

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Description of Data

4.1.1 Finding of Preliminary Study

4.1.1.1 The result of Interview

Pre interview of this research was held on Thursday, April 19th 2018 started at 07.00 A.M. until 07.45 A.M. during the interview, the teacher was asked some questions. The questions were about the general condition in teaching learning process of English material especially writing subject in the X-8 class, and then about the difficulties faced by the students in writing, about their participation, and the strategy that is used by the teacher in teaching writing and about task based learning.

In general, teaching learning process in the class was conducted as usual. In where there were pre activities like brainstorming, main activities, and post activities. In writing subject, the teacher used some activities such as grouping and individual work. The other question is about some difficulties faced by the students. The teacher gives some arguments, which is as it knows that writing is one of difficult skill among other skill to be learnt by students. The students usually feel difficult in generating their idea into a paragraph. It may be caused of lack of vocabulary, grammatical understanding, less critical thinking and choosing suitable word in a sentence.

The next question was about the strategy that is used by the teacher in teaching writing subject and asking about the task-based learning. The teacher said that he ever used task-based learning in writing subject in different English class and different type of writing text, and he has known about task-based learning. He argued that task-based learning can be an effective strategy in

teaching writing because it can facilitate the students in generating their ideas.

The conclusion of the interview in the term of students' difficulties in writing was the tenth grade students of X-8 SMA Negeri 13 Surabaya had problems in writing in the term of generating ideas, organizing idea into paragraph, critical thinking and grammatical function.

4.1.1.2 The result of pre-test

The pre-test was conducted on Friday, April 20th 2018. In pretest, the students of X-8 class at SMA Negeri 13 Surabaya assigned to write explanation paragraph consisting of five sentences or more about their opinion related to questions which given. To get the result of the pre-test of writing aspect, firstly the mean score was calculated such following:

1. Students' writing aspect score

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$X = \frac{1.381}{34}$$

$$X = 40.7$$

2. Students' critical thinking aspect score

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$X = \frac{1.228}{34}$$

$$X = 36$$

Next, to know the class percentage that passed the minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* using the following formula:

1. Student writing aspect

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{4}{34} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 12\%$$

2. Student critical thinking

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{4}{34} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 12\%$$

The data score made by using writing and critical thinking rubric which was adopted and modified to find the significant result. Based on the result of the pre-test, the data showed that the writing mean score of pre-test was 40.7 and 36 for critical thinking aspect. There were only four students or 12% in both writing and critical thinking aspect of the students who got the score above the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* meanwhile the other 30 students were below the criterion. From that analyzing, it could be seen that the students score and ability in writing explanation paragraph and their critical thinking were still very low.

After analyzing the result of preliminary study, it could be concluded that most of the students at tenth year of SMA Negeri 13 Surabaya had difficulty in writing skill and produce their critical thinking skill. So, it needed method to find out the solution to overcome this problem. The teacher used task-based learning in teaching writing as an innovation in teaching learning process.

The action was needed to improve students' critical thinking ability in writing skill. The action research conducted in one cycle for two meetings. Every meeting followed the procedures of action research involving planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. In one cycle was conducted in two meetings. The following was the explanation of the action research results.

4.1.2 Finding in Cycle

4.1.2.1 Meeting I

a. Planning

There are some activities which conducted in this phase. The plan was attended by teacher as a collaborator and researcher as an observer. The teacher and observer discussed the preparation for implementing teaching learning in the class. The teacher and observer discussed about lesson plan and made sure it is suitable for subject and method which would be used. The lesson plan consisted of indicators, learning objectives, designing steps of teaching learning activities, assessment instrument, and learning material. The lesson plan in this cycle was one lesson plan which consisted of two meetings activities and selected the appropriate material. The learning material used in accordance with the syllabus of government of senior high school about explanation text of natural phenomena. The teacher also was told about the method used in the research so the teacher could be easily teaching the students. The learning model also prepared the model of task-based learning. The model of task-based learning was using grouping. The

material and source of study were also prepared, besides the media of learning also prepared.

After that, the preparation of learning instrument and teaching aid such as Laptop, power point, LCD, and mini sound speaker. Then the preparation of observation sheet, and the teacher gave the students' list of name and there was agreement with all the planning and ready to be applied. Furthermore, the researcher and teacher determined the criteria of success. The criterion of success was 75% of the students' writing score achieved the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)*.

b. Action and Observation

Action of the first meeting was conducted on April 20th 2018. In this section took 2 x 45 minutes. In this meeting the activity was divided into three activities they are: pre activity, main activity and post activity which was conducted in 90 minutes.

In pre activity teacher came to class the by giving greeting to the students. The students answered respectfully. The teacher introduced the researcher to the students and after that he conveyed the purposes of learning at that day. The students looked so excited and interested because they like to meet a new people. Then the teacher pleased the observer to sit behind the students to do observation. Then the teacher invited the students to pray before starting the lesson. After that the teacher check attendance list. All of students present at that day. Then the teacher explained the outlines of the material and what the students would do.

After that the teacher was going to the main activity, In the first meeting, the teacher asked the students to make their own group which consists 3-4 students and sat together according to the number of their group, and the number of group divided into 8 groups. Then the teacher gave pre-test for the students and asked them to do the test in group. The test was conducted for 45 minutes, there are 5 questions that had to be answered by students and the models of questions are essays. In the pre-test sheet there were vocabulary lists so the students do not need to ask to teacher about the meaning in each question. The questions were about what was the opinion of students about climate change that happens to earth now days. The questions were essays or guideline model which consisted of 5 questions and the questions are about the change of climate or natural phenomena, related to the eco-composition of environment. In each questions had different focus, in the first question the students were command to give the answer in the form of essay minimum one paragraph about two different pictures of river which has significant differences. In the second question the students were commanded to see the significant differences between two period of time where long time ago the way was quiet and nowadays the ways are full of transportation, in the third question the students were commanded to think and find what causes some differences in their environment, in the forth question the students were reminded about the effect for their life and next generations, and the last question commanded the students to find out how to solve the problem related to the question before. The

students were so serious in doing their assignment in group. After the students doing their post test, they were commanded to gather their post-test paper on teacher's table. Then they were asked to discuss the question number 1 to 5 one by one.

After doing the pre-test the students collect their work to the teacher's table. After that the teacher showed the video related to the topic that would be given to the students. The video was about the climate change or natural phenomena which taken from YouTube which had durations about 5 minutes and 49 seconds. After watching the video, the teacher asked some questions about what happening in the video and the students could answer as means they pay attentions when watching the video. Then the teacher gave a worksheet which consisted 3 paragraphs of text about air pollution and 3 questions related the text. The teacher explained what the students should do and he gave them 20 minutes to do that task by discussing with their group. Before the teacher start the timer, he asked the students about their understanding related to the assignment and the one of the students raised his hand and asked about how many lines should they write and the teacher answered that they need to write minimum one paragraph in each question.

The students did the assignment focus with their group. After 20 minutes passed, the teacher announced to students that the time was up so they had to stop answering. After that they discuss what had been answered by students together by giving their statements in front of class, each group were so spirit

to come forward to give opinion or statement. The last activity was post activity where the teacher asked students to conclude and review the conclusion of their discussion. Finally the teacher closed teaching and learning activity by greeting after bell was ringing.

The observation in the class started from the beginning of teaching learning activity until the post activity. The researcher observed the teaching learning process by monitoring the students' activities in the cycle. In fact, the first meeting was not running well. The students still looked confused, and still felt difficult to generate their ideas into a readable text of explanation. There are many students still asking about the meaning of some words in worksheet to teacher and the teacher looked unable to handle them because they asked in the same times. There were many members of group did not contribute their ideas and choose to talk each other. It caused of most of students had problems in looking for vocabularies and correct grammar.

c. Reflection

After doing the action and observation, the teacher and observer did the reflection; they analyzed and evaluated teaching learning process that had been done. Based on the observation in the first meeting the teacher and observer saw that the students still had some problems in writing explanation text from seeing the data of worksheet and pre-test, the students did not work together because they were 3-4 students in one group. The teacher suggested that was better to make individual model post-test than in grouping and the

teacher focused on how the students could be able writing their own ideas related the topic of explanation text that would be given in the next meeting individually to get the significant and best result.

4.1.2.2 Meeting II

a. Planning

In the second meeting, the teacher and researcher discussed the preparation for implementing teaching learning in the class. The teacher and observer discussed about lesson plan and made sure it is suitable for subject and method which would be used in the class. After doing the observation in the first meeting, the teacher and researcher fixed the lesson plan and the post test paper design and content by giving some lines to make the students were easier to write. The model also prepared that was task-based learning. The model of task-based learning was using individual looking back from the pre-test the student were not working together as a group. Beside, the material and source of study was prepared to support the activities of teaching learning, the media of learning are laptop, power point, and video related the topic, mini sound speaker to make the teaching learning running well. Furthermore, the researcher and teacher determined the criteria of success. The criterion of success was 75% of the students' writing score achieved the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)*.

b. Action and Observation

Action of the second meeting was conducted on April, 27th 2018. In this section there are three activities which the teacher conducted, they are pre activity, main activity and post activity. In pre activity teacher came to class and entered the by giving greeting to the students. The teacher pleased the researcher to sit behind the students. Then the teacher invited the students to pray before starting the lesson. After that the teacher check attendance list. All of students present at that day. Then the teacher explained the outline of the material was about explanation text and what the students would do after they learn it. The observer sat behind the class to observe teaching learning activity. After that the teacher switched on laptop and LCD to start the teaching learning activities. The teacher implemented the teaching learning process based on the lesson plan had been made.

In the main activity, the teacher started by encouraging the students by asking what did they learn in previous meeting, after the students answering, the teacher started to give explanation about explanation text began from the meaning, structure, organization, language features, purposes, impersonal language, example of explanation text and how to write explanation text which had been prepared in power point, he explain one by one in every slides and the students were paid attention when the teacher explained and they tried to get what the teacher mean. After that the teacher asked the students about their understanding or if they had any questions about the material that had been explained. No students wanted to try to ask some

question, so the teacher asked the students to make sure that they understand. The teacher asked “what is explanation text?” then one of the students raised her hand and answered “explanation text is the text which explain how and why something happens, for example like earth quake and air pollution”. After that the teacher asked again one more question about the purposes of explanation text but there were no students who tried to answer, then the teacher repeated the explanation about the purposes of explanation text and point one of students to answer the same question and she answered what is the purpose of explanation text correctly.

After the teacher ensured that the students had already understood, the teacher applied task-based learning method. In the second meeting the students were leaded to do post test activity. Different from the pre-test in the first meeting, post-test used individual work. The students were command to do the post-test by themselves and using their own words without cheating with others student. The post test used essays model which consisted only one command. The students were commanded to write one or more paragraphs of explanation text about natural phenomenon by choosing their own title and topic this made to make students focus on their own ideas and work. The students looked so serious without asking to other because they have different topic in their mind. The students were given 60 minutes to do the post test considering they work individual. After 60 minutes left the teacher announced that the time was over and they must submit their work to the teacher’s table.

The last activity was post activity, the teacher asked the students related to the teaching learning activities today. Teacher asked if there were some questions related to the topic today he was ready to explain. There was no students raised their hands as assumed that they had already understood. Then at the last time the teacher review the lesson that has been learned, after that he closed the meeting by greeting. The observation was carried out and saw that in the second meeting the class was running better than the first meeting. The students were not confused, and they did not feel difficult to generate their ideas into a readable text of explanation.

c. Reflection

After did the action and observation, the teacher and observer doing reflection on 28th April 2018. They evaluated the teaching learning process that had been done. Based on the observation, interview with representative students and teacher, the implementation of task-based learning through eco-composition can give the improvement to the students' critical thinking of X-8 SMA Negeri 13 Surabaya. The first improvement was the enthusiastic and participant of students in following the lesson. The second was the improvement of students' critical thinking ability in writing explanation text; it can be seen from the students score. After knowing the score, students' writing and answer in post –test activity, some problems which was found such as students less comprehend, bored, less interest in writing before doing the research in this class is solved.

Beside, all of learning processes using task-based learning method through eco-composition was running well. Even though there were students who still opening dictionary and they made a little grammatical error but it could be accepted. Overall, the teacher and observer did not find a significant problem in applying teaching learning activities.

The teacher gave observer some feedbacks about the use of TBL for the future. He said that teaching learning using TBL is very useful for the students in writing explanation text and it can improve students' critical thinking and writing ability. The students got motivation and felt confident in writing because they knew how to write generate their ideas in paper. In sum up, it can be concluded that the implementation of task-based learning through eco-composition can improve students' critical thinking and writing ability.

4.1.3 Finding after Implementing the Action

4.1.3.1 The result of students writing

In this stage the improvement of students' writing ability showed. To know the result of students' writing, it needs to calculate the mean score firstly. The mean score derived from the following formula:

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$
$$X = \frac{2.760}{34}$$
$$X = 81$$

Then, the researcher calculated the class percentage that passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{32}{34} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 94\%$$

The data showed that the mean score of post-test was 81. There were thirty two students or 94% of the students who got the score above the Minimum Mastery Criterion or *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* meanwhile the other two students were below that criterion. It implied that the first criterion fulfilled.

Based on the result of the students' writing, there was a slight improvement of students' mean score from the students' writing on the preliminary study to the students' writing on the first cycle. The mean score of the previous score was 40.7 and the mean score of the students' writing on the first cycle was 81. That means that there was 40.3 points of mean score improvement. The improvement percentage derived from the formula:

$$P = \frac{y_1 - y}{y} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{81 - 40.7}{40.7} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 80\%$$

4.1.3.2 The result of students critical thinking

In this stage the improvement of students' critical thinking ability showed. To know the result of students' writing, it needs to calculate the mean score firstly. The mean score derived from the following formula:

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$X = \frac{2.720}{34}$$

$$X = 80$$

Then, the calculations of the class percentage that passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* used the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{32}{34} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 94\%$$

The data showed that the mean critical thinking score of post-test was 80. There were thirty two students or 94% of the students who got the score above the Minimum Mastery Criterion or *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* meanwhile the other 2 students were below that criterion. It implied that the first criterion fulfilled.

Based on the result of the students' writing, there was a slight improvement of students' mean score from the students' critical thinking on the preliminary study to the students' writing on the first cycle. The mean score of the previous score was 36 and the mean score of the students' writing on the first cycle was 80. That means that there was 44 points of mean score improvement.

The improvement percentage derived from the formula:

$$P = \frac{y_1 - y}{y} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = \frac{80 - 36}{36} \times 100 \%$$

$$P = 79\%$$

Table 4.1

The result of pre-test students' writing score

Number	Students' Number	Pre-Test
1	S1	32
2	S2	39
3	S3	39
4	S4	26
5	S5	46
6	S6	20
7	S7	34
8	S8	39
9	S9	34
10	S10	70
11	S11	20
12	S12	32
13	S13	20
14	S14	77*
15	S15	70
16	S16	77*
17	S17	22
18	S18	26
19	S19	22
20	S20	39
21	S21	22
22	S22	32
23	S23	34
24	S24	77*
25	S25	70
26	S26	46
27	S27	22
28	S28	20
29	S29	32
30	S30	26
31	S31	77*
32	S32	70
33	S33	46
34	S34	26
Mean		40.7

*Note: *) students who passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion (KKM) Seventy five (75).*

The score was gotten from the students writing and the score was taken by using writing and critical thinking rubric which had been modified. After the teaching action had been implemented, the researcher carried out the interview to English teacher who acted as a collaborator. It was to know his response about implementation the action. The result of post-test showed that the mean score of the class derived 81 in which there were 32 students who passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM) 75 (seventy five)*.

Table 4.2
The comparison of Students' Score

Number	Students' Number	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
		Writing	Critical Thinking	Writing	Critical Thinking
1	S1	32	26	81	80
2	S2	39	26	78	79
3	S3	39	26	79	80
4	S4	26	22	82	81
5	S5	46	32	83	82
6	S6	20	16	80	81
7	S7	34	28	86	80
8	S8	39	26	79	81
9	S9	34	28	81	82
10	S10	70	71	81	80
11	S11	20	16	79	79
12	S12	32	26	81	80
13	S13	20	16	72	74
14	S14	77*	81	81	82
15	S15	70	71	81	80
16	S16	77*	81	81	81
17	S17	22	20	82	80
18	S18	26	22	84	81
19	S19	22	20	82	80
20	S20	39	26	78	79
21	S21	22	20	85	83
22	S22	32	26	81	80
23	S23	34	28	85	81
24	S24	77*	81	81	82
25	S25	70	71	81	80
26	S26	46	32	84	83
27	S27	22	20	85	81
28	S28	20	16	71	73
29	S29	32	26	81	80
30	S30	26	22	85	82
31	S31	77*	81	81	83
32	S32	70	71	81	82
33	S33	46	32	84	81
34	S34	26	22	85	79
Mean		40.7	36	81	80

From the data above, it could be concluded that the implementation of task-based learning has given satisfactory result on the improvement of students' critical thinking and writing ability. The students had achieved the Minimum Mastery Criterion- *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM)* after two meetings in one cycle.

The students' critical thinking score would be explained in detail in the tables below;

Table 4.3
Students' Critical Thinking Detail Aspects of Pre-Test

Group	Pre-Test						Total Score
	Explanation Issues	Contexts	Perspective	Assumptions	Evidence	Implication	
A	14	14	15	14	8	6	71
B	3	4	4	4	3	2	20
C	5	5	4	6	5	3	28
D	5	5	4	7	6	5	32
E	5	5	4	5	4	3	26
F	3	4	4	4	3	4	22
G	5	5	4	5	4	3	26
H	16	16	16	13	10	10	81
I	2	4	3	3	2	2	16
Mean	6.4	6.8	6.4	6.7	5	4.2	36

Table 4.4
Students' Critical Thinking Detail Aspects of Post-Test

Student	Post-Test						Total Score
	Explanation Issues	Contexts	Perspective	Assumptions	Evidence	Implication	
1	16	16	16	13	9	10	80
2	15	17	14	14	9	11	79
3	16	16	16	13	9	10	80
4	16	16	15	13	10	11	81
5	17	15	16	13	9	12	82
6	17	16	15	12	8	13	81
7	15	16	17	12	10	10	80
8	15	17	15	11	11	12	81
9	16	15	16	14	11	10	82
10	15	15	15	13	11	11	80
11	13	14	16	15	10	11	79
12	14	14	15	15	10	12	80
13	13	13	14	13	11	10	74
14	16	15	16	13	10	12	82
15	15	16	15	12	12	10	80
16	15	15	15	14	10	12	81
17	14	15	14	15	9	13	80
18	15	16	15	14	10	11	81
19	14	14	15	14	11	12	80
20	13	14	15	16	11	10	79
21	17	15	16	13	10	12	83
22	15	16	15	12	12	10	80
23	15	15	15	15	10	11	81
24	16	15	16	13	10	12	82
25	16	15	16	13	10	10	80
26	17	15	16	13	11	11	83
27	15	15	15	15	10	11	81
28	14	14	13	12	11	9	73
29	15	16	15	14	9	11	80
30	15	16	15	14	11	11	82
31	16	16	15	15	12	9	83
32	16	15	16	13	10	12	82
33	15	15	15	15	10	11	81
34	15	15	15	14	10	10	79
Mean	15	15	15	13.5	10	11	80

From the data above it could be seen that most of student score was good in the aspects of explaining issues, contexts and perspective. In the pre-test the mean of students score in the aspect of explain issues was 6.4, contexts 6.8, perspective 6.4, assumptions 6.7, evidence 5, and implication 4.2, so the calculation of the score was 36, it could be seen that the students score which was still low or under expectation.

After the implementation of teaching learning, the students' critical thinking increased in the aspect of explain issues from 6.4 to 15, contexts 6.8 to 15, perspective from 6.4 to 15, assumptions 6.7 to 13.5, evidence from 5 to 10, and implication from 4.2 to 11.

After knowing the students' critical thinking score and ability in detail in each aspect in the previous explanation it could be seen that the students' who got the highest score of critical thinking was Student 14, 16, 24 and 31 by getting total score 81 in pre-test and Student 21, 26 in the post test. The lowest score obtained by Student 6, 11 and 28 in the pre-test who got 16 score, and in the post test the student 13 and 28 who got the score 73 and 74.

All of the result of instruments after accomplishing the classroom action research revealed the good result from implementing task-based learning in explanation writing. The students admitted that they were interested this technique. They felt easier in writing explanation text. The students looked motivated and confident in writing. The improvement of critical thinking of the students can be seen in the pre-test and post-test. The students' critical thinking could be seen if the students can formulate the ideas and facts, analyze problems systematically and find some solutions related to the questions. The score was taken in each students writing by maximum 17 points in explain issues aspects, 17 points of contexts, 17 points of perspective, 17 points of assumptions, 16 points of evidence, and 16 points of implication, so the calculation of the score would be 100 if their writing category perfect. So the student score was made by identified and gave points according to students' writing.

The sample of the student writing as follows;

Students' writing (Student 32) : "Global warming is a bad thing for the earth and the life on it. Many things cause global warming. Earth naturally insulated by a delicate balance of heat-trapping (greenhouse) gases in the atmosphere. These gases protect the earth, when the sun shines the earth these gases absorb some the heat of the sunlight to keep the earth warm enough to support the life. However, human activities since the industrial revolution have released more and more carbon dioxide so it has increased the concentration of greenhouse gases. That is the most important thing that causes global warming. There are still many things that cause global warming and they are still caused by human activities, for example deforestation. Global warming is the worst thing that may happen in the earth, but it doesn't mean that Global warming progress cannot be fixed. We can solve this global warming problem to avoid the worst effect of global warming. These are some ways that we can do to solve global warming:

1. Don't cut down the tree. We must plant the trees and keep them well.
2. Minimize the used of electricity.
3. Save the water
4. Minimize the used of AC
Every little thing that we do now will determine the kind of world in the future, so keep saving the earth".

After identified the students' writing, the researcher decided giving score in each aspects of writing and critical thinking that students answer and calculated all of the points so that the score was found in pre-test and also post test.

Considering the explanation above, it can be concluded that the research was successful and the technique task-based learning technique through eco-composition can improve the students' writing and critical thinking ability in writing explanation text although still there were some weakness such as in grouping model there were some students who did not focus to generate their ideas because they did not feel needed considering the group members were three to four students but overall students could enjoy the teaching learning section well. Beside, the improvement of students' ability in critical thinking and writing explanation text can be supported by the improvement of students' score. The result of pre-test and post-test showed a significant improvement.

4.2 Discussion

Based on the observation, the observer found some problems faced by students such as they do not have ideas to write, they were confused in organizing in writing, lack vocabulary and less critical thinking in giving comment and solution related to the topic. Those problems were important to be solved and the implementation of Task-Based Learning (TBL) were chosen as the method to improve students writing and critical thinking ability in writing explanation text in the class by giving topic about climate changes as their topic to encourage their critical thinking.

Willis (1996: 26) has stated about several types of TBL tasks which could be implemented. They are: listing, ranking items, comparing items, problem-solving activities and creative tasks. Among those types of TBL, comparing items and problem-solving activities were implemented in teaching-learning activity in the class related to this research. The comparison and problem solving activities of TBL was implemented by asking the students to make comparison between two things in this case they compared about natural phenomena or in specific about climate change so the students had to problem solving related to the topic.

This research had applied the activities TBL processes which had been suggested by Willis. The first process was 'pre task'; this step had been implemented in this research by setting up a task. The second was 'task cycle' this process had been implemented in this research by giving the students change to perform. The third was 'language focus' components which had been implemented closely specific to language used the students in the task.

Based on the result of students' writing score, it was found that the students' writing in an explanation text was gradually improving significant. It was showed that there was a good impact of task-based learning toward the increasing of students' ability in writing explanation text. The use of task-based learning in teaching writing could overcome the research problem that is how to improve students' critical thinking ability and writing explanation text. The students also had positive response to the implementation of teaching

explanation writing using task based learning could improve the students' critical thinking and writing ability.

Filename: 2. BAB 4 - Ria Novia (201411111111)
Directory: D:\Kuliah\S1\=8th SEMESTER\Skripsi OK\Skripsi Revisi OK\SKRIPSI UM
SURABAYA 2018 BY RIA NOVIA (201411111111)\3. Isi
Template: C:\Users\user\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dotm
Title:
Subject:
Author: user
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 8/31/2018 9:51:00 PM
Change Number: 7
Last Saved On: 9/1/2018 1:48:00 PM
Last Saved By: user
Total Editing Time: 26 Minutes
Last Printed On: 9/2/2018 2:04:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 26
Number of Words: 4,839 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 27,583 (approx.)