

IMPROVING DESCRIPTIVE WRITING SKILL THROUGH MIND MAPPING TECHNIQUE OF GRADE SEVEN STUDENTS AT MTS TAHFIZH AL MADINAH MALANG

Binti Masruroh

English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate School, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: bintitaufiqul@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to improve the students' writing ability in descriptive text using mind mapping technique. The research was conducted for 7th grade students of MTS Tahfizh Al Madinah Malang because the researcher found that the ability of these students were lower than the passing grade set. This condition was caused by the passiveness of the students in using English both in asking or answering questions. Therefore, the researcher was intended in taking a classroom action research by applying an appropriate technique to help these students. And mind mapping technique was chosen to be applied here.

To do the research, the researcher applied Collaborative Classroom Action Research design where the collaboration between researcher and teacher is applied to plan, implement, observe, and evaluate the actions taken.

The two cycles are applied here; and each cycle contains four primary stages, i.e. action planning, implementation, classroom observation, and reflection. The main data used in this research is taken from the writing test result. And the secondary data was obtained from the interview and documentation.

The students' average writing score for the first cycle was $M=71$, while the targeted average score was $M \geq 75$. The number of students who reached the score target was only 63%, below the targeted percentage number, 85%. Then, the action taken proceeded the second cycle was using pictures and write down keywords for those. Then, the students' average writing score improved; it was $M=77$. The number of the students who reached the targeted score improved as well, 88%. It means that there was improvement in students' writing skill in the second cycle.

So, it can be concluded that the using of mind mapping technique could help 7th students of Mts. Tahfizh Al Madinah Malang to improve their skill in writing descriptive text.

Keywords: *Writing ability, Descriptive Text, Mind Mapping*

INTRODUCTION

Based on the 2013 curriculum, the objective of teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia, particularly for the Junior High students is to provide students with the ability to use the target language for communication. To obtain this objective, English teaching is focused on the development of the students' competences in all language skills. The English curriculum for the seven grade students of MTs stated that the objective of studying English is to enable the students to have four skills, which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The students are expected to use English as a means of communication both in oral and written forms. While in written forms students often find difficulties in some aspects such as capitalization, punctuation, inexplicitness or fuzziness, poor organization or illogical sequence, spelling, and grammatical error as well as it is stated by Masanjila in Sapitri (2019). Therefore, in teaching writing, there are some techniques to be used by teachers; one of them is mind mapping technique. Mind mapping techniques have some steps to do.

Buzan in Sugiharti (2020) mentions six stages to make a mind mapping are; the first is the main idea of a mind mapping should be described by central image, the second is key word, the third is basic ordering ideas are the branches that collect short information. The fourth, the elements of mind are arranged intuitively according to the importance of the concept, and are classified into branches or areas, the fifth is color the last but not the least is picture. It seems like what Hedge in Fadhila (2015) said in her book entitled "Writing", she stated that using mind-map before writing can make us have ideas like we make a construction in building.

METHOD

This research is a type of a classroom action research (CAR). Classroom action research is a research that is a reflective based on real conditions which are then sought for problems and followed up by carrying out concrete actions that are planned and measures (Suwandi, 2009:10).

Since this research dealt with the development of a teaching learning to improve students' writing skill classroom action research was applied on this research. As it is stated by Kemmis and Mc. Taggart (1983:5) action research is a process of applying ideas into practice as a means of improvement and a way to

increase knowledge about curriculum, teaching, and learning. While Mc Niff (1988:2) mentioned that action research is seen as a way to improve the quality of education by characterizing a loose set of activities that are deliberately designed. In addition, Elliot (1993:69) sees that the action research as the study of a social situation with a view to enhance the action quality. And the other definition of the action research was proposed by Bogdan and Biklen (1992:65). It was said that action research is a self-reflection analysis done by participants in social condition (including educational one) to develop the rationality and justice of their (a) practice both in social and educational practice, (b) their comprehension of these practices, and (c) the condition where the practices are held. It is most reasonably empowering when carried out by participants collaboratively, though it is often done by individuals, and sometimes cooperative with other people.

The activities of the research are using the following procedures: (1) Finding the research problem collaboratively with the object with the high-level English teacher, (2) Finding out some documents to gain the supporting data, (3) Finding out class with lowest score from document, (4) Planning the action (constructing the lesson plan for the first cycle), (meeting I and meeting II) collaboratively with the teacher, (5) Implementing the first action cycle (writing by using mind mapping technique), (6) Observing the classroom activity done by the researcher while implementing the action done by the English teacher in the first cycle, (7) Giving writing test to the subjects after the actions in the first cycle, (8) Analyzing the result of writing test quantitatively, then classified the result qualitatively based on the classification of the score levels, (9) Reflecting the result of the observation and the writing achievement test.

Hughes (1998:22) states that a good test should be valid and reliable. A test will be valid when it measures precisely what is meant to measure. Meanwhile, a test will be reliable if it contibutes constant result wherever the same test is undertaken at different time (Frankel and Wallen,2000:128). The validity of content will be important because the content of the test material will be compied by considering the measured indicators. Here, validity of content was set.

The students' writing test was scored as follows:

$$\text{Final score} = \frac{\text{Raw score}}{\text{Maximum score}} \times 100$$

Student	Students' score of writing test based on description						Calculation for total score	Final score
Indicator	C	S	G	V	M	Total	$\frac{20}{25} \times 100$	80
Name								

The description of writing test are as follows:

Analysis and Reflection

a. Analysis

T

Aspect	Score	Performance narrative	Max score
Content (C) Topic Detail	4	The topic is complete and clear and the details are relating to the topic	4
	3	The topic is complete and clear but the details are almost relating to the topic	
	2	The topic is complete and clear but the details are not relating to the topic	
	1	The topic is not clear and the detail are not relating to the topic	
Structure(S) Identification Description	4	Identification and Description is clear and complete	
	3	Identification and Description is almost clear and complete	

	2	Identification and Description is not clear but complete	4
	1	Identification and Description is not clear and not complete	
Grammar (G) Use simple present agreement	4	Very few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies	4
	3	Few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies but not effect on meaning	
	2	Numerous grammatical or agreement inaccuracies	
	1	Frequent grammatical or agreement inaccuracies	
Vocabulary (V)	4	Effective choice of words and words forms	4
	3	Few misuse of vocabularies, words forms but not change the meaning	
	2	Limited range confusing words and word form	
	1	Very poor knowledge of words, words form and not understandable	
Mechanics (M) Spelling Punctuation Capitalizations	4	It uses correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	4
	3	It has occasional error spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	
	2	It has frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	

	1	It is dominated by error of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	
--	---	---	--

The percentage formula applied was as follows:

$$E = \frac{n}{N} \times 100\%$$

Notes:

E = the percentage of students who gets 75 or more.

n = students who gets 75 or more

N = total students

Table of pretest score

No.	Name	Att.	Ask.	Ans.	Will	Att.	Total	Score
		5	5	5	5	5	25	100
1	Sis	3	4	4	3	4	18	72
2	Boy	3	3	3	3	2	14	56
3	Yan	3	3	3	3	3	15	60
4	Big	4	4	4	3	3	18	72
5	Jil	4	4	3	3	4	18	72
6	Sat	2	3	3	2	3	13	52
7	Ech	3	2	3	3	2	13	52
8	Aul	3	4	4	4	3	18	72
9	Caty	3	3	4	4	5	19	76
10	Vin	3	4	3	4	5	19	76
11	Did	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
12	Kay	1	1	1	1	3	7	28
13	Lea	3	4	4	3	5	19	76
14	Fad	4	4	3	3	5	19	76
15	Jay	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
16	Ant	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
17	Hany	3	4	3	4	4	18	72

JUMLAH %	61%	68%	64%	67%	84%	60%	
----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

Table of planning

No	Cycles	Time	Number of meeting	Number of students	Teaching Planning
1	Cycle 1	7 th of February 2020 and 10 th of February 2020	2 meetings	43 students	<p>1st meeting: (1) the teacher gave the topic to the students (2) teacher gave MM based on models (animals) (3) the teacher made group of students (4) students did assignment and produce a descriptive text in a group</p> <p>2nd meeting: (1) the teacher asked the students to write the descriptive text based on the teacher's MM.</p>
2	Cycle 2	14 th of February 2020 and 17 th of February 2020	2 meetings	43 students	<p>1st meeting: (1) the teacher explained how to make MM, the students made MM</p> <p>2nd meeting: (1) the students wrote a descriptive text from the MM made before</p>

b. Reflection

The reflection was done after analysing the process and result of the first cycle. This process was intended to see if there was still weakness in the action that had been done in this cycle. Besides, the reflection was done to underline what points were done well. By doing the reflection, then the researcher and her collaborator will be able to discuss what solution should be done in order to solve the problems encountered by both the students and the teacher. And the result is going to be used as the consideration to do the second cycle.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result in cycle one

Result of writing test in cycle one as listed below.

No.	Name	Forms of Participation				Active	Passive
		Att.	Ask.	Ans.	Will		
1.	Sis	√		√	√		
2.	Boy	√			√		
3.	Yan	√			√		
4.	Big	√	√	√	√		
5.	Jil	√			√		
6.	Sat	√			√		
7.	Ech	√			√		
8.	Aul	√	√	√	√		
9.	Caty	√		√	√		
10.	Vin	√	√	√	√		
11.	Did	√			√		
12.	Kay	√			√		
13.	Lea	√	√	√	√		
14.	Fad	√		√	√		
15.	Jay	√			√		
16.	Ant	√			√		
17.	Hany	√			√		
18.	Guse	√		√	√		
19.	Lia	√			√		
20.	Popi	√			√		
21.	Sandy	√			√		
22.	Jimy	√			√		

23.	Hans	√		√		√	
24.	Bint	√		√		√	
25.	Dian	√			√	√	
26.	Vivi	√	√	√	√	√	
27.	Eri	√				√	
28.	Clay	√	√	√	√	√	
29.	Tania	√		√		√	
30.	Kiki	√		√		√	
31.	Lena	√	√	√	√	√	
32.	Magda	√	√	√	√	√	
33.	Yus	√		√		√	
34.	Fria	√				√	
35.	Opik	√			√	√	
36.	Gasha	√		√	√	√	
37.	Alan	√			√	√	
38.	Nola	√				√	
39.	Idar	√	√	√	√	√	
40.	Dava	√		√		√	
41.	Anam	√				√	
42.	Bily	√				√	
43.	Chiki	√				√	

Table of score in cycle one

No.	Student	Descriptor						Final Score
		C	S	G	V	M	Total	
1.	Sis	3	4	4	3	5	19	76*
2.	Boy	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
3.	Yan	3	3	3	3	5	17	68
4.	Big	4	4	4	3	5	20	80*
5.	Jil	4	4	3	3	5	19	76*
6.	Sat	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
7.	Ech	3	2	3	3	5	16	68
8.	Aul	3	4	4	4	5	20	80*
9.	Caty	3	3	4	4	5	19	76*
10.	Vin	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*
11.	Did	2	3	3	3	3	14	56
12.	Kay	1	1	1	1	3	7	28
13.	Lea	3	4	4	3	5	19	76*
14.	Fad	4	4	3	3	5	19	76*
15.	Jay	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
16.	Ant	3	4	3	3	4	17	68
17.	Hany	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*
18.	Guse	3	3	4	3	5	19	72
19.	Lia	3	3	4	4	5	19	76*
20.	Popi	3	3	3	3	4	16	64
21.	Sandy	3	3	2	3	5	16	64
22.	Jimy	3	3	4	3	4	17	68
23.	Hans	3	4	4	4	4	19	76*
24.	Bint	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*

25.	Dian	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*	
26.	Vivi	4	3	3	4	5	19	76*	
27.	Eri	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*	
28.	Clay	4	4	3	4	5	20	76*	
29.	Tania	4	4	3	4	5	20	76*	
30.	Kiki	4	4	3	4	5	20	76*	
31.	Lena	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*	
32.	Magda	4	4	3	3	5	19	76*	
33.	Yus	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*	
34.	Fria	3	3	3	3	3	15	60	
35.	Opik	3	4	4	4	5	20	76*	
36.	Gasha	4	3	3	4	5	19	76*	
37.	Alan	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*	
38.	Nola	3	3	3	3	4	16	64	
39.	Idar	4	4	3	3	5	19	76*	
40.	Dava	3	4	4	4	4	19	76*	
41.	Anam	2	3	3	3	4	15	60	
42.	Bily	3	3	3	3	4	16	64	
43.	Chiki	3	4	3	4	5	19	76*	
	Σ								3052
	N (43)	N (27)							

The students' average score in writing ability.

M = $\frac{\text{The total scores of the students' writing result}}{\text{The total number of the students doing test}}$

The total number of the students doing test

$$M1 = \frac{3052}{43}$$

43

$$M1 = 71$$

The percentage of the students' writing ability through mind mapping as follows:

$$E1 = \frac{n}{N} \times 100\%$$

$$E1 = \frac{27}{43} \times 100\%$$

$$E1 = 63\%$$

Based on the data, the mean score of the students' writing ability was 71, while the target is 75. And the target score was only obtained by 63% of the students. This number showed that students the target score had not obtained the target yet, and that must be obtained by 85% of the students. Therefore, the first cycle was not successful. And the research should be continued to the next cycle.

The result of cycle 2

The scores of students' writing assignment in cycle two as listed in the table:

No.	Name	Participation				Active	Passive
		1	2	3	4		
1.	Sis	√		√	√	√	
2.	Boy	√		√		√	
3.	Yan	√		√		√	
4.	Big	√	√	√		√	
5.	Jil	√		√		√	
6.	Sat	√				√	
7.	Ech	√		√		√	
8.	Aul	√	√	√	√	√	
9.	Caty	√	√	√	√	√	
10.	Vin	√	√	√		√	
11.	Did	√				√	
12.	Kay	√				√	
13.	Lea	√	√	√	√	√	
14.	Fad	√		√		√	
15.	Jay	√			√	√	
16.	Ant	√			√	√	
17.	Hany	√			√	√	
18.	Guse	√	√	√	√	√	
19.	Lia	√			√	√	
20.	Popi	√		√	√	√	
21.	Sandy	√		√		√	
22.	Jimy	√		√		√	
23.	Hans	√		√	√	√	
24.	Bint	√		√		√	
25.	Dian	√			√	√	
26.	Vivi	√	√	√	√	√	
27.	Eri	√				√	
29.	Clay	√		√		√	

30.	Tania	√		√	√	√	
31.	Kiki	√	√	√	√	√	
32.	Lena	√	√	√	√	√	
33.	Magda	√		√		√	
34.	Yus	√		√		√	
35.	Fria	√			√	√	
36.	Opik	√		√	√	√	
37.	Gasha	√			√	√	
38.	Alan	√		√		√	
39.	Nola	√	√	√	√	√	
40.	Idar	√		√	√	√	
41.	Dava	√				√	
42.	Anam	√				√	
43.	Bily	√				√	
		43	11	30	22	37	6
						86%	14%

Table of score in cycle 2

No.	Name	Participation				Active	Passive
		1	2	3	4		
1.	Sis	√		√	√	√	
2.	Boy	√		√		√	
3.	Yan	√		√		√	
4.	Big	√	√	√		√	
5.	Jil	√		√		√	
6.	Sat	√				√	
7.	Ech	√		√		√	
8.	Aul	√	√	√	√	√	
9.	Caty	√	√	√	√	√	
10.	Vin	√	√	√		√	
11.	Did	√				√	
12.	Kay	√				√	
13.	Lea	√	√	√	√	√	
14.	Fad	√		√		√	
15.	Jay	√			√	√	
16.	Ant	√			√	√	
17.	Hany	√			√	√	
18.	Guse	√	√	√	√	√	
19.	Lia	√			√	√	
20.	Popi	√		√	√	√	
21.	Sandy	√		√		√	
22.	Jimy	√		√		√	
23.	Hans	√		√	√	√	
24.	Bint	√		√		√	
25.	Dian	√			√	√	
26.	Vivi	√	√	√	√	√	
27.	Eri	√				√	

29.	Clay	√		√		√	
30.	Tania	√		√	√	√	
31.	Kiki	√	√	√	√	√	
32.	Lena	√	√	√	√	√	
33.	Magda	√		√		√	
34.	Yus	√		√		√	
35.	Fria	√			√	√	
36.	Opik	√		√	√	√	
37.	Gasha	√			√	√	
38.	Alan	√		√		√	
39.	Nola	√	√	√	√	√	
40.	Idar	√		√	√	√	
41.	Dava	√				√	
42.	Anam	√				√	
43.	Bily	√				√	
		43	11	30	22	37	6
						86%	14%

The students' average score in writing ability:

$M = \frac{\text{The total scores of the students' writing result}}{\text{The total number of the students doing test}}$

$$M1 = \frac{3304}{43}$$

$$M1 = 77$$

The percentage of the students' writing ability by using mind mapping as follows:

$$E1 = \frac{n}{N} \times 100 \%$$

$$E1 = \frac{38}{43} \times 100\%$$

$$E1 = 88\%$$

The result said that the average score of writing ability got by students in this cycle two was 77 and it had been achieved by 88% of the students. This means that the score of the students' writing ability in the cycle two had better improvement than that in the first cycle. It improved from 71 in the first cycle up to

77 in the second cycle. Moreover, the percentage of the students' writing ability had been improved from 63% up to 88% of the students. It means that the target score (at least 75 and reached by 85% of the students) of writing ability had improved.

Table: The score percentage of cycle 1 and cycle 2

Type of students	Circle 1		Cycle 2	
	Percentage	students	Percentage	students
Active	63%	27	86%	37
passive	37%	16	14%	6

Discussion

The result of writing test through mind mapping in the cycle 1 presented in the table above shows only 63% (27) of students who get score at least (75). It means that the action given to the students in the cycle I had not been successful. The criteria of the success of the action is determined at last 85% of the students reached score 75. However, the first action done had actually made good point. Based on the data, the previous mean score for writing test was 68, while in the first action the mean score has improved into 71. It means it had made 3 points improvement.

Then, the second action was given to the students by revising the teaching media of the action cycle. using colourful mind mapping given by the teacher, and also revise the implementation of teaching and learning processes by asking them to create their own mind mapping to conduct the action in the cycle 2. The revised teaching media of writing was the use of colourful mind mapping concept and by asking the students to create their own mind mapping.

The result of writing test through mind mapping in cycle 2 indicated that more than 85% of the students reached score 75. It means that the second cycle had

improved the students' writing ability. Compared to the result of cycle I there is an increase or improvement of the students' writing ability in the cycle II.

Also, from the observation checklist, it be concluded that the participation of the students (active or passive) was increased from 63% (27) of students to 86% (37) of students. It means that the mind mapping concept made them more enthusiastic.

The result suggests that the application of mind mapping in teaching writing can enhance grade seven students' writing ability of MTs Tahfizh Al Madinah Malang. The use of mind mapping can also motivate the students to express their ideas through writing. It means that the use of mind mapping in teaching writing is effective to improve the students' writing ability. In other words, mind mapping is considered as one of useful media which provide valuable assistance to students and they are well suited to encourage students' participation and motivation in all the activities during the writing lesson, especially in writing descriptive text.

The result of this classroom action research suggest that the use of mind mapping is quite effective to develop the students' writing ability in descriptive text. The improvement was interpreted as the result of mind mapping factors involved by the students during the learning process, and the students' motivation when joining English writing class. Generally, the students showed improvement in writing descriptive text by using mind mapping. This was indicated from the students' responses in cycle one and cycle two. It could be seen from the mean score of the questionnaire cycle one was 27 students so the criteria were passive. It could be concluded that the students experienced problems in writing class. It made the researcher try to apply Mind Mapping technique to make the students responses be more positive. And the result of the cycle one was 27 it could be

categorized as a passive. On the other hand, the mean score of cycle 2 was 37 and it could be categorized as active.

The result of cycle one was not successful. It was caused some factors. The first, some of the students did not asking question more. The second, the students did not answer question more. In the seventh grade, the students must able to make descriptive text. Depdiknas 2013 in Sumiati (2021) states that the students in seventh grade in junior high school must ably writing in descriptive text. Unfortunately, in learning writing, they never used mind mapping as a technique. So, they have difficulty how to deliver their ideas in written form actively.

The result of cycle two was successful. It was success because the researcher effort to solved the problem. The first, the researcher gave the keywords as vocabularies for making them easier to find the vocabulary related the question of the topic. The second, the researcher guided the students in detail how to make mind mapping completely and clearly. The third, the researcher asked the students to understand gram-mar together, especially adjective and so on. Its similar with the research did by Sumiati, et.all (2021). "Improving The Students' Writing Skill in Descriptive Text Using Mind Mapping". Their research indicated that the implementation of mind mapping was successful in improving the students writing skill. So, the researcher concluded that mind mapping is very useful and easy to help the students in learning writing descriptive text. The students could express their ideas actively. Thus, mind mapping also be the best solution for the students' problem in writing.

Beside the research did by Sumiati, et.all (2021) the researcher also noticed the similarity of this study with research did by Sapitri, et.all (2019). "The Use of Mind Mapping Technique to Increase EFL Students' Motivation in Writing. The

object of the study was Junior High School. It conducted at eight-grade students. They did it by qualitative research method. Their research indicated that mind mapping also very helpful in increasing the students' motivation in writing descriptive text.

It also has the similarity with the research did by Sugiharti, et.all(2020). "Students' writing ability In Writing Descriptive Text By Using Mind Mapping Technique (A classroom Action Research In Class X-A UPW)". They conducted classroom action research used mind mapping technique. And the research method was classroom action research. They did two cycles; it was meant that the first cycle was not satisfied enough after doing reflecting so they did the second cycle. But it has the differences, Sugiharti et.all conducted their research at senior high school. Although it has different object, at the conclusion of the research, they said that the mind mapping technique could improve students' writing ability in descriptive text.

CONCLUSSION

In general, based on the findings and the discussion presented in this research, it can be concluded that the use of mind mapping as teaching media is helpful to improve the first-year students' writing ability of MTs Tahfizh Al Madinah. It was proven by the result of writing test through mind mapping which showed there was an increase of the students who reached scores at least 75 from 63% (27) of students in the cycle I to 88% (37) of students in the cycle II.

In particular, the application of mind mapping was effective to improve the students' ability in writing. It can stimulate and motivate students to write and lead them to develop their own interpretation about the people or events involved. It can also enhance the students' activeness during the class. They become more

active in asking and answering questions. They paid more attention, and they had willingness to write English. But, the teachers must remember theories in enjoyable way to prevent students' boredom and the mind mapping used are appropriate to the material that is going to be thought.

REFERENCES

- Amaniarsih, Meidarabia, Nurmahyuniasrul 2020. Improving students' writing skill of Descriptive Paragraph Through Mind Mapping, Method. Medan :Potensi Utama University
- Beti Sugiharti, Sudirman, GedeSukerama 2020. Writing Ability in Writing Descrptive Text By Using Mapping Technique. Singaraja :Ganesha University of Language and Art Faculty
- Buzan, T. 2005. Brand Child. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Buzan, T. & Buzan, B. 1993. The Mind Map Book. London : BBC Worldwide Limited.
- DEDIKNAS. 2006. Panduan PengembanganSilabus Mata Pelajaran Bahasa InggrisSekolahMenengah Atas. Jakarta: DirektoratPembinaanSekolah Menengah.
- Elliot, J. 1993. Action Research For educational Change, Philadelphia: Open University Press
- Gie, 2002. Trampil Mengarang.Jogjakarta: Penerbit Andi.
- Hughes, A. 1989. Testing For Language Teacher. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Leni Sapitri. 2019. The use of Mind Mapping Technique to increase EFL Students' Motivation in Writting. Ciamis : Universitas Galuh Ciamis.
- Sumiati, Rayanto, Mabaroh. 2021. Improving The Students' Writing Skill in Descriptive Text Using Mind Mapping. Pasuruan: Universitas PGRI Wiranegara Pasuruan
- Nunan, David. 1994. Research Method in Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sumiati, Rayanto, Mabaroh. 2021. Improving The Students' Writing Skill in Descriptive Text Using Mind Mapping. Pasuruan: Universitas PGRI Wiranegara Pasuruan

Suwandi, Sarwiji, 2009. Classroom Action Research (CAR) and scientific Writing, Surakarta: 13th Teacher Certification Committee FKIP UNS Surakarta.