

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLEDGE

The Effect of Value Clarification Learning Strategy (Group Interview Type and Consequences Search Type) on Respect for Diversities of Students Who Have Different Cognitive Styles in the Civic Education

Shofiyatul Azmi

Lecturer, The Civic Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Wisnuwardhana
University of Malang, Indonesia

Wayan Ardhana

Lecturer, Civic Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Universitas, Negeri
Malang, Indonesia

I Nyoman Sudana Degeng

Lecturer, Civic Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Universitas, Negeri
Malang, Indonesia

Waras Kamdi

Lecturer, Civic Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Universitas, Negeri
Malang, Indonesia

Abstract:

This study aims to determine whether there are differences in respect for diversity of students that learned with values clarification learning strategy in group interview type and the Consequences Search type, respect for diversity in students who had the cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI), and between values clarification learning strategy of group interview type and the Consequences Search type with cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI). The method research used is a quasi-experimental design. The subject of this research are students of Civic Education with number 45 students by implementation value clarification learning strategy in the type of group interview, as an experimental class. Mathematics Education with the number 34 students by implementation value clarification learning strategy in the type of Consequences Search, as a control class. The technique of data analyzed used ANOVA statistical two lanes (2x2) with SPSS + 20 for windows. The results of the study showed that (1) The attitude of the students to appreciate the diversity by using learning method for the type of group interview was lower than on the type of Consequences Search. (2). The attitude of the students to appreciate the diversity who had cognitive style of field dependence (FD) was lower than students who had cognitive style of field independence (FI), and (3) There was an interaction between the values clarification learning strategies in type of group interview and the type of Consequences Search with cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI) on respect for diversity.

Keywords: *value clarification, the type of group interview, the type of consequences search, cognitive style, respect for diversity.*

1. Introduction

The civic education as referred to in constitution number 20 in 2003 on National Education System, civic education is a compulsory subject on curriculum for primary and secondary education and compulsory subject on the curriculum of higher education (Article 37). This provision is clear and reinforced by the Article 37 section explanation of the constitution that civic education is meant to create students to be human beings who have a sense of nationalism and patriotism. With the provisions of the act, the position of civic education as a basis for developing the students to have a sense of nationalism and patriotism. The sense of nationalism and patriotism should take precedence over personal or group interests for the sake of the unity and integrity of the Republic of Indonesia. The state of Indonesian society which is different from all sides of life (religion, culture, customs, language, and others) requires every citizen has respect diversities for the integrity of the state proclamation on August 17 in 1945, just as it is said that the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia is fixed price.

The Informal education in creating a sense of nationalism and patriotism actualize to appreciate the diversities one of them is given responsibility in the of civic education subject. The civic is one of the spearheads of national education, in order to establish the character of citizens who respect the diversities in the motto Unity in Diversity. The relevance builds respect for diversities with the implementation of civic education can be seen from its the characteristics, the charge, vision, mission, and purpose. The civic

education has the characteristics, namely the introduction of life together in the community in the human dimension as social beings, who must understand himself, developing the values and the character and understand the surrounding environment. Winataputra (1999) said that as the value of education, civic education is expected to build and transform the value, moral and norms that are considered good by the nation and the state to students, thereby nation and character building.

Therefore, Noto Nagoro said that there needs to be an effort to help students internalize the values and moral not only in the ability to reason but also can be a part of the personality. It required steategi adequate learning thus attempts to internalize the value can be achieved. Quiqley and Tochcqueville (2000) said that in civic education, the someone will have effectivity as citizens if they have a feeling of individual sensitivity and awareness of personal values. Therefore, the creativity of teacher and lecturer to find out and develop civic education learning model and is able to create meaningful learning situation is one of the things that determine the success of the implementation of learning civic education, particularly in building a nation morally, respect for diversity. Oneof strategy which is chosen is the value clarification in the original language is Value Clarification Technique (VCT). In the process of civic education learning, the lecturers demanded to develop a learning strategy that builds respect these diversities, one of which was developed values clarification strategy. It is very importance in choosing to learnnational values strategy carried out by the teacher and lecturer of civic education. It is done to obtain an efficient and effective method to provide knowledge about the life of the state and internalize the values and morals of nationality.

According to Taniredja (2011: 88), the goal of using of VCT, among others, (a) to know and measure the level of students' awareness of a value, so it can serve as a base of reference to determine the target of value to be achieved, (b) to create students' awareness about values owned both the level and nature of the positive or negative and then built toward the improvement and the achievement of the values, (c) to build certain values to students by logical method and received by the students, so that in the end the value will belong to the students as a process of moral consciousness is not a moral obligation, (d) to train students in accepting her value and position the value of others, accept and take decisions on a problem related to daily life. The results of the study showed the advantages of this strategy, among others Lauren Teboho (2002) about the impact of values clarification on critical thinking, Gibson and Michell (1981), a conflict of values in society can be minimized with values clarification. The research by Fairizah Haris (2013), which concluded that the VCT learning strategy to increase awareness of services appreciates the value of the hero. Dewi Anggarini et al (2013), the results of research experiments showed the superiority of VCT methods compared with the conventional method, which concluded that VCT models can enhance students' character. Sudrajat (2011), VCT methods with a variety of methods can increase moral understanding, attitude, and self-reliance of students. It caused students can clarify what values are followed and reinforce the student's commitment to implement those values.

Harmin, Rath, and Simon as a pioneer of value claification technique (VCT) or values clarification strategy explained the steps VCT with seven steps in three stages or phases, namely (Reimer, et al., 1983: 9):

No.	Stage	Sub Stage	
1.	Choosing (cognitive)	1.	Choosing freely.
		2.	Choosing from a variety of alternatives.
		3.	Choosing from a variety of alternatives by considering the consequences.
2.	Prizing (affective)	1.	The feelings of pleasure and reward, proud of his choice.
		2.	Affirming value which has been chosen and admitted it publicly.
3.	Acting (behavioral)	1.	Behave, implement in accordance with the choice.
		2.	Repeating the behavior of his choice, until it became a pattern of behavior that is life.

Table 1: Main Stages in values clarification strategy

1.2. The First Stage: Choosing

Choosing freely, it means that in choosing is free from all forms of pressure. usually, environment demanding to perform a deed that is not in accordance with our beliefs. It is not valued yet, due to the nature of actual value is the value that we choose freely. The values that built in childhood had not been considered actual value, it only is considered to as an indicator or a seed value that can develop into real value.

Choosing freely assume there are a variety of alternatives, if there is not an alternative option, then there is no freedom of choice. Sub third stage was chosen from various alternatives after considering the consequences of each alternative. Selecting a value means determining after considering the consequences of all the alternatives. Don't know the effect of an alternative means does not know what will happen, so it is no free to accept the consequences. Knowing the consequences of some of the alternatives that exist, then people can make the right choice.

1.3. The Second Stage: Respect

Respecting and feeling happy with his choice. The value is something that is considered positive, appreciated, respected, high revered, honored and maintained. The values can make people happy and excited and grateful. When the someone has determined a choice, and the someone has executed a person's behavior becomes excited, then he or she has found a value for himor her. Otherwise,if someone becomes moody and sad after executing her choice then it means he has made a mistake in determining his or her choice. So when someone has decided to select a value then he or she should be happy with his or her choice, and keeping it as precious something to him or her. This sub stage is followed by boldly affirm the value of his or her choice in public. When a value revered, appreciated and can make a person happy, then he or she will recognize and communicate it to others.

1.4. Third Stage: Acting

Behave in accordance with the selection. To really be a value, then person's act must conform or based on the value that was followed, in other words a value to be realized in his or her behavior, when a value has not reflected in behavior, or someone has not acted in accordance with his or her choice, then something can not be called a real value, it only is considered as a desire, idea, or dream. The weight of a value can be measured from several lots of time, energy, and material that are sacrificed for the value which believed. Sub last stage is repeat behavior suitable with choices, and eventually become a pattern of behavior in life.

The values clarification strategy focuses on student's involvement in determining which values are selected and then be implemented. The main task of a lecturer in values clarification method is to guide and lead students in determining the choice of values.

The values clarification strategy is cooperative learning as described Fullan and Steigelbauer "these are significant cooperative learning techniques for teaching values clarification. This strategy is based on a reasoning that a teacher is a tool in transforming value. Furthermore, Reimer and colleagues (1983: 8) stated: indeed, arguing for value neutrality is itself a value position. A teacher by their pedagogical choices and their modeling behavior are of necessity moral educators, regardless of the subject matter by teaching. Thus, when question raised, "Should school engage in values and moral education?" we have no choice but to answer that schools are necessary institutions of the significant moral enterprise.

As a pioneer of clarification strategies, Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum in their book *A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students* guiding the implementation of learning values clarification with 79 kinds / type of strategy. Each of these types of strategies is explained by a different procedure. Its application in learning can be used to vary, it can be done singly or merger of some type. (Simon, 1972: 19) values clarification approach that we discuss in this book is more systematic and could be applied more broadly. This values clarification approach is based on the approach formulated by Louis Rath, which explores Dewey's idea.

In this study was carried out values clarification learning in the Group Interview type/strategy number 14 (Simon, p: 160) and the Consequences Search strategy type number 26 (Simon: 207). Learning values clarification in Group Interview type is applied in small groups, providing opportunities for learners to express their interests, beliefs, activities and personal values in a way that is more familiar. This strategy also provides experience for the learners to interview each other with each other.

While type Consequences Search (Simon: 207), this strategy allows students to consider alternatives to the action in a variety of special situations. Its aim is to encourage the learners to be able to make his daily actions consistently and give reasons or consequences arising from the alternative chosen, so it is more suitable with their feeling and belief. Evaluating to consequences is as important as the search for alternatives because if we choose an alternative without thinking of the consequences, we raise the risk of making bad decisions or incorrect. This strategy gives training to the students to practice in looking for the consequences of various alternatives.

In addition to the selection of learning strategy, the results of the study are also determined by the condition of learners, one of them is cognitive style. Witkin (1976) described the cognitive styles are forms of functioning in a special way based on the ability of a person's intellect displayed in the activities of perception and intellectual activity. Keefe (1987) suggested that cognitive styles are part of the learning styles that describe the habit of behaving relatively fixed in a person in receiving, thinking, solving problems or storing information.

Based on the explanation above, then performed the study about the influence of value clarification learning strategy in the Group Interview type and the Consequences Search type on respect for diversities of students who have different cognitive styles in civics education subject. Based on this background, the formulation of this study are as follows: (1) Is there a difference of respect for diversities in students that learned with the value clarification learning strategy in Group Interview type and Consequences Search type? (2) Is there a difference in respect for diversities in students who have the cognitive style field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI)? (3) Is there an interaction between the values clarification learning strategy in Group Interview type and the Consequences Search Type with cognitive style field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI) on respect for differences Interview group

2. Method of Study

2.1. Study design

This design of the study is a quasi-experiment with purpose to examine the reliability or effectiveness of the use of value clarification strategy in Group Interview type and Consequences Search type

2.2. The variable of Study

The variables in this study consisted of (1) the independent variable, ie the variable which is manipulated that is a cause. The independent variables in this study is the value clarification strategy in Group Interview type and Consequences Search type, (2) the moderator variable is a variable that has the potential, or may effect on the independent variables and the dependent variable, namely the cognitive style consist of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI). The dependent variable ie variable which will be predicted as a result of treatment of independent variable. The dependent variable in this study is the form of student's attitudes to appreciate the diversities after the implementation of two types of learning of the values clarification strategy.

2.3. The Subject of Study

The subjects of this study are students of the Wisnuwardhana University of Malang. The reason for choosing this campus because students of the Wisnuwardhana University of Malang consists of several provinces in Indonesia. While the sample of this study was students of mathematics education program and students of civic education who are taking civic education subject.

2.4. The Treatment of Study

This research applies two groups of value clarification learning strategies, namely group interview type and consequences search type. Thus, there are two treatment groups. One group is taught with the strategy group type interview and the other group is taught by using the consequences search type. Prior to the experiment, both groups were given GEFT (Group Embedded Figures Test) cognitive style test to determine their cognitive style. Thereafter, a pretest is given to determine the level of initial ability in respect for differences of opinion from both groups.

The allocation of time and material were given to the group is the same. However, the worksheets of each group are different. In other words, the student worksheets are adapted to the steps or scenarios of each learning strategy. There is a difference in the implementation step between the learning of clarification strategy of type value of Interview group with value clarification strategy of Consequences Search type as shown in the following table

Learning Steps	Lecturer-Student Activities
1. The Initial Activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lecturer communicated the activity plan in the learning that will be implemented, by presenting the learning objectives 2. The lecturer starts the activity by explaining the concept of the subject discussed globally. 3. The lecturer gave questions related to the subject as a stimulus. Students pay close attention 4. The lecturer divided the class into 4 groups. Each group had two people as volunteers to answer questions asked by his friend.
2. The Core Activities (Discussion)	<p>The Group Discussion Phase</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each group was in their respective positions once established together. All group members were given time to read the literature they had related to the subject 2. All group members made inquiries relating to the maximum of two subjects. Unless two people were callers as answerers. 3. After all group members made a written question. Choosing a member as a group secretary, to inventory questions and answers as well as moderators, or intermediaries between each question and answer. 4. The group discussion, if there was an answer from volunteers that need to be evaluated by other group members to find the right answer by agreement with the group members. 5. Class Discussion Phase <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Taken in class discussions, so all class members know the issues of each group with different themes from the other groups, with a sense of appreciation, pride in their choice. Affirm the value of his choice and admit it in public. ii. The lecturer controlled the discussion process to fit the rules of discussion. <p>Concluding Phase The lecturer with students concluded the discussion.</p>
3. Closing Activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reflection on learning 2. The lecturers provided a description test in the form of Students' Worksheet undertaken by individual students.

Table 2: the Steps of value clarification strategies for group interview type.

Learning Steps	Lecturer-Student Activities
1. The Initial Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The lecturer communicated the activity plan in the learning that will be implemented, by presenting the learning objectives. The lecturer started the activity by explaining the concept of the subject discussed globally The lecturer showed a video about the subject as a stimulus. Students pay close attention. The lecturer divided the group class into 4 groups
2. The Core Activities (Discussion)	<p>Phase 1 (Alternatives Search) The students in the group explored alternative values that will be developed with the help of the table</p> <p>Phase 2 (Consequences Search) After collecting some alternative values and attitudes of students sorted from, the first sequence to third, sought consequences that occur both positive and negative consequences if any.</p> <p>Phase 3 (Class discussion)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Each group presented its work with a sense of respect, pride in its choice. Affirm the value of his choice and admit it in public. The lecturer controlled the discussion process to fit the rules of the discussion. <p>The lecturer with students concluded the discussion.</p>
3. The Closing Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reflections on learning The Lecturer provided a description test in the form of Students' Worksheep undertaken by individual students.

Table 3: The steps of learning strategy of value clarification of Consequences Search type

2.5. The Instrument of Study

The instrument of this study consists of achievement test which is a test to appreciate the diversities, in the form of two types of assessment, namely: During learning both with the value clarification strategy in Group Interview type and Consequences Search type, made rubrik attitude assessment in accordance with the content of material. The rubric had been consulted with experts. The end of learning devised scale of attitude test by using Likert scale, the thirty questions for attitude is adapted with the material that had been taught. The contents of the questions are consulted and validated by experts.

2.6. The Techniques of Data Analysis

The data about the cognitive styles of students used an instrument which is known as the Group Embedded Figure Test (GEFT) which distinguished a person's cognitive ability into two, namely the field independence (FI) and field dependence (FD).

The data analysis technique used to determine differences of using values clarification learning strategy in the group interview type and the consequences search type on respect for diversities of students who had different cognitive style used ANOVA statistical analysis techniques with two lanes (2x2) by using SPSS + 20 for windows. The statistical analysis technique had also been used to describe the interactions between variables.

3. The Results of Study

3.1. The result of Pretest and Posttest

Based on the results of the descriptive analysis can be presented briefly about the score of the attitude of respecting the differences of students both the control group and experimental group at the time of pretest and posttest. Scores of mutual respect at the time of pretest can be shown in table 2 below.

Number	Value	Eksperimen Class		Control Class		Total
		f	%	f	%	
1	50 – 64 is Low	23	51,1	20	58,8	43
2	65 – 79 is Medium	20	44,4	13	38,2	33
3	80 – 100 is High	2	4,5	1	2	3
	Total	45	100	34	100	79

Table 2: the score of mutual respect at the pretest

Based on table 2, it can be seen that the result of pretest for appreciation of difference of opinion from the experimental class was 23 people (51,1%) in low category, 20 people (44,4%) in the medium category, 2 people (4,5%) in the high category. While for the control class was 20 people (58,8%) in low category, 13 people (38,2%) in the medium category, and only 1 person (2%) in the high category.

While the score of mutual respect after posttest was shown in table 3 below.

Number	Value	Experiment Class		Control Class		Total
		f	%	f	%	
1	50 - 64 is Low	1	2,3	4	11,8	43
2	65 - 79 is Medium	29	64,4	4	11,8	33
3	80 - 100 is High	15	33,3	26	76,4	3
	Total	45	100	34	100	79

Table 3: Scores the value of mutual respect at the time of posttest

Based on table 3 it can be seen that the score of attitudes appreciated the difference of opinion for the experimental class after being taught using value clarification strategy with Interview group type was 1 student (2.3%) in low category, 29 students (64.4%) in moderate category, and 15 students (33.3%) in the high category. While for the control class taught by using value clarification strategy were 4 students (11,8%) in low score category 4 students (11,8) in medium category, and 26 students (76,4%) in high category

The score of posttest for the respect for difference of opinion then analyzed with descriptive statistic calculation. From the result of posttest score analysis for students which became experiment class and control class can be shown in the following table.

Descriptive Statistics				
Dependent Variable: Post_Tes				
Cognitive Style	Learning Strategy	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Field Independence	Group Interview Type	76.25	10.243	20
	Consequences Search Type	85.95	7.351	21
	Total	81.21	10.048	41
Field Dependence	Group Interview Type	75.20	5.678	25
	Consequences Search Type	74.61	11.982	13
	Total	75.00	8.219	38
Total	Group Interview Type	75.66	7.948	45
	Consequences Search Type	81.61	10.781	34
	Total	78.22	9.675	79

Table 4: Results of Posttest Data Analysis Attitude Appreciate the Differences of Opinion

The result of posttest data analysis on respect for difference of opinion in table 4 explains that 29 students who have a cognitive style of Field Independence get mean score 76,25, SD (Standard Deviasion) equals 10,243, after being taught by using Group Interview Type strategy. However, 21 students obtained mean 85.95, SD (standard Deviasion) = 7.351, after being taught using strategy Consequences Search Type. As for students who have a cognitive style of Field Dependence, there were 25 students got an average score of 75.20 with Deviasion standard of 5.678 after being taught using Group Interview Type strategy, and 13 students got an average score of 74.61 with Standard Deviasion 11,982 after being taught using Group Search Type strategy. From these data, it can be concluded that students who had cognitive style of Field Independence got higher grade values compared to students who had Field Dependence cognitive style in respecting differences of opinion

3.2. The Results of Examining The Variables' Effect Individually

The test results of the effect of individual variables are presented in Table 5 below:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: Post_Tes					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1730.119 ^a	3	576.706	7.763	.000
Intercept	453780.749	1	453780.749	6108.202	.000
Cognitive style	715.187	1	715.187	9.627	.003
Learning strategy	387.493	1	387.493	5.216	.025
Cognitive style * Learning strategy	493.247	1	493.247	6.639	.012
Error	5571.779	75	74.290		
Total	490750.000	79			
Corrected Total	7301.899	78			

a. R Squared = .237 (Adjusted R Squared = .206)

Table 5: Test Results Influence Variables individually

The table 5. showed that the result of ANOVA 2x2 test to the effect of cognitive style on sikap menghargai perbedaan pendapat memperoleh values of F-test equals 9.627 with a probability value or significance equals 0.003 < 0.05. it means that sikap menghargai perbedaan pendapat among students who had a cognitive style of Field Independence (FI) with students who had a cognitive style of Field Dependence (FD) were significantly different

The Result of hypothesis Test About the effect of strategy belajar terhadap sikap menghargai perbedaan pendapat memperoleh value of F equals 5.216 with a probability value or significance equals 0,025 < 0.05. It means that there were significant differences between antara mahasiswa yang diajar dengan strategi belajar Group Interview Type dengan Consequences Search Type dalam sikap menghargai perbedaan pendapat

The Result of hypothesis showed that the value of F-test for the interaction antara strategi belajar dengan with a cognitive adalah 6.639 with a probability value or significance equals 0:012 < 0.05. It means that there was an interaction effect between learning strategies with cognitive style on sikap menghargai perbedaan pendapat.

4. Discussion

From the data analysis above obtained that there are differences in respect for diversities in students that learned with the value clarification learning strategy in Group Interview type and Consequences Search type with F_{count} equals 9.627 and sig. 0.003. The students' appreciate to diversities which used teaching methods for the of group interview type obtained lower scores than Consequences Search type. It means that the control class group with learning values clarification in Consequences Search type better result than the experimental class with learning the values clarification in Group Interview type or otherwise.

While respect for diversities of students with different cognitive styles, there was difference respect for diversities in students who had the cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI) with F_{count} equals 5,216 and sig. 0,024. The students' respect for the diversities that have a cognitive style of field dependence (FD) lower than students who have the cognitive style of field independence (FI). In other words, students have the cognitive style of field independence (FI) had respect for diversities was better than students who had the cognitive style of field dependence (FD).

While the interaction between the values clarification learning strategy in Group Interview type and the Consequences Search type with the cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI) on respect for diversities with F_{count} is 6.639 and sig. 0.012. With regard to patterns of interaction in figure 4.1, where the distribution lines of mean post-test of students who used the Group Interview type of students who had a cognitive style of FD above the line of post-test of students who used the Consequences Search type. On the contrary, the distribution of the mean of post-test of students who used the Group Interview type of students who had cognitive styles of FI is in under line of the post-test of students who used the Consequences Search type.

5. Conclusion

There were differences in respect for diversities of the students that learned by the value clarification learning strategy in Group Interview type and Consequences Search type with F_{count} equals 9.627 and sig. 0.003. The students' respect to diversities who used teaching methods for the Group Interview type < Consequences Search type.

There were differences in respect for diversities of the students who had the cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI) with F count equals 5,216 and sig. 0,024. The students' respect to diversities who had cognitive style of field dependence (FD) < cognitive style of field independence (FI)

There was an interaction between the values clarification learning strategy in Group Interview type and the Consequences Search type with the cognitive style of field dependence (FD) and field independence (FI) on respect for diversities with F count equals 6.639 and sig. 0.012.

6. References

- i. Ardhana, W. 1982. Beberapa Metode Statistik untuk Penelitian Pendidikan. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.
- ii. Ardhana, W. 1990. Atribusi Terhadap Sebab-sebab Keberhasilan dan Kegagalan Serta kaitannya dengan Motivasi berprestasi (Pidato Guru besar). Malang perpustakaan IKIP Malang.
- iii. Arends.R.T. 1997. Classroom Instruction and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill BookCo.
- iv. Azwar, Saifuddin, 2013 Sikap Manusia Teori dan Pengukurannya. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- v. Azwar, Saifuddin. 2014. Tes Prestasi Fungsi dan Pengembangan Pengukuran Prestasi Belajar. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- vi. Anggraini Dewi, Kd., dkk, 2013. Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Value Clarification Technique Berbantuan Media gambar terhadap Nilai karakter Siswa Kelas V Gugus VI Tajinan. Accessed 20 September 2014.
- vii. Bakry, Ms Noor. 2002. Pendidikan Kerwarganegaraan (Kewiraan). Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- viii. Budiningsih, A. C. 2004. Pembelajaran Moral Berbasis Pada Karakteristik Siswa dan Budayanya. Jakarta: Rineke Cipta.
- ix. Cassidy, W. & Bates, A. 2005 Drop-Outs, and Push-Outs; Finding Hope at a School That Actualizes the Ethic of Care. American Journal of Education. 22 (2) p.66-100.
- x. Cogan J.J. and Derricott, B.J. 1998. Multidimensional Civic Education, Tokyo
- xi. Cohen, L. 1978. Educational Research in Classrooms and schools: A Manual of Materials and Methods. London: Harper & Law Publishers.
- xii. Cohen, L Manion, L & Marrison, K. 2011. Research Methods In Education. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

- xiii. Degeng, I Nyoman Sudana. 1989. Ilmu Pengajaran Taksonomi Variabel. Jakarta. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Dirjen Dikti. P2LPKTK.
- xiv. Dikti, 2003. Modul Acuan Proses Pembelajaran Matakuliah Pengembangan Kepribadian. 2003. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi.
- xv. Djahiri, K.A., 1985. Strategi Pengajaran Afektif-Nilai-Moral VCT dan Games dalam VCT. Bandung: PMPKN FPIPS IKIP Bandung.
- xvi. Djahari, A.K. 1995. Dasar-dasar Metodologi Belajar Mengajar IPS. Bandung LPPP-IPS IKIP.
- xvii. Depdiknas, 2002. Educational New Paradigm of Educational for primary and Secondary, Jakarta.
- xviii. Dwyer, F.M., & Moore, D.M. 1992. Effect of color coding on cognitive style. (online) (http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/Data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/000019b/80/23/1b/56.pdf). Accessed 22 May 2009.
- xix. Eggen, P. & Kauchak, D. 2012. Strategie and Models for teachers: Teaching Content and Thinking Skills. Sixth Edition. Terjemahan oleh Satrio Wahano 2012. Strategi dan Model pembelajaran, Jakarta: PT Indeks.
- xx. Haris Fairizah. 2013. Penerapan Model Pembelajaran VCT Untuk Meningkatkan Kesadaran Nilai Menghargai Jasa Pahlawan Pada Siswa SD. Journal PGSD Unesa Vol 1 Nomor 02 tahun 2013. Accessed 22 Jun 2014.
- xxi. Hunter, D., Gambell & Randhawa, 2005. Gender Gaps in Group Listening and Speaking: Issues in Social Constructivist Approaches to Teaching and Learning. Educational Review. Vol 57.
- xxii. Kolb, A.Y. & Kolb, D.A. 2005. The Kolb Learning Style Inventory-Version 3.1 (2005) Technical Specifications. Hay Group Copyright 2005 Experience Based Learning System. Inc.
- xxiii. Lisenco, S. 2006. Involving Students In Tracking Discussions Learning Through Evaluation, Thinking Classroom. (7):40
- xxiv. Messick, S. 1976. Individual In Learning. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass. Weber, D. 1990. The Biological Bondaries of Cognitive Style: A Neurophy Psychological Analisis. Dalam Globerson and Zelniker (Eds). Cognitive Style and Cognitive Development. Noorwoos, H.J. Ablex: Publishing Cooperation.
- xxv. Moore, K.D. 2005. Effective Instructional Strategies: from Theory to Practice. Kondon Sage Publications. Inc.
- xxvi. Kansil, C.S.T. dan Chistina Kansil. 2003. Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Di Perguruan Tinggi. Jakarta: PT Pradnya Paramita.
- xxvii. Keefe, J. W. 1987. Learning Style Theory and Practice. Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- xxviii. Liu, Y & Ginther. 1999. Cognitive Style and Distance Education. Journal of Distance Learning Administration. Vol 2(3):1-9.
- xxix. Rahmadani, D. 2005. Implementasi Pendidikan nilai Dalam Matakuliah Dasar Umum (MKDU) Desertasi Program Pascasarjana
- xxx. Reimer, Joseph., Paolitto, Diana Pritchard., & Hersh, Richard H., (1983). Promoting Moral Growth: From Piaget to Kohlberg. New York: Longman In.
- xxxi. Rheta, V. & Zan, B. 1994. Moral Classrooms, Moral Children, Columbia University, Teachers College Press.
- xxxii. Sacken, M. 2003. The Heart of Caring; From Work of Nel Nodding. <http://caring.com/index.html>.
- xxxiii. Sapriya, M. Ed. 2009. Pendidikan IPS Konsep dan Pembelajaran. Bandung: Rosda
- xxxiv. Sanjaya, Wina. 2007. Strategi Pembelajaran: Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group
- xxxv. Sudrajat. 2011. Mewujudkan insan Cendekian mandiri dan bernurani Melalui metode Values Clarification Technique Dalam Matakuliah Sejarah Lokal, Jurnal SOCIA edisi Mei 2011, accessed 21 Juni 2014.
- xxxvi. Suhardjono. 1990. Pengaruh Gaya Kognitif dan Perancangan Pengajaran Berdasar Component Display Theory terhadap Perolehan Belajar, Retensi, dan Sikap. Disertasi tidak diterbitkan. Malang: Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Malang.
- xxxvii. Sumarsono, S. dkk. 2002. Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- xxxviii. Suseno, F.M., 1986. Etika Dasar: Masalah-Masalah pokok Filsafat Moral, Yogyakarta, Kanisius
- xxxix. Taniredja, Tukiran dan Efi Miftah. 2011. Model-model Pembelajaran Inovatif. Bandung: Alfabeta
- xl. Tocqueville, A. 2000. It Can not be doubted that in the united states the instruction of the people powerfully contributes to the support of the democratic republic. National Alliance for Civic Educational. [Http://www.google.co.id/id/E/Civic.htm](http://www.google.co.id/id/E/Civic.htm)
- xli. Undang-Undang No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional (SISDIKNAS) Bandung: Citra Umbara.
- xlii. Witkin, H.A. 1976. Cognitive Style Academic Performance and Teacher Student Relation. Dalam Messich, (ed). Individually in Learning. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.
- xliii. Winataputra, H. Udin S. 1999. Perkembangan PK sebagai wahana Pendidikan Demokrasi di Indonesia, Makalah, Bandung.
- xliv. Winataputra, H. Udin S. Desember 2003 "Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Sebagai Wahana Sistematis Pendidikan Demokrasi: Paradigma Baru Dalam Era Reformasi". Makalah Seminar Nasional Jurusan PPKn FIP Universitas Negeri Malang.
- xlvi. Witkin, H.A. 1976. Cognitive Style Academic Performance and Teacher Student Relation. Dalam Messich, (ed). Individually in Learning. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.