THE IMPLEMENTATION OF POEW IN TEACHING WRITING

Sianna Sianna
FKIP, UniversitasMuhammadiyahParepare, Indonesia
E-mail: sayasianna@gmail.com

Syawal Syawal
FKIP, UniversitasMuhammadiyahParepare, Indonesia
E-mail: awal.umpar@gmail.com

Abstract
This research was aimed to investigate how significant the implementation of POEW model improved the students' writing ability. It was conducted using a quasi-experimental method with two pretest-posttest group design. It was implemented to the third semester students of English department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare in academic year 2016/2017. At first, the researcher implemented POEW model to treat the students in teaching writing. After that, they were tested to find out their ability after being treated through POEW model. Data were analyzed quantitatively using 21.0 version of SPSS program.The result indicated that the students who were treated through POEW model have significant improvement in their writing ability than the students who were not. It is found that the significant value (0.000) was lower than the probability value (0.05). This means that there was a significant difference between the students' writing ability before and after being taught through POEW model where the students' writing ability improved significantly in posttest (after being taught through POEW model). The mean score of posttest of the students in experimental class (72.40) was higher than the students in control class (62.46) which indicated that the students ability in the experimental class was better than the students in control class. The students ability in experimental class was improved from 61.24 to 72.40 while in control class only from 61.36 to 62.46. Besides that, the standar deviation in experimental class (7.832) was also lower than in control class (8.364) which indicated that the students ability in experimental class was slightly similar to control class

Keywords: POEW model, students' writing ability, writing.

INTRODUCTION

This research was based on writing problem of the third semester students in English department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare. The students stated that most of them found difficulties in starting to write and in exploring their ideas because of the lack of vocabularies. Therefore, the researcher conducted a study by implementing POEW model in teaching writing. POEW stands for Predict-Observe-Explain-Write. The students' vocabulary can be improved in Predict and Observe stages. During the teaching and learning process, the students should do prediction before writing. The researcher prepared some vocabularies which could be found in the video and then they would watch them. The activity helped the students predict the video that they would watch.

CONCEPT OF WRITING

Cox in Brindley (2005, p. 151) explains that "written language serves many purposes both for individuals and for society as a whole, and is not limited to the communication of information". He further explains that for the individual author, writing can have cognitive functions in clarifying and supporting thought while at the level of whole society, written language serves the functions of record keeping and storing both information and literary works.

Components of Writing

Hughes (2008, p. 103) points out that "in analytic scale, it has five components in writing", namely:

Content

The content of writing should be clear to the readers, so that the readers can understand the message that is conveyed and gained from the content of the information itself. In order to have a good content of writing, its content should be well unified and completed. The term is usually known as unity and completeness, which becomes the characteristics of a good writing.

Organization

Organization in writing includes coherence, order of important, general to specific or specific to general, chronological order, and spatial pattern.
1. Coherence means all ideas have to be sticking together, in the right order, and clear.
2. Order of importance means arranging and building the ideas to give a strong ending in paragraph.
3. General to specific means arranging the topic sentence to make a general statement followed by a series of supporting sentence with specific, details, examples, and facts. On the other hand, specific to general is the contrary of general to specific.
4. Chronological order means the paragraphs are organized chronologically, events and details are arranged in the order in which they occurred, usually moving from the first and earliest to the last or latest. Not paragraph arranged chronologically tell stories. Some give directions of explanation a process: other summarizes historical events, and still others report on the steps or action taken by an individual or organization. Nevertheless, they all share an underlying similarity; they present their ideas in the order in which they happened.
5. Spatial order means telling how something looks and is more effective in describing
.

Vocabulary

One of requirements of a good writing always depends on the effective use of words. In personal description, word plays a dual role: to communicate and to evoke; and then, to the readers, it is to perceive and to feel. This twofold purpose is evident even it is a practical and common form of writing as in advertisement. Effective use of words also deals with connotative or figurative languages which are forms of writing, but mostly in personal description. In such description, word values in association are more effective than those mainly in communicating information.

Language use

Language use in writing involves correct usage endpoints of grammar such as verbs, nouns and agreement. Specific nouns and strong verbs give a reader a mental image of description. These specific nouns can be characterized by using modifier of adjectives, adverbs, and participle form. There are many opportunities for errors in the use of verb, and mistakes in agreement are very common. Mistakes in written work, and however, are much more serious, and since people have an opportunity to reread and to correct what have been written. Errors in verbal forms, subject-verb agreement, and pronoun antecedent agreement and in case of noun and pronoun should be avoided.

Mechanics

The use of mechanics is due to capitalization, punctuation, and spelling appropriately. This aspect is very important since it leads readers to understand or recognize immediately what exactly the writer means. The use of favorable mechanics in writing will make the readers easy to understand the conveyed ideas or the messages that is stated in writing.

1. Capitalization. The use of capitalization in writing can clarify the ideas. The sentences are capitalized correctly and they are utilized to avoid ambiguous meaning and misunderstanding. Besides, through correct capitalization of sentences, it also helps the readers to distinguish one sentence to others;
2. Punctuation. It can be used as a unit of meaning and it suggests how the units are related to each other;
3. Spelling. There are three important rules followed in using spelling appropriately, namely: suffixed addition, plural formation, and handling-error within the words.

Principles/Criteria of Good Writing

There are many criteria of good writing that are presented by linguists. Cox in Brindley (2005, p. 149) says that "the best writing is vigorous, committed, honest and interesting".

Crimmon (1967) emphasizes that an effective topical paragraph has four requirements, namely (1) unity (2) completeness, (3) order, and (4) coherence (p. 18). Unity discusses at least one topic which has unity of subject matter; completeness must state all that readers need to know about the topic; order means that the information given in a paragraph is arranged systematically and follows some reasonable order that readers can recognize and follow; coherence means that each sentence must be so tied together that readers can read the paragraph as a unit, not as a collection of separate sentences.

Types of Writing/Essay

Before writing, a writer should decide first what types or genre of the text that he or she wants to write. Zainurrahman (2011, p. 36) states that "it is important, considering that writing with concerning about certain types of text or genre oriented writing emphasizes the social aspect of language use". It means that the writer expects the product of writing can be read by public and can give useful information.

There are seven types of writing classified by Heard and Tucker in Amilah (2013, p. 17) as in the following types:
1. Narrative tells a story and its purpose is to provide information about an event.
2. Descriptive describes the way something looks like.
3. Process explains something such as how to do something, how something is done, or how something works.
4. Compare and contrast point out the similarities and/or differences between two or more things.
5. Cause and effect analyze the causes or factors that brought about an event and examine the result or consequences of that event.
6. Problem analysis and solution identify a problem and offers solutions for that problem.
7. Persuasion attempts to persuade others to particular point of view, or tries to convince others to do something.

Process of Writing

Tompskins & Kenneth (1991) explained that "it is a linear series of neatly packaged categories in exploring the writing process". In the classroom activities, the stages are merged and cycled. The students personalize the process to meet their needs and vary the process based on the writing assignment. This notion implies that writing is gradual that consists of some stages. Furthermore, they stated that generally there are four stages in the process of writing such as prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. In line with it, Graves in Johnson (2008:179) explores the five-step of writing process.

Step 1: Prewriting
According to Graves, prewriting is the stage where the writer starts to write by generating ideas. Wyrick (2006:8) argues that

some people simply need to start writing to find a focus. Then, Graves in Johnson (2008:179) said that "listing, brainstorming, outlining, silent thinking, conversation with a neighbor, or power writing are all ways to generate ideas". Tompskins & Kenneth (1991) divided the prewriting activities into background activities and informal writing strategies. They elucidate that background activities are the experiences that provide the knowledge students need for writing and take many forms, including drawing, talking, redrafting, and interviews, while informal writing strategies includes many forms namely, brainstorming, clustering, and free writing.

Step 2: Drafting

Graves says that drafting is the writer's first attempt to capture ideas on paper which quantity is valued over quality. He adds that when it is done correctly, the draft is rambling, disconnected accumulation of ideas.

Step 3: Revising

Graves explains that revising stage is where the piece is revised and reshaped many times. He argues that the draft stage is like throwing a large blob of clay on the potter's wheel then shaping the blob, adding parts, taking parts away, and continually molding and changing. Here the writer looks for flow and structure. The writer rereads paragraphs and moves things around.

Step 4: Editing

Graves elucidates that editing is the stage where the grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors are corrected. Johnson adds that real writers edit their writing at the end and also rely on editors, spell check, and grammar check. He also says that teaching students to approximate the writing process used by real writers means teach them to become authors and composers of authentic writing. It is to set up peer editing groups and to teach students how to use the grammar and spelling functions on a word processor.

Step 5: Publishing and sharing

Graves says that publishing and sharing are the stage where students' writing is shared with an audience. He adds that writing becomes real and alive at this point. In addition, he says that publishing can involve putting together class books, collections of writing, school or class newspapers, school or class magazines, or displaying short samples of writing in the hall or out in the community.

The Concept of POEW Model
The Nature of POEW model

Sholihat (2012) states that POEW model is developed by the combination of Predict-Observe-Explain (POE) teaching model and Think-Talk-Write (TTW) teaching strategy. Joyce (2006) also explains that POE model was developed by White and Gunstone in 1992 to uncover individual students' predictions, and their reasons for making these into a specific event. Joyce continued that POE is a strategy often used in science which works best with demonstrations that allow immediate observations and suit Physical and Material World context. He also adds that mathematics, particularly in statistics, is a subject where POE strategy can also work well. It is said that it can be used for finding out students' initial ideas; providing teachers with information about students' thinking; generating discussion; motivating students to want to explore the concept; generating investigation.

There are three main steps of POE (Joyce, 2006; Solihat, 2012; Sani & Laurent, 2010; and Juita, 2013) namely:
1. Prediction, that is making hypothesis of an event.
2. Observation, doing analysis what happen in the event.
3. Explanation, giving explanation related to their hypothesis and what have been happened. Joyce (2006) adds that in this

stage, the students discuss their observation result together.

Meanwhile, TTW was developed by Huinker & Laughlin in 1996 (Sholihat, 2012), it is explained that there are also three main stages of TTW, namely:

1. Think. It means thinking about feasible answer or finding out a solution for a problem.
2. Talk. It refers to discussion, construction of some ideas related to the problem. Kuswari (2012) explained that the process of TTW strategy will run well in a heterogenic group which consists of 3-5 students.
3. Write. In this stage, the students are instructed to write their idea as a result of their think and talk or discussion process.
4. In their research, Sani & Laurent (2010) explain that POEW model result has some advantages as follows:
5. Enabling the students to be active in teaching and learning process.
6. Giving them chance to construct their knowledge, communicating their ideas and discussing their result to comprehend the problem well, mastery the concepts, and improve their critical thinking skill.
7. The students' participation in teaching and learning process will improve through POEW model because they are involved directly in every stage of the teaching and learning process as follows:
   a. Making hypothesis of the problem that can galvanize their critical thinking skill;
   b. Doing experiment to test their prediction. By observing directly, the students are able to differentiate theories and realities;
   c. Explaining through group discussion and writing down the result by using their own words. Oral and written communication is really important because through communication, the ideas can be used in every perspective;

and also the students' paradigm will be honed.

Besides all those advantages of POEW model, there are also some disadvantages as in the following lists:

1. Each step—predict, observe, explain, write—needs much time to be done. Therefore, the teacher should estimate the time for each step.
2. For the first time, the teacher probably encounters difficulties because the students are still not accustomed with the process of the POEW model.
3. There will be some students encountering difficulty in predicting process without guidance from the teacher.
4. There will be some students who do not do the observation as good as their friends's because in the explanation step they could not get information which is related to the observation from the other students. In this case, the teacher should walk around to monitor the students' activity and check the students' note in observation process.

Based on description above, the researcher will ask the students to prepare their notes while doing the observation until the end of the writing step.. The researcher assumes that both POE and TTW are kinds of cooperative teaching model. The explain phase in POE and talk in TTW have the same process in doing the discussion. Discussion is a kind of cooperative activity, either in group or in pairs. Harmer (1998:21) stated that "groupwork is a cooperative activity: five students, perhaps, discussing a topic, doing role-play or solving problem". He further explains that in group, students tend to participate more equally, and they are also more able to experiment and use the language than they are in a whole-class arrangement. In pairwork, the students start talking about something and only one student talks at a time when the teacher is working with the whole class.

In another part, Harmer informs that the students are given chances for greater

independence through both pairwork and groupwork. Because they are working together without the teacher controls in every move, they take some of their own learning decisions, they decide what language to use to complete a certain task, and they can work without the pressure of the whole class listening to what they are doing. Decisions are cooperatively arrived at and responsibilities are shared.

Fountain in Brindley (2005:50) explains ways to organize small-group work which will encourage pupils to review their current understandings. According to him, three examples of classroom strategies are as follows:
1. Brainstorm, e.g. pairs quickly remember and write down three reasons why people write poetry, then share their ideas with another pair, rework them and appoint one person to feel back to a whole-class scribe
2. Talk patterns can be asked to interview each other to find out what their partner thinks or know about x or y.
3. Talk partners can be given a minute to review what they did at the last session and what they hope to achieve in.

The Process of POEW Model

The main steps of POEW according to Sholihat (2012) are combining the steps of POE and TTW as in the following description:
1. Predicting. In this step, the students have to think first or predict about a problem as a step to get in to their knowledge which is related to the problem. According to Samosir (2010:12), predict and think stages are identical.
2. Observing. The main goal of this step is to prove the students' prediction in the first step.
3. Explaining. In this step, the students are doing discussion related to their observation result. By doing discussion, the students' comprehension can be improved. Samosir (2010:12) says that explain stage is identical to talk stage.

4. Writing. In this step, the students reflect their knowledge and opinion in written form. According to Masingila & Wisnioska (1996:95), writing helps the students to express their knowledge and idea. They explain further that the advantages of students' writing for the teacher are: (a) direct communication in written form from whole class, (b) information about mistakes, misconception, thinking habit, and the students' belief, (c) the variance of students' concept from the same idea, and (d) evident of students' achievement or performance. In addition, Rivard & Straw (2000:29) state that analytical writing is an important tool for transforming rudimentary ideas into knowledge that is more coherent and structured.

Those steps are implemented by the researcher in conducting this study. They were modified to suit the teaching and learning English writing.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The method used by the researcher in this study was a quasi-experimental method which involved two classes with different treatment, namely experimental and control classes. The experimental class received a treatment through POEW model meanwhile the control class was treated through a conventional method. The control class was needed in order to compare whether the treatment of experimental class was more effective than the conventional method or not. The design is presented as follows:

Research Design

Gay (2006:256) shows the following two pretest-posttest group research design which was used by the researcher.

Table 1. Research design

Class	Pre-Test	Treatment	Post-test
E	O_1	X_1	O_2
C	O_1	X_2	O_2

Where:
E   : Experimental Class
C   : Control Class
O_1 : Pre-test
O2   : Post-test
X_1 : The treatment for experimental class
X_2 : The treatment for control class

The data were collected from both pretest and posttest. The procedures of data in this research were:

1. Pre-test

The researcher gave the pre-test before giving treatment to the students both in experimental and control group. Its purpose was to measure and define the students' prior ability in writing. This test used writing test by giving some topics to the students. The students had to explore their ideas in written form or essay without cheating to their neighbor/friends. The processes were:

   a. The researcher explained the procedure of the test to the students.
   b. The researcher distributed the test to the students.
   c. The researcher asked the students to read the instruction carefully before doing the test.
   d. The researcher let the students to do the test.
   e. The researcher asked the students to submit their work.

2. Post-test

The post-test was given after the students of experimental and control group administered the treatment. It was given to find out the significant improvement of the students' writing skill after being treated through POEW model. The process was similar to pretest process.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the following description, the researcher presents the writing ability of the students through the data that had been analyzed through SPSS program with version 21.0.

The result of the students' writing ability in pretest was shown in the following table and histogram.

Table 2. Students' writing ability in pretest

Statistics		Experimental	Control
N	Valid	25	28
	Missing	3	0
Mean		61.24	61.36
Median		63.00	61.50
Mode		60[a]	61
Std. Deviation		8.719	7.804
Variance		76.023	60.905
Range		35	32
Minimum		40	43
Maximum		75	75
Sum		1531	1718

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

In the table above, it can be seen that the mean score of experimental group was slightly similar with the control group's but the median in experimental group was higher than in control group's. The mode, standard deviation and variance of control group were lower than the experimental group's. Besides that, the minimum and score of the control group was also higher than experimental group's. The result indicated that the prior ability of the students in control group was categorized fair than the experimental group. The category was based on UMPAR scoring classification.

The following table shows the students' classification in pretest based on UMPAR score classification.

Table 3. Students' score classification in pretest

No	Range Percentage	Classification	Experimental		Control	
			F	(%)	F	(%)
1	85% - 100%	Very Good	0	0%	0	0%
2	70% - 84%	Good	2	8%	3	10.71%
3	55% - 69%	Fair	19	76%	22	78.57%
4	50% - 54%	Poor	1	4%	0	0%
5	0% - 49%	Very Poor	3	12%	3	10.71%
	Total		25	100%	28	100%

Based on the data in the table above, it showed that most of students in both experimental and control group were categorized fair. 76% - 8.57% students were in this category. Only few of them (about 8%-10.71%) were categorized good and very poor. No one was categorized very good from both groups. This indicated that most students in pretest were difficult to generate their ideas in constructing an essay in the form of narrative text, in this case.

The following table shows the students writing score in posttest.

Table 4. Students' writing ability in posttest

Statistics		Experimental	Control
N	Valid	25	28
	Missing	3	0
Mean		72.40	62.46
Median		77.00	63.50
Mode		77	70
Std. Deviation		7.832	8.364
Variance		61.333	69.962
Range		25	33
Minimum		55	42
Maximum		80	75
Sum		1810	1749

The perceding table showed that there was an improvement of mean score, median, mode, minimum and maximum score from both groups in posttest but the experimental group was extremely higher than the control group's. Besides that, standard deviation, variance, and range in experimental group was lower than in control group's. It can be assumed that there was a significant improvement of students's writing from both groups but the experimental group was more significant than the control group's. The data showed that the mean score of most students in experimental group was categorized good while the students in control group were categorized fair. The students's score classification is shown in the following table:

Table 5. Students' score classification in posttest

No	Range Percentage	Classification	Experimental		Control	
			F	(%)	F	(%)
1	85% - 100%	Very Good	0	0%	0	0%
2	70% - 84%	Good	20	80%	6	21.42%
3	55% - 69%	Fair	5	20%	19	67.85%
4	50% - 54%	Poor	0	0%	0	0%
5	0% - 49%	Very Poor	0	0%	3	10.71%
	Total		25	100%	28	100%

The data in the table above presents that none student was categorized very good but the frequency of the students in both groups in this category was improved. The frequency of the students in experimental group was extremely increased from 8% in pretest to 80% in posttest. Whereas in control group, the frequency of students in good category was also increased from 10.71% in pretest to 21.42% in posttest. In the meantime, the frequency of the students in fair category both in experimental and control groups was decreased. In experimental group, only 20% students were categorized fair and none was categorized poor and very poor. Meanwhile, 67.85% students were categorized fair, none was categorized poor, and 10.71% students were categorized very poor in control group. The data indicated that most of students' writing ability in experimental group was more improved than the students's in control group.

The following table is a result of multiplication of the data through SPSS program. The data in the table shows the answer of the research question about the significant difference resulted from t-test value.

Table 6. T-test: Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest	-11.160	5.850	1.170	-13.575	-8.745	-9.538	24	.000

The result of t-test in the table above shows that the significant value was lower than the probability value (0.05). This means that there was a significant difference between the students' writing ability before and after treated through POEW model. Whereas, the students' writing ability was improved significantly in posttest. This data was supported by the research result found by Sani and Laurent (2012). They conclude that students' learning achievement was better taught through POEW learning model. In addition, Juita (2013) argues that the implementation of POEW model motivated the students to study because the students could observe their prediction directly.

Based on the research findings, the researcher found that teaching writing through POEW model can be used to improve the students' writing ability more significantly than the students who teach in a conventional way. This result was proven by the results of students' writing test which were conducted in pretest and posttest. The score in pretest showed that the students' mean score in experimental and control classes was almost equivalent (61.24 in experimental and 61.36 in control) which was then categorized as fair based on UMPAR score classification and the standard deviation in experimental was higher (8.719) than in control class (7.804) which indicated that the students' writing ability was quite various in the class. Whereas the score in posttest showed that the mean score of the students' writing ability in experimental class was extremely improved with 72.40 which was then categorized as good. Its standard deviation was also deceased with 7.832. Meanwhile, in control class, the mean score of the students' writing ability was also increased with 62.46 which was lower than the former.

This study supports some related previous researches. Sani & Laurent (2012) conducted their research in physics by using POEW model but they did not use video as in this research. They used visual aids that were frequently used in physics instructions. In their research, they distinguished their students' ability in experimental and control groups. The results were 74.97 for experimental group and 73.05 for control group. Even though, their research design used only one group pretest-posttest in time series design, their result showed the difference between the students' ability which was treated by POEW and and which was not. In line with it, Supriyati (2013) who also conducted her research in physics found that there was an improvement of her students' ability who were taught using POEW model and POE model. The students' gained score after treated through POEW model was 0.63. While, the students who were treated through POE model gained 0.50 score. These results supported this study which also found an improvement of the students' writing ability after treated through POEW model.

Moreover, Juita (2013) also found in her research that the studets' concept mastery in learning physics was improved after being treated through POEW model. She also found that the students were motivated to study physics because they observed their prediction directly. Likewise, in this study, the students did direct observasion by watching the video to prove whether the words that they predicted would be used in the video or not. Therefore, they focused more their attention on watching the video before rewriting the story in the video. Besides in physics, Suspriati (2012) in her research used POEW model in teaching biology. She combined it with SETS approach and PBL model. Her research result also showed her students's improvement after applying POEW model in her class.

In conducting this study, the researcher was confronted with time zone. This study took too much time because of the length of time to use to watch the video. The purpose to watch the video was to clarify the students's prediction. The researcher also encountered the other problem, that was, time management in the class. Therefore, it was suggested that the time duration of watching the video and the kinds of activities applied in the class should be paid more attention in writing class. Even though the researcher faced those problems, she could finish the study and found that the students's writing was improved significantly after treated through POEW model.

REFERENCES

Tompskins, Gail E. & Kenneth Hoskisson. (1991). *Language Arts. Content and Teaching Strategies*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Huinker, D. & Laughlin, C. (1996). Talk Your Way into Writing. In P. C. Elliot, and M. J. Kenny (Eds). *Communication in*

Matematics, K-12 and Beyond. USA: NCTM.

Masingila, J.O & Wisniowska, E.P. (1996). *Develoving and Assessing Mathematical Understanding in Calculus thorough Writing.* In P.C Elliot and M.J Kenny (Eds). *Yearbook Communication in Mathematics* K-12 and Beyond. Reston VA: The National Council of Teacher of Mathematics.

Harmer, Jeremy. (1998). *How to teach English.* England: Longman.

Rivard L. P. & Straw, S. P. (2000). The effect of talk and writing on learning science: An exploratory study. *Journal of Science Education*, 84*(5)*, 566-593.

Brindley, Susan. (2005). *Teaching English.* Walton Hall, Milton Keynes: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Gay, L. R. (2006). *Educational Research*, *Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Eight Edition. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Inc.

Joyce, Chris. (2006). *Predict, Observe, Explain (POE)*. Retrieved fromarb.nzcer website: http://arb.nzcer.org.nz/strategies/poe.php,

Hughes, Arthur. (2008). *Testing for Language Learners*, UK, Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Johnson, Andrew P. (2008). *Teaching Reading and Writing: A Guidebook for Tutoringand Remediating Students*. United States of America: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

UMPAR. (2008). *Pedoman Akademik Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare*. Parepare.

Samosir, Heppy. (2010). *Model Pembelajaran Predict-Observe-Explain-Write (POEW) untuk Meningkatkan Penguasaan Konsep Kalor dan Keterampilan Berpikir Kritis Siswa SMA*. Unpublished Thesis. Bandung: PPS UPI Bandung.

Zainurrahman. (2011). *Menulis dari Teori Hingga Praktik*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.

Kuswari, Usep. (2012). *Model Pembelajaran Menulis dengan Teknik Think-Talk-Write (TTW).*Retrieved fromfile.upi website: http://file.upi.edu/direktori/fpbs/jur._pend ._bahasa_daerah/195901191986011-usep_kuswari/model_pembelajaranmenul is_dengan_teknikthik.pdf

Sani, Ridwan Abdullah & Laurent Febrina Anggryani Sinaga. (2012). Improvement of Student Competency in Physics Using Predict-Observe-Explain-Write (POEW) Learning Model at Senior High School. *Jurnal Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran Fisika*. ISSN 2085-5281.. Retrieved from jurnalagfi website: http://jurnalagfi.org/wpcontent/uploads/2 013/03/Artikel-Ridwan-1-7.pdf.

Sholihat, Rizky Nur. (2012). *Model Pembelajaran POEW (Predict, Observe, Explain and Write.* Retrieved from rofayuliaazhar website: http://www.rofayuliaazhar.com/2012/12/ model-pembelajaran-poew-predict-observe.html

Amilah, (2013). *Enriching English Instructional Material to Improve The Students' Writing Ability Through Mind Mapping SMP Negeri 2 Pinrang.* Unpublished Thesis: Pps UMPAR.

Heard, James (Ed.). (2013). *Advanced Writing: An Accelerated Method for University Students*.

Juita, Dewi (Ed.). (2013). Predict-Observe-Explain-Write Model: Bagaimana Model Pembelajaran Tersebut Meningkatkan Pemahaman Konsep dan Motivasi Siswa Terhadap Materi Fisika? *Prosiding Seminar Kontribusi Fisika 2013 (SKF 2013), 2-3 Desember 2013, Bandung, Indonesia.* Retrieved from prosiding: http:prosiding.papsi.org/index.php/SFN/a rticle/view/545/556