The Psychological Influence of Contextual Teaching and Learning Models on Students' Social Cohesion Attitudes

Syahril[*1]**, Firman**[2]**, Khairani**[3]

[1,2,3] Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Padang
Email: rilmpd@gmail.com[*]
Coresponding: rilmpd@gmail.com[*]

Abstract: This research aims to determine the influence of the contextual teaching and learning model on the learning motivation of class XI students at SMK 1 Padang. This research is of the type quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental method with a non-equivalent comparison-group design. The population used in this study were all students of class XI at SMK 1 Padang, consisting of two classes, namely XIA and XIB. Research data collection techniques with simple random sampling. Technical data analysis to test the hypothesis is done by statistical calculations product-moment correlation. The results of hypothesis testing show that there are significant differences between classes that learn using the contextual teaching and learning learning model and classes that learn without the contextual teaching and learning learning model. This obtained r-count of 0.696 > r-table 0.242 with a significance of 0.05 and n = 66 that H_0 was rejected. This means that it can be concluded that there is an influence contextual teaching and learning model for understanding the concept of social cohesion for class XI students of SMK 1 Padang.

Keywords:- Teaching, Learning, Social Cohesion Attitudes

INTRODUCTION

The world of education in Indonesia is endlessly shocked by information relating to acts of violence, bullying behavior, fights, and brawls between students. Fights and brawls are considered to have become "culture" among students because cases continue to recur and increase every year. In 2018, for example, the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) recorded an increase in brawls between students by 1.1%, from 12.9% in 2017 to 14% (Tempo, 2018). In the 2017–2018 range, KPAI recorded 202 children who conflicted with the law as a result of brawls (Harmer, 2009). Furthermore, in 2019, KPAI received 153 complaints of acts of physical and psychological violence in schools, with a percentage of 44% perpetrated by teachers and school principals against students, 13% perpetrated by students against teachers, 13% perpetrated by students' parents against teachers and students, and another 30% being violence that occurs between fellow students (Harjanto et al., 2018).

Apart from the above phenomena of violence and brawls, an attitude of intolerance among students is also developing, which is quite disturbing. The results of a study by Sugihartati et al. (2020) of 500 students in various regions of East Java suggest that even though students have realized the importance of multiculturalism, in practice they often behave ambivalently (Sung et al., 2022). Research data shows that 32.4% of students admitted that they had, 29.2% admitted that they rarely did, and 3.2% admitted that they often carried out acts of intolerance towards other students. Meanwhile, another 36.2% admitted that they had carried out acts of bullying (Mercer, 2005), and 5.8% often carried out acts of persecution against students in the form of verbal abuse, such as harsh words, cursing, scolding, and other similar actions. Bullying was 14.4%, spreading gossip was 11.4%, and physical violence, such as kicking, hitting, and the like, was 6.4%. The data above shows the increasing weakening of solidarity and social cohesion among students (Fonseca et al., 2019).

The data above shows weak social cohesion among students. Social cohesion is the tendency of a group or society to defend itself and unite its components (Rocha et al., 2020). Aspects of social cohesion include a sense of belonging, social trust, generalized reciprocity and cooperation (Velyna et al., 2023), as well as the creation of social harmony among members of the group (Eshuis et al., 2014). Weak social cohesion among students makes it easy for acts of violence to occur, including fights and brawls among students, which are sometimes only triggered by trivial issues such as misunderstandings, boyfriend problems, offenses, grudges, and so on (Sturgis et al., 2014).

The phenomenon of weak social cohesion also occurs among SMK students in Padang City, West Sumatra. The results of Wahidah and Firman's (2020) research on the cohesion of Padang City Vocational High School students seen based on the dimensions of belonging, participation, inclusion, recognition, and appreciation show that most Vocational High School students in Padang City still have a tendency toward social cohesion in the low and medium categories. Forms of low social cohesion include the inclusion dimension of 10%, the participation dimension of 23%, and the dimensions of recognition and appreciation of 25%. Meanwhile, the highest dimension is a sense of belonging at 42% (Heuser, 2005). Weak social cohesion causes widespread fights and brawls among vocational school students in the city of Padang. In 2015, the Civil Service Police Unit (Sat Pol PP) of Padang City recorded that there were 433 cases of brawls that occurred in Padang City, of which 220 (50.8%) were committed by SMK students, while 90 (20.8%) cases were carried out by junior high school students, and as many as 123 (28.4%) cases were committed by non-students.

This gang phenomenon in vocational schools not only causes fights and brawls to easily occur among students but also has an impact on social cohesion among students (Heuser, 2005). In everyday interactions, students are often selective in making friends, only getting along with their group friends and not blending in with other students (Healy, 2019). The existence of gangs or groups causes students to be less cohesive. For example, when dividing study groups determined by the teacher, students often reject the study groups determined by the teacher on the grounds that they do not want to be separated from their close friends or in the same group as other students (Holtug, 2017). The existence of this friendship group causes easy quarrels, fights, mocking and bullying among students (Mona, 2018).

In connection with the phenomenon of weak social cohesion and widespread acts of violence, brawls, and tolerance among students, Islamic Religious Education (PAI) subjects in schools are considered to have an important role in producing and forming a generation with character, religion, and noble morals (Leupold et al., 2018). In the Merdeka Belajar Curriculum in point 5, it is stated that among the learning objectives of PAI and Budi Pekerti is "to form students who uphold the value of unity so that they can strengthen human brotherhood (ukhuwwah basyariyyah), religious brotherhood (ukhuwwah islmiyyah), and the brotherhood of fellow countrymen and nationalities (ukhuwwah waaniyyah) with all its religious, ethnic, and cultural diversity (Meiring, 2010). In PAI Learning Achievements in the Moral Element, it is stated that by learning PAI, students are able to apply ways to overcome the problem of fights between students and believe that religion prohibits fighting between students, getting used to obeying the rules, caring socially, being responsible, loving peace, being polite, mutual respect, national spirit, being honest, innovative, and humble, and so on (Pagani, 2014).

Based on the learning outcomes above, PAI learning is closely related to social cohesion, preventing acts of violence, fighting, brawls, and forming attitudes of tolerance, respect for diversity, and so on. PAI learning in schools not only emphasizes the transfer of knowledge but also emphasizes the importance of forming students' attitudes and behaviors in accordance with Islamic values and teachings. PAI subjects in schools not only form personal piety but also social piety, individuals who always maintain harmonious relationships with the Creator (hablum minallah) and with humans (hablum minannas) in the life of society, nation, and state.

Among the PAI learning approaches that can be offered to anticipate rampant acts of violence, student brawls, reduced intolerance, and weakened social cohesion among students is the Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) approach (O'Grady, 2013; Sari et al., 2020). The CTL approach does not only emphasize cognitive aspects but also requires active student involvement in learning activities, discovering the concepts and material being studied for themselves and linking them to students' real lives (Adim, 2020; Meirawan et al., 2022). The CTL approach also encourages students to apply the knowledge they have in everyday life (Gaol & Simarmata, 2019). Thus, it can be argued that the CTL approach can not only increase students' knowledge and understanding of PAI subject matter but can also increase social cohesion and build tolerance and inclusiveness in students according to Islamic values (Edge et al., 2015; Zuliyanti, Putri & Pujiastuti, 2020).

Awareness of the need to apply the CTL approach in PAI learning is based on the fact that most students have not been able to relate the material being studied to real everyday life and its benefits for the formation of student attitudes and behaviors (Bhathal, 2016; Sulfeni, Wahyu Bagja & Yuliani, 2019). The knowledge obtained by students is still abstract and does not touch on practical aspects related to their daily lives. Through the CTL approach, students are encouraged to elaborate on their knowledge in real life, both in personal, social, and cultural contexts, so that the PAI lessons learned become more meaningful for them. Starting from the description above

(Ahrisya, Ledy., Praherdhiono, Hendry & Adi, 2019; Ambrose et al., 2013), related to the weak social cohesion of students, which causes widespread cases of violence, brawls between students, and the development of attitudes of intolerance among students, the focus of this research is related to the influence of the Islamic Religious Education learning model using contextual teaching and learning on the cohesive attitude of vocational school students in Padang City.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, researchers used a quantitative approach to the type of quasi-experimental research (quasy experiment). The design used in this study is a nonequivalent comparison-group design (Creswell, 2023; Sugiyono, 2020). This research was conducted in the even semester of the 2021–2022 school year, namely from January to April for the 2021–2022 school year. This research was conducted in class XI, SMK 1, Padang City. The sample for this study was 56 students in classes XIA and XIB. Then the two classes were randomly selected to determine which class was given treatment by applying the contextual teaching and learning model and which was not. This research was conducted using the true experiment method, namely applying the contextual teaching and learning model.

The following are the steps in implementing learning using the contextual teaching and learning model at SMK 1 Padang City. The data collection technique used was a questionnaire instrument related to understanding social cohesion. The data analysis technique used is descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistical measures can be classified into two groups, namely mean values and deviation measures. The measure of the middle value consists of the average (mean), median, and mode. Meanwhile, deviation measures consist of variance, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, and distance value (range). The second uses inferential statistics consisting of normality tests, homogeneity tests, and hypothesis tests. The normality test is used to determine whether the sample comes from a normally distributed population or not.

The normality test was carried out on the pre-test and post-test data for the experimental and control groups. If the data is not normal, parametric statistical techniques cannot be used for analysis. Data normality test using SPSS on the results of an understanding questionnaire related to social cohesion carried out in each class, namely the experimental class and the control class. A homogeneity test was conducted to find out whether the research subjects came from homogeneous populations or not. The homogeneity test for the prerequisite data for the t-test in this study used SPSS. The homogeneity test was carried out on the post-test data on students' learning motivation in the two sample data groups, namely the experimental class and the control class.

RESULTS

As for the research results from the pretest results data obtained from the experimental class, the number of respondents was 34. It is carried out before learning begins with the maximum value obtained, which is 109, the minimum value is 65, the average is 88.8, the range is 44, the number of grades is 6, and the length of class is 7, as can be seen from the following table:

Table 1. Experimental Class Pretest Result Data

Interval	Frequency	F relative %	F cumulative
65-71	1	2.94	2.94
72-78	5	14.71	17.65
79-85	6	17.65	35.29
86-93	11	32.35	67.65
94-100	6	17.65	85.29
101-107	4	11.76	97.06
108-204	1	2.94	100.00

Furthermore, the results of the calculation of posttest data were obtained from the experimental class with the same number of respondents, namely 34 students. Done

After learning is carried out using the Contextual Teaching and Learning learning model, with a maximum score of 120, a minimum score of 94, and an average of 108.4,

The range is 26, the number of classes is 6, and the length of class is 4. The following is a table of results from the experimental class posttest.

Table 2. Experimental Class Posttest Results

Interval	Frequency	F relative %	F cumulative
94-97	1	2.94	2.94
98-101	3	8.82	11.76
102-105	5	14.71	26.47
106-109	12	35.29	61.76
110-113	5	14.71	76.47
114-117	3	8.82	85.29
118-121	5	14.71	100.00

Based on the results of the posttest data, it can be concluded that students really understand the concept of social cohesion in following the learning given after participating in learning using the contextual learning model teaching and learning. Pretest results data obtained from the control class with the number of respondents, namely 34 students. Done before learning begins with the maximum value of 97, the minimum value is 66, the average is 84.06, the range is 31, the number of classes is 6 and the length of class is 5, it can be seen from the following table.

Table 3. Control Class Pretest Data Results

Interval	Frequency	F relative %	F cumulative
66-70	3	8.82	8.82
71-75	3	8.82	17.65
76-80	5	14.71	32.35
81-85	5	14.71	47.06
86-90	9	26.47	73.53
91-95	7	20.59	94.12
96-100	2	5.88	100.00

Next, there is posttest result data obtained from the control class with a total of 34 students. Carried out after learning has been carried out and without using the Contextual Teaching and Learning learning model, with a maximum score of 114, a minimum score of 75, and an average of 97.03, The range is 39, the number of classes is 6, and the length of each class is 6, as can be seen from the following table:

Table 4. Control Class Post-test Data Results

Interval	Frequency	F relative %	F cumulative
75-80	2	5.88	5.88
81-86	0	0.00	5.88
87-92	7	20.59	26.47
93-98	10	29.41	55.88
99-104	8	23.53	79.41
105-110	6	17.65	97.06
111-116	1	2.94	100.00

Based on the results of the posttest data, it can be concluded that the control class students do not understand and master the concept of social cohesion in their learning because the control class learns without the

contextual teaching and learning model, in contrast to the xperimental class students, who were initially unmotivated and with Given the contextual teaching and learning model, students were immediately motivated after being given the treatment. From the results of the calculation of the data that has been obtained, it can be concluded that. In experimental classes, students are more motivated to study compared to the control class. Evident from the results of hypothesis testing shows t-count > t-table which is 6.007 > 2.034 then H_0 is rejected and H_a accepted.

This matter due to contextual teaching and learning learning applied in the experimental class. Encouraging students to be more motivated in learning process. Students are formed in several groups so students can discuss about their respective experiences and Provide ideas about the material provided. From the discussion above and based on the research that has been conducted, it can be concluded that students' understanding of the concept of social cohesion using the contextual teaching and learning model in class XI is better than without the contextual teaching and learning model learning.

CONCLUSION

Based on data analysis and testing hypothesis that has been done, it can be withdrawn conclusion that: There are differences in motivation learning students who learn using models contextual teaching and learning with students who learn without models contextual teaching and learning, and proven by the results of hypothesis testing t-count > t-table, namely 6.007 > 2.034, then H_0 is rejected and H_a accepted.

REFERENCES

1. Adim, M. (2020). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Contextual Teaching And Learning (CTL) Menggunakan Media Kartu Terhadap Minat Belajar IPA Kelas IV SD. *Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika Dan Sains*, *3*(1).

2. Ahrisya, Ledy., Praherdhiono, Hendry & Adi, E. P. (2019). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Contextual Teaching And Learning (CTL) Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar. *JKTP: Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, *2*(4).

3. Ambrose, V. K., Davis, C. A., & Ziegler, M. F. (2013). From research to practice: A framework for contextualizing teaching and learning. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *44*(1), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2013.10850371.

4. Bhathal, R. (2016). An appraisal of an online tutorial system for the teaching and learning of engineering physics in conjunction with contextual physics and mathematics, and relevant mathematics. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, *41*(5), 504–511. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2015.1095162.

5. Creswell, J. W. (2023). *RESEARCH DESIGN Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

6. Edge, K., Reynolds, R., & O'Toole, M. (2015). Contextual complexity: The professional learning experiences of seven classroom teachers when engaged in "quality teaching." *Cogent Education*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1120002.

7. Eshuis, J., van Dam, R., van Twist, M., & Anquetil, V. (2014). Understanding Social Cohesion Differences in Common Interest Housing Developments. *Housing, Theory and Society*, *31*(3), 235–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2013.867278.

8. Fonseca, X., Lukosch, S., & Brazier, F. (2019). Social cohesion revisited: a new definition and how to characterize it. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, *32*(2), 231–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2018.1497480.

9. Gaol, R. L., & Simarmata, E. J. (2019). Efektivitas Bahan Ajar Tematik Sekolah Dasar Berbasis Budaya Lokal Melalui Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) Terhadap Aktivitas Belajar Siswa. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Fakultas Ilmu Sosial Universitas Negeri Medan*, *3*(4), 1032–1035.

10. Harjanto, I., Lie, A., Wihardini, D., Pryor, L., & Wilson, M. (2018). Community-based teacher professional development in remote areas in Indonesia. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *44*(2), 212–

231. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2017.1415515.

11. Harmer, B. M. (2009). Teaching in a contextual vacuum: Lack of prior workplace knowledge as a barrier to sensemaking in the learning and teaching of business courses. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *46*(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290802646149.

12. Healy, M. (2019). Belonging, Social Cohesion and Fundamental British Values. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *67*(4), 423–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2018.1506091.

13. Heuser, B. L. (2005). Social cohesion and voluntary associations. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *80*(4), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8004_3.

14. Holtug, N. (2017). Identity, causality and social cohesion. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *43*(7), 1084–1100. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1227697.

15. Leupold, A., Klinger, U., & Jarren, O. (2018). Imagining the City: How local journalism depicts social cohesion. *Journalism Studies*, *19*(7), 960–982. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2016.1245111.

16. Meirawan, D., Komariah, A., Kurniady, D. A., Kurniawan, E., Asri, K. H., Sururi, Rahyasih, Y., Sutarsih, C., & Rahman, F. S. (2022). Leadership in fostering vocational school partnerships in the time of COVID-19. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *6*(May), 1300–1315. https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS6.10672.

17. Meiring, B. (2010). Discourse patterns at social cohesion campaigns. *Language Matters*, *41*(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2010.490559.

18. Mercer, J. A. (2005). Teaching the bible in congregations: A congregational studies pedagogy for contextual education. *Religious Education*, *100*(3), 280–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344080591001979.

19. Mona, N. (2018). Kohesi pada Jaringan Sosial Bullying. *Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.7454/jki.v5i2.8461.

20. O'Grady, K. (2013). The religious dimension of intercultural education. Contributions to a contextual understanding. *British Journal of Religious Education*, *35*(3), 347–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2013.817102.

21. Pagani, C. (2014). Diversity and social cohesion. *Intercultural Education*, *25*(4), 300–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2014.926158.

22. Rocha, H., Kunc, M., & Audretsch, D. B. (2020). Clusters, economic performance, and social cohesion: a system dynamics approach. *Regional Studies*, *54*(8), 1098–1111. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2019.1668550.

23. Sari, P. M. N., Parmiti, D. P., & Sukmana, A. I. W. I. Y. (2020). Efektivitas Hasil Belajar Matematika Melalui Model CTL Berbasis Masalah Terbuka Siswa Kelas IV SD. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar*, *4*(2), 248–256.

24. Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., Kuha, J., & Jackson, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity, segregation and the social cohesion of neighbourhoods in London. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *37*(8), 1286–1309. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.831932.

25. Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

26. Sulfeni, Wahyu Bagja & Yuliani, N. (2019). Model Pembelajaran Contextual Teaching And Learning (CTL) Berbantu Media Miniatur Lingkungan Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar IPS. *Edunomic: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Ekonomi*, *7*(2).

27. Sung, H. Y., Hwang, G. J., Chen, C. Y., & Liu, W. X. (2022). A contextual learning model for developing interactive e-books to improve students' performances of learning the Analects of Confucius. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *30*(3), 470–483. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1664595.

28. Velyna, T., Julia, R., Jepri, S., Afiah, U., Tolitoli, U. M., & Makassar, U. P. (2023). *Upaya Meningkatkan Kohesi Sosial untuk Pencegahan Tawuran Melalui Konseling Realitas*. *7*(2), 5825–5831.

29. Zuliyanti, Putri & Pujiastuti, H. (2020). Model Contextual Teaching Learning (CTL) untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Matematis Siswa SMP. *Jurnal Prisma*, *9*(1).