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Abstract: This study aims to describe the accuracy of empathy in Javanese and Sundanese students from the Guidance and Counseling Study Program at Ahmad Dahlan University. Samples were taken by a purposive sample that consists of Javanese students and Sundanese students. The instrument used was the empathy accuracy scale. The study results were analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis and different tests with Anova. The results showed there was no significant difference between the accuracy of empathy among Javanese and Sundanese students. This research also reveals that the highest aspect of empathy accuracy in Javanese students is an emotional concern, while Sundanese students are perspective-taking. This means that the accuracy of empathy among Javanese students is higher in understanding and feeling the emotions of others, while the accuracy of empathy of Sundanese students is higher in understanding and placing themselves in the minds of others. The results of this study can be used as a base for developing techniques and strategies in guidance and counselling services that focus on developing the accuracy of empathy in adolescents.
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INTRODUCTION

Empathy has an important role in the life of Indonesian society which is a pluralist country consisting of various tribes and cultures. This diversity can be found from the diversity of regional languages, religions, customs and tribes. Consisting of various tribes and cultural values, it can be seen as a nation's wealth that needs to be preserved and preserved (Ratu, Misnah, and Amirullah 2019). On the other hand, such diversity can also be a trigger for conflict between ethnic groups if it is not based on empathy and the tolerance (Atkins, 1 Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia, tri.sutanti@bk.uad.ac.id
Uskul, & Cooper, 2016; Gustini, 2017). In addition to social life, empathy also has a role in various interactions in the educational environment, including in higher education. The development of student skills does not only lead to skills and cognitive development, but moral as a basis for virtue in behaviour are urgently needed (Agboola & Tsai, 2012). One of the moral parts that are the basis for individuals in interacting in the social environment is empathy (Borba, 2008; Goleman, 2007; Hoffmann, et al., 2016; Schultze-Krumbholz & Scheithauer, 2013; Shu, et al., 2017).

Accuracy of empathy is the most essential ability of social intelligence that is built on primary empathy or basic empathy (Goleman, 2007). The term of accuracy empathic describes the ability to accurately deduce the specific content of the experiences and feelings of others (Ickes, 2010). So, someone who has empathy accuracy is someone who can consistently read the thoughts and feelings of others correctly. The development of psychology today, Goleman (2007) suggests an expansion of the term empathy which is divided into two namely primal empathy and empathic accuracy. Both primal empathy (primary empathy) and empathic accuracy (empathy accuracy) are sub-constructs of social awareness which is a component of social intelligence. Primary empathy is one's ability to understand other people's feelings following nonverbal emotional cues, while empathy accuracy is one's ability to understand the thoughts, feelings, and intentions of others. So that in this sense three activities have empathic accuracy, namely first understanding the thoughts of others, then understanding what other people feel and then understanding the intentions of others shown both verbally and nonverbally. Accuracy of empathy is one's ability to accurately identify and understand emotional states, thoughts, and intentions of others (McLaren, 2013).

In daily life, individuals are confronted with various events that make individuals empathize. However, the extent to which individual accuracy in empathizing is important to be able to provide an appropriate response to others and to improve harmony in social interactions (Cohen, et al. 2012; Hinnekens, et al., 2016; Ickes & Hodges, 2013). People who empathize accurately are people who can read the thoughts and feelings of the target, they can read the condition of other people not with their clothes, they take off their clothes and replace them with other people's clothes. With their new clothes, they can imagine what others think and feel. So when they read the situation will produce accurate conclusions following the real situation in the
target (Ickes, 2010). Rogers (1992) accuracy of empathy is the ability to feel the personal world of others as if it were his, but without ever losing the quality "as if" it. Accuracy of empathy focuses on the connection between cognitive in an interaction, namely the ability to deduce what is in the minds of others (Klein & Hodges, 2001) and the ability to feel the emotional state of others appropriately (Smith, 2015; Steffgen, et al., 2011; Wright, Wachs, & Harper, 2018).

Rogers (Pedersen, Crethar, & Carlson, 2008) states that the accuracy of empathy consists of cognitive components and affective components. Cognitive empathy is the ability to understand the condition or state of mind of another person precisely, and without losing the real condition. While effective ability is to feel a certain form or feeling as what is felt or told by others. According to Davis (1983), the accuracy of empathy can be measured from multidimensional components, namely the cognitive component and the affective component, each of which has two specs. The cognitive component is taking perspective and fantasy, while the affective component includes Emphatic Concern and Personal Distress. Mead in Davis (1983) emphasizes the importance of ability in perspective-taking for non-egocentric behaviour, that is, abilities that are not oriented to one's interests but the interests of others. Empathic concern is sympathy that is oriented towards others and attention to the misfortune of others. this aspect is also a reflection of a feeling of warmth that is closely related to sensitivity and concern for others. Cohen & Wheelwright (2004), stated criticism of the Davis IRI scale that aspects of fantasy and personal distress are not used because they can measure other processes more broadly. So based on the views of the experts, then to measure the accuracy of empathy can be done by looking at the aspects of empathy in the form of perspective-taking, cognitive accuracy, emotional concern and accuracy emotional.

Accuracy of empathy owned by individuals is influenced by the individual's cultural background to grow and develop (Chung, Chan, & Cassels, 2010; Park, et al., 2016; Sharifi-Tehrani, et al., 2019; Wang, et al., 2003). Culture influences identity and a set of attributes that determine identity. culture becomes one of the factors that influence individual development (Chopik, O’Brien, & Konrath, 2017; Maghrabi & Palvia, 2012). Culture is a human medium that translates and regulates human actions and gives meaning to what he does or consciously restrains (Dahl, 2012). Cultural
background influences the perspectives and values of individuals, skills that are mastered and considered important, the expected role of adults, the development of language and communication skills, emotional expression and regulation, and the formation of self-image (Ormord, 2009). Culture influences what individuals think, feelings, how to dress, what and how individuals eat, talk, values and moral principles that individuals hold, as well as how individuals interact with each other and how individuals understand the world (Ratts, et al., 2016).

The results of research conducted by Fathurroja (2018) on the description of the ethnic identity of adolescent Sundanese and Javanese shows that the two ethnic groups are at a low level in exploring their ethnicity. The ability to explore ethnicity is an important part of cultural intelligence (Nugraha, 2019) and an important part of empathy is needed to understand what is being thought and felt by others who are from their ethnicity and who are of different ethnicity (Matsangidou, et al., 2018). Furthermore, the results of a study conducted by Nurwati & Rosilawati (2017) found that there were contradictory perceptions between Javanese and Sundanese people. An example is in dance culture. For Sundanese people, dancers are interpreted as "ronggeng" which connotes poorly. Whereas in Javanese society, dancers are referred to as "bedaya" which means respectable community. Differences in perceptions of cultural diversity can trigger conflict, if not based on empathy in the life of a plural society (Gonçalves, et al., 2016; Klimecki, 2019; Perrone-McGovern, et al., 2014).

Accuracy of empathy is important for students because the ability to empathize accurately affects the harmony of social interactions and influences learning success (Faisal & Zuri Bin Ghani, 2015; Yalcin-Tilfarlioglu & Arikan, 2012). One way to foster harmony between students and students and lecturers in social interaction in higher education environments is accurate empathy (Bouton, 2016; Dahri, Yusof, & Chinedu, 2018; Daltry, et al., 2018). Accuracy of empathy also has an important role in the success of counselling and guidance services in helping counselees (Atzil-Slonim, et al., 2019; Bayne, Pusateri, & Dean-Nganga, 2012). So the ability to give empathy accurately is important to have by a counsellor who needs to be sharpened since the study in college. Based on the background above, this study aims to determine the accuracy of student empathy from the guidance and counselling study program from the Javanese and Sundanese. The results of this study can
be used as basic data to develop techniques and strategies in guidance and counselling services that focus on developing the accuracy of empathy for adolescents in a multicultural environment.

**METHOD**

This study aims to describe the empathy accuracy of Javanese and Sundanese students from the Guidance and Counseling Study Program UAD. Samples were taken using purposive sampling with a total of 60 students consisting of 30 Javanese students and 30 Sundanese students from the students of the University of Ahmad Dahlan's guidance and counselling study program. The total sample of men is 31 people and women is 29 people. Consideration of the selection of research samples is based on the subject domicile area, namely the Javanese ethnic group drawn from students of guidance and counselling study program from Yogyakarta Special Region and Central Java which includes Semarang, Pati, Kedu, Banyumas, Pekalongan, Surakarta, Salatiga, and Magelang. Whereas Sundanese students were drawn from students of guidance and counselling study program who came from Tatar Pasundan which covered the provinces of West Java, Banten, Jakarta, the city of Bandung, Bogor, and Tangerang. The instrument used was the empathy accuracy scale with a reliability value of 0.937. The measured aspects of empathy consist of cognitive aspects (perspective-taking and cognitive accuracy) and affective aspects (emotional concern and emotional accuracy). Data analysis used descriptive statistical analysis with one way ANOVA different test.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Student's accuracy empathy data is categorized into three levels, namely high accuracy, medium accuracy, and low accuracy (Azwar, 2012). Calculation of empathy accuracy data categorization is shown in table 1.

| Range of Scores | Category          |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| \(X \geq (\text{Mean} + 1,0 \ SD)\) | High Accuracy     |
| \((\text{Mean} - 1,0 \ SD) \leq X < (\text{Mean} + 1,0 \ SD)\) | Medium Accuracy   |
| \(X < (\text{Mean} - 1,0 \ SD)\) | Low Accuracy      |
Based on the results of data analysis of 60 students from Javanese and Sundanese ethnic categories, the empathy accuracy of BK study program students is listed in table 2.

Table 2 The Level of Empathy Accuracy of Students From Guidance and Counseling Study Program in Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

| Number | Category       | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | High Accuracy  | 10        | 16.67%     |
| 2      | Medium Accuracy| 45        | 75%        |
| 3      | Low Accuracy   | 5         | 8.33%      |

Based on the results of data analysis, it shows that most of the empathy accuracy of students are in the medium accuracy category, which is 75%, high accuracy category is 16.67% and low accuracy category is 8.33%. Accuracy of empathy for guidance and counselling students from Javanese and Sundanese shows that most are in the medium accuracy category. This can be the basis that the accuracy of empathy of students from the two tribes still needs to be developed because empathy is a very important ability for counsellors. As a guidance and counselling student candidate for the counsellor, the primary ability that should be possessed is the ability to empathize to support the success of the counselling process (Corey, 2011; Jones, 2011).

Furthermore, based on the results of data analysis shows that the average accuracy in each aspect of empathy among Javanese students and students does not show a large difference. The average empathy accuracy of Javanese and Sundanese students in each aspect is shown in Graph 1.

Graph 1. Average Comparison of Accuracy Empathy of Java Tribe Students and Sunda Tribe Students

Based on the results of data analysis shows that the accuracy of empathy among Javanese students, the highest aspect is in the aspect of emotional concern that is 2.78, then the second aspect is the accuracy aspects of
emotional 2.76 and the third aspect is the perspective-taking 2.74, and the lowest aspect is the cognitive accuracy of 2.72. The accuracy of empathy in Sundanese tribe students shows the highest is in the perspective-taking aspect is 2.80 while the aspect of cognitive accuracy is 2.75. Furthermore, the emotional concern aspect is 2.72 and the emotional accuracy score is 2.64.

The highest aspect of empathy accuracy in Javanese ethnic students on emotional concern aspects means that Javanese students are higher in understanding and feeling the emotions of others. Whereas Sundanese students are higher in the aspect of perspective-taking, it means that Sundanese students are higher in understanding and putting themselves in the minds of others. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Wewekang and Puspawuni (2016) that Javanese people hold the value of Javanese culture in the form of rumangsca bisa which can be able to feel themselves and others. Besides, the results of this study are also in line with studies conducted by (Asep 2010) that Javanese people have the habit to teach from generation to generation that each group member should be able to develop virtues such as compassion, kindness, generosity, ability to feel other people's anxiety, a sense of social responsibility, concern for others, learning to sacrifice for others and living the sacrifice as a high value, helping and helping one another. Teaching empathy by habituation is one of the effective methods for developing empathy in individuals (Decety & Svetlova, 2012; Eisenberg, 2000).

For Sundanese students, the average aspect of perspective-taking Sundanese students is higher than the other aspects of empathy accuracy. The results of this study are in line with the results of a study conducted by Fitriyani, Suryadi & Syam (2015) and a study conducted by Rinawati (2010) that Sundanese culture for generations teaches the cultural value of Sundanese pameo silih asih (love one another), silih asah (improve one another), and silih asuh (nurture one another) that make up for the teachings taught from generation to generation. Cultural values of haste mean mutual improvement through education and science. The cultural values of this penance also contain teachings so that with the education and knowledge they possess, individuals have self-awareness and can conduct self-reflection that is useful for improving themselves. Taking perspective is related to the ability to reflect on one's self to improve themselves (Gilbert, et al., 2017). People who have self-awareness for self-reflection tend to have good perspective-taking abilities (Emen & Aslan, 2019; Gilbert, et al., 2017). Besides, people who have self-
awareness tend to avoid egocentrism (Abbate, Boca, & Gendolla, 2016). People who like to self-reflect to improve themselves will have a good perspective-taking in understanding the conditions and situations experienced by others (Gerace, et al., 2017; Moreira, DeSouza, & Guerra, 2018).

Before the different test from ANOVA, data on the accuracy empathy of Javanese and Sundanese students were tested for data normality. The results of the normality test data analyzed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample Test showed Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.070> 0.05 means that the accuracy empathy data of students is normally distributed. Furthermore, the results of different empathy accuracy tests on Javanese and Sundanese students analyzed using ANOVA showed that in each aspect of empathy accuracy there were mean differences but these differences were not significant. The results of the different empathy accuracy test results for Javanese and Sundanese students are listed in Table 3.

| Aspek                  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | Sign  |
|------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|
| Perspective Taking      |                |    |             |       |
| Between Groups         | 11.267         | 1  | 11.267      | .426  |
| Within Groups          | 1015.467       | 58 | 17.508      |       |
| Total                  | 1026.733       | 59 |             |       |
| Accuracy Cognitive     |                |    |             |       |
| Between Groups         | 3.267          | 1  | 3.267       | .729  |
| Within Groups          | 1558.667       | 58 | 26.874      |       |
| Total                  | 1561.933       | 59 |             |       |
| Emotional Concern      |                |    |             |       |
| Between Groups         | 12.150         | 1  | 12.150      | .572  |
| Within Groups          | 2186.033       | 58 | 37.690      |       |
| Total                  | 2198.183       | 59 |             |       |
| Accuracy Emotional     |                |    |             |       |
| Between Groups         | 32.267         | 1  | 32.267      | .181  |
| Within Groups          | 1020.467       | 58 | 17.594      |       |
| Total                  | 1052.733       | 59 |             |       |
| Accuracy Empathy       |                |    |             |       |
| Between Groups         | 16.017         | 1  | 16.017      | .821  |
| Within Groups          | 18025.633      | 58 | 310.787     | .426  |
| Total                  | 18041.650      | 59 | 11.267      |       |
Based on the results of data analysis shows that the accuracy of empathy of Javanese and Sundanese students did not have a significant difference. From the results of different tests with one way ANOVA on the total score of the accuracy of empathy students from the two tribes shows a significant value of 0.821 > 0.05, meaning that there is no significant difference between the empathy accuracy of Javanese students and Sundanese students. If viewed from each aspect shows there are differences in the average accuracy of empathy among Javanese and Sundanese students, but the differences in each aspect are also not significant. In the aspect of perspective, the average Javanese student taking was 2.74 and Sundanese students were 2.80 with a significance value of 0.426 > 0.05. This means that there are differences in the average perspective of taking among students of Javanese and Sundanese ethnic groups, but there is no significant difference. In the aspect of cognitive accuracy, the average Javanese students were 2.72 and Sundanese students were 2.75 with a significance value of 0.729 > 0.05. This means that there are differences in the average cognitive accuracy of Javanese and Sundanese students, but there is no significant difference. Furthermore, the emotional concern aspect of Javanese students was 2.78 and Sundanese students were 2.72 with a significance value of 0.572 > 0.05. This means that there are differences in the average emotional concern among Javanese and Sundanese students, but there is no significant difference. In the aspect of accuracy, the emotional average of Javanese students was 2.76 and Sundanese students were 2.64 with a significance value of 0.181 > 0.05. This means that there are differences in the average emotional accuracy of Javanese and Sundanese students, but there is no significant difference.

Accuracy empathy among Javanese and Sundanese students does not have a significant difference because it can be caused by the Sundanese and Javanese ethnic groups both having a cultural value of empathy taught for generations. Sundanese culture has values that are held in high esteem by the Sundanese people as reflected in the slogan of mutual love (mutual love), self-improvement (mutual improvement), and fostering that is taught from generation to generation, one of which is through parenting patterns (Fitriyani et al. 2015; Rinawati, 2010). Likewise in Javanese culture, since childhood children have been taught about compassion and help from family through the role of parents (Wewekang & Puspawuni, 2016). One of the prominent features of Javanese society is tulung tinulung / please help. The manifestation of these values in behaviour appears in all activities in society both in
development or in other activities called "splice" which comes from the word *sambat* (ask for help), that is, please help or work together to help others without the payment of money. These values of empathy are taught from generation to generation (Lestari, 2016).

Furthermore, data on the accuracy empathy of Javanese and Sundanese students when viewed from gender differences show that the highest average aspect of empathy accuracy for women in the emotional concern and the highest aspect of male empathy accuracy in accuracy cognitive. The data regarding differences in accuracy of student empathy from Javanese and Sundanese in terms of gender are listed in table 4.

| Aspect              | Mean Female | Mean Men | Sign    |
|---------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| Prespective taking  | 2.79        | 2.75     | 0.519   |
| Accuracy cognitive  | 2.81        | 2.66     | 0.096   |
| Emotional concern   | 2.87        | 2.64     | 0.019   |
| Accuracy emotional  | 2.79        | 2.61     | 0.046   |

Based on the results of data analysis shows that the accuracy of empathy of Javanese and Sundanese students, when viewed from the sex, shows that there are meaningful differences in each aspect but these differences are not always significant in each aspect. In the perspective-taking aspect shows that there is no significant difference between the empathy accuracy of male and female students with a significance value of 0.0519 > 0.05. The cognitive aspect shows a significant value of 0.096 > 0.05. This means that there is no significant difference in cognitive accuracy specs between male and female students. Furthermore, the results of data analysis show that there are significant differences in the aspects of emotional concern and emotional accuracy. The emotional concern aspect shows a significant value of 0.019 <0.05, which means that there are significant differences between the emotional concerns of male and female students. The accuracy emotional aspect shows a significant value of 0.046 <0.05. This means that there is a significant difference between the emotional accuracy of male and female students.
The results of the data analysis also showed that the average empathy accuracy of female and male students showed the average accuracy of female empathy was higher than that of male students, which was an average of 163.65 while male students of 154.93 with a significance value of 0.049 <0.05. Men tend to be higher in cognitive accuracy and women in emotional aspects. This result is in line with the opinion of Goleman (2007), that women in western culture are on average more able to empathize than men, women tend to; have the same feelings as those felt by others, for example when someone feels sad or happy, it is also felt by women who are nearby. The results of this study are also in line with the results of a study conducted by Rueckert et al. (2011), showed that empathy at Northeastern Illinois University among female students was higher in the aspect of emotional empathy compared to male student empathy. This study is also in line with studies conducted by Mastre, Navarro, Samper, & Porcar (2009) found that female empathy responses are greater than male empathy responses in adolescents in Spain. But the results of this study are not in line with the results of a study conducted by Fischer, Kret, & Broekens (2018) found that men and women are equally more intense in capturing the emotional conditions experienced by others.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION
The results of the study showed that the accuracy of empathy among Javanese and Sundanese students did not have a significant difference. This can be caused by the two tribes having the same cultural value of empathy taught for generations. This research also reveals that the highest aspect of empathy accuracy in Javanese students is an emotional concern, while Sundanese students are taking perspective. This means that the accuracy of empathy among Javanese students is higher in understanding and feeling the emotions of others, while the accuracy of empathy of Sundanese students is higher in understanding and placing themselves in the minds of others. Besides, if viewed from the gender, the accuracy of female empathy is higher than the accuracy of male empathy. The results of this study can be used as a basis for developing techniques and strategies in guidance and counselling services that focus on developing the accuracy of empathy in adolescents.
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