

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MIND MAPPING METHOD IN TEACHING WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT FOR EIGHTH GRADERS OF SMP NEGERI 2 WAIKABUBAK

Katrina Kaba Leiru^{a,1*}
Leni Amelia Suek^{b2}
Marcelinus Akoli^{c3}
Zantty O. Padahana^{d4}

^a Nusa Cendana University
¹Osianakaka92@gmail.com *
²leni.suek@staf.undana.ac.id
³marcelakoli@staf.undana.ac.id
³zantty@staf.undana.ac.id

| KEYWORDS | ABSTRACT |
|--|--|
| <i>Implementation, Mind mapping, Narrative text, Writing skill</i> | This study aimed to know whether the mind mapping can improve students' skill in writing narrative text at the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak and to know the students' difficulties in writing narrative text at the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak. The eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak were chosen as the subject of this research. The research focused on implementing the mind mapping method in teaching writing narrative text. The data collected with test, questionnaire, and observation sheet as the instruments of this research, and Classroom Action Research (CAR) used as the research design in one cycle. The data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The result showed that the students' ability in writing narrative text using the mind mapping method was significantly increased after using the mind mapping method where the pre-test score was 63.6 (below average) with percentages of students' scores was 20% where there were only four students who passed the test. While the post-test total score was 1.765, and the average score was 88.25 (very good category) as the standard measurement applied and the percentages of percentage scores was 90% of students who passed the test. Besides that, the result of the interview with students about their difficulties in writing narrative text using mind mapping were positive, the results showed that there were three students' difficulties in writing. Those are carelessness, first language interference, and translation. Almost all students said that writing narrative text using the mind mapping method can help them improve their writing skills because it was fun and they enjoyed it. Therefore, the researcher suggested the mind mapping method can be continually implemented in learning English, especially in improving students' writing skills. In conclusion, the mind mapping method could enhance the students' ability in writing narrative text. |

How to cite: Leiru, K., Suek, L., Akoli, M., Padahana, Z (2023). The Implementation of the Mind Mapping Method in Teaching Writing Narrative Text For Eighth Graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak . *SPARKLE Journal of Language, Education and Culture*, 2 (1) 104-116.

INTRODUCTION

Creating interesting learning in the classroom is the hope of many teachers to achieve the goal of the study. It depends on how teachers create the strategies to make their students feel interested in learning English. There are

many methods or strategies that teachers may use to create a learning process that relates to their purpose which makes students enjoy and be interesting in the learning process. Writing is one of the most skills which is difficult because when doing an activity, the students must pay attention to the content, organization, vocabulary, the use of language, and mechanics simultaneously.

Richard and Renandya (2002) state that comparing to other skills, writing is considered the major and one of the most difficult skills for learners to master. White (1986b) states that writing is the process of expressing ideas, information, knowledge, or experience and understanding the writing to acquire the knowledge or some more information to share and learn. Students usually feel bored and cannot understand what they study during the lesson. They are having difficulty exploring their idea in writing something, especially narrative text. In this research, the researcher chose the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak to introduce the implementation of the mind mapping method in teaching writing narrative text to help them express their ideas through the mind mapping method. The mind mapping method is an effective strategy that can help the students create well composition because they can discuss their composition with their partners.

Mind mapping also allowed the students to get and improve by observing the story given by the teacher. This is why the researcher is interested in exploring the implementation of writing narrative texts by using mind mapping to the Eighth graders and finding out how far the student's improvement are after using the mind mapping method. Also, this research aims to describe how the mind mapping method could be applied in teaching writing narrative text. The implementation of the mind mapping method is a good strategy that teachers have used in teaching writing narrative text because it has been proved from some research before that a mind map can activate both hemispheres of the brain and also is an easy way to get information from inside and outside the brain, a new way to learn and practice fast and powerful, how to make a record that was not boring, and the best way to get new ideas and plan a project. According to Hedge (1988), mind map is a strategy for note-making before writing; in other words, writing down ideas about a topic and developing those ideas as the mind makes associations. Hayes (1992) states that through mind mapping, students turn random thoughts into patterns that can be written down and developed. Students become increasingly motivated to complete a writing task as their ideas emerge in organized forms

The lack of students' ability in learning English, especially in writing narrative text can be the major factor that makes students get difficult in learning writing. In other words, students are not interested in the teaching and learning process because of their lack of writing ability. This study aimed to know whether the mind mapping can improve students' skill in writing narrative text at the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak and to know the students' difficulties in writing narrative text at the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak. Based on the explanation above, the researcher decided to conduct research on The Implementation of the Mind Mapping Method in Teaching Writing Narrative Text for Eighth Graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak.

According to Djarwanto (1994), hypothesis comes from two words, the words hypo which means less than and thesis which means belief are the roots of the word hypothesis. Therefore, a hypothesis is an assumption or concept regarding a phenomenon or situation of reality that we do not know that has to be verified by conducting research on the field.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher proposed the hypothesis of this research is the implementation of the mind mapping method can improve students' skill in writing narrative text at eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak.

METHOD

The type of this research was Classroom Action Research (CAR) developed by Lewin (1946), which attempts to change the current situation into the expected improvement. Car and Kemmis as cited by Burns (2010) stated that Action Research (AR) is a "self-reflective inquiry" undertaken by participants to improve the rationality and justice of their own social or educational practices as well as their understanding of these practices and the situations in which these practices were carried out." In general, Classroom Action Research (CAR) involves some cycles:

planning, acting, implementing, observing, and reflecting on an issue. The model of the CAR used in this study was based on the model offered by Kemmis and McTaggart. It consists of four stages: planning, action, observation, and reflection. Burns (2010:9).

This Study was conducted in SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak which is located in Teratai Street, Number 06 Waikabubak, West Sumba East Nusa Tenggara. It consisted of 6 classes with total number of students was about 1985 students and the class VIII B was chosen as the subject of the study. Arikunto (2013) described that if the total of population is less than 100 subjects, it is necessary to take all of the population as the subject, but if the total population is more than 100 subjects, the sample can only be taken 10-25% of the population. This research used purposive sampling technique where the researcher chose students from class VIII B as the sample of this study. Based on the explanation above, the researcher selected 10% or 20 of 195 students as the sample of this research. The action was held on September, 21st 2022 where. Before conducted the classroom action research, the researcher made a pre cycle to the students in classroom to know their ability in learning English especially writing narrative text using mind mapping method. The following are the procedure of pre cycle in this study:

1.1. Planning

In this phase, the researcher presented the planning procedure for the activities that the researcher conducted in this research.

1. Asking for the letter permission of research in the faculty (Appendix 1)
2. Setting the classroom action research schedule
3. Designing the pre-test to diagnose the student’s problem
4. Designing the lesson plan and teaching materials for conducting the classroom action research
5. Constructing post-test.

1.2 Action

The action was held on Wednesday, 21st September 2022, in the classroom. The researcher carried out action based on lesson plan preparation in planning. The researcher acted as the English teacher who teaches writing narrative text through Mind mapping. In contrast, the English teacher was the observer who observed all the activities during the teaching-learning process. In the first meeting, the researcher entered the classroom by greeting all the students. After that, the researcher explained the lesson's objective and delivered the scope of the learning material that will be learned. Next, the researcher continued to perform the pre-test. Then, the researcher showed an example of Mind Mapping using a projector or pictures and introduced Mind Mapping. Afterwards, the researcher asked students to identify the topic discussed in the text. Next, the writer described the narrative text including the definition, social function, and generic structure of the narrative text. After that, the students took the post-test based on the topic before.

1.3 Observation

In this stage, the researcher observed the student’s behaviors toward the teaching-learning activity. It means that, the researcher observed the students’ behavior during the teaching and learning process. The researcher used an observation sheet to observed students’ performance during the teaching learning process. The observation was done by an English teacher of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak.

1.4 Reflection

After implementing the action, the researcher and the English teacher discussed the action, it was successful or not. This final step aims to know the result of action and observation that supported by the instruments in this step. If the post-test results surpassed the criteria, the research would not continue to the next cycle.

Table 1. Research Plan

| Research Activities | | | | | | Month | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Sept | Oct. | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Research Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | Asking for the research permission | | | √ | | | | | | | | |
| b | Preparing the research instruments | √ | | | | | | | | | | |
| c | Setting the pre-test & pre mind mapping | √ | | | | | | | | | | |
| d | Setting the lesson plan | | √ | | | | | | | | | |
| e | Setting the video lesson (Mind Mapping) | | √ | | | | | | | | | |
| f | Preparing the students' worksheet | √ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Action Implementation | √ | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | Meeting 1 | | | √ | | | | | | | | |
| b | Meeting 2 | | | √ | | | | | | | | |
| c | Post test | | √ | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Data Analysis and Reporting | | | | | | | √ | | | | |
| a | Data analysis | | | | | | | | √ | | | |
| b | Revisions | | | | | | | | √ | | | |

Table 1 shows that the research planned which included preparation by the researcher before conducting the classroom action research. Before conducting research, the researcher have to make a preparation about any materials needed in conducting research. Thus, it can helps the researcher doing research by followed the list of planned.

In collecting the data, the researcher used some instruments:

1. Writing test. Students' writing skills data were collected using writing tests, especially in writing narrative text. The pre-test before implementing the mind mapping technique, and the post-test after implementing the mind mapping technique. To get students' scores, the researcher used criteria of scoring rubric by Weigel. C, (2001)
2. Questionnaire. The questionnaire was done to know the difficulties of students' writing ability, the questionnaire aimed to know the students' opinions about their difficulties in learning English especially in writing narrative text through the mind mapping technique.
3. Observation. According to Ary (2010: 431), observation is a basic method for obtaining data in qualitative research which is aim to understand complex interaction in natural setting. During the lesson, the observer observed teacher and students performance in classroom by using the observation sheet.

1.1 Techniques of Data Analysis

The researcher used scoring rubric of writing by Weigel (2001) to get the students' score of their ability in writing a narrative text using mind mapping.

Table 2. Scoring Rubric of Writing

| No | Component | Score | Level | Criteria |
|----|-----------|-------|------------------------|---|
| 1. | Content | 30-40 | Excellent to very good | • Knowledgeable, relevant to assigned topic, able to identification the characteristics of narrative. |
| | | 28-33 | Good to average | • Some knowledge of subject, little substance, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to the topic. |
| | | 20-27 | Fair to poor | • Limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. |
| | | 13-19 | Very poor | • Does not show the knowledge of |

| No | Component | Score | Level | Criteria |
|----|--------------|-------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | subject, non-substantive, not enough to evaluate. |
| 2. | Organization | 24-30 | Excellent to very poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fluent expression, ideas clearly, well organize, logical sequencing, cohesive, the text are complete with (orientation, complication, and resolution). |
| | | 18-23 | Good to average | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loosely organized but ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing, the text are complete with (orientation, complication, and resolution). |
| | | 12-17 | Fair to poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-fluent ideas confused or disconnected, lack logical sequencing and development. |
| | | 7-11 | Very poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not communicate, no organization, not enough to evaluate. |
| 3. | Vocabulary | 24-30 | Excellent to very good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sophisticated range, effective word, word form mastery, appropriate register, using past tense, there are time conjunction and speech function. |
| | | 18-23 | Good to average | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice usage but meaning not obscured, using the past tense, there are time conjunction and speech function. |
| | | 12-17 | Fair to poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited range, frequent errors of word/idiom, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured. |
| | | 7-11 | Very poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate. |

Scoring Rubric of Writing by Weigel (2001)

Table 2 shows the scoring rubric of writing by Weigel (2001). It was describe the component included in scoring students' writing which consisted of content, organization, and vocabulary that have scores from level very poor to excellent to very good.

1.2 Students' Score Analysis

To get the average of the students' scores, the researcher used the formula as follows:

$$x = \frac{\sum x}{n} \quad (\text{Arikunto 2012:15})$$

X = Mean

x = Individual Score

n = Number of students

Table 3. Classifying student's scores of ability levels

| Classification | Score |
|----------------|----------|
| Excellent | 96 – 100 |
| Very good | 86 – 95 |
| Good | 76 – 85 |
| Average | 66 – 75 |

| | |
|-------------|---------|
| Fairly good | 56 – 65 |
| Poor | 36 – 55 |
| Very poor | 0 – 35 |

Table 3 shows that there were several classifications of students’ score into several levels from very poor category to excellent category in range 0-3.5 to 96-100 which used to classifying the students’ score in pre-test and post-test.

3.3 Students’ Result Test Analysis

The students’ answer sheets were grouped based on the standard of measurement and proceeded by determining the score and ability of each student and the students as a class using the formula below.

To get the average of students’ score, the researcher used the formula as follow:

$$\frac{\text{Total students' correct answer}}{\text{Total number of students}} = \text{final Score}$$

$$x = \frac{\sum x}{n}$$

To get the students’ percentages of students who pass the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM) 75, the researcher used the following formula:

$$p = \frac{F}{n} \times 100\%$$

P= the class percentage

F= students’ total score

N= number of students

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research focused on finding out the students’ ability in writing a narrative text about personal experience and described the students’ perceptions about their difficulties in writing after implementing the Mind Mapping method in the classroom. The mind mapping method was a teaching strategy that helps students improve their ideas and knowledge more freely and creatively in writing narrative text by using lines, colors, and images or pictures to make it more interesting. Windura (2008) states that a mind map is an effective technique of note-taking and valuable for solving the problem of students in writing.

As previously stated in chapter 1, there were two objectives in this research; (1) to know whether the mind mapping method can improve skills in writing narrative text at the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak, (2) to know the students’ difficulties in writing narrative text at eight graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak. To achieve the research objectives, the writer described them in the following ways:

Pre-Test

Table 4. Pre-Test Results

| NO. | Students’ Number | Pre-Test Score | Criteria |
|-----|------------------|----------------|----------|
| 1. | S1 | 86 | P |
| 2. | S2 | 35 | F |
| 3. | S3 | 65 | F |
| 4. | S4 | 54 | F |
| 5. | S5 | 39 | F |
| 6. | S6 | 68 | F |

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 7. | S7 | 70 | P |
| 8. | S8 | 87 | P |
| 9. | S9 | 55 | F |
| 10. | S10 | 83 | P |
| 11. | S11 | 57 | F |
| 12. | S12 | 55 | F |
| 13. | S13 | 60 | F |
| 14. | S14 | 60 | F |
| 15. | S15 | 60 | F |
| 16. | S16 | 75 | P |
| 17. | S17 | 68 | F |
| 18. | S18 | 65 | F |
| 19. | S19 | 60 | F |
| 20. | S20 | 70 | P |
| Total Score | | $\Sigma x = 1.272$ | |
| Mean score | | $Mx = 63.6$ | |

Note: P: Pass (Equal or more than 75); F: Fail (Less than 75)

Table 4 shows that from 20 students who took the test, only 4 students were able to pass the passing grade, while the other 16 students failed it. The table presents that the highest score was 87 and the lowest score was 35. For further analysis, as the total score of the pre-test was 1.272, the mean score was 63.6 and percentage of the students who reached the Minimum Mastery Criteria was 20%. It means that the number of students who failed the pre-test was extremely high, and the students' success criteria were mostly poor and students discovered difficulties in writing narrative text. Therefore, the researcher should suggested a strategy to solve the students' difficulties in writing. Thus, the mind mapping method was implemented in learning this topic.

Process of Pre-Test

1. Planning

Before implementing the Mind Mapping method, the researcher planned the following preparation:

- a. Designing the pre-test to diagnose the students' problem.
- b. Prepared teaching materials and the lesson plan
- c. Setting the video lesson

2. Action

The action was held on Wednesday, September, 21th 2022. The researcher started the class by greeting students. Then, while the researcher delivering the objective of the lessons, the researcher also delivered the scope of learning material they learned. The pre-test instructed them to write a narrative text about their personal experience to know their skills in writing.

After the pre-test, the researcher showed a video about the example of Mind Mapping using a laptop because there was not enough projector to use. The researcher introduced and gave the example of the Mind mapping method to the students, and told the students about the advantages of the mind mapping. After explained the material, the researcher set the class to sit in groups and then asked them to watch a video about mind mapping and then asked them to map their mind by following the procedure of the mind mapping in the video they have watched before. The students were asked to help each other during the lesson while the researcher went around the classroom to check the students' progress and provided help when they needed.

3. Observation

During the teaching learning process the observer observed the students' and researcher behavior towards the teaching learning activity. The results of the observation can be seen in the following statements:

- a. From 20 students during the teaching and learning process, there are 13 students did not pay attention to the explanation from the researcher
- b. There are 5 students did not really write their narrative text of personal experience

- c. There are 5 students were confused to choose suitable words during writing.
- d. 15 students lacked of vocabulary during the lesson.
- e. There was 1 student wrote his Indonesian narrative texts not in English.

4. Reflection

After implementing the action, the researcher evaluated the action done. The result shows that most students were not really motivated when they were writing. The researcher found that there were students who were still confused to write their narratives because they lacked of vocabulary and they did not have dictionary to help them in translating some words they did not know.

From the result of the reflection, the students’ score on the pre-test was poor and it necessary to improve the students writing skills by give them post-test used mind mapping method.

Post-test

This test was distributed to know the students’ ability after the classroom action research. Similar to the pre-test, the students were writing their narrative text about personal experience but in this case they used the mind mapping method to improve the students’ skills in writing narrative text. To get the perfect scores, students have to write a good mind mapping related to the procedure of mind mapping. Therefore, the researcher used this method to help students improve their writing skills.

The students’ products of Mind Mapping were described as follows:

Table 5. Post-test results

| NO. | Students’ Number | Pre-Test Score | Criteria |
|-----|------------------|----------------|----------|
| 1. | S1 | 95 | P |
| 2. | S2 | 80 | P |
| 3. | S3 | 95 | P |
| 4. | S4 | 95 | P |
| 5. | S5 | 80 | P |
| 6. | S6 | 95 | P |
| 7. | S7 | 95 | P |
| 8. | S8 | 95 | P |
| 9. | S9 | 95 | P |
| 10. | S10 | 95 | P |
| 11. | S11 | 80 | P |
| 12. | S12 | 60 | F |
| 13. | S13 | 70 | F |
| 14. | S14 | 95 | P |
| 15. | S15 | 95 | P |
| 16. | S16 | 95 | P |
| 17. | S17 | 95 | P |
| 18. | S18 | 80 | P |

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 19. | S19 | 80 | P |
| 20. | S20 | 95 | P |
| Total Score | | $\Sigma x = 1.765$ | |
| Mean score | | $Mx = 88.25$ | |

Note: P: Pass (Equal or more than 75); F: Fail (Less than 75)

Table 5 shows that from 20 students who took the post-test, there was a student who got 60 which classified in “fairly good” category, 1 student who got 70 classified in “average” category. While the 13 others got 95 classified in “very good” category. And 5 students got 80 in “good” category. The highest score was 95 and the lowest score was 60. The finding shows that the total score was 1.765, the average of students’ score was 88.25 in very good category and the percentages of students who achieved the KKM or Minimum Mastery Criterion was 90%. This calculation revealed that almost all of the students passed the post-test and obtained very good as the criteria of success. The aspects that were monitored here were only the logic sequence of the map from topic, sub topic, to the piece of information and keywords used to summarize the information. The used of less word is better

It means that the students’ ability in writing narrative text using mind mapping classified in “very good” category. In conclusion, the implementation of mind mapping has succeeded in improving the students’ writing skills.

Process of Post-Test

Based on the reflection on the pre-test, the students’ score was very low, they were classified in “poor” category. To improve the students writing skills, the researcher motivated students to use Mind Mapping method in improving students’ writing skills.

1. Planning

In this stage, there was same stage as the previous test where the researcher prepared the teaching material and the lesson plan before the teaching and learning process.

2. Action

The researcher started the class by greeting all the students. After that, the researcher asked some questions to review the previous meeting and explained the materials they learnt on that day. The researcher then delivered the objective and the scope of the learning material that will be learnt. The researcher explained that they would continue to write a narrative text about their personal experience by used the Mind mapping method. There should be a dictionary for each student to help them in finding appropriate vocabularies.

3. Observation

During the teaching learning process, the observer observed students and researcher’s behaviors in class. From the observation, the researcher found the following results:

- a. From 20 students during the lesson, all of them pay attention to the explanation from the researcher. They understand and were interested to the topic they learnt
- b. All of the students (20 students) used dictionary in finding appropriate vocabularies
- c. They help each other in during write their mind mapping
- d. The students enjoyed the lesson. and they tried to made a good mind mapping
- e. Students already know how to write a mind mapping related to the procedure of making mind mapping explained by the researcher. They enjoyed the process of write mind mapping with colorful markers.

4. Reflection

The result of the reflection after the students write narrative text of personal experience used mind mapping method was improved. It can be seen from the students’ score in their post-test that the findings shows that the total score was 1.765, the average of students’ score was 88.25 in very good category and the percentages of

students who achieved the KKM or Minimum Mastery Criterion was 90%. This calculation revealed that almost all of the students passed the post-test and obtained very good as the criteria of success. From the result of the reflection above in summary, the mind mapping method can improved students writing skills.

Questionnaire Result

The questionnaire was given on Saturday, September 24th, 2022. In this part, the researcher discussed the second question regarding to the students' perceptions of the Mind Mapping method. Their opinion were gathered from the questions of questionnaire with students after conducted the classroom action research. The researcher chose some students and asked 10 questions about the students' opinions in learning English and their difficulties in writing narrative text especially writing their personal experience used Mind Mapping method.

The students' opinions about the Mind mapping method were positive. Almost all of the students said that writing using mind mapping method can help them improve their writing skills. Although students have a lack of vocabulary and ideas in writing. Besides, they also have problem with their first language interference, while among of them were not interested in writing and did not have dictionary when translating the new words they did not know. To solve the problem, the researcher suggested the mind mapping method to improve students' skills in writing. From the students' answers about the questions in questionnaire, there are three students' difficulties in writing based on Norrish (1987) theory. They are carelessness, first language interference, and translation.

The students' response in questionnaire about learning English and their difficulties in writing were presented in appendix. In the following, the researcher described some of students perceptions based on the questions asked after the classroom action research.

1. Students' Response about Carelessness

The first question was about students' motivation in learning English. Students' opinions about learning English in class were positive, they enjoyed the topic they learnt. Especially during they were writing narrative texts using mind mapping method. . The following are the answers of some students:

“I think, learning English so far has been very fun and has help me to improve my knowledge.” (S1)

“In my opinion, learning English was fun and I enjoyed it, but I have a problem because I don't have a dictionary in learning English.” (S15)

“I like writing narrative text with mind mapping because I like drawing and coloring.” (S15)

Before implemented the action, mostly students have the lack of motivation in teaching and learning process, students usually feel bored and did not interested with the topic they learned, but after implementing the mind mapping method, students' motivation in learning English especially in writing narrative text have enhance.

It means that learning English especially writing narrative text using mind mapping in class was effective to support students' motivation about the topic they learned. The students stated that learning English especially in writing narrative text through mind mapping was fun and they enjoyed it. Besides that, the Students' number 15 opinion that he has problem because he did not have a dictionary although he enjoyed the learning process.

2. Students' Responses about First Language Interference

The second question was about the students' first language interference. The researcher asked if there was an effect with student's first language interference in writing narrative text using mind mapping, and the following are their answers:

“Yes. My first language was interference my English” (S7)

“Sometimes, my first language influence me in writing narrative text, because I usually put my first language during writing in English.” (S15)

From the students' responses above, it can be inferred that the first language was interfered students in writing narrative text with mind mapping method. As the student number 15 said that he usually put his own language during writing narrative text.

3. Students' Responses about Translation

The last question was about translation. The researcher asked students if there are difficulties in translating some words from their first language to the target language (English) especially in writing narrative text using mind mapping. There are the following answers from students:

"I have difficulties in writing because the lack of vocabulary make me get difficult in translating the words from Indonesian to English" (S2)

"I get difficult in translation because the lack of tenses and vocabulary" (S20).

From the students' answers above, we can draw a conclusion that students get difficulties in translating some words because the lack of vocabulary and they were confused in using tenses. Besides that some students answers that they were not have dictionary for help them in translating some words.

In summary, there were three students' difficulties in writing, those are carelessness, first language interference, and translation. Students thought that writing narrative text using mind mapping was fun and they enjoyed it (the statement based on S1 and S15). They also said that writing narrative text using mind mapping can help them to improve their writing skills because mind mapping was an easy way to organize and create their ideas and knowledges, then put it in some lines, colors, and pictures or images. Although, there was some difficulties in writing but they can solve some problem such as in translation like bring dictionary in next lesson, tried to improve their vocabulary therefore it can help them in writing narrative text, and concentrate during the lesson.

From the results of questionnaire above, it can inferred that the mind mapping method could improve students skills in writing narrative text about personal experience and they were enjoyed and interested the lesson about mind mapping because the mind mapping method was fun and give them an easy way to created their ideas, knowledges and information they have more freely and creatively.

In teaching and learning process, students were need an interactive and creative learning that can help them interested and understand to the topic they learnt. Especially in learning writing narrative text, students usually have problem in their writing skills. To help them solve the problem, the researcher suggested mind mapping method as a good strategy to improve the students' ability in writing narrative text especially writing their personal experience.

Mind mapping technique used to denote a process in which the writer described and clarify his ideas in a graphical form. According to Windura (2008) a mind map is an effective technique of note-taking and valuable for solving the problem of students in writing. Mind mapping is a diagram used to represent words, ideas, tasks, and other items linked to and around a central key word or idea. Therefore, the following part discusses two main parts, mainly students' ability and students' perceptions about the writing narrative text using mind mapping method.

Before implementing the Mind Mapping method, the students' skills in writing classified in very low category. It can be seen from the students' scores in the pre-test where the percentages was 20% as only 4 students who achieved the Minimum Mastery Criteria or KKM. In their pre-test results, the mean score was 63.6 (below average) and most of them failed the test.

After implementing the Mind mapping method, there was a significant improvement in the students' scores compared with the pre-test results. This can be seen from the majority of students who obtained good and very good category as their success criteria. From the post-test results, it showed that the mean scores was 1.765 and the average of students' scores was 88.25 classified in very good category, and percentages of students' scores was 90%.

From the results of open-ended questionnaire with students, it can be seen that mostly students' responses that they enjoyed learning English especially writing narrative text through the mind mapping method because it was fun and helps them to create their ideas more freely. The questions in questionnaire was taken based on the

theory by Norrish (1987) in review related to literature that there were three types of students' difficulties in writing; they are carelessness, first language interference, and translation.

It means that the used of mind mapping technique was effective in teaching writing narrative text at Junior high school especially at the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 2 Waikabubak. Therefore, the implementation of the mind mapping method was significantly increased the students writing skills in writing narrative text and the cycle stop.

CONCLUSION

This classroom action research has been conducted in one cycle. The results were based on the research questions the researcher discovered two conclusions. Those are the students writing skills in writing narrative text through mind mapping and the students' difficulties in writing.

First, the students' writing skills about narrative text through mind mapping increased significantly. This could be seen from the students' improvement before and after implementing the mind mapping method. The mean score enhanced from 63.6 (below average) to 88.25 in very good category and the percentage of students who passed the Minimum Mastery Criteria – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM) 75, changed from 20% to 90%. Before the classroom action research, the students who passed the KKM were only 4 students and after that there were 18 students who passed the KKM. From the results of pre-test before conducted the mind mapping and the post-test after conducted the Mind mapping method, it can be inferred that the students' writing skills has improvement after used the mind mapping method.

Second, the students' perceptions about their difficulties in writing were positive. There are three students' difficulties in writing. First, carelessness, second first language interference and the last is translation. According the students' perceptions about their difficulties in writing, they said that they enjoyed writing narrative text using the mind mapping method although some of them have some difficulties in translation or their language interference and the lack of motivation while they learning English, but they can solve the problem and enjoyed learning English especially in writing narrative text using mind mapping because they stated that it was fun and mind mapping can help them improve their ability in writing. In conclusion, there are three types of students' difficulties in writing. They are carelessness translation and first language interference.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto. (2012). *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Bumi Aksara.
- Arikunto. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Bumi Aksara.
- Ary, D. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education*. Wadsworth: Cengage learning.
- Ary, D. & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introductionto Research in Education*, 8th edition. Canada: Wadsworth.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners*. New York: Routledge.
- Djarwanto. (1994). *Principles of Research Methods and Thesis Writing Technical Guidance*. Yogyakarta:Liberty.
- Hayes, D. A. (1992). *A Sourcebook of Interactive Methods for Teaching with Text*. United States: America.
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing: Resource Books for Teachers*. Oxford University Press.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). *The action research planner* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin

University Press.

Lewin, K. in G. W. L. (Ed. . (1946). *Action Research and Minority Problem*. New York: Harper & Row.

Norrish. (1987). *Language Learning and Their Errors*. London Macmillan: Ltd.

Richard & Renandya. (2002). Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice. In *An Anthology of Current Practice* (Cambridge).

White. (1986a). *A Practical Rhetoric and Handbook*. New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Windura, S. (2008). *Mind Mapp: Langkah Demi Langkah*. Elex Media Komputindo.