THE EFFECT OF POWER STRATEGY ON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' EXPLANATION TEXT WRITING ABILITY AT SMAN 1 UKUI

Mutiara Amalia Nuril[1], M.Syarfi[2], Masyhur[3]
E–mail: mutiara.amalia2605@student.unri.ac.id , msyarfi1961@gmail.com , masyhur@lecturer.unri.ac.id
Contact: +6281277230783

English Education Study Program
Department of Language and Arts Education
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Riau University

***Abstract**: Writing is one of the basic skill that must be mastered by students or learners to comprehend English. However, it is difficult to do for some reason. The Objectives of this research are (1) to find out whether there is an effect of POWER Strategy on third-year senior high school students' explanation text writing ability or not and (2) to find out whether there is any significant difference on the third-year senior high school students' explanation text writing ability between those who are taught using POWER Strategy and those who are not. This research used a quantitative approach and the research design is quasi-experimental with 58 students as the sample. The samples of this research were XII MIPA 1 as Experiment Group and XII IPS 1 as Control Group, selected by using cluster random sampling. The instrument of the data collection is a written test, the data was analyzed by using SPSS 26.*

The results of this research were (1) there is an effect of POWER Strategy on third-year senior high school students' explanation text writing ability proved by the result of Independent Sample T-Test, which is the significant two-tailed is 0.000 lower than Alpha 0.05 and H_a (1) is accepted. (2) there is a difference on the third-year senior high school students' explanation text writing ability between experiment group and control group but the difference is not significant because the results of the mean score for both groups are still in the same range of mean score (Good). This is proved by the mean score of the experiment group's post-test (74.79) is higher than the mean score of the control group's post-test (71.17).

***Key Words:** POWER Strategy, Writing Ability, Explanation Text.*

PENGARUH DARI POWER STRATEGI TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN MENULIS TEKS EKSPLANASI SISWA SMA DI SMAN 1 UKUI

Mutiara Amalia Nuril[1], M.Syarfi[2], Masyhur[3]
E–mail: Mutiara.amalia2605@student.unri.ac.id , msyarfi1961@gmail.com , masyhur@lecturer.unri.ac.id
No HP: +6281277230783

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Riau

Abstrak: Menulis adalah salah satu skill dasar yang harus dikuasai oleh siswa untuk memahami bahasa inggris. Akan tetapi, hal ini sulit dilakukan untuk beberapa alasan. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah (1) untuk mencari tahu apakah ada pengaruh dari POWER strategi terhadap kemampuan menulis eksplanasi teks siswa kelas 3 SMA atau tidak dan (2) untuk mencari tahu apakah ada perbedaan signifikan pada kemampuan menulis teks eksplanasi siswa kelas 3 SMA antara siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan POWER strategi dan siswa yang tidak diajarkan dengan menggunakan POWER strategy. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode pendekatan Quantitative dan desain penelitian quasi-experimental, dengan 58 siswa sebagai sampelnya. Sampel dari penelitian ini adalah kelas XII MIPA 1 sebagai grup eksperimen dan kelas XII IPS 1 sebagai grup control yang dipilih dengan menggunakan teknik cluster random sampling. Instrumen pengumpulan data yaitu sebuah test tertulis, data nya dianalisis dengan menggunakan SPPS 26.

Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah (1) ada pengaruh dari POWER strategi terhadap kemampuan menulis teks eksplanasi siswa SMA yang dibuktikan dengan hasil dari test Mann-Whitney, yang mana significant two-tailed nya adalah 0.000 lebih rendah dari Alpha (0.05) nya dan H_a (1) diterima. (2) ada sebuah perbedaan pada kemampuan menulis teks eksplanasi siswa SMA antara grup eksperimen dan grup control akan tetapi perbedaan tersebut tidaklah signifikan karena hasil dari skor rata rata kedua grup masih berada di tingkat nilai rata rata yang rama (bagus. Hal ini dibuktikan oleh skor rata rata dari hasil post-test grup eksperimen (74.79) lebih tinggi dari nilai rata rata hasil post-test grup control (71.17).

Kata Kunci: POWER Strategi, Kemampuan Menulis, Teks Explanasi.

INTRODUCTION

There are 4 skills in learning English: Speaking, Writing, Reading, and listening. Writing is one of the most difficult components of language skills. Writing should have good components in it, such as punctuation, sentence structure, vocabulary, and grammatical patterns, and specialized abilities as well as various procedures and ways of thinking, such as beginning to write, producing ideas that should be considered, and developing ideas. According to Hyland (2003), writing is a way to convey personal meanings, and writing classes emphasize the individual's ability to construct his or her own opinions on a subject. Students must comprehend the written form of the language and understand structures that are rarely used in speech but are important for effective communication in writing. Therefore, students should learn how to arrange their ideas so that they may be understood by a reader who is not there and possibly by a reader who is unknown to the writer (Nadlifah, 2019). After all, students must be able to develop words and make sentences that are sequential and related to the text. Writing is an important aspect of communication for our students throughout their educational lives because it helps them organize their thoughts and feelings and express meaning through well-constructed writing (Afrin, 2016). Generally, it is much harder if the student is an EFL student because it is not their everyday language, so they must understand two things at once: understanding English and understanding how to write well and produce good writing. Abas & Aziz (2016) state that most foreign language learners experience difficulties with writing because they must use proper English grammar and vocabulary, use the writing skills they've learned, and combine these skills with their previous experience on the topic when writing. Nowadays, students' interest in writing is decreasing; however, writing is important, especially in the world of education. Through writing, students who are unable to convey their ideas and thoughts directly (speak) can express their ideas, thoughts, and what they want to convey.

Bashir (2017) stated that an explanation text is a text that contains information about explaining a process of an event such as natural phenomena, social phenomena, cultural and scientific phenomena. It contains a sequence of events (explaining how) and reasons for a process or phenomenon (why). Based on the researcher's experience in pre-teaching service program at SMAN 1 Ukui, the school used K13, or curriculum 2013. In curriculum 2013, for third-year students, there are some texts that they must study, and one of the texts is an explanation text. This kind of text also requires the writer's understanding and knowledge of what will be explained. The third-year students in SMAN 1 Ukui learn about explanation text, but they cannot write a good text because of difficulty in generating ideas, lack of grammar, and so on. The students also had difficulties with writing because they thought that writing was a boring lesson because they did not understand how to write well.

Therefore, the researcher decided to do quasi-experimental research using a strategy for writing named the POWER strategy. POWER strategy is a strategy that can be used by teachers to teach their students to write in sequence and can be used by students to learn how to write properly and structured. Englert et al.

(1991), Clark (1994), Richard (2004), and Kamilasari (2013) state that POWER stands for Plan, Organize, Write, Edit, and Revise. Furthermore, in this thesis, it will be abbreviated as POWER strategy. For that reason, the researcher wanted to know if the third-year students at SMAN 1 Ukui are taught about explanation text using the POWER strategy and find out if there is an effect of POWER strategy on students' ability to write an explanation text.For that reason, the researcher wanted to know if the third-year students at SMAN 1 Ukui are taught about explanation text using the POWER strategy and find out if there is an effect of POWER strategy on students' ability to write an explanation text.

The research on the effect of POWER strategy on students' writing ability has attracted the attention of other researchers which are (Saraswati et al., 2018), (Munawaroh, 2020), (Panjaitan, 2013), (Fitrianah, 2017), (Agustina, 2018), (Rofiqoh, 2020), and (Manan, 2020). Most of the research are using descriptive text as this research using explanation text and most of the research only has one objective which is to find whether there is an effect or not. So this is what has made this research different from previous research.

So, based on the problem and explanation above, the researcher decided to conduct a research entitled "The Effect of POWER Strategy on Senior High School Students' Explanation Text Writing Ability at SMAN 1 UKUI." The researcher formulates the problems of this research as " is there any effect of POWER strategy on the third-year senior high schoool students' explanation text writing ability after they were taught using the POWER strategy?" and " is there a significant difference on the third-year senior high school students' explanation text writing ability between those who are taught using OWER strategy and those who are not?"

METHODOLOGY

This research approach was Quantitative with Quasi-experimental as research design. There were two groups; experiment group and control group. Experiment group was given pre-test, treatment by applying POWER strategy and then post-test, whereas control group was given pre-test, treatment without applying POWER strategy and then post-test. The researcher used design formulated by White & Sabarwal (2014). Researcher needs population to conduct a research, Singh (2006) state that population or universe refers to the whole mass of observations that form the parent group from which a sample is formed. The population of this research is the third grade students at SMAN 1 Ukui. The population can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. Total Population of the 3rd grade students of SMAN 1 Ukui.

No	Class	Population
1	12 MIPA 1	29
2	12 MIPA 2	28
3	12 MIPA 3	30
4	12 IPS 1	29

5	12 IPS 2	30
6	12 IPS 3	29
Total		**175**

In this research, the sample has been choose by using cluster random sampling, where it dividing the entire population into clusters or groups. The researcher determined the sample by randomizing the name of the class in a small roll of paper then the researcher took two roll of paper, one as experimental group and the other one as control group. The sample of this research are class XII MIPA 1 as experimental group and XII IPS 1 as control group, each group consists of 29 students.

The data for this research were collected from the result of each group's pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was used to assess students' knowledge of writing explanation texts, and the post-test was used to assess students' improvement in writing explanation texts. The instructions for the pre-test and post-test were the same as well. The treatment was conducted in four meetings and each meeting lasted for 2 x 45 minutes by the researcher. Furthermore, students' test scores were determined using an assessment of writing adopted from Jacobs (1981). The assessment of writing can be seen as below:

Table 2. The Asssessment of Writing

Component	Criteria	Score
Content	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: Knowledge, substantive, through development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic.	30-27
	GOOD TO AVERAGE: Some knowledge of subject (adequate range), limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic, but lack detail.	26-22
	FAIR TO POOR: Limited knowledge of subject, kittle substance, inadequate development of topic.	21-17
	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.	16-13
Organization	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/ supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.	20-18
	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.	17-14
	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lack logical sequencing and development.	13-10

	VERY POOR: does not communicate, no organization, or not enough to evaluate.	9-7
Vocabulary	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: shoptisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropiate register.	20-18
	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured.	17-14
	FAIR TO POOR: limited range, frequent errors of work/idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured.	13-10
	VERY POOR: essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idiom, word form, or not enough to evaluate.	9-7
Language Use	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.	25-22
	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions, minor problems in complex construction, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured.	21-18
	FAIR TO POOR: major problem in simple/complex constructions, frequents errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons deletions, but meaning confused or obscured.	17-11
	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate, or not enough to evaluate.	10-5
Mechanics	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing.	5
	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paraphrasing, but the meaning is not obscured.	4
	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, the meaning is confusing or obscured.	3
	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions,	2

	dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible, or not enough to evaluate.	

The researcher used SPPS 26 to analyze the pre-test and post-test results of the experiment and control groups. The researcher first analyzed the descriptive statistics of the data to determine the mean score of each group. The researcher then analyzed the data's normality to determine whether or not the data was distributed normally. The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determined the effect of the POWER strategy on students' writing abilities after it was discovered that the data were not normally distributed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

RESULTS

1. Results of Experiment group and Control Group

   The researcher used the pre-test in order to find out students' knowledge of explanation text. The researcher used written test in the form of 1 essay question with the type of command question. The results of pre-test and post-test of experiment group can be seen below:

Table 3. Result of pre-test and post-test of experiment group

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test
1	S1	63	71
2	S2	59	71
3	S3	76	83
4	S4	59	70
5	S5	59	71
6	S6	74	79
7	S7	69	75
8	S8	64	72
9	S9	70	76
10	S10	66	75
11	S11	67	76
12	S12	66	72
13	S13	66	75
14	S14	64	71
15	S15	73	80
16	S16	62	74
17	S17	64	74
18	S18	67	75
19	S19	67	74
20	S20	66	73
21	S21	72	77
22	S22	69	76

23	S23	66	73
24	S24	63	73
25	S25	70	77
26	S26	66	74
27	S27	69	76
28	S28	72	80
29	S29	69	76
Mean		**66.8**	**74.8**

Based on the table, the highest score of pre-test of experiment group was 76 obtained by one student and the lowest score was 59 obtained by three students. After getting the students' individual pre-test score, the researcher counted students' mean score by dividing the total score by the number of students. The mean score of experiment group on pre-test was 66.79.

The highest score of post-test of experiment group was 83 obtained by one students, the lowest score was 70 obtained by one student and the mean score of experiment group on post-test was 74.8. The result of pre-test and post-test of control group can be seen below:

Table 4. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Group

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test
1	S1	68	71
2	S2	74	78
3	S3	71	74
4	S4	68	71
5	S5	72	77
6	S6	66	70
7	S7	67	71
8	S8	65	71
9	S9	69	73
10	S10	66	70
11	S11	59	64
12	S12	64	68
13	S13	66	69
14	S14	65	71
15	S15	68	74
16	S16	70	76
17	S17	59	65
18	S18	61	66
19	S19	66	67
20	S20	70	76
21	S21	65	70
22	S22	71	77
23	S23	64	68
24	S24	68	71

25	S25	68	70
26	S26	73	75
27	S27	66	70
28	S28	70	74
29	S29	64	67
Mean		**67**	**71.2**

The researcher used the same formula used in the experimental group to calculate the students' individual scores in the control group. As a result, the highest score of pre-test of control group was 74 obtained by one student and the lowest score was 59 obtained by two students. After getting the students' individual pre-test score, the researcher counted students' mean score by dividing the total score by the number of students. The mean score of control group on pre-test was 67.

The highest score of post-test of control group was 78 obtained by one students, the lowest score was 64 obtained by one student and the mean score of control group on post-test was 71.2.

2. The Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics test was used to describe the research data that included the total data, mean score, median score, standard deviation, minimum score, maximum score, etc. the result of descriptive statistics could as follow:

Table 5. The Descriptive Statistics of the Data

		Pre Test Experimental Group	Post Test Experimental Group	Pre Test Control Group	Post Test Control Group
N	Valid	29	29	29	29
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		66.7931	74.7931	67.0000	71.1724
Median		66.0000	75.0000	67.0000	71.0000
Mode		66.00	76.00	66.00[a]	71.00
Std. Deviation		4.35381	3.07501	3.71291	3.71358
Variance		18.956	9.456	13.786	13.791
Range		17.00	13.00	15.00	14.00
Minimum		59.00	70.00	59.00	64.00
Maximum		76.00	83.00	74.00	78.00
Sum		1937.00	2169.00	1943.00	2064.00

In summary, from the results of the pre-test between the experiment group and control group, the researcher found that students from both groups had the same level with a mean score difference of only 0.21 and the highest score differing by 2 points. Meanwhile, the mean score of the Experiment group and control group post-test had a 3.62 difference, so it can be concluded that, there is an improvement in the experiment group after being taught the concept of the POWER strategy, even though there were several students who had a slight improvement. According to the table, it can be seen from the mean score of the experiment group and control group post-test that there was a 3.62 difference point, which means there is a difference between the two groups.

3. Normality Test

Table 6. The Normality Test

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Post Test Experimental Group	.140	29	.150	.947	29	.155
Post Test Control Group	.174	29	.025	.966	29	.457

Based on the calculation above, sig. value of the post-test experiment group was 0.155>0.05, which means the data was normally distributed. Meanwhile post-test control group was 0.457>0.05, which means the data was normally distributed. Because both sets of data were normally distributed, a parametric test (Independent Sample T-Test) could be applied.

4. Homogeneity Test

Table 7. The Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
test_awal	Based on Mean	.534	1	56	.468
	Based on Median	.444	1	56	.508
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.444	1	53.349	.508
	Based on trimmed mean	.525	1	56	.472
tes_akhir	Based on Mean	1.057	1	56	.308
	Based on Median	.849	1	56	.361

	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.849	1	54.471	.361
	Based on trimmed mean	1.064	1	56	.307

The homogeneity test criteria were that if the probability value (critical value) was higher or equal to the level of significance alpha (r=α), it meant that the distribution was homogeneous. Based on the calculation above, the value significance of the post-test of the experiment group and control group was 0.308. Since the significance value was higher than α (0.308>0.05), it meant the data was homogeneous.

5. Independent Sample T-Test

Table 8. Independent Sample T-Test

Table 4.14. Independent Sample T-Test

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Post-test	Equal variances assumed	1.057	.308	4.044	56	.000	3.621	.895	1.827	5.414
	Equal variances not assumed			4.044	54.118	.000	3.621	.895	1.826	5.416

The table showed that the result of T-Test calculation using SPSS Program. The formula for calculating the variance score of the data is as follows:

If the sig. (2-tailed) < α (0.05), Ha accepted and H_0 rejected.

If the sig. (2-tailed) > α (0.05), Ha rejected and H_0 accepted.

There is an effect of the POWER strategy on third-year senior high school students' writing ability after being taught using POWER strategy because the post-test results between he experiment group and control group had different scores of variances, and it was found that the sig. (2-tailed) was lower than α or (0.000 <0.05). As a result, Ha (Alternative hypothesis) was accepted and H0 (Null hypothesis) was rejected.

DISCUSSIONS

1. The Effect of POWER Strategy

   In this section, the researcher found the effect of the POWER Strategy on Senior High School Students' Explanation Text Writing Ability at SMAN 1 UKUI. Based on the calculation of the Independent Sample T-Test Test using SPSS statistic program the result showed that the T test of significance two-tailed is lower than Alpha 0.05, which mean Ha (1) accepted, that there is an effect of the POWER strategy on third-year senior high school students' writing ability after being taught using the POWER strategy. The mean score of the experiment group post-test is 74.79 higher than the mean score of the experiment group pre-test (66.79), indicating that there is improvement and effect after being taught using the POWER strategy. So, the research question was answered, where Ha stated that the POWER strategy was effective for teaching writing explanation text to third-grade students at SMAN 1 Ukui, and Ho stated that the POWER strategy was not effective for teaching writing explanation text to third-grade students at SMAN 1 Ukui was rejected.

   This is also supported by previous research conducted by Diah Dwihning Saraswati, M.Yunus and Fiftinova (2018), Dewi Munawaroh (2018), Daniel Panjaitan (2013), Surani Fitrianah (2017), Rofiqoh (2020) and Sukmawati Manan (2013), in which research results showed that there was an effect of the use of POWER strategy on the writing ability of junior and senior high school students in writing descriptive and explanation texts.

2. The Significant Difference

   In this section, the researcher found a difference in third-year senior high school students' writing ability between those who are taught using the POWER strategy and those who are not. Based on the descriptive statistic of the data from SPSS, the result showed that the mean score of the experiment group post-test is 74.79 higher than the mean score of the control group post-test (71.17). From this result, it can be interpreted that there is a difference between the two groups post-test results, but not a significant difference because both scores are in the same range in the criteria of the mean score.

   This statement is supported by previous research conducted by Diah Dwihning Saraswati, M.Yunus and Fiftinova (2018) and Surani Fitrianah (2017), in which research results showed that there was a difference between the score of students in the experiment group who were taught using the POWER strategy and students in the control group who were taught using the general method. However, in this research, it was found that the difference was not significant.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research findings and discussions, there are several things that can be concluded, which are:

1. The implementation of POWER strategy had an effect on students' explanation text writing, this is proved by the experiment group's post-test results, which are higher than the experiment group's pre-test results.
2. There is a difference between experiment groups' and control groups' results, but the difference between those two results is not significant because both results were still in the same range based on the criteria of the mean score. It was proved by the experiment group's post test result higher than the control group's post-test result.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In this research, the writer would like to provide some suggestions especially for the teachers, students and other researchers. From the conclusion above, it is found that POWER strategy affects the ability to write explanation text of students.

The suggestions are:

1. For the teachers
   Hopefully, teachers can implement the strategy in teaching writing because it can improve students' writing abilities. Teachers should support the strategy by using interesting topics that are appropriate for the students' level, as well as interesting media, and clearly trying to present the lesson objective in order to motivate students to participate in learning activities.
2. For the students
   The students should try to improve their writing ability and be more active in the learning process in order to support their writing mastery.
3. For other researchers
   Hopefully, other researchers can collect the references as the related studies for their research. It would be better if the researcher could create a learning process in applying strategy power so that the difference could be seen as significant.

REFERENCES

Abas, I. H., & Aziz, N. H. A. (2016). Indonesian EFL Students' Perspective on Writing Process: A Pilot Study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *7*(3). https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.7n.3p.21

Afrin, S. (2016). Writing Problems of Non-English Major Undergraduate Students in Bangladesh: An Observation. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *04*(03), 104–115. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.43016

Agustina, T. (2018). *the Effectiveness of Using Please and Power Strategies To Teach Students' Writing Skills on*.

Bashir, M. (2017). Bahasa Inggris. In *Language Teaching* (Issue 3). Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Balitbang, Kemendikbud. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000068

Clark, T. D. (1994). *Power communication : plan, organize, write, edit, revise*. College Division, South-Western Pub. Co.

Englert, C. S., Raphael, T. E., Anderson, L. M., Anthony, H. M., & Stevens, D. D. (1991). Making Strategies and Self-Talk Visible: Writing Instruction in Regular and Special. In *Source: American Educational Research Journal* (Vol. 28, Issue 2).

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing* (J. C. Richards, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, H. L. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach* (Issue DESEMBER). Newbury House Publishers.

Kamilasari, N. (2013). TEACHING WRITING BY COMBINING RAFT (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) AND POWER (Plan, Organize, Write, Edit, Revising) STRATEGY AT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Bahasa Inggris*, *2*(2), 6.

Manan, S. (2013). *Increasing the Students' Writing Ability to Write Descriptive Paragraph Through Power Strategy (Plan, Organize, Write, Edit and Revise)* (Issue 259). Makassar Muhammadiyah University.

Nadlifah, F. (2019). *THE EFFECT OF USING POWER STRATEGY ON SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING ACHIEVEMENT*.

Richard, G. R. (2004). *Tool Kit for Parents: Tips for Helping With Writing Tasks*. LD OnLine. http://www.anc.org/data/masc

Singh, Y. K. (2006). *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New Age International (P) Limited.

White, H., & Sabarwal, S. (2014). *Quasi-Experimental Design and Methods*. UNICEF. www.unicef-irc.org