

THE EFFECT OF USING PICTURE WORD INDUCTIVE MODEL IN IMPROVING THE TENTH GRADE STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS IN DESCRIPTIVE TEXT AT SMAN 10 GOWA

Salsabila Rahman

UIN Alauddin Makassar

E-mail: Salsabilarhman@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to examine the effectiveness of Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) in enhancing descriptive writing skills among tenth-grade students at SMAN 10 Gowa. Writing skills are essential for English fluency, yet students often face difficulties in word generation, idea organization, and sentence structure. PWIM, which employs visual aids and inductive learning, addresses these challenges effectively. This quasi-experimental study used a non-equivalent control group design with fifty tenth-grade students, twenty-five in the experimental group and twenty-five in the control group. Both groups completed a pre-test and post-test. Data were analyzed using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to determine the effect of PWIM on students' writing achievement while controlling for prior writing ability. The results showed that the experimental group significantly improved in writing performance, with the mean score rising from 64.11 in the pre-test to 85.24 in the post-test, whereas the control group showed only slight improvement. ANCOVA results indicated a statistically significant difference between the two groups ($p < 0.001$), with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = 0.886). The improvement can be explained not only by visual scaffolding and structured guidance but also by the engagement of students in inductive reasoning, enabling them to infer general language patterns from concrete examples. In conclusion, PWIM effectively enhances students' descriptive writing skills, including vocabulary use, idea organization, and sentence construction. English educators may consider PWIM as an alternative instructional strategy, and further research is recommended to explore its impact on different text types, grade levels, and educational contexts.

Keywords: PWIM, descriptive writing, writing achievement, quasi-experimental design, ANCOVA

1) INTRODUCTION

Students need to master four linguistic skills in order to reach fluency in the English language. The ability to read, write, speak, and listen are all part of this set of skills. Students who are able to put their ideas, feelings, and perspectives into coherent written form improve not just their language acquisition but also their critical thinking, reflective abilities, and capacity for self-expression (Ermita et al., 2019).

Strong writing abilities are beneficial for students in many ways. Elmahida et al. (2021) asserts that students will benefit from developing strong writing skills across all academic levels since it

will provide them with a practical understanding of literature. According to Çavdar and Doe (2012), students may sharpen their critical thinking abilities via writing, which demands them to present their thoughts in a cohesive and concise way. Therefore, opportunities in school and the job will be more accessible to those who can articulate their ideas effectively and convincingly.

According to Nurdianingsih (2018), writing is a crucial part of learning in general. Nino and Paez (2018) state that students may enhance their linguistic abilities via writing. Significant improvement in language acquisition may be shown by increased writing output.

In addition to its importance, writing is considered one of the most difficult skills for students to acquire. According to Richards and Renandya (2002), this difficulty arises from the complex cognitive processes required, such as concept generation, logical organization, and proper sentence presentation. This statement was also consistent with Silalahi's (2021) assertion that writing abilities are particularly challenging to develop due to the complexity of the activities involved. Because writing requires attention to numerous factors, a large percentage of students find it difficult to become proficient writers. Content, organization, mechanics, language use, and vocabulary are the five aspects of writing that must be considered by the author.

The learning objectives for the English subject in Phase E of the Merdeka Curriculum, particularly in writing skills, are as follows: (1) participate in guided activities to create different types of fiction and nonfiction texts; (2) plan, draft, revise, and self-correct written texts using proper capitalization and punctuation; (3) organize ideas coherently and cohesively to improve writing clarity and readability. These competencies are stated in Keputusan Kepala Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan (BSKAP) No. 033/H/KR/2022.

In senior high school, students learn about many different types of literature. Reports, procedures, news, anecdotes, explanations, discussions, expositions, information, and reviews are all part of this category (Sartika & Nurdin, 2019). Among these types of writing is descriptive text. Any living thing, location, or event may be described using this type of text. Students are instructed to produce a descriptive text about how objects look, sound, and taste. Kane (2000, p. 351) stated, "The act of describing involves the senses of sight, hearing, and taste." Students also utilize descriptive text to provide knowledge about a subject by describing its features without offering any subjective judgments.

The preliminary research conducted in March 2025 on tenth-grade students at SMAN 10 Gowa discovered that many students struggle to organize and develop their thoughts in writing.

They frequently struggled to choose words appropriate for the particular context. Additionally, grammatical errors were frequently observed in their work, notably in subject-verb agreement. Students regularly postponed their writing tasks until the teacher's deadline.

The researcher was interested in studying the effectiveness of PWIM in improving the descriptive writing skills of tenth grade students at SMAN 10 Gowa in relation to the problems mentioned above. The researcher selected PWIM as the teaching strategy. PWIM, according to Rachel & Samban (2022) and Nurani & Rosyada (2017), can help students write better descriptive texts. Basically, PWIM is a teaching strategy that uses visual aids to enhance learning.

PWIM is ideal for tenth grade students since it aligns with their cognitive development. Piaget (1972) explains that adolescents between the ages of 15 and 16 reach the formal operational stage, during which they learn to think abstractly, logically, and systematically. This stage highlights the move from concrete thinking to the ability to evaluate complicated situations, examine hypothetical possibilities, and comprehend various viewpoints.

During this stage of development, PWIM is useful because it encourages students to think abstractly by allowing them to make connections between concrete visuals and abstract phrases. Students exercise critical thinking and logical reasoning, which are crucial cognitive abilities in the formal operational stage, through organized observation and word classification.

Furthermore, PWIM encourages inductive thinking by allowing students to build knowledge from specific examples, analyze visual clues, and create vocabulary. Incorporating PWIM into tenth grade writing education is beneficial due to its inductive approach, which promotes cognitive growth.

Another piece of evidence that PWIM may help students become better writers comes from Paivio's (1971) Dual Coding Theory. This theory argues that the brain is more efficient at processing information when it uses both verbal and nonverbal representations simultaneously. According to this theory, the brain has two interconnected subsystems: one for processing visual information and another for processing linguistic information. By combining visual stimuli with written language, PWIM improves students' ability to retain terminology, comprehend text structures, and construct cohesive descriptions.

2) METHODS

In this study, the researcher used a quasi-experimental design with a non-equivalent control group to investigate the effect of Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) on tenth grade students' descriptive writing skills at SMAN 10 Gowa. The study involved two groups: an experimental group receiving PWIM treatment and a control group receiving conventional instruction. The independent variable was the instructional strategy, while the dependent variable was students' descriptive writing performance.

The population consisted of all tenth-grade students at SMAN 10 Gowa during the 2024/2025 academic year, totaling eight classes with 216 students. Two classes, KM 1 and KM 7, were purposively selected as the sample to represent both teachers, ensuring equivalence in professional qualifications, curriculum implementation, textbooks used, and conventional teaching approaches. One class served as the experimental group and the other as the control group, allowing differences in student outcomes to be attributed to the PWIM treatment rather than teacher-related factors. A summary of the research design is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Research Design

No	Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
(R)	Experimental	Y1	Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)	Y2
(R)	Control	Y1	Conventional Approach	Y2

To assess students' descriptive writing abilities, the researcher employed two writing assessments, a pre-test and a post-test. Each assessment required students to produce four types of descriptive texts: an object, a place, a person or people, and an event, with each text divided into identification and description paragraphs. An analytic scoring rubric adapted from Brown (2019) was used to evaluate students' performance across five dimensions: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The instruments were validated by two lecturers from the English Education Department at UIN Alauddin Makassar, focusing on clarity, content relevance, alignment with the Basic Competencies, and bias prevention. Following the validators' recommendations, minor revisions were implemented, and the instruments were officially deemed fit for use, ensuring accurate measurement of students' descriptive writing skills.

The study was conducted over seven meetings: a pre-test in Meeting 1, five PWIM treatment sessions in Meetings 2–6, and a post-test in Meeting 7. During the first treatment session, students were introduced to descriptive writing concepts, including goals, generic structures, and relevant linguistic features such as present tense, linking verbs, action verbs, mental verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and adverbial phrases. In the subsequent treatment sessions, students practiced PWIM activities for different text types: objects, places, people, and events. Each session followed a structured sequence of observing pictures, identifying and labeling objects or details, generating vocabulary, creating word charts, drafting texts, and revising for clarity, coherence, and accuracy. The post-test required students to produce the same four types of descriptive texts (object, place, person/people, and event) using different prompts or pictures, with each text divided into identification and description paragraphs and employing the same linguistic features as in the pre-test. This allowed a comparison of students' writing performance before and after the PWIM intervention.

All writings were evaluated by a single rater holding a Bachelor's degree in English Language Education, trained in the use of the analytic scoring rubric. Calibration sessions ensured a consistent understanding of the scoring dimensions. Each text was scored twice, and the final scores for each student were calculated as the average of the two assessments. Intra-rater reliability was verified using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC), confirming high consistency and dependability of the scoring process. The students' final scores were categorized according to the school's writing proficiency scale, ranging from Excellent to Very Poor.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS, encompassing descriptive statistics to determine means, standard deviations, and score ranges for both groups. Normality was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilk test, homogeneity with Levene's test, and linearity between pre-test and post-test scores was confirmed. ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariance) was then used to evaluate differences between the experimental and control groups while controlling for initial ability, and Partial Eta Squared was calculated to determine the effect size of PWIM on students' writing performance. This methodological approach ensured that the study's findings were both valid and reliable, providing a comprehensive understanding of the impact of PWIM on descriptive writing skills.

3) RESULTS

Intra-Rater Reliability

Paper presented at The 5th ICONELE on April 16th-17th, 2026 English Education
Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar
South Sulawesi-Indonesia

A single rater assessed the students' writing performances twice, using identical scoring criteria. The first assessment was conducted in May, and the second in December. Intra-rater reliability was evaluated using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) to measure the consistency of the scoring across the two assessments.

Table 2. Intra-Rater Reliability Result

	Intraclass Correlation ^b	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.996 ^a	.994	.998	559.854	49	49	<.001
Average Measures	.998 ^c	.997	.999	559.854	49	49	<.001

Two-way mixed effects model where people effects are random and measures effects are fixed.

a. The estimator is the same, whether the interaction effect is present or not.

b. Type A intraclass correlation coefficients using an absolute agreement definition.

c. This estimate is computed assuming the interaction effect is absent, because it is not estimable otherwise.

The ICC values indicate excellent intra-rater reliability, showing that the rater consistently applied the scoring criteria across the two assessments.

Writing Score Classification

The students' writing scores were categorized into six proficiency levels: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, and Very Poor. The distributions of the pre-test and post-test scores for both groups are presented below.

Table 3. Pre-Test Score Classification of Control Group

Classification	Scale	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Excellent	90-100	0	0%
Very good	80-89	0	0%
Good	70-79	1	4%
Fair	60-69	23	92%
Poor	50-59	1	4%
Very poor	≤ 49	0	0%
Total		25	100 %

Table 4. Pre-Test Score Classification of Experimental Group

Classification	Scale	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
----------------	-------	---------------	----------------

Paper presented at The 5th ICONELE on April 16th-17th, 2026 English Education
Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar
South Sulawesi-Indonesia

Excellent	90-100	0	0%
Very good	80-89	0	0%
Good	70-79	1	4%
Fair	60-69	22	88%
Poor	50-59	2	8%
Very poor	≤ 49	0	0%
Total		25	100 %

Table 5. Post-Test Score Classification of Control Group

Classification	Scale	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Excellent	90-100	0	0%
Very good	80-89	0	0%
Good	70-79	6	24%
Fair	60-69	18	72%
Poor	50-59	1	4%
Very poor	≤ 49	0	0%
Total		25	100 %

Table 6. Post-Test Score Classification of Experimental Group

Classification	Scale	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Excellent	90-100	2	8%
Very good	80-89	19	76%
Good	70-79	4	16%
Fair	60-69	0	0%
Poor	50-59	0	0%
Very poor	≤ 49	0	0%
Total		25	100 %

Descriptive Statistics

The pre-test and post-test scores for both groups are summarized in Table 7 and Table 8.

Table 7. Pre-Test Descriptive Statistics

Pre_Final			
Research Group	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Controlled Group	65.0250	25	3.23293
Experimental Group	64.1150	25	4.04369
Total	64.5700	50	3.65231

Table 8. Post-Test Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Post_Final			
Research Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Controlled Group	66.5850	4.46510	25
Experimental Group	85.2450	3.87374	25
Total	75.9150	10.29273	50

Pre-requisite Tests for ANCOVA

Shapiro-Wilk test was used due to small sample size ($N < 50$).

Table 9. Normality Test

Tests of Normality							
	Research Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Post_Final	Controlled Group	.106	25	.200*	.966	25	.536
	Experimental Group	.159	25	.102	.932	25	.096
Pre_Final	Controlled Group	.152	25	.138	.942	25	.169
	Experimental Group	.086	25	.200*	.954	25	.305

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

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

All significance values were greater than 0.05, indicating normal distribution.

Table 10. Linearity Test

ANOVA Table						
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Sig.
Post_Final * Pre_Final	Between Groups	(Combined)	3719.028	32	116.220	1.342
		Linearity	56.060	1	56.060	.647
		Deviation from Linearity	3662.968	31	118.160	1.365
	Within Groups		1472.048	17	86.591	
	Total		5191.076	49		

No significant deviation from linearity was observed.

Levene's test for post-test score:

Table 11. Homogeneity of Variance

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Post_Final

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.740	1	48	.394

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Pre_Final + Group

Variance was homogeneous (Sig. > 0.05).

Interaction between group and pre-test:

Table 12. Homogeneity of Regression Slopes

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Post_Final

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4612.879 ^a	3	1537.626	122.330	<.001
Intercept	166.852	1	166.852	13.274	<.001
Pre_Final	259.620	1	259.620	20.655	<.001
Group	40.142	1	40.142	3.194	.081
Group * Pre_Final	7.111	1	7.111	.566	.456
Error	578.197	46	12.570		
Total	293345.438	50			
Corrected Total	5191.076	49			

a. R Squared = .889 (Adjusted R Squared = .881)

Hypothesis Testing (Ancova)

ANCOVA was conducted using post-test scores as the dependent variable, group as the independent variable, and pre-test scores as covariate.

Table 13. ANCOVA Results

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Post_Final

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	4605.768 ^a	2	2302.884	184.921	<.001	.887
Intercept	192.701	1	192.701	15.474	<.001	.248
Pre_Final	253.323	1	253.323	20.342	<.001	.302
Group	4549.708	1	4549.708	365.340	<.001	.886
Error	585.308	47	12.453			
Total	293345.438	50				
Corrected Total	5191.076	49				

a. R Squared = .887 (Adjusted R Squared = .882)

Paper presented at The 5th ICONELE on April 16th-17th, 2026 English Education
Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar
South Sulawesi-Indonesia

The ANCOVA results show a significant difference between experimental and control groups after controlling for pre-test scores (Sig. < 0.001). The Partial Eta Squared value indicates a very large effect size.

4) DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that the use of the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) significantly enhanced students' ability to produce descriptive texts. The experimental group demonstrated a substantial increase in mean scores, from 64.11 in the pre-test to 85.24 in the post-test. In contrast, the control group, which received traditional instruction, showed only modest improvement. ANCOVA results confirmed this difference, with a significance value of $p < .001$, indicating that the observed improvement was unlikely to occur by chance, even after controlling for students' initial writing competence.

The notable improvement in the experimental group can be explained through the psychological principles underlying PWIM. According to Paivio's Dual Coding Theory (1971), learning is more effective when both verbal and visual channels are engaged. Through PWIM, students were provided with visual stimuli that supported vocabulary generation and concept development rather than isolated word lists. During the instructional sessions, students identified and labeled objects, actions, and attributes in the pictures, simultaneously activating verbal and visual cognitive channels. This dual activation facilitated memory retention and vocabulary retrieval, enabling students to organize and articulate their ideas more effectively.

Another factor contributing to the success of PWIM is its structured instructional sequence, which provides systematic scaffolding for the writing process. Writing descriptive paragraphs can be challenging for tenth-grade students due to difficulties in generating ideas and organizing content coherently. PWIM mitigates this issue by guiding students through progressive learning stages. Following the steps proposed by Ermita et al. (2019), students started with observation and labeling, progressed to sentence construction, and ultimately developed full descriptive texts. This sequencing enabled students to build content knowledge early, reducing anxiety and enhancing confidence, which in turn resulted in more coherent, detailed, and well-organized texts in the post-test.

The effect size obtained in this study (Partial Eta Squared = 0.886) indicates that the instructional strategy accounted for a substantial proportion of variance in writing scores.

Although this is considered a very large effect, it should be interpreted with caution. Small sample sizes and the quasi-experimental classroom setting may amplify effect sizes, and the close alignment between PWIM activities and post-test tasks may have intensified outcomes. Therefore, while the findings demonstrate PWIM's effectiveness in this context, generalization to broader populations should be done carefully.

Pedagogical factors also explain why PWIM improved writing achievement. The strategy effectively addressed common challenges faced by tenth-grade learners, such as limited vocabulary and grammatical weaknesses. Consistent with previous research (Farooqui, 2023), students often struggle to express ideas clearly due to insufficient linguistic resources. PWIM reduced this difficulty through systematic labeling and categorization, allowing students to generate specific nouns and adjectives (Knapp & Watkins, 2005), enhancing clarity and detail in their writing. The use of word charts provided consistent visual reinforcement for correct spelling and grammar, facilitating accurate sentence construction and reducing mechanical errors.

Additionally, inductive reasoning played a key role in PWIM's effectiveness. Students progressed from observing concrete visual stimuli to identifying linguistic patterns such as adjective-noun sequences and linking verbs. This progression aligns with Piaget's (1972) formal operational stage, where learners can abstract general rules from specific examples. Consequently, students internalized descriptive writing patterns and applied them accurately in the post-test.

The findings align with previous studies on PWIM. Wahyuningsih et al. (2019) reported increased engagement and writing achievement using PWIM, while Rachel and Samban (2022) found improved writing classification from Fair to Very Good. Compared to these studies, the present research contributes quantitative evidence through ANCOVA, confirming that PWIM is effective for tenth-grade students. Furthermore, the effect size observed here was larger than that reported by Cahyani et al. (2023), potentially due to the descriptive writing focus, which directly benefits from visual labeling activities.

Overall, the results demonstrate that PWIM is a highly effective and cognitively aligned instructional strategy for teaching descriptive writing to tenth-grade students.

5) CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, it can be concluded that tenth-grade students at SMAN 10 Gowa initially demonstrated limited ability in composing descriptive texts, with most

students categorized as Fair in the pre-test and very few reaching Good or above. After treatment using the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM), the experimental group showed substantial improvement, achieving predominantly Very Good and Excellent scores in the post-test, while the control group exhibited only modest progress. Statistical analysis using ANCOVA confirmed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups (Sig. < 0.001, $F = 365.340$, Partial Eta Squared = 0.886), indicating that the instructional strategy accounted for a large proportion of the variance in students' post-test scores. The improvement can be attributed to the structured scaffolding, visual support, and engagement of students in inductive reasoning provided by PWIM. These findings suggest that PWIM is an effective instructional strategy for enhancing tenth-grade students' descriptive writing skills and can be recommended for classroom implementation. However, given the relatively small sample size and the unique characteristics of the study setting, the results should be interpreted with caution, and further studies with larger and more diverse participant groups are recommended to confirm and generalize these findings.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. D. (2019). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices* (3rd ed.). White Plains: Pearson Education ESL.
- Cahyani, I. D. A. I. D., Suprianti, G. A. P., & Budiarta, L. G. R. (2023). The implementation of picture word inductive model (PWIM) in teaching writing to junior high school students. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 14–22.
- Çavdar, G., & Doe, S. (2012). Learning through writing: Teaching critical thinking skills in writing assignments. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 45(2), 298–306. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511002137>
- Elmahida, H., Nia, D. P., & Komariyah, T. (2021). Exploring teachers' strategies in teaching writing for young learners. *Erudita: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.28918/erudita.v1i1.300>
- Ermita, M., Emzir, E., & Lustyantje, N. (2019). Picture word inductive model for better descriptive text writing. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v5i2.1736>
- Farooqui, A. (2023). Writing assignments difficulties, factors, and solutions: ESL teacher's perspectives. *AWEJ: Arab World English Journal*, 14(4), 351–371. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no4.22>
- Kane, T. S. (2000). *The Oxford essential guide to writing*. USA: Berkley Books.
- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assesing writing*. UNSW Press.
- Niño, F. L., & Páez, M. E. V. (2018). Building writing skills in English: Analysis of strategies based

- on literature and creativity. *English Language Teaching*, 11(9), 102-117.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n9p102>
- Nurani, S., & Rosyada, A. (2017). Implemented PWIM in developing students' communicative competence of SMK Islam Wijaya Kusuma Jakarta. *Lingua Cultura*, 11(1), 25-30.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v11i1.1608>
- Nurdianingsih, F. (2018). Language learning strategy and students writing skill achievement: A correlational research. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 4(2), 23.
<https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v4i2.1372>
- Paivio, A. (1971). *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. Oxford University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1972). *Psychology and the child*. Routledge.
- Rachel, R., & Samban, M. (2022). Using the picture word inductive model (PWIM) to write descriptive text. *Ethical Lingua*, 9(1), 218–224. <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.367>
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 2(4), 436.
<https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i4.p436-441>
- Silalahi, E. B. (2021). Writing descriptive mapping on students D3 Bahasa Inggris Programs. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistic*, 3(1), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.36655/jetal.v3i1.559>
- Wahyuningsih, T., Sugianto, Y., & Hasibin, N. (2019). Descriptive study on the implementation of picture word inductive model (PWIM) in teaching writing descriptive text to the eighth grade students of SMP Sunan Giri 2 Kalipuro in the 2019/ 2020 academic year. *Lunar: Language and Art Journal*, 3(2), 100–104.