The Effectiveness of EXO OLO TASK Learning Model to Improve Students' Achievement in English Learning

Sherla Chintia Rahmi[1] and Witri Oktavia[2]
Universitas Negeri Padang[1]
Correspondence Email: sherlachintiarahmi24@gmail.com

Article History	Abstract
	The objective of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of EXO OLO Task learning model on students' achievement in English learning. Participants in this study are science eleventh graders at SMAN 1 Kamang Magek. There are 42 students and classified into two classes. The control group is XI MIPA 1. This class consists of 21 students. The experimental group is XI MIPA 2, consists of 21 students. In this study, the researcher employed total sampling. The study was conducted over eight meetings and the experimental class chosen was XI MIPA 2. The essay test was used as the primary data collection tool. The dataset initially comprised 23 questions. However, during the validity and reliability assessments, three questions were identified as invalid and subsequently revised by the researcher. The two-tailed t-test result indicated a significance value of 0.000, meaning the significance value was below 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_0 could not be accepted and the alternative hypothesis H_1 could be accepted. This indicates an enhancement in students' English learning outcomes through the utilization of the EXO OLO Task learning model.
Keywords: EXO OLO Task, Effectiveness, Achievement, Learning model	

INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that English is a widely used international language across the globe, it is still a requirement for elementary, middle, and high school students to attain proficiency in the language. Unfortunately, many students still perceive English as a difficult language to learn, resulting in unsatisfactory grade outcomes or low value.

According to Kemendikbud (2013), the objectives of learning English at each level of education in Indonesia are differentiated according to the ability of students at each level of education. The English subject at SMA/MA aims

for students to have the ability to develop competence at the degree of informational literacy, to understand the nature and value of English to enhance the country's competitiveness in a global society, and to advance students' comprehension of the connection between language and culture. Looking at the objectives of learning English at the SMA/MA level, high school students who can be called adult learners should have acquired adequate knowledge of English .

Silberman (2006) suggests that the majority of Senior High School students are engaged in active learning rather than passive learning; this is because they are actively engaged in the learning process, in which they are able to apply the material to their learning. While the teacher may be able to effectively communicate the content to the students during the learning process, this does not necessarily guarantee that the students will be able to effectively implement the content. If the student is able to be actively engaged in their learning process by exploring concepts, resolving problems, and executing the content, then the outcome will be different.

Silberman (2006) claimed that effective learning can be implemented through discussion and project, presentation, debate, practice through experience, simulation, and case study. It means that there are some techniques in the process of teaching and learning to encourage pupils to participate.

In the field of English, Juliana (2017) found that the learning process is still largely focused on the teacher. This is usually due to the fact that the learning strategy used by the teacher is sufficient to adequately communicate the subject matter without seeing the outcomes or quality of the students in mastering the English material. The teacher typically employs a range of learning strategies in the classroom. Additionally, there is a lack of interaction between students to complete the assignments, which is due to the lack of strategies used by teachers to motivate students to solve new problems in the learning process.

In contrast to Juliana (2017), research by Pradana (2021) revealed that students' lack of ability in English made it difficult for them to learn English. There are several obstacles and causes why it can happen, English is rarely used in daily life, difficulty in choosing and stringing words in English, and lazy in learning.

Sultra & Baharudin (2020) found in their research that lack of interest or excitement for learning English is one issue that affects students' difficulty in learning, especially English. This is indicated by their lack of interest in learning English. Furthermore, the teacher and the teaching strategy have an impact on student achievement. Teachers, instructors, the environment at school, and students' peers all have an impact on students' interest in school and desire to learn. Teachers, on the other hand, are the most significant aspect because they play such an important influence in students' learning.

To overcome the problem above, it needs a learning strategy or model. There are many models and strategies used to improve high school student's English skills, such as case method, cooperative learning, flipped classroom. Pratiwi (2020) used cooperative learning type "make a match" in her research. This method can improve interest and students' learning outcomes because students work in groups and they can discuss together. Another research by Ananda (2018) is using case method, the result of the research is employing the case study method as a learning strategy has the potential to enhance learning outcomes.

The other way to enhance students' English proficiency is through the use of the EXO OLO Task Learning Model. The EXO OLO Task constitutes a compilation of learning models rooted in cognitive and constructivist educational theories. This model's principal aim is to furnish students with tasks, questions, and challenges that stimulate independent, paired, and collaborative work.

Several previous studies regarding the EXO OLO Task learning model conducted by Nofrion (2019: 76) states that the EXO OLO Task learning model which is relevant to both the 2013 curriculum and the 21st century learning framework, attempts to improve students' cognitive abilities. The EXO OLO Task learning model can trigger students to hone critical thinking skills through multilevel questions (EXO Task and OLO Task), develop quality learning, create meaningful learning experiences, and develop collaboration between students. In addition, the EXO OLO Task learning model prioritizes collaboration, discussion, and assigning multilevel assignments to students. Another research by Suasti et al. (2019) the EXO-OLO Task model can influence students' educational engagements on atmospheric dynamics with a score of 65.51%. Fariha (2020) conducted a research in Physics revealed that the EXO-OLO Task learning model can build students' abilities in critical thinking on the elasticity of solids. Then, research conducted by Dani & Fajriati (2022)

According to Nofrion et al (2019), this learning model leads to effective learning, both from the side of the teacher and students. By using this model, it becomes possible to clarify the types of activities that can be conducted within the classroom setting to achieve specific objectives. From the several studies that have been described, EXO-OLO Task can also be applied in learning English, considering that this learning model has not been widely used. This learning model emphasizes creating an environment that allows students to learn in interactive ways. Learning conditions can vary, whether it be individuals studying alone, working in pairs, or participating in group activities. By effectively implementing this model in this manner. Students are expected to have the ability to explore, develop and create additional knowledge.

METHOD

This research utilized a quasi-experimental design, which places emphasis on both the treatment and outcomes of the investigation (Sugiyono, 2006). The study's participants consisted of 42 XI MIPA students, divided evenly between two classes, with each class comprising 21 students. Prior to the instructional phase, a pre-test was administered, followed by a post-test after the instructional phase. The experimental group, XI MIPA 2, underwent a treatment, while the control group, XI MIPA 1, did not receive any treatment. The experimental treatment employed in the study was the EXO OLO Task learning model. Total sampling, a method where the sample size is proportional to the number of participants, was used as the sampling technique (Sugiyono, 2011). The assessment tool comprised 23 essay questions.

The pre-test was conducted prior to the learning phase, and the post-test was conducted subsequent to learning. Following the collection of data, the researcher determined if the data were distributed normally or not. Consequently, the normality testing was performed using the Kolgomorov smirnov test, and the hypothesis testing was conducted using the paired specimen t-test.

Teaching Procedure

1. Experiment Class

Meeting 1

Pre-Teaching

1. The researcher welcomes the learners.
2. The learners attendance is checked by the researcher
3. The researcher tells that they are going to discuss about "Giving Example"

While Teaching

Strengthening Concept

4. The researcher shows some keywords to the learners. And the learners looking for the significance of the keywords.
5. The researcher instructs the learners to look for the meaning of the keywords.
6. The researcher gives the brief explanation about giving example.

EXO Task

7. The researcher instructs learners do EXO Task questions, and learners do it in pairs.
8. In the EXO task, learners prompted to identify the correct use of the expression of giving example.
9. The learners discuss with their partners.

10. The researcher discusses EXO Task with the learners.
11. The researcher explains the material related to the question that they did not understand.

Post Teaching

12. The researcher tells the learners what they will learn in the next meeting.

Meeting 2

Pre-Teaching

1. The researcher welcomes the learners.
2. The learners' attendance is checked by the researcher
3. The researcher tells the learners what they will do at this meeting.

While Teaching

- *OLO Task*
  4. The researcher intstrucs learners to sit in group of four.
  5. The researcher shows OLO Task questions to the learners.
  6. In the OLO task questions, learners are asked to understand the problem given.
  7. They discuss with their group members, and the researcher asks if there are difficulties in the group, they could ask to other groups.
  8. The researcher walking around the class to see the group progress.

Post-teaching

10. The researcher tells students to continue the discussion in the next week.

Meeting 3

Pre-Teaching.

1. The researcher welcomes the learners
2. The learners' attendance is checked by the researcher

While Teaching

- **OLO Task**
  3. The learners continue their group work last week.
  4. The researcher asks one of the member group to write their discussion result in the whiteboard.
  5. The researcher checks the results of their discussion one by one, the researcher asked the learners where are the mistakes in the paragraph.
  6. The researcher and the learners fix it together.
- *Reflection*
  7. The researcher and the students make a conclusion about giving example.

Post-teaching

9. The researcher informs learners about the topic that will discuss next week.
10. The researcher instructs learners to read the material at home.

Meeting 4
Pre-Teaching

1. The researcher welcomes learners.
2. The learners' attendance is checked by a researcher
3. The researcher tells that they are going to discuss about "Hortatory Exposition Text"

While Teaching

- ***Strengthening Concept***
1. The researcher shows some keywords to the learners, and inquires the learners to look for the meaning of the keywords in their dictionary.
2. The learners look for the meaning of the keywords in their dictionary.
3. The researcher discusses about hortatory exposition with the learners.
4. The researcher strengthens learners' understanding about the hortatory exposition.
- ***EXO Task***
5. The researcher gives EXO Task to the learners and instructs the learners to do it in pair.
6. In the EXO Task, learners are given some questions. First, learners are asked to identify the structure and compose a random hortatory exposition text.

Post-Teaching

7. The researcher tells learners to continue the task next week.

Meeting 5

1. The researcher welcomes the learners
2. The learners' attendance is checked by the researcher.
3. The researcher asks the learners to continue the task.

While Teaching

- ***EXO Task***
    4. The researcher and the learners discuss the EXO Task together.
    5. The researcher instructing the learners to read the random paragraphs and provide their responses.
- ***OLO Task***
    6. The researcher divides the learners into 5 groups.
    7. The researcher directs the learners to take their seats within their respective groups and do the OLO Task.
    8. Each group asked to understand the questions given, if they did not understand, they could ask other groups.
    9. The researcher observed the discussion of each group.

Closing

13. The researcher tells learners to continue the discussion in the next week.

Meeting 6
Pre-teaching
1. The researcher welcomes the learners.
2. The learners' attendance is checked by a researcher.

While Teaching
- *OLO Task*
  3. The researcher instructs learners to continue the discussion.
  4. The researcher and the learners discuss the OLO Task together.
  5. Each group explained the contents of the text that they had made.
- *Reflection*
  6. The researcher does the reflection about learning using EXO OLO Task learning model.

Post-teaching

7. The researcher close the learning activity.

2. **Control Class**

Meeting 1

Pre-Teaching

1. The researcher welcomes the learners.
2. The learners attendance is checked by a researcher.
3. The researcher asks the learners about the topic that they will learn.

While Teaching

4. The researcher tells that they are going to discuss about "Giving Example (such as, for example, and for instance)"
- *Observing*
  5. The researcher shows a dialogue about giving example.
  6. The researcher instructs the learners to read the dialogue.
- *Questioning*
  7. The researcher asks the learners about the dialogue.
- *Collecting data*
  8. The researcher explains the material to the learners.
  9. The learners write the explanation from the researcher.
- *Associating*
  10. The researcher gives several examples of sentences using "for example", and "such as" to students.
  11. The researcher intructs learners to identify the social function and generic structure of the sentences.
- *Communicating*
  12. The researcher and the learners discuss together.

13. The researcher and the learners conclude today's activities.

Closing

14. The researcher tells students to continue the learning next week.

Meeting 2

Pre-Teaching

1. The researcher welcomes the learners.
2. The learners' attendance is checked by a researcher

While Teaching

- *Observing*
    3. The researcher shows a dialogue about giving example.
    4. The researcher intructs learners to read the dialogue.
- *Questioning*
    5. The learners ask about things that they do not understand about the dialogue.
- *Collecting data*
    6. The researcher explains the part that learners do not understand.
- **Associating**
    7. The researcher gives some questions, and asks students to answer it.
    8. The researcher guides the learners to answer the question, they have to identify social function and sentence. Structures of giving examples.
- *Communicating*
    9. The researcher and the learners discuss students' work.
    10. The researcher and the learners conclude today's activities.

Post-teaching

11. The researcher tells the learners to continue the learning next week.

Meeting 3

Pre-Teaching

1. The researcher welcomes the learners.

2. The learners' attendance is checked by the researcher

While Teaching

- *Observing*
    3. The researcher shows a dialogue about giving example.
    4. The researcher instructs learners to observe the dialogue.
- *Questioning*
    5. The researcher asks learners about the dialogue.
- *Collecting data*

6. The researcher reviewed the part of the material that is considered important.

- **Associating**
7. The researcher instructs learners to sit in pair and make a dialogue using "for example" and " such as".
8. The learners discuss the dialogue with their partner.
- *Communicating*
9. The learners practice the dialogue in front of the class
10. The researcher and learners conclude the material together.

Post-Teaching
13. The researcher tells learners to read the material for next week at home.

Meeting 4

Pre-Teaching
1. The researcher welcomes the learners.
2. The learners' attendance is checked by a researcher
3. The researcher tells that they are going to discuss about "Hortatory Exposition Text".

While Teaching
- *Observing*
1. The researcher shows some pictures to the learners.
2. The researcher instructs the learners to pay attention to the picture.
- *Questioning*
3. The researcher asks some questions to the learners about the picture.
4. The learners express their opinions regarding the questions given by the researcher.
- **Collecting data**
5. The researcher explains about the social function, generic structure, and language features to the students.
- *Associating*
6. The researcher presents a hortatory exposition text to the learners.
7. The researcher instructs the learners to read the text.
8. The researcher facilitates a discussion with the learners to collectively comprehend the text's meaning.
9. In pairs, learners engage in identifying the social function, generic structure, language features, and the main idea of the text they read.
- *Communicating*
10. The researcher and the learners discuss the answer together.

Closing
11. The researcher tells learners to continue the learning next week.

Meeting 5

Pre-Teaching
1. The researcher opens the learning by greeting the students.
2. The student's attendance is checked by a researcher.

While Teaching
- *Observing*
3. The researcher shows a hortatory exposition text to the learners.

4. The researcher instructs learners to peruse the text.
- *Questioning*
   5. The researcher asks the learners about the text.
- *Collecting Data*
   6. The researcher explains about the social function, generic structure, and language features in the text.
- *Associating*
   7. The researcher gives the worksheet to the learners.
   8. The researcher and the learners discuss the worksheet that they have done.
- *Communicating*
   9. The researcher and the learners discuss the answer together.

Post-Teaching
   10. The researcher tells learners to continue the learning on the next next week.

Meeting 6
Pre-teaching
   1. The researcher welcomes the learners
      The learners attendance is checked by a researcher

While Teaching

- *Observing*
   3. The researcher shows a hortatory exposition text to the learners.
   4. The researcher instrucs the learners to peruse the text.
- *Questioning*
   5. The learners ask about the things that they do not understand related to hortatory exposition text that has been showed.
- *Collecting data*
   6. The researcher explains to the learners about the things that they don't understand from the text.
- *Associating*
   7. The researcher instructs learners to make a group of 4.
   8. The researcher asks the groups to make a hortatory exposition text.
- *Communicating*
   9. The learners present the outcomes of their discussions to the class.
   10. The researcher instructs groups to show their text, encompassing the structure and language features employed, in front of the class.
   11. The researcher and the learners collectively draw conclusions from the material covered.

   Post-Teaching

   13. The researcher close the learning activity.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the experiment class, students were instructed through the utilization of the EXO OLO Task learning model. In contrast, the control class, comprised of XI MIPA 1 students, was instructed using a scientific approach. Before the learning process, the researcher conducted a pre-test to assess the

initial English language proficiency of the students. The outcomes of this pre-test are detailed in the subsequent table.

Experiment Class				Control Class			
No	Pre test Score	No	Pre test Score	No	Pre Test Score	No	Pre Test Score
S1	39	S12	26	S1	18	S12	20
S2	28	S13	19	S2	16	S13	34
S3	14	S14	42	S3	25	S14	37
S4	20	S15	23	S4	19	S15	3
S5	33	S16	18	S5	29	S16	28
S6	48	S17	19	S6	34	S17	3
S7	3	S18	22	S7	33	S18	29
S8	22	S19	14	S8	25	S19	27
S9	43	S20	32	S9	36	S20	32
S10	13	S21	34	S10	34	S21	8
S11	28			S11	39		
Mean = 25,71				Mean = 25,19			

Drawing from the pre-test results, the control group displayed scores ranging from 3 to 39 among its 21 students. Conversely, the experimental group's pre-test scores spanned from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 48, with the same number of students. The mean scores for both groups are relatively similar, as the experimental class achieved an average of 25.71, while the control class maintained a mean of 25.19.

The researcher giving the post-test to the students to see if there is an improvement of students' achievement in learning English. The outcome is presented in the table that can be seen below.

Experiment Class				Control Class			
No	Post test Score	No	Post test Score	No	Post Test Score	No	Post Test Score

S1	70	S12	54	S1	57	S12	42
S2	75	S13	51	S2	40	S13	75
S3	40	S14	79	S3	66	S14	64
S4	60	S15	61	S4	31	S15	75
S5	62	S16	53	S5	66	S16	48
S6	81	S17	47	S6	70	S17	28
S7	35	S18	50	S7	61	S18	77
S8	49	S19	77	S8	31	S19	59
S9	79	S20	61	S9	68	S20	70
S10	62	S21	72	S10	63	S21	33
S11	67			S11	70		
Mean =61.19				Mean = 56.86			

1. Data Description

The table that can be found below displays the outcome of the data description that was performed in SPSS based on the outcomes of the pre-test and the post-test.

Statistics

		PreEks	PostEks	PreControl	PostControl
N	Valid	21	21	21	21
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		25,71	61,19	25,19	56,86
Std. Error of Mean		2,478	2,900	2,345	3,555
Median		23,00	61,00	28,00	63,00
Mode		14[a]	61[a]	34	70
Std. Deviation		11,354	13,288	10,745	16,289
Range		45	46	36	49
Minimum		3	35	3	28
Maximum		48	81	39	77
Sum		540	1285	529	1194

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Table 3. Descriptive Statistic

Based on the data provided in the table, the pre-test scores for the experimental group ranged from 3 to 48, with 48 being the highest score and 3 the lowest. In contrast, the control group's pre-test scores ranged from 3 to 39. The mean pre-test score for the control group was 25.19,

while the experimental group had a slightly higher mean pre-test score of 25.71.

Furthermore, the post-test results showed that the average score for the control group was 56.86, whereas the experimental group achieved a higher average score of 61.19. The post-test scores indicate an improvement for both groups.

In the control class, the post-test scores demonstrated an increase, with the highest score reaching 77 and the lowest remaining at 28. Similarly, in the experimental class, the highest post-test score climbed to 81, while the lowest was 35. It's noteworthy that the mean score for the experimental class experienced a significant rise from 25.71 to 61.19. Although the mean score for the control class also increased, it remained lower than the average of the experimental class, going from 25.19 to 56.86.It can be concluded that there is an increase in the mean score from the pre test to the post test. The highest mean score is the post test experiment class.

2. Normality Testing

Tests of Normality

| | kelas | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | |
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df
hasil belajar siswa	PreEks	,118	21	,200[*]	,976	21
	PostEks	,095	21	,200[*]	,960	21
	PreCntrl	,160	21	,173	,904	21
	PostControl	,172	21	,107	,880	21

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4. Normality Testing

SPSS Version 24.0 software is utilized to perform a normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test. If the significance value surpasses 0.05, it can be concluded that the data follows a normal distribution. The data related to the pre-test experiment, post-test experiment, pre-test control, and post-test control all exhibit characteristics of a normal distribution. Specifically, the pre-test experiment yields a significance value of 0.2, indicating that it exceeds 0.05. Similarly, the post-test experiment presents a significance value of 0.2, that higher than 0.05. The pre-test control demonstrates a significance value of 0.173, once again exceeding 0.05. Additionally, the post-test control records a significance

value of 0.107, which higer than 0.05. Consequently, the findings of this research confirm the presence of a normal distribution within the data.

3. **Homogeinity test**

The criteria for the homogeneity test in SPSS are if Sig > 0.05 then Ho accepted. Judging from the results of the homogeneity test output table The SPSS above has a Sig value of 0.201. Then Sig 0.201 > 0.05 so that Ho is accepted. This means that the post-test data the experimental class and the control class have different variants homogeneous.

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
hasil	Based on Mean	1,691	1	40	,201
	Based on Median	,562	1	40	,458
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	,562	1	34,727	,459
	Based on trimmed mean	1,493	1	40	,229

Table 5. Homogenity Testing

4. **Hypothesis Testing**

The researcher employed the paired sample t-test for data analysis. There are two hypotheses in this research, there are:

Null hypothesis (H_0) : The EXO OLO Task Learning model does not have effectiveness to improve students' achievement in Learning English**.**

Alternative hypothesis (H_1) The EXO OLO Task Learning model has effectiveness to improve students' achievement in Learning English**.**

The outcomes of the paired sample t-test are displayed in the accompanying table.**.**

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PreEks	25,71	21	11,354	2,478
	PostEks	61,19	21	13,288	2,900
Pair 2	PreControl	25,19	21	10,745	2,345
	PostControl	56,86	21	16,289	3,555

Table 6. Paired Sample Statistics

The table above provides insights into the data. For the experimental class, the pre-test average score was 25.71, derived from a sample of 21 data points. In the post-test experiment, the average score increased to 61.19, indicating an improvement from the pre-test. In the pre-test control, the average score is 25.19, in the post-test control, the average score increase to 56.86.

Table 7. Paired Sample T-test

Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
PreEks - PostEks	-35,476	8,903	1,943	-39,529	-31,424	-18,261	20	,000
PreControl - PostControl	-31,667	13,555	2,958	-37,837	-25,497	-10,706	20	,000

In order to evaluate the hypothesis using the t-test paired sample, the following assumptions must be made: The two-tailed significance value must be less than (0.005 / 0.05) in order to reject the hypothesis H_0 and accept the hypothesis H_1. As can be seen from the data provided in the table above, the second-tailed significance value is (0.000). The significance value is below 0.05 and the null hypothesis H0 is rejected and the alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

CONCLUSION

This study has reached the conclusion that the EXO O LO Task learning model effectively enhances students' academic performance in English. The paired sample t-test results indicate that the null hypothesis (H_0) cannot be accepted, necessitating the adoption of the alternative hypothesis (H_1). The researcher proposes some recommendations for the teaching and learning of English. Which can be beneficial for students, educators, and researchers. These suggestions include; increasing students' awareness of their English learning conditions;studying harder to acquire useful knowledge;and finding a new strategy to improve students' achievement, particularly in English.

The EXO O LO Task learning model assists the teacher in discovering an accessible and successful method of teaching English that encourages students to engage in critical thinking and collaborate to resolve the issue in order to improve student performance in learning activities. Furthermore, the outcome of this study can serve as a reference for similar studies with varying variables or populations. Furthermore, the researcher is hopeful that other researchers will be able to replicate this approach to other student levels.

REFERENCES

Husein, R., & Pulungan, A. H. (2017). *SUMBER BELAJAR PENUNJANG PLPG 2017.* Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Guru Dan Tenaga Kependidikan.

Rahman, A., Nofrion, Suasti, Y., & Ernawati. (2022). Exo Olo Task Learning Model with Case method To Improve Students' HOTS on the Distribution of Flora and Fauna. *International Journal of Educational DynamicsVol. 4 No. 2* , 66-71.

Badriyah, L., Kiptiyah, M., & Wijaya, M. K. (2021). The Influence of Problem-Based Learning on the Students' Writing Skill in Hortatory Exposition Text at Eleventh Grade of SMA Saidiyah Arosbaya. *Sell Journal*, 112-127.

Dani, A. U., & Fajriati, N. (2022). Application of Flipped Classroom Learning Model Based on Task Exo Olo Using Story Articulate Media. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal PendidikanVol.14*, 2507-2512.

DEducation, T. (2020, December). *Learning Research Definition.* Diambil kembali dari Tel Education.org: https://www.tel-education.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/TEL-Research-Definitions.pdf

Fariha, D. N. (2020). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Exo Olo Task untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Berpikir Kritis Peserta Didik pada Materi Elastisitas Zat Padat.

Juliana, T. (2017). Pengaruh Strategi Pembelajaran Dan Kematangan Kognitif Terhadap Hasil Belajar Bahasa Inggris Siswa Kelas Xii Sma Negeri 1 Kuala Tahun Pelajaran 2016/2017. *Repository unimed*.

Mahdi, O. R., Nassar, I. A., & Almuslamani, H. A. (2020). The Role of Using Case Studies Method in Improving Students' Critical Thinking Skills in Higher Education. *International Journal of Higher Education Vol. 9, No. 2; 2020*, 297-308.

Nofrion, N., Ananda, A., Anwar, A., Hasan, H., & Furqon, F. (2017). ffectiveness of EXO OLO TASK Learning Model Based on Lesson Study in Geography Learning. *https://iopscience.iop.org/journal/1755-1315*, 1-9.

Nofrion, Suasti, Y., Khairani, Rahmanelli, Wijayanto, B., Novio, R., & Surtani. (2019). EXO OLO TASK: The Development of Higher Order Thinking Skillsthrough Learning Activities Management in Geography Learning. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2-7.

Pradana, N. F. (2021). Reason Why English is Difficult for Highschool Student and What Impact on It . *Research gate*.

Pratiwi, V. U. (2020). Improving Students' Writing Skills through Collaborative Learning: A Case Study of Senior High School Veteran 1 of Sukoharjo. *ACADEMY PUBLICATION*, 527-535.

Sholihah, U. (2017). Project – Based Learning (Pjbl) To Improve Students' Writing Capability. *Science, Engineering, Education, and Development Studies (SEEDs) Conference Series*, 57-72.

Silalahi, M., Purba, A., Benarita, Matondang, M. K., Sipayung, R. W., Silalah, T. F., . . . Jay, I. (2022). Analisis Kesulitan Belajar Bahasa Inggris Siswa Sma Negeri 1 Narumonda Kabupaten Tobasa. *Communnity Development Journal Vol.3, No.2*, 728-732.

Sugiyono. (2006). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R dan D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode penelitian pendidikan ; Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sultra, E. D., & Baharudin. (2020). Analysis Of Student's Difficulties In Learning English At Sma Negeri 1 Batauga. *ENGLISH EDUCATION JOURNAL (E2J)*, 65-75.

Yusuf, B. B. (2018). Konsep dan Indikator Pembelajaran Efektif. *Journal Kajian Pembelajaran dan Keilmuan Vol 1. No.2* , 13-17.