

Increasing Eighth Grade Student's Writing Skills Using Mind Mapping Technique

Chrissy Andrea Putri¹

¹ Master of English Education, Universitas Terbuka

Article Info

Article history:

Received mm dd, yyyy

Revised mm dd, yyyy

Accepted mm dd, yyyy

Keywords: (3 – 5 keywords)

Keyword 1

Keyword 2

Keyword 3

Keyword 4

ABSTRACT

Mind mapping has been viewed as the way to increase students' writing skills. The current research aims to find out if mind mapping technique is more effective than using peer review in increasing the eighth-graders writing skills. This research is also intended to determine whether eighth-graders with higher levels of creativity have better writing skills than those with lower levels of creativity. This research is an experimental study with a 2x2 factorial design. There were 48 students who involved in this research. Research instrument used was writing and creativity tests, especially ANOVA and the Tukey test. The research findings showed that that the mind mapping technique is more effective than the peer review technique for teaching eighth-grade writing. In addition, the students with high creativity have better writing skills than students with low creativity.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Corresponding Name

Email: chrissyaputri@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is very important in preparation for teaching and learning because it accelerates students in using the target language. It is evaluated that 75 % of all universal communication is in composing and 90 % of web substances are in English (Schütz, 2018). It implies student utilize English as a medium for exchanging data and innovation. This is also in relation to what Beckett, Gonzalez, & Schwartz (Beckett, Gonzalez, & Schwartz, 2004) informed that learning a second language entails learning how to interact with others through understanding them, speaking with them, and reading what they write.

Based on Curriculum 2013, there are five genres which are conducted in junior high school. These five genres are narrative, recount, procedures, descriptive, and report (Bastian & Al-Hafizh, 2014). Each genre has own social function, the generic structure and the language features. After the students learn all kinds of genres, they are expected to understand to differentiate the texts according to their own features based on their genres. One of the genres stated is recount text.

Composing in a composition can be utilized in post-perusing as well. Writing more ended up as critical expertise that took a portion of students' competence in communication. Ur (1996) states that much higher measures of dialect are regularly requested in composing than in discourse. In addition, composing or writing is one of the two abilities tested on the national final exam. Hence, it is assumed that composing expertise is one of the foremost vital aptitudes within educating (in teaching) English in

Indonesia. On the other hand, concurring with Simpson (1998), the trouble is due to the truth that an author must have sufficient language and common mental aptitudes to produce and organize thoughts and puts those thoughts into coherent, consistently requested, comprehensibly sentences, sections and papers. It is upheld by Richard and Renandya (2002) that state composing isn't as it were to produce and organize thoughts utilizing a suitable choice of lexicon, sentence, and passage organization but also to turn such thoughts into clear content. Other than that, students have challenges exchanging thoughts from their local language with the target language.

In order to address the issues encountered by students, the researcher is considering the use of mind mapping in the instruction of writing skills. Mind mapping is an instructional method that employs brain management to reveal the brain's latent potential and power. In addition, mind mapping is frequently used to facilitate effective, productive, and pleasurable learning among students. According to Buzan (2010), the brain has a natural capacity for visual perception. Mind mapping utilises this capacity to obtain as many results as feasible. The colour, images, and branches contribute to the stimulation of the brain. They stimulate the brain quicker than traditional note-taking methods, which are typically linear and monochromatic.

In addition, both mind mapping and peer review techniques will be effective in writing instruction if students' creativity is enhanced. "Creativity involves thinking that is aimed at producing relatively novel and in some way compelling ideas or products" (Sternberg, 2006). Good writing is a component of good reasoning. In the interim, pondering is a component of originality. Consequently, excellent writing significantly depends on creativity. Verbal creativity is the form of creativity that has the greatest effect on writing skill. It is the ability to assess a person's verbal fluency, adaptability, and originality in relation to words and sentences using logical and critical thought. Additionally, verbal creativity is the capacity to generate original ideas and then combine them with existing knowledge. Divergent thought articulated verbally reveals the fluency, adaptability, and originality of the new ideas.

In this study, the researcher conducted an experimental study entitled "The Use of Mind Mapping Techniques in Teaching Writing to Eighth-Grade Students Using Google Meet Platform Viewed from Their Creativity in the Academic Year of 2020/2021". English is a language of communication that has gained prominence in recent years. English is therefore taught in all Indonesian institutions. Among them is SMP. Students are encouraged to learn multiple languages at school. The purpose of English instruction at this school is to teach pupils how to acquire and use the language in ordinary situations. According to the School-Based Curriculum of 2013, the purpose of junior high English classes is to teach students four skills that will enable them to comprehend and produce oral and written texts. They combine conversing, writing, reading, and listening to achieve the level of information. Because it allows students to articulate their thoughts in writing, writing is one of the most important skills they should acquire.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Writing Skills

Writing is an activity of exploring opinions and ideas into words. It includes the organization of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences into coherent and cohesive paragraphs and texts. There is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill for all language users: foreign, second, and even for first language. Writing needs a well preparation and a lot of practices. According to White (1986), writing is the process of expressing the ideas, information, knowledge, or experience and understanding the writing to acquire the knowledge or some information to share and learn. Besides that, (Tarigan, 2008) state that writing is activity to produce or draw graphic symbols which represent a language that is understood by people, so that other people can read the graphic symbols presented. People will understand the graphic symbols presented if they understand the language and the graphic itself. Almost the same with Tarigan, Ramelan (1992) also states that writing is representation or symbol of language.

In writing, there are some indicators that prove the appropriate writing. Genesee and Upshur (2013) suggest general categories which are often used for the evaluation of students' writing, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use or grammar, and mechanic. According to R. Hughes (R. Hughes, 2011) the indicators that prove the competence of students are grammar, vocabulary, or sentence formation, and mechanics. Reid (1993) states that good writing has some criteria as follows: content, organization, style, and correctness. Further, Brown (2015) states that writing pedagogy focuses on how to generate ideas, how to organize them coherently, how to use discourse markers and rhetorical conventions, how to revise text for clearer meaning, how to edit text for appropriate grammar, and how to produce a final product. In Table 2, it can be seen that indicators of writing are grammar, vocabulary, organization, mechanics, and content.

Table 1. Indicator of Writing skill

| Experts | (Harris, 1969) | (Genesee & Upshur, 2013) | (R. Hughes, 2011) | (Reid, 1993) | (Jacobs et al., 1981) |
|------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Indicators | Contents | Content | | Content | Content |
| | Grammar | Language use/ grammar | Grammar | Style | Language Use |
| | Word choice | Vocabulary | Vocabulary | | Vocabulary |
| | Organization | Organization | Sentence Formation | Organization | Organization |
| | Mechanics | Mechanic | Mechanic | | Mechanics |
| | | | Correctness | | |

2.2. Mind Mapping

Mind mapping is the easiest way to put information into the brain and take information out of the brain. Mind Mapping is a creative, effective way of noting and will literally "map" our thoughts. With mind mapping, long lists of information can be turned into colorful, highly organized, and easy to remember diagrams that work in harmony with how the brain works in doing things (Buzan, 2010).

Therefore, making a mind map is a strategy for note-making before writing. Mind mapping can also be viewed as the process of scribbling down ideas about a topic and developing those ideas as the mind makes associations (Hedge, 1988). Mind mapping can give students a way to begin writing assignments. Hayes (1992) states that the application of mind mapping enables students to 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.

Mind mapping has been applied in personal, family, educational, and business situations. Buzan (2010) states that mind mapping helps us make a plan, to communicate, to be more creative, to save our time, to solve problems, to focus on the problems, to arrange and to explain our mind, to memorize better, to learn quickly and efficiently. For example, a student could listen to his teacher in the classroom and take down notes using mind mapping for the most important points or keywords. A student can also use mind mapping to sort out a complicated idea. Moreover, mind mapping can be used to promote as a way to collaborate in color pen creativity sessions.

Buzan (2010) suggests the rules of converting ideas into a mind mapping, namely: (1) use unlined paper or a whiteboard. One can use an entire board for strategic thinking and planning; (2) start by drawing a color symbol in the middle of the page and use at least three colours. This encourages right brain activity from the outset; (3) branch the main ideas of these central images; (4) use one keyword or symbol per line. Avoiding clutter permits more ideas to be represented and encourages our minds to see how they relate to each other; (5) print the words on top of the lines. Printed words are easier to read than cursive; (6) use colour throughout. This can be useful in grouping related ideas; and (7) use images throughout our mind mapping

3. METHOD

This is an experimental study aimed at discovering the effect of teaching techniques and students' creativity on students' writing ability. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Helen (2012), experimental research is the most conclusive and scientific approach because it really establishes many treatments before examining their effects. Furthermore, the researcher applied factorial design 2x2. Ary, Jacobs, Irvine, & Walker (2019) point out that a factorial design is a method that allows the researcher to evaluate the influence of two or more independent variables on the dependent variable at the same time. There are two factors with two levels that are involved in this research. Those two factors are Mind Mapping Technique and Peer Review Technique, while the two levels are high creativity and low creativity. The design is as follows:

Table 2. Research Design: Factorial Design 2X2

| Factor A | | Teaching Techniques | |
|----------|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | Mind Mapping Technique Experimental Group (Group A ₁) | Peer Review Technique Control Group (Group A ₂) |
| Factor B | High (B ₁) | Group A ₁ B ₁ (Students having high creativity taught using Mind Mapping Technique) | Group A ₂ B ₁ (Students having high creativity taught using Peer Review Technique) |
| | Low (B ₂) | Group A ₁ B ₂ (Students having low creativity taught using Mind Mapping Technique) | Group A ₂ B ₂ (Students having low creativity taught using Peer Review Technique) |

The picture shows that (1) by comparing the observation under treatment variable, Mind Mapping Technique (A₁) to observation under Peer review Technique (A₂), it is possible to contrast the effectiveness of those teaching techniques to teach writing to junior high school students viewed from their creativity; (2) by comparing the observation under creativity variable, High creativity (B₁) to observation under Low creativity (B₂), it is possible to find out which students have better writing skills viewed from their creativity, (3) by comparing the individual cell effects, group A₁B₁ versus A₂B₁, group A₁B₂ versus A₂B₂, it is possible to identify the interaction of types of teaching techniques and students' creativity that might exist, and (4a) by comparing A₁B₁ to group A₂B₁, it can be pointed which teaching technique is better applied to teach writing to junior high school students having high creativity; (4b) by comparing group A₁B₂ to group A₂B₂, it can be pointed which teaching technique is better applied to teach writing to junior high school students having low creativity.

The participants in this study are eighth-grade students of SMP Widya Wacana 1 Surakarta during the 2020/2021 academic year. Two classes were chosen at random to serve as an experimental class and a control class. These two classes serve as the subject of the study. The experimental class was VIII A (24 students) and the control class was VIII B class (24 students).

The score obtained from Munandar (Munandar, 2009) adapted and modified verbal creativity test is the metric used to determine students' verbal creativity. The researcher looked at the test results after giving the students the creativity test. It is a nominal scale with two categories: low and high.

Descriptive and inferential statistics are employed to evaluate the data because the researcher wished to provide an interpretation of the data and make a conclusion. While descriptive analysis is intended to explain a pattern in the data for a single variable or instrument question, inferential statistics are used to compare two or more groups on the independent variables in terms of the dependent variable (Creswell, 2012).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity testing utilized in this review is by executing the Bartlett equation. The purpose of the test is to determine whether or not the data are uniform. The fact that the data are uniform indicates that the population is well-formed makes this test significant. Table 3 presents the summary of the homogeneity testing result.

Table 3. The Summary of Homogeneity Testing

| Sample | df | 1/(df) | S_i^2 | $\log S_i^2$ | df $\log (S_i^2)$ |
|------------|------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 11 | 0.09 | 16.61 | 1.22 | 13.42 |
| 2 | 11 | 0.09 | 13.30 | 1.12 | 12.36 |
| 3 | 11 | 0.09 | 23.84 | 1.38 | 15.15 |
| 4 | 11 | 0.09 | 28.20 | 1.45 | 15.95 |
| Σ | 44 | 0.36 | 81.95 | 5.17 | 56.89 |
| χ_o^2 | 1.88 | | χ_t^2 | 7.81 | |
| Conclusion | | Homogeneous | | | |

According to the test results, the value of chi-square observation χ_o^2 is 1.88, which is lower than the table value of chi-square for $df = 3$ at a level of significance = 0.05, χ_t^2 is 7.81. It is possible to conclude that the data is homogeneous.

Summary of 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

To ascertain whether the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted or rejected, researchers use hypothesis testing. Multifaceted Examination of Change (ANOVA) is utilized to test the speculations.

Table 5. The Data Analysis Summary of ANOVA

| Source of Variance | SS | df | MS | F_0 | $F_{t(0.05)}$ |
|-------------------------------|----------|----|----------|---------|---------------|
| Between columns (technique) | 368.52 | 1 | 368.52 | 17.9883 | 4.06 |
| Between rows (creativity) | 3283.52 | 1 | 3283.52 | 160.275 | 4.06 |
| Columns by rows (interaction) | 111.02 | 1 | 111.02 | 5.41916 | 4.06 |
| Between groups | 3763.06 | 3 | 1254.35 | | |
| Within groups | 901.42 | 44 | 20.48674 | | |
| Total | 4664.479 | 47 | | | |

From the summary of the 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) above, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis of the method of teaching writing is that there is no difference in the effectiveness between the Mind mapping Technique and the Peer review Technique. Because F_0 between columns (17.9883) is higher than $F_{t(0.05)}$ (4.06), the null hypothesis is rejected. It can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the mind mapping technique and the peer review technique to teach writing. The mean of the students taught using mind mapping (82.54) is significantly higher than the mean of those taught using peer review (77), therefore it can be concluded that the mind mapping technique is more effective than the peer review technique.

The null hypothesis is that there is no interaction between writing technique and creativity in teaching writing. From the data analysis, it can be found that the null hypothesis is rejected because F_0 between rows (5.41916) is higher than $F_{t(0.05)}$ (4.06). It can be concluded that there is an interaction between the two variables, teaching techniques and creativity. It means that the effect of teaching techniques on performance in writing depends on the degree of creativity.

The Summary of Tukey Test

The researcher must use Tukey testing to look at the various group means after assessing the variance. Researchers can calculate q by multiplying the difference in means by the square root of the ratio of variation within groups to sample size. The summary of assessing the significant level of mean difference using the Tukey Test is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary of Tukey Test

| Between Columns | n | q_0 | $q_{t(0.5)}$ | Meaning | Category |
|-------------------|----|-------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| $A_1 - A_2$ | 24 | 6.00 | 2.92 | $q_0 > q_t$ | Significant |
| $B_1 - B_2$ | 24 | 17.90 | 2.92 | $q_0 > q_t$ | Significant |
| $A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$ | 12 | 9.29 | 3.08 | $q_0 > q_t$ | Significant |
| $A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$ | 12 | 2.71 | 3.08 | $q_0 < q_t$ | Not Significant |

The interpretations that can be drawn from the aforementioned summary of the Tukey Test are as follows:

Because q_0 ($A_1 - A_2$) 6.00 is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.92), When teaching writing, the mind mapping method differs significantly from the peer review method. The average score of students who receive instruction through the mind mapping method (82.54) is higher than the average score of students who receive instruction through the peer review method (77). As a result, it can be concluded that teaching writing through mind mapping is more effective than through peer review.

Because q_0 ($B_1 - B_2$) 17.9039 is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.92), Writing skills of students with high creativity differ significantly from those of students with low creativity. Students with high creativity (88.04) have a mean score that is higher than that of students with low creativity (71.5), it can be concluded that students with a high level of creativity write more effectively than students with a low level of creativity.

Because q_0 ($A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$) 9.29 is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.08), the Mind Mapping Technique is significantly different from Peer Review Technique for students having high creativity. The mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by the Mind Mapping Technique (92.33) is higher than the mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by the Peer Review Technique (83.75). Therefore, it can be concluded that the Mind Mapping Technique is more effective than Peer Review Technique.

Because q_0 ($A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$) 2.71 is lower than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.08), so Mind Mapping Technique is not significantly different from Peer Review Technique for students having low creativity.

The mind mapping is an effective technique to teach writing for the eighth grade of SMP

Mind mapping is more effective than peer review in teaching writing to eighth-grade pupils at SMP Widya Wacana 1 Surakarta during the 2020–2021 academic year. The technique of thought mapping is effective for teaching writing. It improves the enjoyment, accomplishment, and significance of learning activities. According to Kotob, Styger, & Richardson (Kotob, Styger, & Richardson, 2016), mind mapping is a method for generating creative and effective thought. The method facilitates the aggregation of research topics around a central keyword or concept for visual presentation.

Mind mapping is a valuable technique that encourages and improves creative problem-solving, improves the way knowledge is recorded, and facilitates more efficient learning efficiently (Sugiharti, 2020). Mind mapping is an effective method for developing an essay's structure. Mind mapping allows you to visualise every argument image and objectively evaluate the logic and structure of an essay's argument and structure. Mind mapping is a beneficial aid for both the completion and planning of writing projects write (Buzan, 2010).

According to Buzan (2010), when creating a mind map, the central image must initially communicate the main concept. It should be in the centre of the paper to stimulate the right hemisphere of students' minds, improve their memory, and make learning enjoyable. Because it stimulates the right brain, mind mapping will facilitate students' ability to generate new ideas. Therefore, their literature would be dense with concepts.

According to Dewi (2017), the student's behaviour improved after the implementation of the mind-mapping strategy. Throughout the discussion, the students' communication abilities improved. They also worked on their confidence when presenting the results of the conversation to others. This development resulted from the teacher's participation in the learning process, which increased the students' creative and active participation. The instructor makes the students the focal point of the lecture by involving them.

Asrul et al. (Asrul, Hasibuan, Hutagalung, Tarigan, & Siregar, 2021) conclude that mind mapping is a practical technique that can be applied to writing assignments. The implementation of the mind mapping technique makes the classroom environment more pleasurable. According to Pribadi and Susilana (2021), the use of mind mapping as a learning strategy engages students and increases their motivation to complete writing assignments. It offers students a visual representation of their knowledge and opinions, enabling them to influence the implementation of constructivist-based theoretical evaluations.

Students were able to arrange and organise their thoughts for writing assignments under exam conditions, according to Waloyo (2017). This indicates that mind mapping provided writers with keywords for use in planning and the ability to document their ideas regarding the content they were required to write. One could argue that mind mapping is a technique that helps students strengthen their understanding of concepts. Before writing, students may use mind mapping to organise their thoughts into broad categories. After penning down their ideas, students can organise them into the introductory paragraph and the final draught. This demonstrates that when using mind mapping as a comprehensive plan for paragraphs, students can simply adhere to what they've written down.

Unlike mind mapping, however, the peer review method does not permit navigation. Through the interaction of peer review, students exchange their knowledge. During the writing process, students are also responsible for providing written and verbal feedback on and criticism of one another's writing (Hansen & Liu, 2005). According to Ruru and Sulisty (2020) in peer review technique, students appear to perceive their classmates as having the same status as them and are less skilled than instructors at providing feedback. The majority of students believe that, compared to their instructors, their peers are less likely to identify and rectify all errors in written feedback.

According to Hyland (2015), the peer review technique frequently consumes too much time during the teaching and learning process, instructors are unable to superintend each group simultaneously, and students are sceptical of the review's value due to the absence of pertinent experience among the reviewers. Peer review encourages students to view instructors and peers as collaborators as opposed to judges and is less authoritative than teacher review. Students will need guidance from their teacher to know what to look for when reading the work of their peers (Harmer, 2004). In instructing writing, the mind mapping technique is therefore more effective than peer critique.

Students who have high creativity have better writing skills than those who have low creativity in the eighth grade

Writing is an active method for communicating an idea. It is a component of thought. Students need to think clearly in order to produce quality writing. Some individuals link creativity and thinking. It implies that pupils need to think creatively in order to produce quality writing. Creative students will have the adaptability, fluidity, and originality of thought necessary for writing.

Creativity is one of the human skills that combines broad stimuli with memory to form something new (Kulsum, 2018; Prasetyo et al., 2022). Nurfaizah, Suarlin, Amrah, and Nurhaedah (2020) state creative thinking is a cognitive habit that is developed through paying attention to intuition, developing imagination, expressing new possibilities, opening up amazing vistas, and producing unexpected thoughts. Ideas will emerge, relationships between them will be discovered, imagination will be developed and carried out, and there will be a variety of perspectives on a topic as creativity develops. Students who can think creatively well are more likely to be interested in learning and to feel challenged.

Students who lack creativity, on the other hand, tend to be passive. They only do any task based on what is told to them, and they don't like being told to think outside the box. They will also be hesitant to participate in activities that need them to think creatively. They enjoy being guided and enjoy something straightforward. Processes and difficulties are typically seen as obstacles by students with low creativity (Abdul Kohar et al., 2022; Hermawar et al., 2021). They will have more responsibilities the more activities they have to participate in. They don't like doing activities since they prefer guided, simple, and straightforward ones, which calls for strong teacher supervision. The explanation claims that children with higher levels of creativity perform better in writing than students with lower levels of creativity.

There is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity in teaching writing at the eighth grade

Mind mapping fosters critical thinking skills by challenging students to confront new concepts and providing students with quick feedback on their intellectual reaction to particular material. Mind mapping is a method for developing a visual learning style. It develops and integrates a person's potential brain function. A person will be able to organize and remember all kinds of written and verbal information if both hemispheres of the brain are involved. The creative, efficient, and literally mapping of the mind is also a route map that makes it easier to remember things and makes it possible to build facts and ideas, involving the human brain's natural functions from the start. As a result, information will be easier to remember and more reliable than traditional peer review methods. According to the analysis, the use of the mind mapping technique enhances and enhances students' creative thinking abilities during the learning process (Miranti & Wilujeng, 2017).

Naturally, students must be more inventive in order to accomplish this. In a nutshell, students with a high level of creativity will have no trouble mastering the mind mapping technique. When the mind mapping method is used in a classroom activity, it is likely that students with high levels of creativity will be able to maximize their potential.

Mind mapping is an excellent tool for developing and refining previously learned concepts or subject matter. In other terms, a mind map is a visual organization that can systematically represent knowledge. The instructor or researcher can also use it to classify the information. Of course, it enables students to learn through independent practice. It is clear that when students are learning in their preferred manner, mind mapping fosters the development of creativity (Jogan, 2020; Syafriani et al., 2023).

Mind mapping enables students to explore and arrange their ideas in a structured manner. Mind mapping will also foster creativity because kids employ symbols, visuals, and colors in addition to words. Mind mapping can therefore be utilized to successfully teach writing recount text (Dewi, 2017).

The teacher can use mind-mapping as an alternative teaching method because its implementation has positive outcomes. Students will be able to think more critically and creatively by using mind maps. The students will be more engaged in their education and interested in the subject matter as a result. The environment in the classroom will be improved by the students' curiosity and interest. As a result, instructing students to participate in the learning activities will not be difficult for the facilitator.

According to Tukey test results, the Mind Mapping Technique is not significantly different from Peer Review Technique for students having low creativity. So, the effectiveness of both the Mind Mapping Technique and Peer Review Technique is similar for teaching writing to students who have low creativity because whatever learning technique is used it does not have any effect on the students who have low creativity. Students having low creativity tend to be passive in doing the task. According to (Fasko, 2001), when a learning strategy is taught to students with low creativity, it fails to work. As a result, students with low levels of creativity score almost identically in writing when taught through mind mapping or peer review.

CONCLUSION

When comparing two methods for teaching writing in eighth grade, mind mapping outperforms peer review. Students with high levels of imagination tend to be better writers than their less imaginative peers. When instructing eighth graders in the art of writing, there exists a dynamic between the methods used in instruction and the pupils' individual imaginations. Those results suggest that the Mind Mapping Technique is useful for teaching eighth graders how to write. The success of this method depends on the originality of the pupils using it. As a result of these findings, several suggestions have been made for use in the classroom and among future scholars. Educators would benefit from classroom settings that are less stressful and more exciting, especially when it comes to teaching students how to write. This is why it is recommended that English teachers use it into their lessons. Students may easily use the tool of mind mapping in their writing projects. In addition, innovative students have the capacity to see things in a different light and provide fresh ideas. The development of this skill does not occur mechanically.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Kohar, D., Saehu, A., & Sri Ardiasih, L. (2022). Strengthening reading comprehension and interest through SQ3R strategy using Whatsapp during pandemic. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 8(2), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v8i2.6440>
- Bastian, A. Y., & Al-Hafizh, Muhd. (2014). Using Pictorial Story Media in Teaching Writing Recount Text at Junior High School. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 47–51.
- Brown, H. D. (2015). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Buzan, T. (2010). Buku Pintar Mind Map untuk Anak. In *Gramedia Jakarta*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Dewi, C. L. (2017). Improving Students' Creativity In Writing Recount Text by Using Mind Mapping. *Manajemen Pendidikan*, 12(2), 128–138. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23917/jmp.v12i3.5531>
- Fasko, D. (2001). Creativity and Education. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(3–4), 317–327. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326934CRJ1334_09
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Helen, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

- Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. A. (2013). *Classroom-Based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci004>
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Longman.
- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. McGraw-Hill.
- Hayes, D. A. (1992). *A Sourcebook of Interactive Methods for Teaching with Text*. Pearson.
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing: Resource Books for Teachers*. Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, R. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hyland, K. (2015). *Teaching and Researching Writing* (2nd ed.). Pearson. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717203>
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., & Hearfield, V. F. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: a Practical Approach*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Jogan, S. N. (2020). Mind Mapping: A Tool for Developing Creativity in Students. *Studies in Indian Place Names (UGC Care Journal)*, 40(70), 4006–4012.
- Kotob, F., Styger, L., & Richardson, L. P. (2016). Exploring mind mapping techniques to analyse complex case study data. *Australian Academy of Business and Economics Review*, 2(3), 244–262.
- Kulsum, N. U. (2018). Mind Mapping Model in Increasing Students' Creativity and Learning Outcomes. *Classroom Action Research Journal*, 2(3), 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um013v2i32018p127>
- Miranti, M. G., & Wilujeng, B. Y. (2017). Creative Thinking Skills Enhancement Using Mind Mapping. *1st International Conference on Social, Applied Science and Technology in Home Economics (ICONHOMECS 2017)*, 39–42. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iconhomecs-17.2018.9>
- Munandar, U. (2009). *Pengembangan Kreativitas Anak Berbakat*. Rineka Cipta.
- Nurfaizah, A., Suarlin, Amrah, & Nurhaedah. (2020). The Effectiveness of Mind Mapping Model Toward Students' Creative Thinking Ability on Basic Concepts of Civics at PGSD FIP UNM. *Proceeding of The International Conference on Science and Advanced Technology (ICSAT) The 4th Edition*, 752–758.
- Prasetyo, N., Saehu, A., & Sundari, H. (2022). Grammatical Errors in Writing Recount Texts (A Case Study at The First Year of Senior High School). *EDUKATIF: JURNAL ILMU PENDIDIKAN*, 4(5), 7086–7096. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v4i5.4000>
- Pribadi, B. A., & Susilana, R. (2021). The Use of Mind Mapping Approach to Facilitate Students' Distance Learning in Writing Modular Based on Printed Learning Materials. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(2), 907–917. <https://doi.org/10.12973/EU-JER.10.2.907>
- Ramelan. (1992). *Introduction to Linguistic Analysis*. IKIP Semarang Press.
- Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL Writing*. Regents/Prentice Hall.
- Ruru, T. A. N., & Sulistyio, T. (2020). Peer review in writing activities: outcomes and perceptions of EFL students. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning (J-REaLL)*, 1(2), 27–132. <https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v1i2.6845>
- Schütz, R. E. (2018). *English-The international language*.
- Simpson, P. (1998). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. Routledge.
- Sternberg, R. (2006). Introduction. In J. Kaufman & R. Sternberg (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 1–10). Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiharti, B. (2020). Students' Writing Ability in Writing Descriptive Text by Using Mind Mapping Technique (a Classroom Action Research in Class X-A UPW). *Mimbar Pendidikan Indonesia*, 1(1), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.23887/mpi.v1i1.27838>
- Syafriani, A., Husein, R., & Ardiasih, L. S. (2023). Developing Formative Assessment AKM-Based for Recount Text in Reading Skill for Grade X SMA Negeri 1 Pangkalan Susu North Sumatera. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 6(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v6i1.7444>
- Tarigan, H. G. (2008). *Membaca Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Angkasa.
- Ur, P. (1996). A Course In Language Teaching: Practice And Theory. In *New York: Cambridge University Press* (Vol. 20, Issue 3). Cambridge University Press.
- Waloyo, E. (2017). The Implementation of Mind Mapping Technique in Teaching Writing: a Case Study at MAN 13 Jakarta. *ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 2(1), 72–82. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v2i1.1596>
- White, F. D. (1986). *The Writer's Art: a Practical Rhetoric and Handbook*. Wadsworth.
-