

IMPROVING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING ACHIEVEMENT BY USING POWER STRATEGY

Diah Dwihning Saraswati

M. Yunus

Fiftinova

English Education Study Program

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University

dwihningdiah@gmail.com

Abstract: The objectives of this study were (1) to find out whether or not there was a significant improvement in descriptive writing achievement before and after the students were taught by using POWER Strategy, (2) to find out whether there was a significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between the students who were taught by using POWER Strategy and those who were not, and (3) to describe the students' ability in writing descriptive text before and after the treatment. The population of this study comprised 349 tenth graders of SMK Negeri 7 Palembang. By using convenience sampling method, sixty-two students were chosen as the sample of this study. The data were analyzed by using paired sample and independent sample t-test SPSS Version 22. The result of paired sample t-test showed that the p-value was lower than the significance level ($0.00 < 0.05$). It means that there was a significant improvement in students' descriptive writing achievement before and after they were taught by using POWER Strategy. The result of independent sample t-test showed that the p-value was lower than significance level ($0.00 < 0.05$). It means that there was a significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between the students who were taught by using POWER Strategy and those who were not. The result of the students' text analysis showed that the students' performance before the treatment was still low as they still confused in identifying the schematic structure of descriptive text. Moreover, they seemed to have less sense of English grammar as they still made a lot of mistakes in the text they wrote. Meanwhile, the students' performance after the treatment was better. They had a good control of the schematic structure and linguistic features of descriptive text.

Keywords: *Improvement, Descriptive Text, POWER Strategy*

Writing is one of the most important language skills because it helps the students to expand other language skills. In writing, students are free to express their ideas, thoughts, feelings, opinions, beliefs, arguments,

information, or even their experiences into a written form. It can be such a way for the writer to convey the messages to the readers in order to make the readers know what the writer is trying to share. As Pincas (1998)

states, writing is a way of communicating a message to the reader for a purpose; expressing one's self, providing some information, creating a literary work or even persuading the readers.

Writing is classified as one of the productive skills which enable students to be creative in producing the ideas. According to Sanders, Tingloo, and Verhulst (1992), writing is considered as the most complex human activities since it involves the development of a design idea, the capture of mental representations of knowledge, and experience with subjects. Besides, writing is also a form of communication to deliver thought or to express feeling through the written form (Harmer, 2001, p. 79). Furthermore, according to Sapkota (2012, p.70), writing is the act of putting down the graphic symbols that present a language in order to convey some meaning so that the reader can grasp the information which the writer has tried to convey. It can be concluded that writing is a process of transforming the ideas, thought or opinion into written words as a means of communication between the writers and the readers.

Moreover, writing is an essential skill to be acquired by students. In fact, even though writing is an essential skill to be acquired, the students still have difficulties in mastering it. This happens because writing is not only about how to write something on a piece of paper but also how to use correct vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, language use, and mechanics. In this case, it is quite difficult to master writing, especially for Indonesian students, since there are some differences between *Bahasa* and English such as structural and grammatical terms and styles. In

addition, the students need an ability to translate or transform the meaning of a word from *Bahasa* to English context in order to avoid awkward writing result and to enable people, especially native speakers, to read the text easily (Ariyanti, 2016). Besides, the students' mother tongue also influenced a lot in the production of the students' writing. Megaaib (2014) found that the students tend to use their first language to write in English, and as a consequence, they mostly face problems on grammar such as spelling, prepositions, verbs, tenses, singular and plural, and articles. Moreover, the students also face difficulties in terms of punctuation and capitalization. Furthermore, Hussain, Hanif, Asif, and Rehman (2013, p. 831) claims writing is the most complicated skill because it requires much concentration, conscious efforts and practice in all its steps, namely composing, developing, and finalizing.

Based on Curriculum 2013, there are some texts that should be learned by the tenth-grade students. One of them is descriptive text. Descriptive Text is one types of writing which deals with the senses; how something looks, feels smells, tastes, and/or sounds. Generally, Descriptive text is a text which tells what a person or a thing looks like. The purpose is to describe and reveal a particular person, place, or thing in specific. A good description is a description that presents sensory information that makes the writing result's come alive, which means the reader can imagine the object, place, or person in his or her mind. (Oshima & Hogue, 2007).

The students seem to have difficulties in writing a descriptive text. This conclusion was based on the study done by Husna, Zainil, and Rozimela (2013). Based on findings, it

can be concluded that the students still have some problems in composing the text, namely:

- (1) The students are still unable to transfer and develop their ideas into a written form well,
- (2) The students fail to show well-organized writing. They do not use identification and description processes on writing appropriately. They do not follow the order of the writing process. They do not write a list of their ideas; they just directly wrote what they thought without planning, and
- (3) The students have the insufficient vocabulary. They put the words which were unsuitable contextually.

The tenth grade students of SMK Negeri 7 Palembang seem to have difficulties in writing descriptive text. This conclusion was based on the result of the interview with the English teacher who teaches the tenth grade students. The teacher said that the tenth grade students of SMK Negeri 7 Palembang had difficulties in almost all of the English skills, but the most difficult one was writing due to the students' lack of motivation in learning English and students' perception that learning English is a difficult thing to do. In addition, when the writer checked the students' writing, it was found that the students had some difficulties in writing descriptive text such as unable to use an appropriate word in their sentence, write some sentences without clear meaning, and make some errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and word order.

Due to students' problem in writing English, the teacher needs to have a good strategy in order to help

the students to improve their writing skills. POWER Strategy is one of the strategies that can be used by the teacher. Englert, Raphael, and Anderson (1991) suggest POWER strategy because this strategy provides explicit instruction on how to write more effectively by five steps namely, planning, organizing, writing, editing, and revising. It is an effective way to help the students take all the steps necessary for writing, keep the students from skipping the planning and revising stages of writing, make sure the students included enough information on their writing, and make their writing stronger and more effective as well. In line with this idea, Johnson (2008, p.185) states that this strategy can build students energy and confidence in writing. Furthermore, another research finding was conducted by Munawaroh (2013) who showed that POWER strategy was effective to improve students' ability in writing descriptive text. By using this strategy, it enables the students to write many words or ideas related to the topic that they are asked to write.

The objectives of this study were to find out whether or not there was a significant improvement in descriptive writing achievement after the students were taught by using POWER Strategy, to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between the students who were taught by using POWER Strategy and those who were not, and to describe the students' ability in writing descriptive text before and after the treatment.

METHODOLOGY

A mixed-method design was used in this study. A mixed-method design is characterized by the combination of at least one qualitative

and one quantitative research component. According to Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007), mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e. g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration.

Quantitatively, this research was an experimental research. Meanwhile, in order to give detailed information about the students' ability in writing descriptive text, the students' writing sheet was qualitatively analyzed. This design consisted of two groups which were the control group and the experimental group. The population of this study was 394 tenth grade students at SMK Negeri 7 Palembang, and the sample of this study was 62 tenth grade students. Each group had 31 students. The technique of selecting the sample was convenience sampling by having X.SL as the experimental group and X.DKV2 as the control group.

In this study, only the experimental group was given a treatment while the control group was not given any treatment. During the treatment, the experimental group was taught by applying POWER Strategy for 16 meeting including pretest and posttest. At the beginning of the study, the teacher began the writing process by dividing the students into six groups. In a group discussions, they chose a topic they know more. Then, the students used the *plan* think-sheet (from POWER Strategy) which consists of a set of self-questions to gather all the information needed for their writing and the *organize* think-

sheet to organize their ideas into text structure. Next, the students wrote their first draft based on what they had from the planning and organizing stage. At the next meeting, they were asked to check their writing result. They were asked to check their spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and grammar. The representative from each group was asked to read aloud their writing result. After the reader has finished his/her reading, the teacher and the other groups gave a comment or correction (if there was a mistake) in their works. At the next meeting, the students re-read their writing and revise their writing based on the suggestion they received from the teacher and the other groups.

To collect the data, the writer used test. The writer gave the test to both the experimental group and the control group to measure the students' descriptive text writing achievement. The tests were pretest and posttest. The students were asked to write a descriptive text based on the topic given in 45 minutes. Besides, the students' worksheets were also documented in order to see the students' performance in writing descriptive text before and after the treatment.

In this study, the writer used the content validity to determine whether the test is accordance with the curriculum, syllabus, and textbook used by the tenth-grade students of SMK Negeri 7 Palembang. The writer asked two experts to check whether the test is appropriate or not. To check the level of appropriateness of the test, the writer provided the validators with the syllabus, test of specifications, format of the test, and the rubric of the test.

To check the reliability of the test, two raters were employed to give

score of students' writing test based on the suitable rubric. The result of students' writing were collected and analyzed by using SPSS 22 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program. Moreover, Pearson Product Moment was also used in order to calculate the reliability of the test. It is considered reliable if the reliability of the test is higher than 0.70, in which the reliable coefficient should be at least 0.70. The result of reliability of this study was 0.941 for pretest experimental group, 0.978 for posttest experimental group, 0.966 for pretest control group, and 0.877 for posttest control group. Because the correlation between two raters were higher than 0.70, so it can be concluded that the data were reliable.

To analyze the data, the writer used T-test, which was Paired sample T-test and independent sample T-test. Paired sample t-test was used to analyze the data obtained from pretest and posttest of the experimental group. Meanwhile, independent sample t-test was used to analyze the data obtained from the control group and experimental group. To find out the

difference, the writer compared the result between the pre-test and the post-test given to each group.

FINDINGS

The result of students' descriptive achievement was distributed based on four categories: Very Good, Good, Enough, and Low. The score interval was between 0-100.

As presented in Table 1, the result of pretest in experimental group shows that none of students (0%) in very good category, 9 students (29.03%) in good category, 18 students (58.06%) in enough category, and 4 students (12.90%) in low category. After they got exposed to the treatment, 6 students (19.35%) in very good category, 23 students (74.19%) in good category, 2 students (6.45%) in enough category, and none of students (0%) in low category. Furthermore, the mean score significantly enhanced from 67.74 to 81.29. It can be summed up that there was an improvement after the students were treated by using POWER Strategy.

Table 1
Score Distribution in the Experimental and Control Groups

Score Interval	Category	Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
86-100	Very Good	0	0	6	19.3	2	6.4	4	12.9
71-85	Good	9	29.0	23	74.1	18	58.0	17	54.8
56-70	Enough	18	58.0	2	6.4	11	35.4	9	29.0
<55	Low	4	12.9	0	0	0	0	1	3.2
	Total	31	100	31	100	31	100	31	100
	<i>Mean Score</i>	67,74		81,29		75.32		75.48	

As presented in Table 1, the result of pretest in experimental group shows that none of students (0%) in very good category, 9 students

(29.03%) in good category, 18 students (58.06%) in enough category, and 4 students (12.90%) in low category. After they got exposed to the

treatment, 6 students (19.35%) in very good category, 23 students (74.19%) in good category, 2 students (6.45%) in enough category, and none of students (0%) in low category. Furthermore, the mean score significantly enhanced from 67.74 to 81.29. It can be summed up that there was an improvement after the students were treated by using POWER Strategy.

In contrast, the result of pre-test in control group shows that there were 2 students (6.45%) in very good category, 18 students (58.06%) in good category, 11 students (35.48%) in enough category, and none of students (0%) in low category. Meanwhile, in the posttest, there were

4 students (12.90%) in very good category, 17 students (54.90%) in good category, 9 students (29.03) in enough category, and 1 student (3.22%) in low category. There was also a slight improvement in the mean score of control group. The mean score was from 75.32 to 75.48.

Paired Sample t-Test

Paired sample t-test was used to know whether there was a significant improvement in descriptive writing achievement after the students were taught by using POWER Strategy or not. Table 2 shows the result of paired sample t-test.

Table 2
Result of Paired Sample *t*-Test in Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Test	Mean	Mean Diff.	t	DF	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental	Pre test	67.74	-13.54	-6.505	30	.000
	Posttest	81.29				
Control	Pre test	75.32	-0.16	-0.111	30	.912
	Posttest	75.48				

Based on the paired samples statistics' finding, in the experimental group, the mean score of posttest (81.29) was higher than the mean score of pretest (67.74) with sig. level (.000) which was less than 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. It could be concluded that there was a significant improvement in students' writing achievement before and after they were taught by using POWER Strategy. Meanwhile, in control group, the mean score of posttest (75.48) was higher than the mean score of pretest

(75.32) with sig. level was (.912) which was more than 0.05. It means that there was no significant difference in the mean score of pretest and posttest of control group. Although the results of both groups increased, the result of experimental group was more increased than the result in control group.

Moreover, Paired sample was also used in order to see the improvement of each writing aspect in the experimental and control groups. It was important to know not only the improvement of the students writing achievement in general but also the

improvement of each aspect of writing. The result of the test could be seen in the following table. The result of paired sample t-test showed that the significant values of all aspects were below 0.05. It means that there were

significant improvements in all aspects of writing achievement after the treatment in the experimental group.

Table 3
Result of Paired Sample *t*-Test of Writing Aspects (Experimental Group)

Aspect	Mean		DF	T	Sig. Value
	Pretest	Posttest			
Content	6.54	7.48	30	-3.319	.002
Organization	6.09	7.54		-7.411	.000
Vocabulary	5.09	6.77		-7.179	.000
Grammar	4.80	6.13		-6.127	.000
Mechanics	4.54	6.64		-9.162	.000

Independent Sample *t*-Test

Independent sample *t*-test was applied in order to find out the significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between the students who were taught by using POWER Strategy and those who were not. To find out the difference of posttest both in the experimental group and control group, the writer did the independent sample *t*-test in SPSS 22. The result of independent sample *t*-test was shown in Table 4.

The result of independent sample *t*-test showed that the mean score of

experimental group was higher than in control group (81.29 > 75.48), the mean difference was 5.80, the standard error difference was 2.46, *t*-obtained was 2.352, and *p*-value was .022. Since *p*-value was lower than significant level (0.05), the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. It means that there was a significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between the students who were taught by using POWER Strategy and those who were not.

Table 4
Result of Independent Sample *t*-Test

Group	N	Mean	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Exp	31	81.2	5.80	2.46	2.35	.022

Independent sample t-test was also applied to see the improvement of each writing aspect in the experimental and control groups. It was important to know not only the improvement of the students writing

achievement in general but also the improvement of each aspect of writing. The result of the test could be seen in the following table.

Table 5
The Result of Independent Sample t-Test of Writing Achievement

Aspect	Mean (Post-test score)		N	t	Sig. Value
	Experimental	Control			
Content	7.48	6.16	31	2.927	.005
Organization	7.54	5.80		5.196	.000
Vocabulary	6.77	5.96		2.260	.027
Grammar	6.61	5.22		4.019	.000
Mechanics	6.64	4.96		5.063	.000

The result of independent sample t-test showed that the significant values of all aspects were below 0.05. It means that there were significant improvement in all aspects of writing achievement between the experimental and control group.

Result of the Analysis of Students' Descriptive Text Writing

Text (Before treatment)

My school
the address of the manuscript 2 No 733 km 7
is attached to the school SMK N 7 Palembang.
which is place my school, in SMK 7 has 24 rooms
class and there are 8 majors namely majors
kriya metal, kriya wood, textile, kriya painting, etc, and
I occupied the department of painting. In my
school there are many ~~extra~~ extracurricular activities
one of the extracurricular activities of the theater.
The theater's extracurricular activities is very interesting
for me to follow the activities and I can justify
the characters very well, and then there is the race
between schools, and our school also won the race
we get the champion first. after the race is over
we celebrate his victory at a small restaurant place.
and many more extracurricular studies. In
SMK 7 is very fun.

Text (After treatment)

My School
SMK N 7 Palembang is my school, located in
Naskah II Street no 733 km 7 Palembang.
There are 24 classrooms and 8 majors to be
chosen by the students. They are art painting,
textile crafts, wooden crafts, visual communication
design, metal crafts, TKR, TPM, and TSM.
My school has some extracurricular activities.
From the extracurricular, this school got so many
award. We won many competitions. I join theater,
it is such an interesting activities, I can just justify
the characters very well.

In low category (before the treatment), it is revealed that the students still struggle to write a successful descriptive text as they still confused in identifying the generic structure of descriptive text itself. They also made a lot of mistakes in almost all aspects of writing such as Content, Organization, Grammar,

Vocabulary, and Mechanics. In terms of Content, the topic was complete and clear but the details were almost relating to the topic. In terms of Organization, the identification is not complete enough and the descriptions were arranged with few of connectives. Vocabulary aspect; the student writes *manuscript* instead of *Naskah street*, Grammar aspect; *which is place my school (which is my school place)*, in SMKN 7 has 24 rooms class (classrooms), and Mechanics aspect; *in my school there are many extracurricular activities (in my school, there are many extracurricular activities), in my school (In my school)*.

Different from the students' performance before being treated by using POWER Strategy, the students' ability in writing was quite better after the treatment. It could be seen from the results of their posttest. The result showed that the students only made a few mistakes such as the use of the word "no" and "km" in the sentence, "SMK N 7 is my school, located in Naskah II street no 733 km.7 Palembang". It should be written in complete words such as "number" and "kilometers".

In enough category (before the treatment), it showed that the students were incapable of differentiating the linguistics features of descriptive text because they use past tense instead of present tense: *went (go), sat (sit)*. Besides, the students also made mistakes in terms of Vocabulary and Mechanic aspects. Vocabulary aspect; *my school is an the road scripts II km 7,5 (My school is located at Naskah Street II km 7,5)*, Mechanic aspects; *my school (My school) is not Far (far) from my house), my school is not far from my house (.) my (My) school has classrooms, 3 labs, 1 library, 7 men's*

bathrooms, 2 girls' bathrooms, 1 hall room (.). Moreover, the content and the organization seem to be fine.

Text (Before treatment)

MY SCHOOL
 I went to school in smk 7 Palembang count 4
 I eat 10 Th grade painting class, my school is an
 The road of scripts II km 7.5 my school is not
 Far from my house my school has 24 classrooms, 3 labs,
 1 library, 7 men's bat hrooms, 2 girls bathrooms, 1
 hall room There are 2 classes, 1 painting, 2 space
 light Transport technique, 2 room E. engineering machinry
 2 motor cycle motor space, 1 metal craft room, 1 beko
 craft room, 7 wooden are room for grade 10 only

After the treatment, student outcomes were better. The sentence they made was more structured with the right verb tense. Even though there was still some errors in capitalization and grammar {(my school => My school), (we have four canteens that you visit can if hungary => we have four canteens that you can visit if hungary)}.

Text (After treatment)

In good category (before the treatment), the students' mistake in this category was similar to the students in low and enough achievers' category but they mostly face problems in terms of Mechanics. Examples: *mem (ma'am) mariam tito, en (an) english teacher, he is very discriplined (disciplined) in school environment and school order, (Monday), saturday (Saturday), mariam tito (Mariam Tito), english (English), The beginning of This (this) school established on 03-03-198, I learned from Monday till Saturday (.) Ma'am Mariam Tito is an English teacher*. Moreover, in terms of content and organization, the student in this category gave a complete and

clear topic with details almost relating to the topic and well-organized.

After the student received the treatment, there was an improvement in the students' writing. The topic was complete and clear, and the details were relating to the topic. Identification was also complete and descriptions were arranged with proper connectives. In addition, from the students' sheet, it could be seen that there were only a few mistakes in terms of capitalization; *one (One) of the best schools, the (The) size of my building, when (When) we first enter the school*, etc. Besides that, the text was fine.

Text (Before treatment)

My school
 My name is Pinda Anisa. I am a student in SMK N 7 Palembang. My school is located on Naskah 7 road. I learned from Monday till Saturday. My name is to he is an English teacher in SMK 7 and guardian class in my class. I went to school at 7:00 am. Home school at 13:00 noon. My principal is named. He is very disciplined in school environment and school order. My school teacher is kind and friendly. The beginning of this school establishment on 03-03-1984. School I has eight departments of painting, textile man, wooden kria metal kria, mechanical engineering, motorcycle engineering, visual communication design, technical light vehicle. And this school has some ekstrakurikuler like theater and others every Friday is had routine activities that is lecture in hall SMK country 7.

Text (After treatment)

My school
 My school is SMK N 7 Palembang, one of the best schools with its A Accreditation status. The completeness of the facilities and the extent of my school also became one of the factors that encouraged student's prospective to study at my school. The size of my school building is about 2 hectares. When we first enter the school, we will find a room that is the room teachers, administrative offices, and space kejurusan. After passing through these rooms we will find the class or majors. There are some majors that is major in TEK (light vehicle engineering), TSMC (motorcycle engineering), TTM (machining technique), DKV (visual communication design), SL (painting), EK (wooden craft) etc metal craft, etc (textile craft). In front of my school there is a very spacious field and usually used for ceremonies. It can also be used for sports activities. In my school this facility is very complete. Many facilities such as computer lab, library, multimedia room, hall and others. In addition, my school also has a very large canteen. Our canteens are very clean, very neatly arranged. We can find a variety of snacks and heavy foods such as cilok, noodles, fried and much more. dan dan that's my school, the best school so I'm proud to be school here.

In very good category (before the treatment), it was found that the students did misspell some words such as *begining (beginning), ekstrakulikuler (extracurricular), deportemens (departments), and enginering (engineering)*. This might happen because of the insufficient vocabulary. In addition, some students seem did not know how to translate some appropriate words from Indonesian language to English. For example, in the first paragraph, *SMK country 7 school of art the only one that is in Palembang*, the student probably would say this "SMKN 7 Palembang is the only art school in Palembang, which is located at Naskah Street II no.733 km.7."

Text (Before treatment)

My school
 SMK COUNTRY 7 School of art the only one that is in Palembang
 Location SMK ~~country~~ country 7 in Naskah road 2 No.733 km7
 The beginning of this school establishment on 03-03-1984
 School I has eight departments of painting, textile man, wooden kria, metal kria, mechanical engineering, motorcycle engineering, visual communication design, technical light vehicle.
 And this school has some ekstrakurikuler like theater and others every. The day of entering school at 07:00 and return at 01:15 on every Friday is had routine activities that is lecture in hall SMK country 7.

Meanwhile, after the students got the treatment, the students' writing was better. The student in this category showed a good control about the schematic structure of descriptive text. She also showed her capable in applying the linguistic features of descriptive text in the text she wrote.

Text (After treatment)

My School

My school is SMK Negeri 7 Palembang, one of the best school in Palembang. With its A accreditation, no wonder that this school is always attracted new students every year.

My school has eight majors, namely Art Painting, Textile, Wood Crafts, Metal Crafts, Visual Communication Design, Mechanical Engineering, Motorcycle Engineering and light Vehicle Engineering. Besides, there are some extracurricular in this school such as Theater, Volley, PMR, Choir and many more.

This school has earned many awards from every extracurricular activity. Besides the achievements in many ~~students~~ competitions, the school facilities are also one of the factors that encourage many students want to learn in this school.

DISCUSSION

Based on the findings of this research, the writer made some interpretations. First, the students in the experimental group performed better in the posttest after the POWER strategy implementation. It can be seen from the result of paired sample t-test (as indicated in table 3). The result of paired sample t-test showed that the mean score of the students' posttest in was higher than the mean score of their pretest ($81.29 > 67.74$) with p-value was $0.000 < 0.05$. It means that there was a significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between before and after the students were taught by using POWER Strategy.

The improvement in the students' descriptive writing achievement happened because the experimental group was given treatment through POWER Strategy. During POWER strategy implementation, three stages of writing namely prewriting, drafting and post-writing were done. In prewriting stages (which includes planning and organizing), the students

were asked to answer a set of self-questions that provided in the Plan Think-sheet and the Organize Think-sheet. In the Plan Think-sheet, there were three questions that students had to answer, namely (1) Who am I writing for? (2) Why am I writing this?, and (3) What do I know? (Brainstorm). The aim of doing this activity was to help the students consider an array of strategies related to identifying their audience and purpose, retrieving relevant ideas from background knowledge, and developing a plan that subsumed groups of brainstormed ideas in categories (Englert, Raphael, and Anderson, 1991). In the Organize Think-sheet, the students were also asked to answer another three questions namely (1) What place do you want to describe?, (2) Material/things you need to identify?, and (3) What would the readers looks, smells, feels, tastes or sounds?.

The activity was beneficial to help the students organize their ideas into text structure and use it as a map in planning. Next, in the drafting stages, students were asked to re-read the plans they had been made earlier in the planning stage, translate the plans into text by fleshing out their ideas and adding some keywords, engage their reader through introductions and conclusions (e.g., use of questions, dialogue, personal examples), and consider strategies for introducing readers to text structure categories to provide "reader considerate" text (Armbruster & Anderson, 1982). Last, in the post-writing stages, the students were included in the process of self-editing (edit) and peer-editing (editor). Both self-editing and peer-editing were beneficial to prompted students to reflect on their own or their peers' papers in terms of content (e.g.,

placing stars next to the parts of the text they liked and question marks by the parts that might be confusing) and text organization (e.g., rating the extent to which criterion text structure features were present), and guided them to make revision plans (giving feedback on students' work). By holding peer editing in order to edit the draft, the students could have a positive attitude and they could work together and tolerate each other when they have a different opinion (Khaki and Biria, 2016). In addition, peer editing also can enhance the students' attitude to be more self-confident (Mac Arthur, Philippakos, and Ianetta, 2015). Meanwhile, Corrective feedback from the teacher can enhance the students' motivation in writing (Arege, 2015).

Second, there was a significant difference between students' score in experimental group and control group. The students in the experimental did better than the students in control group. It can be seen from the result of their posttest. The mean score of experimental group in posttest was 81.29 meanwhile the mean score of control group in posttest was 75.48. The result of independent sample t-test also proved that there was a significant difference in descriptive writing achievement between the students who were taught by using POWER strategy and those who were not as the p -value was lower than 0.05 ($0.022 < 0.05$). The reason why there was a significant difference between those groups was because there was a strategy applied. The students in experimental group were taught by using POWER Strategy in the writing process, while the students in control group were not given any strategy; they were directly asked to write the descriptive text without any explanation. Therefore, it

is considered that POWER strategy gives an effect on the improvement of students' descriptive text achievement.

Based on the findings, it was also found that there was an increase in every aspect of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Based on the result of posttest in the experimental group, the highest score was in the aspect of the organization. This is in line with the statement from Department of education and training (2007), who states that POWER strategy help students to organize their ideas. Moreover, during the teaching and learning process, the writer affirms that it is important to have a well-organized writing, with a clear and smooth transition. Because good organization will help the reader to have a better understanding of the ideas presented. In line with this idea, Knapp and Watkins (2005, p.80) said that organizing writing according to parts of the whole helps a reader to better visualize the items being described. Therefore, the highest aspect of students achieved in writing was in organization.

Based on the students' text analysis, it was found that the students' performance before the treatment was still low as they still confused in identifying the schematic structure of descriptive text. Moreover, they seemed to have less sense of English grammar as they still made a lot of mistakes in the text they wrote. Meanwhile, the students' performance after the treatment was better. They had a good control of the schematic structure and linguistic features of descriptive text.

CONCLUSION

Conclusively, the experimental group performed better than the control group. It means that the students in the experimental group, who received the treatment by using POWER strategy had improvement in descriptive writing achievement. Therefore, it could be interpreted that POWER Strategy could improve descriptive writing achievement of the sample students and be a recommended technique for teaching descriptive writing.

REFERENCES

- Arege, J.B. (2015). The relationship between different methods of teacher correction feedback mechanisms and students' writing fluency in botswana. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 225–232.
- 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 education classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(2), 337–372.
- Englert, C. S., Raphael, T. E., Anderson, L. M., Anthony, H. M. (1988). A case for writing intervention: Strategies for writing informational text. *Learning Disabilities Focus*, 3(2), 98-113.
- Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching. *ELT Journal*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Husain, Z., Hanif, M., Asif, S. I., & Rehman, A. U. (2013). An error analysis of L2 writing at higher secondary level in Mutan, Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4 (11), 828-844.
- Husna, L., Zainil, & Rozimela, Y. (2013). An analysis of students' writing skill in descriptive text at grade X1 IPA 1 of MAN 2 Padang. *Journal English Language Teaching (ELT)*, 1 (2), 1-16.
- Jhonson, Andrew P. (2008). *Teaching Reading and writing*. New York, NY: Rouman and Littlefird Education.
- Khaki, M., & Biria, R. (2016). Effects of Self-and Peer-Editing on Iranian TEFL Postgraduate Students' L2 Writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(1), 155–166.
- MacArthur, C. A., Philippakos, Z. A., & Ianetta, M. (2015). Self-regulated strategy instruction in college developmental writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(3), 855.
- Megaiab, M. M. (2014). The English writing competence of the students of Indonesian senior high school. *The 2014 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings*, 187-192. Bali, Indonesia.
- Munawaroh, S. (2013). *The Effect of using POWER (Preparing, Organizing, Writing, Editing, Rewriting) Strategy toward Ability in Writing Descriptive Text of The First Year Students at MTs Al-Istiqomah Selatpanjang*

Meranti Island Regency.
Retrieved from
http://repository.uin-suska.ac.id/9714/1/2013_201386PBI.pdf

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007).
Introduction to academic writing.
New York, NY: Pearson
Education.

Pincas (1998). *Teaching English
Writing: Essential language
teaching series*. London, UK: The
Macmillan Publisher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY \ 1057 Sapkota,

A. (2012). Developing students'
writing skill through peer and
teacher correction: An action
research. *Journal of NELTA* , 17
(1-2), 70-82.

About the authors:

Diah D. Saraswati was the graduate of
English Education Study Program Faculty
of Teacher Training and Education,
Sriwijaya University

Drs. M. Yunus, M.Ed and **Fiftinova,
S.S., M.Pd** are the lecturers at the
English Education Study Program Faculty
of Teacher Training and Education,
Sriwijaya University