From Group Work to Independent Writing: Enhancing Students' Analytical Exposition Texts through Task-Based Learning

Fauzia Nurmalasari, Windy Citra Negara, Linda Mayasari
Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya, SMAN 20 Surabaya, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya
fauzianurmalasari@gmail.com , windynegara52@guru.sma.belajar.id , lindamayasari@um-surabaya.ac.id

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui sejauh mana penerapan model Task-Based Learning (TBL) dapat meningkatkan kemampuan siswa kelas XI di salah satu SMA negeri di Surabaya dalam menulis teks eksposisi analitis. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan dalam bentuk Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (PTK) selama sepuluh minggu dan terdiri atas tiga siklus. Dua siklus pertama menggunakan strategi Project-Based Learning (PjBL), sementara siklus ketiga menerapkan TBL sebagai intervensi utama. Setiap siklus mencakup tahap perencanaan, pelaksanaan tindakan, observasi, dan refleksi. Data diperoleh melalui rubrik penilaian menulis, rekaman video kegiatan kelas, dan lembar refleksi guru. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa meskipun metode kolaboratif seperti PjBL dapat membangun keterlibatan awal, metode ini belum cukup efektif dalam meningkatkan keterampilan menulis secara mandiri. Sebaliknya, penerapan TBL pada siklus ketiga, dengan tugas menulis individual berbasis konteks nyata, dibedakan menurut tingkat kemampuan siswa, serta tanpa penggunaan gawai, terbukti mampu meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menyusun argumen, mengorganisasi teks, dan menggunakan unsur kebahasaan secara tepat. Nilai rata-rata siswa meningkat menjadi 75,78, dengan 55,56% siswa mencapai nilai minimal 75, sehingga memenuhi kriteria keberhasilan penelitian. Selain itu, keterlibatan siswa juga meningkat secara signifikan, khususnya dalam hal fokus, inisiatif, dan ketepatan penggunaan bahasa. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa Task-Based Learning merupakan pendekatan pembelajaran yang efektif dalam mengembangkan keterampilan menulis eksposisi analitis di jenjang sekolah menengah, terutama ketika tugas disusun secara bertingkat sesuai dengan kemampuan siswa dan didukung oleh penilaian formatif yang terstruktur.

Katakunci: Pembelajaran Berbasis Tugas; Teks Eksposisi Analitis; Penelitian Tindakan Kelas; Keterampilan Menulis; Tugas Berdiferensiasi

Abstract: This study aims to investigate the extent to which the implementation of the Task-Based Learning (TBL) model can enhance the ability of Grade XI students at a public senior high school in Surabaya to write analytical exposition texts. Conducted as a Classroom Action Research over ten weeks, the study comprised three cycles. The first two cycles applied the Project-Based Learning (PjBL) approach, while the third cycle introduced TBL as the main instructional intervention. Each cycle followed the stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection. Data were collected through writing assessment rubrics, classroom video recordings, and teacher reflection sheets. The findings revealed that although collaborative methods like PjBL encouraged initial engagement, they were insufficient in fostering independent writing skills. In contrast, the application of TBL in the third cycle, featuring context-rich, differentiated writing tasks conducted without gadget use, significantly improved students' abilities in constructing arguments, organizing ideas, and using linguistic features accurately. The average student score rose to 75.78, with 55.56% of students reaching the minimum target score of 75, thus meeting the study's success criteria. Additionally, student engagement improved markedly, particularly in focus, initiative, and language accuracy. These findings indicate that Task-Based Learning is an effective instructional approach for developing analytical exposition writing skills at the secondary level, especially when supported by leveled tasks and structured formative assessment.

Keywords: Task-Based Learning; Analytical Exposition Text; Classroom Action Research; Writing Skills; Differentiated Tasks

INTRODUCTION

Writing skills are essential in education, particularly for Senior High School students who are expected to articulate their ideas and arguments clearly and coherently. Students with strong writing skills can achieve better academic results because writing helps them communicate effectively and reflect on their thoughts. Additionally, good writing skills are important for their future, especially when applying for scholarships, which often require a writing test. In line with this, Genç Ersoy & Göl Dede (2022) argued that writing is a valuable tool for learning and teaching because it helps people communicate by combining words with knowledge, sharing feelings and ideas, organizing thoughts, and supporting the learning process. According to the Educational Laboratory Northwest & Educational Laboratory Southwest at IES (2020), there are eight types of text, namely argumentative, descriptive, narrative, informational, technical, persuasive, reflective, and expressive. However, this study focuses on analytical exposition texts, which are considered a type of argumentative text that aims to explain and elaborate on topics with well-structured arguments.

Despite their importance, many students struggle to master these skills, indicating that new and creative methods are needed to boost their motivation and improve their writing abilities. Several studies have shown that these difficulties stem from cognitive, linguistic, and psychological challenges. For example, Nurlatifah & Yusuf (2022) identified three major problems in writing, especially analytical exposition: cognitive, linguistic, and psychological challenges faced by students. Moreover, another study found that mistakes in spelling, grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation are still commonly made by most students (Fahmi & Rachmijati, 2021).

Analytical exposition texts are an important part of the English curriculum in Indonesian high schools. However, writing this type of text is challenging for students because they need to build strong arguments, use correct language features, organize their ideas clearly, and write independently. Traditional teaching methods often do not meet all of these needs.

To address this issue, this study examines how Task-Based Learning (TBL) can help improve students' writing skills. TBL focuses on real-life tasks and encourages students to take more responsibility for their learning. Previous research has shown that TBL can be effective in improving writing by making lessons more meaningful and student-centered(Ratnawati et al., 2022)

Based on this background, the research question addressed in this study is: *How can the implementation of Task-Based Learning (TBL) improve the writing skills of analytical exposition texts among eleventh-grade students at a public Senior High School in Surabaya?* The objective of this *classroom action research* is to examine and describe the improvement in students' writing skills through the implementation of TBL, particularly in the areas of argument construction, use of language features, and text organization. The findings are expected to benefit English teachers by providing insights into differentiated, task-based instructional strategies. Moreover, the study contributes to the broader development of writing pedagogy in Indonesian secondary education.

The hypothesis of this study is: *If Task-Based Learning (TBL) is effectively implemented in the classroom, then students' ability to write analytical exposition texts will improve*, as evidenced by enhanced argumentation, improved language accuracy, and better text organization.

RESEARCH METHOD

Type and Design of the Research

This study employed a Classroom Action Research design aimed at improving students' ability to write analytical exposition texts. The CAR process followed the model proposed by Kemmis et al. (2014) which consists of four cyclical stages: Planning, Acting, Observing, and Reflecting. This design enabled the researcher to identify problems in the classroom, apply targeted interventions, and evaluate their effectiveness continuously across multiple cycles.

Research Subject and Location

This study was conducted at SMA Negeri 20 Surabaya in class XI-10 during the even semester of the 2024/2025 academic year. The class included 36 students from diverse academic backgrounds as research subjects. The researcher also collaborated with an English lecturer, an English teacher, and colleagues who acted as observers during the implementation of each cycle.

Time and Research Procedure

The study took place from 11 February 2025 to 22 April 2025, encompassing three full action cycles. Each cycle consisted of four stages as follows:

a. **Planning**
   The researcher identified students' main challenges in writing analytical exposition texts, including organizing arguments, applying appropriate language features, and ensuring coherence. Based on a preliminary study and diagnostic writing assessment, detailed instructional plans were developed. These included designing lesson plans, modifying writing tasks to students' proficiency levels, instructional materials, and assessment instruments such as observation sheets, rubrics, video recordings, and teacher reflection sheets. Different strategies were applied in each cycle: Project-Based Learning (Cycle 1), "Two Truths and A Lie" as an intervention game (Cycle 2), and Task-Based Learning (Cycle 3).

b. **Acting**
   This stage involved implementing the designed interventions. Cycle 1 focused on collaborative group activities to create outlines, full texts, and presentations. Cycle 2 introduced an interactive game to stimulate critical thinking of argumentation. Cycle 3 emphasized individual task completion based on real-life contexts, such as environmental issues (plastic waste in Surabaya), using Task-Based Learning principles. Each teaching session was aligned with the designed learning objectives and evaluation tools.

c. Observing

Throughout each cycle, classroom activities were observed by the collaborator using structured observation sheets. Additional data were collected through student worksheets (LKPD), rubric assessment, recorded video, and teacher reflection sheets. These tools allowed the researcher to monitor students' participation, engagement, task performance, and behavioral responses during the learning process.

d. Reflecting

After each cycle, data were analyzed and reflected upon to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. Adjustments were made based on student progress, classroom dynamics, and observed challenges. The reflection process informed improvements in instructional planning, including task difficulty, scaffolding techniques, and classroom management strategies for the following cycle.

Success Criteria

The criteria for the success of this research were as follows:

a. At least 50% of students achieve a minimum score of 75 on the analytical exposition writing rubric (covering argument construction, language accuracy, and text organization).

b. Increased student engagement in writing tasks and classroom discussions, as observed in each cycle.

Data Collection Techniques and Research Instruments

The data in this study were collected using the following techniques:

a. Writing Assessments:

At the end of each cycle, students' analytical exposition texts were collected and scored using a standardized rubric. The rubric assessed aspects such as argument construction, text organization, and use of language features.

b. Video-recorded Classroom Observations:

During each cycle, the teaching and learning process was video-recorded to allow for a more detailed analysis of student behavior, engagement, and task interaction. These recordings served as the primary source for observation data, helping in completing the students' engagement observation sheets, which were limited due to the researcher's dual role as teacher and observer.

c. Teacher Reflection Sheets

In each cycle, the teacher completed a structured reflection sheet designed to capture pedagogical insights and instructional effectiveness. These sheets addressed four main components: (1) the quality and specificity of feedback given to students, (2) the degree of instructional adaptation based on student needs, (3) the availability and implementation of enrichment or remedial materials, and (4) strategies used to encourage student self-reflection. The reflections served as a valuable qualitative data source, documenting the teacher's evolving approach across the three cycles and providing contextual understanding of classroom decisions, challenges, and adjustments. These sheets complemented the

quantitative writing scores and supported deeper interpretation of student progress and instructional outcomes.

Although peer assessments and student self-reflection forms were originally intended to be part of the data collection process, they were ultimately excluded from the final analysis. This decision was made due to a low rate of student submissions for these instruments, which limited their usefulness as reliable data sources.

Data Analysis Techniques
The collected data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches:
a. Quantitative Analysis:
   Students' writing scores from each cycle were analyzed using a rubric and categorized into three levels of proficiency: Advanced, Intermediate, and Needs Improvement. These scores were compared across cycles to determine the effectiveness of each intervention.
b. Qualitative Analysis:
   Video recordings were collected during each cycle to capture classroom activities, serving as a tool to aid the observer in collecting data on students' engagement using the observation sheet. In addition, the qualitative analysis in this study also focused on the teacher's structured reflection sheets, which were completed after each cycle. These reflections provided insights into four key pedagogical dimensions: the quality of feedback, adaptability of instructional strategies, provision of enrichment/remedial materials, and encouragement of student self-reflection. Thematic analysis was applied to these written reflections to identify emerging patterns, instructional challenges, and the teacher's evolving responses to classroom dynamics. This approach allowed for a contextual understanding of the teaching and learning process throughout the intervention.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
This section presents the findings from each research cycle in detail, following the stages of Classroom Action Research. Each cycle is summarized based on its objectives, instructional strategies, learning outcomes, and reflections.

Cycle 1: Project-Based Learning (PjBL)

In the first cycle, the Project-Based Learning (PjBL) model was implemented to help students collaboratively develop analytical exposition texts. The cycle was carried out over two sessions, aiming to guide students in generating ideas, creating outlines, and expanding them into full texts. To initiate the writing process, students were asked to complete an individual worksheet via Liveworksheet.com to help generate initial ideas. Following this, they worked in groups to create outlines using a sample text as a model. Despite the structured guidance, participation was generally low. Several students failed to submit their work or struggled to engage in collaborative efforts. The use of mobile phones further disrupted focus, and group roles were often unclear or ignored, limiting the effectiveness of the project-based approach.

In the second session, the teacher provided further clarification on the task to assist students in transitioning from outline to full text. While some groups showed improvement and successfully expanded their outlines, others bypassed this step entirely and attempted to draft full texts directly. This resulted in disorganized writing, and most groups were unable to complete their work within the allotted time. The excessive use of digital tools led to distractions, and there were concerns about students' overreliance on external sources, which negatively affected authenticity and performance.

Although a few students demonstrated better idea development, overall performance remained inconsistent. The experience underscored several key issues: the need for stronger scaffolding, clearer delegation of group tasks, and more effective classroom management to enhance focus and accountability. A summary of this cycle's procedure and findings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The CAR Procedure and Activities in Cycle 1

Stage	Description
Objective	To engage students in collaborative planning and writing of analytical exposition texts through structured group tasks.
Instructional Activities	Group-based outlining, followed by text development based on the outlines.
Findings	Many students failed to submit tasks or misunderstood the instructions. Group coordination was weak, and the use of gadgets led to distractions. The average group score was 63.
Reflection	Students required clearer instructions, better task division, and more scaffolding. Time management should be emphasized to support more focused writing sessions.

Student engagement scores further supported the reflection on Cycle 1. As shown in Table 2, nearly all engagement indicators were rated at Level 2 (Minimally Involved), suggesting a passive learning environment.

Table 2. Student Engagement Observation in Cycle 1

No.	Aspect	Engagement Indicator	Score	Notes
1.	**Emotional Engagement**	Students' enthusiasm during discussions and outlining	2	Students appeared passive, unenthusiastic, and showed little emotion
2.	**Active Participation**	Activeness in group work and Q&A sessions	2	Only a few students were active; most were passive
3.	**Teamwork**	Collaboration among group members in writing	2	Roles were unclear; minor conflicts occurred; results were weak
4.	**Task Focus**	Concentration during writing activities	2	Focus was disrupted by gadget use
5.	**Initiative**	Willingness to complete tasks without being prompted	2	Some students waited for the teacher's direction
6.	**Use of English**	Use of the target language in discussions and texts	2	Many still relied on automatic translations

| 7. | **Problem Solving** | Ability to resolve conflicts or task difficulties | 2 | Students were not yet able to overcome confusion independently |
| 8. | **Reflection & Feedback** | Engagement in evaluation and giving feedback | 1 | Not systematically implemented |

*Scale: 1 = Not Involved; 2 = Minimally Involved; 3 = Moderately Involved; 4 = Actively Involved

The data indicate that most students lacked emotional investment, demonstrated weak initiative, and showed low concentration levels during writing tasks. Unclear group roles and unregulated gadget use further disrupted collaboration and productivity. These findings underscore the necessity for clearer task instructions, more structured scaffolding, and improved classroom management in the next cycle to foster student accountability and meaningful engagement.

Cycle 2: "Two Truths and A Lie" Game

The second cycle aimed to reinforce students' critical thinking skills, particularly in distinguishing between facts and opinions, an essential skill in composing analytical exposition texts. This was achieved through an interactive activity, namely the *"Two Truths and a Lie"* game. The activity served as both an icebreaker and a contextual introduction to the day's lesson. After the game, the teacher revisited key points from the previous cycle, reinforcing the structure and purpose of analytical exposition texts.

A notable adjustment in this cycle was the formation of level-based groups to accommodate varied student proficiency. Group A (Advanced Level) consisted of groups 1 and 2, Group B (Intermediate Level) included groups 3 and 4, and Group C (Needs Intervention Level) comprised groups 5 and 6. Each group was assigned a differentiated worksheet tailored to their skill level. The average score across all groups rose to 68.67, indicating modest improvement compared to Cycle 1.

Despite the engaging nature of the game, student behavior showed some recurring challenges. Observations indicated that gadget use persisted during the task, often distracting students from independent work. As a result, the teacher applied score deductions to reflect the lack of original effort. While the activity stimulated enthusiasm and discussion, it did not significantly strengthen writing autonomy. A summary of Cycle 2 activities is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The CAR Procedure and Activities in Cycle 2

Stage	Description
Objective	Encourage students' critical thinking and argumentation using an interactive group game, followed by composing the full text of the Analytical Exposition.
Instructional Activities	Students created arguments based on statements and developed them into group texts.
Findings	The average score was 68.67. Students enjoyed the activity but were frequently distracted by gadgets. Peer dependence remained high, and many texts were incomplete.
Reflection	Clearer classroom policies on gadget use needed to be enforced. While the task format was engaging, it did not adequately promote independent thinking or writing mastery.

A comparison of scores from Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 revealed a positive trend in student achievement. In Cycle 1, the highest average score recorded was 63, achieved during the outlining activity in the second session. In contrast, Cycle 2 produced a higher average of 68.67, reflecting a gain of 5.67 points. This improvement suggests that the strategic changes introduced, particularly structured groupings and the integration of a gamified learning experience, contributed to greater focus and student involvement. Despite the negative impact of continued gadget use, students demonstrated a better grasp of the analytical exposition text structure in a more supportive and engaging environment.

Student engagement data in Cycle 2, summarized in Table 4, further supports these findings. Most indicators rose to Level 3 (Moderately Involved), signaling an increase in emotional engagement, active participation, and teamwork. The *"Two Truths and a Lie"* game served as an effective hook, encouraging more enthusiastic responses and improved group interaction. Nevertheless, persistent gadget distractions and reliance on peers limited the development of independent writing proficiency. These insights informed the decision to adopt a more individualized and differentiated approach in the next cycle.

Table 4. Student Engagement Observation in Cycle 2

No.	Aspect	Engagement Indicator	Score	Notes
1.	Emotional Engagement	Emotional responses to the game and discussions	3	Students seemed more cheerful and interested in the activity
2.	Active Participation	Participation in the game and argument development	3	Increased participation in certain groups
3.	Teamwork	Collaboration in group writing	3	More structured due to level-based groupings
4.	Task Focus	Concentration when developing arguments and writing texts	2	Still distracted by gadget use
5.	Initiative	Taking active roles in group work	3	Some students took the initiative to lead discussions
6.	Use of English	Attempts to use English in forming arguments	3	Students tried, though they still relied on gadgets
7.	Problem Solving	Ability to identify false statements in the game	3	Students showed more critical thinking in the game context
8.	Reflection & Feedback	Responses to teacher/peer feedback	2	Prompts were given, but students responded minimally

Scale: 1 = Not Involved; 2 = Minimally Involved; 3 = Moderately Involved; 4 = Actively Involved

In summary, Cycle 2 demonstrated moderate progress in both performance and engagement. The interactive format and leveled groupings successfully captured students' attention and encouraged critical thinking. However, the continued presence of distractions and dependency on group work highlighted the need for a more individualized instructional strategy in the following cycle to foster greater writing independence and responsibility.

Cycle 3: Task-Based Learning (TBL)
In the third cycle, the researcher applied the Task-Based Learning model by assigning individual writing tasks under the theme "Analytical Mystery." This cycle aimed to improve students' ability to construct analytical exposition texts independently and accurately, without relying on gadgets or peer support. Unlike previous cycles, tasks were completed manually in a strictly gadget-free environment, encouraging authenticity and autonomy.

To align with students' varying proficiency levels, three differentiated, riddle-based worksheets were designed:
   a. Topic A *for advanced students* - Solution for Surabaya:
      Students analyzed a problem regarding the city's waste management policy and proposed solutions using 10 analytical sentences.
   b. Topic B *for intermediate students* - Uncovering the Facts:
      Students used statistical facts about plastic waste in Surabaya to write a 6-sentence analytical exposition, structured with a thesis, arguments, and conclusion.
   c. Topic C *for needs interventions* - Junior Detective Training:
      Students observed three pictures and constructed sentences where the first image served as the opinion, and the next two as supporting reasons.

Each task was intentionally scaffolded to fit students' abilities while maintaining the core elements of analytical exposition: thesis, arguments, logic, and conclusion. The use of real-world scenarios and a mystery theme added creative and cognitive engagement, promoting problem-solving and reasoning skills.

While some students thrived in this more structured and independent format, others experienced a decline in performance, likely due to the absence of digital aids such as Google Translate or peer assistance. Nonetheless, the task revealed more authentic levels of student proficiency and generated a more valid assessment of their writing skills. A summary of the process and findings is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The CAR Procedure and Activities in Cycle 3

Stage	Description
Objective	Assess students' authentic writing abilities in analytical exposition through level-based individual tasks, without gadget assistance.
Instructional Activities	Task-Based Learning model with three differentiated, riddle-themed writing tasks: Topic A (advanced), Topic B (intermediate), and Topic C (needs intervention).
Findings	The average score showed an increase over Cycle 2. However, the results were more valid and reflective of individual student performance. Some students who had previously scored well under collaborative or technology-supported tasks struggled when writing independently. Conversely, other students demonstrated consistent or even improved performance.
Reflection	This cycle successfully revealed each student's true level of writing proficiency. It was proved that the average score increased became 70.42, and the fairness and accuracy of the assessment improved significantly. The differentiated task design

		helped ensure that all students were appropriately challenged and allowed for clearer identification of those requiring targeted support in future instruction.

Student engagement during this cycle showed a marked improvement, as reflected in Table 6. Most indicators received a score of 4 (Actively Involved). The combination of a real-world, differentiated task format and a gadget-free environment led to stronger focus, deeper critical thinking, and more confident language use. Although teamwork was not applicable due to the individual nature of the task, students demonstrated increased autonomy and responsibility. The outcomes confirm that the TBL approach is effective in fostering authentic, independent writing, meeting the research goal of developing meaningful and self-directed learning.

Table 6. *Student Engagement Observation in Cycle 3*

No.	Aspect	Engagement Indicator	Score	Notes
1.	**Emotional Engagement**	Enthusiasm toward the individual task challenge	4	Very positive response, especially due to the "mystery" theme
2.	**Active Participation**	Initiative in completing the worksheet	4	All students attempted to complete the task independently
3.	**Teamwork**	Collaboration with others (not applicable in this cycle)	2	Not relevant as the task was individual
4.	**Task Focus**	Focus while composing texts without distraction	4	Gadgets were banned; concentration improved significantly
5.	**Initiative**	Efforts to solve problems independently	4	Many students no longer relied on peer assistance
6.	**Use of English**	Independent writing with correct structure and language use	4	Accuracy improved due to the lack of dependence on translation tools
7.	**Problem Solving**	Ability to handle writing challenges without help	4	Increased critical thinking and logical reasoning were observed
8.	**Reflection & Feedback**	Self-evaluation after task completion	3	Limited due to time constraints, but guided by the teacher

*Scale: 1 = Not Involved; 2 = Minimally Involved; 3 = Moderately Involved; 4 = Actively Involved

In conclusion, Cycle 3 marked the most significant progress in terms of both performance and engagement. The Task-Based Learning model, paired with differentiated task design and strict removal of digital tools, effectively encouraged independent writing and deeper critical thinking. This cycle confirmed the value of individualized assessment in accurately identifying student needs and supported the study's objective to foster authentic, autonomous language learning.

Summary of Student Performance Across Cycles
Overall, students' writing proficiency showed consistent improvement across the three cycles, as illustrated in Table 7. In **Cycle 1**, group-based Project-Based Learning (PjBL) was hindered by weak coordination and unclear student roles, resulting in an average

score of **63**. In **Cycle 2**, the introduction of the interactive game "Two Truths and A Lie" along with level-based groupings led to an increase in the mean score to **68.67**, although students remained heavily dependent on gadgets.

By **Cycle 3,** a significant shift occurred through the application of Task-Based Learning (TBL) with individual, gadget-free tasks. This cycle produced a more authentic demonstration of student writing ability, with the average score increasing to **75.78**. The trend reflects that more individualized and structured tasks led to higher levels of independent mastery.

Table 7. *Students' Writing Proficiency Across Cycles*

Task	N	Mean	Min	Max
Group Work: Making an Outline and Developing Analytical Text **(Cycle 1)**	35	63	32.5	80
Group Work- Writing Analytical Text **(Cycle 2)**	34	68.67	50	80
Individual Task- Writing Analytical Text **(Cycle 3)**	30	75.78	45	100

In Cycle 3, individual scores were used as the benchmark to assess actual student achievement. A threshold of 75 was set to determine success. Out of 30 students who submitted their work, 20 students (55.56%) achieved the target, while 16 students (44.44%), including 6 who were absent and did not submit, did not meet the criteria.

Table 8. *Summary of Students' Achievements*

Criteria	N	Percentage (%)
Achieved	20	55.56
Not Achieved	16	44.44
Total	36	100

These findings suggest that while collaborative methods like PjBL support engagement and early skill-building, they may obscure individual competence. The use of differentiated individual tasks under the TBL model provided a more accurate measure of writing proficiency. This aligns with prior research (Barokah, 2018; Sari et al., 2023), emphasizing the value of scaffolding and formative assessment to build autonomy and mastery in academic writing.

To deepen the analysis of instructional effectiveness and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the teacher's role throughout the intervention, structured self-

reflections were documented after each cycle. These reflections focused on four key areas: the quality of feedback provided, the adaptability of instructional methods, the availability of enrichment and remedial materials, and efforts to encourage student reflection. Table 9 below presents detailed reflections for each cycle, highlighting the teacher's evolving practices, instructional adjustments, and the challenges encountered in supporting students' writing development. This reflective documentation served as a critical tool for continuous improvement, informing the pedagogical decisions made in subsequent cycles.

Table 9. Teacher's Reflection Across Cycles

Guiding Questions	Cycle 1 – Project-Based Learning (PjBL)	Cycle 2 – "Two Truths and A Lie" Game	Cycle 3 – Task-Based Learning (TBL)
1. Was I able to provide feedback after presentations and tasks?	Not yet optimal. The feedback I provided was still general and did not address the specific needs of each group or individual student.	Improved. I began to give brief verbal feedback during students' presentations and writing sessions.	Consistently done. I provided brief oral feedback during task performance and used a scoring rubric tailored to each student's proficiency level.
2. Was I able to adapt my teaching method based on students' understanding?	Not sufficiently. The group-based method was ineffective for students with low motivation, and I failed to adjust my approach accordingly to fit the class dynamics.	Initiated. I grouped students by proficiency level and customized worksheets for Advanced, Intermediate, and Needs Intervention groups.	Yes. I fully applied differentiated instruction based on student levels and the classroom context through Task-Based Learning.
3. Did I provide additional materials or exercises for students needing enrichment or remediation?	No. At that time, I had not prepared differentiated materials tailored to students' varying levels of proficiency.	Materials were available but not implemented optimally due to time limitations.	Yes. I prepared tiered materials for both remediation and enrichment, but time constraints limited their full implementation.
4. Did I encourage students to reflect on their learning after each lesson?	No. Reflection activities were not implemented systematically, and students were not guided to evaluate their learning processes.	Yes, I provided prompts to stimulate student reflection at the end of the lesson, but no students responded or engaged in the reflection activity.	Not consistently. Due to limited class time, reflection sessions were not conducted regularly.

This progression of instructional strategies and reflective practice illustrates how thoughtful adaptations and responsive teaching can lead to improved learning outcomes. The shift from collaborative to individualized tasks revealed authentic student capabilities, and the reflections allowed the teacher to gradually enhance instructional quality. The findings underscore the value of differentiation, autonomy, and formative feedback in fostering writing mastery in the senior high school context.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
Conclusion

This Classroom Action Research showed that while collaborative methods used in the first two cycles, such as Project-Based Learning and group games, helped students understand the basics of analytical exposition texts, they were not sufficient to enhance students' independent writing abilities. Issues such as low motivation, unclear group roles, ineffective teamwork, and uncontrolled gadget use hindered students from performing optimally.

In Cycle 3, the implementation of Task-Based Learning (TBL) with differentiated and well-planned individual tasks, completed without gadgets, led to more meaningful, accurate, and measurable improvement. The average student score increased to 75.78, and 55.56% of students (20 out of 36) met the target score of 75. Furthermore, student engagement and participation gradually improved throughout the three cycles, with the highest level of involvement observed during the TBL cycle.

These results indicate that the success criteria for at least 50% of students scoring 75 or higher were met, and the research objective was achieved. The data suggests that TBL facilitated improvements in students' abilities to build arguments, organize ideas, and apply appropriate language use. When tasks were designed based on students' proficiency levels and supported by clear expectations, their confidence and independence also improved.

In conclusion, Task-Based Learning proved to be an effective instructional strategy that enabled students to write analytical exposition texts more independently, clearly, and confidently. The research question was answered positively, and the intervention proved to be both effective and replicable for similar classroom contexts.
.

Implications

The research findings have several important implications for English language teaching in Indonesian high schools:

1. Instructional Design Needs Balance
   A combination of group-based tasks for initial exposure and individual tasks for skill mastery is essential. Collaborative learning fosters engagement, but true writing competence is best assessed through individual work.
2. Classroom Management Affects Learning Outcomes
   Uncontrolled gadget use undermined performance in early cycles. Enforcing gadget policies and designing engaging, hands-on tasks can help keep students focused.
3. Differentiated Instruction Supports Diverse Learners
   TBL with leveled tasks allowed students to work within their zone of proximal development. This strategy helps identify learners who need intervention and those ready for advanced challenges.
4. Formative Assessment is Crucial
   Continuous feedback and reflection supported student growth and allowed timely instructional adjustments. Video-based observations and writing rubrics proved valuable in capturing student progress objectively.

Recommendations
Based on the study's findings and reflections, the following recommendations are proposed:
1. For Teachers:
   a. Implement structured scaffolding that gradually transitions students from group outlines to full individual texts.
   b. Limit gadget use during instructional and writing tasks to promote genuine student effort.
   c. Apply Differentiated Task-Based Learning activities to accommodate varying proficiency levels.
   d. Provide ongoing formative feedback and opportunities for reflection to support skill development.
2. For School Administrators:
   a. Support teacher professional development focused on effective task-based and differentiated instructional strategies.
   b. Facilitate the creation of learning environments that minimize distractions and promote focused collaboration.
3. For Future Research:
   a. Explore the long-term impact of TBL on writing development across different text genres.
   b. Investigate how digital tools can be responsibly integrated into task-based instruction.
   c. Examine student motivation and self-efficacy in TBL-based classrooms through mixed-method approaches.

REFERENCES

Barokah, N. (2018). *THE EFFECT OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING (TBLT) AND CRITICAL THINKING ON STUDENTS' WRITING OF ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY (A Quasi-experimental Research in the Twelfth Grade students of SMAN 1*.

Educational Laboratory Northwest, R., & Educational Laboratory Southwest at IES, R. (2020). *Supporting your middle or high schooler's writing skills at home*.

Fahmi, S., & Rachmijati, C. (2021). *Improving Students' Writing Skill using Grammaly Application for Second Grade in Senior High School |69* (Vol. 4, Issue 1).

GENÇ ERSOY, B., & GÖL DEDE, D. (2022). Developing Writing Skills, Writing Attitudes and Motivation through Educational Games: Action Research. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, *9*(3), 569–589. https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.1089781

Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research. In *The Action Research Planner: Doing Critical Participatory Action Research*. Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4560-67-2

Nurlatifah, L., & Yusuf, F. N. (2022). STUDENTS' PROBLEMS IN WRITING ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION TEXT IN EFL CLASSROOM CONTEXT. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *10*(3), 801–810. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i3.6633

Ratnawati, Abduh, A., & Salija, K. (2022). *THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK BASED LEARNING IN TEACHING WRITING IN STATE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL 7 BONE*.

Sari, S. F. E., Basya, D., & Ismaili, I. (2023). Investigating the Impact of Task-Based Learning in Writing Skill of EFL Undergraduate Students at Indonesian University: Qualitative Interview Study. In *Linguapedia* (Vol. 7, Issue 2). http://ejurnal.uij.ac.id/index.php/LIN