Schools

| School | Control class | Eksperiment class |
|--------|---------------|-------------------|
| 1      | 61            | 66.22             |
| 2      | 50.36         | 51.42             |
| 3      | 57.81         | 68.86             |
| 4      | 72.18         | 74.29             |
| 5      | 50.8          | 65.08             |
| 6      | 61.63         | 64.12             |
| 7      | 68.57         | 66.19             |
| 8      | 63.97         | 63.61             |
| 9      | 45.77         | 62.5              |
| 10     | 68.62         | 49.07             |
| 11     | 67.35         | 49.03             |
| 12     | 60.52         | 61.62             |

Table 7 shows clearly that there are three control classes which pre-test scores are better than the experiment class. However, the seven experiment classes look better than the control class. Meanwhile, there is a very slight difference in one of the control classes by which is better than the experiment class (in class no. 8: 63.97 > 63.61 or there is a difference of 0.36). The whole of the 24 classes involved in the study the pre-test scores in the experiment class shows better results than the control class though the difference is not significant. This means that all students or 12 classes are eligible to be involved in this study whether as a control or experiment classes. The level of effectiveness of the developed model is clearer from the details shown in the results of the pre-test and post-test in the following 6 experiment classes.

| <b>Eksperimental class</b> | Pretest | Posttest |
|----------------------------|---------|----------|
| 1                          | 66.22   | 82.39    |
| 2                          | 51.42   | 89.27    |
| 3                          | 68.86   | 80       |
| 4                          | 74.29   | 71.62    |
| 5                          | 65.08   | 75.2     |
| 6                          | 64.12   | 71.54    |

Table 8. Average Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experiment Classes in Urban and Rural Schools

Table 8 above indicates that the average post-test score for the experiment class is better or higher than the average pre-test score amongst 12 experiment classes. A slight difference (of 75.41 > 71.62) is seen and is at good category as the post-test score is still above 70, the specified minimum standard. That is, the average learning outcomes with the developed model increasingly reach success in increasing student achievement. It is proven by the average post-test score by which is higher than the pre-test score. This means that the learning model developed has proven to be effective in improving student achievement. Furthermore, more detail learning success through post-test scores between 6 control classes and 6 experiment classes (there are 12 classes) involved in the research will be clearly rovided below.

| Table 9. Post-Test Average | Value of Control | Class and Experiment | Class in Urban | and Rural Schools |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|

| School | Control class | Eksperiment class |
|--------|---------------|-------------------|
| 1      | 80.05         | 82.39             |
| 2      | 59.08         | 89.27             |
| 3      | 64.71         | 80                |
| 4      | 75.41         | 71.62             |
| 5      | 59            | 75.2              |
| 6      | 67.63         | 71.54             |
| 7      | 74.07         | 73.74             |
| 8      | 91.7          | 88.54             |
| 9      | 48.36         | 78.7              |
| 10     | 78.48         | 77.04             |
| 11     | 86.25         | 73.03             |
| 12     | 66.3          | 83.15             |

Table 9 clearly indicates that from the 6 control classes and 6 experiment classes, the average post-test scores in the experiment class are generally better than the 3 experiment control classes. Meanwhile, there are 3 control classes which average post-test results are better than the experiment class. There is one school (no. 7) which experienced a very slight difference where the post-test scores in the control class are better than the experiment class (74.07 > 73.74) or there is a difference of 0.33. The average post-test score in the low control class shows that it strengthens the success of the experiment class. There is a significant difference because the average student learning outcomes in the experiment class are better than the control class.

Table 10. Increase in Learning Outcomes in the Control Class and Experiment Class in Urban and Rural Schools

| School | Control class | Experiment class |
|--------|---------------|------------------|
| 1/A    | 19.05         | 16.17            |
| 2/B    | 8.72          | 37.85            |
| 3/C    | 6.9           | 11.14            |
| 4/D    | 3.23          | 0                |
| 5/E    | 8.2           | 10.12            |
| 6/F    | 6             | 7.42             |
| 7/G    | 5.5           | 7.55             |
| 8/H    | 27.73         | 24.93            |

| 9/M  | 2.59 | 16.2  |
|------|------|-------|
| 10/N | 9.86 | 27.97 |
| 11/O | 18.9 | 24    |
| 12/P | 5.78 | 21.53 |

Table 10 above clearly shows that in general the experiment class and the control class experience an increase in their post-test scores. It seems clear that in the experiment school the post-test score can be said to have a zero increase or no increase. The achievement of the post-test score has decreased compared to the pre-test score. It means that the tolerant character development model in social studies learning based on local wisdom that has been developed is proven to be able to improve student achievement. The number of students does not have a direct effect on the level of increase in the average learning achievement (Table 7).

The quality of students does not always contribute to the success of understanding the developed learning model. It is evidenced by the average rural class with lower pre-test scores (compared to urban school pre-test scores) but the result of an increase in the average post-test score is higher. Moreover, it is higher than schools in urban areas, because (possibly) the developed learning is in accordance with the values of local wisdom in rural schools. Values that are still loyally maintained in the society.

The developed learning model in general can be well understood by students in experiment classes. This means that the social studies learning model based on local wisdom developed in this study is effective in increasing tolerance awareness as evidenced by increasing student achievement in the experiment classes.

#### The Effectiveness of Tolerance Character Development

The effectiveness of tolerant character development is carried out using parametric statistical tests. The researcher conducted the test 3 times. The first test was to do an independent samples to test the balance of the data before the treatment was given to know whether the control class and the experiment class had the same (homogeneous) variance. Then the second test also used independent samples to test whether there was a significant difference between the control class and the experiment class after the treatment was given. The third test was the paired samples test to test whether there was a significant increase in the experiment group.

Based on the output, it can be seen the value of Sig. The Levenes Test for Equality of Variances is 0.887 > 0.05. It can be inferred that the variance of the data between the control class and the experiment class is homogeneous (similar). Obtained a sig (2-tailed) value of 0.157 > 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no significant significant average diffrence of pretest scores between the control class and the experiment class.

The paired samples test shows that the sig. (2-tailed) is 0.045 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in student scores before using the developed model with student scores after using the model. The t-value is -2.666 indicating that the value of group 2 (post-test) is higher than the value of group 1 (pre-test).

#### **Model Effectiveness Description**

The limited applicability test stage I is to determine the effectiveness of the model in urban schools. It is assumed that the results of the effectiveness of the model in urban areas and rural areas of schools effective where the average learning achievement in the experiment class is better than the control class. This means that the tolerant character development model has proven effective so that it can be continued to phase II limited applicability test both in urban schools and rural schools.

The results of the average pre-test scores in the control class in urban schools are not much different from the control class in rural schools (relatively similar). Meanwhile, in the experiment class, the average pre-test scores in rural schools are below urban schools. It appears that there are two classes in rural schools which results are below 50 and in the experiment class in urban schools are above 60. The experiment class in urban schools have better pre-test scores than the experiment class in rural schools, while there is no significant difference between the control class in urban schools and rural schools. It indicates that learning achievement in urban schools is better than in rural schools.

The difference that appears in the average pre-test scores, especially in the experiment class, actually reinforces the assumption so far, that rural schools, because they have limited learning facilities and access to education than urban schools which generally have better facilities and access to a more adequate education. School achievement in rural areas can match schools urban areas although learning facilities and access to education are not as good and advanced as schools in urban areas.

Seen from the average increase in learning outcomes through post-test scores, it can be interpreted that: all the experiment classes show better success than the control classes. The average post-test scores in the control classes corroborate the success of the experiment classes. There is a significant difference because the average student learning outcomes in the experiment classes are better than the control classes This condition proves that the developed learning model has succeeded effectively in increasing students' achievement. That is, the tolerant character development model in social studies learning based on local wisdom that has been developed is proven to be able to improve student achievement.

The developed learning model is successfully implemented by the teacher in accordance with the research objectives. The average experiment class teacher can understand well the model developed to be implemented in the learning process. Learning using the developed model can be understood by experiment class students who are involved in research well. It can be interpreted that the development of a tolerant character in social studies learning based on local wisdom that has been developed has succeeded in effectively increasing awareness of being tolerant as evidenced by increasing student learning outcomes.

The teacher has transformed local wisdom values which contain harmony to be used as a basis for tolerance in the life of the Indonesians (moral knowing). The phenomenon of social problems (social conflicts) developed in the society is used as a learning medium to build empathy (moral feeling) for students so that they can participate in solving social problems. Values that uphold feelings of appreciation, respect others, and cooperation without discriminate against differences in religious, ethnic, cultural and other backgrounds are inserted. Student learning outcomes from the validation test of the applicability of the tolerant character development model in 6 experiment classes show that the students experience a pretty good improvement. It is known from the comparison when the pre-test is carried out that the lowest class average value is 49.03 and the highest is 66.19. Meanwhile, during the post-test, the lowest class average score is 71.54 and the highest class average score is 88.54. It can be interpreted that the development of tolerant character in social studies learning based on local wisdom through application tests shows the success for the students' learning.

#### **V. CONCLUSIONS**

From the analysis result, it is concluded that developed social studies learning based on local wisdom is effective in increasing students' tolerant character. Effectiveness is measured using the t-test with sig.2-tailed results <0.05, thus there is a significant average difference between the control and experiment groups. Obtained t count of -2.690, it indicates that the experiment group is better than the control group. The tolerant character of students can be seen in their attitudes during the social studies learning process by not imposing their will, respecting and appreciating the opinions of friends. There is empathy and being able to work together in role playing. A conducive classroom atmosphere reflects that the learning tools can be applied properly and learning using the developed model is more interesting.

#### REFERENCES

- 1) U. T. Hanifa and D. M. Nurgaha, "Pembentukan Karakter Cinta Tanah Air dalam Situasi Pandemi Covid-19," *Harmony: Jurnal Pembelajaran IPS dan PKN 7*, no. 229, pp. 1–6, 2022.
- 2) J. Mahardhani and Ardhana, "Menjadi Warga Negara yang Baik pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19: Persprektif Kenormalan Baru," *Jurnal Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 65–76, 2020.
- 3) I. Rahmawati, "Metode Bermain untuk Meningkatkan Nilai Sosial Siswa dalam Pembelajaran IPS di SDN 3 Karanganom Klaten Utara," *Jurnal Pendidikan Modern*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 16–23, 2019.
- 4) T. N. Rahmawati, "Peluang Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial (IPS) dalam Mewujudkan Pendidikan yang Berbasis Multikultural," *Jurnal Soshum Insentif*, pp. 86–91, 2020.
- 5) A. Wahid, "Pengaruh Strategi Pembelajaran Kooperatif Jigsaw dan Kabupaten Bangkalan," *Jinotep*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 14–30, 2016.
- N. A. Hidayati, H. J. Waluyo, R. Winarni, and Suyitno, "Exploring the implementation of local wisdom-based character education among indonesian higher education students," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 179–198, 2020.
- R. D. Fitrianah and M. O. Saputri, "Stretegi Guru IPS dalam Menanamkan Sikap Toleransi pada Siswa Multikultural: Studi Kasus di SMP Negeri 15 Kota Bengkulu," *Indonesian Journal of Social Science Education (IJSSE*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 95–104, 2021.
- 8) B. Riyanto and P. Lestari, "Penguatan Perilaku Toleransi Dalam Pembelajaran Ips di SMP Pangudi Luhur Salatiga," *Sosiolium: Jurnal Pembelajaran IPS 2*, no. 2, pp. 84–88, 2020.
- 9) A. Widodo, "Nilai Budaya Ritual Perang Topat sebagai Sumber Pembelajaran IPS Berbasis Kearifan Lokal di Sekolah Dasar," *Gulawentah:Jurnal Studi Sosial*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 1, 2020.
- 10) A. Nursyifa, "Transformasi Pendidikan Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial dalam Menghadapi Era Revolusi Industri 4.0," *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 51, 2019.
- 11) N. R. Sholihah, "Traditional game-based learning: As a local wisdom learning model in elementary school," *Multicultural Education*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 182–186, 2020.
- 12) A. B. Mahmoud, L. Fuxman, I. Mohr, W. D. Reisel, and N. Grigoriou, ""We aren't your reincarnation!" workplace motivation across X, Y and Z generations," *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 193–209, 2021.
- 13) A. Y. K. Matlani Matlani, "Analisis Kritis Undang-Undang Sisdiknas Nomor 20 Tahun 2003," *Jurnal Ilmiah Iqra*', vol. 13, no. 2, p. 81, 2019.

- 14) B. Pang, "Engaging Bourdieu's habitus with Chinese understandings of embodiment: Knowledge flows in Health and Physical Education in higher education in Hong Kong," *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 52, no. 12, pp. 1256– 1265, 2020.
- 15) C. Czingon, A. Diefenbach, and V. Kempf, "Moral Universalism at a Time of Political Regression: A Conversation with Jürgen Habermas about the Present and His Life's Work," *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 37, no. 7–8, pp. 11–36, 2020.
- 16) A. Z. F. Nik Haryanti, M. P. P. kuantitatif, and kualitatif, *Mixed Method, dan Reasarch and Development, Madani media*, 1st ed. Malang: Intrans Publishing, 2020.
- 17) Sugiyono, Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2017.
- 18) E.-A. Dumitru, "Testing Children and Adolescents' Ability to Identify Fake News: A Combined Design of," *Societies*, vol. 10, no. 71, 2020.
- 19) A. Y. Khunaifi and M. Matlani, "Analisis Kritis Undang-Undang Sisdiknas Nomor 20 Tahun 2003," *Jurnal Ilmiah Iqra*', vol. 13, no. 2, p. 81, 2019.
- 20) E.-A. Dumitru, "Testing Children and Adolescents' Ability to Identify Fake News: A Combined Design of," *Societies*, vol. 10, no. 71, 2020.