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Abstract
This study explores the use of project-based learning for student writing skills. It engaged in classroom action research with 32 sophomores from SMP 1 Parepare as participants. Information from this survey was obtained through interviews, observation checklists, questionnaires, and tests. The results of the data analysis show that students have improved their English proficiency, as evidenced by the following: a) Percentage of students who steadily improved their scores at the end of each cycle. The minimum mastery criteria for teaching English The Ketentuan Minimal (KKM) score was 78 (75). The average pretest score for the students was 58.9. In the first cycle, the average score was 76.6. In the second cycle, the average score was 86.3. b) Students’ reactions to growing interest in learning English through project-based learning (PBL) strategies are generally positive. The data showed a score of 94.3%, which means “Excellent”. c) through an observation checklist, students’ participation in students’ activities indicating that students’ participation steadily increased form the first to the second cycle.
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Introduction
Writing is an activity carried out to communicate an idea in right words and present them in written form. We know and believe that writing is a skill that anyone can learn to manage. Writing is not only about grammar rules but more about how students learn to communicate their writing without having to be afraid of making mistakes.

There are many students who do not realize the important of learning writing skills. The good writing in English is based on the principle of writing which used the right language, clear idea, and directional describing. Zum’arini et.al. (2017) stated that many students face the problem in writing because of having low ability in vocabulary, getting difficulty in using grammar, having trouble to express their ideas, and also having low interest in the lesson.

In general, students need to know how to write, how to correctly express an idea in, and how to process and form sentences that can give meaning. The students find that writing is difficult to learn due to some cases: (1) they are less interested in it because it is not correlated with their major, (2) the limited time availability (3) the teaching learning process is less
meaningful, and (4) they are lack of feedback due to the big number of students in one class. (Ekawati, 2018). In spite of difficult, we all believe that it can be learnt by everyone.

The students learned the types of sentences. One of them is descriptive text. In fact, students have a hard time actually writing descriptive text. They don't know how to organize their ideas. When this happens, it's hard for students to start writing and what to write first. Teachers should find the solution. One of them to use of project-based learning (PBL) method.

Project Based Learning is a learning method which focuses on the learner; the teacher acts mainly as a facilitator and motivator (Nguyen, 2011). Danajaya (2013) stated that Project Based Learning is implemented assignment through series activities. It is also a learning model that allows students to work independently to construct authentic products that come from real problems occur in everyday life (Hosnan, 2016). Student participation in activities is a learning process or unlimited learning to know, but also developing the students’ physical potency and psychology, moreover increasing initiative and creativity.

Project Based Learning (PBL) is learning that emphasizes students’ activity in solving various open-ended problems and applying their knowledge in working on a project to produce a specific authentic product (Abidin, 2014). Project-based learning is a learning model that engages students in direct independent work and accumulates in real products.

Nurhajati (2016) explained the results of her research. This shows that PBL is suitable for teaching writing skills as it greatly improves students' writing skills. After teaching by this method, students are able to create good sentence and develop their ideas in making a descriptive text. This study proves to help students write simple texts. They are good at structuring texts and developing ideas. You can also work with other students to motivate them to be more creative.

Putri, et.al. (2017) in her research said that Project based learning has significant effect towards the students’ productive skills. In addition, PBL improves student learning quality in terms of enthusiasm, self-confidence, creativity, and self-directed and collaborative learning. Teacher-side PBL, on the other hand, promotes teacher motivation and satisfaction to teach. It is recommended to be used by teacher to provide valuable teaching atmosphere in the classroom.

Sholihah (2018) stated that project-based learning (PBL) can improve students’ writing capability, can create better situation in the way becomes more alive with various interesting activities, and can improve students’ participation in teaching learning process.
Ekawati (2018) in her research described how the integrated PBL can enhance the students’ writing skill through two main stages: (1) preparation stage. It entails grouping, deciding on project work, deciding on a schedule, studying subject, and learning how to create a recount text in the classroom. (2) Individual writing activity that includes (a) free writing, (b) drafting, (c) evaluating (peer review and teacher learner conference), (d) rewriting, (e) post writing, (f) posting in a social media, and (g) responding to a social media reader's response.

Aghayani, et. al. (2019) conducted research to explore the effect of project-based learning on EFL learners’ writing skill. Following the introduction of project-based learning, the learning process has a major impact on the learners’ writing abilities. Furthermore, the results of the experimental group show that project-based learning aids learners in improving and promoting their writing skill in a collaborative setting.

Siti Juleha et, al, (2019) on their journal research argue that Project Based Learning can be used to build student’ scientific literacy. Achievement of scientific literacy in the areas of subject knowledge, scientific ability, and post-learning attitudes has improved to a very satisfactory level. This is because project-based learning uses problem scenarios related to real-world phenomena to encourage students to participate in the learning process through collaborative work. Implementing project-based learning also has a positive impact on student information literacy.

Syarifah et, al, (2019) in mentioned that Project Based Learning contributes positively to the development of students’ ability and creativity in writing.

Student understanding of the topics, objectives, structures, and linguistic features of the narrative genre is an aspect of that has improved after the implementation of project-based learning. Students also respond positively to this method. Therefore, project-based learning is very helpful in teaching and learning writing. Therefore, this could be an alternative that could be implemented by teachers in the process of teaching and learning writing.

Susana and Anwar Efendi (2020) mentioned that learning-based projects can improve students' skills in reading and writing short stories. It is also evident to improve students' activeness in learning of reading and writing short story material. Besides, the level of cooperation among students increased. Another good achievement occurs in the growth of self-confidence of the students, such as during presentation and answering question.

In SMP 1 Parepare found that the students experience difficulties in writing due to lack of understanding in writing, lack of vocabularies, and the method or strategy used by teachers in the teaching and learning process. Writing is a complex skill, so writing must be done in
stages. Therefore, project-based learning was used by students to improve their writing skills in.

**Method**

This study applied qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques. The qualitative data used by the researcher included a questionnaire, interview process, and observation checklist. The student's final essay serves as a pre- and post-test for quantitative data. Full explanation is as follows:

1. **Questionnaire**
   
   This is used for student responses or feedback on using Project Based Learning (PBL) to improve student writing.

2. **Interview**
   
   An interview is a direct interaction with two or more people who ask and answer questions orally for information. This strategy is used to collect responses or feedback from students while teaching and learning English using the Project Based Learning (PBL) method.

3. **Observation**
   
   Observation is the use of human senses to collect data. In some natural conditions, observation is the act of watching the social phenomena in the real world and recording events as they happened (Herdiansyah, 2013). In this research, observation checklists were utilized to check several characteristics of students’ interest and activity. This contains about classroom activities.

4. **Test**
   
   a. **Pre-test**

      Prior to action at the first meeting, researchers conducted pre-tests to improve the writing skills of students. The pre-test is descriptive test. The pre-test took time around 40 minutes to complete. To make a nice paragraph, write some sentences based on the image.

   b. **Post-test**

      Post-tests are conducted after using "project-based learning" and after students take action to learn how to improve their English writing skills. The result of the test is in the post-test, which is the same as the test in the pre-test, but the image is different.

      The design of the research used Classroom Action Research which consisted of two cycles. The cycles as follow:
1. Cycle 1

In this cycle was consisting of planning, action, observation, reflection

a. Planning

1) The researchers have prepared writing materials to be provided to student through project-based learning.
2) The researcher gave a project to practice the students writing and overcame their problem.
3) The researcher led the students to get the aim of the project in organization material and grammar.
4) The researcher paid attention to the students in using punctuation of their product.
5) The researchers asked students to write down the new vocabulary they learned from doing the project.

b. Acting

1) The researcher gave a driving question for students about the material and gave assignment to do activities in a project.
2) The researcher led the students to determine their topic.
3) The researcher gave planning about rules of the project and informs the instrument and material that they used to generate, select and organize idea to do develop their topic of the project.
4) The researcher gave instruction for students to manage their time.
5) The researchers monitored student activity and instructed students to focus on punctuation, organization, content, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics of their products.
6) The researcher asked the students to note new vocabularies that they got in finishing their project.
7) The researcher evaluated the students’ progress, assesses their product and gave feedback.

c. Observation

During this phase, researchers monitored the student process throughout the project and collaborator helped to make a note of the students’ activities during learning process namely collected data. She wrote in a field note that researchers had prepared
equipment to record student activities during the learning process and to record contributions of project-based learning to improve student writing.

d. Reflection

1) The researcher collected the result of the acting and assessed the outcome of the students’ project.

2) The researchers discussed the results of the study with English teachers and examined the effectiveness of the campaign.

3) The researcher evaluated the experience of the students after doing the project.

4) The researcher revised the implementation of measures based on the results of the evaluation.

2. Cycle 2

In the cycle II, all of the activities were not too different with the activities in the cycle I. It also consisted of planning, acting, observation and reflection but in this cycle, researchers achieved the perfect result of their work based on the reflection of Cycle I.

a. Planning

The planning in this stage was generally same with planning in the first cycle. It is preparing material and project for learning process. However, all wrong things in the first cycle revised.

b. Acting

All activity in action stage was same with action in the first cycle. The researcher gave material and instruction to doing project.

c. Observation

The researchers observed the activity of all students during the teaching and learning process, based on the cycle I review and evaluation process.

d. Reflecting

The researchers looked back at the results of Cycle 2 and then analyzed. Researchers then discovered that the learning process had increased to or was not developed, based on the results of the student’s written exam.

Result

The result of the research completely explanation as follows:

1. The Result of pre-test in Cycle 1
Pre-testing was done before using project-based learning (PBL). It took place on November 16, 2021. Students were asked to write a descriptive text based on the worksheet given.

The results are explained in table 1 as follows:

Table 1. The Result of Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Score</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>MMC</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, the data show that the pretest average scores are 58.8, and the standard deviation is 2.5. This is below the minimum proficiency standard *Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)*. This means that students in the descriptive text need to improve their writing skills. While Table 2 shows:

Table 2. The Result of MMC in Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMC (Minimum Mastery Criteria)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the pre-test, only 5 students exceeded the minimum proficiency criterion of *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)*, while the other 27 students fell below this criterion. The poorest performers achieved a score of 25. From this analysis, it was clear that the writing ability of almost VIII.2 student was still low.

2. The result of Post-Test in Cycle 1

Tuesday, November 30th 2021, after the students completed the learning process in the first, the second, and the third meeting, the researcher distributed a test to determine their comprehension and writing abilities based on the material provided by the researcher during the learning process.

Table 3. The Result of Post-Test in Cycle 1
Based on data presented on the table above, the students’ writing skill was even lower, as the mean score in writing was just 76.5, and the standard deviation was 1.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMC (Minimum Mastery Criterion)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 78$</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\leq 78$</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that 19 students or 59.4% got score $\geq 78$ “success”, and 13 students or 40.6% got score $\leq 78$ “unsuccess”. It signifies that 59.4% of the students had completed their learning while 40.6% were still working on it.

And there was a minimal achievement standard in SMPN 1 Parepare. If the students achieve an ideal score of 78, they will be classified as having completed classical study.

The researcher concluded of implementing the action. Then they tried to change the action so that 40.6% of students in the class could pass the Minimum Mastery Criterion-Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum (KKM), because the result post-test 1 showed that only 59.4% of students passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion-Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum (KKM). Meanwhile, field notes showed that the teaching learning activities went well, while there were a few issues that needed to be solved. During the reflection phase, more efforts should be made to improve students’ writing abilities.

The researchers conclude with the implementation of the action, the post-test 1 showed that only 59.4% of the students passed the minimum proficiency criterion Kriteria Ketuntasan, so that 40.6% of the students in the class could pass the minimum proficiency criterion Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum (KKM). Fieldnotes, on the other hand, showed that education and learning activities are on track, while there are some issues that need to be resolved. At the retrospective stage, further efforts are needed to improve students' writing skills.
3. The result of Post-Test in cycle II

Friday, December 10th 2021, after the students completed the first and second meeting, the researcher distributed a test to determine their comprehension and writing abilities based on the material provided by the researcher during the learning process.

Table 5. The Result of Post-test in Cycle II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Score</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>MMC (Minimum Mastery Criterion)</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>93,75</td>
<td>86,3</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, it was obvious that the students writing abilities improved more in cycle II than in cycle I. It indicated that the first criterion of success has been achieved.

Tabel 6. The Result of MMC in Cycle II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMC (Minimum Mastery Criteria)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that 29 out of 32 students got score ≥78 (success) and 3 of them got ≤ 78 (unsuccessful). The previous target that would be achieved was 59,4% but after doing the cycle II students’ achievement was 90,6%. So, we can conclude that this research was success.

After receiving the results of the observational checklist and the post-test II, the Classroom Action Research (CAR) was reflected on. The researcher was impressed with how well their attempts to increase the students’ writing abilities had been realized. The results of the second post-test revealed that 90,6% of the students achieved a score higher than the Minimum Mastery Criterion-Kriteria Ketuntasa Minimal (KKM). In cycle II, the researcher had a dialogue with a partner to discuss the flaws and successes of learning as follows:

a. The students’ participant and attention more increased
b. The students increased self-assurance as the explained
c. The average score for cycle II evaluation was 90.6% and they had excellent writing skills.

Based on the data above has been noticed that writing abilities had improved from cycle I to cycle II. As a result, it has been demonstrated that using Project Based Learning (PBL) can improve the students’ writing abilities.

**Discussion**

This research was a Classroom Action Research aimed at the effect of Project Based Learning (PBL) in teaching writing to the second grade of SMPN 1 Parepare. After performing the research, it was shown that Project Based Learning can boost students’ ability in learning English, especially their capacity to write descriptive text. The learning process, observation, questionnaires, interviews, and examinations all show that students are more interested in studying English.

The Project Based Learning was done using two cycles. The first cycle took place over four meetings, with one meeting serving as a pre-test, two meetings serving as learning sessions, and one meeting serving as post-test one. In the second cycle, there were three meetings, two for the learning process and one for the post-test two.

Project-based learning is a model of organizing learning around a project where project is a complex task, based on difficult questions or problems, involving students in the design, problem solving, decision making or investigation; gives students the opportunity to work relatively independently for a long time. The students’ ability to make their own items was shown. The students enjoying writing because they understand what they wanted to do and they were also motivated to complete their project since they had a good understanding of the materials.

This learning followed the researchers’ expectations and was then based on the premise that project-based learning can improve. The result of this study suggest that students’ ability in learning English has increased, which is consistent with the benefits of project based learning (PBL). This theory also backs up previous researchs, Nurhajati (2016) Project-Based Learning used to develop supplementary materials for writing skill; Putri, et.al. (2017) Project-based learning activities and EFL students’ productive skills in English; Sholihah (2018) Project–Based Learning to improve students’ writing capability; Aghayani, et. al. (2019) Project-based learning: Promoting EFL learners’ writing skills; Susana and Anwar Efendi (2020) The Improvement of Short Story Reading and Writing Skill through Project-Based
Learning. These all show how the Project Based Learning strategy can improve learning quality, students’ writing ability as general and students’ writing descriptive text specifically.

**Conclusion**

Based on the description in previous can be concluded that Project Based Learning (PBL) had an impact on students’ writing skills. The statistics showed that the mean score cycle1 was 76.5 and the mean score cycle2 was 86.3. It signifies that the students’ writing performance has improved significantly. Besides that, this research indicator of learning achievement had been met. Therefore, the Project Based Learning (PBL) was effective for the second-grade students of SMPN 1 Parepare.
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