



The Effect of the Estafet Writing Method on Students' Descriptive Text Writing Ability at Grade Ten of State Senior High School 2 Kisaran in the 2025/2026 Academic Year

Alita Iras Kusumastuti*, & Yen Aryni

Universitas Asahan, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Writing descriptive texts requires students to organize ideas coherently and employ appropriate linguistic features, yet conventional instruction may not sufficiently facilitate active engagement in the writing process. This study investigates whether the Estafet Writing Method significantly affects tenth-grade students' ability to write descriptive texts at State Senior High School 2 Kisaran. Employing a quantitative approach with an experimental design, the study involved 72 students divided equally into an experimental group (36 students) and a control group (36 students). The experimental group received instruction through the Estafet Writing Method, whereas the control group was taught using conventional instruction, and data were collected through a post-test. The findings revealed that the control group's descriptive writing ability was categorized as fair, whereas the experimental group achieved a good category after receiving the treatment. The experimental group attained a mean score of 80.56, representing an increase of 14.11%, while hypothesis testing demonstrated that the calculated t-value exceeded the critical t-value ($5.60 > 2.00$). These findings confirm a significant effect of the Estafet Writing Method on students' descriptive text writing ability, thereby supporting the alternative hypothesis.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted 15 06 2026
Revised 28 09 2026
Accepted 30 09 2026
Published 05 10 2026

KEYWORDS

Descriptive text; estafet writing method; experimental study; students' writing ability; writing instruction.

*CORRESPONDANCE AUTHOR

 alitanjung44@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30743/bahastra.v11i1.13824>

INTRODUCTION

Writing constitutes a fundamental means of conveying messages through written language by transforming ideas and thoughts into forms that readers can understand. Through writing, individuals organize their thoughts, communicate information, and share experiences in a structured and meaningful manner. Dwilina and Iffatur (2022) define writing as a creative and communicative process through which individuals express ideas, emotions, and opinions using language. This process requires writers to consider not only the substance of their messages but also the clarity, coherence, and appropriateness of the language they employ. Consequently, teachers need to implement creative and innovative strategies, methods, models, and instructional media to strengthen students' English competence.

Within the Indonesian educational context, developing descriptive writing skills constitutes an important component of language learning because this competence enables students to articulate detailed observations and construct vivid representations through written language. Despite its importance, many students continue to encounter difficulties in organizing descriptive ideas and selecting appropriate vocabulary (Kartikasari et al., 2023; Rahman & Rahman, 2022). These difficulties may prevent students from producing coherent and linguistically appropriate descriptive texts. Effective writing instruction therefore requires teaching methods that address students' linguistic challenges while actively engaging them in the writing process. This condition underscores the need to explore instructional methods that correspond to students' learning needs and the Indonesian educational context (Dion & Anggraini, 2023).

Preliminary observations conducted among Grade X students at SMA Negeri 2 Kisaran indicated that their ability to write descriptive texts remained below the expected standard. Interviews with English teachers revealed that students demonstrated limited interest in writing activities and encountered difficulties related to vocabulary mastery and grammatical competence. Some students also experienced difficulties in understanding instructional material, which may be associated with limited motivation and insufficient variation in teaching methods. These challenges affected students' ability to develop and organize their ideas effectively in written form. Such conditions indicate the need for an appropriate instructional method that can actively engage students while addressing their difficulties in descriptive writing.



More specifically, students experienced considerable difficulty in observing objects in detail and transforming their observations into accurate written descriptions. Their major challenges included limited vocabulary, insufficient grammatical understanding, and difficulty constructing coherent sentences. Consequently, the descriptive texts they produced tended to be monotonous, lacked sufficient detail, and did not adequately conform to the linguistic conventions of descriptive texts. These problems suggest that students require an instructional approach that facilitates idea generation, vocabulary development, sentence construction, and active participation in the writing process. Addressing these difficulties is essential for improving both the quality of students' written products and their engagement with descriptive writing activities.

The *Estafet Writing Method* offers a potentially relevant instructional approach to address these challenges. As a collaborative writing technique, the method requires students to contribute sequentially to the development of a text in a process resembling a relay. This collaborative mechanism encourages students to exchange ideas, respond to their peers' contributions, and participate actively in constructing a written text. Such interaction has the potential to create a more dynamic and engaging writing environment while helping students develop descriptive texts collaboratively. The method may therefore provide an alternative to conventional writing instruction by integrating individual linguistic competence with collaborative participation.

Based on these considerations, this study investigates whether the *Estafet Writing Method* significantly affects students' ability to write descriptive texts. The study specifically focuses on Grade X students at SMA Negeri 2 Kisaran during the 2025/2026 academic year. By examining the effect of this instructional method, the study seeks to determine whether collaborative sequential writing can contribute to improving students' descriptive writing performance. The findings are expected to provide empirical evidence regarding the application of the *Estafet Writing Method* in English writing instruction. Accordingly, this study is entitled "The Effect of the Estafet Writing Method on Students' Descriptive Text Writing Ability at Grade Ten of State Senior High School 2 Kisaran in the 2025/2026 Academic Year."

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental design, specifically a *post-test-only control group design*. The research was conducted at State Senior High School 2 Kisaran during the 2025/2026 academic year. The population comprised all tenth-grade students, while the sample consisted of 72 students divided equally into an experimental group (Class X-1) and a control group (Class X-2), with 36 students in each group (Yasin et al., 2024). The experimental group received instruction through the *Estafet Writing Method*, whereas the control group received conventional instruction. This design enabled the researchers to compare the writing performance of the two groups after they had received different instructional treatments.

The *Estafet Writing Method* employed in the experimental group constitutes a collaborative writing technique in which students sequentially contribute to the development of a text within a group. Each student continues or develops the text initiated by another student while maintaining coherence and logical connections among ideas. Through this process, students actively participate in constructing a complete text rather than relying exclusively on individual writing activities. The method emphasizes cooperation, creativity, imagination, and concentration throughout the writing process. In contrast, the control group followed conventional instruction characterized primarily by teacher-directed explanations and individual learning activities.

Table 1. Research Design

Group	Treatment	Post-Test
Experimental	<i>Estafet Writing Method</i>	X
Control	Conventional Model	Y

Where:

X = Use of the *Estafet Writing Method* in descriptive text writing

Y = Use of the conventional model

The experimental and control groups received different instructional approaches to determine the effect of the *Estafet Writing Method* on students' descriptive text writing ability. The experimental group engaged in sequential collaborative writing activities through which each student contributed to the development of a descriptive text. The control group received conventional instruction through teacher-centered explanations and direct delivery of learning materials. Both groups received the same topic and instructional content to maintain comparability between the learning conditions. The primary distinction between the two groups therefore concerned the instructional method applied during the learning process.

Data collection required an appropriate research instrument capable of measuring students' writing performance. Arikunto (2006), as cited in Nasution (2022), defines a research instrument as a device used to collect the data required for a study. In accordance with the *post-test-only control group design*, this study involved two principal research procedures: instructional treatment and post-test administration. The treatment differentiated the instructional experiences of the experimental and control groups, while the post-test measured their writing performance after instruction. The following sections describe both procedures.

Treatment

The researchers administered different instructional treatments to the experimental and control groups. The experimental group learned descriptive writing through the *Estafet Writing Method*, which required students to construct texts collaboratively and sequentially by continuing ideas contributed by their group members. The control group received conventional instruction that relied primarily on teacher explanations and direct delivery of information. Despite receiving different instructional methods, both groups studied the same descriptive writing topics and learning materials. This arrangement allowed the researchers to attribute differences in post-test performance more appropriately to the instructional treatment rather than to differences in learning content.

Post-Test

Following the instructional treatment, the researchers administered a post-test to evaluate students' descriptive text writing ability. The post-test required students to produce a descriptive text based on the topic provided by the researchers. Students completed the task under comparable testing conditions to ensure consistency in data collection across the experimental and control groups. The researchers subsequently assessed the students' texts using predetermined writing criteria covering content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The resulting scores provided the empirical basis for comparing the writing performance of students taught through the *Estafet Writing Method* with those taught through conventional instruction.

Table 2. Scoring Guide

Aspect	Level	Score	Criteria
Content	Excellent to Very Good	20	Demonstrates substantial knowledge, clear development of ideas, and strong relevance to the selected topic.
	Good to Average	15	Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject and acceptable development, although some details remain limited.
	Fair to Poor	10	Demonstrates limited knowledge of the subject, insufficient substance, and inadequate topic development.
	Very Poor	5	Demonstrates little or no relevant knowledge of the subject, provides insufficient substance, or cannot be adequately evaluated.
Organization	Excellent to Very Good	20	Presents fluent expression, clearly developed concepts, effective organization, logical sequencing, and coherence.
	Good to Average	15	Presents generally clear ideas and adequate organization with a logical sequence and sufficient coherence.
	Fair to Poor	10	Presents ideas with limited fluency; ideas may be confused or disconnected and lack logical sequencing or development.
	Very Poor	5	Fails to communicate ideas effectively, demonstrates little organization, or provides insufficient material for evaluation.
Vocabulary	Excellent to Very Good	20	Demonstrates an appropriate range of vocabulary, effective word or idiom choice and use, mastery of word forms, and appropriate register.
	Good to Average	15	Demonstrates an adequate vocabulary range with occasional errors in word or idiom form, choice, or usage that do not obscure meaning.
	Fair to Poor	10	Demonstrates limited vocabulary with frequent errors in word or idiom choice and usage that interfere with meaning.

Aspect	Level	Score	Criteria
	Very Poor	5	Demonstrates extremely limited English vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, or word forms and provides insufficient evidence for evaluation.
Language Use	Excellent to Very Good	20	Demonstrates effective grammatical control with few errors in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions.
	Very Good to Average	15	Uses effective but relatively simple constructions with minor errors in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, or prepositions that rarely obscure meaning.
	Fair to Poor	10	Demonstrates major problems in simple or complex constructions, including frequent errors in agreement, tense, number, word order, sentence structure, or negation that obscure meaning.
	Very Poor	5	Demonstrates little knowledge of sentence-construction rules; pervasive errors substantially interfere with meaning or prevent adequate evaluation.
Mechanics	Excellent to Very Good	20	Demonstrates few errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing.
	Very Good to Average	15	Demonstrates occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, or paragraphing, while meaning remains clear.
	Fair to Poor	10	Demonstrates frequent problems with handwriting, spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing that interfere with clarity.
	Very Poor	5	Demonstrates pervasive errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing that substantially impede comprehension.

Source: (Heaton, 1988)

Assessing students' writing ability requires a systematic scoring rubric that establishes explicit criteria and provides detailed descriptions of different performance levels. Such assessment tools enable teachers and researchers to evaluate students' written work more consistently, provide constructive feedback, and facilitate students' monitoring of their writing development over time (Fleckenstein et al., 2023). In this study, the researchers assessed students' descriptive texts across five dimensions: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, as presented in Table 2. Each dimension provided specific performance descriptors that guided the scoring process and reduced ambiguity in evaluating students' written products. The rubric therefore served as the primary framework for converting students' descriptive writing performance into quantitative scores.

Instrument validity refers to the extent to which an instrument accurately measures the construct it is intended to assess. Arikunto et al. (2023), citing Scarvia B. Anderson, explain that a test can be considered valid when it effectively measures the specific variable for which it was designed. In this study, the researchers examined instrument validity statistically by applying the *Product-Moment Correlation*. This analysis determined the relationship between the scores obtained from individual items and the overall measurement scores. The researchers calculated the validity coefficient using the following formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Reliability concerns the consistency and stability of an instrument rather than merely its accuracy as a measurement device. Scarvia B. Anderson, as cited in Arikunto et al. (2023), defines reliability as the consistency and stability with which a measurement represents the characteristic being assessed. A reliable instrument should therefore generate sufficiently consistent results when used to evaluate the same construct under comparable conditions. Establishing reliability is particularly important in writing assessment because scoring involves evaluating multiple dimensions of students' written performance. The reliability assessment consequently supports the consistency and dependability of the scores used in subsequent statistical analyses.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The students' writing performance was assessed across five components: content (C), organization (O), vocabulary (V), language use (L), and mechanics (M). The assessment results provide an overview of students' descriptive writing performance under the two instructional conditions. The first set of scores represents students who received conventional instruction, whereas the second set represents students who received instruction through the *Estafet Writing Method*. The results indicate differences in the overall writing performance of the two groups. The detailed scores are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Students' Writing Scores in the Control and Experimental Groups

No.	Students' Initial	C	O	V	L	M	Score	Category
1	AN	20	15	15	15	15	80	Good
2	AM	10	15	10	10	15	60	Fair
3	AS	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
4	AR	15	15	15	15	10	70	Fairly Good
5	AA	15	10	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
6	AD	15	10	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
7	AF	20	15	15	15	15	80	Good
8	CD	15	15	10	15	15	70	Fairly Good
9	DA	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
10	DNA	10	10	15	10	15	60	Fair
11	DAM	15	10	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
12	FA	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
13	FL	15	15	20	15	15	80	Good
14	GK	20	15	15	15	15	80	Good
15	GF	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
16	GF	15	10	10	15	10	60	Fair
17	RW	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
18	JK	15	20	15	15	15	65	Fair
19	JK	15	10	15	15	15	80	Good
20	KN	15	15	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
21	KC	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
22	KP	15	15	15	10	10	75	Fairly Good
23	LG	10	10	15	10	15	65	Fair
24	MAN	10	15	15	15	15	60	Fair
25	MFA	15	15	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
26	MGD	10	15	10	15	15	75	Fairly Good
27	MIA	15	15	15	15	10	65	Fair
28	NA	15	10	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
29	NM	15	10	15	10	15	70	Fairly Good
30	NA	15	10	10	10	15	65	Fair
31	OU	15	10	15	10	15	60	Fair
32	RC	15	15	15	10	10	65	Fair
33	RA	15	15	15	15	15	65	Fair
34	RP	15	20	15	10	20	75	Fairly Good
35	RW	15	15	10	15	15	80	Good
36	YKY	15	15	10	15	15	70	Fairly Good
Total							2,545	
Mean							70.69	

The control group, which received conventional instruction, obtained a mean score of 70.69, with the highest score reaching 80 and the lowest score reaching 60. These results indicate that students demonstrated varying levels of descriptive writing performance after receiving conventional instruction. Although several students achieved good performance, others remained within the fair and fairly good categories. Students generally encountered difficulties in developing ideas, organizing descriptions, and selecting appropriate vocabulary. The distribution of scores therefore indicates that conventional instruction produced moderate writing performance but did not fully address several essential components of descriptive writing.

The mean score of 70.69 indicates that students in the control group demonstrated a moderate level of writing performance after receiving conventional instruction. Although some students successfully produced satisfactory descriptive texts, their overall performance suggests that several dimensions of writing remained insufficiently developed. Writing in an English as a Foreign Language context requires learners to simultaneously generate ideas, organize information, select appropriate vocabulary, and construct meaningful sentences. Managing these interconnected processes can create substantial linguistic and cognitive demands for learners. Previous studies have similarly identified idea development, organization, vocabulary, and grammar as recurring difficulties among Indonesian learners of English as a Foreign Language (Fitriyah, 2025; Wibowo et al., 2025).

Content development emerged as one of the notable challenges affecting students' descriptive writing performance. Some students appeared to understand the assigned topic but experienced difficulty expanding their

initial ideas into detailed and informative descriptions. Consequently, their texts tended to contain general statements rather than specific information that could enable readers to visualize the person, place, or object being described. Cahyaningtyas et al. (2024) similarly emphasize the importance of sufficient descriptive detail in producing effective written descriptions. This finding also corresponds with Zahra et al. (2024), who identify idea generation and development as significant cognitive challenges for learners of English as a Foreign Language when transforming initial thoughts into coherent written expressions.

Organization also influenced the overall quality of students' descriptive texts. Effective writing requires students to arrange ideas logically and establish meaningful connections among sentences and paragraphs. Students who experience difficulty organizing ideas may include relevant information in their texts but fail to establish a coherent sequence or relationship among those ideas. Such organizational weaknesses can reduce textual coherence even when individual sentences convey appropriate information. Evidence from Indonesian English as a Foreign Language contexts similarly identifies idea organization, coherence, and paragraph development as persistent challenges in students' writing (Fatimah et al., 2023).

Vocabulary limitations constituted another factor associated with students' writing difficulties. Descriptive writing requires students to select precise vocabulary, particularly adjectives and descriptive expressions, to communicate the characteristics of the subject effectively. Limited lexical resources may lead students to repeatedly use familiar words or select expressions that do not accurately communicate their intended meanings. Such limitations can reduce the specificity, variety, and expressive quality of descriptive texts. Vira and Sarmidi (2024) similarly found that insufficient vocabulary mastery can prevent learners of English as a Foreign Language from producing precise and appropriately expressed written texts.

The results can also be interpreted in relation to the instructional approach applied to the control group. Conventional writing instruction may provide students with knowledge about textual characteristics and organizational structures, but writing development also requires opportunities to plan, draft, revise, and evaluate ideas. Process-oriented instruction incorporates several stages, including pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (Nurjanah et al., 2025; Sari & Hasanudin, 2022). These stages enable learners to develop their ideas gradually rather than producing a final written product through a single writing activity. The remaining difficulties observed in the control group suggest that students may benefit from instructional practices that provide more structured opportunities to engage with these stages of writing.

Previous empirical findings further indicate that structured writing approaches can facilitate improvement across multiple dimensions of writing performance. Agesta and Cahyono (2017), for example, found that the process-genre approach significantly influenced Indonesian students' English writing achievement in organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Warsiati (2023) similarly reported that students who received process-genre instruction demonstrated stronger post-test performance in content, organization, and vocabulary. These findings provide a relevant empirical context for interpreting the performance of students who received predominantly conventional instruction in the present study. They also suggest that systematic engagement with the writing process may provide greater opportunities for students to develop multiple writing components simultaneously.

The scores in the control group ranged from 60 to 80, indicating meaningful variation in individual writing performance. Some students achieved good scores, whereas others remained within the fair category despite receiving the same instructional content. This variation may reflect differences in vocabulary knowledge, previous writing experience, ability to generate and elaborate ideas, and familiarity with English sentence construction. Students' writing performance therefore cannot be attributed exclusively to the instructional method because individual linguistic and cognitive characteristics may also influence their achievement. Muliadi et al. (2023) and Rahmadani and Kusumawati (2025) similarly characterize writing difficulties among Indonesian learners of English as multidimensional, involving linguistic barriers related to vocabulary and grammar as well as cognitive challenges associated with idea generation and paragraph organization.

The second set of results represents the writing performance of students in the experimental group after receiving instruction through the *Estafet Writing Method*. The group obtained a total score of 2,900 and a mean score of 80.56. Several students achieved scores between 85 and 95, indicating higher levels of writing performance after participating in collaborative sequential writing activities. The detailed scores of the experimental group are presented

below as the continuation of Table 3. These results provide the basis for comparing the performance of the experimental group with that of the control group.

Table 4. Students' Writing Scores in the Control and Experimental Groups (Continued)

No.	Students' Initial	C	O	V	L	M	Score	Category
1	ADP	15	15	20	15	15	80	Good
2	ASP	15	10	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
3	AAP	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
4	AIM	15	15	10	15	15	70	Fairly Good
5	AU	15	20	20	15	15	85	Good
6	AIS	20	20	20	15	20	95	Very Good
7	DZA	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
8	DPM	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
9	GDS	20	15	20	15	20	90	Very Good
10	GHS	20	15	20	15	20	90	Very Good
11	HJA	20	20	20	15	20	95	Very Good
12	IR	20	15	15	15	20	85	Good
13	IR	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
14	KR	15	20	15	20	20	90	Very Good
15	K	15	15	20	20	20	85	Good
16	MH	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
17	MAA	15	15	20	15	15	85	Good
18	MSRG	15	15	15	15	20	80	Good
19	NUSP	15	15	15	10	15	70	Fairly Good
20	NK	15	10	15	15	15	70	Fairly Good
21	NIS	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
22	NI	20	20	20	15	15	90	Very Good
23	NS	20	15	20	15	20	90	Very Good
24	NH	15	10	15	10	20	70	Fairly Good
25	NSA	20	15	20	15	20	85	Good
26	PA	15	15	15	15	20	80	Good
27	PSG	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
28	PP	15	15	15	15	20	80	Good
29	RPN	15	15	15	15	15	75	Fairly Good
30	RAB	20	20	20	20	15	95	Very Good
31	SHN	20	15	20	15	15	85	Good
32	SZP	15	15	20	15	15	80	Good
33	AM	15	15	15	20	15	80	Good
34	SAA	15	15	20	20	15	85	Good
35	TAS	15	10	10	10	15	60	Poor
36	ZGFK	4	3	3	3	3	80	Good
Total							2,900	
Mean							80.56	

The experimental group achieved a mean score of 80.56, which was 9.87 points higher than the control group's mean score of 70.69. The distribution of experimental-group scores also shows that several students reached the good and very good categories, with the highest reported score reaching 95. These results indicate stronger descriptive writing performance among students who received instruction through the *Estafet Writing Method*. Collaborative sequential writing allowed students to participate actively in developing a text by extending and responding to ideas contributed by their peers. The difference in descriptive performance provides preliminary evidence of the potential contribution of the *Estafet Writing Method*, although inferential statistical testing remains necessary to determine whether the difference is statistically significant.

Overall, the control-group results demonstrate that conventional instruction enabled students to produce descriptive texts at varying levels of achievement, although difficulties persisted across several essential writing components. The mean score of 70.69 represents students' combined performance in content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics rather than merely a numerical outcome. In comparison, the experimental group achieved a higher mean score of 80.56 after receiving instruction through the *Estafet Writing Method*. The descriptive difference between the two groups suggests that a more interactive and collaborative writing environment may support students in developing their descriptive writing performance. Research on process-based writing similarly

supports the value of structured and iterative writing activities in strengthening the writing proficiency of learners of English as a Foreign Language.

CONCLUSION

The findings demonstrate that the *Estafet Writing Method* significantly improved the descriptive text writing ability of tenth-grade students at State Senior High School 2 Kisaran. Students who received conventional instruction achieved a mean score of 70.69 and were categorized as fair, with persistent difficulties in developing ideas, organizing descriptive details, and selecting appropriate vocabulary. In comparison, students taught through the *Estafet Writing Method* achieved a higher mean score of 80.56 and demonstrated stronger performance in developing ideas, organizing descriptions systematically, and employing a broader range of appropriate vocabulary. The hypothesis test further confirmed this difference, as the obtained t -value (5.60) exceeded the critical t -value (2.00) at the 0.05 significance level, leading to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H_a) and rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0). These findings confirm that the *Estafet Writing Method* provides an effective collaborative instructional approach for enhancing students' descriptive writing performance.

This study has several limitations that should inform the interpretation and generalization of its findings. The research involved only 72 tenth-grade students from one senior high school and focused exclusively on descriptive text writing, which limits the extent to which the findings can represent students from different educational settings, grade levels, or writing genres. Future studies should involve larger and more diverse samples, include multiple schools, and examine the effectiveness of the *Estafet Writing Method* across different types of written texts and longer instructional periods. Researchers may also investigate additional dimensions, such as students' motivation, engagement, collaborative interaction, and perceptions of the method, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of its pedagogical effects. English teachers are encouraged to consider the *Estafet Writing Method* as an alternative collaborative strategy while adapting its implementation to students' proficiency levels, learning needs, and classroom conditions.

REFERENCES

- Cahyaningtyas, A. N., Riyadi, S., & Kariadi, M. T. (2024). Using Chain Writing Method to Improve the Students' Skills in Writing Descriptive Texts. *Jurnal Vokasia*, 4(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.vokasia.2024.4.1.12141>
- Dion, L., & Anggraini, R. (2023). Improving Students' Writing Skill Through Estafet Writing Method To The Tenth Graders At SMA Sinar Husni Medan | Journal MELT (Medium for English Language Teaching). *MELT Journal*, 8(2), 1–10. <https://upu-journal.potensi-utama.org/index.php/melt/article/view/381>
- Dwilina, T., & Iffatur, L. (2022). The Effect of the Relay Writing Method on Students' Narrative Writing Skills. *Indonesian Journal of Education Methods Development*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.21070/ijemd.v17i.630>
- Fatimah, K., Imrotin, I., Badrih, M., & Tjahyaningrum, D. (2023). Pemanfaatan Mind Mapping pada Penulisan Buku Antologi Flash Fiction. *Diksa: Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(2), 99–115. <https://doi.org/10.33369/diksa.v9i2.28559>
- Fitriyah, A. N. (2025). The Effectiveness of Estafet Writing Strategy Using Padlet Application on Students Writing Skill. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Dan Riset Pendidikan*, 4(2), 12204–12211. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v4i2.4000>
- Kartikasari, I., Sudar, S., Basuki, B., Ngafif, A., & Rokhayati, T. (2023). The Effect of Estafet Writing to Improve Students' Writing Descriptive Text at Senior High School. *Scripta: English Department Journal*, 10(1), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.37729/SCRIPTA.V10I1.2671>
- Muliadi, M., Rahman, K., Rizal, S., & Azhar, A. (2023). The Effect of Estafet Writing Technique on Writing Recount Text. *Nusra: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4(3), 592–603. <https://doi.org/10.55681/nusra.v4i3.1326>
- Nurjanah, Tobroni, & Fajri, K. (2025). Penerapan Metode Estafet Writing dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Teks Cerita Pendek pada Siswa Kelas XI SMA Negeri 1 Krangkeng Tahun Pelajaran 2023/2024. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 10(03), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.23969/JP.V10I03.33040>
- Rahmadani, S., & Kusumawati, T. I. (2025). Pengaruh Metode Estafet Writing terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Teks Narasi Siswa. *JP-BSI (Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia)*, 10(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.26737/jp-bsi.v10i1.7425>

- Rahman, A., & Rahman, M. S. (2022). Study of Estafet Writing Method and Students Barriers in Writing Recount Text. *Proceeding STAI Rakha Amuntai*, 1(1), 44–51. <https://www.jurnalstairakha.com/index.php/proceeding/article/view/186>
- Sari, M. P., & Hasanudin, C. (2022). Peningkatan Kemampuan Menulis Cerpen dengan Metode Estafet Writing pada Siswa Sekolah Menengah Atas. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Daring: Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1), 893–898. <https://doi.org/10.31332/ALADL.V2I1.1346>
- Vira, A. E., & Sarmidi, G. (2024). Meningkatkan Motivasi Menulis Cerpen Kelas XI-1 SMAN 6 Malang Dengan Metode Pict To Pict. *Seminar Nasional Dan Prosiding PPG Unikama*, 1(2), 2331–2341. <http://conference.unikama.ac.id/artikel/index.php/ppg/article/view/1146>
- Warsiati, T. (2023). Using Relay Writing Through WAG to Improve Short Story Writing Skills for Class IX at SMP Negeri 4 Wates. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Guru (JIPG)*, 4(1), 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.30738/jipg.vol4.no1.a13148>
- Wibowo, L. H., Kaswadi, & Sofiasuti, D. (2025). Penerapan Metode Estafet Writing untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Cerpen pada Siswa Kelas XI SMAN 21 Surabaya Tahun Ajar 2024/2025: Indonesia. *Singular: Journal of Pedagogical Language, Literature, and Cultural Studies*, 2(1), 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.63011/JS.V2I1.25>
- Yasin, M., Garancang, S., & Hamzah, A. A. (2024). Metode dan Instrumen Pengumpulan Data (Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif). *Journal of International Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(3), 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.62504/ZHNV9724>
- Zahra, A., Yuliati, Y., Imamsyah, I., Manik, W., & Anisaturrahmi, A. (2024). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Continuous Writing Sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Nilai Menulis Puisi Siswa SMP. *Literatur: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 6(1), 35–68. <https://doi.org/10.47766/literatur.v6i1.2395>