*IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*
*e-ISSN: 2320–7388,p-ISSN: 2320–737X Volume 7, Issue 5 Ver. VI (Sep. – Oct. 2017), PP 25-31*
*www.iosrjournals.org*

# Influence Of Contextual Teaching Learning (CTL) Learning Model and Critical Thinking ON THE Learning Results of Civic Education for 7th Grade Students of Imelda School Medan School Year 2017/2018

Minar Trisnawati Tobing[1]; Daulat Saragi[2]; Reh Bungana Perangin angin[3]
[1](Post Graduate, State University of Medan, Medan, Indonesia)
[2](Lecturer, State University of Medan, Medan, Indonesia)
[3](Lecturer, State University of Medan, Medan, Indonesia)
*Corresponding Author: Minar Trisnawati Tobing*

***Abstract***: *This study aims to determine: (1) differences of Civic Education learning outcomes that are taught by CTL learning approach with Civic Education learning outcomes that are taught by Expository learning approach; (2) differences of Civic Education learning outcomes that have higher critical thinking with Civic Education learning outcomes that have low critical thinking; and (3) the interaction between CTL learning approaches and critical thinking on learning outcomes of Civic Education. The population of this study is all students of VII grade Imelda Junior High School on School Year 2017/2018 for even semester which consist 2 classes. The sample of this study is determined randomly by cluster random sampling technique, by taking two classes with the total of each class is 30 children. This research method uses Quasi Experimental Research. The instrument that is used in this study is a test of Civic Education learning outcomes in the form of multiple choice as many as 40 questions and Critical Thinking Study questionnaire instrument as many as 25 statements. The data analysis that is used is 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA. Based on the research results obtained: (1) learning result of Civics Education student of CTL learning approach is higher than the result of learning of Civics student of Expository Learning Approach with average score of CTL approach = 80,29 and the average score of Expository approach = 61,48 (2) The result of Civic learning of students who have higher learning critical thinking is higher than the result of Civics learning of students who have low critical thinking with high average critical thinking score = 79.89 and average low critical thinking score = 61.51; and (3) there is and interaction between learning approach and critical thinking of learning toward student's learning result with average score of CTL approach with high critical thinking = 87,25 and low = 73,33 while mean score of Expository approach with high critical thinking = 72.53 and critical thinking is low = 49.7. The results of the research are expected to be applied for teachers and schools in using CTL learning approach in improving student learning outcomes. In addition, it is necessary to improve students' critical thinking in learning in the classroom*.

***Keywords***: *CTL approach, Critical Thinking Learning, Learning Outcomes*

---

Date of Submission: 05-10-2017 Date of acceptance: 18-10-2017

---

## I. Introduction

Learning is a complex process that occurs in all individuals and both in terms of adult, children and parents. The process of learning lasts a lifetime, from infancy to death. [1] "Learning is a process whereby behavior is generated or changed through practice or exercise." [2]"Learning is a process of doing an individual effort to gain a whole new behavioral change, as a result of the individual's own experience in interaction with his environment." [3] From some expert opinions about the meaning of learning, it can be concluded that learning is a series of activities of body and soul to obtain a change in behavior as a result of individual experience in interaction with the environment that involves cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. Based on field observations that are found, the average value of mid terms examination (UTS) is still relatively low from the value of KKM that has been implemented by SMP Imelda.

**Table 1.** Data UTS Case SMP Imelda

| No | Subject | School Year | Average Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Civic Education | 2013-2014 | 68.34 |
| 2 | Civic Education | 2014-2015 | 69.75 |
| 3 | Civic Education | 2015-2016 | 71.00 |

The data above show that the acquisition of learning outcomes of Civics is still relatively low where the subject of Civics has 70 KKM, but the fact is still low in which the value that is obtained by students is still under the criteria of completeness that has been set. It is caused by the lack of understanding of students on the concept of learning Civics. They consider that the Civics is a boring subject. Another issue that is put forward is the lack of attention of teachers in developing learning skills. To overcome various problems in the implementation of learning above, it takes a more effective and inovative model of learning that makes students be more active during the learning lasts, so that there is a paradigm shift learning that originally centered on the teacher (teacher centered) which is switched to student-centered learning (student centered); the methodology that is originally more dominated by Expository learning turned to the CTL learning model. There is an assumption about learning that connects that the students will learn well if the environment is created naturally. Learning will be more meaningful if students experience what they learn, not knowing. Learning-oriented assignment of learning outcomes proves to fail to equip students to solve problems in life they face. Learning outcomes are the learning outcomes that have been achieved from a learning process that has been done by learners, so to know a job is successful or not, it requires a measurement. The results are raw scores that have not been able to provide information on the ability of the learners. In order to provide the expected information about the learner's abilities, an assessment of the entire teaching-learning process will be performed so that it will show many things that are achieved during the teaching and learning process. According to the researchers, the use of CTL learning model will be very memorable and meaningful to the learners because the educational process that aims to help learners to see the meaning in Social Science learning with daily life, will be able to help learners to develop skills in the cognitive process of the introduction of learners.

**LITERATUREREVIEW**

[5] defines that learning is an active process in which students build new knowledge based on the experience / knowledge they already have. In the view of constructivism 'learning' is not merely the transfer of knowledge that exists outside of itself, still learning more about how the brain processes and interprets the new experience with the knowledge it already has in the new format. This development process can be either assimilated or accommodated. Based on some of the opinion above, the researcher concludes that learning is a series of activity of body and soul to obtain a change of behavior as a result of individual experience in interaction with its environment which concerns cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

## II. Method

Research method that is used by the researcher is "Quasi Experimental Method" with research design as the base of research implementation. It is to distinguish the influence of learning model of CTL and influence of model of Expository learning toward the result of Civic learning in high critical thinking and low critical thinking where the treatment class is VII A and class VII B with the total number is 60 people, the sample is all students of class VII. The instruments used are observation sheets and objective tests. Data analysis techniques are normality test, homogeneity test, test and normalized gain test, and hypothesis technique using ANOVA test.

## III. Results

**Table 2.** Normality Test of Pretest Data

**Test of Normality**

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Pretes_CTL | ,154 | 30 | ,068 | ,946 | 30 | ,131 |
| Pretes_eks | ,134 | 30 | ,180 | ,943 | 30 | ,108 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

In table 2. shows that the value of normality pretest CTL class of 0.946 with significance of 0.131 because of the significance is greater than 0.05 then the data pre-test of CTL is normal distribution. Furthermore, the normality value of the Expository class is 0.943 with significance is 0.108 because of significance is greater than 0.05 then the data pre-test Expository is normally distributed.

**Table 3.** Test of Homogeneity of Variences

Pre-test CTL

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2,596 | 5 | 16 | ,067 |

Test results show the value of F for pre-test is 2.596 with significance is 0.067. This value indicates that pre-test data has the same variance because the value of sig. is 0.067> 0.05. In other words the pre-test results of both homogeneous classes.

**Post-test Learning Outcomes**

**Table 4.** Result of Normality Test Result of Student Post-test Study

**Tests of Normality**

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Post-test_CTL | ,206 | 30 | ,002 | ,951 | 30 | ,175 |
| Post-test _ekspository | ,135 | 30 | ,171 | ,937 | 30 | ,074 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

**Table 5.** Interagency Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Post-test _CTL

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2,409 | 8 | 15 | ,068 |

**Result of Questionnaire Critical Thinking**

**Tabel 6.** Grouping Students Based on Critical Thinking

| | Critical Thinking | | | Critical Thinking | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Learning Model** | **High (H)** | **Low (L)** | **Learning Model** | **High (H)** | **Low (L)** |
| **CTL** | 96,6 | 88,6 | **Expository** | 80,7 | 59,1 |
| | 96,6 | 86,4 | | 80,7 | 58,0 |
| | 96,6 | 85,2 | | 75,0 | 58,0 |
| | 94,3 | 84,1 | | 73,9 | 56,8 |
| | 94,3 | 77,3 | | 73,9 | |
| | 94,3 | 73,9 | | 73,9 | |
| | 93,2 | 73,9 | | 73,9 | |
| | 93,2 | 65,0 | | 72,7 | |
| | 93,2 | | | 72,7 | |
| | 93,2 | | | 71,6 | |
| | 93,2 | | | 71,6 | |
| | 92,0 | | | 71,6 | |
| | 92,0 | | | 70,5 | |
| | 90,9 | | | 70,5 | |
| | 90,9 | | | 65,9 | |
| | 90,9 | | | 65,9 | |
| | 90,9 | | | 65,9 | |
| | 90,9 | | | 65,9 | |
| | 89,8 | | | 65,9 | |
| | 89,8 | | | 64,8 | |
| | 89,8 | | | 63,6 | |
| | 89,8 | | | 63,6 | |
| | | | | 62,5 | |
| | | | | 61,4 | |
| | | | | 61,4 | |
| | | | | 60,2 | |
| **N** | 22 | 8 | **N** | 26 | 4 |

Next is grouping of students with high and low critical thinking in each class. Grouping is done based on average critical thinking of all students. Students with above-average critical thinking are classified as high critical thinking groups, while students with critical thinking below average are classified as low critical thinking groups. The mean total critical thinking in the CTL class is 89 so that the value> 89 is classified as high critical thinking whiles the value <89 is considered low critical thinking. The result of grouping can be seen in table 6. Based on table 6 the number of students with high critical thinking CTL class is 22 students while low critical thinking for 8 students, while the number of students with high critical thinking in Expository class is 26 students while critical thinking low is 4 students. So from 60 students, the total students think critically high as many as 48 students and low critical thinking as many as 12 students

**Table 7.** Grouping Post-test Based Student Value Level of Critical Thinking

| | Experiment Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No** | **No. Respondent** | **Result Study** | **Value of Critical Thinking** | **Level of Critical Thinking** | **No. Respondent** | **Result Study** | **Value of Critical Thinking** | **Level of Critical Thinking** |
| **1** | **C8** | **82,4** | **96,6** | **High** | **C1** | **52,9** | **80,7** | **High** |
| **2** | **C20** | **85,3** | **96,6** | **High** | **C2** | **58,8** | **80,7** | **High** |
| **3** | **C28** | **97,1** | **96,6** | **High** | **C4** | **52,9** | **75,0** | **High** |
| **4** | **C2** | **94,1** | **94,3** | **High** | **C12** | **67,6** | **73,9** | **High** |
| **5** | **C9** | **82,4** | **94,3** | **High** | **C16** | **79,4** | **73,9** | **High** |
| **6** | **C22** | **76,5** | **94,3** | **High** | **C18** | **76,5** | **73,9** | **High** |
| **7** | **C13** | **82,4** | **93,2** | **High** | **C19** | **79,4** | **73,9** | **High** |
| **8** | **C18** | **88,2** | **93,2** | **High** | **C3** | **58,8** | **72,7** | **High** |
| **9** | **C19** | **73,5** | **93,2** | **High** | **C26** | **70,6** | **72,7** | **High** |
| **10** | **C21** | **70,6** | **93,2** | **High** | **C15** | **64,7** | **71,6** | **High** |
| **11** | **C26** | **79,4** | **93,2** | **High** | **C22** | **73,5** | **71,6** | **High** |
| **12** | **C6** | **82,4** | **92,0** | **High** | **C29** | **50,0** | **71,6** | **High** |
| **13** | **C17** | **82,4** | **92,0** | **High** | **C8** | **50,0** | **70,5** | **High** |
| **14** | **C1** | **82,4** | **90,9** | **High** | **C17** | **41,2** | **70,5** | **High** |
| **15** | **C4** | **76,5** | **90,9** | **High** | **C5** | **52,9** | **65,9** | **High** |
| **16** | **C15** | **82,4** | **90,9** | **High** | **C10** | **44,1** | **65,9** | **High** |
| **17** | **C25** | **82,4** | **90,9** | **High** | **C13** | **61,8** | **65,9** | **High** |
| **18** | **C30** | **85,3** | **90,9** | **High** | **C24** | **70,6** | **65,9** | **High** |
| **19** | **C11** | **82,4** | **89,8** | **High** | **C27** | **82,4** | **65,9** | **High** |
| **20** | **C16** | **82,4** | **89,8** | **High** | **C7** | **82,4** | **64,8** | **High** |
| **21** | **C23** | **82,4** | **89,8** | **High** | **C25** | **61,8** | **63,6** | **High** |
| **22** | **C27** | **82,4** | **89,8** | **High** | **C30** | **55,9** | **63,6** | **High** |
| | | | | | **C23** | **41,2** | **62,5** | **High** |
| | | | | | **C14** | **52,9** | **61,4** | **High** |
| | | | | | **C28** | **41,2** | **61,4** | **High** |
| | | | | | **C6** | **55,9** | **60,2** | **High** |
| **Average** | | **82,5** | **92,6** | | | **60,7** | **69,2** | |
| **23** | **C14** | **76,5** | **88,6** | **Low** | **C9** | **76,5** | **59,1** | **Low** |
| **24** | **C7** | **91,2** | **86,4** | **Low** | **C20** | **41,2** | **58,0** | **Low** |
| **25** | **C24** | **70,6** | **85,2** | **Low** | **C21** | **79,4** | **58,0** | **Low** |
| **26** | **C5** | **76,5** | **84,1** | **Low** | **C11** | **55,9** | **56,8** | **Low** |
| **27** | **C29** | **82,4** | **77,3** | **Low** | | | | |
| **28** | **C3** | **91,2** | **73,9** | **Low** | | | | |
| **29** | **C12** | **82,4** | **73,9** | **Low** | | | | |
| **30** | **C10** | **82,4** | **65,0** | **Low** | | | | |
| **Average** | | **81,6** | **79,3** | | | **63,2** | **58,0** | |

Based on table 8. can be explained that the average of student learning outcomes in the CTL class is 82.5 with high critical thinking is 92.5 and average student learning outcomes is 81.6 with low critical thinking is 79.3 while the average learning outcomes in the Expository class is 60, 7 with high critical thinking 69.2 and learning outcomes is 63.2 with low critical thinking is 58.0. Pre-test t test is used to examine differences in student learning outcomes applied with the CTL model and the expository model. After the data of the research result is known the distribution of data is normal, and has homogeneous variance, and then t test can be used. If value> 0,05 then Ho accepted and Ha rejected. If the value of sig <0,05 then Ha accepted and Ho rejected.

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Gain | Equal variances assumed | 1,464 | ,236 | ,111 | 28 | ,912 | ,32667 | 2,94503 | -5,70595 | 6,35928 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | ,111 | 26,163 | ,913 | ,32667 | 2,94503 | -5,72508 | 6,37842 |

Based on the result of t test output above can be known sig score of equal variances assumed value 0,65> 0,05 hence concluded Ho accepted (Ha rejected) which mean there is no difference of learning result of student with model of CTL and Expository

4.4.3. t Test Post-test

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Gain | Equal variances assumed | 4,680 | ,039 | ,911 | 28 | ,370 | 4,20000 | 4,60779 | -5,23863 | 13,63863 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | ,911 | 23,172 | ,371 | 4,20000 | 4,60779 | -5,32803 | 13,72803 |

Based on the result of t test output above can be known sig score of equal variances assumed value is 0,39 < 0,05 then concluded Ha accepted (Ho rejected) which mean there is difference of learning result of student with model of CTL and Expository

**Hypothesis testing**

**Table 9.** Factual Design Facts 2x2

| **Critical Thinking** | **Average of the Result Study** | | **Average Total** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | CTL | Expository | |
| High | 87,5 | 64,95 | 76,22 |
| Low | 80,45 | 60,6 | 70,52 |
| Average Total | 83,97 | 62,77 | |

To see the difference of Critical Thinking and student learning outcomes to the learning given, Two Way Anova Test is used by selecting the General Linear Model (GLM) Univariate on SPSS 20. The test also aims to see how the Critical Thinking effect on student learning outcomes, whether students with Thinking Critical high has high learning outcomes or vice versa, as well as whether the interaction of learning models and Critical Thinking affects student learning outcomes.

**Table 10.** Inter-Factor Factor Data

**Between-Subjects Factors**

| | | Value Label | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Critical Thinking | 1 | High | 30 |
| | 2 | Low | 30 |
| Model Learning | 1 | CTL | 30 |
| | 2 | Expository | 30 |

Description of output statistics from Anova data Critical thinking and learning outcomes are presented in Table 10. This table shows that the overall total of students with high critical thinking and critical thinking is low on CTL and Expository classes. Overall students with high critical thinking as many as 43 students and low critical think as many as 17 students.
Furthermore, the results of the two Anova tests are shown in Table 10.

**Table 11.** Two Path ANOVA Test Results

**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Dependent Variable: Result of Study

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 10692,183[a] | 3 | 3564,061 | 108,621 | ,000 |
| Intercept | 299485,350 | 1 | 299485,350 | 9127,338 | ,000 |
| Critical Thinking | 5510,417 | 1 | 5510,417 | 167,940 | ,000 |
| Model Learning | 4878,017 | 1 | 4878,017 | 148,666 | ,000 |
| Critical Thinking * Model Learning | 303,750 | 1 | 303,750 | 9,257 | ,004 |
| Error | 1837,467 | 56 | 32,812 | | |
| Total | 312015,000 | 60 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 12529,650 | 59 | | | |

a. R Squared = ,853 (Adjusted R Squared = ,845)

## IV. Discussion

Learning outcomes is the achievement of educational goals in students who follow the learning process. Learning outcomes are the realization of the achievement of educational goals, so that the measured learning outcome depends on the purpose of education. Learning outcomes need to be evaluated as intended to reflect whether the established goals have been achieved and whether the teaching-learning process has been effective for achieving learning outcomes. Morality is a willingness to accept, exercise rules, values and moral principles. A person can be said to be morally if the person's behavior is in accordance with the value of moral values that are upheld by his social group. A good person is a person who has a moral and a bad person is a moral person. Moral can not be achieved by memorizing or learning rules, but requires interaction with the external environment.

## V. Conclusion

**1. The first hypothesis**

H0: μA1 = μA2: no effect of CTL learning model on student learning outcomes
Ha: μA1 ≠ μA2: there is an influence of CTL learning model on student learning outcomes
Based on the results of Anova in table 11 obtained value of learning model significance of 0,000 because sig.0,000<0.05 then the hypothesis test results reject H0 or receive Ha in the level of 5% alpha. This shows that there is an influence of CTL learning model on student learning outcomes. Because the average of learning outcomes of students taught with CTL learning model is higher than that taught with Expository learning it can be concluded that the learning model of CTL gives better influence to student learning outcome than Expository model.

**2. Second hypothesis**

H0: μB1 = μB2: there is no effect of critical thinking on learning outcomes of students' Civics learning
H0: μB1 ≠ μB2: there is an effect of critical thinking on learning outcomes of students' Civics learning
Based on the results of Anova in Table 4:13 obtained the significance value of critical thinking learning by 0,000 because sig 0,000 <0.05 then the hypothesis test results reject H0 or accept the Ha in the level of 5% alpha. This shows that there is influence of critical thinking learn to student learning result of Civ. Because mean of result of student learning which have high critical thinking higher than those having low critical thinking hence can be concluded high critical thinking give better influence to result of student learning than think critically low.

**3. Hypothesis third**

H0: A> B = 0: there is no interaction between the learning model and the critical thinking of learning on student learning outcomes
Ha: A><B ≠ : there is an interaction between the learning model and the critical thinking of learning on student learning outcomes
Based on the results of Anova in table 4:13 obtained significance value of learning model of students' critical thinking is 0.000 because sig.0,000 <0.05 then the hypothesis test results reject Ho or accept Ha in 5% alpha level. This shows that there is an interaction between the learning model and critical thinking of learning on student learning outcomes.

## References


[1]. Djamarah, Syaiful Bahri. 2011. *Psikologi Belajar*. Jakarta : PT Rineka Cipta
[2]. Ary, D. Jacobs. LC dan Razaviech, A. 1982. Pengantar Penelitian Dalam Pendidikan. Usaha Nasional : Surabaya.
[3]. Arikunto, S, 2009. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas.* Jakarta: Penerbit Bumi Aksara
[4]. Azra, Azyumardi. 2003. Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan (*Civic Education*), Demokrasi Hak Asasi Manusia dan Masyarakat Madani. Jakarta: Prenanda Media
[5]. Aryawan,I Komang Budi Mas, I Wayan Lamawan, & I Made Yudana. 2014. "Pengaruh Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Attension dan Motivasi Berprestasi Terhadap Hasil Belajar IPS pada Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar Negeri di Gugus",*Jurnal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1)2014.
[6]. Atmaja,Putu Guna, I Wayan Lasmawan, & Nyoman Natajaya. 2014. " Pengaruh Pendekatan Pembelajaran Kontekstual Terhadap Sikap Sosial danhasil Belajar Dalam Pembelajaran IPS Kelas V di SD Negeri Gugus Singakerta",*Jurnal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1) 2014.
[7]. Bagus, Ida & Suryadi Made. "Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kontekstual (CTL) Terhadap Keterampilan Berpikir Kritis Siswa Dalam Pembelajaran Geografi Pada Kelas X di SMA Negeri 4 Singaraja". Jurnal Pendidikan Geografi,Fis Undiksha.
[8]. Daryanto. 2010. *Belajar dan Mengajar*. Bandung : CV Yrama Widya_____ 2012. *Model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Malang : Gava Media
[9]. Fadil, Yudia. 2013. Peran Guru Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan Dalam Upaya Pembentukan Karakter Peserta Didik". Jurnal PPKN UNJ ONLINE.1(2) 2013.
[10]. Fisher, alec. 2008. Berpikir Kritis Sebuah Pengantar. Jakarta: Erlangga
[11]. Hamalik, Oemar. 2001. Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara_____ 2010. *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta : PT Bumi Aksara
[12]. Hartono, Ridu. 2013. *Ragam Model Mengajar Yang Mudah Diterima Murid*. Jogjakarta : DIVA Press
[13]. Johnson, E. B. 2002. Contekstual Teaching and Learning: Menjadikan Kegiatan Belajar Mengajar Mengasyikan dan Bermakna. Bandung: Mizan Learning Center
[14]. Komalasari, Kokom. 2010. *Pembelajaran Kontekstual Konsep dan Aplikasi.* Bandung : Refika Aditama
[15]. Mulyana Tatang. 2009. "Pembelajaran Analitik Sintetik untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis dan Kreatif Matematik Siswa SMA", jurnal Educationst, 3. 2009
[16]. Munadi, Sudji . 2013. " Pengaruh Pemanfaatan Internet, Lingkungan dan Motivasi Belajar Terhadap Prestasi Belajar Siswa", *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, 3(3)2013.
[17]. Mustamiin, M. Zainal & Wayan Lasmawan. 2013. " Pengaruh Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Learning Tipe Jigsaw Terhadap Hasil Belajar IPS Ditinjau dari Motivasi Belajar Siswa",*Jurnal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Dasar*, 3(3) 2013.
[18]. Rusman. 2011. *Model-Model Pembelajaran*. Jakarta : Kencana Media Group.
[19]. Sanjaya . 2009. Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.
[20]. Siwalatri, Ni Md, W. Lasmawan, & N. Dantes. 2013. " Pengaruh Pembelajaran Kontekstual Berbantuan Media Gambar Terhadap Hasil Belajar IPS Ditinjau dari Motivasi Berprestasi Siswa Kelas IV Sdnegeri 1 Simarapura Tengah",*Jurnal Program Studi Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Dasar*, 3 (3) 2013.
[21]. Sunaryo Yoni. 2014. "Model Pembelajaran Berbasis Masalah Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Dan Kreatif Matematik Siswa SMA Di Kota Tasikmalaya" Jurnal Pendidikan dan Keguruan. 1(2) 2014.


Minar Trisnawati Tobing. "Influence Of Contextual Teaching Learning (CTL) Learning Model and Critical Thinking ON THE Learning Results of Civic Education for 7th Grade Students of Imelda School Medan School Year 2017/2018." IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME) , vol. 7, no. 5, 2017, pp. 25–31.