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**ABSTRACT**

*This research aims at proving that the use of Task-based Learning (TBL) method can improve the ability of the grade X students of SMAN 3 Paluto write descriptive paragraph. The samples are X MIA 3 as the experimental group and X MIA 4 as the control group. They were selected by using purposive sampling technique. The researcher used quasi experimental research design where the two groups were given pretest and posttest. There are two variables; the use of TBL method as the independent variable and the students’ writing ability as the dependent variable. The result of the research shows that there is a significant improvement of the students’ writing ability after the students were taught using TBL method. The mean score of the experimental group before the treatment is 33.4 while the control group’s is 33. After the treatment, the mean score of the experimental group is 78.7 and the control group’s is 47.3. It is also shown that the t-counted (7.686) is higher than the t-table (2.001).It can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted. It shows that TBL method can improve the ability of the grade X students to write descriptive paragraph.*
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**INTRODUCTION**

Writing is one of the language skills in English which is taught to students of English. It combines human’s ability in listening and reading. It means that writing skill needs other skills to enrich information so that someone can express her/his feeling or ideas in written language easily. Not only information or content does someone need to compose a good writing but also other writing elements such as grammar, mechanics, organization, and vocabulary. All those elements need to be collaborated each other.

There are several types of paragraphin writing, one of them is a descriptive paragraph.The descriptive paragraph is a kind of paragraph that describes something, someone, places, animals, and situation. According to Barnet and Stubbs (1990), it is the descriptive writing that represents an impressive word that is caught by readers’ sensory impressions. It allows someone to describe physical appearance or situation of something. From the argument, in descriptive paragraph, a writer uses vivid words to draw or describe an object to bring the readers into the writer’s intention. Furthermore, the purpose of descriptive paragraph is to make the readers see, feel, and hear what the writer has seen, felt, and heard.

Based on recent curriculum of senior high school in Indonesia, namely Kurikulum 2013, the grade X students are expected to write a good descriptive text. They are expected to be able to analyze the social function, text structure, and grammar in a simple descriptive text and construct a descriptive paragraph about people, tourism destination, and historical places. On the contrary, most students especially senior high school students were not able to write the descriptive paragraph. This also occurred to the students of SMAN 3 Palu. When the researcher had a teaching practicum (Praktek Pengalaman Lapangan) in SMAN 3 Palu, she taught and observed the X grade students four times during the English class. She obtained that the grade X students of SMAN 3 Palu were still not able to use correct grammar especially simple present tense. They also found it difficult to use appropriate vocabularies and sometimes wrote the given tasks less than the required words. Moreover, they also still used incorrect punctuations and put the punctuation in a wrong place.

Referring to the above problems, the researcher was interested in conducting a research using Task-based Learning to overcome the students’ problems. Scrinever (2011) states that the task used in Task-based Learning is meant as a real-world task rather than language focus. For example, students are asked to plan a birthday party rather than to fill in gaps in exercises. It is clearly explained that the Task-based Learning allows the students to have an actual practice. The students will obtain more experiences to make something by writing rather than to complete something. Moreover, there are other definitions of task by Nunan (1989) and Skehan (1998). Nunan (1989) defines task as a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language. Skehan (1998) defines a task as an activity in which meaning is primary. Based on the definitions, task is the real-world task in the classroom activity that should be done by students so that they can comprehend the material using target language.

Furthermore, Prabhu (1987) in Harmer (2001:86) draws an example of Task-based Learning activity in the classroom as follow:

Instead of a language structure, in other words, students are presented with task they have to perform or a problem they have to solve. For example, after a class performs some pre-task activities which involve questions and vocabulary checking (e.g. What is this? It’s a timetable. What does ‘arrival’ mean?), they ask and answer questions to solve a problem such as finding train-timetable information, e.g. When does the Brindavan express leave Madras/arrive in Bangalore?.

Such kind of activity can stimulate students to produce something in the target language rather than to complete something which is really ineffective to make students’ writing skill improved. After doing the tasks, the teacher will check the students’ tasks as highlighted in Harmer (2001:87), “[…] only when the task has been completed does the teacher discuss the language that was used, making corrections and adjustments which the students’ performance of the task has shown to be desirable.”

Task-based Learning has several advantages as stated by Nunan (1989). He states, “Task-based language learning offers a lot of advantages as it is communication based and allows the learners to transfer previously acquired knowledge to new communicative contexts.” From the quotation, it can be concluded that the advantages of Task-based Learning can relate students past knowledge to be used for having a communicative language use.Furthermore,according to Ganta (2015), the strengths of Task-based Learning approach are: 1) helps learners to interact spontaneously; 2) gives language learners opportunity to learn vocabulary; 3) provides essential conditions for language learning; and 4) maximizes scope for communication.

The procedures of applying Task-based Learning was proposed by Hai-yan (2014). She demonstrates that the Task-based Learning is divided into three stages. They are pre-task activities, during-task activities, and post-task activities.

1. Stage 1: Pre-task activities

At this stage, the teacher introduces the topic and directly explains the students what task they are going to write. The teacher give several useful vocabularies and important sentence pattern that probably the students will need in constructing their writing.

2. Stage 2: During-task activities

a. Pair Work

In pair work, the students discuss the questions directed by teacher. Meanwhile, the teacher should not intrude the students’ discussion to let them experience the natural language acquisition process. However, shall the students need any helps and direction, the teacher has to be always ready to help. After this opening discussion, the students may be asked to report the results of their pair work.

b. Group Discussion

Unlike the pair work, it is the group discussion that allows every student to share any information to the bigger participants. The students are asked to discuss again about the question directed by the teacher to determine what they will write. Meanwhile, the teacher has to monitor the whole discussion.

c. First Draft

Finally, after discussing and sharing information with friends, it is the time for students to write their first draft. The students will write based on what they have gotten in the discussion and what they have planned. The students should not worry about any grammatical mistakes, inappropriate vocabulary, and incorrect punctuation. They just have to pour out their ideas.

d. Discussion of the Product

After constructing the task, the students are divided into several small groups and each group has a group leader. They are required to exchange their writing and to check their friends’ writing regarding to vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and organization. Then, the leader reports the result of the group discussion.

3. Stage 3: Post-task activities

Previous stages only emphases the meaningfulness and fluency of the communication process as well as and the expressiveness of ideas. However, those three aspects cannot guarantee that the students will produce a good writing. Therefore, at this stage the teacher should direct the students’ attention to the accuracy of language and the way of restructuring their sentences to be a better writing.

Based on the report of the group leaders, the teacher may get a brief idea of the students’ weaknesses and strengths. To make the students more understand where they lacked, the teacher can write down the language points, chunks or functionality patterns on the blackboard. After that, the teacher should give the students several tasks in order to check whether they have been understood.

**METHODOLOGY**

In conducting this research, the researcher used quasi experimental research design with one experimental class and one control class. The experimental group was given the treatment and the control one was not. Moreover, both of the groups were given a pretest and posttest. Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2005:214) draw the design of this research as follows:

O1 X O2

-------------------------

O3 O4

Where:

O1: Pretest of experimental class

O2: Posttest of experimental class

O3: Pretest of control class

O4: Posttest of control class

X: Treatment of experimental class

----------: there was no random of subject

The population of this research was the grade X MIA students of SMAN 3 Palu which was 247 in total. The samples were X MIA 3 as the experimental class and X MIA 4 as the control class. The classes were taken using a purposive sampling technique. In relation to the topic of this research, the dependent variable was the ability of the grade X students of SMAN 3 Palu to write descriptive paragraph and the independent variable was the use of Task-based Learning.

In collecting the data, the researcher used two tests as the instrument of this research which were pretest and posttest. The pretest was used to know the students’ prior writing skill before the treatment was conducted. After conducting the treatment, the students were given the posttest to measure the students’ improvement to write skill, especially to write descriptive paragraph as well as to find out the effectiveness of using Task-based Learning.

To assess the students’ writing, the researcher used a scoring rubric proposed byWeir in Weigle (2009). Since the focus of this researcher was to improve the three components of writing skill namely grammar especially the use of simple present tense, vocabulary, and punctuation, the researcher only put the grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation on the list.The scoring rubric of the test can be seen in the table 1.

Table 1. Scoring Rubric

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Writing Aspect | Score | Explanation |
| 1 | Grammar | 3  2  1  0 | * Almost no grammatical inaccuracies * Some grammatical inaccuracies * Frequent grammar inaccuracies * Almost all grammatical patterns inaccurate |
| 2 | Vocabulary | 3  2  1  0 | * Almost no inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Only rare inappropriacies and/or circumlocution * Some inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Perhaps some lexical inappropriacies and/or circumlocution * Frequent inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Perhaps frequent lexical inappropriacies and/or repetition * Vocabulary less than 100-150 words, too many repetitions and inappropriate words in context |
| 3 | Punctuation | 3  2  1  0 | * Almost no inaccuracies in punctuation * Some inaccuracies in punctuation * Low understanding of accuracy in punctuation * Ignore of conventions of punctuation |
|  | Maximum Score | 9 |  |

*Adapted from Weir in Weigle (2002)*

**FINDINGS**

In presenting the data, the researcher only focused on grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation. The data were taken from the pretest and the posttest of the experimental group and control group. The pretest was administered before conducting the treatment and the posttest was administered after implementing the treatment.In the tests, the students of X MIA 3 and X MIA 4 were asked to write a descriptive paragraph about certain topics. Then, the researcher assessed their writing by using the scoring rubric (Table 1).

The pretest was conducted on 14 November 2016 for the control group and on 15November 2016 for the experimental group. The result of the pretest of the experimental group showed that the highest score was 78, the lowest score was 11, and the mean score was 33.4.

Table 2. The Pretest Score of the Experimental Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Initials Name | Obtained Score | | | Obtained Score | Standard Score |
| Gram. 3 | Punc. 3 | Vocab. 3 |
| 1 | ADS | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 2 | ARP | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| 3 | AVT | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 22 |
| 4 | AKR | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 5 | AHP | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 6 | CMN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 7 | EAP | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 44 |
| 8 | EKS | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 9 | GBS | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 10 | GML | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 11 | ITM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 12 | JRR | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 13 | JMR | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 14 | KAI | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 15 | KDS | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 16 | KMA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 17 | MSL | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 18 | MHT | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 19 | MHI | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 20 | RDK | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| 21 | SRD | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 22 | SPW | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 23 | SRO | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 24 | SCA | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| 25 | SYR | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| 26 | TGH | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 78 |
| 27 | TRA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 28 | YPS | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 33 |
| 29 | ZHA | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 30 | MRA | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | 1003 |

Meanwhile, the result of the pretest of the control group showed that the highest score was 78, the lowest score was 11, and the mean score was 33.

Table 3. The Pretest Score of the Control Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Initial Name | Obtained Score | | | Obtained  Score | Standard Score |
| Gram. 3 | Punc. 3 | Vocab. 3 |
| 1 | ADM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 2 | ARS | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 3 | ANK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 4 | CCZ | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 44 |
| 5 | DRN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 6 | ELR | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 7 | ELL | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 8 | EEA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 9 | GIS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 10 | GID | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 11 | HDP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 12 | PES | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 13 | IDS | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 14 | INA | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 15 | JGT | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 16 | KTT | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| 17 | KHA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 18 | MTR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 19 | MSR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 20 | MYS | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 21 | MFN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 22 | MLM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 23 | NHR | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 24 | RZA | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 25 | SNP | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 |
| 26 | SNF | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 27 | STM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 28 | SYB | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 29 | WLD | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 30 | DNS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 31 | RCC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | 1024 |

After administering the pretest to the students, the researcher then conducted the treatment which was Task-based Learning in teaching them how to write the descriptive paragraph. The treatment was only conducted to the experimental group and lasted for eight meetings where each meeting took 2x45 minutes. The control group was taught by their teacher using conventional method.

The posttest was administered afterwards on 12December 2016 for the control group and on 14December 2016 for the experimental group.After computing the students’ scores, the researcher revealed the result of both groups. The result of the posttest of the experimental group showed that the highest score was 100, the lowest score was 55, and the mean score was 78.7. It increased about 45.4 from the previous test.

Table 4. The Posttest Score of the Experimental Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Initials Name | Obtained Score | | | Obtained  Score | Standard  Score |
| Gram. 3 | Punc. 3 | Vocab. 3 |
| 1 | ADS | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 2 | ARP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 3 | AVT | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 4 | AKR | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 5 | AHP | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 6 | CMN | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 7 | EAP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 8 | EKS | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 9 | GBS | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 10 | GML | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
| 11 | ITM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 100 |
| 12 | JRR | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 100 |
| 13 | JMR | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
| 14 | KAI | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 15 | KDS | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 16 | KMA | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 17 | MSL | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
| 18 | MHT | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 19 | MHI | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 20 | RDK | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 21 | SRD | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 22 | SPW | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 23 | SRO | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 24 | SCA | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 25 | SYR | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 26 | TGH | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 27 | TRA | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 28 | YPS | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 29 | ZHA | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 89 |
| 30 | MRA | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 68 |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | 2360 |

The researcher also found that there was no significance increase of the control group’s posttest result. The result showed that the highest score was 78, the lowest score was 33, and the mean score was 47.3. It only increased about 14.3.

Table 5. The Posttest Score of the Control Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Initial Name | Obtained Score | | | Obtained Score | Standard  Score |
| Gram. 3 | Punc. 3 | Vocab. 3 |
| 1 | ADM | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 2 | ARS | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 3 | ANK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 4 | CCZ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
| 5 | DRN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 6 | ELR | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
| 7 | ELL | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 8 | EEA | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 9 | GIS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 10 | GID | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 11 | HDP | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 12 | PES | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 13 | IDS | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 14 | INA | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 15 | JGT | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 55 |
| 16 | KTT | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 17 | KHA | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 44 |
| 18 | MTR | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 19 | MSR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 20 | MYS | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 21 | MFN | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 22 | MLM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 23 | NHR | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 24 | RZA | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 78 |
| 25 | SNP | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 26 | SNF | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 27 | STM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
| 28 | SYB | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 44 |
| 29 | WLD | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 30 | DNS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| 31 | RCC | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 44 |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | 1468 |

After presenting the individual score and the mean score of the students, then the researcher computed the deviation and squared deviation. Based on the calculation, it was found that the highest deviation (d) of the experimental group score was 67 and the highest square deviation (d2) was 4489 while the highest deviation (d) of the control group score was 33 while the highest square deviation (d2) was 1089. After getting the deviation of the pretest and posttest in each class,then the researcher calculated the mean deviation score for both experimental and the control group. Finally, the mean deviation of the mean deviation of the experimental group was 45.2 and the mean deviation of the control group was 14.3.

The researcher then calculated the mean square deviation score of the experimental class and the control class.The mean square deviation score of the experimental class was 10333.4and the mean square deviation score of the control class was 4424.8. In order to find out the significance between the experimental class and control class, the researcher then analyzed the data by using formula. The result of the data analysis showed that the t-counted was 7.686. By applying 0.05 level of significant with the degree of freedom (df) N1 + N2 – 2 = 30 + 31 – 2 = 59, the researcher found that t-counted (7.686) was higher than t-table (2.001). It means that the hypothesis was accepted. In other words, using Task-based Learning can improve the ability of students to write descriptive paragraph.

**DISCUSSION**

In this part, the researcher discusses about the finding of the researcher. After having a preliminary observation at SMAN 3 Palu, the researcher found that the grade X students were not able to write a descriptive paragraph properly especially in using correct grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation. Based on that problem, after the students were given the pretest, the researcher then implemented a method which was Task-based Learning to the experimental group.

The researcher followed the procedures of Task-based Learning proposed by Hai-yan (2014) where there are three stages in conducting the method. The first stage is pre-task activity. At this stage, the researcher gave the students useful vocabularies and important sentence patterns which would be needed during the construction of their drafts. For instance, at the first meeting, the topic was my idol. Then, the researcher provided the students with suitable vocabularies and sentence patterns for the topic such as “My favorite singer is ....” and “EXO is my favorite Korean boy band”. The next stage is during-task activities which consist of pair work, discussion, first draft, and discussion of the product. In pair work and discussion, the students were asked to discuss the questions directed by the researcher and determined what would they write. The questions existed to stimulate the students’ idea before they started to complete the task. The questions were, again, based on the topic each meeting. For example, at the first meeting, the questions were “Who is your favorite idol?”, “What does she/he do?”, “Why do you adore her/him?”, “How is her/his physical appearance?” etc. After having a small discussion, the students individually started to write their first writings. They were asked to only focus on constructing their ideas and should not feel afraid of making mistakes while writing the paragraph. After completing their drafts, the researcher asked them to go back to their previous group discussions to exchange their writings and check their friends’ writings. Finally, at the last stage which is post-task activity, the researcher gave correction to the students’ writing and directed the students’ attention to the mechanics of writing particularly the use of simple present tense, vocabulary, and punctuation.

The application of Task-based Learning requires the students to do a repetition activity: writing. Every meeting they were asked to write a paragraph and the researcher gave correction to their writing of each meeting. Hence, the students realized where they still lacked and what they should improve. Furthermore, Task-based Learning allows the students to have an actual and real-world task, such as having an observation, making a postcard, and writing a daily journal. The students were more motivated when completing the task because the task was closely related to their activity.

However, when applying each stage of the proposed procedures, the researcher obtained several difficulties. First, the students often felt bored when they were asked to do the pair discussion and the group discussion. They preferred to get directly to the group discussion because the discussed questions were same either. Second, since the students had limited ability in constructing the task, they spent much time at the first draft stage so that the researcher had less time to give correction to their writings.

After conducting the treatment, both of the groups undertook a posttest to know the achievement of each group and to prove whether the hypothesis was accepted. The mean scores of the pretest of the experimental group and the control group are 33.4 and 33 respectively. The result of the experimental group’s posttest increases significantly where the mean score of the posttest of the experimental group (78.7) is higher than the mean score of the control group’s posttest (47.3). The researcher also realizes that there is a significant progress from their tasks. Most of the students in the experimental group have understood about how to construct a descriptive paragraph properly with correct simple present tense, vocabulary, and punctuation. Meanwhile, the control group did not show any significant progress. By looking at the progress of the students’ achievement to write descriptive paragraph, it can be concluded that using Task-based Learning can improve the ability of the students to write descriptive paragraph.

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

After analyzing and discussing the data in the previous explanation, the researcher finally concludes that the Task-based Learning significantly improves the ability of the students to write descriptive paragraph. It can be seen from the mean score of the experimental group which increases significantly. The mean score of the experimental group before the treatment is 33.4 while the control group’s is 33. After the treatment, the mean score of the experimental group is 78.7 and the control group’s is 47.3. Additionally, the result of the data analysis indicates that the hypothesis of this research is accepted. It can be seen from the t-counted (7.686) that is higher than the t-table (2.001).

Based on the conclusion, the researcher would like to give some recommendations for those who are involved in English learning process. Here are the recommendations:

First, the students should not be afraid of making mistakes when they are asked to write something in English because everybody makes mistakes. Hence the teacher can know what the students lack and then try to solve the problem.

Second, based on the experiences in applying this method, there is one thing to pay attention on that is a teacher should give a plenty of time and a fair chance to the students to explore and practice their own ideas.

Third, during the treatment, the researcher found a problem that was the time allocation was limited because the English class was separated by pray time (Dzuhur). Here are some tips for the next researchers who want to conduct a research using Task-based Learning: a) the researcher should come on time to the class; b) the researcher should not spend much time in the pre-task activity so that the students will have more time in the during-task activity especially to write their first draft; and c) the researcher should warn the students to come right after the pray time has finished.

Lastly,this research has been proven to be a good method to improve the students’ writing ability particularly to write descriptive paragraph. For the future researchers who plan to conduct a research using Task-based Learning, it may be also good for other skills such as speaking.
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