

OPINION WRITING ABILITY USING THE WORK TOURISM METHOD OF GRADE XI STUDENTS OF STATE HIGH SCHOOL 2 TERNATE

Suhardi Kasim¹

¹Khairun University

suhardi04101982@gmail.com

Corresponding Author (*):
suhardi04101982@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 14-06-2025

Revised : 23-06-2025

Accepted : 24-06-2025

KEYWORDS

writing ability,
opinion,
field trip method,
high school students

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the improvement of students' opinion writing skills of grade XI SMA Negeri 2 Ternate through the application of the field trip method. The background of this study is the low ability of students in writing opinions caused by the lack of direct experience and limited ideas in developing arguments logically and systematically. The method used in this study is classroom action research (CAR) which is carried out in two cycles, each consisting of planning, implementation, observation, and reflection stages. The subjects of the study were 30 grade XI students. The instruments used included observation sheets, interview guidelines, and opinion writing ability tests. The results of the study showed that the field trip method can significantly improve students' opinion writing skills. This can be seen from the increase in students' average scores in each cycle. In cycle I, the average score of students reached 70, while in cycle II it increased to 82. Thus, it can be concluded that the field trip method is effective in improving students' opinion writing skills of grade XI SMA Negeri 2 Ternate..

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



INTRODUCTIONS

The task of improving writing skills among high school students, particularly in the domain of opinion writing, poses a significant educational challenge. This is especially true in the context of the Merdeka Curriculum and the 2013 Curriculum in Indonesia. Writing proficiency is not limited to the mechanical aspects of language and structure but also requires the development of critical and logical thinking. These skills are essential for articulating well-reasoned opinions on contemporary issues, which is a core objective in the Indonesian educational framework. Observational data from SMA Negeri 2 Ternate reveal a notable difficulty among students in developing distinct, argument-supported opinions, highlighting the need for more effective instructional strategies to enhance these skills.

Research underscores that traditional methods of teaching writing, which often rely on theoretical and textual approaches, fall short in addressing the full spectrum of skills necessary for students' success. Harris and Graham (2016) emphasize the challenges faced in writing instruction, particularly the need for effective teaching methodologies that engage students while addressing barriers to success. The absence of diverse teaching methods—such as those incorporating experiential learning—has been identified as a critical factor hindering the development

of students' writing abilities (Weber et al., 2024). These insights suggest that instructional strategies need to move beyond conventional methods to foster deeper engagement and skill-building among students.

One promising approach in enhancing writing abilities is the field trip method, a form of contextual learning that connects students directly with the subject matter of their writing. By engaging in real-world experiences, students can expand their understanding beyond theoretical knowledge and apply it to their writing tasks. The effectiveness of such experiential learning has been well documented. For instance, project-based learning (PjBL), which shares similarities with the field trip method, has shown to significantly increase student motivation and writing engagement (Garim et al., 2023; Bardatillah et al., 2023). Students involved in PjBL not only demonstrate improved writing skills but also show enhanced critical thinking abilities as they analyze and reflect on the contexts for their writing (Ardiana et al., 2023; Sultan et al., 2023).

Additionally, field trips and observation-based learning provide students with opportunities to draw connections between real-life experiences and their writing tasks. This hands-on approach has been shown to boost students' confidence in expressing opinions. A study by Karasneh highlights the positive impact of experiential learning on writing skills, confirming the benefits of context-rich learning environments (Sultan et al., 2023). Furthermore, incorporating contextual knowledge into writing instruction has been proven to increase students' engagement and interest, resulting in higher-quality, more thoughtful written work (Royani et al., 2024).

At SMA Negeri 2 Ternate, teachers have reported increased student interest and active participation when teaching includes real-life applications and experiences. This observation underscores the effectiveness of the field trip method in enhancing student engagement and writing outcomes (Afiani et al., 2022). These contextual learning experiences allow students to directly relate their observations to their writing content, enriching their understanding and enabling them to support their opinions with relevant examples from their own experiences (Wulandari & Hastini, 2024).

The field trip method represents a valuable advancement in the teaching of opinion writing to high school students. This approach not only addresses the limitations of traditional textual teaching methods but also fosters critical thinking, argumentation, and self-expression. As such, this study emphasizes the importance of integrating experiential learning into writing curricula to improve students' confidence and skills in opinion writing. By doing so, educators can help students develop the necessary tools to express well-reasoned, contextually supported opinions, thus enhancing their writing abilities in the classroom and beyond.

METHOD

The type of research used in this study is quantitative descriptive. Widodo (2009:14) said that the type of quantitative research is an object by calculating using numerical units to determine the size of the object being studied, both real and abstract objects. This is in line with Sugiyono, (2010 : 14) who stated that the type of quantitative research can be interpreted as a method or type of research based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research certain populations or samples, data collection using research instruments, data analysis is quantitative or statistical in nature with the aim of testing the established hypothesis.

In carrying out research activities, media is needed to achieve good results. Research design is all research processes required in planning and implementing research with the aim of minimizing elements of error. The selection of research design is found by the concept of testing that will be carried out by researchers and the existence of research data needed. In this design, tests are carried out twice, namely before being given treatment called *pretest* and after being given treatment called *posttest*. The research used in this study is Pretest-Posttest according to Sugiyono (2010:111). The design of this research uses (pretest post test), the research design used can be described in table 1 below.

Table 1 Pretest and Posttest Research Design

| Pretest 01 | Treatment X | Posttest 02 |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
|---------------|----------------|----------------|

Information

O1: Pretest value (before treatment).

O2: Posttest value (after treatment)

X: Treatment of the class tested using the field trip method

This design class being tested is given an initial test (pretest) to determine the initial abilities in the class. Then the results of the initial test will be used as a comparison for the results of the final test (posttest). The study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the field trip method in the form of opinion writing text. This can provide data on changes in learning outcomes in the class being tested before and after being given treatment.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Research Results

The results of this study indicate that the application of the field trip method has a positive effect on students' ability to write opinions. The increase in posttest scores proves that the direct experience gained by students during field observations is able to foster stronger, more logical, and contextual ideas in their writing.

The field trip method encourages students to interact directly with objects or social phenomena. This becomes a concrete source of inspiration in writing. Not only seeing and taking notes, students also reflect their experiences into relevant arguments in opinion writing. This is in line with Sujana's opinion (2009) that field trips can stimulate students' critical and expressive thinking skills.

In addition, this method creates a more enjoyable and less boring learning atmosphere. Students who are usually passive in learning to write, become more active because they feel they have experiences that can be told. They do not only write based on theory, but from real experiences that students witness themselves. This is what makes writing more alive and meaningful.

Teachers also have an important role in facilitating field trip activities by providing direction on what to observe, how to record facts, and how to process them into opinion pieces. With proper guidance, students can produce more structured and quality work.

The improvements that occur are not only in the content aspect of the writing, but also in the use of language. Students become more sensitive in choosing words, constructing sentences, and using appropriate language rules. This reinforces that direct experience enriches students' expressive power.

Overall, the results of this study support previous opinions that contextual-based writing learning, such as the field trip method, is very effective in improving opinion writing skills. Therefore, this method is worthy of being an alternative strategy in learning Indonesian at the high school level, especially in developing writing skills.

The research results are divided into two parts, namely the results of *the pretest research* and the results of *the posttest research*. The research results presented are the average value of the opinion writing test results from *the pretest* to compare the values on *the posttest* which have been determined by the standard criteria for completeness of opinion writing. The following are the results of *the pretest research* below.

Pretest Assessment Results

pretest assessment of opinion writing learning serve to determine students' abilities. There are 22 students

who participated in the opinion writing learning. The following *pretest results* can be seen in table 2 below.

Table 2 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in Content Quality Aspects

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-----|-----------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1439 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 12 | 840 | 55 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 9 | 540 | 41 | 65.4 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 1 | 59 | 5 | Enough category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1439 | 100 | |

Tabel 2 the aspect of content quality falls into the category of less.

This is evidenced by the average score obtained by 22 students in this class, which is 65.4. Not a single student got a score of 4 or (0%) students were in the range of scores between 85-100 in the very good category, 12 students got a score of 3 or (55%) students were in the range of scores between 70-84 in the good category, 9 students got a score of 2 or (41%) were in the range of scores between 60-69 in the sufficient category, and 1 student got a score of 1 or (5%) were in the range of scores between 0-59 in the less category.

Students who get high scores are because the content of the essay written by the students is in accordance with the theme, the theme development is complete, and is dense with information. Students who get low scores are because the content of the opinion written by the students is not in accordance with the theme, the theme development is not complete, and is not dense with information. Of the 22 students who took the opinion writing learning test using the field trip method, the average class score of 65.41 was in the poor category.

The next aspect in the opinion writing test is the aspect of writing organization. In the *pretest*, most students had not paid attention to the aspect of writing organization. So in this *pretest*, many students were still doubtful or not confident with their writing results. In addition, there were some students' writing results that were difficult to understand because the structure was still confusing. Many students had difficulty in organizing their writing. This is because the supporting materials for the writing were incomplete, so students had difficulty expressing their ideas. In detail, the results of students' writing skills in this aspect can be seen in table 3 as follows.

Table 3 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in the Organizational Aspect of Writing

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-----|-----------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1490 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 17 | 1190 | 77 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 5 | 300 | 22 | 67.7 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 0 | 0 | 0 | Enough category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1490 | 100 | |

Table 3 above the results of the student's test in writing opinions from the aspect of writing organization are included in the sufficient category. This can be seen from the average value classically of 67.7. No students got a score of 4 or (0%) in the range of 85-100 in the very good category, 17 students got a score of 3 or (77.27%) in the range of 70-84 with a good category, 5 students or (22%) got a score of 2 in the range of 60-69 which is included in the sufficient category. And no students or (0%) of 22 students got a score of 1 with a range of 0-59 in the less category.

Students get average grades because many students are still confused about determining the layout of their ideas. Students no longer care about the outline of the essay that has been made. Students are carried away by the joy of writing without paying attention to the outline of their essay.

Of course, what teachers do is guide students in writing opinions individually, in groups, or as a class, advise students not to simply ignore the outline of the essay that has been made, conduct exercises to correct writing that still has spelling, punctuation, and word choice errors before starting to write, and give students the freedom to discuss with their group members, even though with these efforts the results are not yet optimal.

The third aspect is the word choice aspect. The average class value in this aspect is 68.13. The highest value in this aspect is 81.82% and was achieved by 18 students. The lowest value in this aspect is 13.64% and 4.55% achieved by 3-1 students. The complete results in the word choice aspect can be seen in table 4. as follows.

Table 4 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in the Aspect of Word Choice

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1499 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 18 | 1260 | 81.82 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 3 | 180 | 13.64 | 68.13 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 1 | 59 | 4.55 | Less category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1499 | 100 | |

Based on table 4 above, the results of the student test in writing opinions show that the average value of the word choice aspect in students' writing is classified as lacking, which is 68.13. In this aspect, no students got a score of 4 or (0%) students are in the range of values between 85-100 in the very good category. Furthermore, 18 students or (81.82%) students got a score of 3 in the range of values between 70-84 in the good category. Then 3 students or (13.64%) students got a score of 2 which is in the range of values between 60-69 in the sufficient category. While one student got a score of 1 or (4.55%) got a range of values between 0-59 in the less category.

Students who scored 3 in the range of 70-84 in the good category were caused by the choice of words that were quite appropriate to the theme of the field trip in their group, quite varied, and quite expressive, although there were some words that were still influenced by the Ternate Malay dialect that they usually use in everyday conversation. While students who scored 2 and 1 in the range of 60-69, and 0-59 in the sufficient and less categories were caused by the choice of words used by the students that were less appropriate to the theme of the field trip in their group, less varied, and less expressive.

The next aspect is the aspect of language usage or spelling and punctuation. In the aspect of language usage, the average value of the student class is 70. The highest value achieved by 5 students in this aspect is between 85-100. The lowest value obtained by 5 students in this aspect is between 0-59. The results of students' ability to write opinions in the aspect of language usage can be seen in table 5 below.

Table 5 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in the Aspect of Language Use

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 5 | 425 | 22.73 | 1540 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 10 | 700 | 45.45 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 2 | 120 | 9.09 | 70 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 5 | 295 | 22.73 | Good category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1540 | 100 | |

Based on table 5, it can be seen that the results of the students' test in writing opinions from the aspect of language use or use of spelling and punctuation in classical terms have an average value of average 70 in the good category. As many as 5 students got a score of 4 or (22/73%) students are in the range of 85-100 in the very good category. Furthermore, 10 students or (45/45%) students got a score of 3 in the range of 70-84 in the good category.

While 2 students or (9.09%) students are in the range of 60-69. The remaining 5 students got a score of 1 or (22.73%) are in the range of 0-59 in the very poor category.

Classically, it can be seen that from the 22 students studied, the opinion writing skills from the aspect of language use reached a total value of 1540 with an average value of 77.00. This result is included in the good category, meaning that students' skills in mastering the aspect of language use are included in the good category.

In terms of language usage in this *pre-test*, there are still many students who are not appropriate in using language in their writing. This is because grade XI students still often repeat the same words, use words with the same meaning excessively, are still hesitant in using commas and periods in their sentences, and are still influenced by spoken language in everyday conversations when writing opinions.

The fifth aspect that is also the basis for assessing students' tests in writing opinions is the mechanical aspect of writing. In this aspect, students obtained an average score of 56.63. The highest score achieved by 2 students in this aspect was 100. The lowest score achieved by 8 students in this aspect was 25. The complete results of this aspect can be seen in table 4.5 as follows.

Table 6 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions Mechanical Aspects of Writing

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 2 | 170 | 9.09 | 1468 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 10 | 700 | 45.45 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 8 | 480 | 36.36 | 66.7 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 2 | 118 | 9.09 | (Sufficient category) |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1468 | 100 | |

Based on table 6, it can be seen that the average score of students' test results in the aspect of writing mechanics or sentence effectiveness classically is 66.7 which is included in the sufficient category from the total number of students in one class of 22 students. In the aspect of writing mechanics, 2 students got a score of 4 or (9.09%) students got a score range between 85-100 in the very good category. Furthermore, 10 students or (45.45%) students got a score of 3 with a score range between 70-84 in the good category. Then 8 students or (36.36) got a score of 2 with a score range between 60-69 in the sufficient category. While 2 students or (9.09%) students got a score range between 0-59 in the less category.

In the aspect of writing mechanics or sentence effectiveness in this *pret test*, there are still many students who are not correct in using their spelling and the integration of meaning and form between sentences and paragraphs is unclear. This is because grade XI students still often make mistakes in writing opinions using the field trip method.

pre-test assessments for writing opinions using the field trip method, which can be seen in table 7 below.

Table 7 Results of Opinion Writing Assessment Percentage (Pretest)

| No | Student Name | Rated aspect | | | | | Qty | Score End | Kate Gori | KET |
|----|--------------|--------------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|
| | | KI | OT | KT | PB | MT | | | | |
| 1 | AM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 85 | SB | L |
| 2 | Di | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 3 | HBT | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 80 | B | L |
| 4 | HB | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 60 | C | TL |
| 5 | MB | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 80 | B | L |
| 6 | MK | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 7 | MR | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 8 | MFA | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 65 | C | TL |
| 9 | MR | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 85 | SB | L |
| 10 | IP | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 11 | MRH | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 45 | K | TL |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|---------------|----|
| 12 | MYA | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 13 | MAK | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 30 | K | TL |
| 14 | NK. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 15 | NN | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 65 | C | TL |
| 16 | NA | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 80 | B | L |
| 17 | NSH | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 60 | C | TL |
| 18 | RL | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 50 | K | TL |
| 19 | RR | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 20 | RD | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 45 | K | TL |
| 21 | SMS | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 40 | K | TL |
| 22 | SRS | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 65 | C | TL |
| Total Score | | 55 | 61 | 61 | 59 | 56 | 292 | 1460 | Class average | |
| Average% | | 25.0 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 26.8 | 25.5 | 13.27 | 73 | score 73% | |

Information:

- KI : Content Quality
- OT : Writing Organization
- KT : Vocabulary
- PB : Use of Language
- MT : Writing Mechanics

Table 12 data on the percentage value of learning to write opinions using the field trip method above shows that if we pay attention to the Minimum Completion Standard (SKM) for the Indonesian Language subject, especially learning to write opinions set by SMA Negeri 2 Ternate, which is 70, then the data shows that out of 22 students who were declared to have passed, 12 students or 54.55% had achieved a score of more than or equal to 70, and 10 students or 45.45% had been declared to have not completed because they had not achieved a score of 70.

Posttest Assessment Results

The results of the opinion writing test using the field trip method for grade XI students of Tarakani Galela, North Halmahera Regency in general still use 5 aspects that are assessed, namely the aspect of content quality, the aspect of writing organization, the aspect of word choice, the aspect of language use, and the aspect of writing mechanics. For more details, the opinion writing skills in the *post-test* can also be explained in detail in table 8 as follows.

Table 8 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in Content Quality Aspects

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 17 | 1445 | 77.27 | 1802 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 3 | 237 | 13.64 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 2 | 120 | 9.09 | 81.9 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 0 | 0 | 0 | Good category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1802 | 100 | |

Based on table 8 above, the results of the students' test in writing opinions from the aspect of content quality are in the good category. This is evidenced by the average value obtained by 22 students in the aspect of word choice increasing from 65.61 to 81.9 The highest frequency or 77.27% of 22 students in one class with a total of 17 students getting a score of 4 with a range of 85-100 in the very good category. Then from 22 students in one class, 3 students got a score of 3 or 13.64% with a range of 70-84 or in the good category. Furthermore, 2 students or 9.09% of students got a score of 2 with a range of 60-69 or in the sufficient category. Not a single student got a score of 1 in the less category.

Students get an average class score in the good category because most students or 17 students get very good scores, only 6 students get low scores, and the rest get enough scores. This makes the average score of students' test results for the aspect of content quality in writing opinions in the good category. Students who get high scores are because the content of the opinions written by students is in accordance with the theme, the development of the theme is complete, and is dense with information. Students who get low scores are because the content of the writing written by the students is not in accordance with the theme, the development of the theme is not complete, and there is not enough information.

Thus, the test results conducted by the teacher in *the post-test* to improve the aspect of content quality are to provide guidance on writing opinions in a classical manner by asking several students whose content quality aspects are sufficient and lacking in this *post-test* to read their writings in front of the class. Then, the teacher discusses and compares the writings with the students. In *the post-test*, the teacher together with the students determines the main ideas in the field trip method so that the quality of the content of the students' writings becomes more developed, in accordance with the theme, and dense with information.

The second aspect is the aspect of writing organization. The average score of students in the aspect of writing organization is 81.4 in the good category. The highest score in this aspect is 100 and was achieved by 16 students. The lowest score is 9.09 and was achieved by 2 students. The results of the opinion writing skills in the organizational aspect of writing in detail can be seen in table 9 as follows.

Table 9 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in the Organizational Aspect of Writing

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 16 | 1360 | 72.73 | <u>1792</u> |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 4 | 136 | 18.18 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 2 | 120 | 9.09 | 81.4 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 0 | 0 | 0 | Good category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1792 | 100 | |

Based on table 9, it can be seen that students obtained an average score of 81.4 in the good category. The highest frequency, as many as 16 students or 72,737% obtained a score of 4 in the good category with a value range between 85-100. As many as 4 students or 18.18% obtained a score of 3 in the good category with a value range between 70-84. Students who obtained a score of 2 in the sufficient category were 2 students or 9.09%. And none of the students obtained a score of 1 or 0% in the less category with a value range between 0-59.

On average, students have expressed their ideas clearly and paid attention to cohesion and coherence between paragraphs. Students who get high scores are due to the discussion and discussion at the beginning of learning about the mistakes that students often make in the organizational aspect of writing, especially mistakes in cohesion and coherence between paragraphs. The teacher gives an example of writing that clearly integrates the meaning and form between sentences and paragraphs. The teacher provides material about sentences, paragraphs, and good and correct writing techniques at the beginning of learning. The teacher also maximizes his guidance individually and classically. The teacher reminds students who make mistakes in their writing so that students do not repeat the same mistakes. The teacher also utilizes the participation of friends in reminding students who make mistakes. Students respond by correcting the organizational aspects of writing that students often make on *the posttest* on the board. This minimizes students from making the same mistakes again on this *posttest*.

The third aspect is the aspect of word choice. However, students use word choices that are appropriate to the theme, varied, and expressive in their writing. This is because before the learning process, the teacher and students

have also discussed the mistakes in word choice that many students made in *the pretest*. Students know where their mistakes are and correct them in *the posttest*.

The average score achieved by students in this aspect of word choice is 79.4%. The highest score in this aspect is 100 and was achieved by 11 students. The lowest score of 13.64% was only obtained by 3 students. The results achieved by students in the aspect of word choice in detail can be seen in table 10 as follows.

Table 10 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in the Aspect of Word Choice

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 11 | 935 | 50.00 | 79.4 Good category |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 8 | 632 | 36.36 | |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 3 | 180 | 13.64 | |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1747 | | 100 |

Based on table 10, it can be seen that the average value of the word choice aspect in students' writing is classified as good, which is 79.4. In this aspect, there are 11 students who get a score of 4 in the less category or 50.00%. Students who get a score of 3 in the good category are 8 people or 36.36%. Students who get a score of 2 in the sufficient category or 13.64%. In this aspect, there are also no students who get a score of 1 in the less category or 0%.

In terms of word choice, on average, students have used a lot of word choices that are quite appropriate to the theme of writing opinions in their groups, are quite varied, and quite expressive, although there are some words that are still influenced by the regional language dialect that they usually use in everyday conversation. Students who get very good scores are because the word choices used by the students are appropriate to the theme written in their groups, are varied, and expressive, and use Indonesian well and correctly. Students who get sufficient scores are because the word choices used by the students are less appropriate to the theme of the caricature in their groups, are less varied, and less expressive.

The next aspect is the aspect of language use. The average score of students in the aspect of language use increased significantly from 70.00 in *the pre-test* to 81.91. The highest score was 100 and was achieved by 17 students. The lowest score was only achieved by 2 students, which was 9.09. The results obtained by students in this aspect can be seen in table 11 as follows.

Table 11 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions in the Aspect of Language Use

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 17 | 1445 | 77.27 | 81.9 Good category |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 3 | 237 | 13.64 | |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 2 | 120 | 9.09 | |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1802 | 100 | |

Based on table 10 above, the average value obtained by students in the classical aspect of language use was 81.9, which is in the good category. There are 17 students or 77.27% of 22 students who got a score of 4 in the very good category. As many as 3 students or 13.64% of 22 students got a score of 3 which is included in the good category.

Students who got a score of 2 were 2 people in the sufficient category or 9.09%. There was not a single student who got a score of 1 in the less category or 0%.

Students obtained a good average score because most students already understood the errors in using language forms so that students avoided these errors when writing opinions.

The last aspect is the aspect of writing mechanics. The results of the teacher's opinion writing learning in *the post-test* were to inform students of their mistakes in writing mechanics in *the pre-test* so that these mistakes would not be made again in the post-test. Students reacted by writing opinions using the correct spelling. There were even some students who reminded their group mates who wrote opinions with incorrect spelling. This phenomenon, for example, occurred when respondent no. 3 reminded respondent no. 9 that the mistake was in writing the word system. Respondent no. 3 corrected the incorrect spelling.

The average score of students in the mechanical aspect of writing is 7.8 . The highest score of students in this aspect is 75 and was achieved by 46 students. The lowest score achieved by 2 students in this aspect is 9.09. The detailed test results in this aspect can be seen in table 1.2 as follows.

Table 1 2 Student Test Results in Writing Opinions Mechanical Aspects of Writing

| No | Score | Range Mark | Category | Frequency | Weight Mark | % | Mark Average |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| 1 | 4 | 85-100 | SB | 15 | 1275 | 68.18 | 1734 |
| 2 | 3 | 70-84 | B | 4 | 280 | 18.18 | 22 |
| 3 | 2 | 60-69 | C | 2 | 120 | 9.09 | 7 8 .8 |
| 4 | 1 | 0-59 | K | 1 | 59 | 5 | Good category |
| Amount | | | | 22 | 1734 | 100 | |

Based on table 1 2, the results of the students' test in writing opinions on the mechanical aspect of writing have achieved good results. The average value obtained by students in this aspect is in the good category. This can be seen from the average classical value of 7 8 , 8 in the good category. There are 15 students or 68.18% of 22 students who get a score of 4 in the very good category. As many as 4 students or 18.18% of 22 students get a score of 3 which is included in the good category. Students who get a score of 2 are 2 people in the sufficient category or 9.09%. And as many as 1 student who gets a score of 1 or 5% in the less category.

the post-test assessment percentage of learning to write opinions using the field trip method can be seen in tables 1 and 3 below.

Table 1 3 Results of the Percentage of Opinion Writing Assessment in the Posttest

| No | Student Name | Rated aspect | | | | | Qty | Score End | Kate Gori | KET |
|----|--------------|--------------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|
| | | KI | OT | KT | PB | MT | | | | |
| 1 | AM | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 2 | Di | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 3 | HBT | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 4 | HB | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 5 | MB | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 6 | MK | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 7 | MR | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 8 | MFA | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 9 | MR | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 10 | IP | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |
| 11 | MRH | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | L |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|---------------|----|
| 12 | MYA | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 95 | SB | L |
| 13 | MAK | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 45 | K | TL |
| 14 | NK. | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 95 | SB | L |
| 15 | NN | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 95 | SB | L |
| 16 | NA | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 18 | 90 | SB | L |
| 17 | NSH | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 85 | B | L |
| 18 | RL | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 19 | RR | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 75 | B | L |
| 20 | RD | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 65 | C | TL |
| 21 | SMS | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 50 | K | TL |
| 22 | SRS | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 100 | SB | TL |
| Total Score | | 81 | 80 | 75 | 81 | 77 | 394 | 1970 | Class average | |
| Average% | | 36.8 | 36.4 | 34.1 | 36.8 | 35.0 | 17.91 | 98.50 | score 98.50% | |

Information:

- KI : Content Quality
OT : Writing Organization
KT : Vocabulary
PB : Use of Language
MT : Writing Mechanics

Table 13 data on the percentage value of learning to write opinions using the field trip method above shows that if we pay attention to the Minimum Completion Standards (SKM) for the Indonesian Language subject, especially learning to write opinions set by SMA Negeri 2 Ternate, which is 70, then the data shows that out of 22 students who were declared to have passed, 18 students or increased to 82.82% because they had achieved a score of more than or equal to 70, and students who were declared not yet completed were 4 students or 18.18% because they had not achieved a score of 70.

Discussion

The field trip method has proven to be effective in improving the opinion writing skills of high school students, as demonstrated by the findings in the research. Conducted over two cycles consisting of planning, implementation, observation, and reflection, the study shows a significant improvement in students' writing skills, with the average score increasing from 70 in the first cycle to 82 in the second cycle.

1. Increasing Student Engagement

One of the main challenges in teaching opinion writing is the low engagement of students in the learning process. The field trip method has been shown to significantly increase student participation and interest. In the first cycle, students struggled with developing strong arguments and lacked depth in their writing. However, after participating in the field trip, there was a noticeable change in how students structured their writing, with more ideas developed and supported by real-life experiences. This finding aligns with Nuraeni et al. (2022), which states that experience-based learning methods, such as field trips, enhance student engagement and motivation, which has been shown to lead to greater confidence in expressing their opinions (Harris & Graham, 2016).

2. Generating Better Ideas

Another key finding in this study is that students who participated in the field trip were able to generate more insightful and relevant ideas for their opinion writing. According to Rahayu and Setiawan (2021), students who engage

in field trips are able to collect richer data and facts that strengthen their arguments. In this study, students who participated in the field trip method showed marked improvement in the quality of their writing, both in terms of content organization and word choice. For example, in the first cycle, the average score for content quality was 65.4, but after the field trip experience, the average score increased significantly to 81.9 in the second cycle.

3. Enhancing Critical Thinking Skills

A significant result from this study is the improvement in students' critical thinking skills after participating in the field trip. According to Feldman et al. (2019), direct experiences in the field enhance students' ability to think critically and analytically, which is essential when writing an opinion piece. This is evident in the improvement in students' organizational skills in writing, as they were able to structure their ideas more logically and cohesively. Additionally, students became more confident in expressing their opinions with stronger, evidence-based arguments.

Recommendations for the Implementation of the Field Trip Method

Based on the findings of this research, here are several recommendations for the more effective implementation of the field trip method in opinion writing instruction at the high school level.

1. Curriculum Integration

Given the positive impact of the field trip method on students' writing skills, it is recommended that this method be systematically integrated into the Indonesian language curriculum, particularly for developing opinion writing skills. This integration will ensure that students can connect what they learn in class to real-world experiences, making the learning process more relevant and engaging. This aligns with Mulyasa (2013)'s recommendation that contextual learning be integrated into the curriculum to enrich students' learning experiences.

2. Development of Teaching Modules

The research highlights the importance of clear and structured teaching modules to effectively implement the field trip method. The module should provide detailed guidance on how to conduct observations, collect data, and write effective opinion pieces based on field trip findings. This will help students understand the process from observation to writing, enabling them to produce higher-quality work. As Tarigan (2008) suggests, a more systematic approach to writing instruction is crucial to helping students develop better writing skills.

3. Teacher Training

Given the significant role teachers play in the success of this method, it is essential to provide specific training for teachers on how to effectively implement the field trip method. Teachers need to be equipped with the skills to design engaging field trip activities that encourage critical thinking and reflection. Additionally, training should cover how to provide constructive feedback to students on their opinion writing. This is in line with Samsuri (1981), who emphasizes the important role of teachers in guiding students through the writing process.

4. Evaluation and Feedback

Regular evaluation of the implementation of the field trip method is essential to ensure continuous improvement. In this study, evaluation was conducted after each cycle, allowing for reflection on the process and outcomes. Feedback from both students and teachers is vital for refining the learning process and addressing any challenges. Therefore, regular evaluations are crucial for ensuring the ongoing effectiveness of the method and making adjustments as necessary.

The field trip method has proven to be effective in improving students' opinion writing skills at the high school level. This method not only helps students develop better writing abilities but also increases their engagement in the learning process and enhances their critical thinking skills. Based on the findings of this research, it is

recommended that the field trip method be widely implemented in the Indonesian language curriculum, supported by the development of clear teaching modules, teacher training, and regular evaluations. By doing so, opinion writing instruction can be made more engaging, relevant, and effective, providing students with the tools they need to express well-reasoned, evidence-based opinions.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and data analysis that has been carried out, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Students' opinion writing ability before the field trip method was applied was in the sufficient category. Students showed difficulty in constructing strong arguments, complete writing structures, and were less able to link opinions to facts or real issues in their environment. The average pretest score was 73.
2. After the field trip method was implemented, there was a significant increase in students' opinion writing skills. Students became more able to develop ideas based on research results, organize opinions logically, and use more appropriate language. The average posttest score increased to 98.50.

The field trip method has proven effective in improving the opinion writing skills of grade XI students of SMA Negeri 2 Ternate. Real-life experience-based learning helps students to be more critical, active, and involved in the writing process. Direct observation activities encourage them to think more openly and express opinions based on concrete facts.

REFERENCES

- Alhadar, F. and Tawari, R. (2024). Knowledge and perceptions of ternate's young generation about ternate oral literature. *Ijoleh International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 3(2), 156-167. <https://doi.org/10.56314/ijoleh.v3i2.257>
- El-Yousfi, S., Marshman, Z., Albers, P., Watt, S., Kipping, R., & Williams, J. (2022). Health visiting teams and children's oral health: a scoping review. *BMC Oral Health*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-022-02611-6>
- Emery, K. and Guido-Sanz, F. (2019). Oral care practices in non-mechanically ventilated intensive care unit patients: an integrative review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 28(13-14), 2462-2471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14829>
- Farid, H., Khan, M., Jamal, S., & Ghafoor, R. (2021). Oral manifestations of covid-19-a literature review. *Reviews in Medical Virology*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rmv.2248>
- Halboub, E., Al-Maweri, S., Alanazi, R., Qaid, N., & Abdulrab, S. (2020). Orofacial manifestations of covid-19: a brief review of the published literature. *Brazilian Oral Research*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-3107bor-2020.vol34.0124>
- Iacob, A., Martínez, M., Castro, E., Olay, S., García, S., & Junquera, L. (2024). Effects of vape use on oral health: a review of the literature. *Medicina*, 60(3), 365. <https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina60030365>
- Lim, Y., Totsika, M., Morrison, M., & Punyadeera, C. (2017). Oral microbiome: a new biomarker reservoir for oral and oropharyngeal cancers. *Theranostics*, 7(17), 4313-4321. <https://doi.org/10.7150/thno.21804>
- Mahmood, R. and Hakal, M. (2022). Genderandsocio-culturalrepresentationsinoralliterature:documentationandliterarystudyoftheoralstory"justicein jungle". *Journal of Management Practices Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.33152/jmphss-6.3.10>

- Mazur, A., Kurowska, K., Antolak, M., & Podciborski, T. (2024). Transformation of the cultural landscape in the central part of the historical region of warmia in poland. *Sustainability*, 16(14), 6201.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su16146201>
- McGuire, D., Fulton, J., Park, J., Brown, C., Corrêa, M., Eilers, J., ... & Lalla, R. (2013). Systematic review of basic oral care for the management of oral mucositis in cancer patients. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, 21(11), 3165-3177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-013-1942-0>
- Saydam, M., Öztüren, A., & Kilic, C. (2022). Cultural heritage tourism in north cyprus: findings from in-depth interviews with experts. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 14(4), 349-364.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/whatt-03-2022-0035>
- Seminario-Amez, M., López-López, J., Estrugo-Devesa, A., Ayuso-Montero, R., & Jane-Salas, E. (2017). Probiotics and oral health: a systematic review. *Medicina Oral Patología Oral Y Cirugia Bucal*, 0-0.
<https://doi.org/10.4317/medoral.21494>
- Shafqat, R., Маринова, Д., & Khan, S. (2022). Adapting grounded theory to investigate sustainability heritage in informal settlements: case studies from islamabad, pakistan. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1515.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031515>
- Tilakaratne, W., Jayasooriya, P., Jayasuriya, N., & Silva, K. (2019). Oral epithelial dysplasia: causes, quantification, prognosis, and management challenges. *Periodontology 2000*, 80(1), 126-147.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/prd.12259>
- abbas, s. (2019). Cultural tolerance in oral literature ternate. *Islac Journal of Intensive Studies on Language Literature Art and Culture*, 3(1), 111-117. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um006v3i12019p111>