THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STAR INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL IN TEACHING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT AT SEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF UPTD SMP NEGERI 4 PEMATANGSIANTAR

Bela Rosa Lumbanraja[1], Leonita Maria Efipanias Manihuruk[2],
Siska Anggita Situmeang[3]
[1,2,3]Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar
[1]belarosa820@gmail.com, [2]manihuruknita@gmail.com,
[3]siskasitumeang733@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to find out whether the STAR (Select, Teach, Activate, and Revisit) instructional model had a significant effect on teaching descriptive text to the seventh-grade students of UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Pematangsiantar. This research employed a quantitative method with a quasi-experimental design. The sample consisted of 64 students taken from two classes. Class VII-1 was assigned as the experimental class and received treatment through the STAR instructional model, while class VII-4 served as the control class and was taught using the conventional method. The data were collected through a written essay test. The results showed that the mean score of the experimental class increased from 57.34 in the pre-test to 75.00 in the post-test, which was higher than the control class, which only improved from 58.90 to 66.09. At the significance level of α = 0.05 with a degree of freedom (df) of 64, the t-test result was greater than the t-table value (5.95 > 2.021). This indicates that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the STAR instructional model was effective in teaching descriptive tex.

Keywords: effectiveness, STAR instructional model, teaching, descriptive text

ABSTRAK

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah model pembelajaran STAR (Select, Teach, Activate, and Revisit) memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap pengajaran teks deskriptif untuk siswa kelas tujuh UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Pematangsiantar. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kuantitatif dengan desain quasi-eksperimental. Sampel terdiri dari 64 siswa yang diambil dari dua kelas. Kelas VII-1 ditugaskan sebagai kelas eksperimen dan menerima perlakuan melalui model pembelajaran STAR, sedangkan kelas VII-4 berfungsi sebagai kelas kontrol dan diajarkan menggunakan metode konvensional. Data dikumpulkan melalui tes esai tertulis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa skor rata-rata kelas eksperimen meningkat dari 57,34 pada pre-test menjadi 75,00 pada post-test, yang lebih tinggi

dari kelas kontrol, yang hanya meningkat dari 58,90 menjadi 66,09. Pada tingkat signifikansi α = 0,05 dengan derajat kebebasan (df) 64, hasil uji-t lebih besar daripada nilai t-tabel (5,95 > 2,021). Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa hipotesis alternatif (Ha) diterima dan hipotesis nol (H0) ditolak. Dengan demikian, dapat disimpulkan bahwa model pembelajaran STAR efektif dalam pengajaran teks deskriptif.

Kata Kunci: efektivitas, model pembelajaran STAR, pengajaran, teks deskriptif

A. Introduction

English is one of the international languages many individuals use to communicate with others from different countries. According to Harmer (2007, p.1), English is seen as a global language and is important for communication between countries. Additionally, Crystal (2003, p.30) said that English has a significant influence on many parts of life, including politics, business, communication, entertainment, media, and education. Nowadays, English is recognized as a second language in many countries, including Indonesia, and is learned by individuals. According to Pandey & Pandey (2014, p.93), enhanced English proficiency significantly improves employment prospects and access to better communication opportunities, demonstrating the importance of the language in educational and professional contexts. Therefore, the ability to understand and use English has become an essential necessity in modern world, and schools play a vital role in helping students improve their English skills from an early age.

In the field of education, English functions as a core subject in schools, particularly for junior high school level. Students around the world have different reasons for learning English. According to Harmer (2007, p.1), the necessity to study English language may be part of curriculum or language learning can be based on the students' own willingness and personal motivation. With having a good English skill is the need of the hour and learning it will help one to achieve growth and success in all parts of life. In learning English, all students practice multiple aspects of language skills to strengthen their proficiency and communication. Brown (2001, p.315) said that these four language skills are essential for developing communicative competence in English. Among these skills, writing is one of most important because it helps

students to convey ideas, thoughts, feeling, and experiences clearly. Additionally, through writing skill can give benefits for training and encouraging students to express themselves freely in writing.

Writing is the process of converting information into a written format. According to Amir, H. (2017, p.11), writing is the process of transferring one's thoughts onto paper, starting with words and advancing to sentences, paragraphs, and ultimately an essay. Purnamasari et al., (2021, p.2), also state that writing skill is essential because enable people in conveying their feelings, knowledge, and idea in a text. This process also necessitates attention to important elements, such as correct grammar, accurate spelling, and clarity of ideas. However, in reality, writing is a difficult activity or skills among those language skills for most people because interference of mother tongue. As a productive language skill, writing is not merely about arranging letters, symbols, or numbers; it encompasses various aspects, such as paragraph development, mechanics, and content organization. Additionally, it is closely linked to grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure.

Therefore, the reasons for teaching writing to students include the fact that writing is as fundamental language, just like listening, reading, and speaking. Besides, students should be proficient in English because one of the subjects evaluated on final exams is writing. According to the Kurikulum Merdeka curriculum or Alur Tujuan Pembelajaran (ATP), writing is an essential skill that junior high school students should acquire in order to study English. This is shown in the syllabus's Learning Outcome Elements. Thus, students are required to develop skill in writing multiple kinds of texts. Students, especially those in junior high school, should be proficient in descriptive and procedural text.

Descriptive text is a crucial subject for seventh-grade students to learn, as previously explained. This type of text aims to illustrate places, people, and specific objects. Pratiwi (2019, p.28) emphasizes that descriptive text should be concrete and detailed, so the readers understand what writer is telling about. Therefore, writing descriptive text is interesting because it encourages students to use their imagination and

creativity in expressing ideas. According to Siahaan and Shinoda, as cited in Diana (2021, p.36), descriptive text usually follow a structure composed of identification followed by description. An introduction of what will be described will be provided in the identification section. Whole description provides detailed information of the points introduced in the identification part, focusing on specific aspects like characteristics, form, and quality, with possible personal insights for clarity. The following are indicators of descriptive text: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Additionally, vocabulary and mechanics are also crucial. However, the simple present tense, which is crucial in this text, is difficult for many students to fully comprehend, making it difficult for them to create descriptive text.

Nevertheless, in reality, simple present tense, which is crucial in this text, is difficult for many students to fully comprehend, making it difficult for them to create descriptive text. They also often have limited vocabulary and weak grammar skill. Related to this case, when the researcher did a teaching practice (PPL) at UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Pematangsiantar, majority of seventh-grade pupils were found to struggle with effectively utilizing simple present tense in their descriptive writing. The students continued making errors, including using past or present continuous tense instead of simple present tense in their writing. They also made mistakes in adding the suffixes –s or – es to verbs with singular subjects (*he, she*, and *it*), and frequently confused the use of *has* and *have* in the text.

In addition, students have limited vocabularies, so they often struggle to develop the *description* section in detail. They tend to provide very short and general descriptions without including specific details such as characteristics, size, color, shape of object. However, structure of descriptive text is frequently unclear, resulting in a poorly structured piece of writing. At that point, the students are not motivated to study English, especially when it comes to writing effectively. This happens because students often believe that English is a difficult subject and very different from the language they use in daily life. In addition, many students consider writing in English to be unimportant for their future. As a result, they are less

interested in lessons and unwilling to improve their writing skills. Their lack of confidence also makes things worse, as they feel unable to write well due to limited vocabulary and grammar knowledge. These factors lead to low writing performance, lack of student participation, and hinder development. In fact, motivation has a significant role in determining whether a difficult activity is successful or unsuccessful, particularly when learning a second language. Therefore, a teaching model is needed that can increase motivation, engage students actively, and guide them through the writing process step by step.

These problems are also supported in the results of students' writing. The data collected during the teaching practice showed that, out of 64 students in the two classes, only 5 students passed the quiz administered by the researcher. The minimum mastery criterion for the English lesson of 75, and out of 64 students taught by the researcher, 59 students did not pass. These findings indicate that most seventh-grade students still struggle to write descriptive text effectively. Therefore, it is necessary to apply an appropriate instructional model that can guide students step by step in understanding language features and structure of descriptive text. One way to overcome these problems is by implementing the STAR instructional model, which helped students develop their comprehension and writing skill through structured and engaging steps.

Previous studies related to effectiveness of STAR instructional model have been conducted by Tari, R. H. (2024). The purpose was at examining whether the STAR (Select, Teach, Activate, Revisit) strategy could enhance students' writing skills. The results of research were found that STAR strategy improved writing abilities of students. Therefore, this research's novelty, following previous research, is applying the STAR instructional model for teaching descriptive text, specifically to seventh-grade students of UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Pematangsiantar. While Tari's study focused on writing skills generally at the senior high school, this research is to measure how the STAR instructional model applied in a different context and grade level, providing new insights into its

application in junior high school English classrooms.

The STAR instructional model (Select, Teach, Activate, Revisit) was as a clear and step-by-step way to teach vocabulary. According to Blachowicz (2005, p.5), the STAR model is often suggested as an effective approach to support students in learning new words. This model gives teachers a structured guide to choose and teach important words, help students understand their meanings, and review the words often so that students can remember them for a long time. In learning descriptive text, having enough vocabulary is very important because students need to describe people, places, or things in detail. Without enough vocabulary, students find it difficult and challenging to convey their ideas effectively. Teachers can assist students improve their vocabulary by using the STAR instructional model. This will help students create more descriptive texts.

This model supports students in learning new words in a fun and organized way, which can also improve their writing English well.

The STAR instructional model was chosen in this research because it has clear, structured, and sequential steps, making it very suitable for seventh-grade students who still require guidance from teachers in the writing learning process, especially in English lessons. Unlike other models such as Project-Based Learning or Discovery Learning, which demand independence and higher-order thinking skills from students, the STAR model supports students throughout the entire learning process, from selecting core materials (Select), receiving explanations from the teacher (Teach), practicing actively (Activate), to revisiting and reinforcing understanding (Revisit). This model is highly effective for teaching descriptive texts as it helps students explore ideas, organize them logically, and use appropriate vocabulary. Furthermore, in the *Revisit* stage of the STAR model, students are asked to reflect on and revise their writing, which is crucial for improving writing skills. This aligns with the principle that effective learning occurs when students are given opportunities to understand, practice, and review the material continuously. Therefore, the STAR model is considered more appropriate than other models to achieve the goals of this research and

meet the needs of seventh-grade students.

As previously explained, this research employed quantitative research by implementing the STAR instructional model to determine whether it significantly and positively influences on students' writing skill. It focuses through teaching descriptive text through STAR model to enhance writing ability of students. Thus, the research is titled *"The Effectiveness of STAR Instructional Model in Teaching Descriptive Text at Seventh Grade Students of UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Pematangsiantar"*.

B. Research Methods

Researchers use quantitative methods to determine significant causes and effects between variables. Quantitative methods are research approaches that use statistical tools to analyze numerical data, test hypotheses, identify patterns, and assist in summarizing information.

Therefore, this method is considered effective in obtaining objective and measurable results, particularly in identifying relationships between variables and evaluating the effectiveness of a particular treatment.

The design used by the researcher was the non-equivalent control group design, which involves using two existing groups as the experimental and control groups. The experimental and control groups were not randomly selected in this design, which was comparable to the pretest-posttest control class. The same pre-test was administered to both classes in the first stage to gauge their starting proficiency before treatment. After that, the experimental class was given instruction—more precisely, the STAR instructional model—for teaching descriptive texts, whereas the control group was given traditional education. Following treatment, both groups received a post-test in order to measure the improvement of students' writing skill. To analyze the differences in score improvements, the data were processed through an independent t-test, contrasting the experimental and control groups.

C.Research Results and Discussion

The following table shows essential data on the students' ability to write descriptive text.

Table 1. Pre-test Data of the Experimental Class

No.	Pre-test
1.	45
2.	50
3.	50
4.	50
5.	50
6.	50
7.	55
8.	45
9.	50
10.	55
11.	70
12.	60
13.	55
14.	45
15.	65
16.	75
17.	70
18.	60
19.	55
20.	50
21.	65
22.	55
23.	70
24.	60
25.	65
26.	50
27.	60
28.	50
29.	65
30.	45
31.	70
32.	75

The highest score	75
The lower score	45

N_a=32 $\sum X_{a_1} = 1835$

$\overline{X_{a_1}} = 57.34$

The data in the table above indicate that the students' writing performance remained at a low level. This test was administered to 32 students, and only 2 of them achieved the minimum mastery criterion of 75. The students' scores ranged from 45 as the lowest to 75 as the highest. The mean score was 57.34, showing that most students experienced difficulties in writing descriptive text before the implementation of the STAR instructional model

Post-test Data of the Experimental Class

The post-test results presented in the table, indicate how well students were able to produce descriptive text.

Table 2. Post-test Data of the Experimental Class

No.	Post-test
1.	70
2.	75
3.	70
4.	60
5.	65
6.	60
7.	75
8.	75
9.	65
10.	75
11.	80
12.	75
13.	70
14.	70
15.	80
16.	90
17.	80
18.	80
19.	70
20.	75
21.	80
22.	75
23.	75
24.	80
25.	80
26.	70
27.	75
28.	70
29.	85
30.	70
31.	90
32.	90

The highest score	90
The lowest score	60

N_a=32	$\sum X_{a_2} = 2400$
	$\overline{X_{a_2}}$ = 75

From the data above, it can be seen that the post-test results indicated an improvement in writing descriptive text. The test taken by 32 students, and there was 20 students achived the minimum mastery criterion of 75. The class achieved a highest a pos-test score of 90 and lowest of 60, with an average score was 75, that showing that students' ability had increased in writing descriptive text after receiving a treatment.

Data of the Control Class

Pre-test Data of the Control Class

The results of the tests are shown in the following table:

Table 3. Pre-test Data of the Control Class

No.	Pre-test
1.	60
2.	65
3.	75
4.	65
5.	60
6.	60
7.	40
8.	50
9.	65
10.	90
11.	65
12.	60
13.	55
14.	60
15.	50
16.	70
17.	85
18.	50
19.	45
l20.	50
21.	65
22.	50
23.	60
24.	60
25.	50
26.	55
27.	50
28.	65
29.	50
30.	55
31.	60
32.	45

The highest score	90
The lowest score	45

N_b=32	$\sum X_{b_1} = 1885$
	$\overline{X_{b_1}}$ = 58.90

The table above indicates that the students' writing ability in the pre-test was still relatively low. Among 32 students, there was 3 students achieved the minimum mastery criterion of 75. The highest score was 90, and the lowest score was 45. The mean of pre-test was 58.90, which means that most students still had problems in writing descriptive text.

Post-test Data of the Control Class

The following table displays the post-test results, which demonstrate the students' proficiency in producing descriptive text.

Table 4. Post-test Data of the Control Class

No.	Post-test
1.	65
2.	80
3.	80
4.	80
5.	65
6.	75

7.	50
8.	60
9.	75
10.	90
11.	70
12.	70
13.	65
14.	60
15.	55
16.	75
17.	85
18.	50
19.	50
20.	60
21.	70
22.	60
23.	65
24.	65
25.	60
26.	60
27.	65
28.	70
29.	55
30.	60
31.	80
32.	45
The highest score	90
The lowest score	45
N_b=32	$\sum X_{b_2} = 2115$ $\overline{X_{b_2}} = 66.09$

As shown in the table above, the post-test results of the control class indicated only a minor improvement in writing descriptive text or were still relatively low. There was 9 students achived the minimum mastery criterion of 75 out of 32 students. The highest score was 90, while the lowest score was 45. The mean of post-test in the control class was 66.09 showing that students still faced challenges in writing descriptive text.

Data Analysis

Data Analysis of Experimental Class

The following table shows the writing test results of an experimental class (D).

Table 5. Standard Deviation Data of Experimental Class

No.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D²
1.	45	70	25	625
2.	50	75	25	625
3.	50	70	20	400
4.	50	60	10	100
5.	50	65	15	225
6.	50	60	10	100
7.	55	75	20	400
8.	45	75	30	900
9.	50	65	15	225
10.	55	75	20	400
11.	70	80	10	100
12.	60	75	15	225
13.	55	70	15	225
14.	45	70	25	625
15.	65	80	15	225
16.	75	90	15	225
17.	70	80	10	100
18.	60	80	20	400
19.	55	70	15	225
20.	50	75	25	625
21.	65	80	15	225
22.	55	75	20	400
23.	70	75	5	25
24.	60	80	20	400
25.	65	80	15	225
26.	50	70	20	400
27.	60	75	15	225
28.	50	70	20	400
29.	65	85	20	400
30.	45	70	25	625
31.	70	90	20	400
32.	75	90	15	225
	1835	2400	565	10925

a. Calculating the mean difference score of the experimental class:

$$\overline{X_a} = \frac{\sum d_a}{N_a}$$

$$\overline{X_a} = \frac{565}{32}$$

$$\overline{X_a} = 17.65$$

b. Calculating the standard deviation of the experimental class:

$$da^2 = \sum d^2 - \left(\frac{(\sum da)^2}{N_a}\right)$$

$$da^2 = 10925 - \frac{565^2}{32}$$

$$da^2 = 10925 - 9975.78$$

$$da^2 = 949.2$$

$$da = \sqrt{949.2}$$

$$da = 30.80$$

Based on the calculations above, the mean difference score reached 17.65, while standard deviation of 30.80 with a total of 32 students.

Data Analysis of Control Class

The students' writing test scores (D) in the control class are shown in the table below.

Table 6. Standard Deviation Data of Control Class

No.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D²
1.	60	65	5	25
2.	65	80	15	225
3.	75	80	5	25
4.	65	80	15	225
5.	60	65	5	25
6.	60	75	5	25
7.	40	50	10	100
8.	50	60	10	100
9.	65	75	10	100
10.	90	90	0	0
11.	65	70	5	25
12.	60	70	10	100
13.	55	65	10	100
14.	60	60	0	0
15.	50	55	5	25
16.	70	75	5	25
17.	85	85	0	0
18.	50	50	0	0
19.	45	50	5	25
20.	50	60	10	100
21.	65	70	5	25
22.	50	60	10	100
23.	60	65	5	25
24.	60	65	5	25
25.	50	60	10	100
26.	55	60	5	25
27.	50	65	15	225
28.	65	70	5	25
29.	50	55	5	25
30.	55	60	5	25
31.	60	80	20	400
32.	45	45	0	0
	1885	2115	220	2250

a. Calculating the mean difference score of the control class:

$$\overline{X_b} = \frac{\sum d_b}{N_b}$$

$$\overline{X_b} = \frac{220}{32}$$

$$\overline{X_b} = 6.87$$

b. Calculating the standard deviation of the control class:

$$db^2 = \sum d^2 - \left(\frac{(\sum db)^2}{N_b}\right)$$

$$db^2 = 2250 - \frac{220^2}{32}$$

$$db^2 = 737.5$$

$$db = \sqrt{737.5}$$

$$db = 27.15$$

From the calculations above, mean difference score of a control class was 6.87, with a standard deviation was 27.15 for a total of 32 students. Since number of students in both classes (N_a and N_b = 32) was equal, calculating the t-test was relatively straightforward. Before

conducting the t-test, the researcher first determined t- table value by using the degree of freedom (df) formula, which was then compared with the obtained t-test value.

$$df = N_a + N_b - 2$$
$$df = 32 + 32 - 2$$
$$df = 64 - 2$$
$$df = 62$$

Thus, to compute the t-test value, the formula below was used:

$$t_{test}$$
$$= \frac{\bar{X}_a - \bar{X}_b}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{da^2 + db^2}{(N_a + N_b) - 2)}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_a} + \frac{1}{N_b}\right)}}$$

$$t_{test}$$
$$= \frac{17.65 - 6.87}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{949.2 + 737.5}{(32 + 32) - 2)}\right)\left(\frac{1}{32} + \frac{1}{32}\right)}}$$

$$t_{test} = \frac{10.78}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1686.7}{62}\right)\left(\frac{1}{16}\right)}}$$

$$t_{test} = \frac{10.78}{\sqrt{(52.70)(0.0625)}}$$

$$t_{test} = \frac{10.78}{\sqrt{3.29}}$$

$$t_{test} = \frac{10.78}{1.81}$$

$$t_{test} = 5.95$$

Hypothesis Testing

Based on the results above, the researcher used a significance level of α = 0.05 (95% confidence level), so the results are not likely to happen by chance. Then, the researcher found the t-table value using the t-distribution, with the degree of freedom (df)= 32 + 32 − 2 = 62. The t-table value is t (0.05, 62) = 2.021. After that, the researcher compared the t-test value with the t-table. The t-test value was 5.95, which is greater than the t-table value of 2.021. This shows that t-test > t-table, or 5.95 > 2.021. A significant difference was found between the experimental class and the control class, as evidenced by the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (Ha) and the rejection of the null hypothesis (H0).

Research Findings

The results of the data analysis indicated that the students' ability to produce descriptive text was significantly influenced by the STAR instructional model.

1. Experimental Class
   a. The mean of pre-test score was 57.34 with a total score of 1835.
   b. The mean of post-test score was 75 with a total score of 2400.
   c. The lowest and highest scores in the pre-test were 45 and 75,

while in the post-test were 60 and 90.

d. The mean difference was 17.65 with standard deviation was 30.80.

2. Control Class

a. The mean of pre-test score was 58.90 with a total score of 1885.

b. The mean of post-test score was 66.09 with a total score of 2115.

c. The lowest and highest scores in the pre-test were 45 and 90, while in the post-test were 45 and 90.

d. The mean difference was 6.87 with standard deviation was 27.15.

3. Hypothesis Testing

a. The calculated t-test value (5.95) is greater than the t-table value (2.021) at a significance level of 0.05 (two tails).

b. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected, while the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. This finding indicates that the STAR instructional model significantly improved students' ability in writing descriptive text.

D. Conclusion

Based on data analysis, the researcher concluded that STAR instructional model had a significant effect to teach descriptive text at seventh grade students of UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Pematangsiantar. This is proven by the statistics, which indicate that the experimental class's mean pre-test score was 57.34, originally having a low score as compared to the control class. After treatment was applied in experimental class, score increased to 75, achieving highest score when compared to the control class. It means that students found it easier to create a text when the STAR instructional model was used. At the significance level of 0.05, the researcher also discovered that the t-test value was 5.95, higher than the t-table (2.021). Therefore, this supports the research hypothesis, with the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) being accepted and the Null Hypothesis (H0) rejected. As a result, the STAR instructional model can be applied as a teaching model in English lesson, particularly in developing students' ability to write descriptive text.

REFERENCE

Aki, A. N., & Rorintulus, O. A. (2023). A systematic review: The use of pictures in teaching simple present tense sentence construction to junior high school students. *Journal of English Language Teaching, Literature and Culture*, 2(1), 40-50.

AMIR, H. (2017). *The Implementation of Extended Writing Project Assessment To Increase The Students'writing Proficiency of The Second Year of Ma GUPPI Samata* (Doctoral Dissertation, State Islamic University).

Anamaryanti, A., Syarif, H., & Rozimela, Y. (2015). Students'ability And Problems In Writing Review Text at Grade XII SMAN 4 Kerinci. *Komposisi: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Seni*, 16(1), 1-16.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Walker, D. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Asenahabi, B. M. (2019). Basics of research design: A guide to selecting appropriate research design. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches*, 6(5), 76-89.

Asiah, N., Ardian, E., & Amri, S. (2020). A Study on the Students' Factor Difficulty in Writing Narrative Text at VIII Grade of MTs Sabilal Muhtadin Tembilahan. J-Shelves of Indragiri (JSI), 1(2), pp. 84-97

Asrulla, R., Jailani, M. S., & Jeka, F. (2023). Populasi dan sampling (kuantitatif), serta pemilihan informan kunci (kualitatif) dalam pendekatan praktis. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 7(3), 26320-26332.

Azar, B. S. (2002). Understanding and using. *English grammar. Person Education (US), United States*. Asrulla, R., Jailani, M. S., & Jeka, F. (2023). Populasi dan sampling (kuantitatif), serta pemilihan informan kunci (kualitatif) dalam pendekatan praktis. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 7(3), 26320-26332.

Basri, N., & Syamsia, S. (2020). The effect of applying mind mapping method in writing descriptive text. *Langua: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education*, 3(2), 36-56.

Bayat, N. (2014). The Effect of the Process Writing Approach on Writing Success and Anxiety. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 14(3), 1133-1141.

Blachowicz, C. L. (2005). Vocabulary essentials: From research to practice for improved instruction. *Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Co.*

Bourke, K., & Cook, T. (2003). *English verbs and tenses: don't just test it, fix it!*. Oxford University Press.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (4th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Brown, Douglas. H. 2001. Teaching by Principles. An

Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. (2nd ed). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. Bayat, N. (2014). The Effect of the Process Writing Approach on Writing Success and Anxiety. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *14*(3), 1133-1141.

Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating Writing Difficulties in Essay Writing: Tertiary Students' Perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *4*(1), 61-73.

But, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2000). Using Functional Grammar: An explore's guide (2nd Ed.). Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design* (pp. 155-179). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Daulay, I. K., & Asrul, N. (2021). The Effect of Media Guessing Game Towards University Students'writing Ability On Descriptive Text Local Tourism Content. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *9*(2), 389-398.

Diana, A. D. M. (2021). *An Analysis of Language Features in Writing Descriptive Text of the Tenth Graders at SMAN 1 Balong Ponorogo* (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Ponorogo).

Harmer, J. (2001). Book review: The practice of English language teaching. *RELC Journal*, *32*(1), 135-136.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Cambridge, UK: Pearson Longman I.A.L.F . Welcome to IALF: Education for Development.

Holton, E. F., & Burnett, M. F. (2005). The basics of quantitative research. *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry*, 29-44.

Hyland, K. (2003). Writing and teaching writing. *Second language writing*, *1*(2), 1-30.

Imran, M., Asgher, T., & Ghani, M. (2016). A study on science students' understanding of three lemmas: State verb, action verb and noun in the State Run Colleges in Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *6*(5), 121.

Jayanti, A. D. (2019). Students' writing ability on english descriptive text at grade viii in smpn 33 padang. *English Franca: academic journal of english language and education*, *3*(1), 72-94.

Kane, T.S. (2000). The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing.Berkley Publishing Group: New York.

Kellaher, K. (2001). *Writing Skills Made Fun: Sentences and Paragraphs*. Scholastic Inc..

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing. unsw Press.

Marina, K. A. I. M. (2009). Mental picture of the world: verbs of mental activity and thinking/knowing. *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae (Seria Ştiinţe Umanistice)*, *30*(10), 74-83.

Mayekti, M. H., Faiza, D., & Bestari, A. C. Y. (2022). An analysis of writing descriptive text at the second semester students' English language teaching UNU Purwokerto. *Educalitra: English Education, Linguistics, and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 30-36.

Mukarromah, M., & Suryanto, B. T. (2022). Error analysis on students' writing in using simple present tense in descriptive text. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, *3*(2), 73-83.

Maranita, E. (2014). *The Effect of Applying Select-Teach-Activate-Revisit Technique on Students Vocabulary Achievement In Reading* (Doctoral dissertation, UNIMED).

Onozawa, C. (2010). A study of the process writing approach. *Research Note*, *10*, 153-163.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing* (p. 3). London: Pearson/Longman.

Pandey, M., & Pandey, P. (2014). Better English for better employment opportunities. *International journal of multidisciplinary approach and studies*, *1*(4), 93-100.

Pikulski, J. J., & Templeton, S. (2004). Teaching and developing vocabulary: Key to long-term reading success. *Current research in reading/language arts*, *1*, 12.

Pratiwi, R. C. A. I. (2019). *An Error Analysis of Using Simple Present tense in Descriptive Text Written by The Seventh Grade Sudents of MTs N 2 Karanganyar in Academic Year 2018/2019* (Doctoral dissertation, Thesis: State Islamic Institute of Surakarta).

Purnamasari, D., Hidayat, D. N., & Kurniawati, L. (2021). An analysis of students' writing skill on English descriptive text. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, *14*(1), 101-114.

Rass, R. A. (2001, January). Integrating reading and writing for effective language teaching. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 1-5).

Sari, S. M. (2020). A correlation between simple past tense mastery and writing narrative text mastery. *ANGLO-SAXON: Journal of the English Language Education Study Program*, *11*(1), 91-101.

Sartika, N., & Nurdin, M. (2019). Students' ability in writing descriptive text based on its generic structure at the tenth grade student of vocational high school. *Journal PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, *2*(4), 437.

Siburian, T. A. (2013). Improving students achievement on writing descriptive text through think pair share. *IJLLALW*, *3*(03), 30-43.

Siregar, R. Y. (2020). The Effect of Using (Star) Select, Teach, Active And Revisit Model on Students'writing Ability In Descriptive Text At Nine Grade In Junior High School At Tembung.

Siregar, S. R., & Dongoran, N. (2020). Students' ability in writing descriptive text. English Education: English Journal for Teaching and Learning, 8(01), 81-90.

Sugiyono, D. (2013). Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D.

Supiah, S., & Defi, D. S. (2021). Using Star (Select, Teach, Activate and Revisit) Strategy to Increase Vocabulary Mastery of Eighth Grade Students. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, *1*(1), 11-19.

Tari, R. H. (2024). *The Influence Of Select, Teach, Activate, Revisit (STAR) Strategy On Students' Writing Skill At The Tenth Grade Of SMAN 1 Kibang East Lampung* (Doctoral dissertation, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Metro).

Thornbury, S. (2002). How to teach vocabulary. Pearson educational.

Ulfa, H., Noer, M. U. U., & Rusdiah, R. (2023). Linking Verb Analysis In Earth Novel By Tere LiyE. *Karya Ilmiah Mahasiswa (KIMA)*, *2*(1), 11-17.

Ushchapovska, I. (2020). Multimodal Features of Descriptive Texts: Case Study of Coffee Brands. World Science, 3(1(53)), 23–26.

Vlasákova, J., & Manuhutu, N. (2018). Applying STAR Strategy to Improve Students' Vocabulary. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *1*(2), 210-217.

Wau, C. S. W. (2022). Students'difficulties In Writing Definition Paragraph At The Third Semester Students Of English Language Education Study Program Of Stkip Nias Selatan. *Faguru: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Keguruan*, *1*(1), 1-9.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.

White, H., & Sabarwal, S. (2014). Quasi-experimental design and methods. *Methodological briefs: impact evaluation*, *8*(2014), 1-16.

Zakaria, Rosmawati (2017) *The Impact of Using Select, Teach,Apply and Revisit (STAR) Model on Students' Writing Ability at MAN 1 Makassar.* Undergraduate (S1)

thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar.

Zamin, A. A. M., & Hasan, R. A. (2018). Errors in translation: A comparative study of noun phrase in English and Malay abstracts. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *9*(5), 17-23.

Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *College writing: From paragraph to essay*. Macmillan.