

# The Effect of Differentiated Learning and the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) on Student Wellbeing at SDN Malang Regency

Dedi Prestiadi<sup>1</sup>, Raden Bambang Sumarsono<sup>1</sup>, Teguh Triwiyanto<sup>1</sup>, Teguh Triwiyanto<sup>1</sup>, Satya Eka Pangestu<sup>1</sup>, Olivia Vieca Arrahmah<sup>2</sup>, Endra Ubaidillah<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Management, State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Primary Teacher Education, State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematic and Sains, State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Corresponding author, email: [dedi.prestiadi.fip@um.ac.id](mailto:dedi.prestiadi.fip@um.ac.id)

## Keywords

Differentiated Learning  
P5  
Student Wellbeing

## Abstract

This study aims to: 1) find out the partial influence between differentiated learning on student wellbeing, 2) find out the partial influence between the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) on student wellbeing, and 3) find out simultaneously between differentiated and differentiated learning on student wellbeing, 2) find out the partial influence between the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) on student wellbeing. The research method used in this study uses a quantitative method with a research sample to teachers at Malang Regency State Elementary Schools by taking two sub-districts as research locations. The technique used in this study was through purposive random sampling of 117 respondents. The results of the study show that differentiated learning has a significant effect on student wellbeing. The application of learning that adapts to the needs and characteristics of students is able to create a pleasant learning atmosphere and improve the emotional, social, and cognitive well-being of students. Meanwhile, the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) has not had a significant impact because its implementation still focuses on the final product, not on the process of forming values and character. However, when both are applied simultaneously and meaningfully, differentiated learning and P5 complement each other in supporting student well-being holistically.

## 1. Introduction

Basic education plays a strategic role in building the foundation of character and student welfare. At the primary school level, efforts to create an inclusive and holistic learning environment have become a key focus in national education policies. One of the approaches that is currently prominent is differentiated learning, which seeks to meet the learning needs of each student based on differences in abilities, interests, and learning styles (Tomlinson, 2017). This approach is considered relevant because it provides equal opportunities for every student to develop to their potential.

On the other hand, the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) through the Independent Curriculum aims to form a young generation that is not only academically capable but also has a strong character and is in line with Pancasila values, such as mutual cooperation, independence, and diversity (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2022). The program integrates project-based learning that is relevant to real-life contexts, thus encouraging students to think critically, collaborate, and increase empathy.

Recent advances show that differentiated learning has been shown to increase student engagement in the learning process (De Neve et al., 2015). In addition, research on P5 shows its potential in supporting the development of students' social and emotional competence, which is an important component of student wellbeing (Rahayu et al., 2023). However, the relationship between differentiated learning and P5 in improving student welfare is still minimally explored, especially in the context of elementary schools. This leaves a gap in the academic literature, where there is not much empirical evidence to support how the synergy of these two approaches can affect students' emotional, social, and academic well-being.

Attention to student wellbeing is increasing along with the recognition that student welfare is an important indicator of educational success. Student wellbeing includes interrelated physical, emotional, social, and academic aspects (OECD, 2017). Research shows that students with high levels of well-being tend to have better academic achievement, positive social relationships, and the ability to face challenges more effectively (Park et al., 2020). However, in Indonesia, efforts to integrate learning approaches that support student wellbeing are still limited to partial implementation, without optimal synergy between curriculum innovation and pedagogical approaches.

## 2. Methods

This research is a research with a quantitative approach. This research is quantitative because all information/data is realized and analyzed in the form of numbers which are then described descriptively. Quantitative research is used to look at the partial influence between existing variables. A quantitative approach is used to research a specific population or sample, with a purposive random sampling technique (Sugiyono, 2011). This research was carried out at SD Negeri Malang Regency which is a research population. The samples taken in this study used purposive random sampling. The research activity began by carrying out preliminary observations at the research site to explore data on differentiated learning and P5 on student wellbeing.

Data collection uses statistical data analysis instruments, with the aim of testing the hypothesis that has been determined. This study uses multiple regression analyzers which aims to determine the influence of two independent or independent variables on bound or dependent variables. The independent variable in this study was differentiated learning (X1) and P5 (X2), and as a bound variable was student wellbeing (Y).

## 3. Result and Discussion

### A. Results

#### 1. Normality Test

One of the requirements for analyzing the data is to conduct a distribution normality test. The distribution normality test was carried out to test whether the data on each distributed research variable was normal or not. The analysis technique used is through the kolmogorov-smirnov test. In carrying out this normality test, the SPSS ver 25 application was used. The test results obtained a residual value of asymp.sig (2 tailed) of 0.200 greater than 0.05 ( $0.200 > 0.05$ ) which indicates normal distributed data presented in Table 3.1.

Table. 3.1 Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Normality Test

**NPar Tests**

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Standardized Residual
N		116
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.99126621
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.065
	Positive	.049
	Negative	-.065
Test Statistic		.065
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 <sup>c,d</sup>

a. Test distribution is Normal.  
 b. Calculated from data.  
 c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.  
 d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

#### 2. Linearity Test

After the normality test was carried out, the next linearity test was carried out which was used to test the linearity of two differentiated learning free variables (X1) and P5 (X2) with the bound variable student wellbeing (Y). This linearity test uses the SPSS 25 application. The determination of linearity is seen in the p value in the Sig. column, if the p value is  $> 0.05$  then the data is declared linear and if the p value is  $< 0.05$  then the data is declared non-linear. The linearity test between differentiated learning variables (X1) and student wellbeing (Y) is shown in table 3.2.

Table 3.2. results of linearity tests X1 and Y

**ANOVA Table**

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Student Wellbeing * Pembelajaran Diferensiasi	Between Groups	(Combined)	529.868	13	40.759	2.835	.002
		Linearity	299.313	1	299.313	20.815	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	230.555	12	19.213	1.336	.210
	Within Groups		1466.710	102	14.380		
Total			1996.578	115			

From the results of the linearity test as shown in table 3.2, a deviation from linearity value of 0.210 ( $p > 0.05$ ) and an F value of 1.336 can be concluded that the differentiated learning variable

(X1) and student wellbeing (Y) have a linear relationship, which means that if there is an increase in the differentiated learning variable, it will also occur in student wellbeing.

The next test is to test the linearity between the P5 (X2) and student wellbeing (Y) variables. The test in determining linearity is to look at the p value in the Sig deviation from linearity column. The results of the linearity test using SPSS 25 were obtained data as shown in table 4.3, namely at the sig deviation from linearity value of 0.448 ( $p > 0.05$ ) so that the relationship between the variable P5 (X2) and student wellbeing (Y) has a linear relationship. Thus, it means that if there is an increase in the P5 variable, it will also occur in student wellbeing.

Table 3.3. results of linearity tests X2 and Y

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Student Wellbeing * P5	Between Groups	(Combined)	175.508	10	17.551	1.012	.438
		Linearity	20.047	1	20.047	1.156	.285
		Deviation from Linearity	155.461	9	17.273	.996	.448
	Within Groups		1821.070	105	17.344		
Total			1996.578	115			

### 3. Uji Hypothesis

#### 3.1. The Effect of Differentiated Learning on Student Wellbeing

In the first stage, Hypothesis 1 (H1) will be tested hopefully, namely the effect of differentiated learning on student wellbeing. This test was carried out using SPSS 25 to prove whether H1 was acceptable or rejected which means there was no effect between differentiated learning on student wellbeing. H1 is acceptable if the value of sig  $< 0.05$  or t is calculated  $>$  from t table, then there is a significant relationship between the two variables. To be able to find out the relationship between X1 and Y, the t-test is used. The sig value of the results of this t-test is used as the basis for determining whether H1 is accepted or rejected. The results of the t-test calculation can be seen in table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Results of the t test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17.610	9.682		1.819	.072
	Pembelajaran Diferensiasi	.412	.094	.381	4.386	.000
	P5	.132	.177	.065	.745	.458

a. Dependent Variable: Student Wellbeing

Based on table 3.4, the t-value of the calculated variable (X1) was obtained as 4.386 which means it is greater than the t table ( $4.386 > 1.981$ ) and the sig value is  $0.000 < 0.05$ . Based on these data, there is an influence between differentiated learning variables (X1) on student wellbeing (Y). so that it can be concluded that hypothesis 1 (H1) is acceptable.

Furthermore, to be able to determine the degree of relationship between differentiated learning variables (X1) and student wellbeing (Y), it was carried out through the Pearson correlation test. The test was carried out to find out how much influence the free variable had with the bound variable. The results of the Pearson correlation calculation are shown in table 3.5.

Table 3.5 Pearson X1-Y Correlation Analysis

		Pembelajaran Diferensiasi	P5	Student Wellbeing
Pembelajaran Diferensiasi	Pearson Correlation	1	.093	.387**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.321	.000
	N	116	116	116
P5	Pearson Correlation	.093	1	.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.321		.285
	N	116	116	116
Student Wellbeing	Pearson Correlation	.387**	.100	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.285	
	N	116	116	116

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The determination of the relationship between variables is based on the significance value if  $< 0.05$  then there is a correlation, while if  $> 0.05$  then there is no correlation. From the data displayed in table 3.4, a sig value of 0.000 was obtained which indicates that it is smaller than 0.05 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ) which means that there is a correlation between differentiated learning and student wellbeing. Meanwhile, the degree of relationship between differentiated learning and student wellbeing is seen from the pearson correlation of 0.387 which can be concluded in the medium category as shown in Table 3.5.

### 3.2. Influence of P5 on Student Wellbeing

The next test was carried out on the P5 variable (X2) on student wellbeing (Y). This test is done through the t-test to find out if hypothesis 2 (H2) is acceptable or rejected. The reference in determining whether the hypothesis is accepted if the value of sig  $< 0.05$  or t is calculated  $>$  from t table, then there is a significant relationship between the two variables. The t-value of the table with a confidence level of 0.05 with 117 samples was obtained 1.1.981. Based on the results of the t-test as shown in table 4.4 where the calculated t-value on the P5 variable (X2) is 0.745 which means it is smaller than the t table ( $0.745 > 1.981$ ) and the sig value is  $0.458 > 0.05$ . Based on these data, there is an influence between the P5 (X2) variable on student wellbeing (Y). so it can be concluded that hypothesis 2 (H2) is rejected.

Furthermore, to be able to determine the degree of relationship between the P5 variable (X2) and student wellbeing (Y), it was carried out through the Pearson correlation test. The test was carried out to find out how much the free variable (X) and the bound variable (Y) influenced. The results of the Pearson correlation calculation are shown in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6 Pearson X2-Y Correlation Analysis

		Correlations		
		Pembelajaran n Diferensiasi	P5	Student Wellbeing
Pembelajaran Diferensiasi	Pearson Correlation	1	.093	.387**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.321	.000
	N	116	116	116
P5	Pearson Correlation	.093	1	.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.321		.285
	N	116	116	116
Student Wellbeing	Pearson Correlation	.387**	.100	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.285	
	N	116	116	116

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In determining the relationship between variables is based on the significance value if  $< 0.05$ , there is a correlation, while if  $> 0.05$ , there is no correlation. From the data displayed in table 4.6, a sig value of 0.285 was obtained which indicates that it is greater than 0.05 ( $0.285 > 0.05$ ) which means that there is no correlation between P5 and student wellbeing. Meanwhile, the degree of relationship between teacher training and the effectiveness of the implementation of the independent curriculum is seen from the pearson correlation of 0.100 which can be concluded in the weak category.

### 3.3. The Influence of Differentiated Learning

The final test was to determine the simultaneous effect between differentiated learning variables (X1) and P5 (X2) on student wellbeing (Y). To be able to determine the relationship simultaneously, Test F is used. The criteria to determine whether there is an influence use a reference if the value of Sig.  $< 0.05$ , then the independent variables (X1 and X2) simultaneously affect the dependent variable (Y). The results of the F Test are known as shown in table 4.7. From the results of the F test as shown in table 3.7, it is known that the sig value is 0.000 or less than 0.05 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Based on the results of the F Test, it can be concluded that Hypothesis 3 (H3) is acceptable. This means that there is a simultaneous influence between differentiated learning variables and P5 on student wellbeing.

Table 3.7 Test Results F

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	307.618	2	153.809	10.291	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1688.960	113	14.947		
	Total	1996.578	115			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Wellbeing  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), P5, Pembelajaran Diferensiasi

Furthermore, to be able to determine the amount of contribution of the free variable to the bound variable, it can be seen from the value of R or the determination coefficient presented in table 3.8. in the form of a summary model. Based on the results of the summary model, an R value of 0.393 or 39.3% was obtained. This indicates the magnitude of the influence of differentiated learning variables and P5 has an influence of 39.3% on student wellbeing.

Tabel 3.8 Model summary

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.393 <sup>a</sup>	.154	.139	3.866

a. Predictors: (Constant), P5, Pembelajaran Diferensiasi  
 b. Dependent Variable: Student Wellbeing

**B. Discussion**

In the first hypothesis test (H1), which tested the effect of differentiated learning on student wellbeing, analysis using the t-test showed that the calculated t value (4.386) was greater than the table t (1.981), with a significance value of 0.000 (below 0.05). This shows that the H1 hypothesis is accepted, which means that there is a significant influence of differentiated learning on student wellbeing. Based on the Pearson correlation test, a correlation value of 0.387 indicates that the relationship between differentiated learning and student wellbeing is in the strong category.

This result is in line with Tomlinson's (2017) theory which states that differentiated learning allows teachers to adjust the learning process to students' readiness, interests, and learning profiles. When individual learning needs are met, students feel valued, more confident, and more engaged in the learning process. This creates a learning atmosphere that supports their emotional, social, and academic well-being. Previous research has also supported these results. Santangelo & Tomlison (2012) emphasized that differentiated learning increases students' motivation and confidence because they gain learning experiences that suit their respective potentials and learning styles.

In the context of elementary schools in Malang Regency, teachers who apply the differentiation strategy of content, processes, products, and learning environments have proven to be able to create a classroom atmosphere that is more adaptive to student differences. Teachers who provide freedom to choose the form of assignments, variety of learning media, and personalized feedback also foster a feeling of acceptance and appreciation by students. This condition has a positive impact on the emotional aspects (joy, confidence), social (positive relationships with friends), and cognitive (active learning involvement) students.

Thus, it can be concluded that differentiated learning is not only pedagogically important, but also functional in creating overall student well-being. Teachers who are able to understand the learning characteristics of students and adjust teaching strategies will form a more personalized, meaningful, and enjoyable learning experience. Through this approach, students feel valued as unique individuals, which ultimately improves their emotional, social, and cognitive well-being in school. Differentiated learning is one of the tangible manifestations of the principle of "freedom of learning", where the happiness and welfare of students are at the center of the educational process.

The second hypothesis (H2) test analyzed the effect of P5 on student wellbeing. Based on the results of the t-test, the calculated t-value of 0.745 is smaller than the table t (1.981), with a significance value of 0.458 (greater than 0.05). This shows that H2 is rejected, so it can be concluded that P5 has no significant effect on student wellbeing. The Pearson correlation test showed that the correlation value was 0.100, which indicates a category of weak relationship between P5 and student wellbeing.

Conceptually, the Ministry of Education and Culture (2022) explained that P5 aims to form

Indonesian students who have character, critical reasoning, creativity, mutual cooperation, independence, and noble character. However, previous research suggests that the success of P5 depends heavily on the extent to which teachers are able to facilitate a reflective and collaborative learning experience, not just completing projects (Yuliana et al., 2023). In practice, the implementation of P5 is often still oriented towards the final product, not on the process of forming student values and characteristics.

This can happen due to limited time, resources, or the teacher's understanding of the essence of P5. As a result, the dimensions of student well-being, such as feelings of meaning, healthy social relationships, and satisfaction with the learning process, have not fully grown from the project's activities.

Thus, it can be concluded that P5 has not had a significant impact on student wellbeing because its implementation is still procedural and has not fully cultivated the emotional and social dimensions of students. P5 actually has great potential as a forum for character formation and student welfare but requires more in-depth assistance and understanding from teachers so that project activities really focus on the process of internalizing values, self-reflection, and social cooperation. If implemented consistently and meaningfully, P5 can be an important means to improve the holistic well-being of students.

Simultaneous tests using the F Test were carried out to find out whether the two independent variables (differentiated learning and P5) simultaneously had a significant effect on student wellbeing. The test results showed a significance value of 0.000 (less than 0.05) and a determination coefficient value ( $R^2$ ) of 0.393. This shows that the two variables together contribute 39.3% to the well-being of students, while the rest are influenced by other factors outside this research model, so the third hypothesis (H3) is accepted.

Theoretically, these results reinforce the view of the OECD (2017) which affirms that student well-being is influenced by the quality of an emotionally, socially, and academically supportive learning environment. Differentiated learning provides individual support through recognition of students' differences, while P5 fosters social support through cooperation, tolerance, and mutual cooperation. The two complement each other in creating a positive and meaningful learning atmosphere.

In addition, according to Park et al. (2020), student well-being depends not only on academic learning experiences, but also on social engagement and meaning, personal gain from school activities. By combining a differentiation approach and a P5 project, teachers can foster a balance between cognitive achievement and students' social-emotional development.

Thus, it can be concluded that differentiated learning and P5 simultaneously have a strategic role in building complete student wellbeing. The combination of the two creates a balance between individual freedom of learning and social responsibility in the context of Pancasila values. Teachers who are able to integrate differentiation approaches with meaningful project activities will create learning experiences that are not only academically effective, but also emotionally and socially healthy. In the context of the implementation of the Independent Curriculum, this synergy is the key to realizing education that is in favor of students, a joyful education.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on the results of the research, it can be concluded that differentiated learning and the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) have different relationships with student wellbeing, both partially and simultaneously. The results of the first hypothesis test showed that differentiated learning had a significant influence on student wellbeing, with a calculated t value (4.386) greater than the table t (1.981) and a significance value of 0.000 ( $< 0.05$ ). A correlation value of 0.387 indicates a relationship in the strong category. This indicates that the more optimal the application of differentiated learning, the higher the level of student welfare. Teachers who are able to adapt learning strategies to the needs, interests, and characteristics of students are proven to be able to create a fun learning atmosphere, support active engagement, and improve students' emotional, social, and cognitive well-being.

In the second hypothesis, the results showed that P5 had no significant effect on student wellbeing, with a calculated t value (0.745) smaller than the table t (1.981) and a significance value of 0.458 ( $> 0.05$ ). A correlation value of 0.100 indicates a weak relationship between the two variables. This indicates that the implementation of P5 in elementary schools is still procedural and has not fully fostered the emotional and social well-being of students. The implementation of P5 still focuses on the final product of the project, not on the process of reflection on values and the formation of student character in depth.

Simultaneously, the results of the F test showed that differentiated learning and P5 together had a significant effect on student wellbeing, with a significance value of 0.000 ( $< 0.05$ ) and a value of determination coefficient ( $R^2 = 0.393$ ). This means that both variables simultaneously contributed

39.3% to student welfare, while the rest were influenced by other factors outside of this study. These results confirm the importance of synergy between learning strategies that are responsive to individual needs (differentiation) and meaningful collaborative activities (P5) in supporting student well-being holistically.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thank you to the State University of Malang for providing funding for this research through the Decentralization Scheme of the Faculty of Education as a source of Research Funds in 2025.

## Reference

- Aprima, D., & Sari, W. (2022). Penerapan pembelajaran berdiferensiasi dalam meningkatkan motivasi belajar siswa di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 6(2), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jipgsd.v6i2.3261>
- De Neve, D., Devos, G., & Tuytens, M. (2015). The importance of job resources and self-efficacy for beginning teachers' professional learning in differentiated instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 47, 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.12.003>
- Jager, T. (2013). *Differentiated instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. Utrecht University Press.
- Jager, T. de. (2013). Guidelines to assist the implementation of differentiated learning activities in South African secondary schools. In *International Journal of Inclusive Education* (Vol. 17, Issue 1, pp. 80–94). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2011.580465>
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2022). *Panduan proyek penguatan profil pelajar Pancasila*. Jakarta: Kemdikbudristek.
- Marantika, J. E. R., Tomasow, J., & ... (2023). Implementasi pembelajaran berdiferensiasi di kelas. *German Für Gesellschaft* (J ... <https://ojs3.unpatti.ac.id/index.php/gefuege/article/view/8819>
- Marantika, R. D., Handayani, T., & Kurniawati, D. (2023). Implementasi pembelajaran berdiferensiasi untuk memenuhi kebutuhan belajar siswa di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Nusantara*, 9(2), 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.24853/jpdn.9.2.78-89>
- Mills, M., Monk, S., Keddie, A., Renshaw, P., Christie, P., Geelan, D., & Gowlett, C. (2014). Differentiated learning: from policy to classroom. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), 331–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2014.911725>
- Naibaho, D. P. (2023). Strategi Pembelajaran Berdiferensiasi Mampu Meningkatkan Pemahaman Belajar Peserta Didik. *Journal of Creative Student Research*. <https://ejournal.politeknikpratama.ac.id/index.php/jcsr/article/view/1150>
- Naibaho, L. (2023). The implementation of differentiated learning to improve students' learning outcomes. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 107(1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100107182023>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2017). *OECD framework for measuring student well-being: PISA 2015 results (Volume III)*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264273856-en>
- Pane, R. N., Lumbantoruan, S., & Simanjuntak, S. D. (2022). Implementasi Pembelajaran Berdiferensiasi Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kreatif Peserta Didik. *BULLET: Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu*, 1(3), 173–180.
- Pane, R., Rahayu, S., & Lubis, H. (2022). Pembelajaran berdiferensiasi sebagai upaya mewujudkan merdeka belajar di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 4155–4166. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2998>
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Sun, J. (2020). *The psychology of student well-being: Integrating academic, social, and emotional development*. Routledge.
- Santangelo, T., & Tomlinson, C. A. (2012). Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices: An exploratory investigation. *Action in Teacher Education*, 34(4), 309–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.717032>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Yuliana, N., Hartati, T., & Rahayu, D. (2023). Implementasi proyek penguatan profil pelajar Pancasila (P5) dalam pembelajaran di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Nusantara*, 9(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.24853/jpdn.9.1.45-56>