

# The Effectiveness of Learning Pancasila Courses at Undiksha As a Vehicle for National Character Education In Relation To The Understanding and Orientation of Students' Pancasila Values

Komang Alit Wahyuni<sup>1</sup>, Sukadi<sup>2</sup>

[alit.wahyuni@undiksha.ac.id](mailto:alit.wahyuni@undiksha.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>, [sukadi.sukadi@undiksha.ac.id](mailto:sukadi.sukadi@undiksha.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha<sup>1,2</sup>

**Abstract.** This study was aimed at (1) describing students understanding to Pancasila; (2) describing students values orientation to Pancasila; (3) describing the effectiveness of Pancasila instruction in Undiksha in academic year 2021/2022; and (4) explaining the contribution of Pendidikan Pancasila instruction effectiveness to the students comprehension and students values orientation to Pancasila. To achieve these objectives, this study was conducted in survey approach. The research was applied at Undiksha students who programmed Pendidikan Pancasila in academic year of 2021/2022. Samples was selected purposively and using multistage sampling technique. The number of students was 306 persons. Data were collected by giving students' questionnaire, test, and Pancasila values inventory. Data were analyzed statistically by describing mean, standard deviation, category, graphic, and Manova test with the level of alpha <0.05. The result of this study revealed that: (1) the level of students comprehension to Pancasila was in mediocre category; (2) the level of students values orientation to Pancasila was in high category; (3) the effectiveness of Pancasila instruction in Undiksha was in high category; and (4). There was a significant difference in students values orientation to Pancasila according to the level of Pancasila instruction effectiveness. The students who assessed that Pancasila instruction was very effective, their Pancasila values orientation score was the highest.

**Keywords:** students comprehension to Pancasila, students Pancasila values orientation, and the effectiveness of Pancasila instruction.

## 1 Introduction

Today, in the era of globalization, where there is also ideological competition in life between nations, the problem of national identity crisis is a crucial problem. How not. Many members of society today are considered no longer reflecting their strong commitment in contextually practicing the values of Pancasila as a national ideology in the life of society, nation, and state of Indonesia. The lack of commitment to make Pancasila a view of life in society, nation, and state is suspected not only among the wider community. Among the political elite and leaders of the nation are also alleged to have regressed in this commitment (Kaelan, 2003).

The symptoms in society later, many community members no longer understand the position, function, and meaning of Pancasila in the life of the Indonesian nation and state. In fact, among the younger generation of students, an interview by a TV station reporter showed

that many of them no longer know that Pancasila is the basis of the state and national ideology of the Indonesian nation. They also no longer recognize the meaning, meaning, elements, and values of Pancasila in its correct structure and position and function. Without realizing it, various influences of foreign ideologies and values in people's lives enter, such as the influence of values from the violent religious fundamentalism movement, the influence of values from a strong ethnic assertivity movement, the values of tribal primordialism and strong group interests, and the influence of neoliberalism ideology with a set of values such as individualism, materialism, secularism, hedonism, materialism rationalism, High consumerism culture, and the influence of market culture with its capitalist values. The influence of various ideologies with their values that increasingly dominate the characteristics of social and national life is what is increasingly felt to cause this national identity crisis (Atmadja, 2008; Piliang, 1998; As'ad Said Ali, 2010).

This phenomenon cannot be separated from the reform process that occurred in Indonesia, the influence of globalization, and the misguided application of democratic principles because there is no or no strong belief in the identity or cultural identity of the nation which is actually a reflection of the values of Pancasila. Meanwhile, the lack of confidence in the commitment to the cultural identity of the Indonesian people causes the socialization process and the process of education of Pancasila values to also experience weakness. This can be shown from changes in the national education system according to Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System which no longer uses Pancasila Education as a vehicle for national character education. Here the vision of Pancasila Education as a vehicle for national character education which is piggybacked by Civic Education which is loaded with conceptual material content makes Pancasila Education weak. This is suspected because it does not show its role as ideological education, values, and moral education, but rather shows its function as academic education that culturally instills secular and capitalist rational values. Just look at the end of decision-making of development values and policies that are more dominantly based on economic values, power, and materialistic hedonism. (Sukadi, 2007a, 2007b; Rindjin, 2009; Kaelan 2003; As'ad Said Ali, 2010)

This last statement is a hypothesis that will show why the understanding and orientation of Pancasila values among society in general and among the younger generation in particular has become degraded. The experience of implementing the Pancasila Education program for Undiksha students in several years shows that students' initial experience about Pancasila Education is very lacking. When the students were asked at the beginning of the semester about the meaning of Pancasila and the values contained in it, it turned out that they could not answer well, even many just kept silent. Pursika (2007) found and explained that there are still many students in class discussion activities who equate Pancasila with Garuda birds.

The problem then is not simple that by having been given Pancasila Education, the awareness and ideological commitment of life in society, nation, and state among students must have increased significantly in accordance with the values of Pancasila along with their graduation in attending the Pancasila Education course. The problem is, how effective and quality is the implementation of the Pancasila Education program carried out in its vision as a vehicle for national character education (in the perspective of national and state ideological education, value and moral education, and Pancasila-based ethics education) which has a mission both sociopedagogically, socioacademically, socioculturally, and in carrying out the mission of democratic education (Winataputra, 2001). Similarly, how strong is the Pancasila Education program to provide a foundation for self-development efforts for students to continuously understand and expand the horizon of knowledge, internalize, and practice

Pancasila values actively and participatively in the life of society, nation, and state. Given the weak role models and public figures in this country in defending and applying or implementing the values of Pancasila as a whole and comprehensively, it is natural that in many discussions in class students doubt that the ideology of Pancasila can be applied well in the life of society, nation, and state. In a desperate tone they stated: "We leave this condition to each individual, if he feels that he benefits from living and practicing the values of Pancasila, then he will automatically implement Pancasila; however, if he feels that Pancasila is useless, then let them use the basis of other values in developing their attitudes and actions." Will such ostensibly democratic views continue in the lives of our youth? How concerning is the condition of the character of the children of this nation and country.

This research, thus, becomes very important. As As'ad Said Ali (2010) explains as follows.

"...Ikhtiar ini sungguh sangat penting; demikian pula mensosialisasikannya kepada masyarakat. Sebab sejak reformasi, konstelasi ideologi dunia dalam berbagai pemikiran strategis di Indonesia berkembang pesat, bahkan ekspansinya hampir tidak terbendung. Dampaknya pun sudah kita rasakan, mulai dari peristiwa bom Bali hingga hiruk-pikuk kritik terhadap neo-liberalisme. Ciri penting dari semua gerakan ideologi ini adalah sifatnya supra *nation-state*; karenanya benturannya dengan gerakan yang berbasis *nation state* tidak terhindarkan".

("... This endeavor is very important; Similarly, socializing it to the community. Because since the reform, the world's ideological constellation in various strategic thinking in Indonesia has grown rapidly, even its expansion is almost unstoppable. We have also felt the impact, ranging from the Bali bombings to the frenzy of criticism of neo-liberalism. An important feature of all these ideological movements is their supra-nation-state nature; hence its clash with the Nation State-based movement is inevitable").

The main purpose of this study is to explain how the understanding and orientation of Pancasila values among Undiksha students is associated with the implementation of the Pancasila Education program as a vehicle for national character education and democratic political education. The focus of the research will be emphasized on the level of understanding and orientation of Pancasila values among students, the effectiveness and quality of the implementation of the Pancasila Education program as a vehicle for national character education and democratic political education according to student perceptions and assessments, and the relationship between the Pancasila Education program and the understanding and orientation of students' Pancasila values.

The results of this study provide benefits for input data or input for policy development and development of Pancasila Education programs in general and input data also for the development of research programs at the Undiksha Ideology and Democracy Research Center. Knowing how the picture of the level of understanding and values of Pancasila among students in relation to the implementation of the Pancasila Education program can be an initial database for the development of a better Pancasila Education program as a vehicle for national character education. Similarly, this will be the initial database to develop further research programs on people's ideological awareness in the life of the nation and state which today is increasingly causing concern.

To obtain the benefits as above, this research at least produces outputs in the form of draft policies for the development of the ideology and democracy center program of

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha both in the fields of education and research as well as community service and articles that can be published in accredited national scientific magazines.

## **2 Method**

This study used a descriptive survey research approach and a comparative causal study. The research was conducted on Undiksha students who programmed the Pancasila Education course in the 2021/2022 academic year with a population of around 3,327 people. The study sample was selected purposively and by multistage sampling technique. The number of samples involved was 306 students from 3 faculties, namely: FMIPA, FHIS, and FTK. The main data collected are about the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning, the level of student understanding of Pancasila material, and the level of orientation of student Pancasila values. For this, data were collected through the provision of Pancasila comprehension tests with multiple-choice objective tests, inventory of Pancasila scores, and questionnaires on the effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning. Data analysis was carried out statistically by determining mean values, standard deviations, data categories, frequency distribution graphs, and multivariate variance analysis with manova.

## **3 Result and Discussion**

The results of this study showed the followings. First, the level of understanding of Undiksha students who program Pancasila Education courses in the 2021/2022 academic year on Pancasila material as a whole is at an average score of 10.41 from a score interval between 0 to 25. The average score of this size is in the sufficient category. Statistically broken down shows: 2.3% of students are in the very less category, 36.9% are in the less category, 55.2% are in the sufficient category, 5.2% are in the high category, and 0.3% are in the very high category.

Furthermore, it can be described the level of student understanding of Pancasila material from the five dimensions of knowledge as follows: students' understanding of Pancasila from the aspect of historical studies is in the sufficient category, Pancasila studies as a philosophical system are in the low category, Pancasila studies as a national ideology are in the low category, Pancasila studies as a basis for low category constitution, and Pancasila studies as political ethics and development paradigms as well low category.

Finally, although there were no differences in the categories of student understanding levels, it turned out that there were significant differences in students' levels of understanding of Pancasila material according to student demographic data, namely based on the origin of majors (FMIPA, FHIS, and FTK) and their interaction with student gender. The score of the level of understanding of Pancasila FMIPA students (11.29) is better than the scores of FHIS students (9.75) and FTK (10.09). Similarly, the Pancasila comprehension score of male students in FTK (11.15) is better than the Pancasila comprehension score of female students (9.22).

The results of the above research show that the level of understanding of Undiksha students towards Pancasila material is not optimal and has only reached the lowest score in the sufficient category. The still not optimal level of student understanding of Pancasila material in responding to the objective test given may be related to the difficulty of the question items used in this study. It is known that the average difficulty of the question items used in this

study is indeed at 0.416 with the highest difficulty level is 0.101 and the lowest difficulty level is 0.859. The average difficulty level of the question items of 0.416 does show that the question items used in this study are relatively difficult. The experience of the Pancasila Education lecturer team in carrying out learning does show that learning on Pancasila materials from the study of philosophical systems, national ideologies, political ethics and development paradigms, as well as a constitutional basis is felt relatively more difficult by students compared to learning historical studies and studies of Pancasila values as taught in Santiaji Pancasila (Darji Darmodihardjo, et al. 1991).

The second possibility is the time factor for the implementation of tests carried out after one year of learning. Indeed, the material presented in this study is not material that is at the level of remembering facts or events, but at the level of the ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate. However, maybe there are indeed many students who have forgotten the learning material of Pancasila Education because it is relatively no longer studied. The third possibility is because the factor of students' rational thinking ability at the level of analytical thinking, synthesis, and evaluation skills is indeed quite low. This is evidenced by the difference in the average score of students' level of understanding of Pancasila material between FMIPA, FHIS, and FTK students. There are indications that the level of understanding of Pancasila of FMIPA students is relatively higher than the level of understanding of Pancasila of FTK students and FHIS students; and the level of understanding of Pancasila of FTK students is relatively higher than the level of understanding of Pancasila of FHIS students. This symptom is related to the rational thinking ability of students who are believed by the Pancasila Education lecturer team that FMIPA students are relatively higher in rational thinking skills than FTK students and FHIS students. Similarly, the rational thinking ability of FTK students is relatively higher than the rational thinking ability of FHIS students. Associated with gender, the rational thinking ability of male students is relatively higher than the rational thinking ability of female students (Sudiatmaka, 2001).

The fourth possible factor is because the initial level of knowledge of Undiksha students on Pancasila material is quite limited. This is associated with the previous school curriculum (elementary, junior high, and high school / vocational levels) indeed no longer provides Pancasila Education learning specifically. Pancasila education is generally only integrated into Civics subjects which tend to be nuanced as state governance education; and, therefore, under-examined its Pancasila Education mission (Winataputra, 2001; Sukadi, 2009). The limitation of this initial level of knowledge cannot be improved in learning Pancasila Education which is only given in one semester with a tuition weight of 2 credits.

Second, the level of orientation for Pancasila scores of Undiksha students who program Pancasila Education courses in the 2021/2022 academic year as a whole is at an average score of 184.63 from a score interval between 45 to 225. The average score of this size is in the high category. Statistically broken down shows: 2% of students are in the sufficient category, 59.2% are in the high category, and 38.9% are in the very high category. Furthermore, it can be described the level of orientation of students' Pancasila values from three dimensions of values as follows: the orientation of students' Pancasila values from the aspect of cognition is in the very high category, the aspect of affection is in the high category, and from the aspect of conation it is also in the high category.

Finally, although there is no difference in student Pancasila value orientation categories, it turns out that there are insignificant score differences in the level of student Pancasila value orientation according to student demographic data, namely based on the origin of majors (FMIPA, FHIS, and FTK) and their interaction with student gender. The orientation level score of FMIPA students (186.53) is relatively better than the scores of FHIS students

(184.19) and FTK (182.80). The orientation level score of FHIS students (184.19) is relatively better than the score of FTK students (182.80). Similarly, the orientation score of the Pancasila score of male students in FMIPA (185.61) is relatively lower than the orientation score of the Pancasila score of female students (187.00). Conversely, the orientation score of male students' Pancasila scores at FHIS (186.10) is relatively higher than the orientation scores of their female students' Pancasila scores (182.98). Unfortunately, the difference in scores is not significant enough.

The results of research on the Pancasila value orientation of Undiksha students above, although it has reached a high and encouraging level, the output has also not reached the most optimal level of results. This seems to be associated with the inconsistency of students' Pancasila value orientation from the aspects of cognition, affection, and conation. Similarly, when viewed from the value orientation of each Pancasila precept from the first precept to the fifth precept. Data shows that the orientation of students' Pancasila values from the first precept of cognition that shows knowledge and belief values is already in the very high category, but in the aspect of affection (feeling and emotion values) and in the aspect of conation (the desire to realize values) is still in the high category. Meanwhile, the value orientation of each precept also shows that the orientation of students' Pancasila values from the first precept to the fourth precept is in the high category, while the orientation of the fifth precept value is in the very high category. This indicator shows that not necessarily students who know and believe that something value is good or noble to be upheld based on the values of Pancasila will certainly be happy to realize it and will realize it in everyday life. This inconsistency can be traced to the unsuccessful learning of Pancasila Education in building a strong commitment to values, because learning values tends to only reach the stage of learning value development and has not yet reached the stage of developing value reasoning, making value decisions, and implementing values consistently (Sukadi, et al. 2010).

This inconsistency may also occur due to the influx of the influence of new values that are preferred and more embodied in everyday life because they are considered more profitable. In this era of globalization, it is indeed very possible to enter the influence of new values from other ideologies or understandings in understanding, appreciation, and practice of student values. Not optimal orientation of students' Pancasila values in the first to fourth precept value dimensions allows the inclusion of these new values and may not always be relevant to the values that students have in each Pancasila precept value. Some new values from understandings such as: secularism, individualism, materialism, globalism, rationalism, ethnocentrism, liberal democracy, human rights universalism, and hedonism, for example, can indeed be a challenge to fostering Pancasila values among society in general and among students in particular (Atmadja, 2008).

A quite encouraging result regarding the level of orientation of Undiksha students' Pancasila scores is that there is no significant difference in students' Pancasila score orientation level in terms of the origin of majors (FMIPA, FHIS, and FTK) and student gender. This means that the orientation level of student Pancasila scores does show differences in scores between faculties and between genders, but the difference in scores is not significant. The insignificance of the difference in student Pancasila score orientation level based on the origin of the department and student gender shows that there is no consistency in the relationship between student understanding of Pancasila material and student Pancasila value orientation. Students from faculties who have a higher level of understanding of Pancasila do not always have a higher Pancasila value orientation, except students from FMIPA. Similarly, the relationship between gender and the level of Pancasila value orientation is not consistent between faculties. This inconsistency once again shows that students' Pancasila value

orientation involving indicators of aspects of cognition, affection, and conation cannot always have a consistent relationship between knowledge factors with feeling and emotion factors and with willingness factors to implement these values.

Third, the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning for Undiksha students who program Pancasila Education courses in the 2021/2022 academic year as a whole is at an average score of 97.08 from a score interval between 25 to 125. The average score of this size is in the high category. Statistically detailed shows: 1% of the number of students receiving learning is in the low effectiveness level category, 17.3% is in the sufficient category, 55.9% is in the high category, and 25.8% of the number of students receiving learning is in the very high effectiveness level category.

Furthermore, it can be described the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning obtained by students from the ten dimensions of Pancasila Education learning as follows. (1) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of learning objectives is in the sufficient category. (2) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of learning motivation is in the high category. (3) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of applying constructivism principles is in the high category. (4) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of implementing PAKEM is in the sufficient category. (5) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of creating a democratic climate is in the high category. (6) The effectiveness of learning Pancasila Education from the aspect of material development is in the high category. (7) The effectiveness of learning Pancasila Education from the aspect of knowledge integration is in the high category. (8) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of development and use of learning resources and media is in the high category. (9) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of providing reinforcement is in the sufficient category. (10) The effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning from the aspect of implementing authentic assessment is also in the high category.

Finally, although there tends to be no difference in the category of the level of effectiveness of learning in Pancasila Education according to student assessment, there is a difference in the average score of the level of effectiveness of learning in Pancasila Education between students from FMIPA (average 97.31) and students from FHIS (average 100.90) and FTK (average 92.45). In terms of gender, there also appears to be a difference in the score of the level of effectiveness of learning in Pancasila Education according to overall student assessment between male students (95.22) and female (98.26). Similarly, in each department's origin. In FMIPA students, the score of the level of effectiveness of learning in Pancasila Education according to the assessment of male students (93.58) is lower than the assessment of female students (99.23). In FHIS students, the score of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning according to the assessment of male students (103.50) is higher than the assessment of female students (99.25). In FTK students, the score of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning according to the assessment of male students (88.66) is lower than the assessment of female students (95.56). All of these score differences both due to factors of major, gender, and interaction between the two turned out to be quite significant.

The results of the research on the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning for Undiksha students for the 2021/2022 academic year above, although it has reached a high and encouraging level, the conditions have not shown the most optimal performance. This seems to be associated not only with the quality of lecturers who teach learning, but also depends on the assessment of the students themselves. Based on the assessment indicators of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning, the lecturers who teach this course

at Undiksha seem to need to further improve their performance in carrying out learning, especially in the aspects of setting and delivering more meaningful learning objectives, creating nuances of PAKEM, and in the aspect of providing reinforcement.

The results of the study that are also interesting related to this are the differences in the score of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning according to student assessments in terms of the origin of student majors (FMIPA, FIS, and FTK) and student gender. The results of research related to this turned out to be more consistent in relation to differences in student Pancasila score orientation levels in terms of the origin of the department and the gender of students. This means that student assessment of learning effectiveness is more in line with the distribution of student Pancasila score orientation scores in terms of major, major, and gender.

Fourth, the first hypothesis proposed in this study is that there is a significant difference in the level of understanding of Pancasila material and the orientation of Pancasila values together in terms of the category of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning that Undiksha students participated in in the 2021/2022 academic year. The results of multivariate variance analysis showed that all F values for Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace and Roy's Largest Root were significant with an alpha of  $< 0.05$ . Thus together it can be said: there is a significant difference in the level of student understanding of Pancasila material and student Pancasila value orientation in terms of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning in Undiksha students who program Pancasila Education courses in the 2021/2022 academic year. These results suggest that the first hypothesis proposed in this study is supported by empirical data in the field.

The second hypothesis proposed in this study is that there is a significant difference in the level of understanding of Pancasila material in terms of the category of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning that Undiksha students participate in in the 2021/2022 academic year. The results of the multivariate variant analysis showed that the F value for the effect of the level of learning effectiveness on the level of understanding of Pancasila students was 0.925. This F value has an alpha of 0.398, which means it is insignificant. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the level of student understanding of Pancasila material in terms of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning for Undiksha students who program Pancasila Education courses in the 2021/2022 academic year. These results suggest that the second hypothesis proposed in this study is not supported by empirical data in the field.

The third hypothesis proposed in this study is that there is a significant difference in the level of Pancasila value orientation in terms of the category of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning that Undiksha students participate in in the 2021/2022 academic year. The results of the multivariate variant analysis showed that the F value for the effect of the level of learning effectiveness on the orientation of students' Pancasila values was 15,674. This F value has an alpha of 0.000, which means it is significant. Thus, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the level of orientation of students' Pancasila values in terms of the level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning for Undiksha students who program Pancasila Education courses in the 2021/2022 academic year. These results suggest that the third hypothesis proposed in this study can be supported or verified by empirical data in the field. With the value of Adjusted R Squared = .088, it can be said that there is an effective contribution of 8.8% of the variability of the level of effectiveness of learning in Pancasila Education in explaining the variability of the student Pancasila value orientation level score.

Because this third hypothesis can be supported by data, further tests can be carried out with the Scheffe t test to find out at which level of the three levels of effectiveness of



Pancasila Education learning gives the best or highest Pancasila value orientation effect. The results of the data analysis showed that only the average value of student Pancasila score orientation in the very high learning effectiveness group was significantly different from other groups. This means that, in the effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning which is categorized as very high, the average score of Pancasila value orientation is at the highest level of achievement.

The results of testing the hypothesis above show that the level of effectiveness of learning Pancasila Education simultaneously contributes significantly to efforts to explain the variability of student understanding level scores on Pancasila material and variability of student Pancasila score orientation levels. Thus, it is clear that learning Pancasila Education that is carried out effectively and with quality together can improve both aspects of student understanding of Pancasila and the orientation of students' Pancasila values.

Individually, the contribution of learning effectiveness factors in explaining the variability of scores on the level of student understanding of Pancasila material by controlling the orientation of students' Pancasila scores was not significant. Meanwhile, the contribution of learning effectiveness factors in explaining the variability of student Pancasila score orientation levels remains significant even though the existence of variables on the level of student understanding of Pancasila material is controlled. It is clear from results like this that the effectiveness of learning assessed by students is more correlated with the level of orientation of students' Pancasila values than with the level of student understanding of Pancasila material. This symptom may be explained that learning Pancasila values involving the domains of cognition, affection, and conation is indeed effective cannot only be done by lecturers who tend to do learning rationally. Learning values requires lecturers who are not only assessed well by students, but also their learning is preferred and can be used as a model or example by students. Pancasila learning that is considered effective like this by students can help improve students' Pancasila value orientation. However, effective learning like this may not necessarily increase students' understanding of Pancasila, because increasing understanding of Pancasila material requires lecturers who can improve students' rational thinking skills. In other words, Pancasila learning that can increase students' understanding of Pancasila must come from lecturers who are more oriented towards developing rational thinking skills. If two aspects of learning objectives are to be achieved effectively at the same time, then lecturers are needed who are not only able to stimulate students' rational thinking skills, but also need lecturers who can be assessed well by students, their learning is preferred, and these lecturers can be role models for students in the application of Pancasila values.

## **4 Conclusion**

Based on the results of the research that has been described and described above, several conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study, as follows. First, the level of understanding of Undiksha students towards Pancasila material is in the sufficient category. Second, the level of orientation of Undiksha students' Pancasila values is in the high category. Third, the level of effectiveness of learning Pancasila Education at Undiksha which was held in the 2021/2022 academic year was considered by students to be in the high category. Fourth, together there are significant differences in the average score of the level of student understanding of the Pancasila material and the average score of the orientation level of student Pancasila scores related to the level of learning effectiveness category of Pancasila Education held at Undiksha in the 2021/2022 academic year. Fifth, individually there is no significant difference in the average score of the level of student understanding of Pancasila

material related to the level of learning effectiveness category of Pancasila Education held at Undiksha in the 2021/2022 academic year; however, there is still a significant difference in the average score of the orientation level of student Pancasila scores associated with the level of the Pancasila Education learning effectiveness category held at Undiksha in the 2021/2022 academic year. Sixth, in the very high Pancasila Education learning effectiveness group, the level of student Pancasila value orientation also achieved the most optimal score in the high category compared to the learning effectiveness group Pancasila education which is categorized as sufficient and high is not able to distinguish the level of orientation of students' Pancasila values.

Based on the above findings, several suggestions can be proposed in this study, including the following. First, the team of Pancasila Education lecturers still needs to improve the effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning, especially in the aspects of setting meaningful learning objectives, creating a PAKEM atmosphere in learning, and in providing reinforcement. Second, the Pancasila Education lecturer team needs to achieve a very high level of effectiveness of Pancasila Education learning in the very high category in order to provide the most optimal results in increasing student Pancasila value orientation. Third, the Pancasila Education lecturer team as a team of MPK lecturers also needs to integrate learning models that can stimulate students' rational thinking skills in understanding Pancasila material and learning models that are not only considered good by students, but also preferably learning, and can be used as models by students in the appreciation and practice of Pancasila values. Fourth, other interested researchers are advised to examine more deeply the inconsistency of the relationship between the variable of learning effectiveness of Pancasila Education individually with the variable level of student understanding of Pancasila material and the variable level of student Pancasila value orientation.

## References

- [1] As'ad Said Ali. 2010. Memahami Pancasila. Tersedia pada [http://www.analisadaily.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=36432:memahami\\_pancasila-&catid=78:umum&Itemid=131](http://www.analisadaily.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=36432:memahami_pancasila-&catid=78:umum&Itemid=131)
- [2] Atmadja, N. B. (2008). Sertifikasi Guru: Memperkaya atau Menyejahterakan? (Perspektif Semiotika Komunikasi). *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*. V. 41 No 1 Januari 2008. Hal. 1 – 17.
- [3] CCE. 1997. *Foundations of Democracy; Teachers' Guide*. Calabasas; Center for Civic Education.
- [4] Depdiknas. 2008. *Pembelajaran Inovatif dan Partisipatif*. Jakarta: Depdiknas
- [5] Kaelan, H. 2003. Pendidikan Pancasila. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Paradigma
- [6] Piliang, Y.A. (1998). Dunia yang Dilipat: Realitas Kebudayaan Menjelang Milenium ketiga dan Matinya Posmodernisme. Bandung: Penerbit Mizan.
- [7] Pursika, I N. 2007. Samakah Pancasila dengan Burung Garuda Pancasila. *Jurnal IKA Ikatan Keluarga Alumni Undiksha Singaraja*. ISSN 1829-5282. Vol. 5, No. 1, Mei 2007, Hal. 14-23.
- [8] Rindjin, K. 2009. Pendidikan Pancasila: Pandangan Hidup bangsa Indonesia dan Dasar Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia. Singaraja: Undiksha.
- [9] Sukadi. 2009. Belajar dan pembelajaran (Bermuatan Konsep-konsep Kearifan Lokal). Singaraja: Undiksha.
- [10] Sukadi. 2007a. Studi Etnografi Pendidikan pada SMA Negeri 1 Ubud Bali: Konsep Ajeg Bali (Hindu) Berbasis Ideologi Tri Hita Karana. *Cakrawala Pendidikan. Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan LP2M UNY*, ISSN 0216-1370. Terakreditasi. Februari 2007, Th. XXVI, No. 1. Hal. 1-18.
- [11] ..... 2007b. Pendidikan IPS sebagai Rekonstruksi Pengalaman Budaya Berbasis Ideologi Tri Hita Karana (Stdi Etnografi tentang Pengaruh Masyarakat terhadap Program Pendidikan IPS

pada SMU Negeri 1 Ubud Bali). *Mimbar Pendidikan. Jurnal Pendidikan*. UPI Press, ISSN 0126-2025. Terakreditasi. No.1 Th. XXVI 2007 Hal. 4-13

- [12] ..... 2007c. Praktik Belajar Kewarganegaraan Berbasis Kebijakan Publik dan Peningkatan Kecakapan Kewarganegaraan Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran Undiksha*, ISSN 0215-8250, Terakreditasi. Vol. 40 No. 3 Juli 2007. Hal. 737-757.
- [13] ..... 2007d. Implementasi Model Praktik Belajar Kewarganegaraan Dan Peningkatan Penguasaan *Life Skills* Siswa (Studi Reflektif pada Siswa Kelas X SMA Laboratorium IKIP Negeri Singaraja). *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran Undiksha*, ISSN 0215-8250, Terakreditasi. Vol. 41 No. 1 Januari 2008. Hal. 36-55.
- [14] Winataputra, H.U.S. 2001. *Jatidiri Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan sebagai Wahana Sistemik Pendidikan Demokrasi (Suatu Kajian Konseptual dalam Konteks Pendidikan IPS)*. *Disertasi* (Tidak dipublikasikan). Bandung: UPI.