

## **THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REFLECTIVE LEARNING MODEL PLUS TO IMPROVE PROPOSAL TEXT WRITING SKILLS OF XI SOCIAL 1 STUDENTS OF STATE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 4 JEMBER**

**Sofiatul Annisa, Nurhadi Nurhadi, Martutik Martutik**

Indonesian Language Education Program, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang,  
Indonesia

*\*Email: [sofiatulannisa13@gmail.com](mailto:sofiatulannisa13@gmail.com)*

### **ABSTRACT**

This class action research aims to improve the ability to write proposal text of XI Social 1 students at State Senior High School 4 Jember by using reflective learning model plus. Based on the results of observations and interviews in class XI Social 1 of State Senior High School 4 Jember, it was found that only 13 students (37%) out of 35 students scored above the Minimum Mastery Criteria in learning to write proposal text. To overcome these problems, learning improvement was carried out by applying the reflective learning plus model. This study used a qualitative approach and a type of classroom action research consisting of two cycles. Each cycle consists of four stages, namely: (1) planning, (2) action implementation, (3) observation, and (4) reflection. The methods used to obtain data were observation, tests, interviews, and documentation. The results showed that students' ability to write proposal text increased from cycle I to cycle II. The number of students who reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria in cycle I was 27 students (77%) out of 35 students, while in cycle II 35 students (100%). Based on the results obtained, it can be concluded that the application of reflective learning model plus can improve students' ability in writing proposal text.

### **KEYWORDS**

writing proposal text, reflective learning model plus, class action research

### **INTRODUCTION**

The most complex language skill among listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills is writing. Writing skills demand more exertion in critical thinking so that teaching must be systematic and programmatic. Writing skills need to be taught in Indonesian language learning because it is an active, productive, and expressive skill. In line with the opinion of Nurhadi (2017:3) which states that writing is active and productive because writing is an activity of producing meaningful graphic symbols. Meaningful is the meaning of language that can be understood so that others can read it. Another opinion was expressed by Sari, et al. (2022) who stated that writing activities can make students active in learning activities and stimulate students' skills in stringing words. Writing is said to be expressive because by writing a writer can express thoughts and ideas to others. Sari's opinion is strengthened by Marista, et al. (2020) who state that writing activities must be carried out through a learning process that takes place continuously. Writing requires a thinking process to convey ideas or messages (Lesmana, et al., 2020). Hatmo (2021:4) states that to get good writing, writers must have the ability to use vocabulary, grammar, and language structure. The

mastery of writing skills allows students to express their ideas, thoughts, and feelings in the form of text, either written text or oral text.

The ability to write various texts is a target in Curriculum 2013. Writing activities become one of the important aspects as well as a measuring tool to determine student's mastery of learning materials. In addition, through writing activities, student's understanding of learning materials can be measured and seen from the text that has been created. In the 2013 curriculum, teachers are required to be able to turn learning resources into teaching materials (Sari, et al., 2019).

One of the text types contained in Curriculum 2013 is proposal text. The types of proposal text based on their functions are divided into three types, namely research, activity and business proposal texts. The purpose of proposal text is to communicate plans to other parties in order to obtain approval and financial assistance in carrying out an activity. In the content standards of the 2013 Curriculum for the Indonesian language subject of Senior High School for class XI, the competency on writing proposal texts is contained in Basic Competence (4.13), namely "designing a scientific work proposal by paying attention to the necessary information, objectives, and essence of scientific work."

Based on the results of interviews with Indonesian language teachers at State Senior High School 4 Jember, it is known that the ability to write proposal texts of students in class XI IPS 1 is low. Out of 35 students, only 13 students (37%) scored >78. The low score obtained by students is caused by several things including: (1) students have not been able to express their ideas in writing proposal text, (2) students have not been able to compose proposal text according to the structure of proposal text, (3) students have not been able to compose proposal text according to the linguistic rules of proposal text, and (4) students have not been able to use correct spelling and punctuation in proposal text.

From the observation, during the process of learning activities the teacher only explains the material using the student textbook media. After finishing explaining the material, the teacher gave the opportunity to students who wanted to ask about the material that they did not understand. If no students ask any more questions, the teacher gives the students the task of writing a proposal text. The teacher did not assist the students when writing the proposal text so that some students copied from the internet. Such learning is suspected to be the cause of the low scores obtained by students. There were even some students who fell asleep in class because they felt bored with the learning. When students have become lazy from the start of learning, then learning to write will not run effectively. Teachers as material conveyors to students must master teaching techniques or learning techniques (Sagala, et al., 2020).

Teachers in carrying out teaching tasks need to plan and determine effective classroom management (Mujianto, et al., 2020). The learning model applied by the teacher is one of the keys in determining the success of a lesson. The learning model is basically a form of learning that is described from beginning to end which is presented characteristically by educators (Priyatni, et al., 2017). The success of learning to write is largely determined by how far the teacher's role in delivering material about writing, models, and approaches used by the teacher (Adeninawaty, et al., 2018). Learning models that tend to be theoretical have proven unable to maximize students' ability to write proposals. To support the realization of reflective and critical

abilities, it is necessary to carry out learning by applying a reflective learning model, which allows students to reflect on learning experiences or previous task results by analyzing the tasks performed in learning. With such a learning model, students get the opportunity to be actively engaged in learning by utilizing their own experiences. With the application of reflective learning model, students are expected to focus more on paying attention, thinking, having their own ideas, finding solutions, interpreting, assessing and making self-reflection on what is around them with their thinking skills (Honey, 1992). In addition, with the application of reflective learning models, students are expected to reflect on the text that has been made on the experiences they have or the actions they take, students can learn what they face, assume, provide assessment, solve problems with their own experiences, and students can explore their experiences to gain new understanding of the text that has been made. Putra (2016) states that the reflective learning model is learning by involving reflective thinking activities on its process. Reflection is an intellectual and affective activity that involves students in an effort to explore student's experiences to gain new understanding and appreciation.

Some data and information based on previous research has been found. The purpose of previous research was to measure the effectiveness of the object to be studied in presenting proposal text. Research relevant to this study has been conducted by Wiguna (2020) entitled "Improving the Learning Process of Proposal Writing in Class XI Students of Senior High School Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar Through Numbered Head Together". This research produced findings that the Numbered Head Together learning model can improve the quality of the learning process of writing proposals. Furthermore, Hadi's research (2018) entitled "Efforts to Improve Students' Ability to Make Thesis Proposals Through Direct Learning Model in Research and Language Teaching Courses". This study resulted in findings that there was a significant increase in students' ability to make proposals by using the Through Direct Learning Model. Further research was conducted by Listiyani (2014) entitled "Improving the Ability to Write Activity Proposals with Cooperative Learning Two Stay Two Stray for Students of Vocational High School 3 Kudus". The result of this study showed that learning to write activity proposals using Cooperative Learning Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) can improve the quality of the process as well as the ability to write activity proposals. Thus, the difference between this research and previous research is expected to be the answer to improving the skills of writing proposal texts with a reflective learning model plus.

Based on the description above, to overcome students' problems in writing the proposal text, the reflective plus learning model is chosen. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a class action research with the title "The Implementation of Reflective Learning Model Plus to Improve Proposal Text Writing Skills of XI Social 1 Students of State Senior High School 4 Jember".

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Learning Model

Various things need to be prepared by an educator before starting learning. One of the most important things prepared by educators is the learning model. Choosing a learning model that is suitable for the material and conditions of students will have a good impact on the success of teaching. Learning model is a series of material presentations that are used as guidelines in planning classroom learning. As stated by Afandi, et al. (2013: 15) which states that the learning

model is a systematic procedure or pattern used as a guide to achieve learning objectives in which there are strategies, techniques, methods, materials, media, and learning assessment tools. A different opinion is expressed by Asyafah (2019: 22) which states that the learning model is a description that describes the learning design starting from planning, the learning process, to post-learning chosen by educators used either directly or indirectly.

The application of learning models is an important point in the learning process to be able to change students to be more active (Rahman, et al., 2021). Furthermore, Asyafah (2019: 23) states that there are several things to consider in choosing a learning model, namely (1) philosophical foundation, (2) theoretical foundation, (3) psychological-pedagogical foundation, and (4) sociological foundation. If the model is developed from religious values, it should be added with (5) religious foundation. Considering these points, it is expected that educators will be able to determine a learning model that can be applied appropriately and optimally.

Mirdad (2020) reveals the characteristics of learning models, among others: a) based on educational theory and learning theory from certain experts, b) has a specific educational mission or purpose, c) can serve as guidelines for the improvement of teaching and learning activities in the classroom, d) has parts of the model, e) has an impact as a result of the application of the learning model, f) make teaching preparations (instructional design) with the guidelines of the selected learning model.

The diversity of opinions from experts can be used as a reference and concluded that the learning model is an entire series of presentation of teaching materials used as guidelines in carrying out learning by adjusting the conditions of students and the material to be taught to achieve learning objectives. Thus, the learning model covers the entire learning process that occurs.

### **Reflective Learning Plus**

Reflective learning model is developed based on cognitive psychology and constructivist psychology theories. As a learning that presents the process of learning in a profound and meaningful way, reflective learning provides many opportunities for students to self-reflect on things that happened in the past, present and future. The concept of reflective learning thinking refers to the cycle of discovery in achieving a goal in finding solutions to the problems posed. The reflective learning process reflects the mental process of learning that will manipulate the mind, in order to find solutions to existing problems, making it easier to process thoughts and new information to be studied in depth through analytical and evaluative considerations before something is decided confidently.

Priyatni, et al. (2017: 3) stated that Dewey's concept of reflective thinking is widely used by experts to improve the learning process and outcomes. Reflective thinking is individual and dialogic. Students who are learning can essentially reflect on their learning experiences. Teachers can also conduct dialogs to find out students' cognitive strategies in understanding or practicing something. In line with the opinion of Priyatni (2017), Graham (2010) stated that reflective learning is defined as learning that provides opportunities for students to think reflectively about the phenomena of each field studied, seeking the root of the relationship to project a real and rational future. A more specific view in relation to learning was expressed by Maine in Boud (1989); Kolb (1984); Safery & Duffy (1996); and Degeng (1998) who saw the importance of reflection for the development of

learning skills, as an important part of the experience-based learning process, which reflects metacognitive awareness, namely awareness of one's own mind as seen in the way one works on tasks and the use of self-awareness to control things to be done.

Reflective learning enables effective personal development, developing the future and applying action with a formula that learning is influenced by interaction with other groups through dialog, conversation, communication to provide new understanding and experience (Moon 2004; Stroobants, 2007). A different opinion expressed by Honey (1992) stated that reflective learning allows learners to focus more on paying attention, thinking, having their own ideas, finding solutions, interpreting, assessing and making self-reflection on what is around them with their thinking skills. In line with Moon (2004) and Stroobants (2007) is Morrow's (2009) opinion that reflective learning is a learning model that prioritizes the thinking process based on self-reflection, past experiences, and future expectations.

Reflective learning aims to give students the opportunity to engage actively in the learning process by involving their own experiences. In addition, it is also used as a learning material in forming a knowledge and stimulating students to think creatively based on their knowledge and experience to solve real problems in life. Harrington (1996) stated that a reflective attitude has three main components, namely: 1) open mindedness, as a reflection on what is known, 2) responsibility, as a moral attitude and professional commitment regarding the impact of learning on learners, learning, and others, and 3) wholeheartedness, as a sincerity in acting and performing tasks. The reflection process essentially includes three stages of activity, namely (a) the stage of representing the experience, (b) the stage of managing feelings, and (c) the stage of re-evaluating the experience. Reflective learning model can facilitate learners in reflecting, associating, reasoning, and constructing their knowledge independently. Reflective learning can trigger critical and creative thinking skills and can foster a sense of responsibility and independence.

Reflective learning has five characteristics that show the thinking process, namely: (1) reporting; (2) responding; (3) relating; (4) reasoning; and (5) reconstructing (Bain, 2002). In this research, reflective learning plus is developed in learning to write proposal texts. The five stages of reflective learning plus, namely: (1) reporting and responding; (2) relating; (3) reasoning; (4) reconstructing; and (5) appreciating. At the reporting and responding level is characterized by the ability of students to report and respond to problems or events around them, at the relating level is characterized by the ability to link problems or events with the skills that students have, at the reasoning level is characterized by the ability to reflect (analyze and assess) problems or events that have been presented, at the reconstructing level is characterized by the ability to reconstruct or improve the presentation of problems in a text, and at the appreciating level is characterized by the ability to appreciate the results of problem solving.

### **Writing Proposal Text**

The word proposal comes from the English word "to propose" which means to propose. In language, a proposal can be interpreted as a form of submission or request. A proposal text is a text that contains a plan of activity written in the form of a work design that will be implemented. The activity plan must of course be written properly and correctly so that interested parties can understand it well. In line with Hasnun's (2004) opinion, a proposal is a plan prepared for a particular activity. Another opinion was expressed by Maskurun and Basiran (2019: 1) who stated

that a proposal is a text containing a plan that is presented in the form of a written, systematic, and thorough work design, made by an author or organization that wants to organize activities. A proposal is only a written proposal addressed to related parties involved in an activity. These activities can be business activities, submissions, funds, projects, and research.

In composing a proposal, students do not just make a writing, but still have to be guided by the linguistic structure of the proposal text. In compiling the proposal text, it is necessary to pay attention to the important elements that characterize the text. Maskurun (2017) states that the structure of proposal writing can vary. This depends on the type of activity it proposes. In some aspects, research proposals have some differences with social activity proposals and business proposals. In writing a proposal text, the linguistic rules in it also need to be considered. The linguistic rules in the proposal text include the use of argumentative statements, persuasive, scientific terms, action verbs, the use of describing words, the use of detailing words, the use of plan-related words, and words that are straightforward.

The Ministry of Education and Culture (2013:180) states that in composing a proposal text, assessment criteria are needed so that a good text is produced and is suitable for readers to read, including:

a. Content Aspect

The criteria for evaluating the proposal text from the content aspect, that is, mastering the topic of writing, substantive, complete text development, relevant to the topic discussed.

b. Organizational Aspects

The criteria for evaluating the proposal text from the organizational aspect is that the ideas are expressed clearly, concisely, well-organized, in logical sequence, and cohesively.

c. Vocabulary Aspect

The criteria for assessing the proposal text from the vocabulary aspect deals with word mastery, word choice and effective expressions, as well as mastering word formation.

d. Sentence Usage Aspect

The criteria for assessing the proposal text from the aspect of sentence usage considers complex and effective construction, language use (word order/function, pronominal, and preposition).

e. Mechanical Aspects

The criteria for assessing the proposal text from the mechanical aspect deals with mastering the rules of writing, such as: spelling errors, punctuation, use of capital letters, and paragraph organization.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach and a type of classroom action research. This research was conducted in a cycle format: pre-cycle, cycle I, and cycle II. According to Arikunto (2008:16), there are four stages that are commonly passed in classroom action research, namely planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. This research was planned collaboratively with the Indonesian language subject teacher of class XI Social 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember in identifying, finding, and solving problems in the classroom and taking action in the form of applying the reflective learning model plus in writing proposal text learning. This research was conducted at State Senior High School 4 Jember which has a total of 35 students.

The data collected in this study are (1) students' proposal text writing test scores before and after the implementation of the action; (2) information about the learning process obtained from observation; (3) learning methods used by teachers so far obtained from interviews; and (4) photos and videos of student activities during the learning process obtained from documentation. The data sources in this study were students and Indonesian language teachers in class XI Social 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember in the academic year 2022/2023. Data collection techniques used observation, test, interview, and documentation methods. The techniques employed in the data analysis were descriptive and quantitative. Table 1 is a table of descriptors of the ability to write proposal text using the reflective learning model plus.

**Table 1. Descriptors of Proposal Text Writing Ability**

No.	Assessment Aspect	Assessment Criteria	Score
1.	Suitability of proposal text content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mastering the writing topic, substantive, complete text development, and relevant to the topic discussed.</li> </ul>	25
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly well-versed in the topic, fairly substantive, fairly complete text development, and fairly relevant to the topic discussed..</li> </ul>	20
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of mastery of the writing topic, less substantive, incomplete text development, and less relevant to the topic discussed.</li> </ul>	15
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not master the topic of writing, is not substantive, incomplete text development, and to the topic discussed.</li> </ul>	5
2.	Completeness of proposal text structure a. Activity proposal, including:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete and sequential structure (contains 10 structures for activity proposals and 6 structures for research proposals).</li> </ul>	25
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure is complete but not sequential (contains 10 structures for activity proposals and 6 structures for research proposals).</li> </ul>	22
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure is complete but not sequential (contains 10 structures for activity proposals and 6 structures for research proposals).</li> </ul>	20
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure is complete but not sequential (contains 10 structures for activity proposals and 6 structures for research proposals).</li> </ul>	18
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure is complete but not sequential (contains 10 structures for activity proposals and 6 structures for research proposals).</li> </ul>	15
	1) proposal title, 2) introduction or background, 3) activity basis, 4) objective, 5) form or type of activity, 6) target activities, 7) implementation of activities, 8) organizing committee,		

---

<p>9) funding budget, and 10) cover.</p> <p>b. Research proposal, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) proposal title,</li> <li>2) introduction,</li> <li>3) literature review or theory review,</li> <li>4) research methods,</li> <li>5) bibliography, and</li> <li>6) appendices.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structure is fairly complete and sequential (contains 9 structures for activity proposals and 5 structures for research proposals).</li> <li>• The structure is fairly complete but not sequential (contains 9 structures for activity proposals and 5 structures for research proposals).</li> <li>• Less complete structure (contains 8 structures for activity proposals and 4 structures for research proposals).</li> <li>• Incomplete structure (contains less than 8 structures for activity proposals and less than 4 structures for research proposals).</li> </ul>	<p>10</p>
<p>3. Completeness of the linguistic rules of the proposal text</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Argumentative statements</li> <li>2) Persuasive statement</li> <li>3) Scientific terms</li> <li>4) Action verb</li> <li>5) The use of describing words</li> <li>6) The use of detailing words</li> <li>7) The use of plan-related words</li> <li>8) Denotative words</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete linguistic rules (contains 8 linguistic rules).</li> <li>• Less complete language rules (contains 7 language rules)</li> <li>• Incomplete language rules (contains less than 7 language rules).</li> </ul>	<p>25</p> <p>20</p> <p>15</p>
<p>4. Writing mechanism</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mastering the rules of writing; the use of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraph organization are correct.</li> <li>• Fairly proficient in writing rules; there are 1-5 spelling or punctuation errors or capitalization or paragraph organization.</li> <li>• Poor command of writing rules; there are 6-10 errors in spelling or punctuation or</li> </ul>	<p>25</p> <p>20</p> <p>15</p> <p>10</p>

---

---

capitalization or paragraph organization.

- Does not master the writing rules; there are more than 10 spelling or punctuation errors or the use of capital letters or paragraph organization.
- 

## RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The improvement of the results of the ability to write proposal text after the application of the reflective learning model plus can be seen from the comparison of the scores obtained by students in writing proposal text from the pre-cycle, cycle I, and cycle II stages. Therefore, the reflective plus learning model can be said to be able to improve students' ability in writing proposal texts. The following will explain in detail about the improvement of writing proposal text of students of class XI Social 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember in the academic year 2022/2023.

### Improvement in the Ability to Express Ideas in Writing Proposal Texts

#### ***Pre-cycle***

The average score on the aspect of suitability of the content of the proposal text is 15. Students have not been able to express their ideas in writing the proposal text so that the content of the proposal text written is not appropriate. Students' difficulties can be seen in their writing, especially in the background and closing sections. In the background section, many students still do not write in depth why it is necessary to conduct activities or research and what are the conditions or events behind the activities or research. In the background section, students write the purpose of the activity or research, which should be written in the structure of the objectives of the activity. In the closing section, students only say thank you. Supposedly, the closing section contains a conclusion, summary, and expectations of what is conveyed in the proposal. On average, students scored 10-20 out of a maximum score of 25. 6 (17%) students scored 10, 23 students (66%) scored 15 (77%), while 6 students (23%) scored 20.

#### ***Cycle I***

The average score on the aspect of suitability of the proposal text content is 16.2. Students have been able to express their ideas in writing the proposal text so that the content of the proposal text written is appropriate. It's just that there are still some students who still find it difficult to pour their ideas into correct sentences and paragraphs, especially in the background section. In the background section, many students still do not write in depth why it is necessary to conduct activities or research. On average, students scored 15-20 out of a maximum score of 25. 27 students scored 15 (77%), while 8 students (23%) scored 20.

#### ***Cycle II***

The average score on the aspect of suitability of the proposal text content is 18.5. Students have

been able to express their ideas in writing the proposal text so that the content of proposal text is written accordingly. In the background section, students have been able to explain the importance of conducting activities or conducting research. On average, students scored 15-25 out of a maximum score of 25. 5 students scored 15 (14%), 25 students (72%) scored 20, and 5 students (14%) scored 25. The average score of students increased from 16.2 in cycle I to 19.2 in cycle II.

### **Improvement in the Ability to Present Proposal Text in accordance with the Proposal Text Structure**

#### ***Pre-cycle***

The average score on the proposal text structure aspect is 20.7. The proposal text written by students has not fulfilled the structure of the proposal text because it is still incomplete and not in order according to the correct proposal text structure. Students scored 10-25 out of a maximum score of 25. A total of 3 students (8%) scored 10, 15 students (43%) scored 20, while 17 students (49%) scored 25.

#### ***Cycle I***

The average score on the proposal text structure aspect is 24.4. The proposal text written by students has fulfilled the structure of the proposal text. Students have been able to adjust the structure of the proposal text made with the type of activity to be carried out. Students are already able to write proposal texts in order and in detail according to the proposal text structure. A total of 31 students (86%) scored 25, while the other 4 students (14%) scored 20.

#### ***Cycle II***

The proposal text written by students has fulfilled the structure of the proposal text. Students have been able to adjust the structure of the proposal text made with the type of activity to be carried out. The progress can be seen from the completeness of the majority of the structure elements. Students has been able to write the proposal text in order and in detail. In cycle I students still had difficulty in describing the importance of doing the activity in the background section. However, in cycle II students were able to describe the importance of doing the activity in the background section. All students scored 25 out of a maximum score of 25. A total of 35 students (100%) scored 25. The students' average score increased from 24.4 in cycle I to 25 in cycle II.

### **Improvement in the Ability to Present Proposal Text in accordance with the Rules of Proposal Text Grammar**

#### ***Pre-cycle***

The average score on the linguistic rules aspect of the proposal text is 20. The linguistic rules of the proposal text are the argumentative statements, the persuasive statements, the scientific terms, the action verbs, the use of describing words, the use of detailing words, the use of plan-related words, and the denotative words. The linguistic rules in the student proposal text have not been used completely. Some students did not use persuasive statements, describing words, and detailing words. On average, students scored 15-25 out of a maximum score of 25. 9 students (26%) scored 15, 17 students (48%) scored 20, while 9 students (26%) scored 25..

### ***Cycle I***

The average score on the linguistic rules aspect of the proposal text is 23.5. The linguistic rules of the proposal text are argumentative statements, persuasive statements, scientific terms, action verbs, the use of describing words, the use of detailing words, the use of plan-related words, and the denotative words. Almost all students can use the complete linguistic rules in the proposal text made. There are only a few students who do not use persuasive statements and plan-related words. On average, students scored 20-25 out of a maximum score of 25. 25 students (71%) scored 25, while 10 students (29%) scored 20.

### ***Cycle II***

The linguistic elements of the proposal text are argumentative statements, persuasive statements, scientific terms, action verbs, the use of describing words, the use of detailing words, the use of plan-related words, and the denotative words. In cycle I students rarely used persuasive statements, scientific terms, and plan-related words. However, in cycle II students were able to write proposal texts using complete linguistic rules. On average, students scored 20-25 out of a maximum score of 25. A total of 35 students (100%) scored 25. The students' average score increased from 23.5 in cycle I to 25 in cycle II.

## **Improvement in the Ability to Use Correct Spelling and Punctuation in Writing Proposal Text**

### ***Pre-cycle***

The average score on the writing mechanism aspect, especially the spelling and punctuation of the proposal text, is 15. The score for spelling and punctuation accuracy is low compared to other aspects, many students use lowercase letters after a full stop, writing names of people and place names using lowercase letters. In addition, students still do not know that the words in, at, on, with, while, and but should not be used at the beginning of a sentence. On average, students scored 10-20 out of a maximum score of 25. 8 students (23%) scored 10, 18 students (51%) scored 15, while 9 students (26%) scored 20.

### ***Cycle I***

The average score on the writing mechanism aspect, especially the spelling and punctuation of the proposal text, is 16. The accuracy of spelling and punctuation is still low compared to other aspects. There are still many students who use lowercase letters after a full stop, writing names of people and place names using lowercase letters. The preposition in, at, on, with, while, and but are still used at the beginning of sentences by some students. On average, students scored 15-20 out of a maximum score of 25. 7 students (20%) scored 20, while 28 students (80%) scored 15.

### ***Cycle II***

The accuracy of punctuation is better than cycle I. Students have been able to distinguish the use of the word "di" as prefix and "di" as showing place. In addition, students also understand that the words with, while, and the word but should not be written at the beginning of a sentence. The improvement is shown by the average score of students scoring 15-20 from the maximum score of 25. A total of 10 students (29%) scored 15, while 25 students (71%) scored 20. The average score of students increased from 16 in cycle I to 18.5 in cycle II.

## Discussion

This section describes the learning process of writing proposal text at the pre-cycle, cycle I, and cycle II stages. From the explanation of the improvement of the results of the ability to write proposal text on each aspect above, the following will be explained in detail about the improvement of writing proposal text from each cycle.

### *Pre-cycle*

The ability of students at the pre-cycle stage in learning to write proposal text is said to have not reached lexical completeness. The average ability of students in class XI IPS 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember is 71. There were more students who did not passed than those who did. The scores of students who did not reach the Minimum Mastery Criteria were 22 students or (63%), while students who reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria were 13 students or (37%). Based on these data, learning to write proposal text in class XI IPS 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember has not reached the standard of completeness, so that students' ability to write proposal text needs to be improved.

Based on the observation of students' proposal text writing results, it can be seen that students have difficulty in expressing ideas in writing proposal text, presenting proposal text according to the proposal text structure, using correct language rules in writing proposal text, and using correct spelling and punctuation in writing proposal text. From the observation of the learning outcomes of the pre-cycle stage, efforts were made to improve learning outcomes by applying the reflective learning model plus implemented in cycle I and cycle II.

### *Cycle I*

The ability to write proposal text in cycle I has improved from the pre-cycle stage. Some students were able to write proposal texts well. Students were able to write proposal texts with the correct structure. However, in the aspect of the suitability of expressing ideas, students' abilities were still lacking. In addition, in the aspect of the use of linguistic elements, some students forgot the use of persuasive statements and plan-related words. In the aspect of writing mechanism, especially the accuracy of punctuation, there were still some students who made mistake such as in the use of the words and, in, with, but, while that were used at the beginning of the sentence. The following is a table of students' average abilities from all aspects of the assessment of writing proposal texts.

**Table 2. Average Student Ability in Cycle 1**

No.	Aspect	Average Student Ability	Maximum Score
1.	Suitability of expressing ideas	16	25
2.	Completeness of structure	24	25
3.	Completeness of linguistic rules	24	25
4.	Writing mechanism	16	25

Based on the table above, it can be seen that students got the lowest score in the aspect of suitability in expressing ideas and accuracy of spelling and punctuation. The average student scored 15-20 out of a maximum score of 25. Based on the results of research in cycle I, it can be concluded that learning to write proposal text can be said to be incomplete. However, students' ability to write proposal text improved from the pre-cycle stage to the first cycle. This is indicated

by the average score of students at the pre-cycle stage of 71 then increased to 80 in the cycle I. At the pre-cycle stage, there were 13 students (37%) who met the Minimum Mastery Criteria, while there were 22 students (63%) who did not meet the Minimum Mastery Criteria. In cycle I, the ability to write proposal text increased to (77%) or 27 students reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria, while the remaining (23%) or 8 students out of 35 students still did not reach the Minimum Mastery Criteria. Therefore, it is necessary to improve by doing cycle II..

### **Cycle II**

Learning activities in cycle I still have many shortcomings. Therefore, efforts were made to improve learning outcomes in cycle II. Based on the results of research in cycle II, it can be said that the students' average score increased from 80 to 87.8. That is, there was an increase from cycle I to cycle II. In cycle II all students have achieved Minimum Mastery Criteria, while in cycle I there were 27 students (77%) who reached Minimum Mastery Criteria and 8 students (23%) still have not reached Minimum Mastery Criteria.

All aspects of student assessment in writing proposal text have improved compared to cycle I. Based on the analysis in the table of assessment results of writing proposal text, it can be seen that the average ability of students in each aspect is as follows.

**Tabel 3. Average Student Ability in Cycle II**

No.	Aspect	Average Student Ability	Maximum Score
1.	Suitability of expressing ideas	19.2	25
2.	Completeness of structure	25	25
3.	Completeness of linguistic rules	25	25
4.	Writing mechanism	18.5	25

In cycle II learning activities, students have been able to use the aspects that support writing proposal texts well. That is, there was an increase in all aspects from cycle I to cycle II. The ability to write proposal text of students of class XI Social 1 at State Senior High School 4 Jember using reflective learning model plus has reached the category of very good or successful. Learning outcomes in cycle II showed an increase compared to the previous cycle. Improvement efforts in the next cycle are not needed because students' learning completeness has reached the predetermined standards.

### **Comparison of Student Learning Outcomes at the Pre-Cycle, Cycle I, and Cycle II Stages**

Based on the test results obtained by students of class XI Social 1, student learning outcomes have increased from pre-cycle I and cycle II. The increase in student learning outcomes can be seen in the table of student learning completeness measures in pre-cycle, cycle I, and cycle II in the following table.

**Table 4. Comparison of Student Learning Outcomes at the Pre-Cycle, Cycle I, and Cycle II Stages**

Student Score Criteria	Pre-cycle		Cycle I		Cycle II	
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Completed (score $\geq$ 78)	13	37%	27	77%	35	100%
Incomplete (score $\leq$ 78)	22	63%	8	23%	0	0%
Total	35	100%	35	100%	35	100%
Average	71		80.2		87.8	

Based on the results of the pre-cycle stage, the average student score at the pre-cycle stage was 71. The number of students who achieved learning completeness was 13 students (37%), while 22 students (63%) did not reach the Minimum Mastery Criteria. Furthermore, the results of cycle I after the application of the reflective learning model plus showed an increase compared to the pre-cycle stage. The average student score in cycle I was 80.2. There were 27 students (77%) who reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria and 8 students (23%) who did not reach the Minimum Mastery Criteria. The results of cycle I were better than the pre-cycle, but in cycle I there were still many shortcomings. After the cycle II action, the average score of students in writing proposal text was 87.8 with a very good or successful category. All students could get scores above the Minimum Mastery Criteria.

The improvement of learning outcomes in Cycle II can be concluded that the application of reflective learning model plus can improve the ability to write proposal text of students of class XI Social 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember.

#### **Comparison of Students' Average Score on Each Aspect of Proposal Text**

The average score on the writing activity of proposal text of class XI Social 1 State Senior High School 4 Jember increased from cycle I to cycle II. The increase in students' average scores on each aspect of writing proposal text from cycle I and cycle II can be seen in the following table.

**Table 5. Comparison of Average Values in Cycle I and Cycle II**

No.	Aspect	Cycle I	Cycle II
1.	Suitability of expressing ideas	16	19.2
2.	Completeness of structure	24	25
3.	Completeness of linguistic rules	24	25
4.	Writing mechanism	16	18.5

Based on the aspect of writing mechanism, the average score increased from 16 in cycle I to 18.5 in cycle II. The table above shows that the average ability of students has increased from all aspects. In the aspect of suitability of expressing ideas, the average value increased from 16 in cycle I to 19.2 in cycle II. In the aspect of completeness of structure, the average score increased

from 24 in cycle I to 25 in cycle II. In the aspect of completeness of linguistic rules, the average value increased from 24 in cycle I to 25 in cycle II.

## CONCLUSION

There is an improvement in students' ability to write proposal text after participating in learning with the reflective model plus. Students' learning outcomes increased from 27 students (77%) reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria and 8 students (23%) had not reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria to (100%) or 35 students reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria or completed in cycle II. The average score ability increased from 80 in cycle I to 86 in cycle II. The application of reflective learning model plus can improve students' ability in writing proposal text. This can be seen from the increase in the average score on each aspect from cycle I to cycle II. Based on this improvement, it can be concluded that the research on improving the students' ability to write proposal text using the reflective learning model plus in class XI IPS 1 at State Senior High School 4 Jember can be said to be successful.

## REFERENCES

- Adeninawaty, Dewi. 2018. Application of Discovery Learning Model Think Talk Write Strategy in Improving Motivation and Learning Outcomes of Writing Review Texts in Class VIII Junior High School. *Diglosia Journal*, 1(2), 75-78.  
From <https://diglosiaunmul.com/index.php/diglosia/article/view/11/8>.
- Afandi, M. 2013. *Learning Models and Methods at School*. Semarang: UNISSULA Press.
- Arikunto, S. 2014. *Research Procedure: A Practical Approach*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Asyafah, A. 2019. Considering Learning Models (Theoretical-Critical Review of Learning Models in Islamic Education). *Tarbawy: Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education*, 6(1), 1- 14.  
From <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/tarbawy/article/view/20569>.
- Bain, J. D. 2002. *Reflecting on Practice: Student Teachers' Perspectives*. Flaxton, Australia: Post Pressed.
- Barton, G. dan Ryan, M. 2013. Multimodal Approaches to Reflective Teaching and Assessment in Higher Education. *Higer Education Research & Development*, 33(3), 409-424. Dari <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.841650>.
- Boud, D. 1989. *Promoting Reflection in Learning: a Model*, in David Boud et. all (Ed). *Reflection: Turning Experience into Learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Degeng, I. N. S. 1998. *In Search of a New Paradigm. Learning problem solving. From Order to Chaos. Inaugural Speech of Professor of IKIP Malang*. Malang: IKIP Malang.
- Dewey, J. 1933. *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. New York: D.C. Heath and Company. Dari <https://bef632.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/dewey-how-we-think.pdf>
- Mujianto dan Sudjalil. 2020. Classroom Management in Field Experience Practices (PPL) of Pre-service Teacher Professional Education (PPG) in Indonesian Language Subject at SMAN Negeri 7 Malang. *Kembara Journal: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching Sciences*, 6(2), 255-265.  
From <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/14057/pdf>.
- Graham, G. 2010. *Children moving: a reflective approach for teaching physical education*. 8th ed. Boston: Mc Graw Hill.

- Hadi, A. 2018. Efforts to Improve Students' Ability to Make Thesis Proposals Through Direct Learning Models in Research and Language Teaching Courses. *Linguistics: Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(2), 1-13.  
From <http://jurnal.um-tapsel.ac.id/index.php/Linguistik/article/view/653/506>
- Harrington, L. 1996. Written Case Analyses and Critical Reflection. *Journal Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(1) 25-37.  
From <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/149233716.pdf>
- Hasnun, Anwar. 2004. *Guidelines and Practical Guidelines for Writing*. Yogyakarta: Absolut.
- Hatmo, K. T. 2021. *Indonesian Writing Skills*. Klaten: Lakeisha.
- Honey, P. 1992. *The Manual of Learning Styles*. Maidenhead: Peter Honey.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. 2013e. Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 66 of 2013 concerning Assessment Standards. Downloaded on March 16, 2022.  
From: <https://luk.staff.ugm.ac.id/atur/bsnp/Permendikbud66-2013SPenilaian.pdf>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. 2014. Indonesian Language Self-Expression and Academic SMA/MA/SMK Semester I. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Kolb, D. A. 1998. *Experiential Learning: Experience as The Source of Learning and Development*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Lesmana dan Lubis. 2020. The Effectiveness of the ARCS Learning Model on the Ability to Write Personal Statements of Class VII Students of State Junior High School 11 Medan. *Kembara Journal: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching Sciences*, 6(2), 255-265.  
From <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/13989/pdf>
- Listiyani, E. 2014. *Improving the Ability to Write Activity Proposals with Cooperative Learning Two Stay Two Stray for Students of Vocational High School 3 Kudus*. Unpublished thesis, Surakarta: Postgraduate UNS.
- Marista dan Nurlailiyah. 2020. Development of Teaching Materials for Writing Poetry Using Modeling Techniques at SMPN 1 Tulungagung. *Kembara Journal: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching Sciences*, 6(2), 243-254.  
From <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/14025/pdf>
- Maskurun dan Basiran. 2019. *Indonesian XI B*. Yogyakarta: LP2IP.
- Mirdad, J. 2020. Learning Models (Four Families of Learning Models). (Indonesia Sakinah Journal) *Journal of Islamic Education and Social*, 2(1), 14-23.  
From <https://www.jurnal.stitnusadhar.ac.id/index/index.php/JS/article/view/17>.
- Moon, J. 2004. *A Handbook of Reflective and Experiential Learning: Theory and Practice*. Abingdon, England: Routledge Farmer.
- Morrow, E. 2009. *Teaching Critical Reflection in Healthcare Professional Education*. Higher Education Research Network Journal Prizewinning Essays. King's Learning Institute. King's College London.
- Mujianto dan Sudjalil. 2020. Classroom Management in Field Experience Practices (PPL) of Pre-service Teacher Professional Education (PPG) in the field of Indonesian Language Studies at SMAN Negeri 7 Malang. *Kembara Journal: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching Sciences*, 6(2), 255-265.  
From <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/14057/pdf>.
- Nurhadi. 2017. *Handbook of Writing Panduan Lengkap Menulis*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.



- Putra, F. G. 2016. *The Effect of Reflective Learning Model with Islamic Nuanced Realistic Mathematics Approach on Mathematical Communication Ability*. *ALJabar: Journal of Mathematics Education*, 7(2), 203-210
- Priyatni, E.T. 2017. *Reflective Learning: A Technology-Responsive Reflective Learning Model*. *Tangerang: Tira Smart*.
- Sagala dan Hutagalung. 2020. The Effect of Fish Bowl Technique on the Ability to Analyze Negotiation Texts of Class X Students of SMA Negeri 1 Tanjungbalai. *Kembara Journal: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching Sciences*, 6(2), 213-225.  
From <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/14014/pdf>
- Sari, I. P. 2022. *The Effect of Reflective Learning Model in Writing Procedure Text Skills of Grade XI Students of SMA Negeri 16 Padang*. *Unpublished thesis, West Sumatra: PGRI University of West Sumatra*.
- Sari, L.K. 2019. Learning Development of Writing Lecture Text with Problem Based Learning Model Combined with Picture Media for Grade XI High School Students. *Diglosia Journal*, 2(1), 59-72.  
From <https://diglosiaunmul.com/index.php/diglosia/article/view/18/15>.
- Safety, J.R. dan T.M. Duffy. 1996. *Problem Based Learning: An Instructional Model and Its Constructivist Framework in Brent G. Wilson (ed) Constructivist Learning Environment*. *New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications*.
- Stroobants, H. 2007. *Reflective Journeys: A Fieldbook for Facilitating Life-Long Learning in Vocational Education and Training Rome*. Leonardo da Vinci REFLECT Project.
- Wiguna, M. Z. 2020. Improving the Learning Process of Proposal Writing in Class XI Students of Senior High School Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar through Numbered Head Together. *Journal of Metamorfosa*, 8(1), 1-12.  
From <https://ejournal.bbg.ac.id/metamorfosa/article/view/342/310>.