Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education (JIME)
Vol 9 No. 4 Oktober 2023
p-ISSN : 2442-9511, e-2656-5862
DOI: *10.58258/jime.v9i1.5940/http://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JIME*

Effectiveness of a Critical Literacy Program Based on the PjBL Model to Improve Students' Critical Reading and Creative Writing and English Speaking Ability

[1]Suharti, [2]Faidin
STKIP Harapan Bima

Article Info
Article history:
Accepted: 05 Oktober 2023
Published: 07 Oktober 2023

Keywords:
Critical Literacy;
PjBL model;
Critical Reading;
Creative Writing;
Speaking

Abstract
This research is motivated by the low critical literacy of students due to the learning process which is more about transferring knowledge rather than constructing their literacy skills critically and creatively. Many texts are selected and taken from test books that have cultural issues that are very different from those of students. There is no relevance regarding a number of issues and the relationship between the text and the real life of students. Teachers tend to ask students to read books on certain pages and then the teacher asks several questions for students to answer. Students are less able to write their reading results creatively, and re-express their reading results well. The general objective of the research is to determine the effectiveness of the PjBL Model-Based Critical Literacy Program to Improve Students' Critical Reading and Creative Writing and Speaking Skills. The subjects of this study were all students in grades IX.1 and IX.2 at SMPN 1 Woha, each of which consisted of 30 students. The form of research is quasi-experimental research. Data collection techniques using tests and interviews. Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can be concluded that the PjBL model is effective in improving students' critical reading, creative writing, and speaking skills at SMPN 1 Woha. This can be seen from the results of critical reading analysis which shows that t count is greater than t table, then Ha is accepted, namely 0.061< 0.05. Creative writing ability, 0.009 < 0.05. Speaking ability 0, 049 < 0.05. Thus the hypothesis that has been put forward *is proven that the application of the PjBL model in critical literacy programs can improve students' critical reading, creative writing, and speaking abilities.*

Article Info
Article history:
Diterima: 05 Oktober 2023
Terbit : 07 Oktober 2023

Abstrak
Penelitian ini dilatarbelakangi oleh rendahnya literasi kritis siswa disebabkan oleh proses pembelajaran lebih kepada mentransfer ilmu pengetahuan bukan mengkonstruk kemampuan literasinya secara kritis, dan kreatif. Banyak teks yang dipilih dan diambil dari buku tes yang permasalahan budaya sangat berbeda dengan siswa. Tidak ada relevansi mengenai sejumlah permasalahan dan hubungan antara teks dan kehidupan nyata siswa. Guru cenderung meminta siswa membaca buku pada halaman tertentu kemudian guru mengajukan beberapa pertanyaan kepada siswa untuk dijawab. Siswa kurang mampu menuliskan hasil bacaan secara kreatif, dan mengungkapkan kembali hasil bacaan dengan baik. Tujuan umum penelitian yakni untuk mengetahui efektivitas Program Literasi Kritis Berbasis Model PjBL untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Membaca Kritis dan Menulis Kreatif serta Berbicara Siswa. Subjek penelitian ini adalah semua peserta didik kelas IX.1 dan IX.2 SMPN 1 Woha yang masing-masing berjumlah 30 siswa. Bentuk penelitian yakni penelitian kuasi eksperimen. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan tes, dan wawancara. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian dan pembahasan dapat disimpulkan bahwa model PjBL efektif dalam meningkatkan kemampuan membaca kritis, menulis kreatif, dan berbicara siswa di SMPN 1 Woha. Hal demikian dapat dilihat dari hasil analisis membaca kritis yang menunjukan bahwa t hitung lebih besar dari t table, maka Ha diterima yakni 0,061< 0,05. Kemampuan menulis kreatif, 0,009 < 0,05. Kemampuan berbicara 0, 049 < 0,05. Dengan demikian hipotesis yang sudah diajukan terbukti yakni penerapan model PjBL pada program literasi kritis dapat meningkatkan kemampuan membaca kritis, menulis kreatif, dan berbicara siswa.

Corresponding Author:
Suharti
STKIP Harapan Bima

1. INTRODUCTION

English literacy plays a role in encouraging and improving students' abilities in finding and writing correct information. Critical literacy education helps students explore the relationship between language and power and focuses on the need to create critical speakers, readers and writers who can deconstruct the texts that surround them and interpret them, both as products and processes of particular social practices (Ninawati, 2019). Students' critical literacy is helped to explore the relationship between language and power which focuses on the need to create and even deconstruct texts and interpret them into a product or series of social practice processes (Kriswantara, and Perdana, 2021). procedures that teachers must carry out when carrying out

critical literacy learning, namely: explaining, demonstration, guidance, practice, and reflection. This learning model emphasizes students actively studying texts and using these texts to solve life problems (Jumadi, et al, 2021).

In increasing literacy, there are several weaknesses faced by students, namely: The low critical literacy of students is caused by the learning process being more about transferring knowledge rather than constructing their literacy skills critically and creatively; Students' literacy is given less attention, which can be seen in critical reading classes; creative writing, and speaking, students are only presented with learning experiences with knowledge of concepts only; Students' low literacy is caused by many texts selected and taken from test books whose cultural issues are very different from those of the students. There is no relevance regarding a number of problems and relationships between texts and students' real lives; The low English literacy of students is caused by the lack of interest in the learning carried out by teachers, teachers tend to ask students to read a book on a certain page and then the teacher asks several questions for students to answer; Students' low understanding of critical reading means that students are less able to write their reading results creatively and express their reading results well. Based on the problems above, the problem solving approach used in this research is a scientific approach, a series of data collection activities through observation, processing data, analyzing, formulating and testing hypotheses. Based on Dale's cone of experience, namely reading 10%, hearing 20%, seeing 30%, seeing and hearing 50%, saying 70%, saying and doing 90%. Can be done using audio, visual and audio-visual. The problem solving approach used in this research is a scientific approach, a series of data collection activities through observation, processing data, analyzing, formulating and testing hypotheses. Based on Dale's cone of experience, namely reading 10%, hearing 20%, seeing 30%, seeing and hearing 50%, saying 70%, saying and doing 90%. Can be done using audio, visual and audio-visual. The problem solving approach used in this research is a scientific approach, a series of data collection activities through observation, processing data, analyzing, formulating and testing hypotheses. Based on Dale's cone of experience, namely reading 10%, hearing 20%, seeing 30%, seeing and hearing 50%, saying 70%, saying and doing 90%. Can be done using audio, visual and audio-visual.

This research was carried out in order to increase students' English literacy in three abilities, so that they could solve problems that occur with students, specifically regarding literacy achievement and improvement. Thus, this research aims to describe the achievement and improvement of students' critical reading, creative writing and speaking skills using PjBL; describe literacy learning outcomes after using the PjBL model; analyze the differences in learning outcomes of students who use the PjBL model and students who use the conventional model.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research subjects were carried out in class IX. 1 SMPN 1 Woha. The time of this research is July 2023 to September 2023. The research subjects are all students in classes IX.1 and IX.2 at SMPN 1 Woha, totaling 30 students per group (class). This research uses a quasi-experimental research method (Quasi Experimental Design), the research design used is Nonequivalent Control Group Design, where the experimental group and control group are not chosen randomly. In this case too, the experimental group and the control group were chosen because both had the same achievements in the learning process and outcomes (learning achievements), this was known based on the results of observations, interviews and discussions between researchers and teachers at school. In the experimental and control classes, an initial test (pretest) was carried out, then in the learning process the two classes were given different

treatments, the experimental group used a project-based learning model (PjBL) while the control group used a conventional learning model. After the treatment was carried out, both groups carried out a final test (posttest).

3. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research result

1. N-Gain Test

a. Critical Reading Ability

Table 4.9 Experimental Class N-Gain Test

Student's name	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test - Pre-test	Ideal Value – Pretest	N-Gain	N-Gain 100%
A.I	30	85	55	70	0.79	79
AR	20	78	58	80	0.73	73
AU	20	77	57	80	0.71	71
DA	20	65	45	80	0.56	56
DH	40	85	45	60	0.75	75
IN	30	85	55	70	0.79	79
FB	30	85	55	70	0.79	79
II	50	90	40	50	0.8	80
HE	30	86	56	70	0.8	80
JN	20	80	60	80	0.75	75
MR	24	82	58	76	0.76	76
M.L	34	87	53	66	0.80	80
MI	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MM	20	78	58	80	0.73	73
MH	26	80	54	74	0.73	73
MW	28	80	52	72	0.72	72
NA	20	80	60	80	0.75	75
NI	35	87	52	65	0.8	80
P.A	31	85	54	69	0.78	78
PM	29	80	51	71	0.72	72
RP	35	85	50	65	0.77	77
BC	23	80	57	77	0.74	74
SH	21	79	58	79	0.73	73
elementary school	60	92	32	40	0.8	80
SS	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
WR	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
YO	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
DS	40	90	50	60	0.83	83
S.N	20	78	58	80	0.73	73
K.G	20	80	60	80	0.75	75
Average					0.7483	74.83
Minimal					0.56	56
Maximum					0.83	83

Based on the data in the table above, the N-Gain in the experimental class shows that the average N-Gain of experimental class students is in the High category. The high gain category is 28 students. The medium gain is 2 students and the low category gain is 0, the minimum N-Gain result is 0.56 and the maximum is 0.83. In the experimental class, the difference in pretest and posttest scores is quite significant.

Table 4.10 Control Class N-Gain Test

Student's name	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test - Pre-test	Ideal Value – Pretest	N-Gain	N-Gain 100%
US	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
AN	27	78	51	73	0.70	70
A.M	30	53	23	70	0.33	33
A A	20	78	58	80	0.73	73
AD	25	76	51	75	0.68	68
CD	30	79	49	70	0.7	70
DA	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
IN	29	75	46	71	0.65	65
HA	60	90	30	40	0.75	75
KF	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
MD	30	78	48	70	0.69	69
M.A	30	76	46	70	0.66	66
M.F	27	75	48	73	0.66	66
MR	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MJ	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MI	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
M N	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MM	45	80	35	55	0.64	64
N.F	32	75	43	68	0.66	66
NN	58	80	22	42	0.52	52
NZ	29	75	46	71	0.65	65
PC	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
PR	24	75	51	76	0.67	67
R.I	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
RN	27	75	48	73	0.66	66
RZ	27	75	48	73	0.66	66
S.A	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
YP	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
ZF	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
MH	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
Average					0.669	66.9
Minimal					0.33	33
Maximum					0.75	75

Based on the data in the table above, the N-Gain in the control class shows that the average N-Gain of experimental class students is in the Medium category. The high gain category has 8 students. Medium gain is 20 students, and low category gain is 2 students. The minimum N-Gain result is 0.33 and the maximum is 0.75. In the control class, the difference in pretest and posttest scores was quite significant.

b. Creative Writing Ability

Table 4.11 Experimental Class N-Gain Test

Student's name	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test - Pre-test	Ideal Value – Pretest	N-Gain	N-Gain 100%
A.I	20	74	54	80	0.68	68
AR	25	84	59	75	0.79	79
AU	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
DA	20	78	58	80	0.73	73
DH	32	86	54	68	0.79	79
IN	26	86	60	74	0.81	81
FB	46	86	40	54	0.74	74
II	52	90	38	48	0.79	79
HE	34	62	28	66	0.42	42
JN	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
MR	24	80	56	76	0.74	74
M.L	25	75	50	75	0.67	67
MI	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MM	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
MH	20	80	60	80	0.75	75
MW	24	86	62	76	0.82	82
NA	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
NI	35	85	50	65	0.77	77
P.A	28	80	52	72	0.72	72
PM	20	80	60	80	0.75	75
RP	28	82	54	72	0.75	75
BC	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
SH	26	80	54	74	0.73	73
elementary school	32	90	58	68	0.85	85
SS	31	80	49	69	0.71	71
WR	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
YO	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
DS	35	90	55	65	0.85	85
S.N	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
K.G	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
Average					0.7317	73.17
Minimal					0.42	42
Maximum					0.85	85

Based on the data in the table above, the N-Gain in the experimental class shows that the average N-Gain of experimental class students is in the High category. The high gain category is 23 students. The medium gain is 6 students, and the low category gain is 1. The minimum N-Gain result is 0.42 and the maximum is 0.85. In the experimental class, the difference in pretest and posttest scores is quite significant.

Table 4.12 Control Class N-Gain Test

Student's name	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test - Pre-test	Ideal Value – Pretest	N-Gain	N-Gain 100%
US	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
AN	25	70	45	75	0.60	60
A.M	30	75	45	70	0.64	64
A A	20	60	40	80	0.50	50
AD	25	76	51	75	0.68	68
CD	25	77	55	75	0.73	73
DA	25	76	51	75	0.68	68
IN	20	65	47	80	0.59	59
HA	55	87	30	40	0.75	75
KF	24	75	55	76	0.72	72
MD	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
M.A	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
M.F	27	75	48	73	0.66	66
MR	20	65	45	80	0.56	56
MJ	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MI	21	80	59	79	0.75	75
M N	20	65	45	80	0.56	56
MM	35	80	45	65	0.69	69
N.F	20	75	59	80	0.74	74
NN	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
NZ	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
PC	25	75	55	75	0.73	73
PR	24	75	51	76	0.67	67
R.I	32	80	25	40	0.63	63
RN	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
RZ	20	62	45	80	0.56	56
S.A	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
YP	55	80	32	45	0.71	71
ZF	20	70	50	80	0.63	63
MH	20	70	50	80	0.63	63
Average					0.666	66.6
Minimal					0.50	50
Maximum					0.75	75

Based on the data in the table above, the N-Gain in the control class shows that the average N-Gain of experimental class students is in the Medium category. The high gain category has 10 students. Medium gain is 10 students, and low category gain is 10 students. The minimum N-Gain result is 0.50 and the maximum is 0.75. In the control class, the difference in pretest and posttest scores was quite significant.

c. Speaking ability

Table 4.13 Experimental Class N-Gain Test

Student's name	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test - Pre-test	Ideal Value – Pretest	N-Gain	N-Gain 100%
A.I	20	74	54	80	0.68	68
AR	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
AU	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
DA	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
DH	32	80	48	68	0.71	71
IN	26	80	54	74	0.73	73
FB	35	80	45	65	0.69	69
II	40	85	45	60	0.75	75
HE	34	62	28	66	0.42	42
JN	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
MR	24	80	56	76	0.74	74
M.L	25	75	50	75	0.67	67
MI	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MM	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
MH	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MW	24	86	62	76	0.82	82
NA	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
NI	30	82	52	70	0.74	74
P.A	28	80	52	72	0.72	72
PM	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
RP	28	80	52	72	0.72	72
BC	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
SH	26	80	54	74	0.73	73
elementary school	32	85	53	68	0.78	78
SS	31	80	49	69	0.71	71
WR	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
YO	25	80	55	75	0.73	73
DS	30	85	55	70	0.79	79
S.N	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
K.G	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
Average					0.71	71
Minimal					0.42	42
Maximum					0.82	82

Based on the data in the table above, the N-Gain in the experimental class shows that the average N-Gain of experimental class students is in the High category. The high gain category had 19 students. Medium gain is 10 students, and low category gain is 1 student. The minimum N-Gain result is 0.42 and the maximum is 0.82. In the experimental class, the difference in pretest and posttest scores is quite significant.

Table 4.14 Control Class N-Gain Test

Student's name	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test - Pre-test	Ideal Value – Pretest	N-Gain	N-Gain 100%
US	21	75	54	79	0.68	68
AN	25	70	45	75	0.60	60
A.M	30	75	45	70	0.64	64
A A	20	60	40	80	0.50	50
AD	25	76	51	75	0.68	68
CD	25	77	52	75	0.69	69
DA	25	76	51	75	0.68	68
IN	20	65	45	80	0.56	56
HA	55	87	32	45	0.71	71
KF	24	75	51	76	0.67	67
MD	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
M.A	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
M.F	27	75	48	73	0.66	66
MR	20	65	45	80	0.56	56
MJ	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
MI	21	80	59	79	0.75	75
M N	20	65	45	80	0.56	56
MM	35	80	45	65	0.69	69
N.F	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
NN	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
NZ	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
PC	25	75	50	75	0.67	67
PR	24	75	51	76	0.67	67
R.I	32	80	48	68	0.71	71
RN	20	75	55	80	0.69	69
RZ	20	62	42	80	0.53	53
S.A	30	80	50	70	0.71	71
YP	55	80	25	45	0.56	56
ZF	20	70	50	80	0.63	63
MH	20	70	50	80	0.63	63
Average					0.6537	65.37
Minimal					0.50	50
Maximum					0.75	75

Based on the data in the table above, the N-Gain in the control class shows that the average N-Gain of experimental class students is in the Medium category. The high gain category has 6 students. The medium gain is 14 students, and the low category gain is 10. The minimum N-Gain result is 0.50 and the maximum is 0.75. In the control class, the difference in pretest and posttest scores was quite significant.

A. Research Data Analysis

1. Normality Test of Experimental and Control Classes on Critical Reading Ability

Table 4.15 Normality Test for Experimental and Control Classes on Critical Reading Ability

Shapiro Wilk	Experiment	Control
	Pretest and Posttest	Pretest and Posttest
DF	30	30
Sig	0.8570	0.6078
Significance Level	0.05	0.05
Conclusion	Normally distributed	Normally distributed

Based on the table above, the significance data for Gain in the experimental class is 0.8570 and in the control class it is 0.6078. Thus, the significance value is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that H0 is accepted, which means the sample is normally distributed

2. Experimental and Control Class Normality Test on Creative Writing Ability

Table 4.16 Experimental and Control Class Normality Test on Creative Writing Ability

Shapiro Wilk	Experiment	Control
	Pretest and Posttest	Pretest and Posttest
DF	30	30
Sig	0.7891	0.9175
Significance Level	0.05	0.05
Conclusion	Normally distributed	Normally distributed

Based on the table above, the significance data for Gain in the experimental class is 0.7891 and in the control class it is 0.9175. Thus, the significance value is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that H0 is accepted, which means the sample is normally distributed

3. Test of Normality of Experimental and Control Classes on Speaking Ability

Table 4.17 Normality Test for Experimental and Control Classes on Speaking Ability

Shapiro Wilk	Experiment	Control
	Pretest and Posttest	Pretest and Posttest

DF	30	30
Sig	0.680	0.8705
Significance Level	0.05	0.05
Conclusion	Normally distributed	Normally distributed

Based on the table above, the significance data for Gain in the experimental class is 0.680 and in the control class it is 0.8705. Thus, the significance value is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that H0 is accepted, which means the sample is normally distributed

4. Homogeneity Test
   A. Critical Reading Ability

   If F calculated is smaller than F table then H0 is accepted. It can be stated that the variants are the same (homogeneous)

   Table 4.18 Pretest and Posttest Homogeneity Test for experimental and control classes Critical Reading Ability

Statistics	Pretest and posttest for experimental and control classes
Statistics	2,394
Significant Level	0.05
Conclusion	Both classes are homogeneous

Based on the table above, the significance value of the experimental and control class pretest results is 2.394. This shows that the pretest and posttest results have a sig value smaller than the 0.05 significance level, which is 4.01. This means that both classes have homogeneous abilities. The pretest and posttest data for the experimental and control classes have the same variance.

   B. Creative Writing Ability

   If F calculated is smaller than F table then H0 is accepted. It can be stated that the variants are the same (homogeneous).

   Table 4.19 Pretest and Posttest Homogeneity Test for experimental and control classes for Creative Writing Ability

Statistics	Pretest and posttest for experimental and control classes
Statistics	1,256
Significant Level	0.05
Conclusion	Both classes are homogeneous

Based on the table above, the significance value of the experimental and control class pretest results is 1.256. This shows that the pretest and posttest results have a sig value smaller than the 0.05 significance level, which is 4.01. This means that both classes have homogeneous abilities. The pretest and posttest data for the experimental and control classes have the same variance.

C. Speak

If calculated F is smaller than F table F then H0 is accepted. It can be stated that the variants are the same (homogeneous)

Table 4.20 Pretest and Posttest Homogeneity Test for Experimental and Control Classes for Speaking Ability

Statistics	Pretest and posttest for experimental and control classes
Statistics	0.007
Significant Level	0.05
Conclusion	Both classes are homogeneous

Based on the table above, the significance value of the experimental and control class pretest results is 0.007. This shows that the pretest and posttest results have a sig value smaller than the 0.05 significance level, which is 4.01. This means that both classes have homogeneous abilities. The pretest and posttest data for the experimental and control classes have the same variance.

5. t test

In this section the researcher used the Independent t-test to determine whether there was a difference in the average value between the experimental group and the control group. As a continuation of the results of the normality test with normally distributed data and the homogeneity test where the data is homogeneous. In this case, if the sig value for both groups is greater than the significance level (0.05), then H0 is accepted. Meanwhile, if the sig value for both groups is smaller than the significance level (0.05), then Ha is accepted. The following is a table of T test results (hypothesis testing).

a. Critical Reading Ability

Table 4.21 Hypothesis Test for Critical Reading Ability

Statistics	Experiment and control
Sig	0.061
Significant Level	0.05
Conclusion	Ha accepted

Based on the table above, the significance value of the pretest and posttest results for the experimental and control classes is 0.061, with a significance level of 0.05 which is 1.673. Thus, Ha was accepted.

b. Creative Writing Ability

Table 4.22 Hypothesis Test for Creative Writing Ability

Statistics	Experiment and

	control
Sig	0.009
Significant Level	0.05
Conclusion	Ha accepted

Based on the table above, the significance value of the pretest and posttest results for the experimental and control classes is 0.009, with a significance level of 0.05 which is 1.673. Thus, Ha was accepted.

c. Speaking ability

Table 4.23 Hypothesis Test for Creative Writing Ability

Statistics	Experiment and control
Sig	0.049
Significant Level	0.05
Conclusion	Ha accepted

Based on the table above, the significance value of the pretest and posttest results for the experimental and control classes is 0.049, with a significance level of 0.05 which is 1.673. Thus, Ha was accepted.

B. Discussion

Literacy activities using the PjBL model allow students to find and carry out the activity process themselves with the teacher as a facilitator. In Ausubel's (1968) learning theory, an explanation is given with two categories of learning, namely mastering knowledge and connecting knowledge by assimilating the knowledge one already has with new knowledge. That is what is discussed in assignments (projects) involving real life tasks, which also produce real products (your own work).

PjBL-based literacy activities, teachers provide flexibility for students to develop and improve critical reading, creative writing and speaking skills through investigative activities. This section requires students to work in groups, so that students can solve problems by themselves in groups. This was also expressed by Puangpunsi (2021), one of the interesting things found was that the project worked to increase responsibility and self-confidence as well as the ability to solve problems that occurred in project activities. The above shows that the PjBL model is effective in improving students' critical reading, creative writing and speaking skills (Ha accepted). The ability to read, write and speak are abilities that build on each other. As stated by Suharti, et al (202) that reading is the ability to receive language and writing and speaking are the ability to produce language. Students' abilities in writing and speaking come from the results of reading. Reading and speaking are sometimes done from writing.

The realization of the literacy program using the PjBL model to improve critical reading, creative writing and English speaking skills can be clearly seen in the hypothesis testing that has been carried out. In critical reading skills, the significance value of the pretest and posttest results for the experimental and control classes is 0.061, with a significance level of 0.05 is 1.673, meaning that Ha is accepted. Furthermore, for creative writing ability, the significance value of the pretest and posttest results for the experimental and control classes is 0.009, with a significance level of 0.05 which is 1.673. Thus, Ha was accepted. Finally, the significance value of the pretest and posttest results for the

experimental and control classes is 0.049, with a significance level of 0.05 which is 1.673. Ha accepted.

The results of hypothesis testing in the research show that there is a difference in average scores between students who were treated using the PjBL model and students who used the demonstration method in the critical literacy program to improve their critical reading, creative writing and speaking skills.

The posttest results for the experimental class were much higher than those for the control class, where in the critical reading class the average for the experimental class was 28.7 in the pretest and 81.8 in the posttest. As for the control class, the posttest results were an average of 76.27, while the pretest was 28.1. Creative writing class, where in the creative writing class the experimental class average on the pretest was 27.46 and posttest 80.47. As for the control class, the posttest results were an average of 75.47, while the pretest was 27.06. Speaking class, where in the speaking class the experimental class average on the pretest was 26.36 and posttest 78.63. As for the control class, the posttest results were an average of 74.27, while the pretest was 25.96. Based on this data, students who learn using the PjBL model are much better than students who do not use this model.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, conclusions have been drawn regarding the application of the Project Based Learning (PjBL) model in critical literacy programs to improve students' critical reading, creative writing and speaking skills. The conclusion obtained is that students' critical reading, creative writing and speaking abilities after receiving the Project Based Learning (PjBL) model significantly increased. In the experimental class, the average N-Gain value was 0.74 for critical reading, the average N-gain value for creative writing was 0.73, the average N-gain speaking value was 0.71, so it was said to be in the high category. . Meanwhile, the control class has an average N-Gain value of 0.669 for critical reading, an average N-gain value for creative writing of 0.666, an average N-gain speaking value of 0.653, so it is said to be in the medium category.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ausubel, D.P. (1968). *Educational Psychology: a Cognitive View*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jumadi J, Faradina F, Luthfiyanti L. (2021). Penyuluhan Pembelajaran Literasi Kritis Bagi Guru SMPN di Kota Banjarmasin. *J Hum Educ*. (2):42–51.

Kriswantara G, Perdana I. (2021). Bahan Ajar Digital Membaca Teks Cerita Rakyat Kalimantan Tengah Bermuatan Pendidikan Karakter dan Literasi Kritis. *Sawerigading*. 27(2):191–204.

Ninawati M. (2019). Efektivitas Model Pembelajaran Literasi Kritis Berbasis Pendekatan Konsep untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Kreatif Siswa Sekolah Dasar. P*endas J Ilm Pendidik Dasar*. IV: 68–78.

Puangpunsi, N. (2021). Learners' perception towards project based learning in encouraging English skills performance and 21th century skills. *THAITESOL JOURNAL*. 34 (1).

Suharti., Faidin., Ibrahim., Fajrun. (2022). Upaya Peningkatan Literasi Membaca dan Menulis Bahasa Inggris berbasis Kearifan Lokal pada Pembelajaran Muatan Lokal Menggunakan Model 4C. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education*. 8 (4).