

The Application of Project Based Learning Models to Improve The Skills of Writing Negotiation Text for Students in Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School

Angelique Delavega YS¹, Muhammad Fuad², Nurlaksana Eko Rusminto³
¹ (Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Lampung, Indonesia)
² (Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Lampung, Indonesia)
³ (Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Lampung, Indonesia)

Abstract:

Background: The problem in this study is the low skills of writing negotiation text of class X IPS Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School in the 2019/2020 academic year. This study aims to describe (1) the learning plan, (2) implementation with a Project Based Learning model. The benefits of this research are to foster student learning activity and motivation, broaden insight and knowledge for educators/researchers, contribute to school principals to determine school policies to improve the quality of learning, especially writing lessons. This study used a Classroom Action Research design, the process consisted of four stages, namely planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting. This action research was conducted in three cycles, and each cycle consisted of two meetings.

Materials and Methods: The type of research used is Classroom Action Research which is conducted in three cycles. Place of research at Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School. Cycle I, cycle II, and cycle III through the application of a project based learning model. The cycle consists of planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting.

Results: The results of this study indicate that (1) the learning plan to write negotiating texts through the application of the project based learning model for class X IPS 3 Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School in the precondition is 58.65 with a poor category, cycle I is 70.67 with adequate category, cycle II was 80.76 with a good category, and cycle III was 95.19 with a very good category; (2) the implementation of learning in the precondition 62.91 in the sufficient category, the first cycle of 72.5 in the sufficient category, the second cycle of 81.25 with the good category, and the third cycle of 95.83 with the very good category; (3) the average increase in the quality of learning to write negotiating text for students in class X IPS 3 Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School in precondition is 64.09 with sufficient category, cycle I is 70.93 with enough category, cycle II is 74.78 with good category, and cycle III of 90.65 with a very good category.

Conclusion: Learning activities as a whole, both from lesson planning, learning implementation, and learning assessment from preconditions, cycle I, cycle II, and cycle III have increased.

Keywords: Project based learning model, negotiation text, classroom action research.

Date of Submission: 03-02-2021

Date of acceptance: 18-02-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Improving the quality of the learning process is an effort to improve the quality of education as a whole system. Efforts to improve the quality of education are an integral part of efforts to improve human quality, both aspects of ability, personality, and responsibility as citizens (Sutama, 2000: 3). Marsigit (in Sutama, 2000: 1) states that education experts have realized that the quality of education is highly dependent on the quality of teachers and the quality of the learning process, so that improving the quality of learning is the basic content for improving the quality of education nationally.

In general, Bahasa Indonesia as a subject in the 2013 Curriculum aims for students to be able to listen, read, speak, and write. Basic competence is developed based on three areas of material that are interconnected and mutually support the development of language knowledge competencies and language skills competencies (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) of students. Attitudinal competencies are developed in an integrated manner through competency in linguistic knowledge and competency in language skills. The three aspects of the scope of the material are language; literature (understanding, appreciation, response, analysis, and creation of literary works); and literacy (expansion of Indonesian language competence in various purposes, especially those related to reading and writing (Mendikbud, 2016: 1).

The development of the 2013 revised 2017 curriculum requires students to have the ability to think and act productively and creatively. One of the basic competencies of writing skills that must be mastered by senior high school students in class X is submitting submissions and offers in the negotiating text. This is stated in the formulation of basic competencies. 4.10 Submitting submissions, offers, agreements, and conclusions in the negotiation text orally or in writing.

In the curriculum, it is stated that negotiation is a process of communication between sellers and prospective buyers, both individuals, and groups, in which discussions and negotiations occur to achieve mutually beneficial goals for both parties. According to Sutrisno and Kusmawan (2007: 8) negotiation is a process of communication between sellers and prospective buyers, both individuals, and groups, in which discussions and negotiations occur to achieve mutually beneficial goals for both parties. Negotiation is also a two-way communication, namely the seller as the communicator and the buyer as communication or alternating with each other. Meanwhile, the emergence of negotiation texts as texts taught in Indonesian subjects has only been conveyed explicitly in the 2013 curriculum. By the principles of learning Indonesian in the curriculum, which is text-based. The negotiation text is one of the texts that students must learn. It's just that the negotiation text was only introduced at the high school levels.

The fact shows that students' writing skills are not sufficient. This can be seen in the learning of writing skills with the core competence of writing negotiating texts. The writing results of the X IPS 3 class students at Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School are still low. Also, the number of students who managed to reach and exceed the standard was less than 75%. Based on preliminary research observations, observations, and interviews with students, it can be concluded that the problems in learning to write. The problems that arise include (1) the seriousness of students in participating in learning to write negotiation text is still low, (2) the lack of students asking questions about writing negotiation text, (3) students tend not to be serious when writing negotiation text, and (4) students are not enthusiastic when writing negotiation texts, (5) lack of writing habits.

So far, the learning model used by teachers is still informative. The teacher is the only source of information and plays an active role in learning activities, so the students are accustomed to only receiving knowledge from the teacher. This, causes students to interact less with one another, students tend to be passive, and less practice developing ideas, and less serious in the following learning. In contrast to what is explained in the 2013 curriculum that learning is a series of activities carried out by students to achieve certain learning outcomes under the guidance, direction, and motivation of the teacher. Students are expected to be active in the learning process, students can develop their own knowledge with the help of books or the internet, and at the end of learning, students are expected to be able to conclude learning. In the 2013 curriculum, the teacher only functions as a facilitator for students.

Therefore, to improve the writing skills of negotiating texts, it is necessary to use an appropriate learning strategy or model, namely by using the Project Based Learning (PjBL) learning model. Project Based Learning (PjBL) means learning through experience (Solomon, in Sepahkar, 2015: 49). Wena (2012: 144) defines the PjBL learning model as a learning model that provides opportunities for teachers to manage classroom learning by involving project work. Projects in PjBL are carried out to arrange student activities in compiling a product (Hiscocks, 2008). This learning model emphasizes students to create projects and produce products/works then learn from the process of making these projects and products, so the learning material delivered by the teacher is easy to understand.

II. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The research method is a general strategy adopted in collecting and analyzing the necessary data in order to answer the problems at hand (Furchan, 1982: 50). This research approach uses Classroom Action Research (PTK / Action Research). Arikunto, (2011: 3) says that action research is an examination of learning activities in the form of action, which are deliberately raised and occur in a class together.

Classroom action research was carried out at Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School for the 2019/2020 academic year using one class, namely class X IPS 3. Therefore, the responses that appear cannot be generalized in general. The conclusions and results only apply to Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School.

This research was carried out in two stages, namely the pre-research and the research stage. The pre-research stage was carried out in January 2020, and the research stage started from January to February 2020 (in the even semester of the 2019/2020 school year). This research was conducted in a cycle. Each meeting takes 2 hours of lessons (2 x 45 minutes). This research will be completed if the learning indicators that have been determined experience success.

Based on the problems posed in this study, it emphasizes more on process problems, so this type of research is classroom action research. By using this type of learning practice in the classroom in a professional manner. This research is expected to get as much information as possible to improve student learning outcomes.

III. RESULT

During the study, researchers were assisted by two collaborators. Collaborators assist researchers in collecting data by providing input during the learning process, starting from initial observations, before implementing classroom action research using a project based learning model. Observation and interview activities were carried out on Tuesday, January 7, 2020 at 13.00 to 14.30. Observations and interviews were carried out to find out the problems faced by students. This problem is used for planning and conducting research.

The data were obtained based on direct observation and interviews by researchers and collaboration with colleagues about writing negotiation texts in Indonesian language learning as follows: 1) The lesson plans made by educators have not been able to move students to be active both physically and mentally (thinking) in learning . 2) The learning process of writing negotiation text is boring, because educators have not used a learning model that is able to motivate students to actively participate in learning Indonesian. 3) The evaluation of writing the negotiating text by the educator is only limited to identifying it.

The learning implementation is divided into 3 cycles which are expected to result in a significant increase in value. The implementation of learning in cycle I has not produced maximum results, while in cycle II there has been an increase although it still needs to be refined. In cycle III, the activities of students had progressed significantly. Starting from observing, designing projects, compiling schedules, project progress, testing results, and evaluating experiences. Based on this, it can be concluded that the quality of the process and learning outcomes has increased. This can be seen from the increase in each indicator of writing negotiation text skills.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Pre-Cycle

Based on the average assessment of new colleagues, it scored 62.91 in the sufficient category. It is still weak with the value is not optimal. Therefore, it is fixed in cycle 1. Educators need to improve engaging techniques in the learning process so that students are more motivated in learning to write negotiation texts. Educators must be able to manage learning time efficiently. Educators must be more coherent and systematic in concluding the results of the learning process so that students can better understand the material as expected. Educators must provide opportunities for students to conclude learning material, so that students are more motivated to think critically and creatively. Educators use the PjBL learning model in the first cycle onwards which is deemed appropriate to solve these problems.

To find out the skills of class X IPS 3 students of Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School in writing negotiation texts, students are asked to read the negotiation text, determine the structure of the negotiation text, design and present the negotiation text. The following data were obtained from the negotiation text writing skills in this pre-action: 1) The average skill of writing negotiating texts was 64.09; 2) students who received less scores were 17 people; 3) students who received sufficient grades were 15 students; 4) participants who scored in the good category were 5 out of 32 people; 5) there are no students who get a score in the very good category. For more details, see the table below.

Table 1 Skor Range of Student Negotiation Text Writing Skills in Pre-Cycle

No	Classification	Skor Range	Number of Students and Percentage (%)	
1	Very Good	90-100	0	0,00
2	Good	75-89	5	15,62
3	Enough	61-74	10	31,25
4	Less	≤ 60	17	53,12

Table 2 Average Score of Negotiation Text Writing Skills per Indicator in Pre-Cycle

No	Indicator	Student Score and Category	
		Average Score Pre-Cycle	Category
1	suitability of content with title	80,62	Good
2	accuracy of the main idea of the text	53,90	Less
3	sequence of text structures	54,68	Less
4	text structures	71,87	Enough
5	accuracy of vocabulary	64,06	Enough
6	writing accuracy according to PUEBI	61,71	Enough

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that the average value of writing negotiating text skills per indicator in class X IPS 3 Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School, in the following pre-actions: 1) the suitability of the title with the content of the negotiating text is 80.62 with good categories ; 2) the accuracy of the main content of the negotiating text is 53.90 with a poor category; 3) the coherence of the content of the negotiating text got a score of 54.68 in the sufficient category; 4) the text structure of the negotiation gets a score of 71.87 with a sufficient category; 5) vocabulary according to PUEBI rules by obtaining 64.06 with sufficient category; 5) writing according to PUEBI rules gets a score of 61.71 in the sufficient category.

B. Cycle I

The implementation of learning cycle I consists of four stages, namely planning, implementation (action), observation results (observation), and reflection. The four stages can be described as follows. In observing the activities of students, the researcher was assisted by two collaborators, namely Mrs. Fransisca Pratiwi Prasakti, M.Pd., and Mrs. Susarti, S.Pd., Indonesian Language Teacher at Al Azhar 3 High School Bandar Lampung. Collaborators help observe the activities of educators and students during learning to write negotiating texts using a project based learning model. The learning activities of students that were observed in cycle I were the activities of students (individually) during the learning process. The observed learning activities of students include: observing, designing projects, compiling schedules, project progress, testing results, and evaluating experiences.

This assessment process is carried out using a written test in the form of description questions. Students are asked to make a negotiation text. The form of the test questions is as follows.

Make a negotiation text with the right structure!

The results of the tests in cycle I can be seen in the table below.

Table 3 The Scores of Writing Skills of Negotiation Text with Project Based Learning Model in Cycle I

No	Student Initials	Component						SO	MS	IS	End Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6				
1	AUS	4	2	2	4	3	3	18	24	100	75
2	ASFP	4	2	2	3	2	2	15	24	100	63
3	A	3	2	3	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
4	APDS	4	2	3	3	3	3	18	24	100	75
5	AN	4	3	2	2	3	3	16	24	100	67
6	CDA	4	3	3	4	3	2	19	24	100	79
7	CTWF	4	3	3	4	3	3	20	24	100	83
8	DS	3	2	3	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
9	DSI	4	2	2	2	3	2	15	24	100	63
10	DPZ	4	3	2	4	4	4	21	24	100	87
11	D	3	2	2	3	2	2	14	24	100	58
12	FNH	3	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
13	FDP	3	3	3	2	3	3	17	24	100	71
14	HA	4	3	3	4	3	4	21	24	100	87
15	KZB	4	3	3	4	2	2	18	24	100	75
16	LDH	4	3	2	2	3	3	16	24	100	67
17	MND	3	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
18	MAA	4	2	2	2	3	2	15	24	100	63
19	MRAF	3	2	3	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
20	MMK	3	2	2	2	2	3	14	24	100	58
21	MFR	4	2	2	3	2	3	16	24	100	67
22	MRA	3	3	3	3	3	2	17	24	100	71
23	NS	4	2	2	2	2	3	15	24	100	63
24	NSP	4	4	3	3	3	3	20	24	100	83
25	NAK	4	2	2	3	2	3	16	24	100	67
26	ON	4	2	2	3	2	2	15	24	100	63
27	PS	3	2	3	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
28	RV	4	2	3	4	3	3	19	24	100	79
29	RF	3	3	3	3	3	2	17	24	100	71
30	SFS	4	2	2	2	2	3	15	24	100	63

31	SHU	3	2	3	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
32	ZI	4	2	3	2	3	4	18	24	100	75
Average Score		116	78	80	94	88	90				2270
		90,62	60,93	62,5	73,43	68,75	70,31				70,93

Information:

- SO = Score Obtained
- MS = Maximum Score
- IS = Ideal Score

Based on table 3, it can be seen that 87 is the highest score obtained by students, the lowest score is 58. Students who reach the minimum score are 10 people or 31.25% while students who have not reached the minimum scores are 22 people or 68.75%.

Based on the results of limited interviews conducted by researchers after learning cycle I, it can be seen that students of class X IPS 3 began to enjoy learning negotiating texts through a project based learning model because it is very helpful in learning to write negotiating texts. Sources suggest that it still needs to be improved for good results again. Based on the results of the interview, it was known that most of the students only understood a little material for writing negotiation text per indicator presented by the educators, even though they stated that the educators had presented the material for writing negotiating text per indicator clearly and in detail.

Learning process with the project based learning model in cycle I has provided a situation for students who independently build and modify their knowledge, this is confirmed in the recapitulation of the assessment of writing negotiation text writing skills in cycle I. More details, can be seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4 The range of scores for Negotiation Text Writing Skills in Pre-Cycle and Cycle I

No	Classification	Score Range	Number of Students	
			Pre-Cycle	Cycle I
1	Very Good	90 – 100	-	-
2	Good	75 – 89	5	10
3	Enough	61 – 74	15	20
4	Less	≤ 60	17	2
	Total score		32	32

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the average score of the negotiating text writing skills of Class X IPS 3 students in pre-cycle 5 becomes 10 people in cycle 1 with a good category; in pre-cycle there are still 15 people in the sufficient category. Meanwhile, in cycle 1 there were 20 people; In the pre-cycle there were 17 people who scored in the poor category and in the first cycle it was reduced to 2 people who got less scores.

C. Cycle II

Cycle II is carried out based on the results of the reflection of cycle I. The preparation stage of cycle II is carried out by preparing learning tools and research tools. The learning tools provided are in the form of lesson plans, research instruments, and action plans in accordance with basic competencies. The action stage is carried out by carrying out the learning process according to the design. The assessment process in cycle II was carried out using a written test in the form of description questions. Students are asked to make a negotiation text. The form of the test questions can be seen in the table below.

Make a negotiation text with the right structure!

The results of the scores in cycle II can be seen in the table below.

Table 5 Scores of Negotiation Text Writing Skills with the Project Based Learning Model in Cycle II

No	Student Initials	Component						SO	MS	IS	End Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6				
1	AUS	4	3	3	4	3	3	20	24	100	83
2	ASFP	4	2	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
3	A	4	2	3	4	3	3	19	24	100	79

4	APDS	4	2	3	3	3	3	18	24	100	75
5	AN	4	3	2	2	3	3	17	24	100	71
6	CDA	4	3	3	4	3	2	19	24	100	79
7	CTWF	4	3	3	3	4	4	21	24	100	87
8	DS	3	2	3	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
9	DSI	4	2	2	2	3	3	16	24	100	67
10	DPZ	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
11	D	4	2	2	3	2	2	15	24	100	63
12	FNH	3	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
13	FDP	4	3	3	2	3	3	18	24	100	75
14	HA	4	2	3	4	3	3	19	24	100	79
15	KZB	4	3	3	3	3	3	19	24	100	79
16	LDH	4	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
17	MND	4	3	2	3	3	3	18	24	100	75
18	MAA	4	2	2	2	3	3	17	24	100	71
19	MRAF	4	3	3	4	3	3	19	24	100	79
20	MMK	4	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
21	MFR	4	2	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
22	MRA	3	3	3	3	3	3	18	24	100	75
23	NS	3	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
24	NSP	3	3	3	4	3	3	19	24	100	79
25	NAK	3	3	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
26	ON	3	3	2	3	2	3	16	24	100	67
27	PS	3	3	3	3	3	3	18	24	100	75
28	RV	4	3	3	4	3	3	20	24	100	83
29	RF	3	3	3	3	3	2	17	24	100	71
30	SFS	3	3	2	2	3	3	16	24	100	67
31	SHU	4	3	2	3	3	3	18	24	100	75
32	ZI	3	3	3	3	3	4	19	24	100	79
Average Score		117	87	81	99	96	96				2393
		91,40	67,96	63,28	77,34	75	75				74,78

Information:

SO = Score Obtained

MS = Maximum Score

IS = Ideal Score

Based on table 5, it can be seen that 92 is the highest score obtained by students, while the lowest score is 67. There are 17 students who reach the minimum score or 53.12%, while the students who have not reached the minimum score are 15 people or 46.87. %. The value of writing negotiation text skills for Class X IPS 3 cycle II was an average of 74.78%. Thus the research achievement criteria have not been achieved in cycle II and continued in cycle III. More details, can be seen in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Scores Range of Negotiation Text Writing Skills in Cycle II

No	Classification	Score Range	Number of Student and Percentage	
			Student	Percentage
1	Very Good	90 – 100	1	3,12 %
2	Good	75 – 89	16	50 %
3	Enough	61 – 74	15	46,87 %
4	Less	≤ 60	0	0
Total Score			32	100

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that students who obtained the value of writing negotiating text skills in cycle II with the very good category were only 1 person or 3.12%. Students who obtained the value of writing negotiation text skills in the second cycle with either category (good) 16 people or 50%. Students who obtained the value of writing negotiating text skills in the second cycle with the sufficient category (enough) were 15 people or 46.87%. Students who scored less in cycle II were no longer there.

Table 7 The Improvement of Negotiation Text Writing Skills in Cycle I and Cycle II

No	Indicator	Average Score		
		Cycle I	Cycle II	Improvement in CI to CII
1	suitability of content with title	90,62	91,40	0,78
2	accuracy of the main idea of the text	60,93	67,96	7,02
3	sequence of text structures	62,5	63,28	1,23
4	text structures	73,43	77,34	3,91
5	accuracy of vocabulary	68,75	75	6,25
6	writing accuracy according to PUEBI	70,31	75	4,69

Based on Table 7, it can be seen that the improvement in writing negotiating text skills through the project based learning model from cycle I to cycle II is as follows: 1) The suitability of the title and the content of the negotiating text has increased by 0.78% in very good category; 2) the indicator of accuracy of the main content of the negotiation text is 7.02% in sufficient category; 3) the indicator of the content of the negotiating text content has increased by 1.23% in the sufficient category; 4) the indicator of the negotiation text structure has increased by 3.91% in good category; 5) vocabulary indicators according to PUEBI rules have increased by 6.25% in good category; 6) writing indicators according to PUEBI rules increased by 4.69% in good category.

D. Cycle III

The planning cycle III is obtained from the reflection and recommendation of cycle II. The learning material chosen is the same as in cycle II, namely writing the negotiating text. Competency standards that can be possessed by the ability to think and act effectively and creatively in the abstract and concrete realm as a development of what is learned in schools independently. The assessment process in cycle III is carried out using a written test in the form of description questions. Students are asked to make a negotiation text. The form of the test questions can be seen below.

Make a negotiation text with the right structure!

The results of the scores in cycle II can be seen in the table below.

Table 8 Scores of Negotiation Text Writing Skills with the Project Based Learning Model in Cycle III

No	Student Initial	Component						SO	MS	IS	End Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6				
1	AUS	4	3	4	4	4	4	23	24	100	96
2	ASFP	4	4	4	4	3	3	22	24	100	92
3	A	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
4	APDS	4	4	4	4	3	4	23	24	100	96
5	AN	4	3	4	4	3	3	21	24	100	87
6	CDA	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
7	CTWF	4	3	4	4	4	4	23	24	100	96
8	DS	4	3	3	3	4	3	20	24	100	83
9	DSI	3	4	4	3	4	3	21	24	100	87
10	DPZ	4	4	3	4	4	4	23	24	100	96
11	D	4	2	2	3	3	3	17	24	100	71
12	FNH	3	4	4	4	3	3	21	24	100	87
13	FDP	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
14	HA	4	4	4	4	4	3	23	24	100	96
15	KZB	4	4	4	4	3	3	22	24	100	92
16	LDH	4	4	3	4	3	3	21	24	100	87
17	MND	4	4	4	4	3	3	22	24	100	92
18	MAA	4	4	3	3	3	3	20	24	100	83
19	MRAF	4	4	3	4	4	4	23	24	100	96
20	MMK	3	4	4	4	4	3	22	24	100	92

21	MFR	3	4	4	3	3	4	21	24	100	87
22	MRA	4	4	4	4	3	3	22	24	100	92
23	NS	4	3	4	4	3	3	21	24	100	87
24	NSP	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
25	NAK	4	4	3	4	3	3	21	24	100	87
26	ON	4	4	4	3	3	3	21	24	100	87
27	PS	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
28	RV	4	4	4	4	4	3	23	24	100	96
29	RF	3	4	4	4	4	3	22	24	100	92
30	SFS	3	4	4	4	4	4	23	24	100	96
31	SHU	4	3	3	4	4	4	22	24	100	92
32	ZI	3	4	4	4	4	4	23	24	100	96
Average Score		121	115	114	122	114	110				2901
		94,53	89,84	89,06	95,31	89,06	85,93				90,65

Information:

SO = Score Obtained

MS = Maximum Score

IS = Ideal Score

Based on table 8, it can be seen that 96 is the highest score obtained by students, while the lowest score is 71. Students who reach the minimum score are 31 people or 96.87%, while students who have not reached the minimum score are 1 person or 3.12 %. The value of writing negotiation text skills for Class X IPS 3 cycle II was an average of 90.65%. Thus the research achievement criteria have been achieved in cycle III so there is no need to continue in the next cycle. For more details, the scores range can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9 Scores Range of Negotiation Text Writing Skills in Cycle III

No	Clasification	Range Score	Student Number and Percentage	
			X IPS 3	Percentage
1	Very Good	90 – 100	21	65,62 %
2	Good	75 – 89	10	31,25 %
3	Enough	61 – 74	1	3,12 %
4	Less	≤ 60	0	0
Total			32	100

Based on Table 9, it can be seen that students who obtained the value of writing negotiation text skills in cycle III with the very good category reached 21 people or 65.62%. Students who get the value of writing text negotiation skills in the third cycle with either category (good) are 10 people or 31.25%. Students who obtained the value of writing text negotiation skills in cycle III with the sufficient category (enough) 1 person or 3.12%. The increase in the value of the ability to write negotiation text in cycles II and III can be observed in the following table.

Table 10 The Improvement of Negotiation Text Writing Skills in Cycle II and Cycle III

No	Indicator	Average Score		
		Cycle II	Cycle III	Improvement from CII to CIII
1	suitability of content with title	91,40	94,53	3,13
2	accuracy of the main idea of the text	67,96	89,84	21,88
3	sequence of text structures	63,28	89,06	25,78
4	text structures	77,34	95,31	17,97
5	accuracy of vocabulary	75	89,06	14,06
6	writing accuracy according to PUEBI	75	85,93	10,93

Based on Table 10, it can be seen that the improvement in writing negotiating text skills through the project based learning model from cycle II to cycle III is as follows: 1) The suitability of the title and the content of the negotiating text has increased by 3.13% in very good category; 2) indicators of accuracy of the main content of the negotiation text were 21.88% in very good category; 3) the indicator of the content of the negotiating text content has increased by 25.78% in the very good category; 4) the indicator of the negotiation text structure has increased 17.97% in very good category; 5) vocabulary indicators according to PUEBI rules

have increased by 14.06% in good category; 6) writing indicator according to PUEBI rules has increased by 10.93% in good category.

V. CONCLUSION

There was an increase in the negotiation text writing skills of students of class X IPS 3 at Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School by using a project based learning model from pre-cycle, cycle I to cycle III. In the initial conditions the average value only reached 64.09 in the first cycle the average value increased to 70.93 followed by the second cycle the average value increased again to 74.78 and in the third cycle the average value it has increased to 90.65. The results of the negotiation text writing test have reached the specified success indicators, namely at least getting a good category with a minimum score ≥ 75 . This shows that the project-based learning model can improve the writing skills of negotiating text.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abidin, Yunus. 2014. Desain Pembelajaran dalam Konteks Kurikulum 2013. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- [2] Arikunto, Suhastimi. 1999. Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktis. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- [3] Arikunto, Suhastimi. 2002. Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta .
- [4] Arsyad, Azhar. 2009. Media Pembelajaran. Jakarta : PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [5] Arsyad, Azhar. 2009. Media Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- [6] Dalman. 2012. Keterampilan Menulis. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [7] Daryanto dan Dwicahyono. 2014. Pengembangan Perangkat Pembelajaran. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.
- [8] Daryanto. 2010. Media Pembelajaran. Bandung : Satunusa.
- [9] Depdikbud. 2013. Kurikulum Bahasa Indonesia Di SMA. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- [10] Depdiknas. 2008. Panduan Pengembangan Bahan Ajar. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum.
- [11] Depdiknas. 2005. Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- [12] Forsyth, Patrick. 1996. Negosiasi Menang/Kalah dengan Komunikasi Persuasif. Jakarta : PT Gramedia Utama.
- [13] Gie, the liang. 2002. Terampil Mengarang. Yogyakarta : Penerbit Andi.
- [14] Hamalik. Oemar. 2002. Proses Belajar Mengajar. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [15] Harsiyati, Titik. 2016. Buku Siswa Bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Balitbang, Kemendikbud.
- [16] Kalisa Evayana ,dkk. 2012. Pembelajaran Menulis Teks Negosiasi Siswa Kelas X SMA N 1 Pringsewu. Pringsewu. Lampung. Vol. 9, Nomor 2.
- [17] Kamdi, W dkk. 2007. Model-Model Pembelajaran Inovatif. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- [18] Kemendikbud. 2013. Bahasa Indonesia Ekspresi Diri dan Akademik. Jakarta: Politeknik Negeri Media Kreatif.
- [19] Mahsun. 2014. Teks dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Kurikulum 2013. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [20] Majid, Abdul. 2013. Perencanaan Pembelajaran. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [21] Ningsi. 2014. Pengaruh Model Berbasis Proyek terhadap Kemampuan Pembelajaran Menulis Teks Negosiasi Siswa Kelas X SMA Negeri 1 Kuala (Skripsi). Medan: Unimed.
- [22] Priansa, Donni Juni. 2015. Manajemen Peserta Didik dan Model Pembelajaran. Bandung: Alfabeta Bandung.
- [23] Priyatni. Endah Tri. 2014. Desain Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia dalam Kurikulum 2013. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- [24] Pt. Suryani,dkk. 2014. Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Berbasis Teks di Kelas X SMA Negeri 1 Singaraja. Singaraja. Bali. Vol 3, Nomor 1.
- [25] Purba, Adelita. 2015. Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Penemuan (Discovery Learning) terhadap Kemampuan Memproduksi Teks Negosiasi Siswa Kelas X SMA Negeri 20 Medan Tahun Pembelajaran 2014/2015. Dalam Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia (hal 8)
- [26] Rohani, Ahmad. 1997. Media Instruksional Edukatif. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.
- [27] Sadiman, Arief dkk. 2009. Media Pendidikan: Pengertian, Pengembangan dan Pemanfaatannya. Jakarta : Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [28] Sanjaya, Wina. 2009. Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media.
- [29] Semi, Atar. 1990. Dasar-dasar Keterampilan Menulis. Bandung: Angkasa.
- [30] Sudjana. 2002. Metode statistika. Bandung : Tarsito.
- [31] Sudjono, Anas. 2015. Pengantar Statistika Pendidikan. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [32] Sugiyono. 2012. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [33] Tarigan, Henry Guntur. 2008. Menulis sebagai Keterampilan Berbahasa. Bandung :Angkasa.

Angeliqe Delavega YS, et. al. " The Application of Project Based Learning Models to Improve The Skills of Writing Negotiation Text for Students in Al Azhar 3 Bandar Lampung High School." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 11(1), (2021): pp. 01-09.