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INTRODUCTION
Since English is taught as compulsory lesson, it has been developed wider to the whole aspects of life. It seems that English is becoming such a need for many people. As a matter of fact, English is taught as a foreign language that need to be mastered by the learner both written and spoken. Ironically, even though introduced earlier level of education English still becomes hard subject which makes the pupils get difficulties in learning and recognizing it. Mostly, it is just caused the first introduction about English cannot be packaged nicely that possibly makes the EFL learner uninterested in knowing the subject.

It should take a lot of attention to be cared by the authorities. Curriculum is greatly constructed year by year to improve the weaknesses around education field. In a fact, the resolution cannot cover all the problems which are exist in the real condition. On other hand, globalization era becomes wider. So, individual is expected to be able to be ready with whole conditions that are possibly for every aspects of life.

The ability to use English is a necessity in a global era as a means of communication today. Therefore, mastery of the English language is emphasized, especially second grade students of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir that needs to be mastered as compulsory lesson. They need to be ready to take an active role in the global competition later. Teaching of English in MTS Bustanul Ulum is still covering four main basic skills, namely Listening, speaking, Reading,
and Writing. Element - the element that the other languages are also taught, among other Vocabulary, grammar, and Pronunciation.

From this condition the researcher attempts to do a research that probably can provide a reference for making writing products which is implementing mind map to expose ideas clearly. In this case researcher will focus on writing class of second grade students which fit with the subject given by the teacher. Among the writing classes, the writer just takes a class that has serious problem in composing written product. They just do not have ideas how to work in writing class that can disturb the succes of their learning. The observer focused on lecturer technique, student’s interest and student’s difficulty in writing. On March 29th 2013, the observer gave pre-test to the students, the students were asked to write narrative text on free topics. The researcher scored students writing and calculated it, the mean of student’s score was 60.1, while the expected score on the basis of school standard is 70 out of 20-100 score range. It showed that the writing ability of second grade students are low. A treatment must be given to increase students’ knowledge in studying in writing class.

This study is aimed at implementing mind map strategy to improve the writing ability of second grade of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir. Basically, the teaching writing in the school is not done perfectly by teacher. But on other hand the skill belongs to the students are not really well enough in writing. It makes the learning process is interfered by those. Commonly, the problems got by students are in: (a) obtaining ideas, (b) organizing ideas logically, (c) making grammatical sentences, (d) begining to write. The teacher tended to use old and monotonous techniques to teach writing. Basically, all teaching material can be delivered in interesting form in order to avoid flatness at the moment. Writing is complex subject that accuracy in composing ideas to be expressed into texts. According to Heaton in his book” Writing English Language Test” (1988:138);

1“Writing skill are more complex and difficult to teaching, requiring, and mastering not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgment, because of the difficulties of writing, some efforts have been done to solve the problem. The main objective is to make the writing become easier to learn for the students”.

From the quotation, it can be concluded that writing is more complex which need to recognize grammar but also activate the rhetorical devices, concept the ideas and also judgement. If the those cannot be implemented in the writing class interferes the result of study in the class.

One of the techniques that appropriate for the statement above is mind mapping. As Hayes (1992) states that mind mapping can be powerful method in instruction because it makes use of the students’ spatial-visual abilities for understanding and remembering complex subject matter. Through this activity the students learn the skills of organizaion that assist the development of comprehension, critical thinking, and writing skills. Mind mapping is also called webbing which is like brainstorming but it is more visual and linear.

Map (2002) suggests that mind mapping is a powerful accelerated learning techniques that is available to both teachers and students. It is used to help thinking, learning, and remembering. The previous study that was conducted by Repelitawati (2012) tried to solve problem in writing by using mind mapping. This techniques implemented to aid students in developing ideas to write descriptive text. The findings show that students’ writing ability had significantly increased.

Another study was done by Wilujeng (2005) which focused solving the students difficulties in writing class. In a fact, the findings figure out that the mind mapping can improve the score level and the writing ability.

Therefore, the researcher is greatly motivated to overcome the problem by implementing mind mapping to improve the writing ability of the second grade of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir. Mind mapping Strategy is taken to solve the problems in second grade of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir since it can guide the students to generate ideas, to organize ideas, and to make grammatical sentences. It is a technique to generate and structure ideas, so the ideas can be coherent. (Wycoff, 2005). Writing is easily done by using mind map, it is extremely useful for concepting, generating, connecting ideas to construct texts. Mind maps also provide teacher with insight into their students’ thought process regarding a specific topic. By asking students to create mind maps demonstrating their comprehension of a concept, teachers are able to understand what a student’s prior knowledge was and how well the student understands the assignment or the material being taught. This is a very effective way of evaluating students’ understanding. By using mind map is expected that students can construct their comprehension in generating ideas

**METHOD**

The researcher applies an class action research in this study. This research was conducted in the classroom. Classroom Action research was exactly different from experimental research. The purpose of CAR was developing strategy or English teaching technique which had not developed by the other researcher. Furthermore, the aim of it was to find a new strategy/technique in learning English which could help the teacher solves the classroom problem

**Research Setting and Subjects**

This research was conducted at MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir. It is an islamic junior high school which has several classes. The researcher took second grade students which

---


class consisted of 43 students based on attendent list. There were 19 boys and 24 girls in the class but recently one of the students (girl) left the class. So, the students become 42 students. The class was taught English twice a week. And each meeting of English lesson took 90 minutes. The subjects of this research was students in second grade whose capabilities in English varied and they were taught English by two different teachers.

**Research Procedure**

The writer conducted the research in two cycles. There was preliminary study and the four steps of classroom action research in this study. In preliminary study, the researcher observed the students’ activities in the classroom to find out the students’ learning problems, conducts informal interviews with the students and the other teacher dealing with the writing problems, and analyses the problems and figures out the best solution to deal with the particular problems.

**Preliminary Study**

To identify the actual problem happened an observation and giving pretest to measure achievement level got by the students concerning what students did in the classroom). to get more genuine data about the teaching and learning English in general and the teaching and learning writing in particular. The researcher scored students writing and calculated it, the mean of student’s score was 60.1, which lied score among 50.0 to 75.0. 5 of 42 students (6%) could reach score equal or higher than 70.0 but 36 of 42 students (94%) got lower score than 70.0 while the expected score on the basis of school standard is 70 out of 20-100 score range. It showed that the writing ability of grade eleven students are low. A treatment must be given to increase students’ knowledge in studying in writing class. Questionaire was given on the 7th of may 2013, the students informally were intervied by teacher. The result of responses to the questionaire showed that most of the students wrote in English but the teacher assigned the students write paragraph without giving any guidance to them in the process in writing the paragraph.

**Planning**

The researcher designed the plan based on the facts and problems found in the teaching and learning process at MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir comprised designing lesson plan, preparing instructional media, setting the criteria of success, and preparing the research instruments.

**Designing Lesson Plan**

The lesson plan in this research contained the necessary information about the teaching and learning administration including allotted time, indicators, objectives, teaching media, as well as teaching steps for the implementation of mind mapping strategy.

**Preparing Procedure of Strategy**

Conducting the study, the researcher formulated a model of mind mapping for writing class that is suited in the class condition. In Repelitawati (2011) stated that the process of designing the procedure the reseacher considered three main factors such material

---

availability, students’ need and class condition. In applying mind mapping during the teaching of writing the teacher used several main steps that actually covered all the activities in one meeting. Those were (1) Reviewing about narrated text (2) introducing mind mapping as a strategy to construct good narrative text (3) sampling of mind mapping in constructing narrative text (4) writing narrative process.

**Setting the Criteria of Success**
The criteria of success was set as a measure whether the implementation of mind mapping successfully solved the students’ problems in writing.

In this study, the researcher used two assessments. Based on the result of the preliminary study, the researcher determined the criteria of success related to the students’ writing. The criteria of success in this study were emphasized on the product of writing skill. The assessment which was used to score students’ ability in language function consisting 5 aspects: content, organization, grammar, punctuation mark, and vocabulary. And then the scored assessment will be converted into 20-100 scale. Before the implementation of the classroom action research, the students’ average score for the assessment on writing test was 60.1. In this case, there were only five students of 42 students got 70.0 – 75.0. It means that there were only five students could reach minimum passing grade which is 70. In a fact, the researcher decided that this research would be considered successful if 75% of the students from scale 20-100 for the students’ involvement.

**Preparing Instruments**
In collecting data, the researcher would use some instruments. The instruments was used to collect data comprising qualitative and quantitative data about the students’ performance and responses toward the implementation of the strategy. To collect quantitative data, the researcher used scoring rubric and to collect the qualitative data, questionnaire and observation sheets will be employed.

**Observation sheet**
The data collected through the observation sheet was used to observe the condition of the chosen class which implemented mind mapping. Those were about how the activities of the teacher and the students and how the assessment was conducted by teacher during the teaching and learning process. The collected data was used to help determining the students' involvement give good feedback to the achievement or not. The observation sheet could be seen in Appendix 1a.

**Questionnaire**
Questionnaire was employed to obtain the students’ response about teacher’s treatment in a writing class.
The question was used to know about the students’ opinions about the real condition, experience and atmosphere during the teaching learning process which was done by the teacher before implementing the strategy of mind mapping.

**Scoring Rubric**
The researcher applied the analytic scoring method\(^8\) by Cohen (1994: 328-329) that was adapted to convert score of the scale based on the scoring rule of KKM.

### Table 3.3 Assessment guidelines for writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of writing</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Main ideas stated clearly and accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Main ideas stated fairly clearly accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Main ideas stated not all clear or accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Main ideas stated not at all clear or accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Well organized and perfectly coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fairly well organized and generally coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loosey organized but main ideas clear, Logical but incomplete sequencingIdeas disconnected lack logical sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No error, full control of complex structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Almost no error good control of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some errors fair control of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Many errors, pure control of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A few error in choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some errors in choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Occasional errors in choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frequent errors in choice of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation mark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The punctuation correct and appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The punctuation enough appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The punctuation less appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The punctuation not appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Score calculation

\[
\text{SCORE} = \frac{\text{AMOUNT \, SCORE}}{\text{MAXIMAL \, SCORE}} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{20}{20} \times 100
\]

\[
= 100
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% achievement</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 – 34</td>
<td>POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 64</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 79</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 94</td>
<td>EXECELENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 - 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several adaptations were done by the researcher to suit with the students capability level. At the first adaptation was done at component of writing belongs to Cohen (1994: 328-329) \(^9\) actually, it has 5 indicators. In this case the researcher eliminated one of indicators. The


researcher added a component of writing. It is “punctuation mark” that is absolutely needed in writing. Simple score calculation was employed by the researcher. Score criteria was decided to recognize the achievement of the students.

**Implementation**

Reviewing the concept of narrative text was needed to recall students prior knowledge about this kind of text. To lead the students understanding the teacher explained sample of narrative text that refers to something interesting that happened at them. It was expected to the students produce their own work.

The researcher conducted the model of mind mapping which is developed in the writing class through three meetings. For recognizing, the students writing achievement improved or not in action, the researcher worked the writing test as the instrument. In that case the students were ordered to share “something interesting that happened at them”. In the cycle 1, first meeting the teacher just revised and introduced the material that needed to be given to the students as stated in the teaching procedure, second meeting the teacher gave sampling of mind mapping who was helped by the researcher to make the sampling process more efficient. In the third meeting the researcher helped the teacher watched the student accomplished the writing process. The researcher and teacher analyzed students’ work by using scoring rubric. The students’ involvement could be detected by using observation checklist as the instrument.

Practically, the observer observed the students, activities during the implementation of the action in every meeting. In the end of each meeting, the data gathered through the observation checklist were analyzed quantitatively based on the number of the scale checked by the observer.

The same procedures were applied by the researcher. The topic discussed was still “something interesting that happened at them”. The same procedures were focused to strengthen the students comprehension to the strategy given.

**Observation**

The observation was done at the same time as the implementation of mind mapping strategy. Observation was done to collect the data about how far the strategy could solve the students’ problems. Therefore, the data was about the students’ attitude during the teaching and learning process including their interests and their ability to work.

**Reflection**

Reflection was done based on the data obtained in the observation. In this phase, the researcher compared the data with the criteria of success. If the data met the criteria of success, it means that the strategy was successful and the research was stopped, otherwise, the researcher was revised the teaching scenario and go on to Cycle II. In this research, the researcher used qualitative data procedures for the data analysis. To find out the students’ attitude during the teaching and learning process, the researcher analysed and present the data qualitatively. The data will be obtained from the observation sheet and questionnaire. And to find out the students’ improvement on language function or the speaking itself, the researcher will use quantitative data obtained from the observation sheet.
FINDING

Research findings were finished by the supporting data. The goals of the research were to describe the process of the study in the class by using mind mapping. The explanation of data discuss about the data of the cycle.

Findings in Cycle 1

The teaching schedule cycle was done in three meetings. Each meeting was 2x45 minutes. Total students who attended the meeting were about 42 students. Meeting 1 was conducted on March May 14, 2013, meeting 2 was done on May 16, 2013, and meeting three was done on May 21, 2013 (see the research schedule in appendix 8a). It was conducted in second grade of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir.

The researcher used observation checklist and field notes as the instrument for evaluating the students’ involvement during the teaching and learning process. The test was employed to assess the students’ final product in writing. The students’ score were used to measure the students’ achievement.

The Students’ Writing Achievement

The result of the students’ writing test administered at the end of cycle 1 were collected and analyzed. In this case the researcher and collaborator discussed and scored the student’s writing product one by one. Scoring rubric was used to determine the score. There are five components namely content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, punctuation mark. From the result can be analyzed that the students still could not construct good narrative text due to the texts were no complete with the detail yet. Some errors was rarely found in area of five components. However, the error did not blur the point of their writing.

On other hand the problems that the students still found in writing, the result of writing explained that students’ ability in writing narrative text still could not reach the target. Nevertheless, the effect of implementing mind mapping still remained a positive effect to the students, ability in writing test from 60.1 in preliminary study lie the score among 50.0 to 75.0. 5 of 42 students (6%) could reach score equal or higher than 70.0 but 37 of 42 students (94%) got lower score than 70.0. The implementation of cycle 1 (see appendix 4a). Further, the data obtained from the students, writing showed that the students’ achievement of cycle 1 lie among the score 50.0 to 85.0. 17 of 42 students (45%) achieved the score of 70.0 – 85.0 and 25 of 42 (55%) achieved score 50.0 – 65.0. That means, there was 45% of the students who achieved the score equal or higher than 70.0. The improvement did not reach the first criterion of success yet because there was only 45% of the students who reached the target score 70. From those explanation could be summarized as the table 4.1.
Table 4.1 The result of actions in table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Score’s range</th>
<th>Students’ percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Preliminary study | 60.1   | 50.0 – 75.0   | ● 5 of 42 students (6%) achieved the score of 70.0 – 75.0  
  ● 37 of 42 students (94%) achieved score 50.0 – 65.0 |
| 2  | Cycle 1        | 66.4   | 50.0 – 85.0  | ● 17 of 42 students (45%) achieved the score of 70.0 – 85.0   
  ● 25 of 42 students (55%) achieved score 50.0 – 65.0 |

Table 4.2 Samples of errors in the students’ work in cycle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>Type or error</th>
<th>Samples of the students’ error</th>
<th>The teacher’s correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Because .... look at the clock in my room</td>
<td>Because i looked at the watch in my room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>because look at the clock in my the room</td>
<td>Because i looked at the watch in my room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Punctuation mark</td>
<td>Fortunately the place was not far from gas station</td>
<td>Fortunately, the place was not far from gas station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows samples of error which was frequently done by students. It could be seen that the students’ knowledge in grammar were still low. For instance, in term of grammar, they commonly used bahasa indonesia term. They did not put any subject of the sentence.

The Students’ Involvement in Writing Activity

The analysis was about the data obtained by using the observation checklist and field notes. The data was about the students participation during the writing activities, the teaching procedures, and problems found during the action. The data in the observation checklist and field notes revealed that during the writing activities in meeting 1, 2, and 3, it could be found that not all students could participate well in the class. For instance, there were some students who did not pay attention and follow the instructions. They just did inrelevant activities such as drawing and writing in their own workbooks. In other condition, the students did not utter and share ideas during the discussion. The possible factor that influence that conditions that were caused by the low control from the teacher. Another possibility that the students’ tended to neglect the class activity that was hold by the teacher. because the time was neglected by the students so, it will decrease efficiency of time. Luckily, the students who were willing to follow the teacher’s instruction could give good feedback for material given. They were active in answering teacher’s questions during the introduction of using mind mapping. This fact was extremelly helpfull to run teaching and learning activity.
Table 4.2 figures the students’ involvement during the writing activities in cycle 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Reviewing narrative text | • Paying attention to the teacher’s explanation  
• Responding to the teacher’s explanation | 2     |
|    |                    |                                                                             | 2     |
| 2  | Introducing mind mapping  | • Paying attention to the teacher’s explanation about introduction of mind mapping as a strategy in writing  
• Responding to the teacher’s explanation  
• Asking questions related to the teacher’s explanation about new strategy introduced | 2     |
|    |                    |                                                                             | 2     |
| 3  | Sampling of mind mapping  | • Following the teacher instruction of mind mapping by observing samples of mind mapping chart  
• Asking questions related to the sample given  
• Practicing to construct mind mapping with free topic which is led by the teacher  
• Revising to the work | 3     |
|    |                    |                                                                             | 3     |
|    |                    |                                                                             | 3     |
|    |                    |                                                                             | 3     |
The data in table 4.2 shows that the number of the students who paid attention to teacher instruction, responded to the teacher instruction and asked question in scale 2 (21% - 40% students of the class). In meeting 2 the number of students responded and followed the teacher’s instruction reached 3, that means 41% - 60% students of the whole class. In the meeting three the number of students wrote the final work reached 3, which means 41% - 60% students of the class submitted their work.

As the result was shown by the table 4.2 that the students’ involvement in the writing activities was classified as fair. It means that the result was fail as long as it could not meet the first criterion of success. It was stated that the criterion could be reached if the participation of students were categorized as good. Even though, it is only the result of observation relating to the students involvement in cycle 1. Making the students more active and productive, some revisions were needed by the researcher.

Dealing with the teaching procedures, the data gotten by observation using field notes stated that in meeting 1 the teacher applied the teaching procedures as those stated in the lesson plan. He notified that several steps must be done to guide the students into the strategy. The steps are Reviewing narrative text, Introducing mind mapping, Sampling of mind mapping, Writing narrative process. In the meeting 2 and 3 the teacher also worked with the teaching steps as stated in lesson plan. He also notified the instructional objective needed to be accomplished. The students are expected to be able to construct ideas by using mind map dealing with many kind of Texts correctly and appropriately.

The field notes revealed that during the application of the actions in meeting 1, 2, and 3, some problems were found. The first problem was about the students’ understanding is still low that made them could not do the teacher instruction well. For instance, at the moment the teacher delivered about mind mapping, they seemed that they had no idea with it. It could
be new strategy that they never know before, they were obviously unfamiliar. It could be seen from their expression and responds, they needed more clarification about the strategy.

The second problem was that the students' mastery on language used was still poor so that students made a lot of mistakes in terms of vocabulary. It became worse when they were decayed by availability of dictionary which basically, it could help them to do the task.

The third problem was in term of time efficiency, most of the students needed much time for finishing a text which was automatically they did not have more time to revise, edit and the final work to be submitted to the teacher. Time management could be applied well as stated in the lesson plan.

Result of Reflection on the Strategy of Cycle 1

Refering the result of the students’ writing and the students’ involvement in writing activity in cycle 1, it was concluded that the implementation of the action did not give satisfactory result on the improvement of the students’ ability in writing narrative text. On other hand, the students’ participation were still low. Therefore, revision and improvement must be done in doing the action so that the criteria of success could be reached.

The implantation of the action is started by reviewing about narrative text. The refreshment was needed to recall students’ knowledge about this text. It would help the students to be led into the strategy implemented. Introducing mind mapping as strategy of writing had to be given in order that the students could recognize and implement the strategy given eventhough it needed process to familiarize it. Modelling was implemented to strengthen students understanding. The findings of the present study shows that modelling helps the students comprehend what mind mapping is and be able to apply it in the prewriting activities. By asking them some questions related to it. It was ecpected that they can answer and respond spontaneously to the teacher question. It showed that the can get what the sample figure out. For eaxample, in metting 1 the students could generate ideas by means of mind mapping although some of the took long time in deciding it. In making the mastery of mind mapping easilly, the teacher prepared a worksheet in which the students were guided to map their ideas by filling up the empty spaces in the mind map. In the process of teaching and leraning, the teacher notifies the instructions to the students as well as explaines in the writing activities the students are going to do.

The findings of the present study show that there are some problems found during implementation of the action as stated by the observation checklist ad field notes. First, there are some students who do not exactly understand teachers’ explanation and instruction which is delivered in English. To overcome the problem happened, the teacher try to mix with Bahasa to clear her point. The second problem was that the students' mastery on language used was still poor so that students made a lot of mistakes in terms of vocabulay. It became worse when they were decayed by availability of dictionary which basically, it could help them to do the task.

The third problem was the time allocated in every metting could not be efficient. The students tended to neglect the teacher instruction specially in writing activity. In the phase,
the students were actually asked to produce narrative text. The students took much time in accomplishing the work. On other hand, they should have some revising and editing before it became final work which scored by the teacher and the reseacher.

Revision on the Strategy of Cycle 1

The revision on the cycle 1 was concerned on th procedures of the implementation of the model of mind mapping. First, the teacher should explain clearer what mind mapping is exactly. It seemed that the teacher was not really familiar in using mind mapping so, she often got problems in explaining the detail ways in constructing mind mapping and the teacher should explain he material slowly in order that the students could catch what she explained. The teacher should repeat what the points of material to make the students clearer about the strategy implemented. Mixing the language between English and Bahasa could decrease misunderstanding to the students’ interpretation. By giving more sample of mind mapping was expected increasing the students’ knowledge and comprehension realted the teacher’s explanation.

Enhanced students with large vocabulary could help the students in accomplishing the work easily. Provided some dictionaries also helped them in making their time more efficie than they had to ask the teacher in many times.

Time management must be applied well. Time was allocated will be unefficient if the the students could not finish the task in right time. The controll of the teacher and the reasearcher had to be needed to guide accomplishing their work. Accomplishing the work on time as time allocated, the students could economize little time to revise and edit the work before it must be submitted and scored by the teacher and researcher.

Findings in Cycle 2

This section presents the data analysed throught cycle 2. It consists of the the teaching schedule , cycle 2 was done in three meetings. Each meeting was 2x45 minutes. Total students who attended the metting were about 42 students. Meeting 1 was conducted on march june 18, 2013, meeting 2 was done on june 20, 2013, and meeting three was done on june 25, 2013 ( see appendix 8b). It was conducted in second grade of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir

The reseacher used observation checklist and field notes as the instrument for evevaluating the students’ involvement during the teaching and learning process. The test was employed to assess the students’ final product in writing. The students’ score were used to measure the students’ achievement.

The Students’ Writing Achievement

Based on the result of the students’ work there was better improvement than score from the preliminary study to cycle . The average score in the preliminary is 60.1 and the mean score of the students’ writing in cycle 2 is 71.2. The data obtained from the students’ work show that the students’ writing achievements of the cycle 2 lie among score 55 to 90. 30 out of 42 students (79%) achieved the score 70.0 – 90.0 and 12 of 42 students (21%)
achieved the score 55.0 – 65.0. That means that there was 79% of the students who achieved the score equal or greater than 70 and 21% of students who achieved equal or greater than 65. The improvement met the criteria of success because there was 79% of students who achieved the target score 70.

**Table 4.3 The result of actions in table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Score’s range</th>
<th>Students’ percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>50.0 – 85.0</td>
<td>• 17 of 42 students (45%) achieved the score of 70.0 – 85.0&lt;br&gt;• 25 of 42 students (55%) achieved score 50.0 – 65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>55.0 – 90.0</td>
<td>• 30 of 42 students (79%) achieved the score 70.0 – 90.0&lt;br&gt;• 12 of 42 students (21%) achieved the score 55.0 – 65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On other hand, some students still got low scores, but overall the students’ score was better than before implementing mind mapping. It could be admitted that cycle 2 has fulfilled the intended criteria of success. However, they still could map their ideas to help producing narrative text which is understandable since the text had good content and organization. Despite, some error still did but it did not blur the content.

The result of cycle indicates that the students’ score in writing narrative text improved. In cycle 1 the students’ average score was 66.4, while the students’ average score was 71.4 in cycle 2. It shows that was improvement from the cycle 1 to cycle 2 and it met the criteria of succes.

**Students Involvement in Writing Activity**

The students involvement during the activity of writing was more active. It could be seen to the number of students who did relevant activities to the assigned task. Good interaction must be build between students and the teacher, in this case the teacher intentionally engaged the students with nice expression to make the atmosphere of the class familiar. While, the students did the task the teacher often admonished the with the question “Do you have any problem?”. From this at least, the students felt that they were cared by the teacher. Some others, for example giving nice reinforcement was needed to motivate them in accomplishing their task. The teacher often gave the reinforcement such as “very good”, “that’s great”, “good job” to the students who were active in the writing activities. It makes them more attentive in accomplishing the writing task.
Table 4.3 shows the students’ involvement during he writing activities in the cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>components</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1  | Reviewing narrative text | • Paying attention to the teacher’s explanation  
    |              | • Responding to the teacher’s explanation | 4 | 4 |   |
| 2  | Introducing mind mapping | • Paying attention to the teacher’s explanation about introduction of mind mapping as a strategy in writing  
    |              | • Responding to the teacher’s explanation  
    |              | • Asking questions related to the teacher’s explanation about new strategy introduced | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3  | Sampling of mind mapping | • Following the teacher instruction of mind mapping by observing samples of mind mapping chart  
    |              | • Asking questions related to the sample given  
    |              | • Practicing to construct mind mapping with free topic which is led by the teacher  
    |              | • Revising to the work | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4  | Writing narrative process | • Writing the final work  
    |              | • Revising to the students work  
    |              | • Classroom discussion about the problems found by the students | 4 | 4 | 4 |

Number of students = 42  
note: M = Metting

Scale

6.  = 0% - 20% students of the class (very poor)  
7.  = 21% - 40% students of the class (poor)  
8.  = 41% - 60% students of the class (fair)  
9.  = 61% - 80% students of the class (good)  
10. = 81% - 100% students of the class (very good)
The data in table 4.3 shows that the number of the students who paid attention to teacher instruction, responded to the teacher instruction and asked question in scale 4 (61% - 80% students of the class). In meeting 2 the number of students responded and followed the teacher’s instruction reached 4, that means 61% - 80% students of the whole class. In the meeting three the number of students wrote the final work reached 4, which means 61% - 80% students of the class submitted their work.

As the result was shown by the table 4.3 that the students’ involvement in the writing activities was classified as good. It means that the result could meet the first criterion of success. It was stated that the criterion could be reached if the participation of students were categorized as good. Making the students more active and productive, some revision were needed by by the researcher.

**Result of reflection of the strategy of cycle 2**

Teaching and learning process as well as the analysis of the learning result, it was concluded that implemention of the action in cycle 2 met criteria of success set up previously.

The first that the average score increased and it achieved the score of greater than equal to 70.0. The second, the students had more active during activity teaching and learning process. Eventhough, some students tended to made noyse. Overall, it could be concluded that the implementation of cycle 2 was successfully done as it met the two criteria of success.

The result of the present study comes up with some similarities and difference from that of Wilujeng’s, and Repelitawati’s. The similarities absolutely could be seen in terms the improvement the students’ writing ability and the students involvement during the process teaching and learning.

Wilujeng (2005) shows that the students mean score improve from 71, 73, and 77 to 80, 83.3 and 85.4 in meeting 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Repelitawati (2011) shows that the students mean score from 65.03 to 74.62 in cycle 1 becomes 81.17 in cycle 2. While the result of present study which was done in two cycle can indicates that the implementation of mind mapping in writing class can improve the students ability. It can be seen of the result of average score of preliminary study from 601 became 66.4 in cycle 1 and continued to the cycle 2 with reaching the average score 71.4. That means, it met the first criteria of success.

Wilujeng (2005), Repelitatwati (2011) also showed that the students were active during the writing activities. Wilujeng (2005) did not show and discuss more about the

---


students’ involvement in writing activity. Those findings support the claim that mind mapping is an effective strategy to help the students organize ideas.

The mind mapping used in this study could prove that the students’ ability can improved. The success study is supported by the theories mentioned formerly.

friends and even they just did some irrelevant activities such as drawing in their workbooks. some facts in cycle 2 also found that the teacher is able to control by going around the class to make them focus on their task.

Some weakness found during the implementation of action. Technically, their inability in applying the grammatical rules, using correct spelling, choosing the right words. Behaviorally, they think that they freedom to make their group work that obviously disturb class condition.

DISCUSSION

The implementation of mind mapping can improve the students ability

Refering to the result of study, the implementation of mind mapping can improve the students ability in writing narrative text. Eventhough, all the students have not achieved the maximum result, at least most of their writing abilities have improved as shown in the result of every cycle. It seems that the students are able to communicate by using written language in which they do all the activities provided by the teacher during the process of the action cycles. Buzan (in Wycoff, 2005: 63) asserts that mind mapping as a technique of mind mapping ideas is the most effective skill in the process of thinking creatively. Those activities are related to the procedures employed in writing narrative text. The proper model of mind mapping which is developed by the teacher for writing activities involves the application of the steps of writing such as Reviewing narrative text, Introducing mind mapping, Sampling of mind mapping, Writing narrative process.

Reviewing narrative text is meant to refresh and recall students previous knowledge related to the comprehension of narrative text. To remember what we have learned over the long-term, we need to move information from short-term memory (what we’re currently thinking about or aware of) into long-term memory. By reviewing the text makes the students are easily guided to the action of mind mapping which is implemented to improve students’ ability in writing specially in narrative. Introducing mind mapping as strategy is conducted to solve the problem in writing. Writing as one of English skill that needs to be mastered. Before, the teacher delivered the main materials, she conducted a dialogue with the students. The teacher asked some students orally to the topic discussed, and lead them the related information useful for recognizing new knowledge. This activity was initialed by providing them with


media such as picture related to the topic discussed. From the media given it will make the students easily follow the teacher explanation relating mind mapping.

In the process to strengthen students’ comprehension, sampling is possible way to conduct. The teacher wrote the object (topic) in a circle. Then she elicited the students’ ideas for the possible supporting ideas by drawing line from the circle, one line will represent one supporting idea. Asking the students develop more line from each line made by adding the branches. It makes the students think creatively, to associate ideas more easily and organize and analyze information visually 14. The teacher completed the mind mapping with some missing words related to the topic. To keep the students motivated in teaching and learning process.

The Students Involvement During the Writing Activities
Relating to the students’ involvement, the observation checklist and field notes stated that some students are not active in writing activities during the implementation of the action in cycle 1. For instance, they tend to chat with their friends and even they just did some irrelevant activities such as drawing in their workbooks. Some facts in cycle 2 also found that the teacher is able to control by going around the class to make them focus on their task. Some weakness found during the implementation of action. Technically, their inability in applying the grammatical rules, using correct spelling, choosing the right words. Behaviorally, they think that they freedom to make their group work that obviously disturb class condition.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion
The conclusion focused in “Implementing Mind Mapping to Improve the Ability of the Second Grade Students of MTS Bustanul Ulum Wagir in Writing Narrative”. Based on the result of data analyses, it can be concluded that the study could work as well as the objective. It could be seen from the students’ achievement in writing class. Based on the score of the final test, students’ average score was 71.4 (cycle 2). It increased from 66.4 (cycle 1) while, the preliminary score was only 60.1. The data showed that the score is higher than the minimum mastery learning standard at that school that is 70. From the result of the study, it means that the implementation of mind mapping had positive result and improved students’ writing skill of writing narrative text. Therefore, the researcher successfully achieved the criteria of success of the study.

Based on the result of observation checklist in the classroom, it was concluded that implementing mind mapping did not only improved the students’ achievement, but also their students’ attitude and responsibility toward the implementation of the study. The observation checklist showed that the students’ quality of learning activity in the class was improved

meeting by meeting. This condition happened because of some indicators, such as: first, the students showed that they were more active in each meeting. the students responded the researchers’ instruction when the researcher asked them to do the instruction. Second, the students’ involvement in the writing activities was classified as good. It means that the result could meet the first criterion of success. Third, more than 75% of students in the class could achieve the standart score that had to be achieved by the students

**Suggestion**

**For the Teacher**

In teaching writing narrative, the teacher should explain not only what narrative text and all generic structure of it, but also teacher should focus on student’s writing product and how to generate the ideas well because many students theoretically understand about narrative but they could not write it well. Moreover, in teaching writing, the teacher should bring an appropriate media to make students more interested and motivated in writing class.

**For the Future Researchers**

Further research could be done by other researcher to continue this study in order to get better result. The other researchers that had same condition or other researchers in different context could use this strategy which must be suited with the students need. It was suggested because this strategy succeeded to improve students’ ability in writing narrative. The future researchers were also suggested to conduct a similar study on other skills like listening, speaking, and reading at other level of students for the improvement of teaching English.
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