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ABSTRACT


This research is aimed at identifying the effectiveness of mind mapping and peer-editing to improve students’ writing skill and knowing the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching learning process.

The research was conducted from January to February 2011. It was conducted in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of four steps: planning, implementing the action, observing, and doing reflection. To collect qualitative data, the researcher used field notes, diaries, recordings, photographs, interviews, questionnaires, and documents. To collect quantitative data, the researcher conducted tests before and after the research implementation. To analyze the qualitative data, the researcher conducted five stages: (1) assembling the data, (2) coding the data, (3) comparing the data, (4) building interpretation, and (5) reporting outcomes. To analyze the quantitative data, the researcher used the mean scores of the test.

The research findings are described in line with the problem statements as follows: first, mind mapping and peer-editing improve the students’ writing skill, especially on the aspects of content, organization of ideas, and language features. This is proved by the significant increase of the mean score of the post-test cycle 1 and post-test cycle 2. Second, those techniques cover on the planning stage and revising stage in the process of writing. As the result, there is no missing stage from pre-writing to post-writing. Moreover, during the teaching learning process using mind mapping and peer-editing techniques, the students showed their better attitudes towards the implementation of those techniques. They were also actively involved in the teaching-learning process.

Based on the explanation above, it is concluded that the use of mind mapping and peer-editing improve the students’ writing skill. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers use mind mapping and peer-editing as the techniques in teaching writing.

Keywords: mind mapping, peer-editing, writing skill.
ABSTRAK


Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi keefektifan mind mapping dan peer-editing untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa dan untuk mengetahui penerapan mind mapping dan peer-editing dalam proses belajar mengajar.

Penelitian tindakan kelas ini dilaksanakan pada bulan Januari sampai Februari 2011. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan dalam dua siklus. Setiap siklus terdiri dari empat tahapan: perencanaan, penerapan, observasi, dan refleksi. Teknik pengumpulan data kualitatif yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah catatan lapangan, diari, rekaman, foto, interview, kuesioner, dan dokumen. Untuk data kuantitatif, teknik yang digunakan adalah dengan nilai rata-rata ujian menulis siswa yang dilaksanakan sebelum dan sesudah penerapan kedua teknik tersebut. Teknik analisis data kualitatif yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini terdiri dari lima tahapan: (1) mengumpulkan data, (2) memberikan kode, (3) membandingkan data, (4) menginterpretasikan hasil, (5) melaporkan hasil penelitian. Untuk data kuantitatif, teknik analisis yang digunakan adalah dengan membandingkan nilai rata-rata ujian menulis siswa.


Berdasarkan hasil penelitian ini, dapat disimpulkan bahwa penggunaan mind mapping dan peer-editing meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa. Oleh karena itu, direkomendasikan bahwa para guru menggunakan mind mapping dan peer-editing sebagai teknik dalam mengajar menulis.

Kata kunci: mind mapping, peer-editing, menulis.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Background of Study

One of the objectives of teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia is to develop communicative competence in oral and written form in the target language. The Content Standard also regulates students to attain informational literacy level, that is, a level where the students are able to use language to comprehend and/or to produce some kind of texts either orally or written (Standar Isi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMA, 2006). It means that writing is one of the language skills that the students should master.

Besides, Raimes (1983: 3) argues that the goal of teaching writing is not only to make the students easier to communicate each other in writing, but teaching writing also helps the students learn. It can be realized by the process of writing itself in which they are reinforced to use the correct grammatical structure, vocabulary, and idioms that they have learnt. It means that the students have a chance to be adventurous in writing. The students absolutely need to involve in the new language either their effort to express their ideas or the constant use of eyes, hand, and brain that becomes a unique way to reinforce learning.

Writing skill is as important as speaking and other skills, but it still does not get enough attention and proper time allocation in teaching and learning process. Byrne in Mattews, et. al. (1989: 89) explains that most teachers consider that class time should be almost entirely devoted to develop oral skills, such as the activities that closely linked to some forms of oral activity. Therefore, writing is often conveniently given to the students as an out-of-class activity which is done in students’ own time and pace without any clear instruction and monitor from the teacher. However, lack of teacher’s monitors on the process of the students’ writing activity can cause a lot of problems in the students’ writing skill since writing is considered as a complex activity by many experts.
Harris (1993: 6) states that writing is regarded as the most complex one compared with the other three skills because the relationships between sentences operate at several levels. It involves many aspects such as paragraph development, mechanics, and organization of content and it demands standard form of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary. Similarly, Byrne (1997: 5) argues that in writing, writers have to learn how to organize their ideas in such a way that they can be understood by a reader who is not present and perhaps by a reader who is not known to them. He also adds that writing is a task which is often imposed on writers themselves, perhaps by circumstances. It may also cause a problem in terms of content—what to say. So, being at a loss to write down the ideas is a familiar experience for most of novice writers when they are obligated to write, but for expert writers, it is not (Flower and Hayes’ in Johnston, 1996: 349).

In addition, writing seems to pose great problem for English language students. According to Rosen in Hedge (1998: 5), it is as the part of the nature of writing itself. As Rosen points out, writing is detached from the wide range of expressive possibilities in speech. A writer is unable to exploit all the devices available to a speaker: gesture, body movement, facial expression, pitch and tone of voice, stress, and hesitation.

Therefore, as Brookes and Grundy (1991: 1) state that the skill of writing in a second language needs separate and special attention, students can not be let alone in doing writing activity without clear instruction and guidelines or procedures even when the reason is the limited time that the teacher has during the teaching learning process. It means that teaching writing is of course not easy. The teacher has to be able to find interesting writing activity that promotes students’ writing skill.

Yet, based on the pre-research conducted on the first grade of SMA N I Karanganyar and the pre-test conducted in the class X. 1 as the subject of this research, the researcher found some problems dealing with the first grade students’ writing skill. First, they realized that it was not too difficult to express their ideas as long as they know the background of what they had to write down. However, the text they produced was still in unwell-organized text. It was difficult
for them to write down their ideas in a well-organized written work. They did not know actually what they had to write in the beginning of writing itself while they only had a very limited time to do their writing.

Moreover, the result of the pre-test showed that there were still many errors in the students’ writing. Some of the errors pointed to unfamiliarity with the language itself in which they led to errors in lexical and grammatical system. So, it was still difficult for them to complete this activity in an appropriate form. It means that they have not been able to produce a good writing and it resulted in their writing which was still far from the expectation.

Furthermore, the students responded negatively when the teacher asked them to do writing. They have to deal with many aspects of writing when they are producing a text. It means that most of them are not too interested in writing since they think that it is a complex activity.

In fact, some techniques and approaches have been implemented in teaching writing. Based on the interview with the English teacher, the text book is often used to teach writing and other language skills and she sometimes used songs to teach English, especially in teaching writing. Clearly, they gave good impression when the teacher introduced them to a song, but later they still responded negatively when the teacher asked them to start doing writing based on the song they had listened. As the result, it had not given significant contribution in the students’ writing skill since there was still lack of monitoring and controlling by the teacher during writing.

To cope with the problem above, the researcher proposes the use of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching writing skill on the consideration that it can facilitate the teacher to monitor the process of the students’ writing activity and to make it easier for the students to organize the ideas without leaving out other aspects of writing like grammatical system and mechanics.

Mind mapping introduced in the 1960s by Buzan, is a graphical technique of taking notes or representing thoughts or ideas in a visual manner. Mind maps are structured around one central concept, word or idea, with branches and sub-branches of related ideas (Ellozy, 2010: 635). A good mind map also
shows the overall structure of the topic, and lines and pictures which can be an interesting pre-writing technique for students since it provides some attractive visualization. It helps the students to plan and to organize their ideas first before they start writing.

Meanwhile, peer-editing can be conducted as a technique after the students finish their writing. It can be a fascinating adventure since the students can either take and give feedback or learn to be better writer and reader. Peer-editing is believed that it is a true sharing process in writing (Brown, 2001: 353). In this activity the students can check the use or grammatical system, vocabulary, and mechanics in their writing.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher is interested to carry out the research about writing entitled “THE USE OF MIND MAPPING AND PEER-EDITING TO IMPROVE STUDENTS’ WRITING SKILL (A Classroom Action Research Conducted at the Tenth Grade Students of SMA N I Karanganyar in the Academic Year of 2010/2011).”

B. Problem Limitation

To avoid deviation from the topic, this research is focused on improving writing skill on the tenth grade students of SMA N I Karanganyar by using mind mapping and peer-editing. The writing skill that is observed in this research is limited on narrative text as stated in Content Standard.

C. Problem Statements

Regarding to the title of the research and explanation on the background above, the writer formulates some questions as follow:
1. Can the mind mapping and peer-editing techniques improve the students’ writing skill?
2. How is the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching learning process?
D. The Objectives of the Research

The objectives of this study are to know:

1. whether mind mapping and peer-editing techniques can improve the students’ writing skill or not, and
2. the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching learning process.

E. The Benefits of the Research

The results of this research are expected to give significant contributions to students and English teacher.

1. The students
   a. It is easier for the students to organize their ideas by using mind mapping, so that they are trained to make a well-organized text.
   b. In peer-editing activity, the students are trained to be better writer and reader by composing writing and correcting each other.

2. The English teachers
   a. The teacher can give clear direction and guidelines in teaching writing to the students.
   b. The teacher can control and monitor the students’ writing activity.
   c. It encourages the teacher to develop their creativity to improve teaching learning process.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. The Nature of Writing

1. Definition of Writing

Harmer (1998: 79) states that writing is a skill and he argues that teaching writing has a very important reason since it is a basic language skill, just as important as speaking, listening, and reading. Students need to know how to write letters, how to put written reports together, how to reply to an advertisement – and increasingly, how to write story, message, or other kinds of text either in the form of hand-written or typed by using electronic media. The students also need to know some of writing’s special conventions (punctuation, paragraph construction, etc.), just as they need to know how to pronounce spoken English appropriately.

Meanwhile, in writing, Hedge (1998: 5) makes a comparison with speech, in which effective writing requires a number of things; a high degree of organization in the development of ideas and information; a high degree of accuracy so that there is no ambiguity of meaning; the use of complex grammatical devices for focus and emphasis; and a careful choice of vocabulary, grammatical patterns, and sentence structures to create a style which is appropriate to the subject matter and the eventual readers.

Then, Byrne (1997: 1) defines writing as the act of forming letters or combination of letters: making marks on flat surface of some kind but it is more than the production of graphic symbols, just as speech is more than the production of the sound. The symbols have to be arranged according to certain conventions to form words, and words have to be arranged to form sentences. Nevertheless, it then does not stop here. In writing, a writer does not just write one sentence or a number of unrelated sentences. The writer has to be able to
produce a sequence of sentences arranged in a particular order and linked together in certain ways, so that they will form a coherent whole.

Meanwhile, Raimes (1983: 6) shows what writers have to deal with as they are producing a piece of writing in a diagram as follows:

In addition, May (1996: 61) states that in writing, success usually requires completing the task set with accurate grammar, spelling, and punctuation; adequate vocabulary; suitable layout and clear handwriting; cohesion within a text; and a style appropriate to the context. According to Celce-Murcia (2001: 206), writing is the ability to express one’s ideas in writing in a second or foreign language with reasonable coherence and accuracy.

From those statements, it comes to a conclusion that writing is a process to express idea, opinion, feeling which are arranged into letters, words, then sentences based on particular rules. The rules are concerning with some aspects such as content, grammar, adequate vocabulary, mechanics, and organization within a text which has certain meaning so that it is
understandable for others as a means of communication between writer and readers. Aspect of content is about the ability to think creatively and develop thoughts, excluding all irrelevant information. Organization is the logical order of sentences; it involves unity and coherence. Vocabulary is the ability to choose and use wide range of proper words, and idioms. Language use is the ability to apply sentence structure and other grammatical features. Mechanical aspect is the ability to use punctuation, capitalization, and spelling correctly.

2. Micro Skills of Writing

Brown (2004: 221) states that there are some micro skills as the ultimate criterion in writing which must be fulfilled by the students if they are going to produce a good text. First, the students have to be able to produce graphemes and orthographic patterns of English. In doing this, the students also have to produce it at an efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose. In this case, they are wished to consider about the time provided.

Next, they have to use the appropriate vocabularies in the text. Grammatical system also becomes an important aspect in producing writing. They also can modify the expression that they want to state in different grammatical form.

The last micro skill is using cohesive devices in written discourse. Reid (1993: 36) states that cohesion is defined as more limited term: specific words and phrases (transition, pronoun, repetition of key words and phrases) that tie prose together and direct reader. It means that the students have to be able to make well-organized sentences which resulted in a well-organized text too. Therefore, the text is able to express what the writer is going to say and be a communicative text.

3. The Process of Writing

Harris (1993: 46) states that the process of writing is considered in three stages. The first stage is as assembling strategies, the second stage is as creating and developing the text, and the last stage is as editing.
Then, he (1993: 61) gives more detail explanation about writing process that in the first step, assembling strategies, consists of some classroom activities such as listing questions, brainstorming, research (including reading and note-making), diagrams, planning (using grids and planning sheets), considering text type, purpose, and readership.

Next, creating and developing the text are considered as the second step which consists of some classroom activities too such as drafting using “cut and paste” techniques for revising text, provisional responses from readers (teacher and response-partners), reconsidering text type, purpose and readership. The last step is editing whose classroom activities are like making a final draft, careful reading/proof-reading of text, publication.

In line with the ideas above, Brookes and Grundy (1991: 7) state that writing is an activity made up of several processes, such as thinking what to write and the order to put in it. Meanwhile, they (p. 9) argue that there is no agreed list of writing process among researchers and event less agreement about exactly what the writing curriculum should consist of. However, they have extracted a common core for use in describing the activities; that are, three pre-writing processes, planning, targeting and organizing, and the four in-writing processes, drafting, evaluating, editing, and rewriting.

According to Silva in Brookes and Grundy (1991: 8), during the process of writing, the teacher’s role is to help students develop viable strategies for getting started (finding topics, generating ideas and information, focusing, and planning structure and procedure), for drafting (encouraging multiple drafts), for revising (adding, deleting, modifying, and rearranging ideas) and for editing (attending to vocabulary, sentence structure, grammar, and mechanics).

Based on some points of view above, it can be seen that generally, the process of writing is considered in following stages:

Pre-writing → Whilst-writing → Post-writing
4. The Purpose of Writing

Harris (1993: 18) states that the purpose of the text is its communicative function. It can be intended to entertain, inform, instruct, persuade, explain, argue a case, or present argument. Similarly, Brookes and Grundy (1991: 3) state that the purposes of writing are considered into three points. First, it is to give information to someone we can not presently talk to. Thus, writing allows us to transcend time or space.

Then, writing can solve the problem of volume of having to store more than the human brain can remember. Recently, people believe that writing is useful to store the information reliably. It can be seen in modern industrialized society where written form is the most convenient for storing the sheer information.

The last purpose of writing according to Brookes and Grundy (1991: 4) is to filter and shape our experience. When we write, we think about what to write and how to represent our experience. Indeed, we may well find that writing helps us to come to terms with our experience and understand it better. A further filter will be found when we edit what we have written. Then as well as filtering, we compose. That is, we consider how to present what we want to communicate – with what purpose, for which reader (s), and in what order.

Furthermore, Byrne (1997: 6) says that there are five pedagogical purposes of writing as follows:

a. The introduction and practice of some forms of writing enable us to provide different learning styles and needs.

b. Written work serves to provide the learners with some tangible evidence that they are making progress in the language.

c. Exposure to the foreign language through more than one medium, especially if skills are properly integrated, appears to be more effective than relying on a single medium alone.

d. Writing provides variety in classroom activities, serving as a break from oral work.

e. Writing is often needed for formal and informal testing.
Based on those statements above, it can be said that the purpose of writing itself means the intentions of the writer writes. Some purposes of writing generally can be seen as follows:

a. to entertain the reader;

b. to give information; meaning that the writers can use writing to be the media to send message or to give information to whom we can not presently talk to; and

c. to be one of the evidences whether the students are making progress or no when they are learning foreign language.

5. Types of Scoring Writing

In writing, generally, there are two basic types of grading, analytic and holistic. Each of them has different purposes, though both of them can be useful for evaluating students' writing. When the teacher uses the analytic scoring, it means that the scoring separates various factors and skills, so that it can be used to diagnose writing strengths and weaknesses by both of the teacher and the students. Meanwhile, using the second basic type of grading, that is holistic scoring; the teacher can neither diagnose problems nor prescribe remedies for writing (Reid, 1993: 235).

In this research, the researcher used the analytic scoring in evaluating students' writing. She used the Composition Profile in *Testing ESL Writing: A Practical Approach* introduced by H. Jacobs in Reid (1993: 236)-237) as the analytical scales for ESL writing which becomes the most widely used. The ESL composition profile is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-27</td>
<td>EXCELENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable, substantive, development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-22</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: sure knowledge of subject, adequate rang, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic but lacks detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-17</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-13</td>
<td>VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Language Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-18</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/ supported, succinct, well-organized, logical sequencing, cohesive</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range, effective word/ idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective, complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-14</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range, occasional errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions, minor problems in complex constructions, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, preposition, but meaning seldom obscured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-10</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks of logical sequencing and development</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: limited range, frequent errors of work/ idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/ complex construction, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>VERY POOR: does not communicate, no organization, or not enough to evaluate</td>
<td>VERY POOR: essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate</td>
<td>VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate, or not enough to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the analytical scales for ESL writing above, it can be summed up that the total score is 100 which are described in following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspects of writing</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Language Use/ Grammar</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The Review on Mind Mapping

1. Definition of Mind Mapping

There are some experts who define mind mapping either as a technique of pre-writing activity or as a media or a tool that can be used in teaching learning process. As a technique in teaching writing, mind mapping can be implemented as the pre-writing activity for note-making before writing; in other words, scribbling down ideas about the topic and developing those ideas as the mind makes associations (Hedge, 1998: 30). Furthermore, Lane in Tucker, et. al. in [www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09264.pdf](http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09264.pdf) describes a mind mapping as a technique that stimulates creativity while allowing for clear distinctions between each thought.
As the media in teaching writing, Buzan & Buzan (2000) in hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/31749 defines that mind mapping can be used as a thinking tool which can be applied in numerous daily human activities, including writing and is an innovative approach to organize ideas in writing. Meanwhile, Tucker, et. al. in www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09264.pdf states that mind mapping is a visual tool used to organize and relate themes or objectives.

Then, Buzan in Tucker, et. al. makes a guideline that mind maps, which incorporate pictures and different colors bring ideas to life. A good mind map shows the overall structure of the topic or problem and lines and pictures. Here, Wycoff (1991) summarizes Buzan’s guidelines as: “A central focus or graphic representation of the problem is placed in the center of a page; ideas are allowed to flow freely without judgment; key words are used to represent ideas; one key word or words are printed per line; key words are connected to the central focus with lines; color is used to highlight and emphasize ideas; and images and symbols are used to highlight ideas and stimulate the mind to make connections.”

Then, as the psychology author who developed mind mapping as a technique, Buzan (2009:4) defines mind mapping as the easiest way to put information into and out of the brain, so it is the most effective and creative way and literally will “map” our brain. He also argues that mind map is very simple. A mind map is similar with a map of a city where the core is like the centre of activity. It means that the most important is the creation of the map represents an “idea” that is placed in the centre of mind map. Then, this main idea can radiate outwards by creating curved branches by forming linkages to other related thoughts or ideas. So, the student is allowed to freely access his/her own thinking processes in assigning a word to describe each branch that relates to the main idea.

Based on some opinions above, it can be concluded that mind mapping actually can be in the form of both the media and the technique in teaching writing, especially in planning before the students start to write a text. In this research, mind mapping is especially used to be the technique as the
pre-writing activity. Using mind mapping in pre-writing activity can be conducted to organize some ideas of the topic without leaving the students’ creativity. The students are free to explore their ideas which are still linked to the topic.

2. The Strengths and Weaknesses of Mind Mapping

Making a mind map should be a spontaneous pre-writing activity. Students start with a topic at the centre and then generate a web of ideas from that, developing and relating these ideas as their mind makes associations. As Michalko (2001: 55) says that in mind mapping, there will be organizational ideas which still based on the topic at the centre. He also adds (p.61) that mind mapping can force people to concentrate on his/her subject. It means that during mapping, he/she will always focus on the subject.

Mind maps which work well as their visual design enable students to see the relationship between ideas, and encourage them to group certain ideas together as they proceed. Mind mapping activity will work well when it is conducted in groups, since the discussion this engenders aids the production of ideas, and makes the task livelier and more enjoyable.

Ogawa in http://www.sucra.saitama-u.ac.jp states that the most important part of writing is the starting point for a student. The mind map can link the central idea to supporting branches of thought, and thus, bring the student forward into the next stages of the writing process.

Murley (2007: 176) defines that mind maps offer several advantages over traditional outlines. The radiating design keeps the main topic, with all its major subtopics close to it. Similarly, sub-subtopics stay close to their topics. This arrangement keeps the big picture in focus and makes relationships and connections easier to see. Mind mapping encourages creativity because it is more flexible than outlining.

On the contrary, Eppler (2010) defines that there are some weaknesses in using mind mapping technique in writing. Mind mapping tends to be idiosyncratic or the map produced may be hard to read by others because it is
peculiar to an individual, especially an odd or a usual one. Here, it is also stated that mind mapping can become overly complex (loss of big picture).

Prompted from the explanations above, the strengths and weaknesses of mind mapping can be listed in the following diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mind Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is an association between the ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It can be the starting point or the planning before the students start to write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It encourages students’ creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It makes the task livelier and more enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Hand-drawn Mind Maps and Mind Mapping Software**

Tucker, et. al. in [www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09264.pdf](http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09264.pdf) states that there are two kinds of mind mapping which can be used as the media in pre-writing. They are hand-drawn maps and mind mapping software. Both of them have their own characteristics.

Some users can get some advantages by using hand-drawn mind maps. They actually have no cost. Using this kind of mind mapping, the user will not find any restriction on map design and layout. The users can also create map anytime with very simple tools, just like pencil and paper. Nevertheless, the users can not digitally store other than as a scanned document. There is also limited size in map.

Meanwhile, the use of mind mapping software does have characteristics over hand-draw mind maps. Using this, the users can link to other information such as hyperlinks and notes. They also can modify and filter the map easily. Creating templates is easy to do and there is also no size limits. On the other hand, the use of mind mapping software has high cost since there
is very rare free software. It also requires a computer access. Sometimes, map sharing is restricted due to the format incompatibility.

4. How to Map the Ideas

As stated before that there are two kinds of mind mapping; hand-drawn mind maps and mind mapping software. Here, in pre-writing activity, the procedures in implementing them are basically similar since all mind maps have the same characteristics. All of them use multiple colors, lines, symbols, images, codes, keywords, and dimensions to relate thoughts or ideas. Here, the students are allowed to freely access his/ her own thinking processes in assigning a word to describe each branch that relates to the main idea (Buzan, 2005: 5).

However, Buzan (2005: 15-16) makes clear stages in making a mind map which belongs to hand-drawn mind maps because the user need paper, pen, color pens, brain, and imaginations. The procedures are as follows:

a. Start at the center of a blank page turned sideways. This will allow for the student’s mind to spread out in all directions. The key is to allow students to express themselves more freely and naturally.

b. Create an image or picture in the middle of the mind map. The reason is that the central image makes the mind map more interesting, and keeps the student focused on making the necessary associations for viewing.

c. The use of colors is important for mind maps. The brain is stimulated by colors, and adds a vibrancy and life to the mind map. A mind map should be fun, and will add to a student’s creative energy.

d. After creating a colorful image at the center of the mind map, it is time to connect the central image with second, third and even fourth level branches that move outward from the center. This is important to do because according to Buzan, a person’s brain works by association. The mind likes to link two, three or four things together as a grouping.
e. Create the branches to curve rather than making straight, outward arrows. This allows the student’s brain to absorb the interesting patterns of associations.

f. Use one key word per line because a single word gives more power to a person’s individualized associations. This will help spark more words, new ideas, and vivid thoughts. Phrases will dampen the triggering effect to create more connecting thoughts. One word is sufficient and can produce more branches from the core.

g. Continue to draw images when there is an urge to create one at a particular branch. The more images on one’s mind map, the better it is for a student. According to Buzan, the mind will make the natural associations that are a part of our learning process as a grouping. This can provide a substantial amount of information to start the next phase of the writing process.

From those steps, it can be summed up that mind map can be firstly created by starting from the central idea and works on the expansion of the main idea. It is then branched out by students’ own ideas. Students should be given the freedom to plan with their own sense of creativity. They are free to draw some images, use some colors while making connections between ideas by using curve arrows. The mind maps produced at first may be rough and unstructured or even messy. With constant practice and encouragement, students would gradually get used to plan with clearer and organized mind maps.

Besides hand-drawn mind maps, some mind mapping software can also be used to mind map the ideas by easy operation. They can be used effectively to organize large amounts of information, combining spatial organization, and node folding. There are a number of mind mapping programs available in the internet. One of them is FreeMind. It is an open-source mind mapping software, freely available from the FreeMind Web site (http://freemind.sourceforge.net/wiki/index.php/Mind_Page). This software does an acceptable job of creating mind maps, which can be exported to PDF, JPG, PNG, HTML, and XHTML.
C. Review on Peer-Editing

1. Definition of Peer-Editing

In teaching writing, a common activity in a process oriented curriculum is a peer-review technique, during which students read each other drafts and make suggestions for revision. Sometimes, it is called as peer-editing or peer-correction (Mangelsdorf, 1992: 274). He argues that for beginning English students, peer-editing technique usually consists of a group of three or four students reading or listening to a peer's draft and commenting on what they find most interesting, what they want to know more about, where they are confused, and so on—the types of response that naturally emerge from a discussion of a writer's ideas. The writers then use these responses to decide how to revise their writing.

Celce-Murcia (2001: 244) suggests that whenever possible, the students' own writing can be used for exercise for students to do peer-editing. The students can analyze their peer’s writing about some aspects, such as organization of the text, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Similarly, Ruso in Rivers (1996: 84) defines that in writing, the students can exchange compositions and correct each other’s errors, at least indicate them. Alternatively, students can discuss each other’s work in order to arrive at the best possible solution to a grammar or vocabulary problem.

As a conclusion, peer-editing, in fact, can be the post-writing activity, in which the students can practice to be the reader of their classmate’s writing after they finish their drafting. During this kind of activity, the students are supposed to analyze, criticize, and edit what comes to be inappropriate in their peer’s writing, whether its sentence structure, organization of the text, or content.
2. The Strengths and Weaknesses in Using Peer-Editing

As some researchers have noted, the peer-editing has the potential to be a powerful learning activity. Mittan in Mangelsdorf (1992: 275) has written that peer-editing achieves the strengths as follow:

a. to provide students with an authentic audience; increase students’ motivation for writing,
b. to enable students to receive different views on their writing,
c. to help students learn to read critically their own writing,
d. to assist students in gaining confidence in their writing, and
e. to use oral language skills.

Meanwhile, peer-editing can be conducted as a technique after the students finish their drafting. It can be a fascinating adventure since the students can either take and give feedback or learn to be better writer and reader. Peer-editing is believed that it is a true sharing process in writing (Brown, 2001: 353). In this activity the students can check the use or grammatical system, vocabulary, and mechanics in their writing.

Furthermore, Hedge (1998: 159) believes that in the process of writing, peer-editing has several advantages. The editing takes place immediately after the writing, which makes it meaningful and useful to the writer. Practice in suggesting corrections in their classmates’ work can help students to organize errors in their own. When they have to explain points to their partner, their own understanding is redefined and clarified. It then requires them to think carefully about clarity and acceptability in writing.

Nevertheless, based osn Mangelsdorf’s study about peer-editing (1992: 280), it is believed that according to many of the students, peer-editing or peer-review has neither helped them to be responsible for their improvement, nor to be confident in their ability to criticize a text. The problem is that these students do not think that they, or their peers, could be good critics. He (p. 283) also adds that peer-editing takes patience—from both students and teachers. It is natural that students are skeptical about relying on each other for advice, when eventually they will be graded by the teacher. It
also happens that the first one or two times the students complete peer-editing, their responses to each other might be partly inadequate.

Finally, it can be summed up that peer-editing which is implemented as one of the post-writing activities has either strengths or weaknesses as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-Editing</th>
<th>The Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Strengths</td>
<td>- helps the students learn to read critically;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- helps the students to organize errors in their writing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- increases their motivation and confidence in their writing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- emerges the students to think carefully about the clarity and the acceptability in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weaknesses</td>
<td>- Not all students think that they could be good critics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Both the students and the teacher need patience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Teaching Writing by Using Mind Mapping and Peer-Editing

A set of prescriptions on what teachers and learners should do in the language classroom is a common thing to all methods used in teaching learning process. Prescriptions for the teacher include what material should be presented and when it should be taught and how, and prescriptions for learners include what approach they should take toward learning. The teacher’s job is to match his or her teaching style as well as the learners’ learning style to the method. It means that the teacher has an authority to combine or even to modify some techniques which are suitable for students’ ability and the condition of language classroom itself (Richards, 1997:36).

In the process of teaching writing, mind mapping and peer-editing are able to be combined as the techniques applied during the process of writing as a whole which has been discussed in the previous explanation that consists of pre-writing, drafting, revising and editing. During teaching and learning process in a
writing class, Steele in [www.teachingenglish.org.uk](http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk) explains that there are six stages in implementing both mind mapping and peer-editing as the part of writing processes as follows:

1. Choosing a topic

   Traditionally, students are given a topic to write on by the teacher. However, with certain classes, students may prefer to nominate the topic themselves. This can lead to greater interest in the task on the part of the student, as well as, perhaps, greater knowledge of the topic under study.

   Mind mapping technique can be used to explore almost any topics, though discursive essays and narrative work particularly well as they front students' ideas and lend them to discus ideas in groups.

2. Note making

   Once the topic has been introduced, teacher encourages the students to close their eyes and think about it for a minute or two, in silence. They then have two minutes in which to note down their ideas. If they do not know a word in English, they can write it in first language at this stage, as dictionaries or too much teacher intervention tend to halt and inhibit the creative flow.

   Then, working in groups, they can compare and discuss their ideas, perhaps adding to their mind maps as they go. This stage also provides the opportunity for peer teaching, as other students may be available to provide the English word for the idea that was noted down in first language.

3. Feedback

   The next stage, in which the teacher makes a collective mind map on the board, is optional, but it is useful for students who are new to the idea of mind maps, or for weak classes. It is also in this feedback stage that any remaining language problems can be ironed out. As the teacher elicits students’ ideas, and reformulates expressions or corrects, students will learn how to express their ideas in English. Such personalization is said to aid vocabulary learning.

   The map is fluid and changeable, and new connections or subgroups can be made, or branches added, as the students make suggestions. The end
result should be an organized display of information, showing the central topic, and a number of subtopics and further points that stem from it.

4. Organizing mind maps

In the next stage, the students organize their mind maps into a linear format to decide the best way to present their points. They should first think about the overall structure, for example the order in which to relay the information, and then focus on the precise function each paragraph will have in their final text, as this helps to clarify their writing. This can be done in groups or as a class with the teacher leading the discussion.

5. Writing and peer-editing

Students should then begin to write, next work in pairs if they wish. After finishing, they should exchange their writings so they become readers of each other’s work. This allows for feedback from their peer and possible re-writing.

Once they have finished, they should again exchange their texts. This gives their texts a communicative purpose, as well as developing an awareness of the fact that a writer is always producing something to be read by someone else, rather than for the display of writing alone.

6. Continuation

Once students are familiar with the idea of making mind maps and doing peer-editing, they can be encouraged to use this skill for further writing activities.

Based on the steps above, it can be summed up that mind mapping and peer-editing can be combined as the part of the process of writing. Mind mapping is implemented in a pre-writing activity as the planning before the students start to write and peer-editing is implemented as the next step after the students finish their first draft. In mind mapping, the students deal with the content and organization of the text, while in peer-editing, they do not only deal with those two aspects of writing but also with the sentence structure, vocabulary, and mechanics.
E. Rationale

Writing tends to be one of the most important skills as the other language skills that students of English should master. Learning writing in teaching learning process involves students not only in giving the students chances to express their ideas but also in using the target language in written form correctly. Nevertheless, most of the students believe that it becomes a complex skill since they have to deal with some aspects in writing a good text. The complexity in writing sometimes leads to the students’ boredom in writing activity.

Applying methods or techniques is aimed at giving the best teaching learning process and enjoyable for students. Teaching writing can be an interesting subject if the teacher can implement some techniques or conduct interesting activities which are appropriate with the students’ interest. The role of teachers here can be in the form of applying the techniques by combining some of the alternative ones which are appropriate to overcome students’ problem dealing with their ability in writing. They can be in the form of using students’ creativity to support the process of writing activity and using the students’ corporation in correcting each other which will lead to better result of writing itself.

Mind mapping as the pre-writing activity which can be implemented either by using computer or hand-draw can be more interesting activity for students and promote students’ writing skill. Furthermore, planning in writing is important in order to make a well-organized text. Meanwhile, to produce the good and well-organized text, the students’ adventure in writing does not stop in planning and drafting, but they have to continue it in the next process, that is editing and revising. Here, peer-editing can be used to be the next technique in writing during the teaching learning process since in this step, they have to deal with other aspects of writing and all at once they are able to act as reader and writer.

Prompted by the literature, mind mapping is considered to be good and interesting pre-writing activity which promotes the students’ writing skill without leaving out their creativity. Then, peer-editing is considered to be the true sharing process after the students finish their drafting since in this activity; they are able to
give reciprocal responses. The researcher also recognizes the importance of both planning in pre-writing activity and revising and editing in post-writing activity which help writers write more effectively. Therefore, it can be predicted that mind mapping and peer-editing techniques can improve the students’ writing skill.

**F. Hypothesis**

Based on the review of related literature and rationale, the researcher comes to the hypothesis that the students’ writing skill can be improved by using mind mapping and peer-editing as the techniques in teaching writing.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Place and Time of Study

The research was carried out at the tenth grade of the students at SMA N I Karanganyar in the academic year of 2010/2011. It is located at Jl. A. W. Mongonsidi no. 03, Karanganyar. It is near the city of Karanganyar. There are some schools surrounding this school, such as MI Karanganyar, SMK N 1 Karanganyar, MAN Karanganyar, and SMA Muhammadiyah. The situation around this school was very crowded in every morning, the time for break, and the time for students going home. There are nine classrooms for the tenth grade. Each classroom is completed by a set of computer, LCD, air conditioner, white board and board-marker, the pictures of Indonesian president and vice president, and a calendar. The facilities are very useful to support the teaching learning process.

The research was held from January to February 2011. The schedule of the research is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Preliminary Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Wednesday, 12th Jan 2011</td>
<td>12.00-13.00</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Wednesday, 19th Jan 2011</td>
<td>12.00-13.30</td>
<td>First meeting in cycle I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Friday, 28th Jan 2011</td>
<td>09.30-11.00</td>
<td>Second meeting in cycle I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Wednesday, 2nd Feb 2011</td>
<td>12.00-13.30</td>
<td>Third meeting in cycle I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Saturday, 5th Feb 2011</td>
<td>08.40-09.15</td>
<td>Post-test cycle I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wednesday, 8th Feb 2011</td>
<td>12.00-13.30</td>
<td>First meeting in cycle II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Friday, 11th Feb 2011</td>
<td>09.30-11.00</td>
<td>Second meeting in cycle II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Saturday, 12th Feb 2011</td>
<td>08.30-09.15</td>
<td>Third meeting in cycle II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wednesday, 16th Feb 2011</td>
<td>12.00-12.50</td>
<td>Post-test cycle II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. The Subject of Research

The subject of this research was the students of class X 1 of SMA Negeri I Karanganyar. The number of the students of the class is 34 students; 22 female students or 64.71 percent, and 12 male students or 35.29 percent. Most of the students come from Karanganyar, and some of them come from other cities such as Bali and West Java.

C. The Method of the Research

The research method used in this study is an action research. It was firstly derived from the problems in which most of the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri I Karanganyar had difficulty in composing text because of many reasons. That is why the researcher conducted the action research to make a change for a better practice. In the implementation, the researcher took many procedures starting from identifying the problems, implementing the action by making some plans, doing actions, conducting observations, and then doing reflections.

Therefore, it tends to be an action research since it has some similar characteristics as this kind of research. It is as stated by Burns (1999: 30) who suggests a number of characteristics of an action researcher. First, it is contextual, small-scale and localized. It identifies and investigates problems within a specific situation. Then, evaluation and reflection are considered as the way to bring about change and improvement in practice. He also argues that it is participatory as it provides for collaborative investigation by teams of colleagues, practitioners and researchers. Collection of information or data can encompass the changes of practice that provides the impetus of changes.

Then, Cohen and Manion in Nunan (1992: 18) also offer a similar set of characteristics of action research. They argue that action research is first and foremost situational, being concerned with the identification and solution of problems in a specific context. They also identify collaboration as an important feature of this type of research, and state that the aim of action research is to improve the current state of affairs within the educational context in which the
research is being carried out. It means that action research is conducted to make something better than before, so it is expected that there will be an improvement after the research conducted.

Similarly, Kemmis and McTaggart in Nunan (1992: 17) argue that there are three defining characteristics of action research. First, it is carried out by practitioners (for our purposes, classroom teachers) rather than outside researchers. Then, the action research is collaborative, and the last, it has essential impetus to change something. Meanwhile, Mills (2000: 6) states that an action research is any systematic inquiry conducted by the teacher, researchers, principals, school counsellors, or other stakeholders in the teaching/learning environment, to gather information about the ways that their particular schools operate, how they teach, and how well their students learn.

From the definition above, it can be drawn a conclusion that action research is truly a systematic study. In this study, it was conducted in SMA Negeri I Karanganyar by gathering information about how the teaching and learning process ran there, especially in teaching and learning writing as one of the language skills that the students have to master. Constant effort needs to be made, started from identifying students’ problems and difficulties in learning the language especially learning writing until finding the appropriate techniques to overcome the problems. So, more appropriate teaching strategies and plans can be devised to cater to students’ needs and to improve their learning. The reflection of the teaching practice should, therefore, be continuous and ongoing. With this goal in mind, this researcher regarded an action research as an appropriate research method to be adopted in the present study.

1. The Procedures of Action Research

According to Kemmis and McTaggart in Burns (1999: 32), action research occurs through a dynamic and complementary process, which consists of four essential ‘moments’: planning, action, observation, and reflection. These four steps are included in procedures of action research. The procedures of action research in this research are as follow:
a. Identifying the problem

In this step, the researcher identified the problem occurring in the class. The problem refers to the problem faced by the students in writing. To identify the problem, the researcher observed the teaching learning process, interviewed the teacher and the students, and conducted a pre-test.

b. Implementing the action research

As stated above that there are four moments considered to be an essential procedure in a spiralling process, the participants in the action research group undertake to:

1) Plan

After the problem was identified, the researcher developed a plan of critically informed action to improve what is happening. The researcher made lesson plans as the guidance or the scenario during the research conducted in teaching learning process of writing.

2) Act to implement the plan

The researcher acted to implement the plan. The researcher implemented the teaching writing activity through the process of mind mapping and peer-editing.

3) Observe

The researcher observed the effects of the critically informed action in the context in which it occurred. The researcher observed how the process of the teaching learning ran. She also monitored and wrote the responses of the students in the class.

4) Do the reflection

Reflection sought to make sense of processes, problems and issues in strategic action. If the researcher found some difficulties unsolved during the teaching learning process, the researcher prepared the re-planning steps. The researcher reflected on these effects as the basis for further planning, subsequent critically informed action and so on, through a succession of stages. Then, the researcher tried to formulate commit to user
the conclusion of the previous steps. Finally, the result of observation was analyzed and evaluated.

Similarly, Hopkins makes point of view (1993:48) of the model of action research which is illustrated as follow:

D. Techniques of Collecting Data

In action research, Burns (1999: 79) has categorized the method in collecting data into the broad groupings, observational approaches and non-observational approaches. According to Burns (p. 79), the observational approaches cover some techniques include notes, diaries, recordings, photographs, and transcripts. Meanwhile, he (p. 117) asserts that non-observational approaches cover some techniques include interviews and discussion, questionnaires and survey, and documents.

In this research, the researcher used some techniques above. The following are the detail explanation of each technique according to Burns (1999: 78-151):

1. Field notes

They are flexible tools for an action research data collection. The researcher made descriptions and accounts of observed events and wrote them down in the form of field notes.
2. Diaries

They are an alternative to field notes and provide continuing accounts of perceptions and thought processes, as well as of critical events or issues which have surfaced in the classroom. The researcher used this technique as the continuity of taking field notes.

3. Recordings

Both audio and video recordings are technique for capturing in detail naturalistic interaction and verbatim utterances. They provide more obvious and accurate information on patterns of interactional behaviour during the actual teaching learning process. McKerman in Burns (1999: 94) says that using video in fact provides a useful checklist to focus in on various aspects of classroom behaviour. In this research, the researcher used both audio and video recordings.

4. Photographs

Burns (1999: 101) says that photographic data holds promise as a way of greatly enhancing classroom analysis and providing stimuli which can be integrated into reporting and presenting the research to others. They are also generally used in action research as the qualitative research. So, took some photographs were taken during conducting the research.

5. Interviews

Burns (1999: 118) asserts that interviews are a popular and widely used as means of collecting qualitative data. In this research, the researcher has interviewed the English teacher as the collaborator and some students as the subject of the research.

6. Questionnaires

Besides interviews, the researcher also gave some questionnaires to the students as an alternative form of data collection. It was conducted in order to make the researcher easier and less time consuming to administer and to gather the larger number of informants.
7. Documents

In action research, documents are a readily accessible source of data as many already exist in the institutional system. The researcher used the syllabus and classroom material as the consideration in making lesson plan.

E. Techniques of Analyzing Data

In this research, the data collected are qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data was analyzed in five stages as mentioned by McKernan in Burns (1999: 156-160), while the quantitative data is analyzed by using statistic descriptive technique.

1. Qualitative data

In analyzing the data, the researcher conducted five stages described by McKernan in Burns (1999: 156-160). Throughout those five stages, constant checks must be made to ensure that it is the data, rather than one’s intuitions or assumptions that are leading the analysis. The data provides the evidence for the statements or assertions that are made about the research insights or outcomes. Those five stages are described in detail as follow:

a. Assembling the data

First stage in the process of analyzing the data is to assemble the data that the researcher has collected over the period of the research.

b. Coding the data

After assembling the data, the researcher made categories or codes which can be developed to identify patterns more specifically. Burns (1999: 157) described coding as a process of attempting to reduce the large amount of data that may be collected to more manageable categories of concepts, themes, or types. It means that coding provides less clear cut when a researcher deals with the diary entries, classroom recordings, and open-ended survey questions. So, the researcher used this stage in analyzing the data from questionnaires.
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c. Comparing the data

Once the data have been categorized in some ways, comparison can be made to see whether there are relationships and connections between different sources of data. In this step, the researcher dealt with the occurrences, behaviors, and responses.

d. Building interpretation

There is the point when the researcher moved beyond describing, categorizing, coding, and comparing to make some senses of the meaning of the data. In this stage, it is necessary to the researcher to think creatively as it is concerned with articulating underlying concepts and developing theories about particular patterns of behaviors, interactions, or attitudes have emerged.

e. Reporting the outcomes

As the last stage, it is the stage when the researcher presents an account of the research for others. A major consideration is to ensure that the report sets out the major process of the research, and that the findings and outcomes are well supported with examples from the data.

2. Quantitative data

In analyzing quantitative data, the researcher used the result of pre-test and post-test. Then, they are analyzed to show the achievement of the data. The means of each test can be used to prove whether or not teaching writing skill using mind mapping and peer-editing can improve students’ writing skill.

The mean of pre-test and post-test can be calculated with the following formula:

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{N} \quad \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y}{N} \]
In which:

\( x \) = means of pre-test score

\( y \) = means of post-test score

\( N \) = number of pairs

(Sudjana, 1996: 67)
CHAPTER IV

THE RESULT OF THE STUDY

This chapter deals with how the research was implemented. Some findings and discussion about the use of mind mapping and peer-editing as the techniques to improve students' writing skill are described in this chapter. The research is conducted in two cycles. Each cycle consists of series of steps, namely identifying the problems and implementing the action research which divided into four stages, planning the action, implementing the action, observing, and doing reflection and revising the plan. The explanation of the result of the study described in this chapter is broken down into two sections, namely research finding and discussion.

A. Research Finding

The research finding is taken during the teaching learning process done in this research. The research consists of two cycles. There are three meetings at the first cycle and three meetings at the second cycle. The findings can be explained as follows:

1. Identifying the Problem

The researcher did some observations to know the pre-condition before the implementation of the action research. Based on the result of the pre-research conducted in class X. 1 of SMA N 1 Karanganyar, the researcher could identify the problem faced by the tenth grade students dealing with their writing. As the result, the students’ scores of their writing were still low. It could be seen from the result of a pre-test which was conducted to know the condition of students’ writing skill. In this test, the students were asked to make a simple narrative text. In the instruction, it had been mentioned some aspects that they had to pay attention to. The mean score of the pre-test was 57.73. The score showed that the students’ writing skill was still low. There
were only three students or 8.8 percent who got the score 70 or more and the rest of the students, 31 students or 91.18 percent got less than 70. The detail was on the following tables:

Table 1.1 Pre-test from the first and second corrector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1st Corrector</th>
<th>2nd Corrector</th>
<th>Mean of Inter-rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>57.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Computation for the students who got 70 or more:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Corrector</td>
<td>2nd Corrector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>≥ 70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt; 70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was stated clearly that first, based on the questionnaires given to the students, there were just eight students or 23.53 percent who really liked writing. A half of a number of students that were 17 students or 50 percent said that they did not like writing. The rest of them, nine students or 26.47 percent said that they sometimes liked writing and sometimes did not. Moreover, they thought that writing is a complex activity since they had to deal with many aspects including content and organization of ideas, grammar or sentence structure, vocabulary, and mechanics. It could be seen from the responses of the students dealing with those aspects of writing in the following diagrams:
Figure 1.1  Students’ opinion about the level of difficulty in content and organization of ideas

Figure 1.2  Students’ opinion about the level of difficulty in vocabulary

Figure 1.3  Students’ opinion about the level of difficulty in grammar
Other causes of the problem that could be identified by the researcher during pre-research, among others: (1) the media used by the teacher did not give significant contribution in students’ writing skill as a whole. Based on the interview with the English teacher, the textbook was often used to teach writing and other language skills and she sometimes used songs to teach English, especially in teaching writing. Clearly, they gave good impression when the teacher introduced them to a song, but later they still responded negatively when the teacher asked them to start doing writing based on the song they had listened to. Consequently, it had not given significant contribution to the students’ writing skill since there was still lack of monitoring and controlling by the teacher during writing. (2) The time given to practice writing was so limited so that either the students or the teacher could not conduct the process of writing as a whole in teaching learning process in which it led to the result that still far from what expected.

So, based on the result of the pre-test, some questionnaires, and the interview with the teacher and the students, the researcher identified that it was necessary to improve the students’ writing skill. Then, she decided to improve it by using mind mapping and peer-editing as the techniques in the process of writing. Mind mapping as the pre-writing activity can help the students to organize ideas and it is easier for students to develop paragraph based on the keyword or keywords mentioned in their mind maps. Then, it was resulted in what
is expected that the students are able to compose a well-organized text. Meanwhile, peer-editing is an activity which can be conducted after the students finish composing the text. During this kind of activity, the students are supposed to analyze, criticize, and edit what comes to be inappropriate in their peer’s writing, whether the content, organization of the text, sentence structure, or mechanics.

2. The First Cycle
   a. Planning the Action

   The researcher made a preparation to conduct the research after identifying the problem dealing with the students’ writing ability. Lesson plans for the first cycle were made as the guidance or the scenario during the implementation of action. The suitable techniques would be implemented to support the process of teaching learning writing. Here, the researcher used mind mapping and peer-editing. Mind mapping was implemented as the pre-writing technique in helping the students to generate or to organize their ideas before they started to write or to compose writing. Meanwhile, peer-editing was implemented after the students finished their writing. In this technique, the students were allowed to edit, to analyze, and to criticize their peer’s writing dealing with some aspects of writing.

   In planning the action, the researcher also prepared the teaching aids used during the implementation of the action such as some colorful pencils and the example of hand-drawn mind map. Then, she has downloaded the software of mind mapping namely Freemind, since the researcher also used mind mapping software in implementing the action. Next, she prepared the teaching material based on the syllabus of the curriculum in SMA N I Karanganyar. The material was about Narrative text. For the first cycle, she planned three meetings. The meeting was conducted once a week. One lesson plan was made for three meetings.

   In fact, the researcher did not only prepare lesson plans and teaching aids, but also prepared the instrument for the students’ pre-test
which was conducted before teaching in the class X. The test actually was aimed at knowing their writing skill. Besides pre-test, after doing the treatment in the first cycle, she also gave the post-test to know whether there was an improvement or not. Both pre-test and post-test had similar instructions.

b. Implementing the Action

In implementing the action, the role of teacher was played by the researcher. Meanwhile, the English teacher helped the researcher in observing the students and in finding the solution to overcome the problems faced by the researcher during the teaching learning process.

The researcher divided the teaching learning process into three phases: pre-activity, main activity, and post-activity. Greeting, checking students’ attendance, and giving some questions to students to stimulate their participation were covered in the pre-activity. Then, in the main activity, the researcher gave the explanation about the related material of narrative text. In this activity, she also introduced the procedures in mapping their ideas, both in the form of hand-draw mind map and mind mapping software to be pre-writing activity or the planning before they started writing. Next, the researcher also led the students to do peer-editing. In the post-activity, summarizing the lesson, doing reflection, and finally closing the lesson were conducted by the researcher.

The descriptions of the implementation of the action are as follows:

1) The first meeting (12.05 p.m. – 13.30 p.m.)

The first meeting was conducted on Wednesday, 19th January 2011. Clearly, the teaching learning process ran well. In pre-activity, the researcher greeted the students, checked students’ attendance, arouse students’ motivation by giving some questions related to the topic, and then stated the goal of the lesson. No one was absent. The topic was Malin Kundang.

Then, in the main activity, a simple narrative text entitled Malin Kundang was presented by the researcher by using LCD. All students
paid attention to what the researcher showed. She explained what could be learnt from the text. Then, she asked the students to comprehend the text. Next, some students were asked to read the text and then analyze it by discussing the content and the generic structure based on the language feature that they have learnt before. In this activity, the researcher did not find any meaningful difficulty in explaining about narrative text since the students have learnt it before.

The remaining time was twenty minutes since it spent long time enough to learn and to discuss about narrative text. After the students understood about narrative text, the researcher then introduced them to mind mapping as the pre-writing activity. She gave example of mind mapping software by showing the unfinished mind map of Malin Kundang story. In this step, firstly, she showed the topic Malin Kundang and some branches consisted of some keywords.

![Mind map with the topic of Malin Kundang](image)

**Figure 2.1** A mind map with the topic of Malin Kundang

Then, the students were asked to map their ideas based on the topic. The researcher not only introduced what mind map was, but also explained how to operate that software. The most important thing in this step was that the students were introduced to mind mapping technique which could help their process in writing especially in the pre-writing
step. The students responded very positively at the first time they did this kind of activity. They were very enthusiastic in giving their opinion related to the topic. After introducing the mind mapping software, the researchers also introduced them to hand-drawn mind map which was basically same as mind mapping software.

Finally, in the post-activity, the researcher closed the teaching learning process by giving a home work to the students. They had to make a mind map with the topic was Roro Jongrang and Bandung Bandawasa in pairs. The researcher said that they could use either mind mapping software or hand-drawn mind map. Then, she told the website address of mind mapping software where they could download. Since the time was limited, then as the closing, the researcher just said goodbye to the students.

2) The second meeting (at 09.30 a.m. - 11.00 a.m.)

The second meeting was conducted on 28th January 2011. After doing some pre-activities, the researcher reminded the students of their home work. Some of them did the home work by using mind mapping software and some of them used hand-drawn mind map. Then, the researcher asked one of groups to present their mind map based on the topic of Roro Jongrang and Bandung Bandawasa. After finishing their presentation, the researcher as the teacher led the discussion about the ideas, whether there were some ideas which lost or jumped. Here, some students shared their ideas freely. Then, the researcher also asked them to revise their mind map if there were some losing ideas or some jumping ideas. After that, she asked the students to start writing story based on their mind map.

Unfortunately, at the first time, some of them responded negatively when they were asked to write. They said, “Aduh miss, kalo tidak usah dibuat gimana miss ceritanya, kan sudah ada mind mappingnya. Susah Miss... Bagaimana kalo buat mind map lagi aja Miss?” The researcher responded, “Ok, next time kita akan buat mind
map lagi, namun hari ini kalian harus menuangkan ide-ide brilliant kalian yang sudah dituangkan poin-poin nya selama proses mind mapping. Jadi, proses menulis kalian akan lebih mudah. Tinggal berpedoman pada mind map kalian, terus mengembangkannya jadi sebuah cerita. Salah tak masalah. I am sure that you can.” Then, the students answered, “Ya sudah miss, tapi nanti open dictionary boleh ya miss.” There was a student who asked, “Kalo misal bingung, tanya miss boleh gak?” The researcher responded, “It’s ok. So, let’s start writing.”

When the students were writing the story based on their mind map, the researcher walked around while controlling and giving responses for those who asked some questions related to the process of their writing. The time showed at 10.40, meaning that five minutes later, all the classroom activity must be stopped since there would be a Friday’s regular activity that was reading Quran together led by the religious teacher. So, the researcher asked the students whether they had finished their writing or not. Then, she asked them to submit their writing. After finishing reading Quran together, the researcher closed the lesson by summarizing what had learnt, and said goodbye.

3) The third meeting (at 12.05 a. m. -13.30 a. m.)

The third meeting was conducted on 2\textsuperscript{nd} February 2011. The topic was still based on the genre of narrative. After the students were asked to create a story about Roro Jonggrang and Bandung Bandawasa in the previous meeting, then the researcher distributed their works from the last meeting which had already corrected and contained some marks. The researcher had taken some errors which often made by students as some examples to be discussed in the class. After the students understood and there was no question anymore, the researcher gave a topic about “Cinderella” story. The students were asked to map their ideas based on the topic in pairs, either using mind mapping software or hand-drawn mind map as the pre-writing activity.
Next, it was the time for them to go on to the next process of writing, drafting then revising the text. After the students finished their drafting, the researcher asked them to do peer-editing, in which they dealt with the five aspects of writing. She asked them to exchange their writing in pairs then to edit it. As usual, she walked around the class to make sure that all students were editing their writing and she also gave responses by helping students if they found any difficulties or were confused of doing correction.

Having finished correcting their writing, the researcher asked them to submit it again. Finally, she closed the lesson by praising the students since they had done the process of writing well, giving thanks, and saying goodbye.

c. Observing the action

During the teaching learning process, the researcher did not only teach the students, but also observed what happened in the class. The result of the observation is explained as follows.

1) The first meeting

Although it was the first meeting, both the researcher and the students had had a good relationship since they had ever met before. The students seemed to be enthusiastic to join the class. It could be seen from their attention during the teaching learning process. In fact, they had ever been introduced to narrative text before, so when the researcher gave them the opportunity to ask dealing with the material, only one student who gave her a question. It was about the differentiation between recount text and narrative text. Then, the researcher answered it well until the student really understood about it.

Meanwhile, at the first time they were introduced to mind mapping technique, they gave good impression in doing this kind of activity. It could be seen from their willing to know how they could download the software. Since the time was so limited, the researcher just introduced them some basic ways to operate the software.
2) The second meeting

Some problems dealing with the homework given in the previous meeting occurred today. Some of them had not been successful yet to download the software. As the result, they had not done the homework yet. In fact, they could do the homework by using hand-drawn mind map. Unfortunately, some of the students thought that it was not as interesting as mapping the ideas by using mind mapping software.

In addition, the problem also occurred when there was a pair of students who could not open their mind mapping’s file which actually they were sure that they had saved it. On the other hand, surprisingly, the researcher found that there were some pairs who created very creative mind map either by using hand-drawn or software, whereas they were just introduced to some basic ways in the previous meeting.

During the presentation of one of mind maps made by one of the groups, the students took a part actively in sharing their ideas to complete or even to eliminate ideas based on the topic. During the writing process, most of the students asked about grammatical patterns and vocabularies. Before they submitted it to the researcher, their writing was not re-checked by most of them.

3) The third meeting

All the problems in the second meeting dealing with the mind mapping software had been overcome either for those who had not successfully downloaded it yet or those who could not open the file. The students were actually very interested in this activity. Most of them had been ready to join the class. For those who used mind mapping software, they had prepared their laptop on their table, then for those who used hand-drawn mind map, some pieces of blank paper and many colorful pencils had been prepared too.

Unfortunately, in doing peer-editing, it seemed that most of the students had not followed this process well. They were still confused about doing correction. Some of them asked the researcher about
vocabulary and grammatical patterns. There were some students who said that they were not sure to edit or to correct their peer’s writing since they felt doubtful to criticize it. There were some students who felt confused when reading their peer’s story, so the researcher asked them to ask to their pair about the content of it actually. Here, the role of teacher as a facilitator played importantly.

d. Doing the reflection

Reflection was conducted by the researcher to evaluate the teaching and learning process in cycle one. After doing some reflections, the researcher saw some positive results. First, there was an improvement of students’ mean score in a post-test conducted after cycle 1. The mean score of the pre-test was 57.73. Meanwhile, the result of the post-test was 64.35. The detail information of the mean score of the post-test in cycle 1 is explained in the following tables:

Table 2.1 Post-test of cycle 1 from the first and second corrector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>First Corrector</th>
<th>Second Corrector</th>
<th>Mean of Inter-rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>64.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 Computation for the students who got score 70 or more in cycle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Corrector</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Corrector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>≥ 70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt; 70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of improvement of each aspect of writing can be seen in the following table:
Table 2.3 The improvement on each aspect of writing in post-test 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Pre-test mean of pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test 1 mean of post-test</th>
<th>Level of Improvement</th>
<th>% of Improvement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Corrector 1st: 59.9</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrector 2nd: 59.5</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organization of ideas</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrector 1st: 60.25</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrector 1st: 61.05</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrector 1st: 51.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrector 1st: 57.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it was showed that there was an improvement though it was not the best achievement. The implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing during the process of writing gave significant contribution enough in improving students’ writing skill. The students’ ability in using the right grammar or language use increased to 15.33 percent, and then followed by the students’ ability in organizing ideas which increased 11.27 percent. So, it could be seen that the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing had worked well in the first cycle either in promoting the students’ organization of ideas in writing, content, and their language use or grammar.

Moreover, some of the students showed some positive attitudes towards the process of writing. They became more active and interested in joining each step of writing. They were actively involved in pre-writing activity by using mind mapping technique. By implementing this technique, the students explored their idea freely without leaving out their creativity since they added or drew some colorful pictures and words. Moreover, in writing activity, some of the students seemed to be more serious. They did not try to cheat or imitate someone’s work. Then, they also tried hard to give the correction to their peer’s writing. They actively asked the
researcher about the grammatical features, vocabularies, and even the organization between paragraphs.

Nevertheless, the improvement of the students’ writing skill has not been satisfying yet. There were still some handicaps that the researcher found, among others:

1) Some of the students thought that planning in the process of writing was not important.
2) Some of them still ignored the generic structure in making the narrative text. Some of them just still combined the position of complication and solution or resolution.
3) Some of the students still could not use appropriate vocabulary in their writing. There were still some inappropriate vocabularies which led to be non understandable text.
4) Most of the students had not realized yet that mechanics in writing is important. They tended to ignore this aspect. It was proven by the score of this aspect is the lowest of all.

Therefore, the researcher decided to take the second cycle in order to make a better improvement on the students’ writing skill.

3. The second cycle
   a. Revising the plan

   The reflection demanded the researcher to do better efforts in improving the students’ writing skill. Based on the result of the first cycle, it was found that there were several remaining handicaps which needed to be overcome. Then, the researcher decided to conduct the second cycle by revising the plan. She taught the students by giving more examples about the mechanics and vocabulary as problems found in their previous writing. Besides, she became more active in controlling and monitoring the class so that the students could join the lesson more optimally. Together with the students, she also opened a discussion dealing with the result of their writing
to make the students more active during the learning process. Here, she actually emphasized on the vocabulary and mechanics aspect.

b. Implementing the action

The researcher implemented the research in three meetings:

1) The first meeting (at 12.00 a. m. – 13.30 a. m.)

The first meeting was conducted on Wednesday, 8th February 2011. The genre was still narrative. The objective of the lesson was to provide the students some exercises and to discuss about the common errors occurred in writing narrative text which emphasized on the aspects of vocabulary and mechanics.

The researcher started the lesson by asking some questions about the previous task. She also reviewed generally of the narrative text. In the main activity, the researcher showed a diagram illustrated some incorrect sentences. Some errors dealt with the aspects of writing, such as grammatical pattern, organization of ideas, vocabulary, and mechanics. Nevertheless, the researcher emphasized on vocabulary and mechanics which come to be the meaningful difficulty to the students. The students were asked to analyze and to correct those sentences.

After the students had no questions dealing with the discussion, the researcher gave a free topic to the students, then asked them to map their ideas based on their own topic in pairs as the pre-writing activity. By giving free topic to the students, they seemed to be more interested in constructing the story. They started from mapping their ideas first.

![Figure 3.1 Student's mind map with the topic of Pinochio](image)
Then, the students went on the next stage of writing, that was making draft, while the researcher controlled and walked around the class to make sure that all students were doing the work while giving the students feedback to help them if they found some difficulties. Finally, she submitted the result of their writing.

2) The second meeting (at 09.30 a. m. - 11.00 a. m.)

The second meeting was conducted on Friday, 11th February 2011. After reviewing what had discussed in the previous meeting, the researcher distributed their writing by exchanging it in pairs. What they had to do was editing their peer's writing dealing with some aspects of writing. In this case, the researcher also showed what the students had discussed in the previous meeting, so that it could encompass them in the process of their editing. Furthermore, the researcher still played the role as the facilitator or monitor in this process. After they ended their process of editing, the researcher asked them to give it back to the writer. The students were supposed to re-read the text before it was collected again to the researcher.

The time showed at 10.45 a. m. As usual, there was a Friday’s regular activity so the teaching learning process must be stopped. All the students had to read Quran together led by the religious teacher. After
finishing reading Quran together, the researcher closed the lesson by summarizing what had learnt in a short, and said goodbye.

3) The third meeting (at 08.30 a.m. - 09.15 a.m.)

This meeting was conducted on Saturday, 12th February 2011. After the students conducted peer-editing technique in the previous meeting, the researcher also gave individual feedback to the students by giving some marks and corrections in the students’ work. She distributed the students’ work. After that, the researcher gave the chance to them to do the final revision of their writing. Then, the researcher told them if their writing would be arranged and published in form of a book, so the students were asked to type their writing and then re-collect it in the form of soft file next Wednesday.

The remaining time was still five minutes. The researcher explained that next Wednesday, they would have a second post-test, so she asked them to study what they had learnt. There was no question anymore. Then, the researcher praised what the students had done, said thanks and goodbye.

c. Observing the action

The researcher observed the three meetings conducted in the cycle 2. The observations for each meeting were described as follows:

1) The first meeting

As the researcher has explained, most students still ignored the importance of mechanics as one of the aspects in writing in the first cycle. But, most of them started to realize that it is really important. They started to pay more attention when the researcher showed some of their mistakes dealing with the mechanics in writing include punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.

During the discussion, the researcher asked some of the students to correct the mistakes in some sentences showed on the slide. They participated actively so the classroom atmosphere became a little bit noisy. More practice seemed to give result. By giving more examples and
more exercises, the students tended to get more understanding about what they had to do when they were writing.

As the following up of that discussion, the researcher gave free topic to be composed in the form of written story. They responded positively as they were free to choose their own topic based on their interest.

2) The second meeting

This meeting was held to continue the next stage of writing that was editing or revising the text. Peer-editing was implemented as the technique in this meeting. By doing so, the students looked busy in correcting each other’s writing. Some of them asked freely what they were confused of dealing with the correction. Since the researcher also showed some of the examples of what they had discussed in the previous meeting, they could use them, at least as the guidance.

After the students finished giving correction, they re-exchanged their writing. Some of them just smiled at their work, and others still tried hard to read their own writing. Since the time was almost over, the researcher asked them to submit their writing.

3) The third meeting

The essence of this meeting was just to give the students their work which contained some marks from both their peer and the researcher. Unfortunately, there were some students who did not join the teaching learning process since they had to join POPDA selection for the sport competition. After all students got their work, as the final revision, the students were given chances to re-read and to re-check their text. They were also allowed to ask the researcher if they felt confused in correction.

The students seemed to be more enthusiastic when the researcher told them that their writing would be published in form of a book. Then, she would ask the English teacher of SMA N I Karanganyar to put the book in the library. The students felt that their writing would
have the real readers who all people in the school have the chances to read their story.

d. Doing reflection

Now, it came to the last reflection to be concluded after the series of treatment and evaluation. The techniques used were questionnaire, interviews, recording, diaries, and writing test. The researcher could sum up that it was not easy to make better changes and improvement towards the students’ writing skill and behavior in learning how to write. It actually took six meetings to make changes and improvement towards the students’ writing skill.

Actually, the treatment the researcher conducted, helped a bit in improving students’ writing skill, nevertheless it has not been succeeded yet to label the students as a competent writer. Overall, based on the observation in cycle 2, it could be noted down that there were some positive results after the treatment or the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching learning process, especially towards the students’ writing skill. The positive results could be seen from some points.

The first point dealt with the improvement of the mastery of writing narrative text, the content, the organization of ideas, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. There had been the improvements in mastery of writing narrative text and its aspects in the cycle 1. Then, these improvements in the first cycle were followed in the second cycle. Besides, vocabulary and mechanics which belonged to be the weaknesses in the cycle 1 also improved. They had a significant improvement in cycle 2.

The percentage of improvement of each aspect of writing can be seen in the following tables:
Table 3.1 The improvement on each aspect of writing in post-test 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Post-test 1 Mean of post-test 1</th>
<th>Post-test 2 Mean of post-test 2</th>
<th>Level of Improvement</th>
<th>% of Improvement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organization of ideas</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second point dealt with the students’ writing test in the second cycle. Actually, since there was the improvement of each aspect of writing, it resulted in the increasing of the mean score from post-test 1 to post-test 2. By using the same instruction, the result of the post-test 2 showed the significant improvement. The detail data was illustrated in the following tables:

Table 3.2 Post-test of cycle 2 from the first and second corrector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>First Corrector</th>
<th>Second Corrector</th>
<th>Mean of Inter-rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Computation for the students who got score 70 or more in cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Corrector</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Corrector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>≥ 70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, it could be seen that the mean score of the post-test in the cycle 2 is 73.3. It is better than the mean score of the first post-test which is 64.35. The number of the students who got score 70 or more at the end of this cycle is 23 students or 67.64 percent. Meanwhile, the number of the students who got score 70 or more in the post-test of the first cycle was only eight students 23.53 percent. It meant that there was an improvement of the percentage.

Then, after the explanation and exercises given to the students in cycle 2 whether in the form of correcting peer’s writing or applying the language use, vocabulary, and mechanics which they had learnt, they had made a quite good progress in using them. Some of them used the form of direct sentences in their story. They also were able to use time signal and conjunctions to make their writing readable. Based on the interview with some students, they showed their responses as follows:

- “Lebih mudah dari susunan ..., dari awalan, lalu masuk complication, terus masuk resolution.”
- “Ya, setelah itu saya lebih mengetahui tentang simple past tense.”
- “Saya jadi lebih tahu banyak grammar yang benar, menambah pengetahuan tentang vocabulary nya gitu.”

Those responses were similarly as the students responded on the questionnaires given after the treatment dealt with the use of mind mapping and peer-editing in their writing in promoting the organization of ideas and other aspects of writing which could be seen in the following diagrams:
Figure 3.3 Students’ opinion about the implementation of mind mapping towards their organization of ideas

Based on that diagram, the students thought that by implementing mind mapping, more organized and systematic points could be planned. By using mind mapping technique, it was easier for them to generate their ideas in the correct order. Meanwhile, doing peer-editing also helped the students with the use of language and other aspects of writing such as vocabulary and mechanics in which the students found them as the meaningful difficult as stated on the Table 2.3.

Then, in the following diagram, there were 27 students from 34 students who thought that peer-editing helped them in the aspect of language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

Figure 3.4 Students’ opinion about the implementation of peer-editing towards their language use, vocabulary, and mechanics

The third point dealt with the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing which could carry out the students into a better teaching and learning situation. The students were trained to compose narrative text through some processes since the teaching learning process actually did not emphasize on the product oriented approach but it focused on process oriented one in which the teacher guided, facilitated, and monitored the students during the process of writing in order to make a good final draft.

First, before they started to write the story, they did the pre-writing activity by implementing mind mapping technique. Then, as the next stage they started to compose the story or to make drafts. After that, for revising their writing, they had implemented peer-editing as the technique in which...
they had to deal with some aspects of writing to reach better result. The last, they revised and re-wrote their writing as the best result.

Moreover, not only for better processes they passed, but the students also looked happy and felt easy in learning English which focused on writing by following the process of writing. In this case, not only the students who were active in teaching learning process, but the researcher also played an important role in facilitating and monitoring them during the process. It meant that the researcher actively responded the students’ questions. It was as the responses from some of the students when they were being interviewed:
- “Hmm, saya jadi…. Writing itu jadi menyenangkan buat saya.”
- “.......... tapi jadi penak aja, lebih mudah.”

Besides, some responses on the questionnaires given dealt with the use of mind mapping and peer-editing showed that the implementation of them was able to promote their enjoyment, interest, corporation with other students, and motivation towards the teaching and learning writing.

Firstly, it dealt with their feeling in joining teaching learning process using mind mapping and peer-editing. Based on the following diagram, there were six students who felt very happy and most of them, 20 students felt happy during the teaching learning process. Then, only five students who were not too happy and the rest of them, that were three students felt unhappy in joining the writing class by using those techniques. The reason was that it was no problem for those who did not really enjoy the teaching learning process using mind mapping to map their ideas first as long as they had known the story. It could clearly see in the following diagram:
Figure 3.5 Students’ opinion about the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing towards their feeling in joining the teaching learning process

As they felt happy or unhappy, they enjoyed or did not enjoy the teaching learning process of writing skill by using mind mapping and peer-editing, it would be influenced on their interests. The students were highly interested in the process which they had never experienced before. They learned something new. Therefore, they felt that it was very exciting and was being useful experience for them. Mind mapping did not limit their ideas in their own text. They could express their ideas based on the mind map they had made before and it made them felt more confident with their writing though their writings were still imperfect. Meanwhile, peer-editing allowed the students to have interaction each other and it was resulted in the teaching learning process became more alive. The number of students dealt with their interest of those techniques’ implementation could be seen in the following diagram:

![Bar Chart](image_url)

Figure 3.6 Students’ opinion about the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing related to their interest in joining teaching learning process of writing

Next, since during the teaching learning process, the students conducted both mind mapping technique and peer-editing in pairs, it meant that they had good interaction and communication each other. They communicated each other in planning and discussing their writing. Later, they would increase their corporation each other too. It was proven by their responses on their questionnaire given and could be seen in the following diagram:
In addition, the students felt motivated in joining the teaching learning process of writing. There were six students who felt that the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing really increased their motivation in joining the teaching learning process. 21 students thought that the implementation of them increased their motivation, and the rest of them or just seven students who thought that the implementation did not increase their motivation.

Figure 3.7 Students’ opinion about the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing towards their corporation in joining the teaching learning process

However, these achievements did not mean that the actions done by the researcher has been already perfect. The implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing were two of the techniques in improving students’
writing skill. Their writing skill can actually be improved by the English teacher as long as he or she has a strong willing to reach a better progress on his/her teaching writing. She or he can make use of some alternative techniques which are appropriate to the teaching of writing skill. It of course has to be matched with the classroom and students’ situation.

Actually, there were three handicaps which the researcher found in applying mind mapping and peer-editing to improve students’ writing skill, as follows:

1) The activity requires considerable time commitment and patience by the researcher to read, to evaluate, and to give responses meaningfully to students’ writing.
2) Few students still have opinion that the planning in writing tends to be unimportant activity to conduct since they think that it was useless.
3) Some of students are still not too confident to give correction or to edit their peer’s writing since they did not believe in their ability. They still tend to have low self-confidence in doing peer-editing.

However, by considering the improvements which had been explained in detail above, the researcher concluded that the use of mind mapping and peer-editing can improve students’ writing skill. Besides, the students showed their better and more positive attitudes towards those techniques. Though they are sometimes looked confused of many vocabularies used, they tend to be more active and more freely to ask. Therefore, the researcher decided to stop the cycle.

B. Discussion

This section presents the discussion of the research finding which contains some important points summarized from the first cycle to the second cycle. The points deal with the improvement of students’ writing skill especially in writing narrative text as the genre used in this research, the improvement of teaching learning situation, and the improvement of students’ attitudes towards writing skill.
First, the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing can improve students’ ability in writing narrative text. Mind mapping deals with the technique used to organize ideas in which the students can explore their ideas freely. Here, the students also can radiant them in the form of some keywords that still relate to the topic completed by some colorful pictures. Therefore, it tends to be more interesting for most of the students of class X. 1 of SMA Negeri I Karanganyar. Moreover, in mapping their ideas, they can use either software or hand-drawn. It is actually very suitable for those who like to use computer or who have a hobby in drawing pictures. Then, peer-editing deals with the next stage of writing after the students finish their first draft. The students can criticize, analyze, and edit or correct their peer’s writing so that in using this technique, the students are trained to be both good writer and good reader.

In writing a narrative text, both mind mapping and peer-editing techniques are able to promote the five aspects of writing that are content, organization of the ideas, vocabulary, language use or grammar, and mechanics. In this research, the improvement of those aspects can be seen in the following table:

Table 4 Students’ progress towards each aspect of writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspects of Writing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organization of ideas</td>
<td>60.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>61.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>57.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, it can be noted down that at the time the students learn to write, so their writing can be tangible evidence whether or not they are make progress in the language (Bryne, 1997: 6). It seems that using mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching writing can be the good alternative
techniques since there is a significant improvement of each aspect as described on the table above.

Then, the improvement also can be seen from the changing of the mean scores achieved by the students. It is showed in the following tables:

Table 5 Computation of mean score from preliminary observation, cycle 1, and cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Preliminary Observation</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>64.35</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Computation for the students who got the score 70 or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Pre-Observation</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>≥ 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>&lt; 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, based on the explanation above and analyzing the data started from the preliminary observation to cycle 2, it can be summed up that mind mapping and peer-editing improves the students’ writing skill especially in writing narrative text.

Second, the implementation improves the teaching learning situation effectively. By implementing mind mapping and peer-editing, the teacher focuses on process writing in teaching learning process. The teaching learning process can be seen from the implementation of process writing including pre-writing, whilst writing, and post-writing.

Pre-writing covers everything that the students do before they start to write. It is the stage where the students map their ideas based on the topic on the center of blank paper. Then, they radiant the ideas freely by using some vocabularies as the keywords that later they can develop to be some paragraphs.
The second activity is whilst-writing. The teacher allows the students to start to write a story based on the mind map that they have made before in the pre-writing activity. During this process, the students are allowed to ignore the grammatical mistakes in order that they focus on the content and express their ideas based on the mind map. The next stage is post-writing which covers revising and editing. The students are asked to exchange their writing in pairs, in which they can read their friend’s writing and all at once they can share, edit, analyze, and criticize the rough draft from the writing focusing on the aspects of writing. Then, the last stage is editing. The students also got the feedback from the teacher when they find some difficulties or felt confused during the process of writing.

Referring to the process of writing, the teacher did not only lead the students to follow the stages on the writing process, but the teacher also gave clear instruction. The teacher followed the stages of writing process by implementing mind mapping and peer-editing. Based on the research findings, it could be summed up how mind mapping and peer-editing are implemented:

1. The teacher should explain what mind mapping and peer-editing are, by conducting the process of writing and their activities as clearly as possible.
2. The teacher should give model before applying.
3. The topic of writing narrative text should be in accordance with the students’ level and basic competences that must be achieved by the students. It is in order to make the students easy to do the writing process.
4. The teacher should be able to lead the students to be a good planner before they started to write. They have to be realized that the planning before writing is important to make a well-organized text.
5. Revising and editing are not easy for the students since most of them did not master on them. They also did not have self-confidence to do that. However, the teacher has to keep on giving chances for them to do it as long as the teacher still guides, facilitates, and monitors them. Therefore, both the teacher and the students must be patient.

Third, the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing can improve the students’ attitudes towards writing. In this study, they refer to some
indicators such as students’ interest, enjoyment, motivation, and corporation. The students were very interested in joining teaching learning process by implementing mind mapping and peer-editing. They are guided to write narrative through the writing process. They also enjoyed it and felt easier to understand to write narrative text.

Then, it could be seen that the students felt motivated in joining teaching learning process of writing. They were very actively involved in the teaching learning process. Next, among the students and the teacher also had a good corporation since during the teaching learning process; the students interacted well with other students and even with the teacher.

However, those achievements do not mean that the action has been done perfectly. There are many obstacles occurred dealing with the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching learning writing. In using them, the researcher should really consider of the time and patience to read, to evaluate, and to give responses meaningfully to the students’ writing. Then, some students still believe that it is no problem for them not to do the planning before they start to write. They think that it will only waste their time even though the reality shows that there are sometimes some jumping ideas or they just ignore the generic structure in writing narrative text. In conducting peer-editing, the students still do not have strong self confidence to edit or to criticize their peer’s writing, though the researcher also helps them during the process.

Nevertheless, the researcher finds it hasty to come to such a conclusion at the present stage that the students can not be a good editor or a good reader while there are many improvements on their aspects of writing as explained in detail in the research finding. Besides, the students showed their better and more positive attitudes towards those techniques. Though they are sometimes looked confused of many vocabularies used, they tend to be more active and more freely to ask. Therefore, it can be summed up that the use of mind mapping and peer-editing improve students’ writing skill.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

The researcher has presented the findings and an interpretation and explanation of the results in the preceding chapters. In this chapter, a summary of the major findings that pertains to the research questions will first be given. Then, the implication will be discussed, followed by the recommendations for students, teacher, other researchers, and institution.

A. Conclusion

Based on the research findings, it can be drawn a conclusion that the use of mind mapping and peer-editing techniques can improve students’ writing skill. It improved after they were taught by using those techniques as the parts of the process of writing. This improvement is proven by the data from the findings after the action research was conducted. The findings were:

1. The students had fewer difficulties in exploring their ideas. It could be seen from the score in pre-test which was 59.65 and it improved to 74.15 in the post-test of cycle 2.

2. The students had fewer difficulties in organizing ideas in writing. It was proven by the result of post-test which was 78.7 from the students’ achievement dealing with this aspect in pre-test which was 60.25.

3. The students also made fewer errors in constructing correct sentences in the process of making the narrative text based on the appropriate generic structure. It was proven by the score of the language use aspect which was 51.1 in pre-test and it improved to 65.7 in the post-test of cycle 2.

In addition, in the research, mind mapping and peer-editing techniques promote students’ writing skill during the process of writing. It is proven that mind mapping technique which is implemented during planning stage stimulates the students to actively involve in brainstorming the ideas. They also have plenty
of opportunities to explore their ideas. Meanwhile, in this research, peer-editing is implemented in revision stage. Actually, in this stage, the mind map also helps the students to do peer-editing. It was used as the researcher showed the students’ result of writing to be discussed. In this stage, the students felt more freely to criticize and correct those errors.

Moreover, towards the process of writing, the students seemed more serious in handling the editing process, especially dealing with the aspect of grammar and mechanics. As a result, most of them became more confident in giving feedback towards their peer’s work. So, in this case, they were not only trained as a good writer but also as a good reader.

Therefore, dealing with the implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching writing, it is found that:
1. In this research, mind-mapping is implemented during planning stage and can stimulate the students to actively involve in brainstorming the ideas.
2. Mind mapping gives the students plenty of opportunities to explore their ideas.
3. Peer-editing technique is implemented in revision stage and stimulates the students to be more serious in handling the editing process.
4. The mind maps also help the students to do peer-editing and let them to be more confident in giving feedback towards their peer’s work.
5. The implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing in the teaching writing allows the teacher to control and to monitor the process of writing.
6. The implementation of mind mapping and peer-editing allows the students to follow each stage of writing. There is no missing stage from pre-writing to post-writing.

Finally, based on the explanation above, it can be seen that there are some improvements in many aspects of writing proved by their achievement in the result of writing. Though there were still some students who did not have strong self confidence enough to correct their peer’s work and thought that planning in writing was not too important, in fact, most of students showed their better attitudes towards the implementation of those techniques. Therefore, it
comes to a conclusion that the use of mind mapping and peer-editing improve students’ writing skill.

B. Implication

The findings of the present study suggest some teaching practices. As most students experience difficulty in writing in English, planning and revising each other may seem a possible and useful writing techniques for them. The use of mind mapping and peer-editing, as the findings revealed, would be two effective techniques for students to adopt. As Buzan (2009:4) points out, mind mapping is the easiest way to put information into and out of the brain, so it is the most effective and creative way and literally will “map” our brain. It means that mind mapping is one of kinds of working outline which can help student to make an organization between ideas more clearly. It is worthwhile introducing this planning technique to students. Meanwhile, in peer-editing, Hedge (1998: 159) points out, the editing which takes place immediately after the writing, will make it meaningful and useful to the writer. Practice in suggesting corrections in their classmates’ work can help students to organize errors in their own. When the students have to explain some points to a partner, their own understanding is redefined and clarified. It then requires them to think carefully about clarity and acceptability in writing.

Therefore, in short, teachers who are willing to improve their students’ writing skill should use mind mapping as the pre writing activity and peer-editing as the techniques applied in their teaching writing. Once the students understand the overall writing process in mind mapping and peer-editing, they will be eager to begin writing.

C. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion and the implication explained above, the researcher would like to give some suggestions to the students, the teacher, and the other researchers dealing with the teaching and learning writing.
1. For the Teacher

For most students, writing tends to be one of difficult language skills as the other language skills that are listening, speaking, and reading. Consequently, the students often respond negatively when they are asked to write. Then, of course, it will cause some obstacles during the teaching learning process. In fact, it deals with the teachers’ way in teaching writing. In this case, the teachers have to be able to choose the best and the most suitable techniques in teaching writing in which they can combine or modify some alternative techniques to promote both students’ writing skill and students’ attitudes toward writing. Therefore, the teacher should implement mind mapping and peer-editing in teaching writing.

Meanwhile, in doing correction, it is really necessary for the teacher to be patient since there will be a dozen of students’ writings which need to be corrected. Moreover, in this study, there are still few of the students who have some thought that it is unnecessary for them to do pre-writing activity as long as they know the background of the story in writing narrative text. Here, the teacher should give them the comprehension of the importance of planning in the process of writing.

By implementing those techniques, the students can explore their ideas freely without leaving out their creativity and they still have good communication and cooperation each other. Automatically, the teaching and learning process of writing can run well and it will lead to better achievement of students’ writing skill.

2. For the Students

Writing is of course not easy, but it is less difficult than what some students imagine. Practice makes perfect. It actually can be the best solution when the students really want to achieve better writing. To improve their writing skill, what they have to do is practicing as much as possible. It does not mean that they write something in a formal or scientific text. However, firstly they can write everything without worrying of some corrections. As the time
goes, they also have to pay attention in many aspects of writing skill to be able to compose the best writing. To realize it, they can read many resources from the writing of the more proficient writers. Besides, they can use peer-editing to promote those aspects. Nevertheless, they need to be patient too as the teacher in conducting this technique.

Moreover, during the teaching learning process especially in writing skill, there must be a good participation between the teacher and the students. If there is no students’ participation during the teaching learning process, whatever the technique and whoever the teacher, the improvement will be only a dream. It means that it will be difficult to achieve the best result.

3. For the Other Researchers

This action research placed its focus on the implementation of mind mapping as a pre-writing technique and peer-editing in the writing process of the tenth grade students especially class X. 1 of SMA N I Karanganyar. The study has proved to provide meaningful data for this researcher. If possible, first, the study could be carried out with a larger subject of the research so that the generalization of the study can be increased.

Besides, replications are necessary with different types of writing and with different themes to see if mind mapping skills could be applied in various types of writing and which type(s) of writing would benefit most from the use of this planning technique. In addition, in fact, the current action research could continue and extend over a longer period of time to see if students would have a sustainable or gradual improvement in their writing with the prolonged use of mind mapping and peer-editing techniques in the planning and revising stage of the process of writing.

4. For the Institution

For SMA Negeri I Karanganyar, some teaching aids and facilities have been already complete. As the following up of the complete teaching aids and facilities, it is necessary to give some trainings for teachers especially
English teacher dealing with the teaching learning process based on technology, so those facilities can be used maximally. The media which the students can use as means of expressing ideas are necessary to be created more creatively such as wall magazines, English school magazines, or some competitions which support the students’ writing skill.