MIKAILALSYS
Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences

e-ISSN : 2987-2286
p-ISSN : 2987-3924

Index: Harvard, Boston, Sydney, Copernicus, Sinta 4, Scilit, Semantic, Google, etc

https://doi.org/10.58578/mikailalsys.v4i3.11854

Improving Fifth-Grade Students' Learning Activities and Learning Outcomes in Pancasila Education through the Think-Pair-Share Type of Cooperative Learning Model at SDN 01 Ulak Karang

Nosi Ageni Putri & Gusnita Efrina
Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Sumatera Barat, Indonesia
nosyagenip@gmail.com; gusnitaefrina@gmail.com

Article Info:

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Jul 7, 2026	Aug 4, 2026	Aug 16, 2026	Aug 21, 2026

Abstract

Pancasila Education requires active student engagement to promote conceptual understanding, cooperation, responsibility, and academic achievement in a balanced manner. However, classroom action research simultaneously examining learning activities and outcomes through Think-Pair-Share (TPS) among fifth-grade students remains limited. This study aimed to improve students' learning activities and outcomes in Pancasila Education through the TPS cooperative learning model. Classroom action research was conducted across two cycles involving 26 purposively selected Grade VA students at SDN 01 Ulak Karang. Data were collected through classroom observations, non-test assessments, and learning achievement tests and analyzed using descriptive percentage analysis. The findings showed that students' discussion activity increased from 45.51% in Cycle I to 78.69% in Cycle II, cooperation increased from 42.31% to 82.70%, and responsibility increased from 53.85% to 74.73%. The mean learning outcome score also increased progressively from 63.2 at the pre-action stage to 67.2 in Cycle I and 89.2 in Cycle II. These findings

Mikailalsys is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

demonstrate that TPS can foster a more participatory and collaborative Pancasila Education classroom while improving students' academic achievement. The study highlights the value of structured peer interaction, careful teacher facilitation, and reflective instructional improvement in implementing TPS. Further research should examine the sustainability of these improvements across broader school contexts and longer implementation periods.

Keywords: Cooperative Learning; Learning Activities; Learning Outcomes; Pancasila Education; Think-Pair-Share

INTRODUCTION

Education plays an essential role in developing learners who are intellectually capable, socially responsible, and able to participate meaningfully in society. Schooling is not limited to the transmission of knowledge but also provides a space in which students learn values, attitudes, responsibilities, and ways of interacting with others. This perspective is particularly relevant to Pancasila Education, a subject that seeks to cultivate students' understanding of citizenship while encouraging them to practice the values that underpin social and national life. Pancasila Education is expected to help students understand their rights and responsibilities, develop moral awareness, and build character consistent with the values of Indonesian society (Amelia et al., 2020; Galuh et al., 2021; Marwah et al., 2018). Its instructional process therefore needs to provide meaningful learning experiences rather than merely ask students to remember concepts or reproduce information presented by the teacher.

Contemporary educational practice continues to face the challenge of creating classrooms in which students are genuinely involved in learning. Teacher-centered instruction may provide efficient delivery of content, yet excessive reliance on one-way explanation can limit opportunities for students to question, discuss, exchange ideas, and construct understanding through interaction. Ramdani et al. (2023) note that learning becomes less meaningful when students are positioned primarily as objects of instruction rather than active participants. Evidence from collaborative learning research similarly suggests that children demonstrate stronger engagement when learning situations provide meaningful opportunities for peer interaction (Sun et al., 2022). Student participation is therefore not simply a matter of keeping learners occupied; it reflects the extent to which they invest attention, thought, communication, and effort in understanding what they are

learning. Social interaction also contributes to learning activity because communication among students can encourage participation and create a more responsive classroom environment (Rohanah et al., 2020).

Learning activity is closely connected with the quality of students' learning experiences and the outcomes they eventually achieve. Students who listen attentively, ask questions, communicate ideas, complete learning tasks, and participate in discussion have greater opportunities to process information meaningfully. Learning outcomes, meanwhile, represent the knowledge and competencies students acquire after participating in an instructional process. Academic achievement may be influenced by several interconnected conditions, including students' motivation, discipline, learning environment, and the quality of instructional experiences provided by the teacher (Amalda & Prasojo, 2018). Learning motivation also contributes to students' willingness to remain engaged with academic tasks and pursue expected learning goals (Fernando et al., 2024) . Instructional resources and visual experiences can further stimulate students' interest and motivation when they are used purposefully to support learning (Mayasari et al., 2021). These considerations suggest that improving achievement requires attention not only to assessment results but also to the learning activities through which those results are developed.

Cooperative learning offers a pedagogical response to the need for greater student participation by creating structured opportunities for learners to work with and learn from their peers. Cooperative strategies encourage students to communicate, negotiate understanding, assume responsibility, and contribute to shared learning tasks. Such interaction can strengthen cooperation while creating a classroom atmosphere in which students are more willing to participate (Fijriah et al., 2024). One cooperative structure that is particularly suitable for encouraging individual and social participation is *Think-Pair-Share* (TPS). The model provides students with time to think independently about a question or problem, discuss their ideas with a partner, and subsequently share the results of their discussion with a broader group or the whole class (Rukmini, 2020). The sequence is pedagogically important because participation is preceded by individual thinking and small-scale interaction, allowing students to prepare their ideas before speaking publicly. Research on classroom participation has shown that giving students opportunities to think and collaborate before sharing can support more meaningful participation in classroom discourse (Mundelsee & Jurkowski, 2021). TPS-based learning activities have likewise been developed

to increase students' active involvement through structured peer interaction (Hikmawati, 2021).

Previous studies have provided empirical support for the contribution of TPS to learning processes and academic achievement across different educational contexts. Nurhayati (2017) reported that TPS influenced students' mathematics learning outcomes, while Noor & Munandar (2019) found that cooperative models, including TPS, were associated with learning activity and mathematics achievement. Research conducted specifically in elementary Civics education also demonstrated that students taught through TPS achieved improved learning outcomes, indicating that the model is applicable beyond mathematics and can support subjects concerned with citizenship knowledge and values (Wuryandani & Herwin, 2021). Similar findings were reported by Sekarwati et al. (2023), whose study involving fifth-grade elementary students showed that TPS was effective in improving learning outcomes and student cooperation. Collectively, these studies suggest that the benefits of TPS arise not merely from placing students in pairs but from organizing opportunities to think, communicate, and take responsibility for learning.

Recent studies on Pancasila Education further emphasize the importance of creating participatory learning experiences at the elementary-school level. Istiqomah & Wibowo (2024) found that interactive learning experiences could support students' activeness, motivation, and achievement in Pancasila Education. Sari et al. (2025) also demonstrated that TPS positively influenced elementary students' social attitudes by providing structured opportunities for cooperation, respect, responsibility, and peer interaction. Existing research, nevertheless, has tended to examine TPS through experimental designs, focus primarily on learning outcomes, or investigate related dimensions such as cooperation and social attitudes. Fewer studies have documented, through a reflective classroom action process, how TPS can simultaneously improve observable learning activities and academic learning outcomes in fifth-grade Pancasila Education within an authentic classroom experiencing persistent student passivity. The present study addresses this empirical gap by examining changes in both dimensions across instructional actions rather than viewing achievement as an isolated end result.

Preliminary observations at SDN 01 Ulak Karang revealed a classroom situation that reflected this concern. An initial observation conducted on September 20, 2025, showed that Pancasila Education in Grade VA was still largely delivered through lecture-based

instruction. Students generally listened to the teacher's explanation, while opportunities to engage actively with the learning material were limited. Classroom interaction remained strongly centered on the teacher, and many students showed little initiative to ask questions, express opinions, or become involved in learning activities. A subsequent observation with the Grade VA classroom teacher on September 25, 2025, indicated a similar pattern. Several students appeared hesitant to communicate their ideas, rarely asked questions, and participated minimally in classroom discussion. Some students also lost concentration during explanations and engaged in conversations unrelated to the learning task. These conditions suggest that the classroom needed an instructional structure that would give every learner a reasonable opportunity to think and participate rather than relying primarily on responses from a small number of confident students.

The baseline achievement data reinforced the need for instructional improvement. Grade VA consisted of 26 students, and the initial evaluation indicated that only approximately 40% had reached the Minimum Mastery Criterion (*Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* [KKM]) of 75, while approximately 60% had not yet achieved the expected standard. The class mean of 68 was also below the established mastery criterion. These results need to be understood alongside the low level of classroom participation rather than as an assessment problem alone. Limited opportunities to process ideas, discuss concepts, and communicate understanding may restrict students' engagement with Pancasila Education content. TPS is relevant to this classroom condition because each stage provides a different form of participation: *think* encourages individual cognitive engagement, *pair* creates a relatively safe space for exchanging ideas, and *share* provides an opportunity to communicate understanding to a wider audience. Such a sequence may support students who are initially reluctant to participate while gradually building confidence, cooperation, and responsibility for learning.

The focus of the present research is therefore situated at the intersection of classroom participation and academic achievement in Pancasila Education. Rather than treating students' passivity and low achievement as separate concerns, the study views both as interconnected aspects of the instructional process that can be addressed through carefully planned and reflected classroom actions. The research specifically aims to improve the learning activities and learning outcomes of Grade VA students in Pancasila Education at SDN 01 Ulak Karang through the implementation of the Think-Pair-Share type of Cooperative Learning model. The findings are expected to provide classroom-based evidence regarding how the structured stages of thinking individually, discussing with a

partner, and sharing ideas can contribute to a more participatory and academically meaningful Pancasila Education learning experience.

METHODS

This study employed Classroom Action Research (CAR) because the research was directed toward improving an existing instructional practice through planned actions, classroom observation, and continuous reflection. Classroom action research enables teachers and researchers to examine learning problems in an authentic classroom setting and make instructional improvements based on evidence generated during the learning process. The study followed the action research cycle adapted from Arikunto, consisting of four interconnected stages: planning, action, observation, and reflection. Two cycles were conducted, with each cycle comprising two learning sessions. The research took place at SDN 01 Ulak Karang from September to November 2025 during the first semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. The participants were 26 students of Grade VA, consisting of 10 boys and 16 girls. The class was selected purposively rather than randomly because its initial academic performance required greater instructional attention; the mean score of Grade VA was 72.35, lower than the 78.12 mean obtained by Grade VB.

Each research cycle was implemented through a systematic sequence of planning, action, observation, and reflection. The planning stage included preparing teaching modules and materials, learning media, student worksheets, observation instruments, and achievement tests. Classroom actions were organized according to the three stages of the *Think-Pair-Share* model. During the think stage, students were given time to consider and respond individually to a question or learning task; during the pair stage, they discussed their ideas with a partner; and during the share stage, the pairs communicated the results of their discussion to other students or to the class. Observation was conducted simultaneously with the instructional action to document student participation and the implementation of learning activities. Data were collected through classroom observation, non-test assessment, and learning achievement tests. Observation focused particularly on students' participation during the learning process, whereas the achievement test was administered at the end of each cycle to determine changes in students' understanding of Pancasila Education content. This use of observation and testing is consistent with the role of classroom action research instruments in capturing both the learning process and its outcomes (Firdaus et al., 2023).

The data consisted of qualitative and quantitative evidence. Qualitative data were obtained from observations of classroom processes and were examined through data review, reduction, presentation, interpretation, and reflection, while quantitative data were derived primarily from students' learning achievement scores and observation percentages. Descriptive percentage analysis was used to determine changes in teacher implementation, student learning activities, and learning achievement across cycles; therefore, no inferential statistical software was required. Student activity was examined through three indicators discussion, cooperation, and responsibility with the action considered successful when the expected achievement level reached at least 70%. The initial percentages established in the study were 52.93% for discussion, 44.11% for cooperation, and 52.93% for responsibility, with each indicator expected to increase to at least 70%. Findings from each cycle were reflected upon to identify weaknesses in the instructional process and to determine the improvements required in the following cycle. The cycle was continued when the predetermined indicators had not been achieved and was concluded once the expected improvement in learning activities and learning outcomes had been demonstrated.

RESULTS

1. Initial Learning Conditions

The preliminary classroom observation indicated that the learning activities of Grade VA students at SDN 01 Ulak Karang were still relatively low before the implementation of the *Think-Pair-Share* (TPS) model. Classroom instruction was largely teacher-centered, and most students tended to listen to the teacher without becoming actively involved in questioning, responding, discussing, or expressing their ideas. Several students also showed limited confidence when they were asked to speak in front of the class, while cooperation during group activities had not yet developed consistently. These classroom conditions resulted in uneven participation, with only a small number of students actively contributing to the learning process.

The initial academic data showed a similar pattern. Prior to the classroom action, the students obtained a mean learning score of **63.2**, indicating that their achievement in Pancasila Education still required improvement. Classroom observation further suggested that limited participation was accompanied by low confidence, insufficient peer interaction, and learning activities that provided few opportunities for students to construct and

communicate their own understanding. These findings provided the empirical basis for implementing TPS as a structured learning intervention.

2. Results of Cycle I

Cycle I consisted of two meetings focusing on the topic of cultural diversity in Indonesia. The instructional activities followed the three stages of TPS: *Think*, *Pair*, and *Share*. During the *Think* stage, students worked individually on questions or problems provided through the learning worksheet. They subsequently compared and discussed their responses with a partner during the *Pair* stage before communicating their ideas to the class during the *Share* stage. Although students began to experience a more participatory learning structure, the observation results showed that their involvement had not yet reached the predetermined success criterion of 70%.

Table 1. Student Learning Activities in Cycle I

Learning Activity Indicator	Meeting 1 (%)	Meeting 2 (%)	Cycle I Mean (%)	Interpretation
Discussion	57.69	33.33	45.51	Below success criterion
Responsibility	65.38	42.31	53.85	Below success criterion
Cooperation	53.85	30.77	42.31	Below success criterion

As presented in Table 1, none of the three learning activity indicators reached the required 70% criterion during Cycle I. Discussion activity obtained a cycle mean of 45.51%, responsibility reached 53.85%, and cooperation recorded 42.31%. Responsibility showed the highest percentage among the three indicators, although the result remained below the expected level. Cooperation represented the weakest aspect of student participation during this cycle.

Classroom observation also showed that students were still becoming accustomed to the TPS learning sequence. Some students were hesitant to communicate their ideas during pair discussions, while others relied heavily on guidance from the teacher. Participation during the *Share* stage was still concentrated among students who were more confident in speaking. These findings suggest that simply introducing the TPS structure in the first cycle was not sufficient to produce immediate and evenly distributed classroom participation.

Teacher implementation was also evaluated during Cycle I. The observation showed that the implementation score was 50% in the first meeting and increased to 75% in the

second meeting. The improvement indicated that the teacher became more familiar with organizing the TPS stages, although several instructional aspects still required refinement.

Table 2. Teacher Implementation of TPS across the Research Cycles

Cycle	Meeting 1 (%)	Meeting 2 (%)
Cycle I	50	75
Cycle II	80	95

Table 2 demonstrates a progressive improvement in the teacher's implementation of the learning model. Reflection conducted after Cycle I identified several aspects that required attention. The teacher needed to strengthen the apperception and explanation of learning objectives, provide questions that stimulated greater curiosity, guide students more intensively during pair discussions, and facilitate the formulation of learning conclusions more effectively. These findings became the basis for revising the instructional strategies applied in Cycle II.

Learning achievement also improved during the first action cycle, although the expected results had not yet been achieved. The mean score increased from 63.2 during the pre-action stage to 67.2 in Cycle I. At the end of Cycle I, 9 students had achieved the required learning criterion, whereas 17 students had not yet achieved mastery. The relatively small increase in the class mean and the number of students who remained below the required level indicated that the intervention needed to be continued into a second cycle.

3. Results of Cycle II

Cycle II was conducted through two meetings focusing on the topic of maintaining the integrity of the Republic of Indonesia through unity and solidarity. Improvements based on the reflection from Cycle I were incorporated into the lesson planning and instructional process. The teacher provided clearer learning objectives, more contextual questions, stronger guidance during paired discussions, and greater opportunities for students to communicate their reasoning. Classroom management and time allocation were also improved so that the *Think*, *Pair*, and *Share* stages could be implemented more systematically.

Student participation became more visible during this cycle. At the *Think* stage, students appeared more accustomed to reading and analysing problems independently before writing their initial responses. Pair discussions also became more interactive because students increasingly exchanged ideas rather than merely comparing final answers. The most apparent change occurred during the *Share* stage, where a greater number of students were willing to

present their conclusions and respond to other pairs. Students who had previously been reluctant to participate gradually showed greater confidence in communicating their ideas.

Table 3. Student Learning Activities in Cycle II

Learning Activity Indicator	Meeting 1 (%)	Meeting 2 (%)	Cycle II Mean (%)	Interpretation
Discussion	76.92	80.46	78.69	Achieved
Cooperation	73.08	93.31	82.70	Achieved
Responsibility	69.23	80.77	74.73	Achieved

Table 3 shows substantial improvements in all three indicators. Discussion activity increased to an average of 78.69%, cooperation reached 82.70%, and responsibility increased to 74.73%. All three indicators therefore exceeded the predetermined success criterion of 70%. Cooperation produced the highest percentage in Cycle II, suggesting that students became increasingly comfortable exchanging ideas, assisting their partners, and completing learning tasks collaboratively.

The improvement was particularly apparent from the first to the second meeting of Cycle II. Cooperation increased from 73.08% to 93.31%, while responsibility rose from 69.23% to 80.77%. Discussion also increased from 76.92% to 80.46%. Classroom observations supported these numerical results: discussions became more active, students responded more frequently to their partners' ideas, and more pairs were willing to communicate their conclusions during the *Share* stage. The teacher's implementation also increased from 80% in the first meeting to 95% in the second meeting, indicating greater consistency in applying the TPS learning sequence.

4. Improvement in Learning Activities and Learning Outcomes

A comparison between Cycle I and Cycle II provides a clearer picture of the changes in students' learning activities. All three observed indicators increased considerably after the instructional improvements introduced in the second cycle.

Table 4. Improvement in Student Learning Activities from Cycle I to Cycle II

Learning Activity Indicator	Cycle I (%)	Cycle II (%)	Increase (Percentage Points)
Discussion	45.51	78.69	33.18
Cooperation	42.31	82.70	40.39
Responsibility	53.85	74.73	20.88

As shown in Table 4, the largest improvement occurred in cooperation, which increased by 40.39 percentage points, from 42.31% in Cycle I to 82.70% in Cycle II. Discussion increased by 33.18 percentage points, while responsibility improved by 20.88 percentage points. These results indicate that the TPS structure was particularly effective in

creating opportunities for peer interaction. The *Pair* stage allowed students to exchange ideas in a less intimidating setting before they were expected to communicate them to the entire class, while the *Share* stage gradually encouraged broader participation.

A similar upward pattern was observed in students' academic achievement. The mean score increased at each stage of the research, from the pre-action assessment to Cycle I and finally to Cycle II.

Table 5. Development of Students' Learning Outcomes

Research Stage	Mean Learning Score	Increase from Previous Stage
Pre-action	63.2	–
Cycle I	67.2	4.0
Cycle II	89.2	22.0

Table 5 demonstrates that the students' mean score increased from 63.2 before the action to 67.2 at the end of Cycle I, representing an increase of 4.0 points. A considerably larger improvement occurred in Cycle II, when the mean score reached 89.2, representing an increase of 22.0 points from Cycle I and 26.0 points from the pre-action stage. The improvement in academic performance occurred alongside the increase in discussion, cooperation, and responsibility, indicating that students became more actively engaged in both the process and outcomes of learning.

The reflection conducted at the end of Cycle II confirmed that the predetermined classroom action criteria had been achieved. Students were more accustomed to working through the *Think*, *Pair*, and *Share* sequence, classroom discussions became more interactive, cooperation among students improved, and responsibility for completing learning tasks became more visible. Teacher implementation also became increasingly consistent after weaknesses identified during Cycle I were addressed. Since all three student activity indicators had exceeded the 70% success criterion, the classroom action was concluded at Cycle II. Overall, the findings demonstrate a progressive improvement in both learning activities and learning outcomes following the implementation and refinement of the *Think-Pair-Share* type of Cooperative Learning in Grade VA Pancasila Education.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that the implementation of the *Think-Pair-Share* (TPS) type of Cooperative Learning contributed to a meaningful improvement in students' learning activities in Pancasila Education. The changes were evident across the three observed

indicators: discussion, cooperation, and responsibility. Discussion increased from 45.51% in Cycle I to 78.69% in Cycle II, cooperation rose from 42.31% to 82.70%, and responsibility improved from 53.85% to 74.73%. The strongest improvement occurred in cooperation, with an increase of 40.39 percentage points. These results indicate that students gradually moved from relatively passive participation toward a learning pattern in which they were more willing to communicate ideas, listen to their peers, complete shared tasks, and take greater responsibility for the learning process. The change did not occur immediately after TPS was introduced. Rather, it developed through repeated classroom experiences and instructional reflection, suggesting that students needed time to become familiar with learning expectations that required greater independence and interaction.

The structure of TPS helps explain this change in student participation. The *Think* stage provides students with personal time to understand a question and formulate an initial response before interacting with others. This stage is particularly valuable for students who may need more time or confidence before speaking in a group. The *Pair* stage then creates a smaller and more supportive social space in which students can compare answers, clarify misunderstandings, and develop ideas with a peer. The *Share* stage extends this interaction by encouraging students to communicate the results of their discussion to a wider audience. Rukmini (2020) explains that TPS structures learning around individual thinking, paired interaction, and sharing, allowing students to participate more actively than in predominantly teacher-centered instruction. The present findings also support Hikmawati (2021), who showed that learning activities developed through a TPS-based cooperative structure can encourage greater student involvement. Student interaction therefore appears to be more than an additional classroom activity; it becomes part of the process through which understanding is constructed.

The considerable increase in cooperation is also consistent with the broader principles of cooperative learning. Students in Cycle I were still adjusting to working with partners, and several relied heavily on teacher direction. Improvements made after reflection including clearer instructions, stronger teacher guidance, more appropriate prompting questions, and better organization of classroom time allowed pair interactions to become more productive in Cycle II. The original reflection showed that instructional planning, guiding questions, time allocation, and teacher assistance during discussion required improvement after the first cycle. Similar patterns have been reported by Fijriah et al. (2024), who emphasized that cooperative learning can strengthen students' collaborative skills when

learning activities provide opportunities for meaningful interaction. Rohanah et al. (2020) likewise identified social interaction as an important element associated with students' learning activities. The findings of the present study extend these ideas to fifth-grade Pancasila Education by showing that structured interaction can encourage students who were initially reluctant to participate to become progressively more involved in collaborative learning.

Improvement was not limited to classroom activity but was also reflected in students' academic achievement. The mean learning score increased from 63.2 at the pre-action stage to 67.2 in Cycle I and subsequently reached 89.2 in Cycle II, producing an overall increase of 26 points from the initial assessment. This pattern suggests that greater classroom participation developed alongside stronger academic performance. The finding is consistent with Nurhayati (2017), who reported that TPS had a positive influence on students' mathematics learning outcomes, and with Noor and Munandar (2019), who found relationships between cooperative learning, learning activity, and student achievement. Although those studies were conducted in different subject contexts, their findings support the view that opportunities to think individually and discuss ideas with peers can facilitate students' understanding of learning material. The present study adds evidence from Pancasila Education, where learning requires students not only to recognize concepts but also to communicate viewpoints and understand social values through interaction.

The improvement in learning outcomes can also be understood through changes in the students' learning experiences. Pancasila Education contains concepts related to diversity, unity, responsibility, citizenship, and social life that can become less meaningful when students encounter them only through teacher explanation. Pair discussion allowed students to connect these concepts with their own interpretations and everyday experiences, while the sharing stage gave them opportunities to hear perspectives that differed from their own. Such learning experiences are relevant to the character-building orientation of Pancasila Education. Amelia et al. (2020) emphasize the role of citizenship education in cultivating character values, while Galuh et al. (2021) highlight the importance of moral and value education in elementary-school citizenship learning. TPS therefore has value not only because students obtain higher scores, but also because its learning structure provides a setting in which listening, respecting opinions, cooperating, and accepting responsibility can be practiced directly during classroom interaction.

Teacher reflection constituted another important feature of the improvement observed across the two cycles. Cycle I revealed weaknesses in apperception, questioning techniques, guidance during discussion, time management, and the organization of learning activities. These weaknesses were addressed before and during Cycle II, and teacher implementation consequently became more systematic. The second cycle showed better alignment between students' prior knowledge, prompting questions, learning activities, assessment procedures, and classroom time. This finding highlights an important characteristic of classroom action research: improvement cannot be attributed solely to the use of a named learning model. The effectiveness of TPS also depends on how thoughtfully the teacher facilitates each stage and responds to students' needs. Students may be placed in pairs, yet meaningful cooperative learning will not necessarily occur without clear tasks, balanced participation, supportive questioning, and appropriate feedback. The improvement observed in this study therefore reflects an interaction between the TPS structure and the teacher's increasingly responsive instructional practice.

The findings have both practical and theoretical implications for elementary Pancasila Education. Practically, teachers may use TPS as an alternative when classroom learning is characterized by limited student participation, hesitation to express opinions, or weak peer cooperation. The model is relatively manageable because it does not require complicated technological resources; its main strength lies in organizing time and interaction so that each student first develops an idea, discusses it in a smaller setting, and then contributes to a broader conversation. Theoretically, the results reinforce the view that active learning and academic achievement are closely connected through social and cognitive engagement. Students' achievement improved at the same time as their discussion, cooperation, and responsibility developed, indicating that learning outcomes should not be understood only as final test scores. The process through which students interact, think, communicate, and assume responsibility is also an important dimension of successful learning. This interpretation is consistent with the emphasis placed by Amalda & Prasojo (2018) and Fernando et al. (2024) on the relationship between supportive learning conditions, student engagement, motivation, and educational achievement.

Several limitations should nevertheless be considered when interpreting these findings. The study involved only 26 fifth-grade students from one class at one elementary school, which limits the extent to which the results can be generalized to broader student populations. The classroom action research design also did not employ a comparison or

control group; consequently, the observed improvement cannot be interpreted as evidence that TPS alone caused all changes in student achievement. The two cycles covered different Pancasila Education topics, which may have varied in difficulty and student familiarity. Observation data on discussion, cooperation, and responsibility also depended partly on observer judgment, creating the possibility of subjective assessment despite the use of structured observation sheets. The relatively short duration of the study did not allow examination of whether improvements in participation and academic achievement would be maintained over a longer period. Future research could therefore involve multiple schools or classes, longer implementation periods, more standardized observational measures, and comparative designs to examine the consistency and sustainability of TPS effects in Pancasila Education.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussion, the implementation of the *Think-Pair-Share* (TPS) type of Cooperative Learning model improved both students' learning activities and learning outcomes in Pancasila Education among Grade V students at SDN 01 Ulak Karang. The improvement was evident across the three observed indicators of learning activity. Discussion increased from 45.51% in Cycle I to 78.69% in Cycle II, cooperation increased from 42.31% to 82.70%, and responsibility improved from 53.85% to 74.73%. These changes indicate that the structured stages of *think*, *pair*, and *share* provided students with greater opportunities to develop ideas independently, exchange perspectives with peers, and communicate their understanding more confidently. The instructional process also became more effective after reflection and improvement in the second cycle, particularly in relation to lesson organization, classroom management, teacher guidance, questioning, and student participation.

The improvement in classroom engagement was accompanied by better academic achievement. The students' mean score increased from 67.2 in Cycle I to 89.2 in Cycle II, showing that the learning process became more supportive of students' understanding of Pancasila Education content. These findings suggest that TPS can serve as a practical alternative for elementary-school teachers who seek to create a more participatory, collaborative, and student-centered learning environment. The effectiveness of the model, however, depends on careful teacher facilitation, appropriate learning tasks, and sufficient opportunities for every student to participate in each stage of the activity. Future research is

recommended to examine the implementation of TPS with larger groups of students, across different schools and Pancasila Education topics, and over longer instructional periods to determine whether improvements in participation and learning achievement can be sustained consistently.

REFERENCES

Amalda, N., & Prasojo, L. D. (2018). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Guru, Disiplin Kerja Guru, dan Kedisiplinan Siswa terhadap Prestasi Belajar Siswa. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan, 6*(1), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.21831/amp.v6i1.7515

Amelia, F., Sarjono, S., & Hariyadi, A. (2020). Peranan Pembelajaran PPKn dalam Menanamkan Nilai-Nilai Karakter pada Siswa Kelas VIII di MTs Miftahul Ulum Sitiaji. *Edunesia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 1*(3), 82–88. https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v1i3.63

Fernando, Y., Andriani, P., & Syam, H. (2024). Pentingnya Motivasi Belajar dalam Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Siswa. *ALFIHRIS: Jurnal Inspirasi Pendidikan, 2*(3), 61–68. https://doi.org/10.59246/alfihris.v2i3.843

Fijriah, H., Ningsih, S. Y., & Gusmaneli. (2024). Penerapan Strategi Pembelajaran Kooperatif dalam Pembelajaran PAI untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Kerja Sama Siswa. *Ta'rim: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Anak Usia Dini, 5*(2), 8–21. https://doi.org/10.59059/tarim.v5i2.1177

Firdaus, I., Hidayati, R., Hamidah, R. S., Rianti, R., & Khotimah, R. C. K. (2023). Model-Model Pengumpulan Data dalam Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. *Jurnal Kreativitas Mahasiswa, 1*(2), 105–113. https://riset-iaid.net/index.php/jpm/article/view/1443

Galuh, A. D., Maharani, D., Meynawati, L., Anggraeni, D., & Furnamasari, Y. F. (2021). Urgensi Nilai dan Moral dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Pendidikan Karakter melalui Pembelajaran PKn di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu, 5*(6), 5169–5178. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i6.1598

Hikmawati, L. (2021). *Pengembangan Media Pembelajaran GoGeo untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Pengenalan Geometri Anak Usia Dini di TK Al-Barokah, Tangerang* [Skripsi, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta]. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta Institutional Repository. https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/58767

Istiqomah, L., & Wibowo, S. E. (2024). Effective learning of Pancasila education through technology-based interactive media for elementary school students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif, 14*(3), 1990–2004. https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v14.i3.2024135

Marwah, S. S., Syafe'i, M., & Sumarna, E. (2018). Relevansi Konsep Pendidikan Menurut Ki Hadjar Dewantara dengan Pendidikan Islam. *TARBAWY: Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education, 5*(1), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.17509/t.v5i1.13336

Mayasari, A., Pujasari, W., Ulfah, U., & Arifudin, O. (2021). Pengaruh Media Visual pada Materi Pembelajaran terhadap Motivasi Belajar Peserta Didik. *Jurnal Tahsinia, 2*(2), 173–179. https://doi.org/10.57171/jt.v2i2.303

Mundelsee, L., & Jurkowski, S. (2021). Think and pair before share: Effects of collaboration on students' in-class participation. *Learning and Individual Differences, 88*, 102015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102015

Noor, N., & Munandar, I. (2019). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif (Tipe TAI dan TPS) dan Aktivitas Belajar terhadap Hasil Belajar Matematika: Eksperimen pada Kelas X SMK Kosgoro Karawang. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP) STKIP Kusuma Negara, 11*(1), 65–75. https://jurnal.stkipkusumanegara.ac.id/index.php/jip/article/view/89

Ramdani, N. G., Fauziyyah, N., Fuadah, R., Rudiyono, S., Septiyaningrum, Y. A., Salamatussa'adah, N., & Hayani, A. (2023). Definisi dan Teori Pendekatan, Strategi, dan Metode Pembelajaran. *Indonesian Journal of Elementary Education and Teaching Innovation, 2*(1), 20–31. https://doi.org/10.21927/ijeeti.2023.2(1).20-31

Rohanah, L., Mirawati, M., & Anwar, W. S. (2020). Pengaruh Interaksi Sosial terhadap Aktivitas Belajar Peserta Didik. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran Guru Sekolah Dasar (JPPGuseda), 3*(2), 139–143. https://doi.org/10.55215/jppguseda.v3i2.3011

Rukmini, A. (2020). Model Kooperatif Tipe Think Pair Share (TPS) dalam Pembelajaran PKn SD. *Social, Humanities, and Educational Studies (SHES): Conference Series, 3*(3), 2176–2181. https://doi.org/10.20961/shes.v3i3.57088

Sari, C. I., Fitriyah, C. Z., & Puspitaningrum, D. A. (2025). The effect of cooperative learning model type Think Pair Share on social attitudes of elementary school students. *Jurnal Reviu Pendidikan Dasar: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan dan Hasil Penelitian, 11*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.26740/jrpd.v11n1.p1-11

Sekarwati, D., Widodo, S. T., Azizah, W. A., & Kristiyanti, N. (2023). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Think Pair Share (TPS) untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar dan Kerja Sama Siswa Kelas V SD. *Didaktik: Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD STKIP Subang, 9*(5), 1826–1836. https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v9i5.2145

Sun, J., Anderson, R. C., Lin, T.-J., Morris, J. A., Miller, B. W., Ma, S., Nguyen-Jahiel, K. T., & Scott, T. (2022). Children's engagement during collaborative learning and direct instruction through the lens of participant structure. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 69*, 102061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2022.102061

Wuryandani, W., & Herwin, H. (2021). The effect of the think–pair–share model on learning outcomes of Civics in elementary school students. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 16*(2), 627–640. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5640