Journal of General Education and Humanities
Vol. 5, No. 5, October 2026, pp. 7035 – 7048, https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i5.2193
ISSN 2963-7147

Character Education and the Internalization of Local Wisdom as Predictors of Students' Moral Knowing and Bystander Behavior in the Prevention of Sexual Violence

Sukron Fujiaturrahman[1], Rr. Eko Susetyarini[2], Joko Widodo[3], Junaidin[4]
[123]Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[14]Universitas Muhammadiyah Mataram, Mataram, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-09-26
Revised 2026-10-16
Accepted 2026-11-01

Keywords:

Bystander Behavior
Character Education
Local Wisdom
Moral Knowing
Sexual Violence

ABSTRACT

Preventing sexual violence on college campuses requires strengthening students' moral knowledge and capacity to act as bystanders through a contextual, values-based educational approach. This study aims to analyze the role of character education and the internalization of local wisdom in predicting students' moral knowing and bystander behavior in the prevention of sexual violence. The study employs a quantitative approach with a correlational-predictive design. The research sample consisted of 100 Elementary School Teacher Education students at Muhammadiyah University of Mataram, with 35 males and 65 females. The research instrument used a five-point Likert scale questionnaire consisting of 28 questions, seven questions for each variable: character education, internalization of local wisdom, moral knowing, and bystander behavior. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics, multivariate tests, and univariate tests to identify predictive relationships among the variables. The results indicate that, in a multivariate analysis, character education is significantly associated with moral knowing and bystander behavior ($F = 3.165$; $p = 0.047$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.062$), while the internalization of local wisdom shows a stronger multivariate relationship ($F = 35.540$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.425$). Univariately, the models of character education and the internalization of local wisdom were significant predictors of moral knowing ($F = 107.458$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.689$) and bystander behavior ($F = 26.249$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.351$). Thus, character education and the internalization of local wisdom are predictively associated with moral knowing and bystander behavior, with the internalization of local wisdom showing a larger partial effect size. These findings imply the need to integrate character education and local wisdom into strategies for preventing sexual violence in higher education through contextual learning and the cultivation of values.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Corresponding Author:

Sukron Fujiaturrahman
Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia
Email: sukronfu27@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Character education is an educational process aimed at developing an individual's ability to understand, internalize, and apply moral values in daily life [1]. Character encompasses the interconnection between moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action; thus, character education does not stop at mastering knowledge about right and wrong, but is also directed toward an individual's ability to use that knowledge as a foundation for determining their actions. In the context of higher education, moral knowing is a crucial aspect because students face various social situations that require the ability to identify moral issues, understand relevant values, consider others' perspectives, engage in moral reasoning, make decisions, and understand their own responsibilities [2]. Character education should be directed not only toward the development of general moral knowledge, but also toward students' ability to apply that knowledge when facing real-world social and ethical issues, including when students find themselves in a position as witnesses to sexual violence [3].

The internalization of local wisdom can be part of the character education process because local wisdom encompasses values, norms, knowledge, and social practices that have evolved within community life and serve as guidelines for building interpersonal relationships [4]. Internalization does not merely mean introducing cultural values to students but also encompasses the process of understanding, accepting, internalizing, and making those values the foundation for thinking and acting [5]. Values such as respect for human dignity, courtesy, responsibility, solidarity, compassion, and appreciation for others can serve as a foundation for shaping students' moral orientation as they confront contemporary social issues [6]. This moral orientation is linked to bystander behavior, that is, an individual's tendency to recognize problematic situations, assess risks, make decisions, and take actions that can prevent or reduce the occurrence of violence when the individual is in the position of a witness [7]. Therefore, character education and the internalization of local wisdom can serve as sources for the development of moral knowledge and a framework for action that supports students' courage and responsibility to intervene appropriately in situations of sexual violence [8].

Previous research has shown a positive relationship between character education, local wisdom, and the development of moral behavior; however, some studies still use school students as research subjects. Izzati et al. [9] demonstrated gender differences in character, indicating that the development of moral knowledge, moral feelings, and moral actions may exhibit distinct characteristics across student groups. These findings indicate that character education needs to address the development of moral dimensions comprehensively, as the ability to understand moral values (moral knowing) is a key component related to the formation of students' character and moral actions. Nurmaya et al. [10] provide strong empirical evidence through an embedded mixed-methods study involving 261 students and 15 teachers. The study utilized the Moral Reasoning Questionnaire and the Local Wisdom Integration Scale *Mbojo,* which have reliability coefficients of $\alpha = 0.87$ and $\omega = 0.86$. Quantitative analysis showed that the integration of Mbojo local wisdom explained 72.7% of the variance in students' moral reasoning (R^2 =

0.727; $p < 0.001$), while qualitative analysis indicated that the value of "*maja labo dahu*" was internalized through ethical reflection, social conditioning, and moral exemplification. Yusuf [11] explains that a combined effect size of rRE = 1.237 with z = 9.700 and $p < 0.001$ regarding the use of local wisdom-based learning media on student character indicates that learning local wisdom can effectively shape students' character. Asrial et al. [12] demonstrated through a study of 29 students that an electronic module integrating the local wisdom of *Ngubat Padi* can be used to develop tolerance, thereby showing that culture-based learning can serve as a concrete medium for linking local values to the formation of students' moral character.

Some studies still focus on the elementary education level or general character traits; for example, Jamilah et al. [13] involved 316 students at the Indonesian Institute of Education in Garut and found a positive relationship between understanding of Sundanese customary law and student character, with a correlation coefficient of 0.478, a *p-value* < 0.001, and an R^2 of 0.229. Schneider and Hirsch [14] demonstrated that education can shape knowledge and values that support the prevention of sexual violence. These findings are relevant to this study because character education and the internalization of local wisdom can strengthen students' moral knowing, which in turn can support their ability to recognize high-risk situations and act as bystanders in preventing sexual violence. Muniroh et al. [15] explain that culture-based psychoeducation is a crucial tool for preventing sexual violence and can foster a safe, peaceful, and sexual violence-free campus environment. The use of cultural values in the implementation of effective psychoeducation can help prevent and address sexual violence. Practically, this study provides a model that can be adapted by similar institutions in addressing sexual violence. Krauss et al. [16] and McMahon and Seabrook [17] used regression analysis; the study found that exposure to sexual violence prevention messages before entering college was significantly associated with bystander intentions and behaviors after controlling for gender and exposure to such messages after entering college. These findings suggest that character development can shape students' readiness to take action to prevent sexual violence, thereby supporting the importance of character education in fostering *bystander behavior*.

Research on bystander behavior indicates that knowledge, educational experiences, social norms, and situational characteristics may be associated with college students' decisions to intervene in cases of sexual violence. Chen et al. [18] conducted a survey of 814 college students in China and found that bystander intervention programs are associated with increased perceptions of benefits, subjective norms, and bystander self-efficacy, which in turn are associated with intervention intentions and behaviors. Hoffman and Daigle [19] analyzed 626 college students using a factorial survey design and found that the decision to intervene varied depending on the location context as well as the gender of the victim and perpetrator. In contrast, perceptions of alcohol use did not influence the decision to intervene. Hackman et al. [20] involved 291 college students from two universities and used two linear regression models to analyze the relationships between attitudes, perceived norms, behavioral control, and bystander intentions. Bouchard et al. [21] conducted a meta-analysis of 14 studies involving 2,083 participants in the treatment group and 969 participants in the comparison group, and calculated 38 effect

sizes, including 11 for bystander efficacy, 11 for intention, and 5 for bystander behavior. The findings indicate that bystander behavior is not only related to knowledge about sexual violence but is also associated with moral factors, social norms, self-efficacy, and situational characteristics.

A synthesis of this research reveals three main trends. First, research on character education has provided evidence that the dimension of moral knowledge is related to character development and moral behavior; however, research that identifies character education as a specific predictor of students' moral knowing remains limited. Second, research on local wisdom shows a fairly strong relationship with or contribution to character and moral reasoning; however, such studies more often examine general character traits, tolerance, religiosity, responsibility, or moral reasoning among school students rather than examining the internalization of local wisdom as a predictor of students' moral knowing [22]. Third, research on *bystander behavior:* While there have been numerous studies examining the effectiveness of intervention programs, social norms, self-efficacy, prevention education, and situational characteristics, research that integrates character education and the internalization of local wisdom as predictors of both moral knowing and bystander behavior in the context of Indonesian universities remains limited. This study aims to analyze the ability of character education and the internalization of local wisdom to predict students' moral knowing and bystander behavior in the prevention of sexual violence. This study is expected to provide a theoretical contribution to the development of research on character education, values education, local wisdom, and moral development among college students. This study is expected to provide an empirical basis for the development of sexual violence prevention strategies that are more contextually appropriate and oriented toward strengthening students' capacities.

2. METHOD

This study employs a quantitative approach with a correlational-predictive design aimed at analyzing the ability of character education and the internalization of local wisdom to predict students' moral knowing and bystander behavior in the prevention of sexual violence. The research sample consisted of 100 Elementary School Teacher Education students at Muhammadiyah University of Mataram, with 35 males and 65 females. The research variables included character education (X1), internalization of local wisdom (X2), moral knowing (Y1), and bystander behavior (Y2). The selection of participants was based on their involvement in a higher education environment relevant to character development, local values, moral knowledge, and behavior aimed at preventing sexual violence. The research procedure began with the development of instruments based on the indicators for each variable, followed by the online distribution of questionnaires to respondents via Google Forms. The research instruments used a five-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). The questionnaire consisted of 28 statements, with each variable measured using 7 statements. After the data were collected, all respondent responses were tabulated, and the scores for each indicator were calculated to obtain the scores and means for each variable. These

means were then used to describe the trends in the levels of each variable and served as the basis for analyzing the predictive relationships among the variables [23].

Data analysis was conducted using descriptive and multivariate statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to present the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation of each variable. Multivariate analysis was used to test the predictive ability of the independent variables on the two dependent variables simultaneously, while univariate analysis was used to test the predictive ability on each dependent variable separately. In the multivariate test, H1 is accepted if the *p-value* is < 0.05, indicating that X1 and X2 are simultaneously and significantly associated with Y1 and Y2; H2 is accepted if the *p-value* is < 0.05 in the test of X1 against Y1 and Y2; and H3 is accepted if the *p-value* is < 0.05 in the test of X2 against Y1 and Y2. In the univariate test, H4 is accepted if the *p-value* is < 0.05, indicating that X1 and X2 simultaneously predict Y1, while H5 is accepted if the *p-value* is < 0.05, indicating that X1 and X2 simultaneously predict Y2. Conversely, a *p-value* of ≥ 0.05 provides grounds for rejecting the tested hypothesis. Conclusions are drawn based on the p-value at a 5% significance level (α = 0.05), while taking into account the effect size and the direction of the relationship indicated by the analysis results.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research results were obtained by analyzing questionnaire scores for the variables of character education (X1), internalization of local wisdom (X2), moral knowing (Y1), and bystander behavior (Y2). The score for each variable was calculated based on the average response score across all indicators, then converted by multiplying the average value by 100 to obtain a score in the range of 0–100. Subsequently, the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics with the aid of SPSS software to obtain an overview of the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation of each research variable. The results of this descriptive analysis served as the basis for describing the trends in the scores of each variable before conducting multivariate and univariate tests in accordance with the research hypotheses. The results of the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
X1	100	60.00	40.00	100.00	84.6000	11.31240	127.970	1.608	.478
X2	100	60.00	40.00	100.00	82.8001	11.16580	124.675	1.154	.478
Y1	100	60.00	40.00	100.00	82.5142	11.75064	138.077	.861	.478
Y2	100	40.00	60.00	100.00	85.3138	8.75699	76.685	.062	.478
Valid N (listwise)	100								

Table 1 shows that all research variables were analyzed based on 100 respondents. The character education variable (X1) has a score range of 60.00, with a minimum score of 40.00 and a maximum of 100.00, and has a mean of 84.6000 and a standard deviation of 11.31240, indicating that, in general, the respondents' level of character education falls

into the relatively high category with fairly noticeable score variation. The local wisdom internalization variable (X2) has a range of 60.00, a minimum score of 40.00, a maximum of 100.00, a mean of 82.8001, and a standard deviation of 11.16580, indicating a high level of local wisdom internalization with a score distribution relatively similar to that of X1. The moral knowing variable (Y1) has a range of 60.00, a minimum score of 40.00, a maximum score of 100.00, a mean of 82.5142, and a standard deviation of 11.75064; thus, descriptively, students' moral knowing also shows a high tendency, even though it has the greatest variation in scores between X1 and X2. Meanwhile, bystander behavior (Y2) has a range of 40.00, a minimum score of 60.00, a maximum of 100.00, a mean of 85.3138, and a standard deviation of 8.75699, indicating the highest mean and the lowest score dispersion compared to the other variables. The variance values for each variable, in order, are 127.970 (X1), 124.675 (X2), 138.077 (Y1), and 76.685 (Y2), while the kurtosis values are 1.608, 1.154, 0.861, and 0.062, respectively, with a standard error of 0.478. Overall, the descriptive statistics show that the four variables have means ranging from 82.51 to 85.31 on a scale of 0–100, with Y2 having the highest mean and the lowest score variation. Furthermore, Table 2 shows which variables are normally distributed.

Table 2. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual	Unstandardized Residual	Unstandardized Residual	Unstandardized Residual
N		100	100	100	100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000	.0000000	.0000000	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	8.54682979	7.11836984	7.60141129	6.74672301
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.076	.081	.080	.121
	Positive	.074	.081	.067	.121
	Negative	-.076	-.051	-.080	-.061
Test Statistic		.076	.081	.080	.121
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.172[c]	.106[c]	.110[c]	.001[c]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Based on the results of the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test, a normality test was conducted on the unstandardized residuals of the four analytical models, each involving 100 respondents. The test results showed that the residuals in the first model had a statistic of 0.076 with Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.172*, the second model had a statistic of 0.081 with p = 0.106, and the third model had a statistic of 0.080 with p = 0.110. All three significance values are greater than 0.05; therefore, the residuals in these three models can be considered normally distributed.

Meanwhile, the fourth model has a statistical value of 0.121 with p = 0.001, which is less than 0.05; thus, the residuals in that model do not meet the normality assumption. Thus, overall, three models satisfy the normality assumption, while one model does not; consequently, the results of the analysis for the fourth model should be interpreted with greater caution, or the use of appropriate analytical procedures to address the violation of the normality assumption should be considered. Next, the researcher conducted

multivariate tests to examine the predictive ability of X1 and X2 on Y1 and Y2 simultaneously; the results of the multivariate tests are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of the Multivariate Test of X1 and X2 on Y1 and Y2

Effect	**Pillai's Trace**	**Value**	**F**	***p*-value**	**Partial η²**
X1	Pillai's Trace	0,062	3,165	0,047	0,062
X2	Pillai's Trace	0,425	35,540	<0,001	0,425
Effect	**Wilks' Lambda**	**Value**	**F**	***p*-value**	**Partial η²**
X1	Wilks' Lambda	0,938	3,165	0,047	0,062
X2	Wilks' Lambda	0,575	35,540	<0,001	0,425

Table 3 shows the results of multivariate tests examining the simultaneous relationship between character education (X1) and the internalization of local wisdom (X2) with moral knowing (Y1) and bystander behavior (Y2). Based on Pillai's Trace, character education (X1) yielded a value of 0.062, F = 3.165, and a p-value of 0.047 with a partial η^2 of 0.062. A p-value < 0.05 indicates that character education has a statistically significant multivariate relationship with the combination of Y1 and Y2, with an effect size of 6.2%. Consistent results were obtained using Wilks' Lambda, with a value of 0.938, F = 3.165, p = 0.047, and partial η^2 = 0.062. Thus, H2 is accepted, as X1 is simultaneously and significantly associated with moral knowing and bystander behavior. Meanwhile, the internalization of local wisdom (X2) yielded a Pillai's Trace value of 0.425, F = 35.540, p < 0.001, and partial η^2 = 0.425. The results for Wilks' Lambda = 0.575, F = 35.540, p < 0.001, and partial η^2 = 0.425 also indicate the same outcome. This means that X2 has a significant multivariate relationship with the combination of Y1 and Y2, with an effect size of 42.5%, so H3 is accepted. Overall, the multivariate results show that both character education and the internalization of local wisdom have a significant relationship with the two dependent variables tested simultaneously; however, the magnitude of the effect size indicates differences in multivariate contributions, namely 6.2% for X1 and 42.5% for X2 based on partial η^2. Thus, these results provide empirical support for the predictive relationship of each independent variable with the combination of moral knowing and bystander behavior. However, H1, which states that X1 and X2 jointly affect Y1 and Y2, cannot be established based solely on the "Effect X1" and "Effect X2" rows in Table 3, because the displayed output tests the multivariate effects of each predictor separately, rather than testing the combined effect of X1 + X2 as a single effect. Therefore, the decision regarding H1 should be based on the "Multivariate Tests" output, which includes a test of the overall model, if available. Furthermore, to determine the relationship between each independent variable and each dependent variable separately, the results of the "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Univariate)" are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Univariate)

Dependent Variable	Effect	Type III Sum of Squares	df	F	*p*-value	Partial η^2
Y1 (*Moral Knowing*)	Corrected Model	9.418,666	2	107,458	<0,001	0,689
Y1 (*Moral Knowing*)	X1	255,307	1	5,826	0,018	0,057
Y1 (*Moral Knowing*)	X2	2.980,779	1	68,016	<0,001	0,412
Y2 (*Bystander Behavior*)	Corrected Model	2.665,939	2	26,249	<0,001	0,351
Y2 (*Bystander Behavior*)	X1	90,588	1	1,784	0,185	0,018
Y2 (*Bystander Behavior*)	X2	794,505	1	15,645	<0,001	0,139

Table 4 shows the results of univariate tests examining the relationship between character education (X1) and the internalization of local wisdom (X2) with each dependent variable. For moral knowing (Y1), the Corrected Model yielded $F = 107.458$, $p < 0.001$, and partial $\eta^2 = 0.689$, indicating that X1 and X2 are simultaneously and significantly associated with Y1, with a model effect size of 68.9%. Partially, X1 had a Type III Sum of Squares of 255.307, $F = 5.826$, $p = 0.018$, and a partial η^2 of 0.057. Since $p < 0.05$, character education is significantly associated with Y1, thus providing support for H4 regarding the relationship between X1 and Y1. Furthermore, X2 has a Type III Sum of Squares of 2,980.779, $F = 68.016$, $p < 0.001$, and a partial η^2 of 0.412, indicating a significant relationship with Y1 with an effect size of 41.2%. Thus, X2 also provides support for H4, meaning that X1 and X2 simultaneously have a significant relationship with moral knowing. For bystander behavior (Y2), the Corrected Model showed $F = 26.249$, $p < 0.001$, and partial $\eta^2 = 0.351$, indicating that X1 and X2 are simultaneously and significantly associated with Y2, with a model effect size of 35.1%. However, when examined partially, character education (X1) had a Type III Sum of Squares of 90.588, $F = 1.784$, $p = 0.185$, and a partial η^2 of 0.018. Since $p > 0.05$, X1 did not show a significant partial relationship with Y2. Conversely, the internalization of local wisdom (X2) had a Type III Sum of Squares of 794.505, $F = 15.645$, $p < 0.001$, and a partial η^2 of 0.139, indicating a significant relationship with Y2 with an effect size of 13.9%. Based on the overall model test, H5 is supported because X1 and X2 are simultaneously significantly associated with Y2; whereas in the partial test, X1 is not significant and X2 is significant. These results show that the significance of the model as a whole does not imply that every predictor in the model must be significant individually. Furthermore, the direction and magnitude of the coefficients for each predictor can be seen in the Parameter Estimates results in Table 5.

Table 5. Parameter Estimates

Dependent Variable	Parameter	B	t	*p*-value	Partial η^2
Y1 (*Moral Knowing*)	Intercept	6,249	1,162	0,248	0,014
Y1 (*Moral Knowing*)	X1 (Character Education)	0,205	2,414	0,018	0,057
Y1 (*Moral Knowing*)	X2 (Internalization of Local Wisdom)	0,711	8,247	<0,001	0,412
Y2 (*Bystander Behavior*)	Intercept	44,560	7,695	<0,001	0,379
Y2 (*Bystander Behavior*)	X1 (Character Education)	0,122	1,336	0,185	0,018
Y2 (*Bystander Behavior*)	X2 (Internalization of Local Wisdom)	0,367	3,955	<0,001	0,139

Table 5 shows that character education (X1) and the internalization of local wisdom (X2) have a positive relationship with moral knowing (Y1) and bystander behavior (Y2), although the strength and significance of these relationships vary. For Y1, X1 has a coefficient of B = 0.205, t = 2.414, and p = 0.018, with a partial $\eta^2 = 0.057$; thus, a one-unit increase in X1 is associated with a 0.205-unit increase in the Y1 score, with an effect size of 5.7%. Meanwhile, X2 has a coefficient of B = 0.711, t = 8.247, $p < 0.001$, and partial $\eta^2 = 0.412$; thus, a one-unit increase in X2 is associated with a 0.711-unit increase in Y1, with an effect size of 41.2%. Based on these coefficients, the prediction equation for Y1 is Y1 = 6.249 + 0.205X1 + 0.711X2. Both predictors show a positive and significant relationship with Y1, with X2 having a larger partial η^2 value than X1; thus, in this model, X2 has a larger effect size on Y1. For Y2, character education (X1) has a coefficient of B = 0.122, t = 1.336, and p = 0.185, with a partial $\eta^2 = 0.018$. A p-value > 0.05 indicates that X1 has no significant relationship with Y2 in this model, even though the coefficient is positive. In contrast, X2 has a coefficient of B = 0.367, t = 3.955, $p < 0.001$, and partial $\eta^2 = 0.139$, indicating a positive and significant relationship with Y2 and an effect size of 13.9%. The prediction equation for Y2 is Y2 = 44.560 + 0.122X1 + 0.367X2. Thus, based on the effect size and the significance of the coefficients, X2 shows a stronger relationship with Y2 than X1, whereas X1 does not show a significant relationship with Y2 on its own. In summary, the results of the research hypothesis testing are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Statements	Decisions	Decision Basis
H1	X1 dan X2 → Y1 dan Y2 (Simultan)	Unspecified	Output *Multivariate Tests* The combined X1 + X2 model is not yet available.
H2	X1 → Y1 dan Y2 (Multivariat)	Accepted	$p = 0,047 < 0,05$; Partial $\eta^2 = 0,062$
H3	X2 → Y1 dan Y2 (Multivariat)	Accepted	$p < 0,001$; Partial $\eta^2 = 0,425$
H4	X1 dan X2 → Y1 (Univariat)	Accepted	$p < 0,001$; Partial $\eta^2 = 0,689$
H5	X1 dan X2 → Y2 (Univariat)	Accepted	$p < 0,001$; Partial $\eta^2 = 0,35$

Table 6 shows that most of the research hypotheses received empirical support based on the results of the multivariate and univariate analyses. In the multivariate analysis, character education (X1) was simultaneously and significantly associated with moral knowing (Y1) and bystander behavior (Y2), as indicated by a p-value of 0.047 and a partial η^2 of 0.062; thus, H2 was accepted. The internalization of local wisdom (X2) also showed a significant multivariate relationship with Y1 and Y2, with $p < 0.001$ and partial $\eta^2 = 0.425$, thus accepting H3. The magnitude of the partial η^2 indicates that the effect size of X2 in the multivariate model (42.5%) is larger than that of X1 (6.2%). These findings suggest that both independent variables are associated with the combination of dependent variables, but the effect size indicated by X2 is greater in the analyzed model. In the univariate analysis, models X1 and X2 together showed a significant association with moral knowing (Y1), with $p < 0.001$ and partial $\eta^2 = 0.689$, thus accepting H4. The same results were found for bystander behavior (Y2), with $p < 0.001$ and partial $\eta^2 = 0.351$, thus accepting H5. Thus, the overall predictor model accounts for 68.9% of the variance in Y1 and 35.1% of the variance in Y2. However, H1 cannot yet be decided based on the available output because testing H1 requires the p-value and partial η^2 of the combined X1 and X2 model for Y1 and Y2 simultaneously, rather than the significance values of X1 and X2 separately. If you have a Multivariate Tests table containing a *"Corrected Model"* row for X1 + X2, H1 can be determined immediately. In summary, the mean scores for each indicator across all respondents for each variable are presented as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Average Scores by Respondent for Each Indicator

Figure 1 shows that, in general, the mean for each variable falls within the range of 82.51–85.31, indicating a relatively high level of student response across all measured constructs. In character education (X1), the mean was 84.60, with the highest score of 86.00 on X1.6, which refers to higher education's emphasis on respecting personal boundaries and the rights of others. The lowest score of 83.40 was recorded for X1.3, which pertains to the integration of moral values and character into the learning process.

This pattern suggests that the strengthening of character education is most prominent in the aspect of respect for personal boundaries and the rights of others, while the integration of moral values into learning received a relatively lower score, though it remains high. Regarding the internalization of local wisdom (X2), the average was 82.80, with a maximum score of 85.00 on X2.2, indicating that students consider the values of local wisdom that teach respect and care for others to be important to apply in daily life.

Meanwhile, the minimum score of 80.60 on X2.4 indicates that the application of local wisdom values in treating others with respect remains the lowest-scoring aspect compared to other X2 indicators. Thus, there is a tendency for understanding and recognition of the importance of local wisdom values to be stronger than their direct application in interpersonal behavior. For moral knowing (Y1), the mean was 82.51, with the highest score of 85.00 on Y1.7, the understanding that decisions regarding how to treat others reflect moral responsibility. The lowest score was 80.80 on Y1.5, which relates to the ability to determine the appropriate action when facing situations that could potentially harm or demean others. These findings indicate that students are relatively strong in understanding the dimension of moral responsibility, but their ability to determine the appropriate response in concrete situations still receives a relatively lower score.

Meanwhile, bystander behavior (Y2) had the highest mean among all variables, at 85.31, with a maximum score of 86.40 on Y2.3, related to the willingness to ask for help from those who can assist when witnessing situations that could potentially lead to sexual violence. The minimum Y2 score of 84.40 on Y2.4 relates to the willingness to provide support to someone who has experienced inappropriate treatment. The high scores across all Y2 indicators indicate a tendency among students to recognize situations, seek help, provide support, express disapproval, and participate in creating an environment that prevents sexual violence. Descriptively, the pattern shows that Y2 has the highest mean (85.31), followed by X1 (84.60), X2 (82.80), and Y1 (82.51), with all indicators falling within the range of 80.60–86.40.

The results of the study indicate that character education (X1) and the internalization of local wisdom (X2) are significantly associated with moral knowing (Y1). Partially, character education has a positive and significant relationship with moral knowing ($B = 0.205$; $p = 0.018$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.057$), while the internalization of local wisdom shows a stronger relationship ($B = 0.711$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.412$). Simultaneously, both predictors also showed a significant model for Y1 ($F = 107.458$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.689$). These findings align with the study by Nurmaya et al. (2025), which involved 261 students and found that the integration of Mbojo local wisdom has a substantial relationship with moral reasoning ($R^2 = 0.727$; $p < 0.001$), particularly through ethical reflection, social conditioning, and moral exemplification. These findings were reinforced by Nisa et al. (2025) through a moral reasoning learning model based on Sasak local wisdom applied to 70 students, which showed a simultaneous effect size of 0.992 on critical thinking skills and a spirit of mutual cooperation. The similarity in these patterns suggests that character education and cultural values internalized through educational experiences can provide a normative context for students to understand moral reasoning, recognize the consequences of their actions, and consider their responsibilities toward

others. The larger partial η^2 for X2 (0.412) compared to X1 (0.057) in this study also indicates that the internalization of local wisdom has a stronger association with moral knowing in the analyzed model. However, this difference in effect sizes should not be interpreted as evidence of causality or as an absolute superiority of local wisdom, as this study employed a non-experimental design and measured relationships at a single point in time.

For the bystander behavior variable (Y2), the research results showed that the model consisting of character education and the internalization of local wisdom was simultaneously significant ($F = 26.249$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.351$). However, when tested partially, character education did not show a significant relationship with Y2 ($B = 0.122$; $p = 0.185$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.018$), whereas the internalization of local wisdom was positively and significantly associated with Y2 ($B = 0.367$; $p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.139$).

This pattern can be explained by the findings of [24], who found that moral norms are significantly associated with the intention to intervene as a bystander to prevent sexual violence, and demonstrated that norms derived from parents, peers, the law, and religion are also related to the formation of moral norms. These findings are relevant to the results of this study because the internalization of local wisdom is not only related to an understanding of values but can also provide social norms that serve as a reference when students determine whether to act in situations that could potentially harm others. The results of this study are also consistent with [25]. A study of 380 college students in Australia found that students reported relatively high intentions to intervene as bystanders, but significant barriers arose when they failed to recognize situations as potentially leading to sexual violence. Thus, the findings of this study show that the association between the internalization of local wisdom and bystander behavior (partial $\eta^2 = 0.139$) is more consistent than that of character education alone. This suggests that shaping bystander behavior may not be sufficient through general character education alone but also requires the internalization of social norms, contextual sensitivity, the ability to recognize problematic situations, and a concrete understanding of the actions that can be taken to prevent or respond to sexual violence.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, character education (X1) and the internalization of local wisdom (X2) showed a significant association with moral knowing (Y1) and bystander behavior (Y2). Regarding moral knowing, X1 was significantly associated with $p = 0.018$ and partial $\eta^2 = 0.057$, while X2 showed a stronger association with $p < 0.001$ and partial $\eta^2 = 0.412$; simultaneously, both predictors were also significant with $p < 0.001$ and partial $\eta^2 = 0.689$. Regarding bystander behavior, the model including both X1 and X2 was simultaneously significant ($p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.351$), but when considered separately, X1 was not significant ($p = 0.185$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.018$), while X2 was significantly associated ($p < 0.001$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.139$). These findings imply that strengthening students' moral knowing and bystander behavior requires integrating character education with the internalization of local wisdom through contextual learning, the instillation of values, and practice in responding to situations that have the potential to

harm others, particularly in the context of preventing sexual violence. Future research should examine the effectiveness of learning interventions based on local wisdom using longitudinal or experimental designs to strengthen students' moral knowing and bystander behavior.

REFERENCES

[1] Hermanto, M. Japar, Riyadi, M. S. Sumantri, and R. P. P. Heldy, "Analysis of Character Education Values: School-Based Character in Indonesia," *Educ. Adm. Theory Pract.*, 2024, doi: 10.52152/kuey.v30i1.665.

[2] Purwati, M. Japar, L. Qomariyah, and F. Tentama, "Moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action in reflecting moral development of students in junior high school," *Int. J. Eval. Res. Educ.* , 2024, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v13i3.25499.

[3] P. Hart, "Reinventing character education: the potential for participatory character education using MacIntyre's ethics," *J. Curric. Stud.*, 2022, doi: 10.1080/00220272.2021.1998640.

[4] N. A. Hidayati, H. J. Waluyo, R. Winarni, and Suyitno, "Exploring the implementation of local wisdom-based character education among indonesian higher education students," *Int. J. Instr.*, 2020, doi: 10.29333/iji.2020.13213a.

[5] A. Aris and A. K. Wijaya, "Internalization of Local Wisdom Values In Social Science Learning to Form Students' Character," *Edueksos J. Pendidik. Sos. Ekon.*, 2023, doi: 10.24235/edueksos.v12i2.15224.

[6] A. N. Muhsinin, F. Parizal, R. Rohmatulloh, U. Siliwangi, and P. Kewarganegaraan, "Pembentukan Karakter Dan Moral Mahasiswa," *Adv. Soc. Humanit. Res.*, 2023.

[7] L. I. Vázquez-González, E. Bosch-Fiol, A. Sánchez-Prada, V. Ferreiro-Basurto, C. Delgado-Álvarez, and V. A. Ferrer-Pérez, "Bystander behavior in violence against women in Spain: A scoping review," *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2023.101861.

[8] F. Fachrurradhi, W. N. Nasution, and A. Mukti, "Integrating Local Wisdom Into Character Education," *Scaffolding J. Pendidik. Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, 2025, doi: 10.37680/scaffolding.v7i2.7192.

[9] U. A. Izzati, B. S. Bachri, M. Sahid, and D. E. Indriani, "Character education: Gender differences in moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action in elementary schools in Indonesia," *J. Educ. Gift. Young Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.17478/jegys.597765.

[10] A. Nurmaya, M. Ramli, A. Atmoko, and S. Akbar, "Integrating Local Wisdom into Moral and Character Education to Foster Students' Moral Reasoning: An Embedded Mixed-Methods Study," *J. Cult. Anal. Soc. Chang.*, 2025, doi: 10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.3139.

[11] F. A. Yusuf, "Meta-Analysis: The Influence of Local Wisdom-Based Learning Media on the Character of Students in Indonesia," *Int. J. Educ. Methodol.*, 2023, doi: 10.12973/ijem.9.1.237.

[12] A. Asrial, S. Syahrial, D. A. Kurniawan, and L. Damayanti, "Local Wisdom of Ngubat Padi: Implementation of E-Modules on Tolerance Characters," *JPI (Jurnal Pendidik. Indones.*, 2021, doi: 10.23887/jpiundiksha.v11i2.35444.

[13] Jamilah, M. Aulia Rahman, and S. Zulvia Agustina, "The Implications of Sundanese Customary Law in the Character Formation of IPI Garut Students," *J. Pendidik. Karakter*, 2025.

[14] M. Schneider and J. S. Hirsch, "Comprehensive Sexuality Education as a Primary Prevention Strategy for Sexual Violence Perpetration," *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*. 2020. doi: 10.1177/1524838018772855.

[15] S. M. Muniroh, M. Huda, and M. Ahmad, "Culture-Based Psychoeducational Approach to Anti-Sexual Violence Education in Islamic Higher Education," *Khazanah Pendidik. Islam*, 2024.

[16] A. Krauss *et al.*, "Quantifying College Students' Bystander Behavior to Prevent Sexual Assault and Intimate Partner Violence: Can We Make Improvements?," *J. Interpers. Violence*, 2023, doi: 10.1177/08862605231173939.

[17] S. McMahon and R. C. Seabrook, "Impact of Exposure to Sexual Violence Prevention Messages on Students' Bystander Behavior," *Health Promot. Pract.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1524839918811151.

[18] H. Chen, Q. Huang, and M. Jiang, "Empowering Chinese College Students to Prevent Sexual Assault in Post-MeToo Era: An Empirical Study of the Bystander Intervention Approach," *J. Interpers. Violence*, 2022, doi: 10.1177/0886260520917515.

[19] C. Y. Hoffman and L. E. Daigle, "Event-specific and individual factors impacting college students' decisions to intervene in a potentially risky scenario," *J. Am. Coll. Heal.*, 2022, doi: 10.1080/07448481.2020.1841212.

[20] C. L. Hackman, P. Branscum, S. Rush Griffin, A. Castle, and E. Hagadorn, "Gender Differences in

Bystander Intervention Intentions to Prevent Sexual Assault: A Reasoned Action Approach," *J. Sch. Violence*, 2022, doi: 10.1080/15388220.2022.2075880.

[21] J. Bouchard, J. S. Wong, and C. Lee, "Fostering college students' responsibility as prosocial bystanders to sexual violence prevention: A meta-analysis of the Bringing in the Bystander program," *J. Am. Coll. Heal.*, 2024, doi: 10.1080/07448481.2022.2162825.

[22] K. Nisa, I. W. Suastra, I. W. Lasmawan, and K. Suma, "The Effectiveness of the Local Wisdom-Based Moral Reasoning Learning Model on Critical Thinking Skills and Mutual Cooperation Character," *Int. J. Environ. Sci.*, 2025, doi: 10.64252/fnbz2d98.

[23] P. Branscum, S. Rush-Griffin, C. L. Hackman, A. Castle, and M. Katague, "The role of moral norms as a determinant of intentions to engage in bystander intervention to prevent sexual assault," *J. Community Psychol.*, 2023, doi: 10.1002/jcop.22906.

[24] D. Labhardt, S. Brown, E. Holdsworth, N. McKillop, D. J. Howat, and C. Jones, "UK and Australian University Students' Perceptions of the Nature of Sexual Assault and Intervening Behavior," *J. Interpers. Violence*, 2024, doi: 10.1177/08862605231212171.

[25] D. K. Peterson and M. Seligman, *Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, 2004.