A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE BEHAVIOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL CARE AMONG THE GROUPS OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION IN THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, YOGYAKARTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Oleh: Bambang Syaeful Hadi
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
bb_saifulhadi@lycos.com

Abstract

This study aims to investigate: (1) the role of attitudes and subjective norms on shaping the students` behavior toward environmental awareness, and; (2) the difference between the behavior toward environment among students who attended environment-plus education, those attending PKLH environmental education, and those not attending PKLH environmental education. The population's 2,507 students of FIS UNY in 2006 to 2009. 338 respondents were established as the sample using the proportional sampling and systematic random sampling technique. The data were collected using a questionnaire. The behavioral measurement was done using the Extended Fishbein Model. The data analysis techniques used were descriptive analysis and One Way Anova, with the significance level of 0.05. The results show that the students generally do not care much about the environment. Of the three groups of students, students who earn course PKLH Plus and students who earn course PKLH behave less ordinary care. Non PKLH student groups have no care for the environment behavior.Their indifference to the environment is caused by their lack of knowledge on the impact of such behavior on the environment. The attitude attribute has a greater weight than subjective norm attribute. Of the three groups of students, those taking PKLH Plus and ordinary PKLH are indifferent to the environment, while students' non PKLH do not care about the environment. The Anova result reveals the value of F = 6.948 with the significance level p=of 0.001, which means that there is a significant difference in the behavior toward the environment among the three groups of students who obtain a different portion of environmental education.

.

Keywords: environment education, believe, norms, behavior intention

Introduction

Today, the environmental awareness of the community is very low. Human behavior that reflects ignorance, indifference, greed and arrogance of human power has made the environment as a target tyrany of their actions. The greed has driven humans to mistreat the environment by exploiting excessive. Conversion of forests into oil palm plantations, particularly in Sumatra and Kalimantan, which reached 400,000 hectares/year, so now reaches an area of 8.4 million acres (MPBI, 2010) has been a source of floods and in the long run will be the cause of the drought,. Flooding is a phenomenon that occurs due to errors and mistakes of view of human behavior in managing the environment (Aris Marfai, 2005:17-18).

Chiras (1985:454-460) has classified environmental destructive factors from human into four, namely: human behavior frontier mentality, technological difficulties (tecnological fix), subjective personal views, and the public work together low. Frontier mentality, demonstrated by the following properties: skin-encapsulated ego, cavalier attitude, derived self, reaffirmation throught materialism, biological imperealism, judeo christian teaching. Technological difficulties in question is the difficulty or impasse in obtaining/using certain materials or techniques that are environmentally friendly. Personal views, which include: apathy selfishness, lack of sense of meaning, the value of space and time are limited, low synergize community.

To minimize the development of elements of society into damaging agent environment, it is necessary environmental education to the public, either through formal or non-formal. Environmental education in schools for the new inserted on certain materials that may be related to the environment. In universities, especially in the educational institutions of educational personel (LPTK), environmental education've got good attention, including in UNY. UNY carry out an environmental education into a university compulsory subjects. The name of the subject is Population and Environment Education (PKLH). With the educational environment for students is expected to be a scholar to understand their position themselves as being inhabitants of the earth, which is aware of itself as a part of the environment, care for environment and strive to preserve the environment.

Environmental education recognized by all parties is important because behavior and human action on the environment is very influential on the future of mankind and the environment. Environmental calamities in different parts of the world, including in Indonesia among caused by human activity. Therefore at the university, especially in an environment fostering LPTK assigned teacher candidates,

labeled PKLH environmental education courses that are required as in the group of Personality Development Course (MPK) must be taken by all students. Given the importance of environmental education for students, then the dynamics of the development of the curriculum (Curriculum 1986, the Curriculum 1998, Curriculum 2000, Curriculum 2000 Supplements) PKLH always survive as the character universiter MPK. Ironically, when environmental problems become increasingly serious, even threatening the future of humanity, it was born in 2002 in UNY curriculum policy that puts PKLH course not as a compulsory subject that is a university, although it is still listed in the group of MPK.

UNY decisions that led to PKLH eliminated from the curriculum of various courses are signs of making the provision of the number of courses that exceed MPK decree by the minister of Indonesia numbers 045/U/2002 232/U/2000. The guidelines contain provisions classification and the number of course credits, each classification is 10% of MPK, 20% of MKK (Scientific and Skills Course), 50% of MKB (Skills Course Work), 10% of MPB (Behavior Course Work), and 10% of MBB (living societal Course). Generally, the reason many departement do not take PKLH as part of the MPK because PKLH can be integrated into other courses on specific topics. According to the research Bambang Syaeful Hadi (2008:44) in the FIS UNY, as much as 96% of lecturers never integrate environmrntal subject, but only 10% do so in a planned lecturers, even alarming 64% of lecturers just do it improvised. This condition is pathetic, because the course has an important role in the effort to establish an environmentally conscious behavior.

Implementation of Curriculum 2002 in UNY gives freedom to the majors to choose courses including MPK group. Giving the freedom of an impact on the difference in species composition MPK courses taken by majors / programs of study. One of the subjects that make MPK composition of each course being different is PKLH Course. There majors are taking the course as part of the MPK PKLH and majors that do not put it there.

The birth of the curriculum in 2002 implies a variation in the compotition of MPK courses each departement in the FIS. Many departments do not put the environment education on a group MPK. In the context of this variation in environmental education courses can be grouped into three, namely: (a) courses that put PKLH as MPK; (b) courses that are not installed in the MPK PKLH curriculum, and (c) installing PKLH courses in MPK his education as well as other environmental gain. The existence of such differences would theoretically affect the formation of positive student behavior on the environment. It's just that in practice often only PKLH learning evaluation to determine the cognitive aspect. While affective and psychomotor aspects have not been adequately measured. Various kinds of attitude measurement model has not been applied by the lecturer of PKLH to measure the success of educational learning environment, including the very popular Fishbein model was not used. Fishbein models can be used for a variety of aspects, including to measure environmental concern. For this purpose, the attributes to be modified.

Environmentally conscious behavior is affective domains. Based on Kohlberg's theory of moral development (Reimer, Paolitto and Hersh, 1983:94-103), behavior is influenced by cognitive moral. Cognitive moral knowledge is a set of values that lead people to behave and act (moral action). Environmental education in FIS UNY is an effort to provide students with knowledge and a set of environmental values, so the students are expected to behave caring environment. While in the school, there are many students from several majors who are not getting an education environment, then the theory is based on the moral development of students who obtain environmental education with students who did not obtain environmental education will have the knowledge and environmental values and different behavior. Set of knowledge and environmental values held this student expressed in the form of attitudes and moral behavior based on the environment.

The results Syaeful Bambang Hadi (2007:40) indicates that 66.67% of students FIS UNY never take action to maintain the cleanliness of the campus environment, this fact shows that the awareness of the students to keep the campus environment is still very low. Even among professors (most of which came from the direction you want PKLH integrated learning), 54% of professors never encourage students to pay attention to cleanliness of the classroom. This show is still very low academic concern about the cleanliness of the campus environment.

Pattern of differences in environmental education in a variety of majors in the FIS UNY implications for inequality in an effort to provide a set of knowledge. According to Fishbein and Ajzen (1975:340-341) cognition can form a belief set, then along with the influence of others' opinions (subjective norm) as a reference can shape behavior. PKLH a way to equip a set of environmental knowledge, so based on the knowledge and behavior of students may be concerned about the environment. Extended Fishbein Model gives space to determine the role of people in the surrounding students instrumental in shaping behavior, in this case teachers and friends. This model allows to determine which factors contribute to the formation of a more environmentally conscious behavior of students who receive different environmental education portion. Portion in the sense there is a group of students who earn course

credits in environmental education that many (PKLH Plus), there are only 2 credits, and there is no gain. Based on these facts reveal the influence of researchers interested in environmental education in shaping the behavior of the students care about the environment.

Research Methods

This research is a comparative study, which compared the behavioral tendencies (behavioral intention) environmental awareness of students in various courses/majors, FIS UNY. Comparison of the behavior was due to differences in environmental education portion between groups of students (course of study). This study was conducted in April-August 2009 with a shot in the FIS UNY The study population was all students S-1 FIS UNY. Students who used force population is 2006 to 2009. The reason is (1) for the students of 2004 and 2005 has passed and most of the rest are not actively taking courses so difficult to find, (2) student class of 2010, has not received PKLH courses, both students in the curriculum and students are PKLH Education Geography obtaining environmental education a plus. Based on these reasons, the study population are is defined as in 2507.

The population consists of 10 departments / study programs are classified into three, namely:

a. Students who received environmental education courses plus (PKLH plus other environmental subjects). Students are included in this group are students of Geography Education. Group of students is 266 people.

b. Students who received environmental education courses (PKLH), outside the Geography Education Program, the student PKnH Studies (219) Student), Economic Education (273 students), History Education (229 students), and the Sociology of Education (223 students) . The group consists of 944 people.

c. Students who do not obtain environmental education (PKLH).

d. This group is a student of Department / Office Administration Program (231 students), Accounting Education Studies (294 students), Accounting Study Program (243 students), History of Science Program (91 students), and Program Management Studies (438 students). The student group is the number of students in 1297.

For the determination of the number of samples in this study using the calculation Krejcie and Morgan (Huseini Usman and Setiady Akbar, 2009:49). Of the population, based on the formula obtained a sample of 338 students. The sampling technique used is a combination of proportional sampling and systematic random sampling.

Procedur of analysis of behavior intention with Fisbein Model can be done as step by step below. The data measured in this study is the score of student behavior on the environment. Attitude measurement in this study is to use Feshbein Expanded Model (Extended Feshbein Model.) This model is in principle calculate Ab (Attitude toward behavior), ie, by calculating the overall attributes (multiatribut) in the form of an attitude towards the object and intention to act, then accompanied by the influence of the reference group (people around) with a certain weight. The model can be formulated as follows:

$$Bi \approx (w1.Ab) + (w2.SN)$$

Bi = Behavior Intenstion, w1 = weight for Ab, w2 = weights for SN, Ab = attitude toward the behavior on the basis of her conviction

Analysis procedure is as follows:

1. Calculating Belief (Ab) against certain behaviors, ie, beliefs about the consequences for committing an act. Ab is expressed by the following formula:

$$Ab = \sum b_i x e_i$$

Ab = attitude toward the behavior, Bi = consumer confidence to the consequences of i, Ei = evaluation of the consequences of consumer i

Attitude in this study were classified into three, namely good, moderate, and not good. The classification is based on the possibility of all items answered with a score of maximum and minimum, selanjutkan calculated by the formula, so as to know the lowest score was 20 and the highest score of 300.

2. Calculate Subjective Norm (SN)

$$SN = \sum b_i x m_i$$

bi = belief in the opinion of the reference group, mi = the desire to keep the reference group opinion

3. Calculate the weights w1 and w2, w1 and w2 amount is 100%. w1 is the weight for Ab and w2 are weights for SN. The weight calculation can be done in two ways, namely: (1) based on past data which further created regression models, and (2) make an average of w1 and w2 are obtained from respondents' opinions. In this study the method used is a second way.

4. Calculate the behavior intention (BI) or behave goals, which is the product Ab with SN, taking into account the weights w1 and w2. BI is the formula to calculate:

$$BI = (w1Ab) + (w2SN).$$

w1Ab = proportion by weight which determines the attitude and behavior norms w2SN = proportion by weight which determines the behavior.

To be able to perform descriptive analysis, attitude scores were classified into 3 classes. Classification scores can not be done just by simply summing the scores of each item answer the question, because the score of each group answers each question is processed by using a specific formula. In addition, the two variables (attitude and subjective norm) have different weights, so that if the respondent scores on both variables equal, the possibility of different behavior score, because the weight of the two variables are not equal. Based on calculations using the model of behavior by Fishbein Extended seen that attitude score was 40-160 and subjective norm score was 20-80. If we assume that both variables have weights (w1 and w2) miniml and maximum, the behavior score (Bi) is the lowest and 32 the highest is 130.

Reasons for these models is due to: (1) this model can be used to compare attitudes between people who are directly and indirectly, a case / incident. (2) early Feshbein models only measure positive attitude may not necessarily be followed by action. The draft measure student progress to compute the behavior of the environment in this study were: (1) calculate the attitude (Ai) against certain behaviors, (2) calculate the wiki norm (SN), (3) calculate the weights w1 and w2, and (4) Counting behavior (B) or together with behavioral intention (BI), which is the product Ab with SN, taking into account the weights w1 and w2.

Research data collection techniques are (1) the questionnaire is closed, (2) Documentation. Questionnaire prepared using a Likert Scale. Alternative answer: SS / SP = Strongly Agree / Very Important, S / P = Agree / Important, N = Neutral, TS / TP = Disagree / Not Important, STS / STP = Strongly Disagree / Very Not Important. Alternative answer "important" is used specifically to answer / respond to statements that contain an evaluation component.

Analysis techniques are used to test the answer the problem is (1) performed a descriptive analysis using frequency tables, mean, median, and mode. (2) a single classification Anova (Oneway Anova). Anova test results dinjutkan with further testing in the form of post hoc test and homogeneous subsets. Attitude data normality test results for all three groups of students is normal. Test of homogeneity of variance test results show that the F-statistic Levene coefficient of 0.094 with p = 0.910. Because the probability value> 0.05, can be taken the decision that the three variances are not equal (homogeneous). Based on these facts, the data can be further tested against the data with ANOVA analysis techniques.

Result and Discussion

1. Role of Attitudes and Subjective Norms in the Formation Behavior

Research data in the form of scores of attitude, subjective norm score, score weighting the influence of reference groups (teachers and friends), and a score of intent / purpose behaves (BI) group of students from the three majors in the FIS UNY. Data elements of the three groups of students to the BI environment can be described as follows:

a. Attitude

The data consists of the attitudes and beliefs of data evaluation data of students to a particular attribute. Beliefs and evaluation of data is composed of a number of attributes, each attribute has an average score. Attitude score is the multiplication of confidence scores and evaluation of attribute i. The attribute beliefs and evaluations that include 6 components, and evaluation of the students' beliefs are not true frontier mentality, beliefs and student evaluations of the environment as an essential condition of life, faith and student evaluation that the environment has limitations, beliefs and student evaluation that the function of the environment must be preserved and evaluation of the students' beliefs and personal views mistake. To determine the role of attitudes in the formation of a tendency to behave (Bi), it is necessary to know the dimensions and constituent attributes. Table 1 below illustrates quantitatively (average score) two components of attitude.

Table 1. Average score Belief and Evaluation Group Three Students

Atribut	B dan E pada tiap kelompok mahasiswa					
	PKLH Plus		PKLH Biasa		PKLH Plus	
	B	E	B	E	B	E
Tidak benarnya mentalitas *frontier*	1,98	1,75	1,84	1,78	1,67	1,78
Lingkungan hidup sebagai syarat mutlak kehidupan	2,28	2,10	2,09	2,04	1,91	1,92
Lingkungan mempunyai keterbatasan	2,29	1,85	2,12	1,95	1,92	1,80
Fungsi lingkungan harus dilestarikan	1,96	1,89	1,80	2,09	1,79	1,97
Untuk hidup sehat perlu lingkungan sehat	2,36	1,96	2,14	1,95	2,05	1,82
Kekeliruan pandangan pribadi	2,04	1,88	1,92	1,95	1,86	1,84

B = Bilief, E = Evaluation

1) The attitude of the students group PKLH Plus

Attitude is the result of one's own beliefs and one's evaluation of the consequences of doing an attribute. Of the six groups of attributes (dimensions) is the highest portion of the belief that a healthy life with a healthy environment needs an average score of 2.36. Other attribute groups that have a big role is the belief that the environment has limitations and beliefs towards the environment as an essential condition of life each with an average score of 2.29 and 2.28. In other words, this group of students has a good faith belief. This group of student evaluation of the consequences of doing certain attributes in shaping attitudes toward the environment shows that the dimensions of the greatest role in the formation of attitudes is the evaluation of the environment as an essential condition of life and the lowest attribute group evaluation of the role is not true frontier mentality with a mean score average 1.72.

The average score of the attitude of the student group PKLH Plus is 80.81, the lowest score was 41 and the highest is 115. Based classification is divided into caring attitude, lack of care, do not care, then the attitude of the student group is included in the class of a caring attitude. Regular student attitudes PKLH group characterized by the belief that a healthy life and a healthy environment need confidence that the environment as an essential condition of life is a group of attributes that are believed by the student groups each with an average score of 2.28 and 2.19. While the group of attributes that are not so believed by the student group is not some truth to the belief that frontier mentality with an average score of 1.84. Groups of attributes that have the greatest consequences in shaping student attitudes PKLH Ordinary is an evaluation of the importance of environmental health with an average score of 2.14. Other dimensions that have similar consequences is an evaluation of the environment as an essential condition of life with an average score of 2.06. Most dimensions are considered to have the least consequence to the choice of student attitudes on the environment is not a point evaluation of frontier mentality.

2) The attitude of the group Students Non PKLH

Belief that the need for a healthy life is a healthy environment dimensions are believed to have the largest role in shaping student attitudes Non PKLH ie with a score 2.08. Besides, there are two other dimensions that has a major role in shaping the faith beliefs of the environment as an essential condition of life and the belief that the environment has limitations each with an average score of 1.95. The smallest dimension is not true belief in the frontier mentality with an average score of 1.63.

b. Subjective norm

Subjective norm beliefs include the opinion of the reference group and the motivation to comply with that opinion. Based on the analysis of data obtained information about the score attribute beliefs to the opinion of the reference group and to follow the opinion motovasi as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Average score attributes of beliefe in the Reference Group Opinions and motivation to comply

Kelompok Mahasiswa	Kelompok Referensi			
	Dosen		Mahasiswa	
	bi	Mi	bi	Mi
PKLH Plus	2,03	1,98	1,61	1,60
PKLH Biasa	2,00	1,88	1,65	1,69
Non-PKLH	1,83	1,91	1,66	1,38

bi = belief in the opinion of the reference group, Mi = the urge to follow the opinions of reference

1) Subjective Norms Students PKLH Plus

Based on the total score of subjective norm these students, the highest score was 80 and the lowest 12. Average score was 34.53 (ugly category). Lecturers are part of a group whose opinions affect the confidence and willingness to comply with the act. Seen from the average score of the students confidence to faculty and friends opinion, both have almost the same score, respectively 2.03 and 1.61. Based on the fact the figures show that the learning environment lacks a major role in shaping the beliefs students have an average score of student faith groups PKLH Plus is slightly higher than to the opinion of the lecturer. Opinion of reference groups that tend to be followed by the student group is the opinion of faculty, ie, with an average score of 1.98, while the average score to follow the opinion of friends of 1.61. The student group is more convinced opinion of friends, but in terms of motivation are more likely to follow the opinion of the lecturer. This fact occurs because the student teachers considered opinion is more valid, while his opinion is more likely to influence beliefs, not because of the validity of an opinion but because of the influence of closeness with peers.

2) Subjective Norms PKLH Ordinary Students

Based on the total score of subjective norm these students, the highest score was 90 and the lowest 12. Average score was 34.48 (not good). Motivation to comply with the reference group opinion on this group of students to teachers is higher than followed the opinion of friends. It can be seen from the average score of motivation to comply with the opinion lecturer was 1.88 and the average score to follow the opinion of friends of 1.69. The fact that more students trust the teacher to be a strategic position for education in developing environmentally conscious behavior.

3) Subjective Norms Student Non PKLH

Reference group influence opinion against student faith groups PKLH Non balanced in the sense that the opinion of faculty and students have the same score in influencing the student group beliefs. Average score of conviction on the opinions of lecturers and students respectively 1.83 and 1.66. Motivation to comply with the opinion lecturer has a score of 1.91 and an average score of motivation to comply with the opinion of friends of 1.38. The average score shows that the student group had low motivation to comply with the opinion both the lecturer and his opinion, although the score to keep the higher faculty opinion. This is reasonable considering that the lecturer is positioned as the reference group of students instead of faculty PKLH.

c. Weights w

Attitude named Ab weights to the weights w1 and w2 is called the subjective norm. Number two is 100%. This shows where the weight of the most defining aspects of a person in the act between following his attitude and follow the opinion of the reference group (teachers and friends).

1) The proportion of weight w Student groups PKLH Plus

Overall average of students in the group behave more determined by the attitude of her own rather than follow the opinion of the reference group. It can be seen from the weights w1 and w2, respectively 73.83% and 26.17%. The first percentage indicates that the attitude of the students behave has a share of 73.83% and a share of 26.17% reference group opinion.

2) The proportion of weight w Student groups PKLH Ordinary

Plus, as a group of students turned out PKLH environmental behavior is more influenced by the attitude of the students themselves rather than follow the reference group opinion. The proportion of this student group attitudes in forming Bi is 70% and the proportion of the group follow the opinion of professors and friends is 30%.

3) The proportion of weight w Non PKLH student groups

Behavior of student groups on the environment is determined by his own behavior rather than follow the opinion of the reference group. It can be seen from the weights w1 and w2, respectively 67% and 33%. The first percentage indicates that the attitude of the students behave has a share of 67% and a share of 33% of the reference group opinion. Compared with a group of students Plus, this student group is more obey the reference group, ie, by a margin of 3%.

Based on the facts about the proportion of the reference group attitudes and behaviors of three groups of students more influenced by their own attitudes than followed the opinion of the reference group . This shows that environmental education has not been effective in influencing the behavior of students to care about the environment.

2. Environmental Care Behavior of FIS Student

According Fishbein Theory, behavior was equvalened with behavioral intention (Bi) means the destination can be considered to behave the same as the behavior itself, or in this case if the student already has the intention (intention) to interact with the environment through specific behavior then they will behave that way (thus interacting with intention) , for example, if a student intends to plant trees they will plant trees behave .

a. Behavior of student groups concerned about the environment PKLH Plus

The average score of student behavior PKLH Plus group was 69.5 . While the lowest score was 36 and the highest 100. If classified into three classes then the behavior of this group of students included in the category of behavior are (in between caring and not caring) . However this is only based on intention- behavior that they practice it may be more than just classroom behavior scores or maybe even less concerned .

b. Behavior of student groups concerned about the environment PKLH Ordinary

Behavior of this group of students concerned about the environment has the lowest score and 29 the highest score of 100 , with an average score of 65.07 . Although the highest and the lowest score and average group of students was lower than the group of students PKLH Plus , but in the classification of the behavior in this study belong to the same class as the class group of student behavior PKLH Plus the class is (61-100). This fact suggests that the provision of environmental education courses have a meaningful role, proved to be the behavior of the student group , though with a different score but are in the same class with the student group PKLH Plus .

c . Behavior of student groups concerned about the environment Non – PKLH

Behavior of this group of students concerned about the environment has the lowest score Siantar three groups . Obtained the lowest score was 21 and the highest score of 100 , with an average score of 59.01. Compared with the other two groups of students , the average score of the behavior of this group of students belonging to the lowest. Based on the classification of behavior is classified as a group of students in the class do not care about the environment .

3. Students for Environmental Behavior differences in 3 groups of Students

a. Hypothesis Testing Results

ANOVA test results with the data from the three groups Bi FIS UNY students who obtain different environmental education portion of the result that the coefficient of F = 6.948 and p = 0.01 . Thus the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between the three groups of students Bi rejected , the alternative hypothesis is accepted . That is, the behavior of environmental awareness possessed by each group of students was significantly different .

b. Further test results (post hoc test)

Based on the fact that the results of testing the average Bi in three groups showed a significant difference , then the next step is to conduct further tests anava (post hoc test) with the Tukey and Scheffe test . Based on the test obtained by :

1) The mean difference (mean difference) Bi PKLH Plus group of students with common PKLH student group was 4,429 at the 0.412 significance (according to Tukey) and 0,446 (according to Scheffe). Thus the probability coefficients for significance with the second test > 0.05, it can be stated that the Bi between the two groups were not significant .

2) The mean difference (mean difference) Bi student groups PKLH Plus with Non PKLH is 10.489 at 0.06 significance (according to Tukey) and 0,009 (according to Scheffe) . Based on the significance of the coefficient that has a value of < 0.05, it can be stated that there are significant differences between student groups Bi PKLH Plus with Non PKLH .

3) The mean difference (mean difference) Bi PKLH student group with a group of students Ordinary Non PKLH was 6,059 at the significance level of 0.014 (according to Tukey) and 0.20 (according to Scheffe) . This suggests that the two groups of students have significant difference in Bi . This shows the significance PKLH courses for students .

c. Test homogenous subsets

Having in mind the differences between the groups Bi subsequent test similarity (homogeneous subsets). This test is used to find which groups have in common . This test is done because some of the data sets that were tested together with Anova with significantly different results , but when tested per pair (inter- subset) can only occur equation (homogenous). Based homogenous test with alpha = 0.05 value obtained by the fact that : (1) the average score of students PKLH Plus Bi groups have in common with an average score of student groups PKLH Regular Bi , but have nothing in common with the student group Non PKLH . (Tukey and Scheffe test). When tested together all three have a real difference , but if dikomparasikan per section in pairs , it can occur in common, (2) Average score Bi PKLH Ordinary student groups have in common with an average score of Bi Non PKLH student groups .

Conclusions

Based on the discussion described in the previous chapter some conclusions can be drawn as follows :

1 . The role of attitudes and subjective norms in shaping the behavior of students at each individual is different , including different groups of students . Role of attitudes and subjective norms in shaping behavior on student attitudes weight PKLH Plus is 74.25 % and 25.75 % SN . Role of attitudes and subjective norms on student groups PKLH Ordinary respectively 70 % and 30 % , while the weight of the non- student group PKLH role indicated by weight , respectively 69 % and 31 % . Of the hree groups of students were apparently more decisive stance proportions attribute in the formation of student behavior on the environment .

2 . Student groups and PKLH Ordinary Plus PKLH have behavioral care environment at a moderate level, and non student groups PKLH have no care for the environment behavior . Student behavior on the environment of the three groups of students showed a significant difference . Based on further test (post hoc test) , it turns out the behavior of students and PKLH Ordinary Plus PKLH not significantly different , but significantly different from Non PKLH student groups .

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Aris Marfai, Muh (2005). *Moralitas lingkungan refleksi kritis atas krisis lingkungan berkelanjutan*. Yogyakarta: Wahana Hijau

Bambang Syaeful Hadi (2008). Model pembinaan budaya kampus yang peduli lingkungan di Fakultas Ilmu Sosial UNY. *Jurnal Informasi Vol. 1, Th XXXIII,* 355-470.

Bambang Syaeful Hadi (2009). Tanggapan dosen terhadap pembelajaran aspek lingkungan dalam konteks implementasi kurikulum 2002 di Fakultas Ilmu Sosial UNY. *Jurnal Informasi Vol. 1 Th. XXXIV,* 36-49.

Chiras, Daniel D., (1991). *Environmental science: action for a sustaibale future. third edition.* Redwood City, California: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc.

Fishbein, M. dan Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: an introduction to theory and reseearch.* California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Husaini Usman dan Purnomo Setiadi Akbar. (2009). *Metodologi penelitian sosial.*Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

MPBI (2010). Kerusakan lingkungan, risiko bencana meningkat. http://www.mpbi.org. Diakses pada tanggal 13 April 2010

Reimer, Joseph, Diana Pritchaed Politto., dan Richard H. Hers (1983). *Promoting moral growth from Piaget to Kohlberg. Second edition*. New York: Longman.

Sriagustin Sutrisnowati dan Bambang Syaeful Hadi, 2005. Upaya penanaman kesadaran lingkungan dalam konteks implementasi Kurikulum 2002. *Humanika Vol 5 Nomor 1, 45-51*

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 22, Tahun 1999 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah

Wisnu Arya Wardhana (2003). *Dampak pencemaran lingkungan*. Yogyakarta: Andi