Vol. 4, No. 4, December 2026, pp. 3758-3768
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
POST AXIAL
FUTURISTIC TEACHING AND LEARNING
https://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/postaxial | | ISSN 3025-7549

Implementing Project-Based Learning with Deep Learning for Junior High Students' Public Policy Literacy and Civic Skills

Sarwiningsih[1a*], Oksiana Jatiningsih[2b], Siti Maizul Habibah[3c]
[1,2,3]Master's Program in Pancasila and Civic Education, Faculty of Social Sciences and Political Science, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

[a]26041965009@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [b]oksianajatingsih@unesa.ac.id, [c]sitihabibah@unesa.ac.id

Article History:
Received:
18-09-2026
Revised:
11-10-2026
Accepted:
10-11-2026

Keywords:
Civic skills; Deep Learning; Portfolio showcase; Project-Based Learning; Public policy literacy; QRIS parking

***Correspondence Address:**
26041965009@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstract:
Teaching legislation and public policy at the junior high school level often feels abstract and detached from students' lived experience, and empirical evidence on how Deep Learning principles can be built into project-based civic education is still scarce. This study examined the implementation of Project-Based Learning (PjBL) integrated with a Deep Learning approach (Mindful, Meaningful, and Joyful Learning) to improve students' understanding of public policy and their civic skills. A one-cycle classroom action research with a one-group pre-test–post-test design and performance assessment was conducted with 32 eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 19 Surabaya. Over four meetings, student groups completed a four-part portfolio (problem identification, evaluation of existing policies, alternative policy proposals, and an action plan) on local issues: illegal parking, QRIS cashless parking levies, and school uniforms for low-income students. Data were collected through a HOTS test (C3–C5), performance rubrics, and written student reflections, and analyzed descriptively. Classical mastery (criterion 82) rose from 25.0% (8 students) in the pre-test to 87.5% (28 students) in the post-test, exceeding the 75% success criterion. In the skills assessment, 87.5%–93.8% of students were rated Excellent in discussion and portfolio work, showcase presentation, and creative products. PjBL built around local policy issues and designed with Deep Learning principles can turn abstract legal content into meaningful learning experiences and encourage young citizens' participation. Because the study lacks a comparison group, the results are preliminary and should be tested with quasi-experimental designs.

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction (مقدمة)

Pancasila Education at the junior high school (SMP) level plays a strategic role in shaping the character and legal awareness of students as young citizens. In the Merdeka Curriculum, the Learning Outcomes (CP) for the element of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI 1945) require students not only to memorize the hierarchy of laws and regulations theoretically, but also to be able to critique them, understand the legal hierarchy, and implement citizens' rights and obligations in responding to social issues in their surroundings (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, 2022). This demand is in line with the idea that good civic education must develop three components simultaneously: civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Center for Civic Education, 1994).

Nevertheless, the practice of teaching Pancasila Education in the field often faces methodological constraints. Material on law and legislation is frequently perceived as abstract, rigid, and monotonous when delivered merely through descriptive lectures. This condition leads to low critical engagement and poor retention among students regarding the urgency of a regulation in creating the common good (*bonum commune*). Westheimer and Kahne (2004) warn that civic education that stops at obedience (the *personally responsible citizen*) is not enough; students also need to be trained to participate in public affairs and to weigh the fairness of a policy. On the other hand, students actually encounter public policy every day, for example when their parents pay for parking or when the school distributes uniforms to underprivileged students, but these experiences are rarely connected to the legal concepts studied in class.

The urgency of addressing this problem is supported by empirical evidence. International studies show that the quality of civic learning opportunities matters: an open classroom climate for discussing political and social issues is associated with higher civic knowledge and engagement (Torney-Purta et al., 2001), and school-based opportunities such as discussing current issues and working on community problems predict students' commitment to civic participation (Kahne & Sporte, 2008). Classroom discussion of public issues is likewise regarded as a core practice of democratic education (Hess & McAvoy, 2015). Civic education therefore needs to be organized around experiences in which students investigate and respond to real public problems, in line with Dewey's (1916) view of democratic learning as learning through shared experience, and not around the transmission of legal content alone (Cogan & Derricott, 2014).

Public policy literacy in this study is defined as students' ability to understand the legal basis of a policy, identify the problem it is intended to solve, assess the strengths and weaknesses of existing policies, and formulate alternative proposals argumentatively. This ability lies in the cognitive domain from C3 (applying) to C5 (evaluating) in the revised Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) and demands learning experiences that are far more active than memorizing articles of law.

To address this pedagogical gap, an innovative learning model is needed that can bridge macro-level legal concepts and students' micro-level life realities. This study integrates a portfolio-oriented Project-Based Learning (PjBL) model with a Deep Learning approach (*Mindful*, *Meaningful*, and *Joyful Learning*). Through a contextual PjBL model, students are invited to examine real public policies in the City of Surabaya, such as the implementation of non-cash parking payments based on QRIS (Surabaya Mayor Regulation No. 26 of 2024; Surabaya City Government, 2024), the policy of providing equal free uniforms for students from low-income households (*Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah*, MBR), and environmental governance through waste banks.

PjBL is a promising response to this need. A meta-analysis found that PjBL had a significant positive effect on students' academic achievement compared with traditional instruction (Chen & Yang, 2019), and reviews report benefits for motivation, collaboration, and understanding (Guo et al., 2020; Kokotsaki et al., 2016). However, the same literature stresses that the outcomes depend heavily on the quality of project design, mentoring, and assessment, and that the evidence is "promising but not proven" because many studies cannot rule out alternative explanations (Condliffe et al., 2017; Kokotsaki et al., 2016).

Three research gaps can be identified. First, much of the PjBL evidence comes from higher education and from subjects other than civic education (Guo et al., 2020), whereas, to the authors' knowledge, empirical reports on junior high school students' public policy literacy, that is, the ability to examine real regulations and propose alternatives, remain scarce. Second, the deep learning approach has only recently been introduced in Indonesian national education policy (Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, 2025), and empirical evidence of its application in Pancasila Education is still limited, especially studies that use its mindful, meaningful, and joyful principles as an explicit framework for designing projects. Third, few studies report in the same intervention both higher-order cognitive outcomes (C3–C5) and observable civic skills (discussion, presentation, and real-action products) based on local regulations that students actually experience.

This study addresses these gaps by combining PjBL and Deep Learning principles on local public policy issues close to students' lives, and by examining both cognitive understanding and civic skills in one design. Its contribution is twofold: an empirical estimate of change in a regular Pancasila Education classroom, and a concrete model (Table 1) showing how PjBL syntax, Deep Learning principles, and portfolio components can be aligned meeting by meeting.

Public Policy Literacy and Civic Skills

The national civic education standards in the United States formulate three main components, namely *civic knowledge*, *civic skills*, and *civic dispositions* (Center for Civic Education, 1994). Civic skills encompass intellectual skills (identifying, describing, explaining, and evaluating public issues) as well as participatory skills (interacting, monitoring, and influencing the policy process). In the Indonesian context, these three components are in line with the formulation of knowledge, skills, and civic character in civic education (Winataputra & Budimansyah, 2012). Banks (2020) adds that civic knowledge becomes meaningful only when followed by civic action, so learning needs to give students room to act, not merely to understand. Citizenship education for the twenty-first century likewise treats the ability to analyze public issues and take part in public life as part of what students must learn (Cogan & Derricott, 2014).

Project-Based Learning

Thomas (2000) identifies five characteristics of PjBL: projects are central to the curriculum, are driven by guiding questions or challenging problems, involve constructive investigation, give students autonomy, and are realistic. Krajcik and Blumenfeld (2006) add that driving questions, tangible artifacts (products), collaboration, and the use of technology are the main pillars of PjBL. The review by Kokotsaki et al. (2016) affirms the benefits of PjBL for motivation, collaboration, and understanding, while also noting its challenges, namely time management, clarity of the teacher's role, and fair assessment of group work. The constructivist foundation of PjBL is rooted in Dewey's (1916) idea of learning through experience and in Vygotsky's (1978) theory of social learning within the zone of proximal development.

Deep Learning Approach

The term *deep learning* in education has two roots. First, Marton and Säljö (1976) distinguished the *deep approach* to learning, which focuses on meaning and the relationships

among ideas, from the *surface approach*, which focuses on rote memorization. Second, Fullan et al. (2018) developed *deep learning* as a learning experience that builds global competencies such as character, citizenship, collaboration, communication, creativity, and critical thinking. In Indonesian education policy, deep learning was introduced by the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (2025) with three principles: *mindful*, *meaningful*, and *joyful*. *Mindful learning* emphasizes students' awareness of the purposes and processes of their learning; *meaningful learning* connects content with real contexts; and *joyful learning* creates a safe, collaborative, and enjoyable atmosphere. These principles resonate with earlier theories: mindful learning, in Langer's (1997) sense, involves awareness of context and openness to new information, and meaningful learning occurs when new material is anchored to what learners already know and experience (Ausubel, 1968).

Public Policy Portfolio as a Project Vehicle

The four portfolio documents in this study (problem identification, evaluation of existing policies, alternative policy proposals, and an action plan) follow the logic of the *Project Citizen* classroom portfolio developed by the Center for Civic Education, in which students choose a public problem in their environment, examine existing policies, propose a policy, and design an action plan. This structure fits well with the PjBL syntax because each document becomes an intermediate artifact that can be assessed, and the whole sequence culminates in real action. Table 1 maps the integration of PjBL syntax, Deep Learning principles, and portfolio components at each meeting.

Table 1. Integration of PjBL Syntax, Deep Learning Principles, and Portfolio Components

Meeting	PjBL Syntax	Deep Learning Principle	Portfolio Activities and Products
1	Essential question; project determination	*Mindful* and *Meaningful*	Reflection on rules; *pre-test*; selection of priority issue; formation of 4 groups
2	Investigation; preparation of schedule and documents	*Meaningful* and collaborative	Data collection with *smartphones*; 4 portfolio documents; initial *showcase*
3	Product creation	*Joyful* and creative	Educational posters on legal compliance and QRIS digital parking
4	Presentation; evaluation; reflection	Action and reflection	Real-action video; *post-test*; *Wall of Reflection*

This study aims to: (1) analyze the improvement in students' cognitive understanding of legislation and public policy after participating in PjBL with a Deep Learning approach; (2) describe students' achievement of civic skills in discussion, showcase presentation, and real-action products; and (3) explain how the *mindful*, *meaningful*, and *joyful* principles contribute to these achievements.

Method (منهج)

Research Design

This study used a mixed quantitative and descriptive qualitative approach in the form of Classroom Action Research (CAR) following the stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988), with a one-group *pre-test–post-test* design. The action was carried out in one cycle.

Methodological Framework and Alignment with the Research Objectives

The methodological framework combines Classroom Action Research (CAR) as the overall strategy with a convergent mixed-methods logic, in which quantitative and qualitative data are collected in the same period and then compared (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). CAR was chosen because the researcher was also the teacher and the aim was to improve practice in a real classroom while examining its results (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988). The single cycle proceeded as follows: planning (lesson plans, portfolio templates, rubrics, and the test), action (four meetings), observation (pre-test and post-test, performance assessment, and reflection notes), and reflection (analysis and interpretation of results). The one-group pre-test–post-test design is a pre-experimental design that permits only limited causal inference (Campbell & Stanley, 1963); it is used here to estimate change within a regular classroom as a first step before controlled studies, and this limitation is taken into account in the interpretation of the findings.

Each research objective is matched to a specific data source and analysis. Objective 1 (cognitive understanding) is answered by the pre-test and post-test scores, analyzed as classical mastery against the 75% success criterion. Objective 2 (civic skills) is answered by the performance rubric, analyzed through frequencies, percentages, and mean scores. Objective 3 (the contribution of the *mindful*, *meaningful*, and *joyful* principles) is answered interpretively, by examining how each principle was built into the intervention (Table 1) and by comparing students' written reflections with the quantitative results for triangulation. Because Objective 3 is not tested statistically, it is treated as an explanatory interpretation and not as a causal estimate.

Participant (Subject) Characteristics

The study was conducted at SMP Negeri 19 Surabaya in the odd semester of the 2026/2027 academic year. The participants were 32 eighth-grade students who were heterogeneous in terms of academic and socio-economic background. The researcher acted as the teacher implementing the lessons. Students and parents were given an explanation of the purpose of the study, and student data are presented in aggregate without identifying individuals.

Learning Intervention Design

The intervention was carried out in four meetings (a total of 12 lesson periods of 40 minutes each) based on the PjBL syntax and the Deep Learning framework, as follows.

- **Meeting 1 (*Mindful & Meaningful Learning*):** initial reflection on home/school rules, a *pre-test* based on a case study of public policy in Surabaya, formulation of the essential question, determination of the class's priority issue (illegal parking vs. QRIS parking), and division into four portfolio groups.
- **Meeting 2 (*Meaningful & Collaborative Learning*):** data collection and digital literacy through the use of *smartphones*, analysis of the four portfolio documents (Problem Identification, Existing Policy Evaluation, Alternative Policy Proposal, and Action Plan), followed by presentation of the initial portfolio (*showcase*).
- **Meeting 3 (*Joyful & Creative Learning*):** group production of visual campaign products in the form of educational posters on local legal compliance and QRIS digital parking.
- **Meeting 4 (*Action & Reflection*):** presentation of real-action videos on community participation in supporting public policy, administration of the summative *post-test*, and reflection on the learning experience (*sticky notes* on the *Wall of Reflection*).

Research Instruments

Two types of instruments were used. First, a written test consisting of 10 multiple-choice HOTS items at levels C3–C5 based on public policy case studies, administered as the *pre-test* and *post-test* with equivalent items arranged by cognitive level (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

Second, a performance assessment rubric for three skill aspects, namely discussion and portfolio preparation, *showcase* presentation and media, and the quality of creative products (posters and videos), on a scale of 1–4. In addition, students' written reflections on *sticky notes* were collected at the end of meeting 4 as supporting data.

Data Analysis Technique

Cognitive data were analyzed using the classical mastery formula, namely the percentage of students who reached the Learning Objective Achievement Criterion (KKTP) of 82 out of all students, with a success criterion for the action of ≥ 75% of students reaching the KKTP. The improvement was calculated as the difference in mastery percentage between the *post-test* and the *pre-test*. Skills data were analyzed by calculating the number and percentage of students in each category (Excellent = score 4, Good = score 3, Fair/Poor = score 1–2) as well as the mean score expressed as a percentage of the maximum score of 4. Students' reflection notes were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively through data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing (Miles et al., 2014), and then compared with the quantitative data for triangulation.

Result (نتائج)

The results are presented according to the three research objectives: cognitive understanding of public policy (Objective 1), the development of civic skills (Objective 2), and students' reflections as supporting evidence for the contribution of the three Deep Learning principles (Objective 3).

Objective 1: Cognitive Understanding of Public Policy

The implementation of PjBL integrated with Deep Learning was followed by an improvement in students' cognitive understanding of legislation and public policy in the City of Surabaya. The *pre-test* and *post-test* results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of Cognitive Learning Mastery in the Pre-Test and Post-Test (N = 32)

Type of Evaluation	Number of Students	Mastered (≥ 82)	Not Yet Mastered (< 82)	Classical Mastery (%)
Pre-Test	32	8	24	25.0%
Post-Test	32	28	4	87.5%
Improvement (*Gain*)	–	+20 students	−20 students	+62.5 percentage points

Based on Table 2, at baseline (*pre-test*) classical mastery reached only 25.0% (8 of 32 students). Most students had difficulty with HOTS items that connected regional policies (such as the Surabaya Mayor Regulation on QRIS parking and uniforms for MBR students) with the hierarchy of legislation and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. After the four-meeting PjBL intervention, classical mastery rose to 87.5% (28 of 32 students reached the KKTP), an increase of 20 students. This achievement exceeded the success criterion set for the action and indicates that the process of investigating local problems helped students understand the function of law in an applicable way. The four students who had not yet mastered the material indicate that individual mentoring remains necessary in project-based learning.

This result can also be read through the lens of learning approaches. The *pre-test* items that required reasoning (C3–C5) were difficult for students accustomed to studying law as a list of facts to memorize (*surface approach*). During the project, students had to answer questions such as "why does parking need to be paid non-cash?" and "which policy is fairer for MBR students?",

which forced them to connect norms, policy objectives, and impacts. This pattern is consistent with the characteristics of a deep approach that focuses on meaning (Marton & Säljö, 1976). However, because this study has no comparison group, the improvement cannot yet be fully attributed to the intervention; the influence of other factors such as familiarity with answering the same questions, maturation, or enthusiasm for something new cannot be ruled out.

In summary, the gain of 62.5 percentage points means that classical mastery was 3.5 times higher after the intervention than before it, and that it surpassed the 75% success criterion by 12.5 percentage points. The remaining 12.5% (4 students) shows that the gain was not uniform across the class.

Objective 2: Development of Civic Skills

In addition to cognitive achievement, the performance assessment showed high attainment of civic skills. The assessment results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Students' Skills and Performance Assessment (N = 32)

Assessment Aspect	Excellent (Score 4)	Good (Score 3)	Fair/Poor (Score 1–2)	Mean Score	% of Max. Score
Discussion and portfolio	28 students (87.5%)	4 students (12.5%)	0 students (0%)	3.88	96.9%
Showcase presentation and media	30 students (93.8%)	2 students (6.2%)	0 students (0%)	3.94	98.4%
Creative products (posters and videos)	28 students (87.5%)	4 students (12.5%)	0 students (0%)	3.88	96.9%

All students were in the Good or Excellent category on all three aspects. The *showcase* presentation was the highest-scoring aspect, with 30 students (93.8%) in the Excellent category. This is plausible because students presented their portfolios twice, namely the initial *showcase* in meeting 2 and the real-action presentation in meeting 4, so they received feedback and opportunities to improve. The results for discussion and creative products (87.5% Excellent) indicate that group work based on the four portfolio documents gave students a clear structure for reasoning, sharing roles, and producing assessable artifacts. It should be noted that the assessment was carried out by the teacher who also designed the lessons, so the possibility of rater bias needs to be considered; future research should involve a second rater.

Differences among the three aspects were small (mean scores of 3.88–3.94 out of 4), and no student fell into the Fair/Poor category. This pattern shows high attainment but also a ceiling effect: the rubric differentiated little among students at the top, so the data describe how well the class performed rather than which students needed further support. Whether these skills transfer beyond the classroom project cannot be determined from the present data.

Objective 3 (Supporting Evidence): Student Reflections

At the end of meeting 4, students wrote down their feelings after participating in the lessons. Written reflections on *sticky notes* on the *Wall of Reflection* were analyzed to understand students' learning experiences. These expressions were used as supporting data and were not converted into scores. Because the notes were not scored, they are used in the Discussion only to illustrate how students experienced the three principles and not as evidence of effect.

Discussion (مناقشة)

Interpreting the Cognitive Gains

The rise in classical mastery from 25.0% to 87.5% points in the same direction as the meta-analytic evidence that PjBL improves academic achievement (Chen & Yang, 2019) and as the benefits reported in reviews (Guo et al., 2020; Kokotsaki et al., 2016). The finding also adds two qualifications. First, the test items were at the C3–C5 levels (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), so the gain concerns applying, analyzing, and evaluating policy cases and not only recalling facts. Students' baseline difficulty in linking regional regulations to the hierarchy of laws suggests that they had treated law as a list of facts (surface approach), whereas the project tasks, such as judging which policy is fairer for MBR students, required them to relate norms, objectives, and impacts, which is the hallmark of a deep approach (Marton & Säljö, 1976). Second, the four students who did not reach the criterion illustrate the caution in the literature that project outcomes depend on mentoring and project quality (Condliffe et al., 2017; Kokotsaki et al., 2016): group projects alone do not guarantee individual mastery. Finally, because of the one-group design, the gain cannot be separated from test familiarity, maturation, or the novelty of the activities (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

Interpreting the Development of Civic Skills

The high skills attainment can be related to what is known about civic learning opportunities. Discussing issues, presenting proposals, and working on community problems are the kinds of opportunities that earlier studies associate with stronger civic engagement (Kahne & Sporte, 2008; Torney-Purta et al., 2001), and the collaborative evaluation of competing policy options reflects the practice of classroom discussion on public issues (Hess & McAvoy, 2015). The *Project Citizen*-style portfolio also operationalizes the participatory dimension of civic skills (Center for Civic Education, 1994), because students had to monitor a policy, propose an alternative, and communicate it to the public. This is where the study moves from knowledge toward the participatory citizen described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004). These interpretations should be read together with the ceiling effect noted above and with the possibility of rater bias, since the teacher was also the assessor.

Pedagogical Discussion: Integrating Deep Learning into PjBL

The achievements above can be explained through the three Deep Learning principles integrated into PjBL.

- ***Mindful Learning*** **(critical awareness).** Learning began with trigger questions about compliance with norms at home and at school. Students became aware that rules are not merely restrictions but mechanisms of social protection. Awareness of "what this learning is for" also helped students direct their attention to the project's goals, in line with the function of driving questions in PjBL (Krajcik & Blumenfeld, 2006). This is consistent with Langer's (1997) view of mindfulness as awareness of context and purpose.
- ***Meaningful Learning*** **(contextual connection).** The use of the local context of the City of Surabaya, such as the shift from controlling illegal parking to digital QRIS parking to prevent illegal levies and increase Local Own-Source Revenue (PAD), changed students' perceptions of legal norms. The concepts of the position of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and regional regulations became concrete because their impacts were felt directly in everyday life. This connection is consistent with the principle of realism in PjBL (Thomas, 2000) and the idea of learning through experience (Dewey, 1916). It also fits Ausubel's (1968) argument that meaning arises when new content is anchored to learners' own experience.

- ***Joyful Learning* (enjoyable experience).** Collaborating on the *showcase* portfolio, designing creative appeal posters, and producing community participation videos created an inclusive, active, and enjoyable learning climate, as reflected in students' *sticky notes* feedback at the end of the lessons. Heterogeneous group work also gave students room to help one another within the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978).

Beyond these three principles, the four-stage portfolio design appears to be the key. Each stage demands a different thinking operation, namely identifying (C3), comparing and assessing (C4–C5), and formulating proposals (C5–C6), so that students not only know about policy but practice weighing it. At the same time, students did not stop at documents; they turned their proposals into posters and videos addressed to the public. This pattern reflects the shift from merely obedient citizens toward participatory citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) and underlines the importance of civic action in civic education (Banks, 2020).

Theoretical Contribution

Theoretically, the findings suggest that PjBL syntax and Deep Learning principles can be treated as complementary design layers. PjBL supplies the structure (driving question, investigation, product, and presentation), while the mindful, meaningful, and joyful principles specify the quality of the learning experience at each stage (Table 1). This extends the use of PjBL in civic education from "doing a project" to deliberately designing awareness, relevance, and enjoyment, and it resonates with Fullan et al.'s (2018) view of deep learning as developing citizenship, collaboration, and critical thinking. Because the design cannot isolate the contribution of each principle, this proposition should be tested in studies with comparison groups.

Implications and Limitations

Practically, these findings show that teachers can begin teaching public policy from issues already familiar to students and use the portfolio as a project framework that can be assessed in stages. In terms of policy, school partnerships with regional agencies can enrich learning resources and open opportunities for students' proposals to be heard. This study has several limitations. First, the one-group design without a comparison group limits causal claims (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Second, the small number of participants (N = 32) in a single school limits generalization. Third, the intervention was short (4 meetings), so the durability of learning outcomes has not been tested through a delayed test. Fourth, the analysis was descriptive, without statistical tests or effect sizes. Fifth, the teacher served as both implementer and assessor, so bias may exist. Sixth, a report of the validity and reliability testing of the test instrument has not been presented, so the results should be interpreted with caution. Seventh, the performance rubric showed a ceiling effect (no student below the Good category), which limits its ability to discriminate among students.

Conclusion (خاتمة)

This study examined the implementation of Project-Based Learning (PjBL) with a Deep Learning approach, based on a local public policy portfolio, among eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 19 Surabaya. Regarding the first objective, students' cognitive understanding improved: classical mastery rose from 25.0% to 87.5% (+62.5 percentage points), exceeding the 75% success criterion. Regarding the second objective, civic skills were high: 87.5%–93.8% of students were rated Excellent in discussion and portfolio work, showcase presentation, and real-action products, and none fell below the Good category. Regarding the third objective, the *mindful*, *meaningful*, and *joyful* principles, operationalized through trigger questions, local Surabaya policy issues (QRIS parking and MBR uniforms), and collaborative creative products, offer a plausible explanation for these results, although their separate contributions were not tested. Given the

one-group design, these results are better viewed as promising initial evidence than as proof of effectiveness; they support the use of local policy issues as a context for civic education and justify a controlled follow-up study.

Recommendations

For Pancasila Education teachers, it is recommended to adapt the public policy portfolio PjBL model by raising contextual issues from their own regions, providing clear rubrics for each portfolio document, and scheduling feedback between project stages. For schools and education offices, digital facilities and partnerships with regional agencies (such as the Transportation Agency or the City Government) are strongly recommended to broaden young citizens' insight into active participation. For future researchers, it is recommended to use quasi-experimental designs with control groups, increase the number of schools and the duration of learning, calculate *N-gain* (Hake, 1998) or effect sizes (Cohen, 1988), conduct appropriate statistical tests (for example the Wilcoxon test for paired data), and test the durability of learning outcomes through delayed tests.

Bibliography ((مراجع

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Banks, J. A. (2020). *Diversity, transformative knowledge, and civic action: Selected writings*. Routledge.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Rand McNally.

Center for Civic Education. (1994). *National standards for civics and government*. Center for Civic Education.

Chen, C.-H., & Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review, 26*, 71–81.

Cogan, J. J., & Derricott, R. (2014). *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education*. Routledge.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Condliffe, B., Quint, J., Visher, M. G., Bangser, M. R., Drohojowska, S., Saco, L., & Nelson, E. (2017). *Project-based learning: A literature review*. MDRC.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Macmillan.

Fullan, M., Quinn, J., & McEachen, J. (2018). *Deep learning: Engage the world change the world*. Corwin.

Guo, P., Saab, N., Post, L. S., & Admiraal, W. (2020). A review of project-based learning in higher education: Student outcomes and measures. *International Journal of Educational Research, 102*, Article 101586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101586

Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. *American Journal of Physics, 66*(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.18809

Hess, D. E., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education*. Routledge.

Kahne, J., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 738–766. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208316951

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1988). *The action research planner* (3rd ed.). Deakin University.

Kokotsaki, D., Menzies, V., & Wiggins, A. (2016). Project-based learning: A review of the literature. *Improving Schools, 19*(3), 267–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480216659733

Krajcik, J. S., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (2006). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 317–334). Cambridge University Press.

Langer, E. J. (1997). *The power of mindful learning*. Addison-Wesley.

Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning: I—Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46*(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02980.x

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. (2022). *Capaian pembelajaran mata pelajaran Pendidikan Pancasila fase D* [Learning outcomes for Pancasila Education, phase D]. Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan.

Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education. (2025). *Naskah akademik pembelajaran mendalam: Menuju pendidikan bermutu untuk semua* [Academic paper on deep learning: Towards quality education for all]. Pusat Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran, Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan.

Surabaya City Government. (2024). *Peraturan Wali Kota Surabaya Nomor 26 Tahun 2024 tentang Pelaksanaan Peraturan Daerah Nomor 7 Tahun 2023 tentang Pajak Daerah dan Retribusi Daerah pada Retribusi Jasa Umum* [Surabaya Mayor Regulation No. 26 of 2024 on the implementation of Regional Regulation No. 7 of 2023 on regional taxes and levies for general service levies]. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/295894/perwali-kota-surabaya-no-26-tahun-2024

Thomas, J. W. (2000). *A review of research on project-based learning*. Autodesk Foundation.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237–269. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237

Winataputra, U. S., & Budimansyah, D. (2012). *Pendidikan kewarganegaraan dalam perspektif internasional* [Civic education in international perspective]. Widya Aksara Press.