

Implementation of Mind Mapping Learning Model to Improve English Learning Outcomes in Simple Descriptive Texts

Junaedy

SMP Negeri 2 Ambulu, Jember
(jjun8879@gmail.com)

Abstract

Writing is a linguistic activity that plays an important role in the dynamics of human civilization. Through writing activities, people can also benefit for their development. Unfortunately, English lessons at Ambulu 2 Junior High School showed indications of a decline. This is a classroom action research that aimed to find out how the implementation of mind mapping learning models can improve English achievement of the seventh grade students of Class VII-C at SMPN 2 Ambulu. The results showed that learning with the Mind Mapping model had a positive impact in improving student learning outcomes which was marked by an increase in student's achievement in each cycle, that is cycle I (61.76%), cycle II (76.47%), cycle III (94.12%). Likewise, the application of the Mind Mapping model can improve student learning activities as indicated by the score of observations showing an increase in the percentage of student activity, that is cycle I (23.53%), cycle II (73.53%) and cycle III (91.18). This means that the mind mapping learning model is good to be applied in teaching and learning activities in English materials for Preparing Simple Descriptive Texts

Keywords: Learning outcomes, Mind Mapping.

Learning is a process, an activity and not a goal. Learning is not only remembering but broader than that, namely experiencing. Learning is valued not by mastery of the results of training but changes in behavior, therefore learning should be experienced by people who are learning and can also be observed by others. Learning activities in the form of complex behaviors give rise to various learning theories. A student must live up to what he learns because it is closely related to the learning effort, which is carried out by the learner.

Writing skills are mechanistic skills. Writing skills may not be mastered only through theory, but are carried out through

regular practice and practice so as to produce well-organized writing. The clarity of the writing organization depends on the way of thinking, the right arrangement, and the good sentence structure (Hasani, 2005, p. 2).

Writing skills are the last sequence in the language learning process after listening, speaking and reading skills. Among the four language skills, writing skills are the most difficult to master. This is because writing skills require mastery of various linguistic elements and outside the language itself which will become the content of essays. Writing skills are usually associated with composing learning. Writing and composing exercises in teaching English can familiarize students to

apply linguistic knowledge, such as grammar, vocabulary, style, spelling, and so on.

Writing skills are considered to be the most difficult abilities. When writing, students are expected to use several other abilities to achieve quality writing. Nurgiyantoro (2001, p. 296) suggests that writing is an ability that is more difficult to master than three other abilities, namely listening, speaking and reading. These difficulties can be influenced by internal and external factors. Besides, Hermawan, et al. (2004, p. 59) describe the factors that are most associated with writing learning that aims to improve students' skills, namely the teacher and the motivation of students to learn. Undeniably, the teacher plays an important role in the success of learning that is the key to success in implementing the curriculum in the hands of the teacher.

According to Sudjana (2010, p. 22), learning outcomes are abilities that students have after receiving learning experiences. Furthermore, in Depdiknas (2006, p. 125) is mentioned that the results of learning activities are characterized by a relatively permanent positive change in behavior in the person who is learning. In line with that opinion, Wahidmurni, et al. (2010, p. 18) explains that someone can be said to have succeeded in learning if he is able to show a change in him. These changes include the ability to think, skills, or attitude towards an object.

If studied more deeply, the learning outcomes can be contained in Bloom's taxonomy, which is grouped into three domains, namely cognitive domain or thinking ability, affective domain or attitude, and psychomotor domain or skill. In relation to that, Gagne (in Sudjana, 2010, p. 22) develops the skills of learning outcomes into five types, among others: (1) intellectual skills are the most important learning outcomes of *lingsikolastik* systems; (2) cognitive strategy that is regulating the way of learning and thinking of a person in the broadest sense, including the ability to solve problems; (3) attitudes and values, related to the direction of emotional intensity

possessed by someone as inferred from the tendency to behave towards people and events; (4) verbal information, knowledge in the sense of information and facts; and (5) motor skills, namely skills that function for the environment and achieve concepts and symbols. To find out someone's learning outcomes can be done by doing tests and measurements. Tests and measurements require tools as data collectors, which are called learning outcomes assessment instruments. According to Wahidmurni, et al. (2010, p. 28), the instrument is divided into two major parts, namely tests and non-tests. Furthermore, Hamalik (2006, p. 155) provides an illustration that the learning outcomes obtained can be measured through the progress obtained by students after serious learning. Learning outcomes appear to be changes in behavior in students that can be observed and measured through changes in attitudes and skills. This change can be interpreted as a better improvement and development compared to before.

The Mind Mapping method is a learning method developed by Tony Buzana, head of the Brain Foundation. Mind maps are creative noting methods that make it easier for us to remember a lot of information. When finished, the notes made form a pattern of interrelated ideas, with the main topic in the middle, while the subtopics and details become branches. These branches can also develop again to smaller material. Like the structure of human descent that can develop continuously until the end of the day, so that a human descendant system is formed until the last day.

Learning based on the concept of Mind Mapping is a learning method that uses the concept of comprehensive Total-Mind Learning (TML) learning. In the context of TML, learning gets a broader meaning. That is, at all times and in every place all living things on the earth learn, because learning is a natural process. All learning creatures respond to various stimuli from the surrounding environment to sustain life.

Tony Buzan (2013,p. 15) proposed seven steps in creating a mind map, namely:

1. Start from the middle of a blank paper with the long side lying flat, starting from giving the brain the freedom to spread in all directions and to express itself more freely and naturally.
2. Use images or photos for a central idea, an image means a thousand words and helps us use imagination. A central image will be more attractive, keep us focused, help us concentrate, and activate our brain.
3. use color, for the color brain as interesting as the picture. Color makes mind maps more lively, adds energy to creative thinking, and is fun.
4. Connect the main branches to the central image and connect the second and third level branches to levels one and two, and so on. The brain works according to the association, the brain likes to associate two or more things at once. When we connect branches, we will more easily understand and remember.
5. Make a curved line, not a straight line. Arched and organic branches are much more attractive to the eye.
6. Use one keyword for each line. Single keywords give a lot of power and flexibility to the mind map.
7. Use images on each mind map branch, such as a central image each picture can mean a thousand words.

Writing activity itself is not as easy as imagined. A person often experiences the desire to write, but is unable to do so. Someone experiences a delay in expressing their thoughts or ideas through good and right language, so that the person has difficulty writing, meanwhile the mind mapping learning model provides images or maps that can help direct one's thoughts and imagination so that this method will theoretically be very good if used to improve imagination abilities which can further assist someone in making a writing or essay. The author believes that the steps of the mind mapping model lead to synthesis analysis that can facilitate the growth of ideas and this is important in making essays.

Method

The research is classroom action research carried out at SMP Negeri 2 Ambulu. This research is an independent research. The research subjects taken were class VII-C of SMP Negeri 2 Ambulu. This class action research consists of three cycles. Cycle 1 was held on Wednesday, 17-01-2018, Cycle 2 was held on Wednesday, 21-02-2018 and the third cycle was held on Wednesday, 03-14-2018. Data collection techniques are the methods used by researchers to obtain data to answer the formulation of research problems. Data needed by researchers to answer the formulation of research problems are cognitive learning outcomes, affective learning outcomes and psychomotor learning outcomes.

The instrument of this research: (a) Observation Sheet in Classroom Learning Activities, (b) Student Worksheets for group activities, (c) Cycle Final Tests/ the writing skill test.

Observation Sheet in Classroom Learning Activities is use to find out: (1) Member contribution to group performance (2) Skills for collaboration among members in groups (3) Skills in managing and maintaining groups. (4) taking responsible decisions, (5) Maintaining togetherness with friends, (6) caring and respecting choices

Student Worksheets for group activities observed in presentation activities to obtain the data of affective learning outcomes are: (1) Describe material according to the theme (2) explain pictures or diagrams (3) Social qualities such as articulation, and enthusiasm, give the audience time to think (4) Explain the concept appropriately, in detail in accordance with the material (5) using facts as a basis for argumentation, (7) brave and polite in arguing

In this observation sheet, the results of observations of students are translated into scores with the following criteria. The score criteria are observations of student activities in Observation Sheet in Classroom Learning Activities like shown in Table 1, while The indicators observed in student activities in

Table 1. Observation Sheet in Classroom Learning Activities

Rubric	Score	Criteria
If it does not meet the specifications requested by the teacher	0	Less
If it meets the specifications requested by teacher	1	Good

Table 2. Indicator of Aspects Observed in the Affective Domain in Observation Sheet

No	Student Indicators / Activities
1.	Students actively ask
2.	Students actively work together in groups
3.	Students actively discuss in groups
4.	Students actively complete learning tasks
5.	Students actively socialize with friends

learning using the Mind Mapping model are like that shown in Table 2.

Student Worksheets for group activities is used or assessment of cognitive and psychomotor learning outcomes is carried out in accordance with the Mind Mapping cognitive assessment model consisting of the scores from the worksheet and post scores in each cycle. Each card has a score of 4 if it is answered correctly, so that it obtains a maximum score of 100, while the worksheet consists of 5 questions that have a score of 20 percent to obtain a maximum score of 100. Based on the results obtained from both tests the average score and achievement are obtained. The final test is carried out in each cycle with 20 minutes each. The type of question used is a subjective / description problem in the form of an order to create a essay by starting to choose keywords that are in accordance with the theme and then developed into essays. Students are stated to have completed learning if they 75% of the maximum value.

The writing skill test is focused on the assessment of students' skills in carrying

out writing activities, namely the work of students in the form of essays of descriptive short essays. Affective aspect assessment is focused on assessing students' cooperative skills when students carry out group work and when students present the results of their group work. The researcher formulated the grading of writing skills assessment using the Mind Mapping model. The indicators include: 1) Organization / presentation 2) choice of words; 3) spelling and punctuation; 4) completeness of contents; and 5) neat writing. The maximum score of each indicator is 20, so that if students get a score of 20 on each indicator, it will get a value of $20 \times 5 = 100$.

The researcher summarizes the values obtained by students, which were then divided by the number of students in the class.

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

With

X = Average value

$\sum X$ = Number of all student grades

$\sum N$ = Number of students

There are two categories of learning achievement, namely individually and classically. That is a student has completed learning if he has achieved a score of 65% or a score of 65, and the class is called complete learning if in that class there are 85% who have achieved more than or equal absorption with 65%. To calculate the percentage of mastery learning used the following formula so that the average formative test can be formulated:

$$P = \frac{\sum \text{Student score}}{\sum \text{Student}} \times 100\%$$

Results and Discussion

Data on student learning activities is obtained from observations or observations

Table 3. Increased Student Learning Activities and Learning Outcomes Cycle I - 3

Category	Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle III
Learning Activities	71,11	82,78	92,78
Learning Outcomes	73,35	81,25	90,30

involving colleagues as collaborators. Increased activity and student learning outcomes from cycle I to cycle III can be seen and described Table 3.

Table 3 shows that the research has been successfully conducted after the third cycle. In other words, the implementation of learning actions through the Mind Mapping learning model can improve learning outcomes of students' ability to write simple short texts in the form of descriptive and increase student activities in the learning process.

In the first cycle, learning to compose descriptive text using the Mind Mapping learning model has not succeeded optimally because the test results and processes have not reached the expected outcomes. This can be seen from the results of observations of student learning activities for (71.11%) or only 22 students who actively participated in the lesson in accordance with expectations. While the rest, 14 students have not been seen actively in the learning process using the Mind Mapping learning model. While the average achievement of classical learning outcomes reached 73.35%. In other words, the implementation of action in the first cycle has not been successful.

After carrying out the second cycle of action, the results of the observation indicate that 30 out of 36 students (82.78%) were active in the learning process. Student grades resulting from formative test evaluations showed a fairly good increase to 81.25. This average score has exceeded the ideal score of 75. Thus the results of the implementation of the second cycle of action have experienced a significant increase, even though researchers

have not been satisfied with the results that have been found, the score of classical learning achievement is 81.25%, because in the third cycle various improvements were made during the learning process.

After carrying out the third cycle of action, the results of the observation indicate that 34 out of 36 students (92.78%) were active in the learning process, there were only 2 students who still seemed not too active ... Thus the results of the implementation of the third cycle had been experienced a significant increase.

An interesting note from the observations, group scores and formative tests at the end of the cycle is the absence of extreme surges from cycle 1 to cycle 3. Increases that occur tend to be sloping, as if there were no significant changes. In the first cycle the activity of students who reached the starting point was good, namely 71.11%, in fact in the second cycle it increased slightly to 82.78%. This increase of only 10% raises a question mark, is it true that the learning model is indeed less attractive or there is a mis statement, or inaccurate the implementation of teaching and learning following the Mind Mapping model, or students actually experience difficulties with this learning model. Likewise, the increase in the third cycle, the small increase of which is only 10%, namely 92.82 reinforces the suspicion that there is something needs to be addressed in the learning process in class, and the temporary assumption that the Mind Mapping learning model is rather difficult for students in the early just experienced that transition period. Perhaps this learning model is quite good in the final classes.

Whereas the group scores that are interesting to note is the value obtained by groups B and G which are always within the high category in almost all cycles. Moreover, group G in cycle one only gets a score of 75, in cycles two and three it has a high increase. After being observed, it turned out that in both groups there were two students who were in the smart category. So it can be said

that the Mind Mapping learning method is suitable for students who have a good level of cognition. In the data from the assessment analysis of the written process and test as an evaluation instrument that has been reflected, it can be seen that in the first cycle of learning to compile a descriptive text using the Mind Mapping learning model has not been maximally successful because the test results and processes have not reached the expected outcomes. This can be seen from the results of observations of student learning activities by (71.11%) or only 22 students who actively follow the lessons in accordance with expectations. The scores obtained by the students did not show significant results, because the average score of formative tests in the first cycle was only 69.45, while the achievement of classical learning reached 73.35%. In other words, the implementation of actions in cycle 1 has not been successful and can be said that learning has failed and must be corrected in the second cycle. In the second cycle action the teacher starts to make some improvements to the weaknesses of the learning action. Weaknesses found in cycle 1 include less pleasant conditions, students are not used to / are not yet familiar with Mind Mapping learning mode, as well as limiting the time allocation for each learning stage that is not noticed by the teacher. This is the basis for improvement in the 2nd cycle. The teacher then fixes it by starting lessons with fun activities such as singing and simple gymnastic movements, as well as giving motivation so that students dare to appear and are not afraid of being wrong, students look enthusiastic and focus on the learning process. In addition, the teacher shows the prize that will be received by the group that gets the best score. Besides that, the time limit and explanation of the Mind Mapping game is also conveyed by the teacher in a clear and joking manner that attracts students' interest

After carrying out the 2nd cycle action, the results of the observation indicated that 30 of 36 students (82.78%) were active in the

learning process. The average student score from the formative test evaluation showed a pretty good increase to 81.25. This average score has exceeded the ideal score of 75 .. Thus the results of the implementation of the second cycle of action has experienced a significant increase, although researchers have not felt satisfied with the results that have been found, Classical learning achievement reached 81.25%, because in the third cycle various improvements were made in the learning process. After carrying out the 3rd cycle action, the results of the observation indicated that 34 of 36 students (92.78%) were active in the learning process, there were only 2 students who still seemed to be less active. Even so the two students did not mean just being silent and being an audience, actually contributing only the proportion was too small. . The average student score from the formative test evaluation showed a fairly good increase to 90.30. This average score has exceeded the ideal score of 75 and belongs to the excellent category. Thus the results of the implementation of the 3rd cycle have experienced a significant increase.

Conclusion

After going through several in-depth studies can get some findings after carrying out reflections and the discussion in the previous chapter and this Classroom Action Research can be summarized as follows: The use of Mind Mapping Learning Model can improve the ability to write simple short text in descriptive form for students of class VII-C of SMP Negeri 2 Ambulu in even semester of 2017/2018 school year. This can be proven through formative evaluations with the average score of student achievement increasing from 73.35 in cycle I to 81.25 in cycle II and increasing again to 90.30 in cycle III. Use of Mind Mapping Learning Models can improve student learning activities. This can be evidenced by the percentage of student activity in the first cycle of 71.11% increasing in the second cycle by 82.78% increasing in the third cycle to 92.78%.

The learning steps with the Mind Mapping learning model are as follows; a). Convey competencies and provide a brief explanation of learning material. b). Divide students into several groups to make Mind Mapping. c). Students working in groups make Mind Mapping. d). Students present the results of the discussion in front of the class. e). Make conclusions from learning that has taken place. f). Provide evaluation at the end of learning.

References

- Aceng, Hasani. (2005). *Ihwal Menulis*. Banten: Untirta Press.
- Buzan, Tony. (2013). *Modern Mind Mapping for Smarter Thinking*. UK: Proactive Press
- Depdiknas. (2006). *Permendiknas No 22 Tahun 2006 Tentang Standar Isi*. Jakarta : Depdiknas.
- Hamalik, Oemar. (2006). *Manajemen Pengembangan Kurikulum*. Bandung: UPI
- Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. (2001). *Penilaian dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Sudjana, Nana. (2010). *Dasar-dasar Proses Belajar*. Bandung: Sinar Baru
- Wahidmurni. (2010). *Pembelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial Terpadu Pada Satuan Pendidikan MI/SD dan MTs/SMP*. [Http://Tarbiyah.Uin-Malang.ac.id](http://Tarbiyah.Uin-Malang.ac.id). Retrieved on September 2012 at 08.52.