

## **PEER REVIEW TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING EFL WRITING SKILLS FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

Jufriadi<sup>1</sup>, Fadliyah Rahmah Muin<sup>2\*</sup>, & Ria Mustika<sup>3</sup>  
<sup>1,2,3</sup>State Islamic Institute of Palopo, Palopo, Indonesia

fadliyah\_rahmah\_muin@iainpalopo.ac.id

### **ABSTRACT**

This research aims to determine how peer review improves writing skills for the tenth grade of SMA 13 Luwu Timur. It was applied before the experimental study, focusing on one group pretest and post-test design. The population in this research was the tenth grade of SMA 13 Luwu Timur. The research instrument used was a writing test (pretest and post-test). The data is analyzed by descriptive statistics and calculated using SPSS 22. The data analyzed by calculating the mean score and paired sample t-test revealed that the mean score of students in the post-test (55.08) was higher than the pretest (49.15). The t-count (3,118) is more significant than the t-table (2.179). This shows that the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted, and the null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) is rejected. It can be said that using peer review in learning can be recommended to improve students' writing skills.

Keywords: Descriptive Texts, English Language Teaching, Peer Review Technique, Writing Skills.

### **INTRODUCTION**

One of the four talents in learning English is writing. It is used to communicate facts, emotions, and concepts in writing from authors to readers. The four language skills of speaking, listening, and reading are contrasted with writing. Even for a native speaker, it is harder to master.

For pupils, writing is essential. Students who solely concentrate on oral communication will not be able to grasp English; they must be able to use the skills both orally and in writing. They also need to be proficient writers. Writing and communicating ideas in a way that others can understand them, however, is more difficult than we might think. Writing is more difficult to manage than the other three language skills. This is due to the fact that a number of factors must be taken into account when writing in order for the reader to comprehend what is being said.

Writing about thoughts and emotions can be challenging because the writer must typically put letters together to produce words, phrases, paragraphs, and texts. Since writing is an action that requires a process, it is the hardest skill to learn. In order for the reader to understand the writer's intended message, ideas, or feelings, the texts also need to be readable and understandable. Writing involves putting our thoughts into words and paying closer attention to word choice, spelling, grammar, and other small elements.

It is challenging to choose the right word and use correct punctuation and spelling. Furthermore, they have to write content that is related to the topic and make all the

paragraphs coherent with each other. Students cannot build the link between their ideas and facts, lack vocabulary, and the teacher frequently uses a monotonous strategy.

Based on the researcher's initial observations in SMA 13 Luwu Timur, the researcher discovered that students struggled with studying English, particularly in writing several problems; the writing issues were caused by their lack of vocabulary, making it difficult for them to write their ideas into a written form, which can make them confused about how to transfer their ideas; they needed a lot of time to think what they were written; and m The students should be familiar with a variety of writing-related texts so they can read the reader to expand their vocabulary and hone their writing skills;

Teaching writing via peer review is very useful and beneficial in enhancing students' writing in English. It is a strategy where students discuss and write suggestions. Peer review allows students to receive feedback from their peers and receive information, which benefits them in their writing.

Peer review as a tool for enhancing descriptive writing has been the subject of numerous studies. Leny (2017) investigating the effectiveness of peer-reviewed writing form the motivation of class ix students of SMPN 1 Sekampung. This experimental study implies that Peer Review technique is effective to teach writing for the ninth-grade students. In addition, Sartika and Arriyani (2006), tried to to look into how peer review affects students' writing skills and how they feel about using peer review approaches in writing classes at a junior high school in Malang. The results demonstrate that the experimental group's students were instructed using the products. Additionally, the results of the survey indicate that students' sentiments toward the use of peer review approaches in writing classes are favorable. In addition, Sani (2018) conducted a study to determine whether using the peer evaluation method has an impact on college students' ability to write recount texts. She found that college students' recount is significantly impacted by the peer grading approach. Furthermore, Purna (2017) studied the impacts of peer reviewing on EFL writing skills at Senior High School 2 Luwu discovered that the organization factor had improved more considerably.

One strategy is to use peer-review techniques. This is also a technique that can be used in various schools. The similarities between the researcher and previous researchers are the types of research methods and learning techniques using peer review. The difference is that the last researcher used peer review writing to increase student motivation, discover student perceptions, and improve students' writing skills. In contrast, the researcher focused on using peer review to learn descriptive writing effectively.

The researcher chose peer review because it effectively teaches writing descriptive text. After all, when the students review their peer writing result, they get more information or comment from their peer. It can also make them realize some mistakes in their peer writing result, which is used to construct their better writing result. titled" The Role of Peer Review in Teaching Descriptive Writing to SMA Negeri 13 Luwu Timur 10th Grade Students ".

## METHODS

In this research, the researcher applied pre-experimental studies. (pretest and submit-test) and treatment with non-magnificence assessment. The researcher carried out a pre-experimental design to research whether or not the usage of peer review affected the student's writing abilities. The students went through those steps in 3 tiers: (1) a Pretest, which was used to look at the pupil's understanding; (2) treatment, which was carried out to manual the student's effective writing talents:

Note:

T1 = Pre-test

X<sub>1</sub> = Treatment

T2 = Post-test

### ***Population and Sample***

The participants in this study are students in SMA 13Luwu Timur's 10th grade. The study's target audience consisted of about 250 students. One class as the researcher only used one. The whole sampling techniques used in this study were customized by the researcher. This means that the sample of this study refers back to the 10<sup>th</sup> IPS 2 grade students of SMA 13 Luwu Timur, which contains 28 students in a single class.

### ***Research Instruments***

Which was used as a research tool both before and after treatment and took the form of descriptive writing. The test was designed to gather data on the student's ability to write descriptively. Before beginning the treatment, the researcher administered a pretest to determine their level of experience in descriptive writing. Following the treatment, put-up-checks were employed to gauge the student's ability to produce a descriptive paragraph.

### ***Data Collection Procedure***

#### ***Initial observation***

Prior to conducting the investigation, SMAN Thirteen Luwu Timur's region and population were identified.

#### ***Pretest***

Gives the students an opportunity to practice writing descriptive text by utilizing a topic to describe themselves. The kids completely focused on the issue as they produced a descriptive essay.

### *Treatment*

After the pretest, the researcher offered treatment. Six sessions were held to administer the treatment. As a result, the researcher created a number of procedures to support students' descriptive writing with peer review. In each meeting, the researcher instructed the students to write an essay with different topic for each.

### *Giving Posttest*

The effectiveness of using photographs to teach writing descriptive language will be tested in this experiment. In this Posttest, the researcher administered a quiz on the topic of tourism sites in Luwu Timur, after which the students used peer review to create descriptive writings.

### **Data Analysis Methods**

Data analysis procedures involve classifying the Score, he J.B. Heaton scales that make up the objective score are separated into five parts.

- a) Content describes the concept conveyed or the essence of the writing.
- b) The organization's objective is to maintain organization of the content.
- c) The term "vocabulary" refers to any words or phrases that pupils employ in their writing.
- d) Syntactic patterns and structural terms make up grammar.
- e) Using the SPSS program in Windows 22, determine the mean score, standard deviation, significant test, and standard value for the data.

## **RESULTS**

In this section, the researcher showed the students' overall scores as well as their writing exam results. The researcher provided the data in tables and used SPSS 22 to determine the score. The researcher then displayed the pupils' full speaking skill pretest results. The results of the students' pretest scores are shown in Table 1.

*Table 1. Students' Overall Scores in Pretest*

No	Student	C	O	V	G	M	Scoring of Test
1	S1	11	11	10	15	3	50
2	S2	15	16	13	17	3	64
3	S3	12	10	12	16	2	52
4	S4	16	15	12	11	4	58
5	S5	12	11	13	10	2	38
6	S6	7	8	9	14	3	41
7	S7	9	11	13	17	3	42
8	S8	9	9	10	12	2	42
9	S9	6	6	8	10	3	33
10	S10	10	11	13	16	2	52
11	S11	15	15	16	10	2	58

12	S12	15	15	16	10	3	59
13	S13	14	12	11	2	2	50
Total		Mean Score				49,15	

The researcher discussed the typical rating of students' speaking abilities in this area, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

*Table 2. Descriptive Statistic of Student's Pretest*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PreTest	13	33	64	49,15	9,335
Valid N (listwise)	13				

Pretest results. In addition to stating that the mean score of the students' pretest was 49,15 with a standard deviation of 9,335, it also reveals that the highest student score was 64 and the lowest was 33.

### Content

*Table 3. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Content in The Pretest*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	27-30	0	0
Very Good	15-26	4	30,7%
Good	12-14	3	23,3%
Fair	9-11	4	30,7%
Poor	5-8	2	15,3%
Total		13	100%

The displays the frequency and content % of the students' answers on the pretest that came before the treatment. With a percentage of 30.7%, four pupils got the very good category. Three pupils received a percentage of 23.3% for the "Good" category, four received a percentage of 30.7% for "Fair," and two received a percentage of 15.3% for "Poor."

### Organization

*Table 4. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Organization in Pretest*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	18-20	0	

Very Good	15-17	4	30,7%
Good	12-14	1	7,7%
Fair	9-11	6	46,3%
Poor	5-8	2	15,3%
Total		13	100%

The frequency and percentage of organization among the students during the pretest are shown in the above table. With a percentage of 30.7%, these four pupils were given the Very Good category. One student received a Good category, worth 7.7%, six students received a Fair category, worth 46%, and two students received a Poor category, worth 15.3%.

### Vocabulary

*Table 5. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Vocabulary in The Pretest*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	18-20	0	
Very Good	15-17	2	15,3%
Good	12-14	6	46,3%
Fair	9-11	4	30,7%
Poor	5-8	1	7,7%
Total		13	100%

The frequency and percentage of vocabulary used by the students in the pretest prior to treatment are shown in the table above. A Very Good category was awarded to two students with a percentage of 15,3%, a Good category to six students with a percentage of 46%, a Fair category to four students with a percentage of 30,7%, and a Poor category to one student with a percentage of 7,7%.

### Grammar

*Table 6. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Grammar in The Pretest*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	23-25	0	
Very Good	20-22	0	
Good	16-19	4	30,7%
Fair	9-15	9	69,3%
Poor	5-8	0	
Total		13	100%

The frequency and proportion of grammar used by students during the pretest are displayed in the table above. Nine students received a Fair category with a percentage of 69.3%, while four students received a Good category with a percentage of 30.7%.

*e. Mechanic*

*Table 7. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Mechanics in the Pretest*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	23-25	5	0
Very Good	20-22	4	1
Good	16-19	3	6
Fair	9-15	2	6
Poor	5-8	1	0
Total		13	100%

In the pretest before the treatment, the shows the frequency and proportion of mechanics among the pupils. Six students received an of 46.3%, six students received an of 46.3%, and one student received a Very Good category with a percentage of 7.7%.

*Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Writing Aspects in Pre-test*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Content	13	6	16	11,62	3,280
Organization	13	6	16	11,54	3,017
Vocabulary	13	8	16	12,00	2,415
Grammar	13	2	17	12,31	4,191
Mechanics	13	2	4	2,62	,650
Valid N (listwise)					

The table above shows the descriptive statistics for the pretest's writing sections. With a mean of 11,62 and a standard deviation of 3,280, the content value varies from 6 to 16, with a range from 6 to 16. The organization reports that the average score is 11,54, with a maximum of 16, a minimum of 6, and a standard deviation of 3,017. The vocabulary score varies from 8 to 16, with a mean of 12 and a standard deviation of 2,415 in between. Maximum grammatical value is 17, maximum standard deviation is 4,191, minimum grammatical value is 2, and mean grammatical value is 12. According to the final calculations, the mean is 2,62, the standard deviation is, and the minimum and maximum values are, respectively.

**Posttest**

*Table 9. Students' Overall Scores in Post-Test*

No	Student	C	O	V	G	M	Scoring of Test
1	S1	11	11	11	11	11	11
2	S2	15	15	15	15	15	15
3	S3	12	12	12	12	12	12
4	S4	16	16	16	16	16	16
5	S5	12	12	12	12	12	12
6	S6	7	7	7	7	7	7
7	S7	9	9	9	9	9	9
8	S8	9	9	9	9	9	9
9	S9	6	6	6	6	6	6
10	S10	10	10	10	10	10	10
11	S11	15	15	15	15	15	15
12	S12	15	15	15	15	15	15
13	S13	14	14	14	14	14	14
Total		Mean Score					55,08

The study's findings demonstrated the average rating due to the fact that writing challenges students in a number of areas, including content, business, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. with a final score of 55,08 on average following treatment.

*Table 10. Descriptive Statistic of Student's Posttest*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PreTest	13	34	66	55,08	10,112
Valid N (listwise)	13				

The descriptive facts of the scholars' submit-take a look at results are displayed in Table 4.10. The bottom pupil score is 34, and the exceptional is 66, in step with this explanation. Additionally, it stated that the students' put-up- test had a median score of 55,08 and a preferred deviation of seven.235.

**Content**

*Table 11. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Content in Post-Test*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	27-30		
Very Good	15-26	6	46,3%

Good	12-14	4	30,7%
Fair	9-11	1	7,7%
Poor	5-8	2	15,3%
Total		13	100%

The table above shows the frequency and content percentage of the students' post-test responses. Six students received the very good classification after achieving a 46.3% percentage. Four students received the Good category, one student received the Fair category, and two students received the Poor category, for a cumulative percentage of 30.7%.

### Organization

Table 12. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Organization in Post-Test

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	18-20	1	7,6%
Very Good	15-17	2	15,3%
Good	12-14	6	46,3%
Fair	9-11	2	15,3%
Poor	5-8	2	15,3%
Total		13	100%

The table above displays the frequency and level of organization among the students during the post-test. These pupils achieved a percentage of 7.6% in the Excellent category. Six students scored in the fair range (46.3%), two students scored in the decent range (15.3%), and two students scored in the very good range (2%). The next category, with a percentage of 15.3%, was given to two pupils.

### Vocabulary

Table 13. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Vocabulary in Post- Test

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	18-20	2	15,3%
Very Good	15-17	2	15,3%
Good	12-14	4	30,7%
Fair	9-11	2	15,3%
Poor	5-8	3	23,3%
Total		13	100%

The table above displays the frequency and percentage of vocabulary used by the students during the publish-test. after administering the medication. There were two

college students who got a high-quality class with a percentage of 15,3%, students who got an excellent percentage-based total category of 15,3%, four students were given an excellent category with a percentage of 30,7%, two students were given an honest class with a percentage of 15,3%. Following this, three college students received poor grades with a 23.3%.

*Grammar*

*Table 14. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Grammar in Post-Test*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	23-25	0	0%
Very Good	20-22	0	0%
Good	16-19	1	7,6%
Fair	9-15	12	92,4
Poor	5-8	0	0%
Total		13	100%

The table above shows how often and how much grammar was used by students during the post-test. With a percentage of 92.4%, twelve students were placed in the fair category, while one student was placed in the good group with a percentage of 7.6%.

*Mechanic*

*Table 15. Students' Frequency and Percentage of Mechanics in Post-Test*

Classification	Score	Pretest	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	5	0	%
Very Good	4	3	23,3%
Good	3	3	23,3%
Fair	2	7	53,8%
Poor	1	0	0%
Total		13	100%

The table above displays the frequency and percentage of mechanics utilized by the students in the post-test following the treatment. Three students obtained a Very Good category with a percentage of 23.3%, three students received a Good category with a percentage of 23.3%, and seven students received a Fair category with 53.8%.

*Table 16. Descriptive Statistics of Writing Aspects in Post-test*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Content	13	5	19	13,85	4,375
Organization	13	7	18	12,62	3,280

Vocabulary	13	7	19	12,77	3,898
Grammar	13	10	17	13,62	2,022
Mechanics	13	2	4	2,69	,855
Valid N					
(listwise)					

The table above shows the descriptive statistics for the pretest's writing sections. With a mean of 13,85 and a standard deviation of 4,35, the content value spans from 5 to 19, with a range in between. The organization reports that the average score is 12,62, with a maximum of 18, a minimum of 7, and a standard deviation of 3,280. With a mean score of 12,77 and a standard deviation of 3,898, the vocabulary score varies from 7 to 19. With a mean of 13.62 and a standard deviation of 2.022, grammar scores range from 10 to 17, with a range of scores. According to the final calculations, the mean is 2,69, the standard deviation is, and the minimum and highest values are, respectively.

### ***The Evaluation of Students' Pre- and Posttest Scores***

*Table 17. Comparison of the Student's Pretest and Posttest Results*

No	Classification	Score	Pretest		Pos-test	
			Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Excellent	90-100	-	-	-	-
2	Very Good	80-89	-	-	-	-
3	Good	70-79	-	-	-	-
4	Fair	60-69	1	7,6%	5	38,4%
5	Poor	≤60	12	92,3%	8	61,5%
Total			13	100%	13	100%

Table 17 displays a comparison of the findings from the pretest and Posttest. A student with a percentage of 7.6% obtained a fair. A percentage of 92.3% earned the Fair category for twelve pupils. On the Posttest, eight students scored in the bad group with a percentage of 61.5%, compared to five students who scored in the fair category with a percentage of 38.4%.

### ***The Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Pretest and Posttest***

*Table 18. The Paired samples Statistic of Pretest and Post-test Paired Samples Statistics*

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Pair 1	Pretest	49.15	13	9.335	2.589

Posttest	55.08	13	10.112	2.804
----------	-------	----	--------	-------

Table 18 displays the matched sample statistics for the pretest and Posttest. According to the student's pretest, the result was 49.15. The pretest and posttest standard deviations were 9.335 and 10.112, respectively, while the posttest mean score was 55.08.

*Table 19 The Paired Samples Correlations of Pretest and Post-test Paired Samples Correlations*

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	13	.755	.003

The correlation between the pretest and post-test for paired samples is shown in Table 19. As can be seen, the value is 755.

*Table 20. The Paired Samples Test of Pretest and Post-test Paired Samples Test*

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pretest-Posttest	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest-Posttest	-5.923	6.849	1.900	-10.062	-1.784	-3.118	12	.009

Table 20 displays the results of the paired samples test for the pretest and post-test. Test = 3.118 and df (degree of freedom) = 12, according to the researcher. On the other hand, the t-table is 2,179, the pdf is 12, and the significance level is 5%. According to the data shown above, the probability value was less than  $\alpha=0.003$  ( $\alpha=0.001.0.005$ ), hence the test is greater than the table. The alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted while the null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) was refuted. One may argue that students use peer evaluation to hone their writing abilities.

## DISCUSSION

Researchers discovered various issues in class 10 SMA 13 Luwu Timur, including a lack of vocabulary that makes it challenging for students to express their views in writing, which can leave them perplexed about how to convey their ideas. The researcher discovered a useful learning method for pupils to use in order to address these writing skill issues. Peer review is a type of.

The researcher discovered that students had trouble writing since the majority of them did not comprehend the material in the first meeting's session. Many of them still give arbitrary answers. Students continued to make the same error at the second and third meetings, which was that they continued to be perplexed. However, with continuous

explanations from researchers, students are interested in trying. But from the fourth meeting until the last meeting, they tried to write well. In the post-test, students' writing ability increased. Writing ability improves: Students can understand what is written.

There were variances in the test results of the students following the treatment phase, according to the experimental class that examined the writing skills of the students. It is clear that the average score climbs from 33 at the pretest stage to 34 at the post-stage. The component of listening comprehension received the highest score from the students, with a maximum score, and the average score was from the pretest session. Students received a maximum score of 66 and an average of 55.08 during the post-test session. In this situation, children learn more vocabulary from each of their works in addition to being able to understand the topic.

This study was conducted with several results. First, the advantages of applying new knowledge. This study supports prior research by Suriani Binti Bakar (2022), which found that educators may more readily convey knowledge by utilizing learning approaches. Researchers in this study found suitable learning techniques to help students' writing skills. Second, according to Astuti (2018), Peer review enhances kids' writing abilities. Herawati (2019) claims that peer criticism enhances pupils' writing abilities

The novelty of this research is in the peer review section. The most important part of the peer is feedback, suggestions, and improvements that can make students aware of mistakes in Writing. Peer review is an easy method.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusion that may be reached is that the peer review for children to understand the efficacy of teaching writing sentences to 10th-grade students of SMA 13 Luwu Timur. The writing abilities of students are greatly influenced. This shows that using peer review in an environment where students may share their papers can help them develop their writing abilities. Through their friends' writing, they can learn new things and gain fresh perspectives, and they can also develop their writing talents going forward.

The English teacher has to not forget the appropriate approach primarily based on the students' needs. Except, discovering the students' needs and lacks can be a beneficial guide for the teacher in serving a better lesson system. Using peer overview can be an opportunity approach for teaching writing competencies and motivating for kids to realize the facts correctly. This research investigates that scholars who take part in the use of peer overview become extra enthusiastic in writing classes. Furthermore, instructors can use peer review as a proposal for getting to know techniques with other kinds of speech in teaching.

Every kid has the chance to give a fantastic performance. To attain the learning objectives, nevertheless, the students frequently require a technique to assist them in comprehending the instruction and the key skills in certain circumstances and scenarios. Peer evaluation is therefore anticipated to aid students in improving their academic performance. Additionally, it is anticipated that using peer evaluation would help students find motivation for their work. (Brown, Douglas, 2000)

To assist the pupils in improving their writing abilities, the researcher suggests doing a similar research study. It is anticipated that other research will use the peer review implementation as a model or source of inspiration. The researcher also anticipates that additional researchers will. (Moore, 2020)

## REFERENCES

- Adventris Ndohna Ruru, T. & Sulistiyo T. (2020). Journal of Research on English And Language Learning.
- Alfaki, I.M. (2015). University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy. International Journal of English Language Teaching, Vol. 35, No. 3. 2015.
- Anderson, M. (2003). Text Type in English. Macmillan Educational Australia PTY LTD.
- Apsari, Y. (2017). The Use of Picture Series in Teaching Writing Recount Text. Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia, Vol. 4, No. 3, 51-56.
- Astuti. (2013). The Effectiveness of Peer Feedback to Improve the Writing Ability of the Tenth Grade Students of SMA Kanisius Harapan Tirtomoyo in the Academic Year of 2012/2013. Journal Research, Vol. 112, No.1.
- Bartles, Nat. (2003). Written Peer Response in L2 Writing. English Teaching Forum: Germany.
- Brown, D.H. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Detapratiwi, R." The Impact of Team Pair Solo Technique and Round Robin Technique on Students Ability in Writing Descriptive Text." Journal of English Language Teaching 2 (2013).
- Dietsch, B.M. (2006) Reasoning and Writing Well: A Rhetoric, Research Guide, Reader and Handbook. Graw Hill Marion Technical College.
- Faundi. (2016). The Implementation of Peer Review Technique in Teaching Writing. English Educational Journal, Vol. 19, No. 7, 402-414.
- Fikri, C. (2016). The Effectiveness of Dictogloss Technique on Students' Writing of Descriptive Text. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah
- Harmer, J. (2004). How to Teach Writing. Pearson Educational Limited. Longman.
- Hidayatullah, M.S. & Handayani, A.E. (2018). The Effect of Learning English by Using Pictures Map Towards Students' Ability in Writing Descriptive Paragraphs at the Second Year of MTS Nurul Wahid Bukit Kapur Dumai. Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. 26-30.
- Hansen, J.G. & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response. ELT Journal: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Second Language Writing. Cambridge University Press.

- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Longman.
- Kalsum, U. (2016). The Effectiveness of Using Picture in Teaching Writing of Descriptive Text at the Eighth Grade Students of MtsN Purworejo in the Academic Year of 2015/2016. *English Education Program*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo.
- Leny, S. (2015). The Effectiveness of Peer Review to Teach Writing at Ninth Grade of SMPN 1 Sekampung Academic Year 2014/2015. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
- Lewis, M. (2022). *Giving Feedback in Language Classes*. The University of Auckland; SEAMO Regional Language Centre Vol. 45. No.1
- Luber, J. (2016). *Descriptive Text*. <http://juliantluber.blogspot.com/2014/04/descriptive-text.html>.
- Mariah. (2017) Improving Students' Writing Descriptive Text Ability by Using Peer Feedback Technique at Ten Grade Students of Man Sapirok South Tapanuli. A Thesis 43, no. 9.
- Mashadi. (2014). Improving Students' Writing Abilities Through Peer Feedback Technique at Class VII D of SMP Negeri 1 Mlati in the Academic Year of 2012/2023. A Thesis.
- McMorran, Chris. *Peer Review in Student Writing: Managing Chaos with Turnitin*. BuzzEd.
- Mehrdad, M. (2011). Online and Face-To-Face Peer Review: Measures of Implementation in ESL Writing Classes'. *Asian EFL Journal*.
- Muslimah. (2018). The Effect of Story Pyramid Strategy Toward Students' Writing Narrative Text. *Journal Research* Vol. 29, No.2.
- Muthoharoh (2018). Using Feedback in Teaching Writing Descriptive Text. *English Studies Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3.
- Oshima, A. & Houge (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing (Third Edition)*. York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Permanasari. "Kemampuan Menulis Teks Deskripsi Siswa Kelas VII SMP Negeri 1 Sumber Jaya Lampung Barat." *Jurnal Pesona* 99, no. 4 (Januari 17, 2020).
- Pratiwi. K. (2021) Students Difficulties in Writing English (A Study at The Third Semester Students of English Education Program at University of Bengkulu Academic Year 2011-2012. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching* Vol. 3, No. 2.
- Purna, D. (2017). The Impacts of Peer Reviewing on EFL Writing Skills. State University of Makassar.
- Rahimah. (2020). An Analysis of Peer Feedback towards the Students Writing Skill at Mas Bustanul Ulum. A Thesis.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Technique in Teaching Writing*. Oxford University Press.

- Sani, H.E. (2018). The Influence of Using Peer Review Technique towards Students' Recount Text Writing Ability at the Second Semester of The Regular Eighth Grade of MTs Negeri 2 Bandar Lampung in 2016-2017. Raden Intan State Islamic University Lampung.
- Sartika, D. & Arriyani, N (2006) Enhancing Students Writing Skill to Write Descriptive Text Using Peer Review and Free Writing Techniques.
- Shukla, S. (2018). Variable, Hypotheses and Stages of Research. Lesser. , 67, [http://www.researchgate.net/publication/325127119\\_VARIABLES\\_HYPOTHESES\\_D\\_STAGES\\_OF\\_RESEARCH\\_1](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/325127119_VARIABLES_HYPOTHESES_D_STAGES_OF_RESEARCH_1)
- Zemach, D.E. and Rumisek, L. A. (2005). Academic Writing: From Paragraph to Essay. Macmillan Publisher Ltd.