

**Pengajaran Teks Deskriptif Tertulis Menggunakan *Mind Map*
untuk Siswa Sekolah Menengah Pertama**

Teaching Written Descriptive Texts Using Mind Maps for Junior High School Students

Hilda Chairina Anjari¹, Listyaning Sumardiyani², Fitri Yulianti³

¹²³Universitas PGRI Semarang; Indonesia

*¹E-mail: hildachairina.anjari@gmail.com

²E-mail: listyaningsmd@gmail.com

³E-mail: fitri_yulianti88@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui keefektifan penggunaan media pembelajaran Mind Map terhadap kemampuan menulis teks deskriptif siswa. Metode penelitian yang digunakan bersifat kuantitatif dengan Quasi-Experimental sebagai desain yang menggunakan dua kelompok pretest and posttest only control group design. Oleh karena itu, peneliti memilih dua kelas secara acak sebagai kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol untuk diberikan pretest dan posttest. Sampel penelitian ini adalah 63 siswa kelas VIII SMP N 5 Jepara tahun pelajaran 2022/2023. Instrumen penelitian yang dikumpulkan selama penelitian adalah; tes, angket, dan dokumentasi. Untuk menilai kemampuan menulis teks deskriptif siswa pada pretest dan posttest, peneliti menggunakan rubrik penilaian yaitu skor analisis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat pengaruh positif terhadap kemampuan menulis teks deskriptif siswa setelah menggunakan media pembelajaran Mind Map. Bisa dilihat dari hasilnya perhitungan Toberved yang lebih tinggi dari Ttabel. Toberved diperoleh hasil 3,179 sedangkan hasil tabel independent T-test dengan df 61 dan taraf signifikansi 5% diperoleh Ttabel sebesar 2.000. Ini menunjukkan bahwa perbandingan Toberved dan Ttabel adalah $3,179 > 2,000$ sehingga T-test lebih tinggi dari Ttabel. Sehingga dapat disimpulkan bahwa media pembelajaran Mind Map efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks deskriptif.

Kata Kunci; Teks deskriptif; mind map; SMPN 5 Jepara

Abstract

This research aims to determine the effectiveness of using Mind Map learning media on students' ability to write descriptive texts. The research method used is quantitative with Quasi-Experimental as a design that uses two groups pretest and posttest only control group design. Therefore, the researcher chose two classes randomly as the experimental class and the control class to be given a pretest and posttest. The sample for this research was 63 eighth grade students of SMP N 5 Jepara for the 2022/2023 academic year. The research instruments collected during the research were; tests, questionnaires, and documentation. To score students' writing descriptive texts on the pretest and posttest, the researcher used a scoring rubric, namely an analysis score. The results showed that there was a positive effect on students' writing descriptive texts after using the Mind Map learning media. It can be seen from the results of Toberved calculations which are higher than the Ttable. Toberved obtained a result of 3.179 while the results of an independent T-test table with df

61 and a significance level of 5% obtained a Ttable of 2,000. This shows that the comparison of Toberved and Ttable is $3.179 > 2.000$ so that the T-test is higher than the Ttable. So it can be concluded that the Mind Map learning media is effective for improving students' ability to write descriptive texts.

Keywords; Descriptive text; mind maps; SMPN 5 Jepara



© 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

PRELIMINARY

Mastery of English language skills has become very important for students to support their activities also teaching and learning processes at school (Alzouebi et al., 2020); (Street, 2017). There are 4 aspects that students need in order to master competence in English, including speaking, listening, reading, and writing. However in reality, many students still have difficulty in mastering English skills, especially in the aspect of writing competence. So to overcome this problem, writing learning must be varied so that students feel interested and happy in the teaching and learning process of writing (Simonova, 2019); (Aghajani & Salehi, 2020). There are genres that must be mastered by the students based on the curriculum in Junior High School, including procedure text, recount text, narrative text, report text, and descriptive text. The researcher made observations during internship at SMP N 5 Jepara then found that the students still had difficulties in writing descriptive text especially eighth grade students. Based on the results of interviews that the researcher conducted with several eighth grade students, it was found that the obstacles experienced were caused by lack of ideas making students difficult in describing the subject into writing, students had limited vocabulary, and students did not know the structure of descriptive text.

Seeing these problems, it is necessary to improve learning strategies as an effort to improve students' competence in writing descriptive text. One way to improve learning strategies is to use a learning media in the teaching and learning process. Mind Map is one of the media that can be used to solve students' problems in writing, especially in descriptive text (Maltepe & Gültekin, 2017). Mind Map is media developed by Tony Buzan, where Mind Map can make it easier for someone to map and remember a lot of information through creative note-taking methods using visuals and graphics in a pattern of related ideas. The notes made will form a pattern of interrelated ideas to produce a text. Mind Map proved to be more effective in storing memory for information and helping students improve their descriptive text writing skills (Buran & Filyukov, 2015).

The use of mind mapping techniques in writing has shown positive effects on students' writing skills across various educational levels. Research studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of incorporating mind maps in teaching writing, leading to improvements in students' descriptive writing, news item text writing, and reading comprehension skills. In a study focusing on secondary school students, the implementation of the mind map technique significantly enhanced students' reading comprehension and writing skills (Maltepe & Gültekin, 2017). Another study involving primary school students found that using mind mapping in descriptive writing led to better writing performance compared to traditional teaching methods (Le et al., 2023). An analysis of tenth-grade students' ability in writing news item text using mind maps showed moderate improvement in their writing skills (Eldea et al.,

2017). A study conducted to improve study group students' skills in writing descriptive text using mind maps demonstrated a notable increase in students' achievement in writing descriptive text (Arista, 2021). The use of mind map techniques in teaching eighth-grade students descriptive paragraph writing resulted in an increase in students' writing abilities, emphasizing the importance of teacher guidance and modeling the process (Hodri et al., 2015). These studies collectively highlight the benefits of incorporating mind mapping techniques in teaching writing, showcasing improvements in students' writing skills and overall learning outcomes.

Based on the background of the research above, the researcher gets some problems in the teaching process that can be formulated as follows: To what extent is the students' ability in writing descriptive text being taught with the Mind Map media? To what extent is the students' ability in writing descriptive text being taught without the Mind Map media? Are there any significant differences between teaching writing descriptive text with and without using the Mind Map media?

The method used in this research is experiment. In this research, there were two variables involved. They were Mind Map media as an independent variable and writing descriptive text as a dependent variable (Ismawati, 2012). The experimental research method requires an experimental class and control class so that the condition can be controlled. The experimental design in this research used a Quasi Experimental design using a pre-test and post-test only control group design. In the pre-test and post-test only control group design, there are two classes that are chosen randomly as an experimental class and a control class. In the experimental class applying descriptive text with Mind Map learning media while in the control class using conventional learning methods.

Table 1. Experimental Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental	Y_1	O_1, O_2	Y_2
Control	X_1		X_2

Note:

Y1: pre-test of the experimental group

X1: pre-test of the control group

O : treatment of the experimental group

Y2: post-test of the experimental group

X2: post-test of the control group

Subject of the Research

Population and Sample

The population is an area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by researchers to be studied and then drawn conclusions (Creswell, 2010); (Sugiyono, 2016). The population used by the researcher in this research was eighth grade students of SMP N 5 Jepara which consisted of 8 classes totaling 253 students. Sample is a group of subjects selected for research in which individuals represent a larger group and very important for researchers to obtain information related to research (Hodri et al., 2015). The researcher used purposive random sampling technique in taking sample in this research. The researcher obtained two sample classes, namely as experimental class and control class. The experimental class is the class that uses the application Mind Map learning media, while the control class is the class that uses conventional learning methods. The sample used in this research was students of class eighth B which amounted to 32 students as the experimental class and eighth E which amounted to 31 students as the control class.

Instruments of the Research

Pre-test

Pre-test was given to analyze and determine the initial descriptive text writing skills of the sample. Pre-test was conducted at the beginning of the research before the treatment was given. Pre-test was given to the experimental group and the control group to collect data whether the group had the same ability or not. The pre-test was conducted by giving essay questions.

Post-test

Post-test was given to analyze and check the effectiveness of the sample treatment in the experimental group. Post-test was given after all treatments were carried out. The procedure for pre-test and post-test is the same. In the post-test students were asked to write the same topic. Then students are given a few minutes to find ideas in writing descriptive text using Mind Map learning media.

Questionnaire

Questionnaire is a data collection technique which is done by giving a set of questions or written statement to the respondent to be answered. The researcher uses a closed questionnaire form, namely a questionnaire with questions using an existing answer choice technique, so that the respondent only has to choose the desired answer. The purpose of data collection technique through this questionnaire is to find out the effectiveness of Mind Map on the ability to write descriptive text.

Documentation

Documentation is the collection of data by looking at various events or record existing reports. The documentation can in the form of writing, drawing, or monumental works of somebody. Documentation method used by the researcher to obtain data in the form of school profiles, lists of names of teachers and students, and grades test.

Method of Data Analysis

Scoring Student's Writing Test

In assessing students' pre-test and post-test, the measurement must be consistent. So the researcher uses rubric assessment as suggested in his research, namely analytic scores to assess students' pre-test and post-test. There are several advantages of analytical assessment such as; the scores are compiled to consider aspect of performance which it might otherwise ignore and the very fact that the scores have to give a number of scorer will tend to make the scoring more reliable.

The researcher applied the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{(\text{maximum total score})}{30} \times 100$$

Table 2. Rubric of Analytic Scoring

No	Aspect	Score	Indicators
1	Grammar	6	Few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order.
		5	Some errors of grammar or word order which do not, however, interfere with comprehension.
		4	Errors of grammar or word order fairly frequent; occasional rereading necessary for full comprehension.
		3	Errors of grammar or word order frequent; efforts of interpretation sometimes required on reader's part.
		2	Errors of grammar or word order very frequent; reader often has to rely on own interpretation.
		1	Errors of grammar or word order so severe as to make comprehension virtually impossible.
2	Vocabulary	6	Use of vocabulary and idiom rarely (if at all) distinguishable from that of educated native writer.

		5	Occasionally uses inappropriate terms relies or circumlocutions; expression of ideas hardly impaired.
		4	Uses wrong or inappropriate words fairly frequent; expression of ideas may be limited because of ideas inadequate vocabulary.
		3	Limited vocabulary and frequent errors clearly hinder expression of ideas.
		2	Vocabulary so limited and so frequently misused that reader must often rely on own interpretation.
		1	Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make writing virtually impossible.
3	Mechanics	6	Few (if any) noticeable lapses in punctuation or spelling.
		5	Occasional lapses in punctuation or spelling which do not, however, interfere with comprehension.

		4	Errors in punctuation or spelling fairly frequent; occasional rereading necessary for full comprehension.
		3	Frequent errors in spelling or punctuation; lead sometimes to obscurity.
		2	Errors in spelling or punctuation so frequent that reader must often rely on own interpretation.
		1	Errors in spelling or punctuation so severe as to make comprehension virtually impossible.
4	Style	6	Choice of structures and vocabulary consistently appropriate; like that of educated native writer.
		5	Occasional lack of consistency in choice of structures and vocabulary which does not, however, impair overall ease of communication.
		4	'Patchy', with some structures or vocabulary items noticeably inappropriate to general style.
		3	Structures or vocabulary items sometimes not only inappropriate but also misused; little sense of ease of communication.

		2	Communication often impaired by completely inappropriate or misused structures or vocabulary items.
		1	A 'hotch-potch' of half learned misused structures and vocabulary items rendering communication almost impossible.
5	Organization	6	Highly organized; clear progression of ideas well linked; like educated native writer.
		5	Material well organized; links could occasionally be clearer but communication not impaired.
		4	Some lack of organization; re-reading required for clarification of ideas.
		3	Little or no attempt at connectivity, though reader can deduce some organization.
		2	Individual ideas may be clear, but very difficult to deduce connection between them.
		1	Lack of organization so severe that communication is seriously impaired.

Categorizing the Students' Score

The researcher categorized the students' score to determine the students' achievement after conducting the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group and control group test. After getting the score of the students' test, the researcher used the following table to categorize the students' score:

Table 3. Levels of Achievement

Mark	Score	Level of Achievement
A	90-100	Excellent
B	80-89	Very Good
C	70-79	Adequate
D	60-69	Inadequate
E	Below 60	Fail level

After collecting the data by using the test, the researcher analyzed the result of the data. It used to know whether there was any significant improvement of the writing skill in descriptive text of the eighth grade students of SMP N 5 Jepara by using Mind Map. In analyzing the data, the researcher used the following steps:

Mean

The researcher used a formula to calculate the mean score of the total pre-test and post-test scores of students in the experimental class and control class. The function of the mean score is very important because it reflects the score of a data set. Finding out the mean

of all scores X (score of control class) and the mean of all scores Y (scores of experimental class). The formula of the mean score X as follows:

$$X = \frac{\sum xi}{N}$$

Where:

X : the mean of score X

$\sum xi$: the sum of the score X

N : the total number of the students of control class

The formula of the mean score Y as follows:

$$Y = \frac{\sum yi}{N}$$

Where:

Y : the mean of score Y

$\sum yi$: the sum of the score Y

N : the total number of the students of experimental class

Analysing the Data Using T-Test

After the researcher got the data from the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group and control group, the researcher found out whether the Mind Map was affective or not to improve the descriptive text writing skills of the eighth graders students of SMP N 5 Jepara. Statistical analysis was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two sample means or not. To simplify the calculation, the researcher calculates the data using the t-test in IBM SPSS Statistics 22.

Hypothesis Test

This research was intended to know if there was effect of using Mind Map on students' writing skill. Furthermore, the researcher stated the hypothesis as follows:

(Ha) Alternative hypothesis: there was significance effect of using Mind Map on students' writing skill in descriptive text.

(H0) Null hypothesis: there was no significance effect of using Mind Map on students' writing skill in descriptive text.

To prove the hypothesis, the result of t-test calculation was tested with the criteria were as follows:

If $t_0 < t_{table}$, or the significance was < 0.05 in significance degree 5%, the H0 was accepted and Ha was rejected. It means that there was no significant effect of using Mind Map learning media on students' writing skill in descriptive text.

If $t_0 > t_{table}$, or the significance was > 0.05 in significance degree 5%, the H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. It means that there was significant effect of using Mind Map learning media on students' writing skill in descriptive text.

DISCUSSION

The Students' Writing Ability Who Are Taught without Mind Map (Control Class)

The researcher calculated the pre-test and post-test by using the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{(\text{maximum total score})}{30} \times 100$$

Where:

G : Grammar

V : Vocabulary

M : Mechanics

S : Style

O : Organization

The researcher calculated the mean pre-test and post-test of the control class by using the following formula:

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum x_1}{n}$$

Where:

$\bar{X}_1$: the mean of the sample

$\sum x_1$: the sum of the score

n : the total sample

The result of pre-test in control class

Table 4. Pre-Test Result of the Control Class

No	Respondent	Category of Writing Assessment					Pre-test	CATEGORY	
		G	V	M	S	O			
1	A-01	4	5	4	2	5	67	D	Inadequate
2	A-02	4	4	3	3	3	57	E	Fail level
3	A-03	3	3	3	1	2	40	E	Fail level
4	A-04	4	3	4	4	4	63	D	Inadequate
5	A-05	3	3	4	2	4	53	E	Fail level
6	A-06	5	3	2	2	5	57	E	Fail level
7	A-07	5	4	5	2	5	70	C	Adequate
8	A-08	4	4	3	4	5	67	D	Inadequate
9	A-09	4	4	4	3	3	60	D	Inadequate

10	A-10	4	4	3	5	5	70	C	Adequate
11	A-11	4	4	4	5	6	77	C	Adequate
12	A-12	2	3	3	2	4	47	E	Fail level
13	A-13	3	4	4	5	5	70	C	Adequate
14	A-14	3	3	1	2	3	40	E	Fail level
15	A-15	5	5	4	3	5	73	C	Adequate
16	A-16	3	3	3	4	4	57	E	Fail level
17	A-17	4	4	4	3	5	67	D	Inadequate
18	A-18	4	4	3	6	6	77	C	Adequate
19	A-19	2	3	4	3	4	53	E	Fail level
20	A-20	1	3	2	2	4	40	E	Fail level
21	A-21	3	3	3	4	5	60	D	Inadequate
22	A-22	2	2	2	3	1	33	E	Fail level
23	A-23	3	4	2	3	3	50	E	Fail level
24	A-24	5	5	4	3	5	73	C	Adequate
25	A-25	5	5	4	5	5	80	B	Very Good
26	A-26	2	3	2	3	3	43	E	Fail level
27	A-27	4	4	4	3	4	63	D	Inadequate
28	A-28	3	4	3	5	5	67	D	Inadequate
29	A-29	4	3	4	2	3	53	E	Fail level
30	A-30	3	4	4	3	5	63	D	Inadequate
31	A-31	5	4	3	5	5	73	C	Adequate
Total								1863	

The researcher calculates the mean of pre-test of the control class with the following formula as follows:

$$X_1 = \frac{\sum x_1}{n}$$

$$X_1 = \frac{1863}{31}$$

$$X_1 = 60,10$$

According to the students' pre-test result above, there was 31 students in the control class. The mean of the pre-test was 60,10. Among them were 13 students in fail level, 9 students in inadequate level, 8 students at an adequate level, 1 student at the very good level, and none was an excellent level. The highest score was 80 at the very good level achieved only by one person. While the lowest score was 33 in fail level achieved only by one person.

The Result of Post-Test in Control Class

The students' VIII E writing skill result after taught without Mind Map learning media is showed by the following post-test score:

Table 5. Post-Test Result of the Control Class

No	Respondent	Category of Writing Assessment					Post-test	CATEGORY	
		G	V	M	S	O			
1	A-01	4	5	4	3	5	70	C	Adequate
2	A-02	4	4	4	3	4	63	D	Inadequate
3	A-03	3	2	2	3	3	43	E	Fail level
4	A-04	5	4	4	4	4	70	C	Adequate
5	A-05	4	4	3	3	5	63	D	Inadequate
6	A-06	5	5	4	4	4	73	C	Adequate
7	A-07	5	4	5	4	5	77	C	Adequate
8	A-08	5	5	3	4	5	73	C	Adequate
9	A-09	4	3	4	3	5	63	D	Inadequate
10	A-10	5	4	4	4	5	73	C	Adequate
11	A-11	5	5	4	5	5	80	B	Very Good
12	A-12	3	3	4	2	4	53	E	Fail level
13	A-13	5	5	4	4	5	77	C	Adequate
14	A-14	3	3	3	4	4	57	E	Fail level
15	A-15	5	5	4	5	6	83	B	Very Good
16	A-16	4	4	4	3	5	67	D	Inadequate
17	A-17	5	4	4	3	5	70	C	Adequate
18	A-18	6	5	4	5	6	87	B	Very Good
19	A-19	4	3	5	4	5	70	C	Adequate
20	A-20	3	3	3	3	4	53	E	Fail level
21	A-21	4	4	4	4	3	63	D	Inadequate
22	A-22	3	3	3	3	4	53	E	Fail level
23	A-23	5	4	3	3	5	67	D	Inadequate
24	A-24	4	5	5	4	6	80	B	Very Good
25	A-25	5	5	5	4	6	83	B	Very Good
26	A-26	4	4	3	3	4	60	D	Inadequate
27	A-27	4	4	4	3	5	67	D	Inadequate
28	A-28	4	5	4	5	5	77	C	Adequate
29	A-29	4	3	5	2	4	60	D	Inadequate
30	A-30	5	4	4	4	5	73	C	Adequate
31	A-31	5	5	4	5	5	80	B	Very Good
Total									2128

The researcher calculates the mean of post-test of the control class with the following formula, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_2 &= \frac{\sum x_2}{n} \\ X_2 &= \frac{2128}{31} \\ X_2 &= 68,65 \end{aligned}$$

According to the students' post-test result above, there was 31 students in the control class. The mean of post-test was 68,65. Among them were 5 students in fail level, 9 students in inadequate level, 11 students at an adequate level, 6 students at the very good level, and none was an excellent level. The highest score was 87 at the very good level achieved only by one person. While the lowest score was 43 in fail level level achieved only by one person

The Students' Writing Ability Who Are Taught with Mind Map (Experimental Class)

The researcher calculated the pre-test and post-test by using the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{(\text{maximum total score})}{30} \times 100$$

Where :

G : Grammar

V : Vocabulary

M : Mechanics

S : Style

O : Organization

The researcher calculated the mean pre-test and post-test of the experimental class by using the following formula:

$$\bar{y}_1 = \frac{\sum y_1}{n}$$

Where:

$\bar{y}_1$: The mean of the sample

$\sum y_1$: The sum of the score

n : The total sample

The Result of Pre-Test in Experimental Class

Table 6. Pre-Test Result of the Experimental Class

No	Respondent	Category of Writing Assessment					Pre-test	CATEGORY	
		G	V	M	S	O			
1	A-01	2	2	4	3	2	43	E	Fail level
2	A-02	4	3	3	2	4	53	E	Fail level
3	A-03	5	4	3	4	5	70	C	Adequate

4	A-04	4	5	4	5	5	77	C	Adequate
5	A-05	5	4	4	5	6	80	B	Very Good
6	A-06	3	4	3	3	3	53	E	Fail level
7	A-07	2	3	3	1	4	43	E	Fail level
8	A-08	5	6	5	5	5	83	B	Very Good
9	A-09	3	4	4	3	5	63	D	Inadequate
10	A-10	4	5	3	4	4	67	D	Inadequate
11	A-11	5	5	5	4	5	80	B	Very Good
12	A-12	5	5	5	2	4	70	C	Adequate
13	A-13	3	3	3	3	4	53	E	Fail level
14	A-14	5	4	5	4	5	77	C	Adequate
15	A-15	4	3	3	4	4	60	D	Inadequate
16	A-16	5	4	4	2	4	63	D	Inadequate
17	A-17	1	3	2	2	4	40	E	Fail level
18	A-18	3	3	2	3	5	53	E	Fail level
19	A-19	5	4	4	5	5	77	C	Adequate
20	A-20	3	4	3	2	5	57	E	Fail level
21	A-21	4	5	3	2	6	67	D	Inadequate
22	A-22	2	3	2	3	4	47	E	Fail level
23	A-23	3	4	3	4	5	63	D	Inadequate
24	A-24	2	3	1	2	4	40	E	Fail level
25	A-25	3	4	3	2	4	53	E	Fail level
26	A-26	4	4	4	3	4	63	D	Inadequate
27	A-27	3	4	3	3	4	57	E	Fail level
28	A-28	4	4	4	3	5	67	D	Inadequate
29	A-29	3	2	3	2	3	43	E	Fail level
30	A-30	4	4	2	1	4	50	E	Fail level
31	A-31	5	5	4	3	5	73	C	Adequate
32	A-32	5	4	4	5	5	77	C	Adequate

Total

1962

The researcher calculates the mean of pre-test of the experimental class with the following formula as follows:

$$\bar{y}_1 = \frac{\sum y_1}{n}$$

$$\bar{y}_1 = \frac{1962}{32}$$

$$\bar{y}_1 = 61,31$$

According to the students' pre-test result above, there was 32 students in the experimental class. The mean of pre-test was 61,31. Among them were 14 students in fail level, 8 students in inadequate level, 7 students at an adequate level, 3 students at the very good level, and none was an excellent level. The highest score was 83 at the very good level achieved only by one person. While the lowest score was 40 in fail level achieved by two people.

The Result of Post-Test in Experimental Class

The students' VIII B writing skill result after taught with Mind Map media is showed by the following post-test score:

Table 7. Post-Test Result of the Experimental Class

No	Respondent	Category of Writing Assessment					Post-test	CATEGORY	
		G	V	M	S	O			
1	A-01	3	3	5	4	3	60	D	Inadequate
2	A-02	4	5	3	3	5	67	D	Inadequate
3	A-03	5	5	5	5	5	83	B	Very Good
4	A-04	6	5	4	5	6	87	B	Very Good
5	A-05	6	5	5	5	6	90	A	Excellent
6	A-06	4	5	4	3	5	70	C	Adequate
7	A-07	4	4	3	3	5	63	D	Inadequate
8	A-08	6	6	6	5	6	97	A	Excellent
9	A-09	5	4	4	4	5	73	C	Adequate
10	A-10	6	5	3	6	6	87	B	Very Good
11	A-11	6	5	6	5	6	93	A	Excellent
12	A-12	5	5	5	4	5	80	B	Very Good
13	A-13	4	3	3	3	4	57	E	Fail level
14	A-14	5	5	6	6	6	93	A	Excellent
15	A-15	5	5	4	5	6	83	B	Very Good
16	A-16	5	5	4	5	5	80	B	Very Good
17	A-17	3	3	3	3	4	53	E	Fail level
18	A-18	4	4	3	4	5	67	D	Inadequate
19	A-19	6	5	5	6	6	93	A	Excellent
20	A-20	5	4	4	5	6	80	B	Very Good
21	A-21	5	5	4	5	6	83	B	Very Good
22	A-22	5	4	4	3	5	70	C	Adequate
23	A-23	5	4	5	5	5	80	B	Very Good
24	A-24	4	4	3	3	5	63	D	Inadequate
25	A-25	5	5	4	4	4	73	C	Adequate

26	A-26	5	4	5	4	5	77	C	Adequate
27	A-27	4	4	4	4	5	70	C	Adequate
28	A-28	6	5	4	5	6	87	B	Very Good
29	A-29	4	3	4	3	4	60	D	Inadequate
30	A-30	5	5	4	5	6	83	B	Very Good
31	A-31	6	5	5	5	6	90	A	Excellent
32	A-32	6	6	5	6	6	97	A	Excellent
Total								2489	

The researcher calculates the mean of post-test of the experimental class with the following formula as follows:

$$\bar{y}_2 = \frac{\sum y_2}{n}$$

$$\bar{y}_2 = \frac{2489}{32}$$

$$\bar{y}_2 = 77,78$$

According to the students' post-test result above, there was 32 students in the experimental class. The mean of post-test was 77,78. Among them were 2 students in fail level, 6 students in inadequate level, 6 students at an adequate level, 11 student at the very good level, and 7 students at an excellent level. The highest score was 97 at the very good level achieved by two people. While the lowest score was 53 in fail level achieved only by one person.

T-Test

Based on the purpose of this research is to determine differences in writing ability between students in the experimental class and students in the control class using Mind Map learning media in descriptive texts. To find out the difference in the mean score of students' ability to write descriptive texts, the hypothesis was tested using t-test as follows:

H₀ = There was no difference in the mean score of students' ability to write descriptive texts in classes that use Mind Map learning media and conventional learning.

H_a = There was a difference in the mean score of students' ability to write descriptive texts in classes that use Mind Map learning media and conventional learning.

To prove the hypothesis, the result of t-test calculation was tested with the criteria were as follows:

If $t_0 < t_{table}$, or the significance was < 0.05 in significance degree 5%, the H₀ was accepted and H_a was rejected.

If $t_0 > t_{table}$, or the significance was > 0.05 in significance degree 5%, the H₀ was rejected and H_a was accepted.

To test the t-test data, the researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 22. The results of the calculation of the t-test are presented in the following table:

Table 8. Test T-Test Posttest

Group Statistics					
	class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
learning_result	posttest_control_class	31	68.65	10.394	1.867
	posttest_experimental_class	32	77.78	12.302	2.175

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
learning_result	Equal variances assumed	1.717	.195	-3.179	61	.002	-9.136	2.874	-14.883	-3.390
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.188	59.907	.002	-9.136	2.866	-14.869	-3.403

From the output of the T-Test in table 8 it is known that in class 2 as the experimental class taught with Mind Map learning media in descriptive texts, the number of respondents was 32 students and the mean was 77,78. Whereas in class 1 as a control class taught by conventional learning has 31 students and the mean was 68,65. In the independent samples test table, it can be seen in the row equal variances assumed that the value of $t_0 = 3,179$.

From the Independent T-Test table with df 61 and a significance level of 5% obtained $t_{table} = 2,000$ (t_{table} score closest to df = 61). Based on this t score, it is known $t_0 (3,179) > (5\% = 2,000)$.

Based on the results of the data analysis, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted so that there was significant effect of students' ability to write in classes that

use Mind Map learning media in descriptive texts material for class VIII students of SMPN 5 Jepara for the 2022/2023 academic year.

Teaching Written Descriptive Texts Using Mind Maps for Junior High School Students

Mind mapping is a technique that involves visually organizing information around a central concept, with main ideas branching out into subtopics or related concepts. It is a method used in various educational settings to enhance learning and understanding by creating a visual representation of ideas and their relationships (Ananda et al., 2022). Mind mapping can be an effective tool for improving students' skills in various subjects, such as writing descriptive texts, learning genomic concepts, teaching English, understanding mental health topics like mood disorders, and even enhancing poetry writing skills in elementary school students (Hussein Ahmed, 2018); (Tuán, 2021); (Nikam, 2023); (Mezzaluna Safro & Zulikhatin Nuroh, 2023); (Riska et al., 2023).

Mind mapping is indeed a highly effective learning model, particularly when it comes to acquiring foreign languages. Here are some key reasons why mind mapping is beneficial for language learning (Putra, 2012); 1; Visual Representation. Mind maps provide a visual representation of information, making it easier for language learners to organize and connect new vocabulary, grammar rules, and concepts (Malekzadeh & Bayat, 2015); 2)Memory Retention. The visual and spatial organization of a mind map helps in improving memory retention. Associating words with images or colors can enhance recall (Mahmudah et al., 2023); 3) Creativity and Engagement. Mind mapping encourages creativity and engagement by allowing learners to personalize their maps with drawings, symbols, and connections that make sense to them; 4) Holistic Learning. Mind maps promote holistic learning by showing the relationships between different language elements, such as vocabulary, grammar, and cultural nuances (Rosciano, 2015); 5) Structured Approach. Mind mapping provides a structured approach to language learning, helping learners break down complex topics into manageable chunks; 6) Flexibility. Mind maps are flexible tools that can be easily modified and expanded as language skills progress, allowing learners to adapt their maps to their evolving needs (Zheng et al., 2020). In conclusion, incorporating mind mapping into foreign language learning can significantly enhance comprehension, retention, and overall proficiency in the target language.

This research discusses the effectiveness of Mind Map learning media to improve students' skills of writing descriptive texts at SMP N 5 Jepara. In the control class, the researcher gave a pre-test for the first time. After the pre-test was completed, the researcher continued learning VIII E about descriptive text without Mind Map media. Most of them are new about descriptive text. Then the next day, the researcher gave them a post-test. It is known that in the pre-test, there were 13 students in fail level, 9 students

in inadequate level, 8 students at an adequate level, 1 student at the very good level, and none was an excellent level. It is known that their score has increased from the pre-test score. In the post-test results, there were 5 students in fail level, 9 students in inadequate level, 11 students at an adequate level, 6 students at the very good level, and none was an excellent level.

The researcher also gave a pre-test to the experimental class for the first time. After the pre-test was completed, the researcher gave treatment to class VIII B using Mind Map learning media to teach descriptive texts. The researcher explained descriptive texts using Mind Map learning media. Then the next day, the last one is the post-test. The students should write descriptive text based on what they have learned and discuss it with their friends. The pre-test results show that there were 14 students in fail level, 8 students in inadequate level, 7 students at an adequate level, 3 students at the very good level, and none was an excellent level. The post-test results showed their scores increased a lot after the treatment. The results of the post-test show that there were 2 students in fail level, 6 students in inadequate level, 6 students at an adequate level, 11 student at the very good level, and 7 students at an excellent level.

The effectiveness of using Mind Map for teaching written descriptive text could answer the statement of the problems. Based on the collected data, the experimental group students have better results than the control group students. The researcher found that there were significant differences between students who were taught without Mind Map and students who were taught with Mind Map. This is evidenced by the mean post-test result of the control group which was 68,65 while the experimental group showed that the post-test mean was 77,78. In addition, the alternative hypothesis is accepted with $t_0 > t_{table}$, t_0 is 3,179 while t_{table} is 2,000 so that $3,179 > 2,000$. It can be concluded that the use of Mind Map as a teaching learning media was an effective media for improving students' writing skill in descriptive texts.

The research discussed the effectiveness of Mind Map learning media in improving students' skills of writing descriptive texts. The study conducted a classroom action research to examine the improvement of students' ability to write descriptive texts through learning using appropriate Mind Map media. The results indicated that the use of Mind Map media was successful in enhancing students' writing skills in descriptive texts, aligning with the study's hypothesis (Fauziah, 2022). The research demonstrated that Mind Map media can be a beneficial tool for schools, teachers, and students in enhancing the ability to write descriptive texts effectively.

CLOSING

The statistical analysis conducted on the impact of using Mind Map learning media on students' writing of descriptive texts revealed a significant positive effect. This conclusion is drawn from the comparison of the Toberved value, which was calculated to be 3.179, with the critical T-table value of 2.000 for an independent T-test with 61 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 5%. The Toberved value exceeding the T-table value indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups being compared. In this case, since 3.179 is greater than 2.000, it suggests that the Mind Map learning media had a significant impact on improving students' ability to write descriptive texts. Therefore, based on the statistical analysis and comparison of Toberved and T-table values, it can be confidently concluded that the Mind Map learning media is effective in enhancing students' proficiency in writing descriptive texts. This finding underscores the potential of utilizing Mind Maps as a valuable tool in educational settings to support and improve students' writing skills.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aghajani, F., & Salehi, H. (2020). Effects of Montessori Teaching Method on Writing Ability of Iranian Male and Female EFL Learners. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 2(1), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v2i1.17>
- Alzouebi, S., Ridley, D., & Alzouebi, K. (2020). Educational Background and Identity: Factors Influencing Arab Women Learning English as a Second Language. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 21(6), 208–234.
- Ananda, R. R., Suradi, A., & Ratnasari, D. (2022). Pengembangan Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar – Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) pada Perguruan Tinggi Keagamaan Islam (PTKI). *ISLAMIKA*, 4(3), 224–236. <https://doi.org/10.36088/islamika.v4i3.1868>
- Arista, K. D. (2021). The Use of Mind Map Technique to Improve Study Group Students' Skill in Writing Descriptive Text. *Journal of Educational Study*, 1(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.36663/joes.v1i1.137>
- Buran, A., & Filyukov, A. (2015). Mind Mapping Technique in Language Learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 206, 215–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.010>
- Creswell, J. . (2010). *Research Design*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Eldea, T. J., Roza, W., & Tanjung, F. (2017). *An Analysis of the Tenth Grade Students' Ability in Writing News Item Text Using Mind Map Technique at SMA Negeri 3 Kerinci*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:152274143>
- Fauziah, F. (2022). Peningkatan Keterampilan Menyusun Teks Deskripsi Melalui Pembelajaran dengan Media Mind Map pada Siswa Kelas VII E SMP 2 Kumai. *Anterior Jurnal*, 22(Special-1), 75–81. <https://doi.org/10.33084/anterior.v22iSpecial-1.3228>
- Hodri, A., Sutapa, G., & Arifin, Z. (2015). *The Use of Mind Map Technique in Improving Students' Descriptive Paragraph Writing*.

- <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:142687592>
- Hussein Ahmed, S. R. (2018). Mind Mapping Effectiveness as Genomic Learning Tool: Revolutionize the Nursing Thinking. *International Journal of Nursing Didactics*, 08(07), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.15520/ijnd.v8i07.2236>
- Ismawati, E. (2012). *Metode penelitian pendidikan bahasa dan sastra*. Pnerbit Ombak. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=he95AQAACAAJ>
- Le, L.-A. T., Le, N. P., Ngo, L.-A. T., & Tran, Q.-N. T. (2023). The Use of Mind Mapping Technique in Descriptive Writing among Primary School Students. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 13(4), 321. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2023-0112>
- Mahmudah, M., Siregar, M., & Putra, W. H. (2023). Modernization of Islam and Language Education in the Society 5.0 Era in the Perspective of Harun Nasution. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Dan Multikulturalisme*, 5(3), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i3.3455>
- Malekzadeh, B., & Bayat, A. (2015). The Effect of Mind Mapping Strategy on Comprehending Implicit Information in EFL Reading Texts. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2(3), 81–90.
- Maltepe, S., & Gültekin, H. (2017). The Effect of the Mind Map Technique on Secondary School Students' Reading Comprehension and Writing Skill. *HAYEF: Journal of Education*, 1(2), 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.26650/hayef.2017.14.2.0008>
- Mezzaluna Safro, R., & Zulikhatin Nuroh, E. (2023). The Effectiveness of Canvas Media-Based Mind Mapping Model on Learning Poetry Writing Skills of Elementary School Students. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Dan Multikulturalisme*, 5(2), 560–576. <https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i2.3038>
- Nikam, M. D. S. (2023). *An Experimental Study to Assess The Effectiveness Of Mind Mapping VS. Lecture Method on Knowledge Regarding Mood Disorder Among Nursing Students in Selected Nursing Colleges of Selected City*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259848930>
- Putra, P. P. (2012). The use of Mind Mapping Strategy in the Teaching of Writing at SMAN 3 Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(21), 60–68.
- Riska, J., Syafii, W., & Mahadi, I. (2023). Development of Prezi-Based Electronic Mind Map Learning Media on High School Animalia Biology Material. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(2), 341. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.7.2.p.341-349>
- Rosciano, A. (2015). The Effectiveness of Mind Mapping as an Active Learning Strategy among Associate Degree Nursing Students. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 10(2), 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2015.01.003>
- Simonova, I. (2019). Learning English Grammar in the Smart Learning Environment. In *Smart Education and e-Learning 2018 5* (pp. 142–150). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92363-5_13
- Street, J. A. (2017). This is the native speaker that the non-native speaker outperformed: Individual, education-related differences in the processing and interpretation of Object

Relative Clauses by native and non-native speakers of English. *Language Sciences*, 59, 192–203.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabet.

Tuấn, V. V. (2021). *A Meta-Analysis Study of Mind Mapping Effectiveness in English Language Teaching at a Higher Education Institution*.
<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:240302657>

Zheng, X., Johnson, T. E., & Zhou, C. (2020). A Pilot Study Examining the Impact of Collaborative Mind Mapping Strategy in A Flipped Classroom: Learning Achievement, Self-Efficacy, Motivation, and Students' Acceptance. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(6), 3527–3545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09868-0>