

TEACHING WRITING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT THROUGH TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING (TBLT)

Monitha Geraldine, Y. Gatot Sutapa Y., Surmiyati

English Study Program of Language and Arts Education Department

FKIP UNTAN, Pontianak

Email: geraldinecassiopeia@gmail.com

Abstract: The objective of the research was to find out whether teaching writing hortatory exposition text through Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is effective or not. It was also designed to find out how significant the effectiveness of teaching writing hortatory exposition text through the use of TBLT is. The research was carried out at SMAN 2 Pontianak. It was a quasi experimental research. The subjects of the research were the eleventh grade students of XI IPA 2 and XI IPA 4. Data analysis showed that experimental group outperformed control group. It was also found that although there was a difference between the students' mean score of pre-test and post-test of control group in favor of the traditional approach, this difference was not statistically significant. Therefore, it was concluded that TBLT was more effective in teaching writing hortatory exposition text compared to the traditional approach.

Keywords: hortatory exposition text, writing, TBLT

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah pengajaran menulis teks hortatory exposition melalui Pengajaran Bahasa Berbasis Tugas (TBLT) efektif atau tidak. Penelitian ini juga dirancang untuk mengetahui seberapa besar efektivitas pengajaran menulis teks hortatory exposition melalui pendekatan TBLT. Penelitian ini dilakukan di SMA Negeri 2 Pontianak. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah quasi experimental. Subyek penelitian adalah siswa kelas XI IPA 2 XI dan XI IPA 4. Analisis data menunjukkan bahwa kelompok eksperimen mengungguli kelompok kontrol. Penelitian ini juga menemukan bahwa meskipun ada perbedaan antara skor rata-rata siswa dari pre-test dan post-test dari kelompok kontrol yang mendukung pendekatan tradisional, perbedaan ini tidak signifikan secara statistik. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa TBLT lebih efektif dalam pengajaran menulis teks hortatory exposition dibandingkan dengan pendekatan tradisional.

Kata kunci: teks hortatory exposition, menulis, TBLT

In writing students need an understanding of how words, sentences, and structures can express the meaning they want to convey. Writing for English language learners is not only the act of writing, but also the way to communicate with the readers for particular purposes and context. However, learning to write correctly tends to be one of the most difficult of the four skills for all language users regardless whether the language is a first, second, or foreign language.

In School Based Curriculum (KTSP) for English subject, there are 12 genres of texts that should be mastered by Senior High School students. They are narrative, recount, procedure, descriptive, news item, report, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, spoof, explanation, discussion, and review text. Each text has its own social function, generic structure and language features. One of the text that must be taught to eleventh grade students is hortatory exposition.

Hortatory exposition text is a type of spoken or written text that is intended to explain the listeners or readers that something should or should not happen or be done (Interlanguage, 2008:161). In other words, this kind of text can be called as argumentation. Hortatory exposition text can be found in scientific books, journals, magazines, newspaper articles, academic speech or lectures, and research report. Hortatory expositions are popular among science, academic community and educated people.

The generic structure of hortatory exposition usually has three components: (1) Thesis, it is a statement or announcement of issue concern. (2) Arguments, it shows reasons for concern that will lead to recommendation. (3) Recommendation, it includes statement of what should or should not happen or be done based on the given arguments.

Hortatory exposition text also has the language features. There are (1) Focuses on generic human and non human participants, (2) It uses mental processes. It is used to state what the researcher or speaker thinks or feels about something. For example: realize, feel etc, (3) It often needs material processes. It is used to state what happens, e.g. ...has polluted...etc, (4) It usually uses Simple Present Tense and passive voice, (5) Enumeration is sometimes necessary to show the list of given arguments: firstly, secondly, and finally.

In hortatory exposition text, the students learn how to share opinions, ideas or arguments in form of writing or speaking. The students are required to have the sufficient knowledge to support their ideas about the given topic. This condition encourages the students to be able to develop or elaborate their arguments in order to strengthen their explanation. It also motivates them to think more critically about the issues that arise in their daily life. The students also need to learn the hortatory exposition text since this type of text is popular among science, academic community and educated people. Because this text is considered very beneficial to be taught for Senior High School students, the teacher should have an appropriate approach for teaching writing hortatory exposition text.

However, based on the researcher's pre-research, it was found that most of the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak in Academic Year 2013/2014 encounter problems in writing hortatory exposition text. These problems might be caused by two factors: the students and the learning environment. The first

problem came from the students themselves. The students got difficulties in developing ideas or arguments in hortatory exposition text. It could be indicated when the students were given a topic by the teacher to write. It seemed that they got problem in developing their ideas because they did not have sufficient knowledge to support their ideas about the topic. As the result, the students spent a long time to think what should be written. Furthermore, the students also had problems in grammatical aspect. They faced difficulties in constructing sentences by using simple present tense. When they constructed the sentences, their sentences contained many mistakes. Consequently, the students were unable to write hortatory exposition text correctly.

The unnatural learning context was the last factor that causes the low level achievement of writing hortatory exposition text. The eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak were not given the opportunities to interact each other when they finished their task. They only focused in writing without having any peer-review activity with the other students. As a result, the learning context becomes unnatural for the students. Whereas, learning a foreign language should be based on the natural context which is aimed to create the natural learning environment for students. In this research, the researcher will cover all those points because they are considered as the main factors that cause the low level achievement of writing ability of the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak in Academic Year 2013/2014.

Corresponding to the statements above, the teacher, therefore, needs to develop to teach writing in the classroom. Task-Based Language Teaching has been proposed by various experts as one of the ways in Teaching English. According to Leaver and Willis (2004:3), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is an approach of teaching which focuses on task activity, provides context to activate learning acquisition process, and promotes language learning. The task class work is organized as a series of activities in classroom. Moreover, Ellis (2003:12) states that the main focus of TBLT is on the tasks and language. The teacher will ask the students to do some tasks, such as they are given some problems and they try to solve the problems through tasks. From those tasks, they will learn some specific items of language.

Since the central component of TBLT is the task, various experts have presented the definition of tasks. According to Nunan (2004:4) a task is a series of classroom activities which focuses on comprehending, producing, or interacting in the target language and involves the students to interact by using the target language. It is also stated that the task is more focused on meaning rather than the grammatical form. It is in line with Van den Branden (2003) which states that a task is activity which people engaged and the language is used in order to attain the objectives.

In addition, Skehan (1996) in the study of *a Framework of the Implementation of TBLT* states that the characteristics of a task provides meaningful activity and requires problem solving and real-world based activities. It also offers task completion and task assessment as the outcome. In addition, Nunan (2004:1) asserts that TBLT is not only focused on the learners' language,

but also on the learning process itself. In classroom learning, the tasks are administered in order to give learning experience to the students.

Based on those definitions above, the researcher may conclude that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is an approach for teaching a second/foreign language that seeks to engage learners in interactive authentic language use by having them perform a series of tasks.

Rizky (2010) conducted an action research about Task-Based Language Teaching to teach Writing for 7th Grade Students at SMPN 17 Surakarta. Based on her finding, teaching writing by using Task-Based Language Teaching is much more effective because it can develop students' writing ability through performing a series of activities as steps toward successful task realization. It is also in line with the quasi experimental research conducted by Ali (2009) about The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) on the Iranian Intermediate ESP Learners' Writing Ability. His finding revealed that the data analysis using independent T-test showed that the subjects in TBLT group performed better in writing expository since the lecturer provide them with the authentic teaching materials. Regarding to those two findings, it shows that TBLT has been more effective for teaching writing hortatory exposition text.

Based on the background above, the researcher, therefore, is interested in choosing Task-Based Language Teaching as a learning approach to teach writing. The researcher tried to investigate whether teaching writing hortatory exposition text through Task-Based Language Teaching is effective or not. Therefore, the method that is implemented in this research is quasi experimental study. The research was conducted to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak in Academic Year 2013/2014. In short, the researcher hopes that the Task-Based Language Teaching will give positive contribution in the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text.

METHOD

In carrying out the research, it is necessary to describe the method that is used to achieve the goal. Various kinds of method can be applied to achieve the goal of the research. The researcher used quasi experimental research as the form of research because it was considered very appropriate with this research. Quasi experimental research defined by Cohen (2005:159) is a type of evaluation which aims to determine whether a program or intervention has the intended effect on a study's participants. Since the most common form of a quasi-experimental study includes a pre-post test design with an experimental group and a control group, quasi-experimental studies are often an impact evaluation that assigns members to the experimental group and control group by a method other than random assignment. Because of the danger that the treatment and control group may differ at the outset, researchers conducting quasi-experimental studies attempt to address this in a number of other ways. In this research, the researcher focused on one form of quasi-experimental studies that was a pre-post test design with a control group.

The pre-post test design with a control group will allow the researcher to measure the potential effects of an intervention by examining the difference in the pre-test and post-test results. It does not allow the researcher to test whether this difference would have occurred in the absence of her intervention. For example, perhaps the effect of improved academic achievement is due to the students getting used to taking a test rather than the use of educational software. To get the true effects of the program or intervention, it is necessary to have both an experimental group and a control group. As the names suggest, the experimental group receives the intervention. The control group, however, gets the business-as-usual conditions, meaning they only receive interventions that they would have gotten if they had not participated in the study. By having both a group that received the intervention and another group that did not, researchers control for the possibility that other factors not related to the intervention (e.g., students getting accustomed to a test, or simple maturation over the intervening time) are responsible for the difference between the pre-test and post-test results. It is also important that both the experimental group and the control group are of adequate size to be able to determine whether an effect took place or not.

This method of research was preferable to find out the answer that already stated in the research questions. Moreover, the researcher intended to find out whether Task-Based Language Teaching was effective or not for teaching writing particularly writing hortatory exposition text. It was in line with the characteristic of quasi experimental study which aimed to determine whether a program or intervention has the intended effect on a study's participants. Therefore, the researcher chose quasi experimental study as a method to be implemented in this research.

The procedure of quasi-experimental study which applied in this research was described in the following steps: (1) Applying pre-test (X1) for both classes, which was test to measure the students mean score before the treatment given, (2) Giving the students of experimental group the treatment (T). The treatment is in form of teaching learning process. In teaching hortatory exposition writing to the students, researcher used tree Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as the treatment, (3) Applying post test (X2) for both classes, that was test to measure students mean score after the treatment was given, (4) Compared the X1 and X2 to determine the students mean score of pre-test and post-test, (5) Applying appropriate statistical formula to determine whether the teaching hortatory exposition writing using TBLT approach increased the students' achievement significantly or not. To investigate the students score significance, researcher used t-test formula and to find out the effectiveness of the treatment, the researcher used ES (Effect Size) formula.

The samples of this research were taken through cluster sampling then class XI IPA 2 and XI IPA 4 taken as the sample because these classes represent the population that has same problems in writing. There were thirty five students in class XI IPA 2 as the experimental group and thirty five students of XI IPA 4 as control group. To collect the data, the researcher used measurement technique and written test.

The researcher used measurement technique to measure students' writing achievement. The data were collected by administering the written test twice. First, to collect the data before treatment held, to see students pre-condition before experiment. The second was post test. It was administered to collect the data after experimental treatment given.

Since the data was obtained by using measurement technique, the relevant tool to collect the data was written test. It was used to assess students' writing performance. Students were asked to write a hortatory exposition text based on the topic given. The students' score from the test was used to find the mean score. In assessing the students' writing performance, the researcher provided the scoring rubric so that the scoring would be more objective. The researcher applied the same test for both groups

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

From the result of the pre-test, it could be seen that the students' writing ability in writing hortatory exposition text was low. The mean score of experimental group was 54.02, the highest score was 69, and the lowest score was 22. Meanwhile, the students' mean score in control group was 57, the highest score was 69, and the lowest score was 44. Referring to *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* of class eleventh which is 67; there were 9 students in control group or 25.71% who passed the passing grade. There were 8 students in experimental group or 22.85% who passed the passing grade. Whereas, the class target is 75% of the students should achieve the minimal score, 67.

After administering the pre-test, it was found that both students in experimental and control group got difficulties in developing ideas or arguments and constructing sentences by using simple present tense in hortatory exposition text. The students' difficulties in developing ideas could be indicated when the students were given a topic by the researcher to write. For example, when the researcher gave the students the topic about corruption, they only wrote "I think that corruption is very bad". They were not able to strengthen their topic sentence by giving some arguments. Whereas, their writing was expected to be "I think that corruption is very bad because it can give the negative effects in economic aspect. Corruption leads to the depletion of national wealth. It is often responsible for increased costs of goods and services, the funneling of scarce public resources to uneconomic high profile projects at the expense of the much needed projects such as schools, hospitals and roads. Moreover, large scale corruption hurts the economy and impoverishes entire population....." Therefore, both students in experimental and control group only got 14.77 and 16.42 for their content. Based on the scoring rubric that is used for assessing the students' writing, the content's score of both groups is considered as "poor".

The students also encountered difficulties in constructing sentences by using simple present tense. When they constructed the sentences, their sentences contained many mistakes. Take for the example, the students wrote "She donate

the hospital some money”. Meanwhile, the correct sentence should be “She donates the hospital some money”. Consequently, the students were unable to write hortatory exposition text by using correct grammar. Therefore, both students in experimental and control group only got 12.02 and 15.62 for their content. Based on the scoring rubric that is used for assessing the students’ writing, the content’s score of both groups is considered as “average”.

This condition is in contrast with the students’ score after implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text. From the result of the post-test, it could be seen that the students’ writing ability in writing hortatory exposition text was average. The mean score of experimental group was 67.22, the highest score was 83, and the lowest score was 28. Meanwhile, the students’ mean score in control group was 61.62, the highest score was 80, and the lowest score was 44. There were 14 students in control group or 40% who passed the passing grade. Meanwhile, there were 26 students in experimental group or 74.28% who passed the passing grade.

After implementing TBLT for teaching writing hortatory exposition text, the students in experimental group were able to develop their arguments and construct the sentences correctly by using simple present tense. The students’ content score after implementing TBLT is 21.2. The difference is about 6.43 if it is compared with the students’ content score before implementing the TBLT. Meanwhile, the students’ content score in control group is 18. It also shows that the score is higher than the pre-test’s score. However, the difference is not really significant since the difference is only about 1.58.

In addition, the students post-test score in grammar aspect which is 17.05 also showing that their score is higher after the researcher giving the treatment. The difference is about 5.03 if it is compared with the students’ grammar score before implementing the TBLT. Meanwhile, the students’ post-test score of control group in grammar is 16.51. It also shows that the score is higher than the pre-test’s score. However, the difference is not really significant since the difference is only about 0.89.

In order to find out how significant the effectiveness of the treatment given to the experimental group, the researcher analyzed the effect of the treatment (Effect Size). From the result of the computation, it was found that the effect size of the treatment is 11.2. Based on Harris’ criteria, it is qualified as “high”. Therefore, the effectiveness of the use of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) affects the students writing in writing hortatory exposition text is “high”. From the t-test result, it was also found that t-obtained (14.01). The researcher applied the significance level (α) of 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) = $N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 35 + 35 - 2 = 68$. Based on the table, for (α) 0.05 with (df)= 68, it was found that the $t_{test} = 14.01 > t_{table} = (2.000)$. This finding indicates significant difference result between pre-test and post-test. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It can be concluded that the use of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is effective in teaching writing hortatory exposition text to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak in Academic Year 2013/2014.

Discussion

Based on the gathered data and related analysis, it was found that the students were not familiar with hortatory exposition writing at the beginning of the study. The students only knew that the hortatory exposition text had a thesis, arguments and a recommendation, but they did not know how to develop arguments in hortatory exposition text. When the students were given the topic, they only could write the topic sentence. They were not able to elaborate their arguments in order to strengthen their topic sentence. For example, when the researcher gave the students the topic about corruption, they only wrote “I think that corruption is very bad”. They were not able to strengthen their topic sentence by giving some arguments. During the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text with their teacher, the students were only asked to make summary about hortatory exposition text without obtaining detail explanation from their teacher about that text. They were only asked to create a hortatory exposition text without having practices how to develop arguments in that text. Hence, the major points of their hortatory exposition text were still lack of relevant arguments.

Those students were just able to write paragraphs and the performance of the pre-test hortatory exposition writing was just the same with the model of text they had learned in the previous writing courses taught by their teacher. In fact, they had developed their own text based on the concept that a text was a magnified paragraph with an introductory paragraph, three or more body paragraphs, and a concluding paragraph. Meanwhile, in writing hortatory exposition text, the students are required to be able to create the thesis which can state the announcement of issue concern. They also must be able to write arguments which can show reasons for concern that will lead to recommendation. Another requirement that the students need to fulfill in order to write a good hortatory exposition text is that they must be able to write the statement of what should or should not happen or be done based on the given arguments.

Accordingly, even teaching writing hortatory exposition text through the traditional approach and via lectures by the researcher was effective in teaching the basic features of the hortatory exposition writing especially about the structure and organization of that text. The results show that the hortatory exposition of control group where the main approach was traditional had improved too. However, the improvement of control group was not very significant than the improvement of experimental group.

In the case of structure the difference increased in favor of the experimental group. The students were able to construct the correct sentences by using simple present tense since they had already practiced when doing the first task that is consciousness-raising (CR) task. This task was intentionally designed by the researcher to draw the students’ attention to a particular linguistic feature particularly simple present tense. For example, at the pre-test the students wrote “She donate the hospital some money”. Meanwhile, the students wrote “She donates the hospital some money” after they were taught by using Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach.

Another significant difference was also found in content especially in developing arguments in the hortatory exposition text. The students in experimental group were easily to develop their arguments after the researcher implemented TBLT during the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text. It happened because the researcher gave the reasoning-gap task to the students in experimental group which involved them in deriving some new information from given information through processes of inference, deduction, practical reasoning, or a perception of relationships or patterns. The researcher gave the thesis to the students and she asked the students to express their attitudes toward the topic given by using expression of attitudes that already taught by the researcher. For example, the statement is “I agree that President should punish the corruptors because.....” then the students complete the statements with “I agree that President should punish the corruptors because corruption can lead to the depletion of national wealth. It is also responsible for increased costs of goods and services, the funneling of scarce public resources to uneconomic high profile projects at the expense of the much needed projects such as schools, hospitals and roads.” Therefore, it is said that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach is really communicative and meaning-centered or in a better sense “uses language in order to learn it” in Willis’s words (Willis, 1996, p.189).

Furthermore, another feature which could be referred to as a reason for the outperformance of the TBLT class in comparison with the traditional class is the collaborative and interactive nature of the task-based approach. In the experimental group, the students did their opinion exchange task in groups of 3 to 4. In doing this task, the students engaged in discussion and exchanged of ideas. Therefore, the language use and language learning could take place simultaneously. After doing this task, each group was asked to present the report of their work in front of the classroom so that the other students could give feedback to them. The feedback given covered the arguments and recommendation that they already made with their group. It came from peers from other groups and sometimes from the teacher. The students in experimental group could use such a feedback both during the task cycle that is during the writing process and after that on their final products during the post-task phase. Therefore, the feedback could be thought of as an advantage for this group while in the traditional class the student wrote their text individually. Such an interpretation is in line with the superiority of TBLT has been emphasized by Ellis (2003) which lies in the meaningful, purposeful, communicative and authentic nature of the task-based language teaching approach.

Meanwhile, the students in the control group only knew the generic structures of the hortatory exposition text but they still did not know how to develop their arguments. The students also did not get the feedback during the process of writing. They only got the feedback from their teacher on the end of product. Therefore, the difference of students’ content and grammar score were not really significant.

In addition, at the beginning of the study the learning context was unnatural because the students were not given the opportunities to interact each other when they finished their task. The students only focused in writing without

having any peer-review activity with the other students. The teacher had a dominant role in the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text. The class situation was not alive and the students are uninteresting in writing activities. They only create a hortatory exposition text based on the topic given by the teacher. The students also did not have any opportunity to participate in writing since the teacher did not create such activity which could involve the students working collaboratively with their friends. As a result, the students were very passive. This learning condition was very contrast with the condition after implementing TBLT in the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text.

Related to the personal journals that already made by the researcher during the process of giving treatment, it was found that the class situation was alive with many interesting tasks. The students' participation was also high and they gave fully attention to the lesson. The students were very active in the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text since they dominated the activities. The bigger chances were given through group work when they were asked to do opinion-exchange task and present the report of their work in front of the classroom. Therefore, it can be concluded that TBLT provides students with a natural context for language use. When the students work to complete their tasks, they have abundant opportunities to interact. The interaction is believed to facilitate language acquisition as students have to work to understand each other and to express their own meaning (Freeman, 2000:144).

Eventhough Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach had offered a lot of strengths, there were also some weaknesses in implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in teaching writing hortatory exposition text. One of the weaknesses was TBLT took time in the class because it had a lot of activities. Another weaknesses which was encountered in implementing TBLT wassome students were still not confidence to participate actively during the process of teaching writing hortatory exposition text. However, those weaknesses could be overcome by the researcher. The researcher intentionally createdseveral tasks in which the students were able to finish them in 3x45 minutes. She also encouraged the students to increase their participation in teaching and learning process.

Regarding to the discussion above, it can be concluded that teaching writing hortatory exposition text is effective through the use of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak in academic year 2013/2014. From the computation of the effect of the treatment, the researcher obtained 1.2 which was qualified as "high" based on the Harris's criteria. Hence, the researcher concluded that the effectiveness of teaching writing hortatory exposition text through the use of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Pontianak in academic year 2013/2014 was very significant.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the discussion of the research, it can be concluded that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is very helpful. The current study made it clear that task-based language teaching is definitely more effective than traditional approach in teaching writing in general and in teaching writing mode like hortatory exposition text in particular. In fact, teaching writing to the eleventh grade students through task-based approach has all of the advantages of the process approach to writing such as the focus on the processes involved in the pre-writing, during writing and post-writing phases.

Task-based approach pays enough attention to all of the processes which are involved in producing a good hortatory exposition text. It fully considers such processes and helps learners brainstorm and develop more new ideas; it also activates their previous schemata and background knowledge, motivates the students and encourages them to write with concerning over specific language items. It adopts a dynamic view toward the act of writing and considers all of the involved factors and processes which take place when producing a hortatory exposition text. Moreover, it adds more peculiar aspects to the “process writing” by its complete task cycle. It also has a complete post-task phase or “a language focus phase” in which the specific structures and forms of language are focused on. Hence, it can be stated that task-based language teaching (TBLT) is very effective in teaching writing to the eleventh grade students.

Suggestions

Related to the findings of the research, there are some suggestions: (1) to the academic institution. There is a need in the classroom activities to provide more activities to have writing task because it will encourage the students to write. It needs more opportunities to make the students improve their writing skill. Considering the potential of TBLT in enhancing students’ skills in English, it is necessary for the teacher to learn about TBLT. Therefore, the school can facilitate this by conducting workshops on TBLT, (2) to the English teacher. This study can be used as a reference for the English teacher in improving the quality of teaching by applying the suitable approach toward improving the students’ writing ability. Besides, the teacher can apply TBLT in the other aspect of English skills like reading, listening, or speaking. The research findings are expected to give insight to the teaching writing. Giving homework is one of the efforts to motivate to practice writing English. The teacher should know the students inadequacy. English teacher should give the sufficient vocabulary to solve the students’ lack of vocabulary. In grammar, teacher can focus on language focus. The correct mechanics, content, and organization can be achieved by giving more chances to the students to write. The teacher should be able to develop the teaching learning materials that have been provided in the curriculum, (3) to other researchers. This research is expected to be useful to other researchers particularly those who are

interested in conducting a similar research by giving more various tasks (e.g. jigsaw task, problem-solving task, decision-making task, and so on).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cohen, Luis et al. 2005. *Research Method in Education*. Fifth Edition. London and New York: Routledge-Falmer is an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group.
- Ellis, Rod. 2003. *Task – Based Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leaver B. I. and J. Willis, (eds). 2004. *Task- Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education: practices and programs*. Washington DC, Georgetown University Press.
- Nunan, D. 2004. *Task – Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skehan, P. 1996. *A Framework for the Implementation of Task-Based Instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van den Branden, K. 2003. *Task-Based Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.