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Abstract
This research is a profetic Gestalt study (G-Pro) in improving the religious tolerance of students in IBN ‘AQIL High School. The purpose of this study is to increase the religious tolerance of high school students by using an IT-based Gestalt profetic (G-Pro) guidance and counseling approach. This research uses a quantitative approach with the experimental quation method. The design of the research used is pretest-posttest design of the Nonequivalent group. The population of this study was 110 students at Senior High School (SMA) IBN ’AQIL. Research samples were taken 60 people from the population. A tool for measuring a poll. The data analysis used in this study is quantitative and inferential descriptive analysis. The results of the study known that the G-Pro approach to improving religious tolerance for students in SMA ibn ‘Aqil is known Thitung > this (4,826 > 1,980), so it can be stated that there is a significant influence of religious tolerance of students on Group experiments and control groups or it can be said that groups of students given the approach of Gestalt profetic (G-Pro) guidance and counseling are better than those of the control group.
Introduction

Religious tolerance is to cherish, have awareness to respect human beings without seeing the difference, both from religious differences, race and color of the skin. A Muslim is ruled by God in order to keep fair and peace in a way that is not mutually hostile toward people who are not from Muslims. The difference of religion occurs in the will of God that has given freedom to man to choose his religion, and Allah hates people who are zolim although done by Muslims against non-Muslims. (Nu'man, 2004)

Differences in cultural diversity, ethnicity, language and religion have been a normal thing for the life of people in Indonesia. But it is not uncommon for these differences to ignite some conflicts from small to large conflicts that make war among religious people. Many cases occur in Indonesia because of the public view that is still erroneous and public to religious tolerance, resulting in many people who are unconscious so that it is too free until finally the violence in terms of tolerance. Frequent cases of religious tolerance often found in society are free in interpreting Qur’anic verses by non-expert people, free in Shari’ah, free in associating between Muslims and non-Muslims, to justify LGBT, Allow the equivalent between women and men, respecting religious differences by following the culture forbidden by Islamic religion, etc.

From the case above the authors argue that the understanding of religious tolerance that occurs in the community especially among teenagers can affect the world of education, because the main target is the students And students who are still public in this regard. As a center of education, the role of educational institutions is important and should be involved in addressing the problem. Through educational institutions, it will affect social life in general. This is because at the institution there is a role that serves to form the character of learners to have a quality character, so that can be a role model as a change agent in the community in the better direction. (Syamsu Yusuf, 2016)

One of the types of institutions is a formal school that is reserved for various circles, from early childhood to higher education. The school becomes an educational tool for the community to seek knowledge in the institution, so that children who are schools can get the values and norms of education through the education process provided during the school. So, the school can be a place to embed and practice social values such as tolerance to learners in order to be an example by the community. One way to instill the value of tolerance in schools is by conducting guidance and counseling that can help students better understand and improve religious tolerance.

Guidance is to help someone directly by providing activities in the form of understanding, directing and focusing on development. The process given to someone in the guidance is to foster self-understanding both in terms of material and spiritual to fit the environment, both family, school and community. (Al-Habsyi, 2017)

While counseling is the process of a counselor’s relationship in assisting the contemplations on the facts related to the necessary choices, plans, or adjustments. In the process of counseling counselor does not provide a solution but help Consley find solutions to problems faced without coercion from counselors. (Khakam, 2017)

Guidance and counseling are used to increase the tolerance in this study with the profetic Gestalt approach (G-Pro). G-Pro is different from regular guidance and general counseling. The word prophetic characterizes that this guidance and counseling is done in an Islamic or Islamic way. Islamic guidance and counseling or can be termed as prophetic is the process of giving the assistance given to the individual so that he realizes his existence as a creature
of God. So with the help and direction given he was able to live a life consistent with the provisions and instruction of God so that he could achieve a happy life in the world and in the hereafter. (Rahman, 2017)

The concept of Gestalt is awareness, contact and enhanced support in the Profetetic Gestalt (G-Pro) approach. In G-Pro’s consciousness, contact and support is done in full (full), meaning that a full awareness is realized that the individual has a role as the caliph of Allah. Contact or full contact is to build habituation with humans and the nature of God’s creation. The latter full support has the meaning that individuals are encouraged to consider their choice by looking at the benefits and principles for their environment. (Ummu, 2019)

The study uses G-Pro’s approach and counseling approaches to be an alternative approach to improving religious tolerance for students. Based on the exploration found several writings relating to this study:

1. The study of Imas Kania Rahman in 2017 with the title "Gestalt Profetik Best Practice approach of sufistic guidance and counseling". This research aims to take the profetetic Gestalt approach to increase self-awareness of its existence as a creature of God, developing self-ability, learning responsible for accepting the consequences of choice and deed, Through the profetic Gestalt approach with card game techniques, realizing the help of others and being able to help others because of God. (Imas, 2017)

2. The research of Mohammad Rifa’i in the year 2016 entitled "Inter-religious tolerance in high school good morning Indonesian stone East Java". This research aims to raise students’ awareness to always behave humanist, pluralist and democratic. Based on the excavation of information in the field that can be obtained is by tolerance can be formed a pattern of good social interaction so that it can be established an institution of cultural diversity with multicultural planting in Students in high school good morning. (Rifa’i, 2016)

The difference is that research is done this time more emphasis on how to increase understanding of religious tolerance among students, especially students in IBN’ AQIL High School. An alternative approach conducted by researchers to improve the religious tolerance of students in IBN’ AQIL High School is using a profetic Gestalt approach through experimental methods. The experimental methods provided to students with an experiment use the profetic Gestalt approach and an IT-based guidance and counseling medium, so that students can experience and prove themselves what is learned about religious tolerance, And students can draw a conclusion from the process it experiences.

Referring to some of the above problems, then you should have a question that requires an answer how to anticipate the problem. Among them: First, how is the level of religious tolerance students control class and experimentation class in IBN’ AQIL High school? Secondly, how does the G-Pro approach to improving religious tolerance for students in IBN’ AQIL High school? Thirdly, how much difference is the increase in religious tolerance of the experimental group students and the control group in IBN’ AQIL High school?

Research Methodology

This research uses a quantitative approach with the experimental quation method. Experimental research is the purest study in quantitative. The design of the research used is
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A pretest-posttest design of the Nonequivalent group. This design allows for discrepancies and is not comparable between experimental groups and control groups. The population of this study was 110 students at Senior High School (SMA) IBN 'AQIL. Research samples were taken 60 people from the population. After 60 students were elected to research samples, the researchers divided into two groups (experimental and group control groups). An experimental group of 30 students and a control group of 30 students. The data analysis used in this study is a descriptive statistical analysis and inferential statistics.

Results And Discussion

A. Students' religious tolerance at SMA Ibn 'Aqil

Religious tolerance of the students of Ibn 'Aqil High School can be known from the students' answers to the results of 40 statements given with the following results.

Tabel 1 Pre Test Student Tolerance Experimental group

| No. | Question | SS | S | TS | STS | Value | Criteria |
|-----|----------|----|---|----|-----|-------|----------|
| 1   | 8        | 22 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 3.27  | Very Good|
| 2   | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 3   | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 4   | 10       | 17 | 2 | 1  | 3.17| Good   |
| 5   | 4        | 24 | 2 | 0  | 3.07| Good   |
| 6   | 3        | 20 | 7 | 0  | 2.87| Good   |
| 7   | 3        | 24 | 3 | 0  | 3.00| Good   |
| 8   | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 3.30| Very Good|
| 9   | 12       | 18 | 0 | 0  | 3.40| Very Good|
| 10  | 13       | 17 | 0 | 0  | 3.43| Very Good|
| 11  | 14       | 16 | 0 | 0  | 3.47| Very Good|
| 12  | 8        | 22 | 0 | 0  | 3.27| Very Good|
| 13  | 11       | 19 | 0 | 0  | 3.37| Very Good|
| 14  | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 3.30| Very Good|
| 15  | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 3.30| Very Good|
| 16  | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 3.30| Very Good|
| 17  | 4        | 24 | 2 | 0  | 3.07| Good   |
| 18  | 8        | 22 | 0 | 0  | 3.27| Very Good|
| 19  | 6        | 24 | 0 | 0  | 3.20| Good   |
| 20  | 10       | 20 | 0 | 0  | 3.33| Very Good|
| 21  | 7        | 18 | 2 | 3  | 2.97| Good   |
| 22  | 3        | 9  | 15| 3  | 2.40| Very Good|
| 23  | 4        | 13 | 9 | 4  | 2.57| Good   |
| 24  | 10       | 19 | 1 | 0  | 3.27| Very Good|
| 25  | 9        | 20 | 1 | 0  | 3.27| Very Good|
| 26  | 7        | 23 | 0 | 0  | 3.23| Good   |
| 27  | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 3.30| Very Good|
| 28  | 12       | 18 | 0 | 0  | 3.40| Very Good|
| 29  | 12       | 18 | 0 | 0  | 3.40| Very Good|
| 30  | 14       | 16 | 0 | 0  | 3.47| Very Good|
| 31  | 10       | 20 | 0 | 0  | 3.33| Very Good|
| 32  | 9        | 21 | 0 | 0  | 3.30| Very Good|
| 33  | 8        | 22 | 0 | 0  | 3.27| Very Good|
| 34  | 11       | 19 | 0 | 0  | 3.37| Very Good|
| 35  | 11       | 19 | 0 | 0  | 3.37| Very Good|
| 36  | 10       | 20 | 0 | 0  | 3.33| Very Good|
With an average figure value of interpretation 3.23 above, it shows that the religious tolerance of students in the experimental group following Pre-Test is in **GOOD** category.

**Tabel 2 Post-Test Students' Religious Tolerance Recapitulation**

**Experimental Group**

| No. Question | SS  | S   | TS  | STS | Value | Criteria |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|----------|
| 1            | 14  | 16  | 0   | 0   | 3.47  | Very Good|
| 2            | 16  | 14  | 0   | 0   | 3.53  | Very Good|
| 3            | 18  | 12  | 0   | 0   | 3.60  | Very Good|
| 4            | 12  | 17  | 1   | 0   | 3.37  | Very Good|
| 5            | 10  | 18  | 2   | 0   | 3.27  | Very Good|
| 6            | 3   | 20  | 6   | 1   | 3.83  | Very Good|
| 7            | 3   | 24  | 1   | 2   | 3.93  | Very Good|
| 8            | 16  | 14  | 0   | 0   | 3.53  | Very Good|
| 9            | 16  | 14  | 0   | 0   | 3.53  | Very Good|
| 10           | 15  | 15  | 0   | 0   | 3.50  | Very Good|
| 11           | 17  | 13  | 0   | 0   | 3.57  | Very Good|
| 12           | 12  | 18  | 0   | 0   | 3.40  | Very Good|
| 13           | 19  | 11  | 0   | 0   | 3.63  | Very Good|
| 14           | 17  | 13  | 0   | 0   | 3.57  | Very Good|
| 15           | 15  | 15  | 0   | 0   | 3.50  | Very Good|
| 16           | 13  | 17  | 0   | 0   | 3.43  | Very Good|
| 17           | 5   | 20  | 4   | 1   | 2.97  | Good     |
| 18           | 11  | 19  | 0   | 0   | 3.37  | Very Good|
| 19           | 6   | 24  | 0   | 0   | 3.20  | Good     |
| 20           | 15  | 15  | 0   | 0   | 3.50  | Very Good|
| 21           | 5   | 19  | 4   | 2   | 2.90  | Good     |
| 22           | 12  | 15  | 3   | 0   | 2.30  | Not Good |
| 23           | 2   | 14  | 14  | 0   | 2.60  | Good     |
| 24           | 11  | 17  | 2   | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 25           | 9   | 21  | 0   | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 26           | 10  | 20  | 0   | 0   | 3.33  | Very Good|
| 27           | 9   | 21  | 0   | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 28           | 14  | 16  | 0   | 0   | 3.47  | Very Good|
| 29           | 9   | 21  | 0   | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 30           | 20  | 10  | 0   | 0   | 3.67  | Very Good|
| 31           | 11  | 17  | 2   | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 32           | 9   | 20  | 1   | 0   | 3.23  | Good     |
| 33           | 9   | 20  | 1   | 0   | 3.27  | Very Good|
| 34           | 6   | 24  | 0   | 0   | 3.20  | Good     |
| 35           | 5   | 24  | 1   | 0   | 3.13  | Good     |
| 36           | 17  | 13  | 0   | 0   | 3.57  | Very Good|
| 37           | 21  | 9   | 0   | 0   | 3.70  | Very Good|
| 38           | 10  | 17  | 3   | 0   | 3.23  | Good     |
With an average figure value of interpretation 3.36 above, it shows that the religious tolerance of students in the experimental group following Post-Test is in the **Very Good** category.

**Tabel 3 Recapitulation Of Religious Tolerance Pre Test Students Control Group**
With an average figure value of interpretation of 2.97 above, it shows that the religious
tolerance of students in the control group following Pre-Test is in **GOOD** category.

### Table 4 Post-Test Students Religious Tolerance Recapitulation

**Control Group**

| No. | SS | S  | TS | STS | Value | Criteria |
|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------|----------|
| 1   | 4  | 24 | 2  | 0   | 3.07  | Good     |
| 2   | 8  | 20 | 2  | 0   | 3.20  | Good     |
| 3   | 11 | 17 | 2  | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 4   | 5  | 21 | 4  | 0   | 3.03  | Good     |
| 5   | 5  | 12 | 12 | 1   | 2.70  | Good     |
| 6   | 4  | 11 | 14 | 1   | 2.60  | Good     |
| 7   | 2  | 15 | 10 | 1   | 2.53  | Good     |
| 8   | 5  | 20 | 4  | 1   | 2.97  | Good     |
| 9   | 12 | 18 | 0  | 0   | 3.40  | Very Good|
| 10  | 11 | 17 | 2  | 0   | 3.30  | Very Good|
| 11  | 10 | 18 | 1  | 1   | 3.24  | Good     |
| 12  | 6  | 17 | 7  | 0   | 2.97  | Good     |
| 13  | 6  | 19 | 5  | 0   | 3.03  | Good     |
| 14  | 14 | 10 | 6  | 0   | 3.28  | Good     |
| 15  | 4  | 18 | 5  | 3   | 2.77  | Good     |
| 16  | 8  | 18 | 3  | 1   | 3.10  | Good     |
| 17  | 1  | 18 | 9  | 2   | 2.60  | Good     |
| 18  | 2  | 24 | 4  | 0   | 2.93  | Good     |
| 19  | 2  | 24 | 3  | 1   | 2.90  | Good     |
| 20  | 12 | 14 | 4  | 0   | 3.27  | Good     |
| 21  | 5  | 13 | 11 | 1   | 2.73  | Good     |
| 22  | 2  | 4  | 18 | 6   | 2.07  | Not Good |
| 23  | 1  | 14 | 11 | 4   | 2.40  | Good     |
| 24  | 8  | 17 | 4  | 1   | 3.07  | Good     |
| 25  | 9  | 20 | 1  | 0   | 3.23  | Good     |
| 26  | 10 | 16 | 4  | 0   | 3.20  | Good     |
| 27  | 15 | 14 | 1  | 0   | 3.47  | Very Good|
| 28  | 20 | 10 | 0  | 0   | 3.67  | Very Good|
| 29  | 9  | 20 | 1  | 0   | 3.27  | Very Good|
| 30  | 21 | 8  | 1  | 0   | 3.67  | Very Good|
| 31  | 5  | 21 | 4  | 0   | 3.03  | Good     |
| 32  | 7  | 20 | 2  | 1   | 3.10  | Good     |
| 33  | 8  | 18 | 3  | 1   | 3.10  | Good     |
| 34  | 6  | 19 | 5  | 0   | 3.03  | Good     |
| 35  | 5  | 20 | 5  | 0   | 3.00  | Good     |
| 36  | 19 | 9  | 1  | 1   | 3.53  | Very Good|
| 37  | 16 | 13 | 1  | 0   | 3.50  | Very Good|
| 38  | 6  | 16 | 6  | 2   | 3.87  | Very Good|
| 39  | 5  | 22 | 3  | 0   | 3.07  | Good     |
| 40  | 5  | 22 | 2  | 1   | 3.03  | Good     |
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| No. Question | SS | S | TS | STS | Value | Criteria |
|--------------|----|---|----|-----|-------|----------|
|              | 4  | 3 | 2  | 1   |       |          |
| Average Rating |     |    |    |     | 3.08   | Good     |

With an average figure value of interpretation 3.08 above, it shows that the religious tolerance of students in the control group following Post-Test is in the **GOOD** category.

**B. Experimental Class Religious Tolerance**

Table 5 Results of Pre-Test of Religious Tolerance of Experimental Group Students

| Statistic        | Value  |
|------------------|--------|
| N                | 30     |
| Mean             | 129.33 |
| Median           | 124.50 |
| Modus            | 116    |
| Standar Deviasi  | 13.87  |
| Varian           | 192.29 |
| Skor Minimum     | 111    |
| Skor Maximum     | 159    |
| Total Score      | 3880   |

Based on the calculation results contained in the above table a total score of 3880 is obtained where the highest score is 159 and the lowest score is 111. The average value is 129.33; a median of 124.50; mode of 116; standard deviation of 13.87, and variants of 192.29.

Table 6 Results of Post-Test of Religious Tolerance of Experimental Group Students

| Statistic        | Value  |
|------------------|--------|
| N                | 30     |
| Mean             | 132.50 |
| Median           | 132.50 |
| Modus            | 120    |
| Standar Deviasi  | 11.14  |
| Varians          | 124.12 |
| Skor Minimum     | 115    |
| Skor Maximum     | 157    |
| Total Score      | 3975   |

Based on the above calculation results obtained a total score of 3975 where the highest score of 157 and the lowest score is 115. The average value of 132.50; a median of 132.50; mode of 120; standard deviation of 11.14, and variants of 124.12.
C. Religious Tolerance of Control Classes

Table 7 Results of Pre-Test of Religious Tolerance of Control Group Students

| Statistic    | Value  |
|--------------|--------|
| N            | 30     |
| Mean         | 119.67 |
| Median       | 120    |
| Modus        | 124    |
| Standar Deviasi | 10.28 |
| Varians      | 105.75 |
| Skor Minimum | 101    |
| Skor Maximum | 138    |
| Total Score  | 3590   |

Based on the above calculation results obtained a total score of 3590 where the highest score of 138 and the lowest score is 101. The average value of 119.67; a median of 120; mode of 124; standard deviation of 10.28, and variants of 105.75.

Table 8 Post-test results of the Religious Tolerance of the Control Group Students

| Statistic     | Value  |
|---------------|--------|
| N             | 30     |
| Mean          | 122    |
| Median        | 122.50 |
| Modus         | 126    |
| Standar Deviasi | 10.13 |
| Varians       | 102.69 |
| Skor Minimum  | 100    |
| Skor Maximum  | 141    |
| Total Score   | 3660   |

Based on the above calculation results obtained a total score of 3660 where the highest score of 141 and the lowest score is 100. The average value of 122; a median of 122.50; mode of 126; standard deviation of 10.13, and variants of 102.69.

D. Hypothesis Testing

Table 9 Paired t-test results Pre-Test and Post-Test Experiment Group

| Group                | Average | t_count | t_table | Conclusions              |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------|
| Pre-Test Control Group | 129.33  | 2.975   | 2.000   | There are significant differences |
| Post-Test Control Group | 132.50  |         |         |                          |
Based on the table above, the experimental group's Pre-Test average was 129.33 and the Post-Test average was 132.50 resulting in an increase of 3.17. It is known that the value of $t_{count} > t_{table}$ at a significance level of 5% ($2.975 > 2.000$) which means that it can be concluded that there is an increase in scores and significant differences in the religious tolerance scores of the experimental group students.

**Table 10** Paired t-test results Pre-Test and Post-Test Control group

| Group          | Average | $t_{count}$ | $t_{table}$ | Conclusions          |
|----------------|---------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Pre-Test Control Group | 119.67  | 2.885       | 2.000       | There are significant differences |
| Post-Test Control Group | 122.00  |             |             |                      |

Based on the table above, it is found that the average Pre-Test of the control group is 119.67 and the Post-Test average is 122.00 so it has an increase of 2.33. It is known that $t_{count} > t_{table}$ at the significance level of 5% ($2.885 > 2.000$) which means that it can be concluded that there is an increase in scores and significant differences in the religious tolerance scores of the control group students.

**Table 11** Test Results Post-Test Experiment Group and Control Group

| Group          | Average | $t_{count}$ | $t_{table}$ | Conclusions          |
|----------------|---------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Experiment Group | 132.50  | 3.819       | 1.980       | There are significant differences |
| Control Group   | 122.00  |             |             |                      |

The post-test $t$ test revealed that the average religious tolerance of the experimental group was 132.50 and the average tolerance of the control group was 122.00, so it can be concluded that the average religious tolerance of the experimental group was greater than the control group (132.50 > 122.00), so that it can be seen that the religious tolerance of students who are given a Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling approach (G-Pro) is better than students who are not given a Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling approach (G-Pro). It is known that $t_{count}$ is 3,819 and $t_{table}$ from $dk = 120 - 2 = 118$ at the 5% significance level is 1.980. So the value of $t_{count} > t_{table}$ (3,819 > 1,980), so it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in the religious tolerance of students who are given the Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling approach (G-Pro) with the religious tolerance of students who are not given the Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling approach (G-Pro) or in other words the experimental group better tolerance of diversity compared to the control group.

**Table 12** Test Results for Increase in Experiment and Control Groups

| Group          | Average | $t_{count}$ | $t_{table}$ | Conclusions          |
|----------------|---------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Experiment Group | 130.92  | 4.826       | 1.980       | There are significant differences |
| Control Group   | 120.83  |             |             |                      |

Based on the calculation of independent sample $t$-test, it is known that the average increase of the experimental group was 130.92 while the increase of the control group was 120.83 so that the increase in the score of the experimental class was greater than the control.
group \((130.92 > 120.83)\). Also known is the \(t\) count of \(4.826\) with a significance of \(0.000\). The table value of \(dk = 120 - 2 = 118\) is \(1.980\). So it can be concluded that \(t\) count > \(t\) table \((4.826 > 1.980)\), so it can be stated that there is a significant difference in the increase in religious tolerance of students in the experimental group and the control group or it can be said that the group of students who are given a Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling approach (G-Pro) better tolerance of diversity compared to the control group.

Religious tolerance of students at SMA ibn ' Aqil Bogor from the research results known to average results of 3.23 for religious tolerance of students in the experimental group who follow Pre-Test are in good category, a value of 3.36 for religious tolerance Students in the experimental group following Post-Test are in excellent category, a value of 2.97 for religious tolerance of students in the control group following Pre-Test is in good category, and a value of 3.08 for religious tolerance Students in the control group following Post-Test are in good category.

From these results, it can be noted that the religious tolerance of students in Ibn ' Aqil High School from the experimental group is better than the average religious tolerance of the control group. The results of this research can be concluded that religious tolerance between students in schools is very well created and carried out. This is evidenced by mutual respect, friendship between students intertwined harmoniously and no form of hate speech. The results of the study were noted that the approach of Gestalt profetic guidance and counseling can improve the religious tolerance of students in IBN ' AQIL High School. The schedule of research time is in the table below:

| No | Day/Date          | Activities          | Group                  |
|----|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1  | Wednesday, 24 July 2019 | Pretest             | Controls and Experiments |
| 2  | Thursday, 25 July 2019   | Treatment G-Pro I   | Eksperimen (Card SDBHSM) |
| 3  | Friday, 26 July 2019     | Treatment G-Pro II  | Eksperimen (Empty Chair) |
| 4  | Saturday, 27 July 2019   | Treatment G-Pro III | Eksperimen (Reversal Exercises) |
| 5  | Monday, 29 July 2019     | Postest             | Control                |
| 6  | Tuesday, 30 July 2019    | Postest             | Experiment             |

After the research done, then obtained the following results: The G-Pro approach can improve the religious tolerance of students in IBN ' AQIL High School where the post-test test is known for the average religious tolerance of the experimental group of 132.50 and the average tolerance control group of 122.00, Known \(T\) hitung > This \((3.819 > 2.000)\), so that it can be concluded that there are significant differences in religious tolerance of students given the approach of Gestalt profetic guidance and Counseling (G-Pro) with the tolerance of religious students who do not Given the approach of Gestalt profetic guidance and Counseling (G-Pro) or in other words the experiment group is better compared to the control group. From test data analysis conducted data distribution is normal, and from homogeneous test also found that between the Pretests class and posttest have the same variant (homogeneous).

Significant increase in differences between posttest the two groups. Based on the results of an independent sample of T-Test, the average increase in the experimental group amounted to 130.92 while the control group increased by 120.83 so that the experimental
class score increase was greater than the Control group. Also known is the value of Thitung \( > \) This \((4,826 > 1,980)\), so it can be stated that there is a significant difference in the increase in religious tolerance of students in the group experiments and control groups or it can be said that the group of students who Given the approach of Gestalt prophetic guidance and Counseling (G-Pro) is better in tolerance compared to the control group. Based on the results of the study can be known influences from the approach of the Gestalt Profetik (G-Por) experimentation group with the control group as follows:

![Picture 1 Differences in the level of religious tolerance in the experimental group and control group students](image)

From the graphic image above, it can be seen that the experimental group with the Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling approach (G-Pro) is higher, the average is 130.92, greater than the average control group, which is 120.83, with an average difference between the experimental group and the control group of 10.09. Thus it can be concluded that there is an influence of Gestalt Prophetic guidance and counseling (G-Pro) approach to the level of religious tolerance of students in SMA IBNU ‘AQIL.

**Conclusion**

Based on the results of research and data analysis, this study produces the following conclusions:

1. Students' understanding of religious tolerance in Ibnu 'Aqil High School has been said to be good, this is based on the results of the students' answers which are known to average 3.23 results for the religious tolerance of students in the experimental group who took the Pre-Test in the good category, a value of 3.36 for religious tolerance of students in the experimental group who took the Post-Test was in the very good category, a value of 2.97 for the religious tolerance of students in the control group who took the Pre-Test was in the good category, and a value of 3, 08 for religious tolerance students in the control group who took the Post-Test are in the good category. From these results it can be seen that the religious tolerance of students in Ibnu Aqil High School from the experimental group is better than the religious tolerance of the control group.

2. The G-Pro approach can improve students' religious tolerance in IBNU 'AQIL High School. G-Pro is the right approach in helping students self-awareness. If the individual is in consciousness, he can organize himself to be able to relate well with his environment and overcome various social problems that exist, one of which is by increasing a high sense of religious tolerance in him as an understanding of his existence in social to the community. Awareness gained from the influence of the G-Pro approach to increase tolerance among religious communities towards students, will be a good first step as a role model to the community in socializing the diversity that exists in their environment.

3. The effect of the G-Pro approach on the level of religious tolerance in the experimental class and control class students at IBNU 'AQIL High School is known tcount> table
(4,826> 1,980), so it can be stated that there is a significant influence of religious
tolerance of students in the experimental group and in the experimental group control
or it can be said that the group of students who are given a Gestalt Prophetic guidance
and counseling approach (G-Pro) has better tolerance for diversity compared to the
control group.
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