

PROJECT ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHENING THE PROFIL OF PANCASILA STUDENTS (P5): TO INSTILL GOTONG ROYONG CHARACTER

1st Muhamad Yudha¹, 2nd, Akmal Firmansyah², 3rd Nabilla Nevi Arsyani³, 4th Sabrina Dwi Annisa⁴, 5th Sri Wulan Maulani⁵, 6th Dian Satria Charismana⁶
{muhamadyudha.2023@student.uny.ac.id¹, akmalfirmansyah.2020@student.uny.ac.id²,
nabilla0761fis.2021@student.uny.ac.id³, shabrina7788fishipol.2023@student.uny.ac.id⁴,
sriwulan.2023@student.uny.ac.id⁵, dian_satria@uny.ac.id⁶}

Pancasila and Citizenship Education Study Program, Yogyakarta State University, Special Region of Yogyakarta^{1,2,3,6}, Tourism Study Program, Yogyakarta State University, Special Region of Yogyakarta⁴, Public Administration Study Program, Yogyakarta State University, Special Region of Yogyakarta⁵

Abstract. This study aims to analyze the implementation of the Project to Strengthen the Profile of Pancasila Students (P5) in instilling the value of gotong royong (mutual cooperation) in students. The research employs a mixed-methods approach (sequential exploratory), consisting of two phases: a qualitative phase to gain in-depth insights through interviews and observations, followed by a quantitative phase to measure the impact of P5 on the development of the gotong royong character. The study was conducted at a public Junior High School in Yogyakarta City, Special Region of Yogyakarta, with students and teachers involved in the P5 implementation as the research subjects. Data collection techniques included interviews, observations, and surveys, with research instruments consisting of interview guidelines, observation sheets, and character assessment questionnaires. Data analysis techniques included thematic analysis for qualitative data and descriptive statistical analysis for quantitative data. The results indicate that the implementation of P5 significantly contributes to enhancing students' understanding and practice of gotong royong, as evidenced by positive changes in students' attitudes and behaviors, becoming more collaborative and caring towards others.

Keywords: Gotong Royong Character, P5, Pancasila Education, Junior High School.

INTRODUCTION

Character education has become a strategic issue in Indonesian education, especially in shaping the young generation who have noble values in accordance with Pancasila (Firmansyah, Yudha, Suyato, & Sukarti, 2024). However, the reality in the field shows that the character of gotong royong as one of the core values of Pancasila has begun to fade among students. This can be seen from various phenomena such as increasing individualism, lack of cooperation in school activities, and low student participation in social activities. This condition contradicts the expectation that students can become individuals who have a high sense of solidarity and are able to work together in various aspects of life (Kambali, 2016). The results of research conducted by Miftakhuddin (2020) provide data that current generation Z students are more likely to have an individual attitude, this has an impact on students in schools such as Junior High School tend to be less active in group activities, including activities aimed at strengthening the character of togetherness. This fact is reinforced by teacher reports complaining about the low involvement of students in mutual cooperation activities, both in the classroom and in extracurricular activities.

Expert opinion also underlines the importance of a project-based education approach as an effort to integrate character values in the learning process (Firmansyah, et al., 2024). The implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) initiated by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology is considered as one of the strategic solutions for character development based on Pancasila values. P5 aims to integrate Pancasila values, including gotong royong, into the curriculum (Purwanto, 2023). P5 provides space for students to learn through hands-on practice, so that they can experience the benefits of cooperation and collaboration in a real

context. However, the implementation of P5 in some schools often faces challenges, such as teachers' lack of understanding of implementation methods, limited facilities, and low student enthusiasm because students feel that the task load is often irrelevant or uninteresting (Sinyanyuri, & Yarmi, 2023). On the other hand, there is no in-depth study that evaluates the extent to which the implementation of P5 is able to instill the character of gotong royong in schools.

Based on the gap between ideal conditions and reality, this research is important to conduct. This research has several research problem formulations. First, how is the implementation of P5 in instilling the character of mutual cooperation among students? Second, what are the supporting and inhibiting factors for the implementation of P5 related to the character of mutual cooperation? Third, what is the impact of P5 implementation on students' mutual cooperation character? Therefore, based on the formulation of the problem, this research has several research objectives. First, to analyze the implementation of P5 in instilling the character of mutual cooperation in students. Second, to identify the supporting and inhibiting factors for the implementation of P5 in building the character of mutual cooperation. Third, to evaluate the impact of P5 implementation on strengthening students' mutual cooperation character.

Previous research has discussed the importance of Pancasila-based character education in building a young generation with moral and noble personality (Safitri, 2020). The study by Ginanjar, Septiana, Ginanjar, & Agustin (2021) showed that project-based learning can improve students' cooperation and communication. Meanwhile, research by Pratama, & Febriani (2024) identified obstacles to P5 implementation, including limited resources and teacher understanding. This study differs from previous studies with a specific focus on analyzing the character of gotong royong through the implementation of P5. In addition, this study uses a sequential exploratory method that allows in-depth exploration qualitatively before measuring the impact quantitatively, making a unique contribution to understanding the dynamics of P5 implementation at the school level.

This study uses the social constructivism theory approach by Vygotsky (1997), which emphasizes the importance of social interaction in learning. This theory is relevant because P5 uses a project-based approach that involves collaboration between students in a social context. In addition, character education theory by Lickona (2012) is used to understand how the values of mutual cooperation can be instilled through experiential learning. Through this theoretical approach, the research is expected to provide a holistic picture of the implementation of P5 in instilling the character of mutual cooperation, as well as providing strategic recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the program.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a mixed methods with a sequential exploratory approach, which combines qualitative and quantitative analysis sequentially to gain an in-depth understanding of the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) in instilling the character of gotong royong. This approach begins with a qualitative stage to explore in-depth information, followed by a quantitative stage to measure impact based on more structured data (Creswell, 2023). A sequential exploratory design was chosen as it allows for initial exploration through qualitative data before developing appropriate quantitative instruments (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The first stage involved in-depth interviews and participant observation, while the second stage involved data collection through a questionnaire designed based on preliminary findings. The research was conducted in a public junior high school in Yogyakarta City, Yogyakarta Special Region. The research subjects consisted of teachers who were directly involved in the implementation of P5, then there were students who participated in P5 activities. In addition, there is the Principal as a policy maker related to the implementation of P5. The number of respondents was selected through purposive sampling for the qualitative stage and stratified random sampling for the quantitative stage.

Data collection techniques in this study used several data collection techniques. First, qualitative data collection techniques, namely in-depth interviews using semi-structured interview guidelines to explore the experiences of teachers, students, and school principals related to the implementation

of P5. In addition, there are observation techniques that are part of the qualitative stage of data collection, namely to observe P5 activities directly to see the dynamics of interaction and cooperation between students. Second, quantitative data collection techniques that use questionnaires to measure students' mutual cooperation character based on the dimensions of cooperation, caring, and social responsibility (Lickona, 2012). There are several stages of data analysis techniques used in this study. The first stage of qualitative data analysis is for thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which includes steps of coding, categorization, and interpretation of themes to identify patterns in interview and observation data. Second, the quantitative data analysis stage, which is to analyze data in the form of descriptive statistics to describe the distribution of data and simple regression tests to measure the relationship between the implementation of P5 and strengthening the character of gotong royong. The analysis was conducted using SPSS software.

RESEARCH METHOD

1.1 Quantitative Data Results

The questionnaire was designed to measure the perceptions of students and teachers regarding the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) in instilling the character of gotong royong. The following are the results of the data obtained:

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Questionnaire Responses

Pernyataan	Setuju (%)	Netral (%)	Tidak Setuju (%)
1. P5 berhasil meningkatkan kerja sama antarsiswa.	72%	18%	10%
2. P5 memberikan dampak positif pada kepedulian sosial siswa.	68%	20%	12%
3. Program ini sesuai dengan kebutuhan sekolah untuk menanamkan gotong royong.	70%	15%	15%
4. Implementasi P5 membutuhkan evaluasi lebih lanjut terkait kebijakan.	35%	20%	45%
5. Tidak semua komponen P5 berpihak kepada kebutuhan seluruh siswa.	20%	25%	55%

Based on the data presented in table 1, several data analyses were obtained. First, P5 succeeded in improving the character of mutual cooperation among students. Most respondents (72%) stated that P5 succeeded in improving cooperation between students. This supports the theory of social constructivism, where interaction between individuals in a group is an important factor in the learning process (Vygotsky, 1997). In P5, students collaborate to achieve a common goal, which creates a group-based learning experience. However, 18% of respondents were neutral, and 10% disagreed, suggesting obstacles such as a lack of effective group dynamics or different levels of student participation. According to Bruner (1996), the success of collaborative learning relies heavily on the design of activities that support equal interaction among group members. Second, P5 had a positive impact on students' social awareness. A total of 68% of respondents agreed that P5 has a positive impact on students' social awareness. This is in line with Lickona's (2012) theory of character education, which emphasizes the importance of direct experience in instilling moral values such as caring for others. However, 12% of respondents disagreed, indicating that not all students get the same experience in developing social concern. Narvaez's (2009) opinion criticizes that character education is often temporary and does not touch on the long-term transformation of student behavior.

Third, P5 is in line with the school's need to instill the character of gotong royong. The majority of respondents (70%) agreed that the program is in line with the school's needs. This indicates that P5 has been designed by considering the needs of the school to instill the value of gotong royong. According to Ryan and Bohlin (1999), an effective character education program should be relevant to local needs. However, 15% of respondents disagreed. This could be due to the difference in perception between the program policy and the reality of its implementation in the field, indicating the need for further adjustments to cover school-specific needs. Fourth, P5 implementation requires

further evaluation of quality education policies. Only 35% of respondents agreed that further evaluation of the P5 policy is needed, while 45% disagreed. This majority disagreement may reflect that respondents feel that the P5 policy has been quite effective, although there are still some shortcomings in its implementation. According to Berkowitz and Bier (2005), continuous evaluation is important to ensure that character education programs continue to be relevant and effective. The absence of evaluation can lead to long-term program stagnation.

Fifth, not all components of P5 favor the needs of all students. A total of 55% of respondents disagreed with this statement, indicating that most felt P5 was inclusive enough in reaching students' needs. However, 20% of respondents agreed, which means that there are some students who feel the program has not fully accommodated their needs. This is in line with the critique of social constructivism theory, where social interaction-based learning is often less effective for students with special needs or more introverted students (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The implementation of P5 shows success in creating collaborative learning, but challenges in heterogeneous group dynamics still need to be addressed. Further interventions, such as teacher training in group facilitation, may help overcome this obstacle. The data shows that P5 has a positive impact on students' social awareness, but its implementation has not been fully consistent in all aspects. Project-based character education needs to be complemented with continuous evaluation to ensure the transfer of values to students' daily lives.

1.2 Qualitative Data Results

Observations showed that students were actively involved in group cooperation when carrying out projects, such as the creation of school gardens and social activities. The dynamics of cooperation were prominent among students who received intensive support from the mentor teacher. However, obstacles were found in student groups with diverse social backgrounds, such as gaps in communication skills.

The results of interviews conducted by several research subjects, namely, first, interviews with teachers obtained data in the form of, Teachers said that the implementation of P5 had improved students' collaborative abilities, but they also mentioned the need for further training for teachers to optimize project-based teaching methods. Second, interviews conducted with students obtained data in the form of, some students stated that P5 helped them better understand the importance of mutual cooperation, but students with low levels of participation felt less empowered in the project. Thirdly, interviews conducted with school principals revealed that the principals highlighted the need for flexibility in the P5 policy to make it more relevant to school conditions in certain areas. In addition to observations and interviews, researchers also analyzed P5 activity report documents, which showed that most of the projects focused on community-based activities, such as environmental hygiene programs and social service activities. However, internal school evaluation documents show that assessments of project success often do not include aspects of program.

1.3 Social constructivism theory

The theory of social constructivism proposed by Vygotsky (1997) emphasizes that learning is a social process that occurs through interaction with others. In the context of this research, the Pancasila Learner Profile Strengthening Project (P5) offers opportunities for students to learn through hands-on experiences in groups, reflecting a key tenet of social constructivism. P5, with its project-based approach, allows students to build shared understanding through cooperation, discussion and collaboration, which is relevant to the concept of zone of proximal development (ZPD).

However, the implementation of P5 also showed that not all student groups were able to optimize the benefits of social interaction. Some students with communication limitations or lack of social support showed lower engagement in the project. This highlights a criticism of social constructivism theory in formal education contexts: it often assumes that all learners have an equal basic ability to engage in productive social interactions, which is not always the case in practice (Bruner, 1996). This opinion is in line with Lave and Wenger's (1991) critique which emphasizes the importance of situated learning in social constructivism. P5 needs to pay attention to students' diverse social and cultural contexts to make learning through collaboration more inclusive and relevant. This theory assumes that social interaction is always positive and constructive. However, the findings of this

study show that factors such as group dynamics, different social backgrounds and communication limitations can be barriers in project-based learning. Therefore, social constructivism theory needs to be enriched with an understanding of the challenges in diverse group interactions.

1.4 Character Education Theory

Character education theory, as proposed by Lickona (2012), states that character education should include three main components: moral knowledge, moral feelings, and moral action. In this study, P5 aims to instill the character of gotong royong through an experiential approach that includes all three components. The results showed that P5 succeeded in increasing students' understanding of gotong royong (moral knowledge) and encouraging a sense of concern for others (moral feelings). However, in the aspect of moral action, there are still challenges in ensuring that each student consistently practices the value of mutual cooperation outside of project activities. This is relevant to Narvaez's (2009) criticism, which states that character education often fails to ensure the transfer of learning from the structured environment to real situations outside the classroom.

Another opinion from Ryan and Bohlin (1999) underlines that character education requires a sustainable and systemic approach. In the context of P5, although the program has provided a strong foundation for the cultivation of the character of gotong royong, the sustainability of implementation at the school level is a key success factor that has not been fully achieved. Project-based character education often focuses on temporary activities. This can reduce the long-term impact on students' character building. Character education needs to be supported by a more systemic approach and integrated in the school culture, as suggested by Berkowitz and Bier (2005).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of his research, there are several conclusions. First, the implementation of P5 in instilling the character of mutual cooperation for students has found very significant data to be able to implement the character of mutual cooperation through P5. The implementation of P5 has successfully instilled the character of mutual cooperation among students through various structurally designed collaborative activities, such as group work, project discussions, and community-based social activities. The majority of students stated that P5 activities encouraged them to work together, share tasks, and respect the opinions of others, as reflected in the questionnaire data which showed that 72% of respondents agreed that P5 succeeded in improving cooperation among students. However, the implementation still faces challenges in terms of activity design to ensure inclusivity and overall student engagement.

Second, there are supporting factors and inhibiting factors for the implementation of P5 to instill the character of mutual cooperation. The supporting factors consist of the Merdeka curriculum factor that provides flexibility for schools to integrate the values of mutual cooperation into P5 activities, then the support factor of teachers who are skilled in facilitating collaborative activities. In addition, there are supporting factors from the active participation of students which enable a conducive atmosphere of cooperation. As well as supporting factors in the form of support from the school environment, such as adequate facilities for project-based activities. There are several inhibiting factors, such as the incompatibility of some P5 components with the specific needs of students, as seen from 20% of respondents who stated that the program was not fully in favor of student needs.

Then the inhibiting factor is the lack of intensive training for teachers in implementing P5 optimally. In addition, there are inhibiting factors in the form of differences in the level of student participation which can cause inequality in the learning experience. As well as inhibiting factors in the form of P5 policy evaluations that have not been carried out thoroughly to identify obstacles in the field. Third, the impact of P5 implementation on students' mutual cooperation character is quite significant. 70% of respondents agreed that the program is relevant to the school's needs in instilling the value of gotong royong, and 68% of respondents stated that P5 increased their social awareness. Qualitative results from the interviews show that students are better able to collaborate in groups, show mutual respect, and care more about the surrounding environment. However, there are areas that require improvement,

especially in ensuring that all students benefit from the program equally. This calls for improvements in the design of P5 activities and a more comprehensive policy evaluation to support these positive impacts.

Based on the conclusions of this study, there are suggestions for recommendations to improve the existing P5 program to make it even better, as well as recommendations for future research. First, schools need to ensure that P5 programs are designed by considering the diverse needs of students so that inclusiveness can be achieved. Second, teachers need to receive additional training in facilitating collaborative activities to ensure students are more engaged. Third, evaluation of the P5 policy should be conducted regularly by involving various parties, including teachers, students, and parents, to improve the effectiveness of the program.

References

- Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2005). *What works in character education: A research-driven guide for educators*. Character Education Partnership.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *Frames for thinking: Ways of making meaning*. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *Modes of thought: Explorations in culture and cognition* (pp. 93–105). Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2023). *Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Firmansyah, A., Yudha, M., Suyato, S., & Sukarti, S. E. E. (2024). *The Importance Of Humanism Education For Primary School Children In The 21st Century Globalization Era*. *Waskita: Jurnal Pendidikan Nilai dan Pembangunan Karakter*, 8(2), 222-244.
- Ginanjari, H., Septiana, T., Ginanjari, D., & Agustin, S. (2021). *Keberhasilan Implementasi Pembelajaran Berbasis Proyek: Faktor-faktor Kunci dalam Proses Pembelajaran*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 5(2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v5i2.9703>
- Kambali, M. P. I. (2016). *Analisis Kritis terhadap Kenakalan Pelajar*. *Jurnal Risalah*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.31943/jurnal_risalah.v3i1.27
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.
- Lickona, T. (2012). *Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. Bantam Books.
- Miftakhuddin, M. (2020). *Pengembangan model pendidikan agama Islam dalam membentuk karakter empati pada generasi Z*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 17(1), 1-16.
- Narvaez, D., & Lapsley, D.K. (2009). *Personality, Identity, and Character*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pratama, R., & Febriani, E. A. (2024). *Kendala-kendala dalam Pelaksanaan Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (P5) Tema Kearifan Lokal di SMAN 2 Kinali*. *Naradidik: Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 3(4), 366-376. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24036/nara.v3i4.239>
- Purnawanto, A. T. (2023). *Pendidikan Karakter Melalui Internalisasi Profil Pelajar Pancasila Dalam Kurikulum Merdeka*. *JURNAL PEDAGOGY*, 16(2), 103-115.
- Rahmawati, S. (2022). *Evaluasi Implementasi P5 dalam Pendidikan Karakter*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 10(3), 45–59.

Muhamad Yudha¹ Akmal Firmansyah² Nabilla Nevi Arsyani³ Sabrina Dwi Annisa⁴ Sri Wulan Maulani⁵ Dian Satria Charismana⁶
Project Analysis Of Strengthening The Profil Of Pancasila Students (P5): To Instill Gotong Royong Character

Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. E. (1999). *Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome St., San Francisco, CA 94104.

Safitri, K. (2020). *Pentingnya pendidikan karakter untuk siswa sekolah dasar dalam menghadapi era globalisasi*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 4(1), 264-271.

Sinyanyuri, S., & Yarmi, G. (2023). *Peluang dan Tantangan Implementasi Project Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (P5) di Tingkat Sekolah Dasar: Best Practice*. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 8(3), 1104-1116.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1997). *Educational Psychology*. St. Lucie Press.