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ABSTRACT

Writing skills are one of the skills that must be mastered by language learners. As an effort to improve writing skills, the researcher uses the Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach. The TBLT approach is carried out on 19 level 1 students of the English Literature study program in learning descriptive writing skills in English. The type of research conducted is Classroom Action Research (CAR) in collaboration with lecturers of Writing 1 class. The research is supported by qualitative and quantitative data to determine the students’ improvement in the process of learning descriptive writing using TBLT. The results show a significant increase in the results of descriptive writing tests conducted in the first and second cycles. In addition, the use of TBLT can motivate students in the learning process. The results of this study were obtained based on the grades of the descriptive writing tests, observations and questionnaires. The results of the post-test indicate an increase in the average student score to 85.6 from the average pre-test score of 62.2. Finally, the results of the questionnaire also show that almost all students agreed to use TBLT as a guide in Descriptive writing, and it has proven to be able to improve the students’ writing skills.
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INTRODUCTION

Writing skills in English is an aspect of complex language skills, and they need to be taught to students optimally. This is also stated by Hyland (2003) who said that "writing is difficult and complex because it includes a number of components, such as the structure of the language, the function of the text, the theme, the process of writing, the content and the genre, and the writing context" (Hyland, 2003, p. 2).

Various efforts have been made by teachers so that students can produce writing in English well. These efforts are usually related to changes in the pattern of teaching English. Innovative and varied teaching approaches, strategies, techniques, methods and media are also measures taken to improve the students’ competence and mastery of English language skills. Thus, writing skills do not merely involve copying words and sentences but expressing and developing thoughts, arguments, and ideas, in an orderly, logical, and systematic writing structure, so that it is easily understood by the readers.
Writing, according to Wagiran and Doyin (2010, p. 2), is one of the language skills used in indirect communication. Therefore, writing requires a process of learning and practice. For example, in writing essays, the writer must be skilled in using vocabulary, sentence structures or grammar rules used, so that the writer is able to clearly describe or present information. It is the reason why writing requires training and proper use of media. Based on some opinions by experts, it can be concluded that writing is the expression of ideas into written form using the correct grammar rules.

In an effort to improve student writing skills, several educational institutions make writing one of the subjects or courses at the college level because writing skills are highly essential to support academic writing activities. This is as mentioned by Brown (2001, p. 219) regarding the function of writing skills for academic writing, namely writings related to pedagogical purposes, such as: general subject papers and reports; essays, compositions; journals, technical reports, theses and dissertations.

This research was conducted in one of the courses offered in the English Literature study program, namely Writing 1. The learning purpose of Writing 1 is to improve the students’ competence in writing English texts. Students are expected to be able to produce writings using the correct vocabulary and grammar or proper language rules.

Based on the results of the preliminary study conducted through observation and discussion on 18 October 2018 with the lecturer in Writing 1 in class 1 SA 05 in the English Literature Study Program, it is learned that the ability of students to write descriptive essays is still relatively low. From the results of the pre-test, it is understood that the types of errors that often occur in descriptive writing include inappropriate use of English vocabulary, errors in the spelling of words and improper English sentence structure, and inappropriate development of ideas and patterns of sentence development. In addition, the researchers also identify the problems in the learning activities carried out by the instructors in giving lectures. The problems that occur include:

1. Non-systematic learning methods.
2. Less than optimal management of learning time to train the students’ writing skills.
3. Difficulties among students when instructed to write descriptive texts.

To address these problems in this class, the researcher proposes active, creative, and productive learning using the appropriate approach in teaching English.

The researcher assumes that students need a systematic teaching method in the learning process of writing to train the students’ writing skills, create active learning involving the students’ activeness in the learning process, and design learning assignments to improve their writing skills. Writing skills are productive skills requiring the students to express their ideas, concepts, messages, feelings, and imagination. In connection with this, the researcher chooses a reliable approach that can help improve the situation in writing 1 class at this time. The communicative approach is selected by the researcher because communicative activities can trigger the students to play an active role in the learning process. The type of communicative approach used by the researcher is TBLT or the task-
based language teaching. Descriptive writing learning activities will involve structured tasks in accordance with TBLT procedures that have been designed in such a way by the researcher and partnering lecturers to improve the students; learning process and outcomes in the classroom.

TBLT’s approach to teaching foreign or second languages is commonly used in speaking skills because TBLT is a communicative approach. Nevertheless, the TBLT approach can also be used as a work plan that can be used by teachers so that learning activities are focused. Nunan (1989) argues that the methods of teaching foreign and second languages based on communicative language teaching present the benefits of changing the focus from teacher-centered classroom setting to student-centered setting. Furthermore, Nunan stated that in the communicative language teaching, the learning process represents the needs of students, and the activities carried out encourage students to be active in communication (involving the exchanging of information and negotiating meaning).

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is one of the communicative approaches in the form of interactive activities involving the students to understand using a second language, and these activities are designed through the assignment of tasks within learning activities (Nunan, 2004, p. 4). In general, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) design includes a learning component consisting of structured tasks and three main principles that reflect the stages of implementation, namely:

1. **Pre-task**, the initial stage of activities that teachers and students can do before they begin the task. At this stage, the teacher can provide an introduction to the topic or provide useful inputs, such as by using images, texts, conversation dialogs, and so on.
2. **During task**, the next step is more instructional. Generally students work in small groups to complete assignments and the teacher monitors the students and helps them by giving instructions in completing assignments.
3. **Post-task**, the final step involves the two previous procedures (Pre-task and During task) to follow up on the completion of the tasks (Ellis, 2006, p. 20).

In addition, Willis (1996) also argues that in language teaching, certain learning conditions that can support students to use and develop language skills are required, such as:

1. Exposure to the students through texts, writings, pictures, or videos that can be understood as a medium for second language learning (Exposure),
2. Use of the second language in learning activities (Use),
3. Increasing the students' interest and motivation to learn to use a second language (Motivation),
4. Giving learning instructions using a second language (Instruction).
Regardless of the individual cognitive abilities of each student, the learning conditions become a reference for the researcher to create in the classroom learning.

Classroom Action Research (CAR) is used to see the changes that occur in the teaching in Writing 1 class using the TBLT approach. The CAR requires four stages beginning with the planning, implementing actions, observing, and reflecting. The researcher believes that the use of the Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach in teaching and learning activities in the classroom is able to improve the students' English skills, especially in descriptive writing. In this study, the researcher and lecturers worked together to solve the problems that occurred and tried to improve the writing skills of the students in descriptive writing, such as in composing sentences which is a basic aspect in writing and in using descriptive writing components, namely the selection of vocabulary, punctuation, and grammar points through structured assignments. Some of the reasons why the researcher decided to use this approach are to create more lively, non-stressful learning, reduce boredom in learning, make learning activities more focused and help students to develop and put their ideas into writing, with correct use of vocabulary, spelling and punctuation through the designed task. In addition to trying to improve aspects of the students’ writing skills and learning activities, this research is expected to be used as a reference in Descriptive writing activities.

The researcher formulates several research questions, as follows:

1. How is TBLT implemented in learning Descriptive writing skills among English Literature students?
2. What are the results of the students’ Descriptive writing through the use of TBLT in class?
3. What is the opinion of students regarding the use of TBLT in learning Descriptive writing to improve writing skills?

This study generally aims to improve the students’ writing skills through the Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach in teaching English. The specific objectives of this study are:

1. To learn about the use of TBLT in descriptive writing skills for English literature students.
2. To learn about the results of descriptive writing skills of the students through the use of TBLT in class.
3. To learn about the students’ opinions on the use of TBLT to improve descriptive writing skills.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Writing is a language skill that is quite difficult because in writing, students must also have other skills, such as micro and macro skills. According to Brown (2004) micro skills include:

1. Writing in the correct sentence sequence,
2. Writing using proper grammar,
3. Linking sentences using conjunction.

On the other hand, macro skills are:

1. Producing various types of writing such as Narrative text, Descriptive text, Explanatory text, Argumentative text, and others.
2. Understanding communicative functions of written texts; for instance, the explanatory text is used to explain certain natural phenomena or social facts.
3. Linking between main ideas and supporting sentences (Brown, 2004, p. 221)

When writers have mastered micro-skills and macro-skills in writing skills, it can be assumed that they are able to produce good writing. This is also revealed by Bell and Burnaby in Nunan (1989, p. 141) who argue that writing is a complex cognitive activity because the author requires setting a number of variables or factors simultaneously. These factors include the organization of content, sentence structures, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and the composing and integration of sentences into a coherent and cohesive paragraph.

Besides being a language skill that must be mastered by students to improve their language competence, writing skills also possess certain goals. According to Peck & Schulz in Tarigan (Tarigan, 2008, p. 9) the purpose of writing skills is:
1. To help students understand the variety of written language expressions,
2. To encourage students to express themselves freely in writing.
3. To teach students to use the correct and appropriate language in writing.

Therefore, it can be concluded that writing skills involve various aspects of learning such as vocabulary selection, grammar, spelling, content, and the composing and integration of sentences into a coherent and cohesive paragraph. In addition, writing skills are not skills that can be mastered in a short time, but the students must go through the process of learning and practice. Thus, efforts to improve writing skills require appropriate learning methods or approaches, so that the students’ writing skills can be improved.

Descriptive text is a type of text used to describe the characteristics of certain objects, places, or beings in general, without any in-depth and thorough research. The definition of Descriptive text refers to several sources, such as Wyrick (1987) who argue that Descriptive text is a text that contains images of people, places or objects in detail to provide an impression to the reader. (Wyrick, 1987, p. 227). Whereas according to Nursisto (1999, p. 40), Descriptive text is an essay that describes something in accordance with the actual situation, so that the reader can participate in feeling, seeing, hearing, and smelling what the writer wants to convey. In descriptive text, the authors transfer the impression and the results of their observations and feelings, and convey the nature and all the details of the objects that can be found onto the object. (Gorys kerar, 1981, p. 93). It can be concluded that Descriptive text is a writing about the description of characteristics or definition of an object. In addition, descriptive tests also have special features, such as:

**a. Characteristics of Paragraphs**

1. The contents of writing describe an object, place, living thing, or certain atmosphere.
2. The images are formed by using the five senses including the senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste, or touch.
3. The paragraph produces the impression as if the person who reads or is told participated to feel and see for themselves the object in question.
   
   (Mahsun, 2014, p. 41)

**b. Paragraph Development Pattern**

There are two development patterns of Descriptive paragraph according to Mahsun (2014, p. 42), namely:

1. Subjective patterns which are patterns used to describe the object in question, but also complemented by opinions from the author. For example, the place is comfortable to see, fun, and creepy. The sentence is subjective to person who describes it.
2. Objective patterns, namely the pattern of the development of Descriptive paragraph whose depiction does not include any opinions of the author. The description results are objective in accordance with the object described, without the slightest use of opinion.
c. Framework Structure

According to Gerot and Peter (1995, p. 208) in general, the structure of Descriptive text is in the form of a generic structure consisting of two main components, namely

1. Identification; identifying the phenomenon to be explained.
2. Description; describing parts, quality, and characteristics. Identification usually occurs in the first paragraph and the description is mentioned in the next paragraph.

On the other hand, Mahsun (2014, p. 45) suggests that the structure of the Descriptive text consists of 3 (three) parts, namely:

1. The title represents the contents of the descriptive text and the objects described.
2. General description, describing the definition or identity of the objects described.
3. Description of the section, explaining the objects in detail. Objects are explained in more detail by giving clear images.

d. Linguistic characteristics

According to Indriyastuti (2018) in general the linguistic characteristics of Descriptive texts include:

a) Using Present Tense,
b) Using various kinds of descriptive adjectives, Numbering and Classifying, for example: two strong legs, sharp white fangs, etc.
c) Using Relating verbs to provide information about the subject, for instance: My mum is really cool, It has very thick fur, etc.
d) Using verbs to express the author's personal views about the subject, for example: I think it is a clever animal.
e) Using adverbs to provide additional information about the behavior and properties described, for instance: It is extremely high.

RESEARCH METHODS

This Classroom Action Research is conducted in two cycles consisting of four steps, namely planning, action, observation, and reflection. This research also constitutes a collaborative research conducted by the researcher and an English teacher at the university which is aimed at improving the practice of teaching. The researcher studies the issues or problems that occur, collects and analyzes the data, conducts the action, reflects, and applies changes based on the findings of the research. The model is illustrated as follows.
As illustrated on Figure. 2, activities done in the first cycle are as follows:

1. Planning Stage
   The planning stage begins with the identification of problems up to the planning classroom action. The steps in this stage are explained as follows:
   
   a) Identifying problems through field observation: the researcher tries to identify the problems faced in the classroom.
   b) Focusing on a prioritized problem to improve the current condition: this research focuses on the improvement of descriptive writing learning outcomes.
   c) Formulating Hypothesis: this step aims to determine the action for future improvement based on the issues that have been identified to search for solutions through action hypothesis.
   d) Designing solutions to the problems: this step is carried out through the formulation of Lesson Plans as the action plan that will be carried out by teachers, starting from the materials to be used, the lesson planning (covering the teaching techniques, teaching scenario, instruments for assessment) and the action design.

   Plans as the action plan that will be carried out by teachers, starting from the materials to be used, the lesson planning (covering the teaching techniques, teaching scenario, instruments for assessment) and the action design.

2. Implementation of Action
   In the implementation stage of all designs made by the teachers, who also includes the researcher in this case, the teachers conduct all steps of teaching in accordance with the scenario in the Lesson Plan.

3. Observation
   The third stage is observation during the implementation of the actions, where the researcher is assisted by a collaborator (the class teacher) in conducting the observation by using the previously prepared instruments. Close observation is conducted from the very beginning to the end of the teaching session.
Reflection

The data collected from observation stage is analyzed in the reflection stage. The analysis is conducted jointly with the collaborator (the class teacher) involved in this research. A reflection stage takes place at the end of every action for each cycle. At this stage, the advantages and the drawbacks of every action are identified to be used as the groundworks for the planning for the next cycle. Every successful action is continued in the following teaching session, while unsuccessful ones are altered and improved.

Therefore, this research can be considered reflective research that is aimed at improving the teaching practice in classroom in a professional manner. Classroom Action Research also constitutes an effort from the teacher and the researcher to solve issues related to teaching process through the application of actions in the course of research. Such effort is carried out by changing the usual aspects (e.g.: models, strategies, media) in the teaching activity, with the expectation to improve the learning process as well as the outcomes through several phases within two research cycles.

The researcher identifies the problems faced by the students and tries to improve the learning and teaching practice through several phases in two research cycles. The data used in this research is mainly qualitative. Nonetheless, quantitative data is also used in the form of students’ Descriptive writing exam score. The researcher also directly involves in the research process, while being assisted by the class teacher as an observer from the beginning to the end of the research. The process that is observed is the students’ learning activity during the application of TBLT approach.

a. Quantitative Data

The quantitative data used in this research is the writing scores of the students that are deemed improving while there is an increase in the average score in each cycle. The objective of this is to identify whether or not the cycle is successful. Descriptive statistics analysis that is conducted covers the average scores from five aspects of writing, namely content development, organization, grammar (language use), vocabulary, and mechanics. The scores of each aspect are presented in the evaluation rubric. The evaluation rubric is used in the pre-test, progress test, and post-test to assess the students’ works. The scores that are based on the rubrics are accumulated as the student’s final score for writing class.
| Aspect     | Score | Criteria                                                                 |
|------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Content**|       |                                                                          |
|            | 30-27 | Excellent to Very Good: Knowledge substantive; relevant to assigned topic |
|            | 26-22 | Good to Average: Some knowledge subject; adequate range: mostly relevant topic; but lacks detail. |
|            | 21-17 | Fair to poor: limited knowledge of little substance; inadequate development topic |
|            | 16-13 | Very Poor: does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; irrelevant to topic; or not enough to evaluate |
| **Organization** |       |                                                                          |
|            | 20-18 | Excellent to Very Good: fluent expression; ideas clearly stated/supported; concise; well-organized; logical sequencing; cohesive. |
|            | 17-14 | Good to Average: loosely organized but main ideas stand out; limited support; logical but incomplete sequencing. |
|            | 13-10 | Fair to Poor: non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnected; lacks logical sequencing and development |
|            | 7-9   | Very Poor: does not communicate; no organization; or not enough to evaluate |
| **Vocabulary** |       |                                                                          |
|            | 20-18 | Excellent to Very Good: sophisticated range; effective word/idiom choice and usage; word form mastery. |
|            | 17-14 | Good to Average: adequate range; occasional errors of word / idiom form; choice; usage but meaning not obscured. |
|            | 13-10 | Fair to Poor: limited range; frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage; meaning confused or obscured. |
|            | 7-9   | Very Poor: essentially translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form; or not enough to evaluate |
## Table 2. Writing Skills Evaluation Rubric

| No | Evaluated Aspect      | Maximum Score |
|----|-----------------------|---------------|
| 1  | Content               | 30            |
| 2  | Organization          | 20            |
| 3  | Vocabulary            | 20            |
| 4  | Language Use          | 25            |
| 5  | Mechanics             | 5             |
|    | Total                 | 100           |
b. Qualitative Data

The qualitative data in this research is acquired from the observation sheet filled during the course of the teaching activity. The qualitative data analysis is carried out by summing up the number of ticks in the “Yes” and “No” columns check-list. The data from the observation sheet is then presented with further explanations.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

One-way ANOVA test is used to determine the significance of the average Descriptive writing scores difference in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth meetings. The Descriptive writing scores of the students from the first up to the fifth meetings are presented in the table below. The five scores are then tested by using one-way ANOVA test. The results are as follows.

Table 3. Description of Five Descriptive Writing Scores of the Students

| No | Code | Score in Meeting I | Score in Meeting II | Score in Meeting III | Score in Meeting IV | Score in Meeting V |
|----|------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1  | S1   | 63                 | 66                  | 69                  | 74                  | 80                  |
| 2  | S2   | 52                 | 60                  | 65                  | 74                  | 79                  |
| 3  | S3   | 65                 | 70                  | 74                  | 80                  | 85                  |
| 4  | S4   | 72                 | 74                  | 75                  | 78                  | 84                  |
| 5  | S5   | 72                 | 74                  | 77                  | 77                  | 84                  |
| 6  | S6   | 63                 | 65                  | 71                  | 71                  | 85                  |
| 7  | S7   | 70                 | 71                  | 74                  | 74                  | 88                  |
| 8  | S8   | 71                 | 74                  | 76                  | 76                  | 84                  |
| 9  | S9   | 63                 | 65                  | 69                  | 75                  | 85                  |
| 10 | S10  | 70                 | 73                  | 74                  | 74                  | 82                  |
| 11 | S11  | 60                 | 67                  | 70                  | 72                  | 81                  |
| 12 | S12  | 61                 | 65                  | 68                  | 72                  | 82                  |
| 13 | S13  | 64                 | 70                  | 73                  | 75                  | 87                  |
| 14 | S14  | 65                 | 69                  | 73                  | 75                  | 85                  |
| 15 | S15  | 84                 | 84                  | 83                  | 83                  | 88                  |
| 16 | S16  | 59                 | 63                  | 66                  | 74                  | 85                  |
| 17 | S17  | 84                 | 84                  | 84                  | 85                  | 87                  |
| 18 | S18  | 78                 | 78                  | 80                  | 85                  | 87                  |
| 19 | S19  | 73                 | 74                  | 76                  | 84                  | 87                  |
The data in the table above show that the average Descriptive writing scores are 67.84 for the first meeting, 70.85 for the second meeting, 73.52 for the third meeting, 76.73 for the fourth meeting, and 84.47 for the fifth meeting. The minimum scores are 52 for the first meeting, 60 for the second meeting, 65 for the second meeting, 71 for the fourth meeting, and 79 for the fifth meeting. Meanwhile, the maximum scores are 84 for the first, second, and third meetings, 85 for the fourth meeting, dan 88 for the fifth meeting.

Table 4. Comparison of Students’ Five Descriptive Writing Scores Significance ANOVA

|                  | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups   | 3096.316       | 4  | 774.079     | 23.283| .000 |
| Within Groups    | 2992.211       | 90 | 33.247      |       |      |
| Total            | 6088.526       | 94 |             |       |      |

Table 4 shows the significance of the students’ Descriptive writing scores difference. To determine whether there is any significant difference between the scores in the first to the fifth meetings, several things have to be taken into consideration. The standard significance value used in the SPSS is 0.05. If the significance value < 0.05, it means that there is indeed a significant difference between the two values that are being compared. On the other hand, If the significance value > 0.05 it means that there is no significant difference between the two values that are being compared. Table 4 shows that the significance value of the five descriptive writing scores is 0.000 (< 0.05). Therefore, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the students’ five Descriptive writing scores.

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA ANALYSIS FINDINGS

As discussed in the previous part, the researcher uses questionnaire to understand students’ perception on the implementation of Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach to improve their Descriptive writing skills. Next, researcher performs descriptive statistics analysis by counting the frequency of the evaluation scale responses from each statement in the perception questionnaire and calculating the percentage.

The questionnaire employs positive statements with Likert scale response. The results from this questionnaire are used to identify any improvement on students’ Descriptive writing skills through TBLT, in addition to being used to answer the research question on the students’ responses to TBLT approach. This questionnaire does not constitute a sole instrument to investigate the improvement on students’ Descriptive writing skills. To validate the questionnaire analysis results, the researcher also includes the class observation analysis results, which is based on the direct observation by the researcher. Taking the questionnaire findings into consideration and referring to all statements in the questionnaire with high responses from the respondents, the following table presents the questionnaire data processing results and the findings.
Table 5.
Evaluation Scale for Student Questionnaire

| Statement (P) | Evaluation Scale | Percentage |
|---------------|------------------|------------|
|               | SS (++)          | S (+)      | TS (-) | STS (--) |
| P1            | 13               | 6          | 2      | 1        | 92%        |
| P2            | 11               | 8          |        |          | 89%        |
| P3            | 14               | 5          |        |          | 93%        |
| P4            | 17               | 2          |        |          | 97%        |
| P5            | 14               | 4          | 1      |          | 92%        |
| P6            | 13               | 4          | 2      |          | 87%        |
| P7            | 11               | 8          |        |          | 89%        |
| P8            | 14               | 5          |        |          | 93%        |
| P9            | 14               | 5          |        |          | 93%        |
| P10           | 13               | 6          |        |          | 92%        |
| P11           | 16               | 2          | 1      |          | 95%        |
| P12           | 16               | 3          |        |          | 96%        |
| P13           | 17               | 2          |        |          | 97%        |

The table above shows that there are 13 statements in the questionnaire distributed to the participants or research subjects, namely the students of class 1 SA 05.

DISCUSSION

In this research, the researcher and the teacher of Writing 1 class made a conclusion from the teaching process which took place in the implementation and observation stages. The findings are as follows:

1. Students seemed to be more confident and already got used to the preliminary tasks given prior to the main task of writing a Descriptive paragraph. Students no longer hesitated to express their opinions or to ask questions whenever they faced a problem they did not understand.
2. Students began to use extensive vocabulary in their writings, and the contents or topics of their writings started to vary, from descriptions of places and objects to descriptions of persons. Nevertheless, some mistakes, such as capitalization and punctuation errors, are still found in some of their writings.
3. The researcher found that the number of students actively participating in class activity in cycles I and II has increased from the number of active students before the implementation of TBLT in the writing class. This shows that the implementation of TBLT in writing class can encourage students’ active participation in the learning process.
Based on the findings above, it can be said that teaching Descriptive writing with TBLT approach can improve students’ Descriptive writing skills in a progressive manner, despite some writing aspects, such as the writing mechanics aspect, still need to be further improved. The assignments given during the learning process in the classroom also motivate students to be actively involved in the process of completing the tasks. This can boost the students’ confidence to express their opinions and asking questions.

CONCLUSION

Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is an effective approach to adopt to improve Descriptive writing skills of the English major students in University X during the course of the research. The reason behind it is the preliminary task used to introduce the theme of a lesson or as a scaffolding prior to the writing process has a significant effect as a stimulus that helps students to identify Descriptive text in the initial phase of the lesson. The tasks in this research are designed and adjusted to cater the students’ needs based on the findings on the challenges faced by students in acquiring Descriptive writing skills. This, in turn, helps the students in finishing their main task, which is to write a Descriptive text, with only a little to no difficulty.

Next, the TBLT approach used in the Classroom Action Research can motivate students to be actively involved in the class by, for example, asking questions and expressing opinions whenever they found some challenges during their learning process. In addition, based on the outcomes recorded on the observation sheets and the field notes, it is found that the students have improved their vocabulary use of the words or phrases learned in the previous tasks in their Descriptive paragraphs. This helps the students to produce paragraphs with appropriate choice of words and expressions. These findings are backed by the results from the analysis on perception questionnaires, which show that almost all participants in this research agree that the tasks given in a structured manner have significantly helped them practice expressing their idea in writing before moving on to the main Descriptive writing task.

RECOMMENDATION

Things that are recommended for future research on the use of TBLT approach in Descriptive writing skills learning are, among others, time allocations, availability of lesson materials, and the proper classroom designs to motivate the active participation of students in the class. During the course of the study, the researcher faced some issues related to the limited time allocation in implementing the TBLT approach. The researcher overcame such problems by giving effective tasks to help students write Descriptive texts. Clear instructions and directions are also important in the implementation of TBLT approach to help students avoid mistakes in completing their assignments. Meanwhile, there is still limited availability of the teaching materials for writing with TBLT approach. Therefore, the researcher recommends the future research to make some innovations in creating the preliminary tasks.
for the implementation of this approach. Lastly, the researcher also recommends future studies on the classroom designs for the effective implementation of TBLT approach that can motivate students to take an active role in the course of the lesson.
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