Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation
Homepage: http://jurnal.unipar.ac.id/index.php/jeti/
*P - ISSN*2621-2137E-ISSN2621-2080
Vol 9 No 1, 2026, pp 206-217
DOI:https://doi.org/ 10.31537/jeti.v9i1.3159

IMPROVING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING SKILLS THROUGH THE MIND MAPPING STRATEGY MODEL IN GRADE V STUDENTS

Mayang Sari[1], Dessy Wardiah [2], Siti Rukiyah[3]

[1,2,3]Indonesian Language and Literature Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, PGRI University of Palembang
E-mail:*mayangfahmi1314@gmail.com[1]* ,*dessywardiah77@univpgri.ac.id[2]* ,*sitirukiyahpgri@gmail.com[3]*

Article Info

Keywords:

Mind Mapping,
descriptive writing
writing skills,
classroom action research
elementary education

Article history:
Received: [Maret, 30 2026]
Revised: [Mei, 16 2026]
Accepted: [June, 07 2026]
Published: [June, 30 2026]

Abstract

ABSTRACT
This study aims to improve the descriptive text writing skills of fifth-grade students at SDN 6 Suak Tapeh through the implementation of the Mind Mapping learning model. The novelty of this research lies in the systematic integration of Mind Mapping as a visual learning strategy to support idea generation, paragraph organization, and vocabulary development in descriptive writing activities at the elementary school level. This study provides practical contributions by offering an effective instructional approach that helps students organize information more coherently and actively participate in the learning process compared to conventional writing instruction.
The research employed Classroom Action Research (CAR) based on the Kemmis and McTaggart model, conducted in two cycles consisting of planning, action, observation, and reflection stages. Data were collected through classroom observations, writing performance tests, interviews, and documentation. The effectiveness of the learning model was evaluated using students' average writing scores, learning mastery percentages, and classroom participation indicators.
The results showed a substantial improvement in students' descriptive writing performance. The average writing score increased from 65.60 in the pre-action stage to 71.80 in Cycle I and 86.16 in Cycle II. Learning mastery improved from 36% in the pre-action stage to 60% in Cycle I and reached 92% in Cycle II. In addition, classroom observations indicated increased student engagement, participation, and ability to develop ideas systematically through visual mapping techniques. These findings demonstrate that the Mind Mapping learning model effectively enhances descriptive writing skills, improves learning efficiency in organizing ideas, and promotes active student involvement in the writing process.
Keywords: Mind Mapping, descriptive writing, writing skills, classroom action research, elementary education

ABSTRAK
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk meningkatkan keterampilan menulis teks deskripsi siswa kelas V SDN 6 Suak Tapeh melalui penerapan model pembelajaran Mind Mapping. Kebaruan penelitian ini terletak pada integrasi Mind Mapping sebagai strategi pembelajaran visual yang digunakan secara sistematis untuk membantu siswa menghasilkan ide, menyusun paragraf secara terstruktur, dan mengembangkan kosakata dalam kegiatan menulis teks deskripsi di

sekolah dasar. Penelitian ini memberikan kontribusi praktis berupa alternatif model pembelajaran yang lebih efektif dibandingkan pembelajaran menulis konvensional dalam membantu siswa mengorganisasi informasi secara lebih koheren dan meningkatkan keterlibatan mereka dalam proses pembelajaran.
Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (PTK) model Kemmis dan McTaggart yang dilaksanakan dalam dua siklus, meliputi tahap perencanaan, pelaksanaan tindakan, observasi, dan refleksi. Data penelitian dikumpulkan melalui observasi, tes keterampilan menulis, wawancara, dan dokumentasi. Evaluasi keberhasilan tindakan dilakukan melalui analisis nilai rata-rata keterampilan menulis, persentase ketuntasan belajar, dan indikator partisipasi siswa selama pembelajaran.
Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya peningkatan yang signifikan pada kemampuan menulis teks deskripsi siswa. Nilai rata-rata siswa meningkat dari 65,60 pada tahap prasiklus menjadi 71,80 pada Siklus I dan 86,16 pada Siklus II. Persentase ketuntasan belajar meningkat dari 36% pada tahap prasiklus menjadi 60% pada Siklus I dan mencapai 92% pada Siklus II. Selain itu, hasil observasi menunjukkan peningkatan keaktifan, partisipasi, serta kemampuan siswa dalam mengembangkan ide secara sistematis melalui teknik pemetaan visual. Temuan ini membuktikan bahwa model pembelajaran Mind Mapping efektif dalam meningkatkan keterampilan menulis teks deskripsi, meningkatkan efisiensi proses pengorganisasian ide, serta mendorong keterlibatan aktif siswa dalam kegiatan menulis.

Kata Kunci: Mind Mapping, teks deskripsi, keterampilan menulis, penelitian tindakan kelas, pendidikan dasar

Corresponding Author:
Mayang Sari
Affiliation : Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Universitas PGRI Palembang
e-mail: mayangfahmi1314 / ORCID :

1. INTRODUCTION

Language plays a vital role in human life. Through language, a person can communicate ideas and feelings, and establish social interactions with others. Keraf (2010:3) states that language is the most comprehensive and effective means of communication in human social life. Language allows a person to express themselves, adapt to their environment, and form harmonious social relationships. Halliday (1978:19) adds that language has instrumental, regulatory, interactive, personal, heuristic, imaginative, and representational functions, all of which demonstrate that language is a vital part of human development.

Language proficiency is one of the main indicators for assessing student competence, especially in Indonesian. Language skills are the primary means for understanding and mastering other subjects, so mastery of language skills will significantly impact student success overall. Tarigan (2008:1) states that language skills consist of three interrelated factors: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These four skills form a unified whole in the communication and learning process. Each skill supports the development of other skills. For example, good listening skills will strengthen speaking skills, and good reading skills will support writing skills.

Harmer (2004:3) points out that writing is a productive skill that requires mastery of various linguistic elements such as grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and logical and coherent text structure. Byrne

(1988:5) also states that writing is a complex activity because it involves conveying a written message that must be understood by the reader without direct interaction.

Writing and learning in general are undervalued, claims Daud (2003:6). This is due to current learning methods that do not prioritize the development of students' language skills, such as memorization, teaching grammar, introducing students to language theory, and meeting exam objectives. Practice, and lots of practice, is the only sure way to become a proficient writer (Tarigan, 2008:1). Good writing skills will benefit students, both academically and socially, according to Akhadiah (2004:1).

Writing is not just a medium for expressing ideas and feelings, but also serves as a means to train students' critical and creative thinking skills. According to Dalman (2014:3), writing is a communication activity in the form of conveying messages (information) in writing to another party using written language as a tool or medium.

The ability to express ideas, thoughts, emotions, and facts in written form is an essential talent for everyone, making writing a fundamental language skill. Tarigan (2008) argues that the ability to express thoughts on paper allows for more indirect than direct communication. This highlights the importance of writing as a mode of communication, particularly in academic and professional contexts.

Furthermore, Suparno (2008:1.4) said that writing skills can increase intelligence, develop creativity and foster courage and must be developed starting from elementary school. According to Semi (2007:41) a writer should master three writing skills, namely (1) language skills, (2) presentation skills, (3) expressive skills.

Meanwhile, Keraf (2004) states that writing is the activity of expressing thoughts and feelings in the form of organized linguistic symbols so that they can be understood by others. This view emphasizes the importance of order and clarity in writing. Furthermore, Hughes (2003) states that writing is a complex process that involves various cognitive and physical processes, so the activity of writing requires a deep understanding of the content and form of the writing.

Text is a series of language pieces arranged coherently and logically, used in specific communication situations to convey information, ideas, or feelings to readers or listeners. In functional linguistics, text is viewed not simply as a collection of sentences, but as a manifestation of meaning related to a specific social context. According to Jasnain, Anita, and Siti Rukiyah (2022), objects must be defined so that readers can identify them even when they cannot directly see them for descriptive writing to be effective.

Meanwhile, description is a form of literary expression that aims to evoke an emotional response in the reader by painting a vivid picture of its subject. Descriptions typically utilize concrete details that can be perceived by the five senses, such as color, shape, smell, sound, and texture.

Based on initial observations, the majority of students tended to be passive during the writing learning process. The texts they produced were shallow, did not describe objects in detail, and did not meet the structure and linguistic characteristics of descriptive texts. Furthermore, students also faced difficulties in recognizing and using descriptive words, such as adjectives and verbs, which function to provide descriptions or explanations in their writing. They were also unable to differentiate between general and specific descriptions. The limited use of effective sentences and a weak understanding of the function of paragraphs in texts also hampered their overall writing skills.

These various obstacles can be impacted by various factors, including: (1) the use of learning methods that still focus on lectures and individual assignments, so that studentslack of enjoyable and meaningful writing experience; (2) limited use of interesting and contextually appropriate learning media, which should be able to help students explore ideas and expand vocabulary; and (3) less than optimal strategies that can encourage active student participation in the writing and revision process, which will cause students to have difficulty in developing creativity, finding ideas, and composing descriptive texts in a structured and coherent manner. One approach that is considered effective in overcoming low writing skills, especially in writing descriptive texts, is to apply the Mind Mapping model.

In the context of writing lessons, Mind Mapping plays a role in helping students break down main topics into more detailed subtopics, link relevant information, and establish a logical flow that underlies the structure of their writing. This way, students are not only helped in finding initial ideas but also more easily develop the content of their writing coherently. Furthermore, the use of color, images, and keywords in Mind Mapping has also been shown to increase students' appeal and retention of the material, while expanding vocabulary and strengthening critical thinking skills.

Furthermore, this model provides space for students to actively participate in the writing planning process, which is often overlooked in conventional learning. By giving students the opportunity to explore their ideas through Mind Mapping, they will be more confident in writing and better able to produce writing that is meaningful, structured, and in accordance with the text's communicative purpose. Thus, the application of Mind Mapping in writing learning is not only a creative and enjoyable alternative method, but also a pedagogical approach that aligns with the principles of active and constructivist learning. This model is believed to be a strategic solution in significantly improving students' writing skills.

The Learning Objective Achievement Criteria (KKTP) for the Indonesian Language subject in grade V of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh is 75, meaning students are considered to have completed the learning if they obtain a score of 75 or above. From the results of observations carried out in August 2024 when researchers carried out learning activities on writing descriptive texts, several problems were found.

From the results of initial observations conducted by researchers in August 2024 in class V of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh, it was stated that the majority of students had difficulty writing descriptive texts.

From the evaluation results, it was found that of the 25 fifth grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh observed, only 7 students (28%) were able to write descriptive texts with complete structures and vocabulary that obtained scores above the KKTP in the Indonesian subject, namely above 75. Meanwhile, as many as 18 students (72%) had not reached the KKTP. From these results, it can be stated that students' descriptive text writing abilities are still at a low level. Thus, solutions are needed to optimize students' writing skills, especially in descriptive text material.

One alternative that is expected to provide a solution is the implementation of the Mind Mapping model. This model is expected to improve the descriptive text writing skills of fifth-grade students at SDN 6 Suak Tapeh.

2. METHODS

Research Design

This study employed Classroom Action Research (CAR) using the Kemmis and McTaggart model, which consists of four stages: planning, action, observation, and reflection. The research was conducted in two cycles, and each cycle consisted of two meetings. The CAR approach was selected to improve students' descriptive writing skills through continuous planning, implementation, evaluation, and reflection processes.

Participants

The participants were 25 fifth-grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh during the 2024/2025 academic year. The participants were selected because preliminary observations indicated difficulties in generating ideas, organizing paragraphs, and using appropriate vocabulary in descriptive text writing. The classroom teacher collaborated with the researcher throughout the implementation of the study.

Research Procedure

Cycle I

Meeting 1

1. The teacher introduced the concept and characteristics of descriptive texts.
2. Students identified the structure and language features of descriptive texts.
3. The teacher explained the Mind Mapping technique and demonstrated how to create a mind map.
4. Students created individual mind maps based on selected topics.

Meeting 2

1. Students reviewed and refined their mind maps.
2. Students developed descriptive texts based on their mind maps.
3. The teacher provided guidance and feedback during the writing process.
4. Students submitted their writing assignments for assessment.

Cycle II

Based on reflections from Cycle I, improvements were made to learning activities.

Meeting 1

1. The teacher reviewed descriptive text concepts and previous learning outcomes.
2. Students created more detailed mind maps using keywords, branches, images, and supporting vocabulary.

3. Students discussed and refined their mind maps with peers.

Meeting 2

1. Students developed complete descriptive texts from their revised mind maps.
2. The teacher facilitated revision and editing activities.
3. Students finalized and submitted their descriptive texts.
4. Reflection activities were conducted to identify learning experiences and challenges.

Instruments

Several instruments were used to collect data:

Writing Test

The writing test required students to compose a descriptive text based on a selected topic. Student performance was assessed using a writing rubric consisting of five indicators:

Indicator	Score Range
Content relevance and completeness	1–20
Organization and paragraph coherence	1–20
Vocabulary usage	1–20
Grammar and sentence structure	1–20
Mechanics (spelling and punctuation)	1–20

The maximum score was 100.

Observation Sheet

Observation sheets were used to record student participation and learning activities during the implementation of the Mind Mapping model. The observed aspects included:

1. Attention to teacher explanations
2. Participation in Mind Mapping activities
3. Ability to generate ideas
4. Collaboration during discussions
5. Engagement in writing activities

Interview Guide

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with students and the classroom teacher to obtain information regarding learning experiences, difficulties encountered, and responses toward the implementation of Mind Mapping.

Documentation

Documentation included lesson plans, observation records, student worksheets, photographs of learning activities, and students' written products.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Content validity was established through expert judgment by Indonesian language education experts and experienced elementary school teachers. The instruments were reviewed to ensure alignment with research objectives, learning indicators, and descriptive writing competencies.

Reliability of the observation instrument was checked through inter-observer agreement between the researcher and collaborating teacher. Consistency of scoring for writing assessments was ensured through rubric-based evaluation using predefined criteria.

Data Collection

Data were collected through:

1. Classroom observations conducted during each meeting.
2. Writing tests administered at the end of each cycle.
3. Interviews conducted after each cycle.
4. Documentation collected throughout the research process.

The use of multiple data sources enabled triangulation and increased the credibility of the findings.

Observation Data Analysis

Observation data were analyzed descriptively by calculating the frequency and percentage of observed student activities. The results were then categorized into levels of participation and engagement.

Interview Data Analysis

Interview data were analyzed through data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Responses were grouped into themes related to student learning experiences and perceptions of the Mind Mapping model.

Data Triangulation

Data credibility was strengthened through methodological triangulation and source triangulation. Methodological triangulation involved comparing findings from observations, writing tests, interviews, and documentation. Source triangulation involved comparing information obtained from students, the classroom teacher, and researcher observations.

Success Criteria

The action was considered successful when:

1. At least 80% of students achieved the Minimum Learning Mastery Criterion (KKTP) score of 75.
2. Students demonstrated active participation during Mind Mapping activities based on observation results.
3. There was improvement in descriptive writing performance across the research cycles

Results

Pre-Action

The pre-action stage was conducted on August 21, 2025, to identify students' initial ability in writing descriptive texts before the implementation of the Mind Mapping learning model. The assessment results showed that only 9 out of 25 students achieved the minimum mastery criterion (KKTP ≥ 75), while 16 students did not achieve mastery. The average score obtained by students was 65.60, indicating that their descriptive writing skills were still below the expected standard. Table 1 presents the learning mastery results in the pre-action stage.

Table 1. Pre-Action Learning Outcomes

Category	Number of Students	Percentage
Mastery	9	36%
Non-Mastery	16	64%
Total	25	100%

Analysis of students' writing revealed several weaknesses, including limited idea development, weak paragraph organization, insufficient use of descriptive vocabulary, and frequent grammatical and punctuation errors. Most students were unable to elaborate object characteristics in detail and tended to produce short, less coherent descriptions.

Cycle I Results

The implementation of the Mind Mapping model in Cycle I encouraged students to organize ideas visually before writing. Students created mind maps containing the main topic, supporting details, descriptive vocabulary, and object characteristics.

The results of Cycle I showed improvement compared to the pre-action stage. The average writing score increased from 65.60 to 71.80. A total of 15 students achieved mastery learning, while 10 students remained below the minimum criterion.

Table 2. Learning Outcomes in Cycle I

Category	Number of Students	Percentage
Mastery	15	60%
Non-Mastery	10	40%
Total	25	100%

The observation results indicated that student activity reached 72%, categorized as active. Students demonstrated greater participation in brainstorming activities, identifying object characteristics, and developing ideas through visual mapping.

Table 3. Student Activity in Cycle I

Indicator	Percentage
Attention to teacher explanation	76%
Participation in Mind Mapping activities	74%
Idea generation	70%
Classroom discussion	68%
Writing participation	72%
Average Activity	72%

Analysis of Writing Aspects in Cycle I

Writing Aspect	Average Score
Content	74
Organization	70
Vocabulary	69
Grammar	72
Mechanics	74

The findings indicate that students began to develop ideas more systematically; however, paragraph coherence and vocabulary use still required improvement.

Reflection on Cycle I

Reflection results showed that some students still experienced difficulties in expanding mind maps into complete paragraphs. Several students relied on limited vocabulary and produced descriptions that lacked detail. Therefore, improvements were made in Cycle II by providing more examples, enriching descriptive vocabulary, increasing guided practice, and encouraging peer discussion during the development of mind maps.

Cycle II Results

Cycle II focused on improving the quality of students' mind maps and providing more structured guidance during the writing process. Students were encouraged to use more detailed keywords, descriptive adjectives, and supporting information before composing their texts.

The results showed a significant improvement in writing performance. The average score increased to 86.16, and 23 out of 25 students achieved mastery learning.

Table 4. Learning Outcomes in Cycle II

Category	Number of Students	Percentage
Mastery	23	92%
Non-Mastery	2	8%
Total	25	100%

Student activity also increased substantially.

Table 5. Student Activity in Cycle II

Indicator	Percentage
Attention to teacher explanation	92%
Participation in Mind Mapping activities	90%
Idea generation	88%
Classroom discussion	87%
Writing participation	89%
Average Activity	89.2%

Analysis of Writing Aspects in Cycle II

Writing Aspect	Average Score
Content	89
Organization	85
Vocabulary	84
Grammar	86
Mechanics	87

The data indicate improvements across all assessed writing aspects. Students were able to generate ideas more effectively, construct coherent paragraph structures, and utilize a wider range of descriptive vocabulary. Final Improvement and Discussion. The implementation of the Mind Mapping model resulted in continuous improvement throughout the research cycles.

Table 6. Improvement of Students' Writing Achievement

Stage	Average Score	Mastery Percentage
Pre-Action	65.60	36%
Cycle I	71.80	60%
Cycle II	86.16	92%

The average score increased by 6.20 points from Pre-Action to Cycle I and by 14.36 points from Cycle I to Cycle II. Overall, the average score improved by 20.56 points from Pre-Action to Cycle II.
The improvement occurred because Mind Mapping helped students organize ideas visually before writing. The visual structure enabled students to identify relationships among ideas, develop more detailed descriptions, and maintain paragraph coherence. In addition, the use of keywords and branching concepts facilitated vocabulary expansion and reduced students' difficulties in starting the writing process.

Observation results also revealed a positive relationship between student activity and writing achievement. As students became more active in creating mind maps, discussing ideas, and organizing information, the quality of their descriptive texts improved. This finding suggests that Mind Mapping not only supports cognitive processes in writing but also promotes active participation and engagement during learning activities.

DISCUSSION

Results of Cycle I Implementation

Of the 25 fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 6 Suak Tapeh, 15 students scored 75-100 or according to the KKTP for the fifth-grade Indonesian language subject at SDN 6 Suak Tapeh, with a percentage of 60.00%. 10 students scored less than 75 or did not reach the KKTP for the fifth-grade Indonesian language subject at SDN 6 Suak Tapeh, with a percentage of 40.00%.

The average score of students in cycle 1 was 71.80. The results of the cycle I test still showed that classically the learning activities were not yet complete. If the completion requirement is 85% of students have obtained a score of ≥75 or in accordance with the Learning Objective Achievement Criteria (KKTP) in cycle I, students who have obtained a score of ≥75 or in accordance with the Learning Objective Achievement Criteria (KKTP) have only reached 60.00%, meaning that the cycle I research needs to be continued to cycle II.

These results align with Buzan's (2005) opinion, which states that Mind Mapping helps the brain work naturally in organizing ideas and information, as it involves the work of both hemispheres of the brain, the logical left side and the creative right side. Using mind maps helps students find and organize previously scattered ideas into a more structured way. However, as Buzan emphasized, the effectiveness of Mind Mapping depends on students' ability to understand how to connect main ideas and sub-ideas into a meaningful whole. Furthermore, Tarigan's (2008) theory explains that writing is a productive and expressive language skill that requires organized thinking and the ability to develop ideas clearly. In the context of this study, some students were still in the early stages of developing ideas and organizing them into coherent sentences. This is natural because writing is a skill that cannot be mastered instantly, but requires repeated practice with the right strategies.

From the results of the reflection on cycle I, the teacher made several improvements, including providing simpler examples of mind maps, increasing guidance in connecting ideas, and increasing individual writing exercises. These improvement efforts are in line with the views of Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) in the classroom action research model, which emphasizes the importance of reflection as a basis for planning corrective actions in the next cycle. Thus, the results of cycle I can be concluded as an initial stage that shows positive changes, but still requires refinement in the application of Mind Mapping so that students are more skilled at expressing ideas and producing complete and interesting descriptive texts.

During the implementation of cycle I actions, the researcher received a lot of criticism and suggestions from observers, this shows that the implementation of cycle I actions carried out by the researcher was not optimal, the researcher still made many mistakes that should not have happened during the implementation of cycle I actions.

Furthermore, student learning outcomes in cycle I also did not achieve completeness as a class. Therefore, errors that occurred during the implementation of cycle I actions need to be corrected during subsequent actions in cycle II.

Results of Cycle II Implementation

Of the 25 fifth-grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh who took the test, 23 students obtained scores in accordance with the Learning Objectives Achievement Criteria (KKTP) for the fifth-grade Indonesian language subject at SDN 6 Suak Tapeh with a percentage score of 92.00%. Meanwhile, there were 2 students with a percentage score of 8.00% who had not yet achieved the KKTP. If classically the completion requirement is 85% of students obtaining a score of 75 or above, in the second cycle, students who obtained scores in accordance with the Learning Objectives Achievement Criteria (KKTP) for the fifth-grade Indonesian language subject at SDN 6 Suak Tapeh reached 92.00%. Based on the classical completion requirements, the test results in cycle II indicate that the learning activities are declared complete. The average score of students in cycle II is 88.16.

These results indicate that the implementation of the Mind Mapping learning model has been running optimally. Students can easily express their ideas because the thinking process becomes more focused and organized. This finding is in line with Buzan's theory (2005), which states that Mind Mapping is a creative thinking tool that can help students connect main ideas with supporting ideas visually. With mind maps, students can see the relationship between concepts and ideas, making it easier for them to develop coherent and interesting writing content. The improvement in students' writing skills in cycle II is also in line with Christensen's opinion (2005), which emphasizes that Mind Mapping can improve students' critical and creative thinking skills. Through the activity of gradually arranging branching ideas, students learn to analyze relationships between concepts and organize information systematically. This has a positive impact on their ability to compose complete and logical descriptive paragraphs.

The findings of this study also support the research of Harefa, Pudjiati, and Usman (2022) and Kholisah, Indihadi, and Karlimah (2020), which demonstrated that the application of Mind Mapping can improve students' descriptive writing skills. Both studies demonstrated that the use of mind maps helps students organize ideas before writing and increases learning interest because writing becomes easier and more enjoyable. In the context of this study, students were not only able to produce better writing but also showed increased motivation and self-confidence in the learning process. Furthermore, the improvement in results in cycle II is also in line with Trianto's (2018) theory, which states that constructivism-based learning positions students as active subjects who construct their knowledge through meaningful learning experiences. The Mind Mapping model allows students to play an active role in the thinking and writing process, rather than just passively receiving information. This active involvement is evident in the increased student activeness in discussions, collaboration, and sharing ideas in class. The achievement of optimal learning outcomes in cycle II can also be explained through the Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) model on classroom action research. According to them, each learning cycle consists of the planning, action implementation, observation, and reflection stages.

Thus, it can be concluded that the implementation of the Mind Mapping model in cycle II successfully improved students' descriptive writing skills in terms of content, structure, and language use. Students were able to write more coherently, logically, and engagingly because they understood the relationships between ideas visually before putting them into writing.

This improvement also proves that Mind Mapping-based learning is effective for teaching writing skills in elementary schools, because it is able to develop creativity, increase activity, and strengthen overall understanding of concepts.

Analysis of Research Results from Cycles I and II

In the pre-action activities, the average value obtained by students was 65.60 and in cycle I the average value of students increased to 71.80. When compared with the values obtained by students in the pre-action activities with the results of the implementation of the cycle I test, the percentage increase in the average value of students from pre-action to cycle I was 71.80-65.60 = 6.20. This means that there was an increase in the average value from pre-action to cycle I of 6.20. In the implementation of the cycle I action, the results of the evaluation that the researcher conducted on 25 fifth grade students of SD Negeri 6 Suak Tapeh, students who got a score of 75-100 or according to the KKTP were 15 people with a percentage value of 60.00%, students who got a score of less than 75 or below the KKTP were 10 people with a percentage value of 40.00%. The average value of students in cycle 1 was 71.80. The results of the test implementation in the second cycle, from the total number of 25 students of grade V of SD Negeri 6 Suak Tapeh, 23 students were declared to have completed the learning activities, this means that in the second cycle there were still 2 students who were declared not to have completed and obtained scores that did not reach the KKTP for the Indonesian Language subject for grade V of SD Negeri 6 Suak Tapeh. The average score of students in the second cycle was 86.16.

Based on the results of classroom action research that has been carried out in two cycles, it can be stated that the implementation of the Mind Mapping learning model assisted by image media has proven effective in improving the ability to write descriptive texts of fifth grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh. The increase is seen from the learning outcomes of students who initially only achieved 36% completion in the pre-action, increased to 60% in cycle I, and finally reached 92% in cycle II. In addition to the increase in learning outcomes, student learning activities and teacher performance also experienced significant development. Students became more active, creative, and motivated in expressing ideas into written form, while teachers became more skilled in managing student-centered learning. Thus, it can be emphasized that the use of the Mind Mapping model assisted by image media is an effective, innovative, and fun learning strategy in developing descriptive text writing skills and improving the quality of Indonesian language learning in elementary schools. should not contain only the repetition of the results and discussions or abstracts. You should also suggest future research and point out those that are underway.

3. CONCLUSION

The conclusion from the results of this study is:

1. The implementation of the mind mapping learning method can improve the ability of fifth grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh in writing descriptive texts. Student learning outcomes increased from cycle I to cycle II. If in cycle I, 15 fifth grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh completed the task or with a percentage of 60.00%. In cycle II, the number of fifth grade students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh who completed the task was 23 people with a percentage value of 92.00%.
2. The level of improvement in the learning outcomes of fifth grade students of SD Negeri 6 Suak Tapeh on the material of writing descriptive text after the implementation of the action until cycle II can be explained as follows: At the pre-action stage, the average value of students reached 65.60. After the implementation of cycle I, the average value increased to 71.80. Furthermore, in cycle II there was a more significant increase with an average value reaching 86.16. Thus, the percentage increase in the average value from pre-action to cycle I was 6.20%, while from cycle I to cycle II it increased by 14.36%.

Author Contributions : Conceptualization, Mayang Sari; Methodology, Mayang Sari; Validation, Mayang Sari; Formal Analysis, Mayang Sari; Investigation, Mayang Sari; Resources, Mayang Sari; Data Curation, Mayang Sari; Writing Original Draft Preparation, Mayang Sari; Writing—Review & Editing, Mayang Sari; Visualization, Mayang Sari; Project Administration, Mayang Sari. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments : The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the Principal, teachers, and students of SDN 6 Suak Tapeh for their cooperation and active participation throughout the research process. Appreciation is also extended to colleagues and all parties who provided academic, administrative, and technical support during the implementation of this study.

Conflicts of Interest : The author declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Akhadiah, S., et al. (2004). Developing Indonesian writing skills. Erlangga.

Arikunto, S. (2019). Research procedures: A practical approach. Rineka Cipta.

Arief, T. A., & Wiratman, A. (2023). Improving writing a descriptive paragraph of elementary school students through picture-based mind mapping. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar, 7*(2), 284–292. https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v7i2.54013

Buzan, T. (2005). Mind mapping: Developing brain potential with mind maps. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Byrne, D. (1988). Teaching writing skills. Longman.

Cahyono, BY (2009). Techniques in teaching writing. UM Press.

Dalman. (2014). Writing skills. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Daud, MD (2003). Writing effectively. Rineka Cipta.

Dianto, R., & Basuni, M. (2015). The effectiveness of using mind mapping technique toward the students' achievement in writing descriptive text. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia, 7*(2), 165–172. https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.2015.7.2.165-172

Ministry of National Education. (2012). Guidelines for writing scientific papers. Ministry of National Education.

Febriani, R., Sulastri, AD, & Wahyuni, L. (2023). Classroom action research as a solution to improve the quality of learning. Journal of Education and Learning, 11(2), 89–97.

Fisher, R. (2020). Teaching children to think. Cambridge University Press.

Gie, TL (2002). Skilled in composing. Liberty.

Gie, TL (2019). Effective ways to write. Liberty.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2019). Effective writing instruction. Routledge. Halliday, MAK (1978). Language as social semiotic. Edward Arnold.

Harefa, R., Pudjiati, S., & Usman, A. (2022). Mind mapping model to improve elementary school students' descriptive writing skills. Indonesian Elementary Education Journal, 8(2), 145–156.

Harmer, J. (2004). How to teach writing. Longman.

Harmer, J. (2020). The practice of English language teaching. Pearson.

Hughes, A. (2003). Testing for language teachers (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Huda, M. (2018). Innovative learning models. Student Library. Hyerle, D. (2000). Thinking maps: Visual tools for learning. ASCD.

Irawati, N. (2019). The influence of image media on the results of writing descriptive text. Prima Edukasia.

Jasnain, T., Anita, & Rukiyah, S. (2022). Show not tell technique using caricature media for writing descriptions. Visionary: Journal of Education and Learning, 10(2), xx–xx.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1988). The action research planner (3rd ed.). Deakin University Press.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. (2022). Guide to the Implementation of the Independent Curriculum. Ministry of Education, Culture, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia.

Keraf, G. (2004). Argumentation and narrative. Gramedia.

Keraf, G. (2010). Diction and style. Gramedia.

Kholisah, N., Indihadi, D., & Karlimah. (2020). Analysis of descriptive writing skills through mind mapping. Journal of Elementary School Education, 6(1), 45–52.
Kosasih, E. (2014). Types of texts and their skills. Yrama Widya.
Langan, J. (2001). College writing skills. McGraw-Hill.
Lestari, A. (2021). The effectiveness of mind mapping in improving descriptive writing skills. Scientific Journal of Elementary School Teacher Education, 9(1), 39–46.
Marwoto. (1987). Indonesian language skills. Erlangga.
Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
Mulyasa, E. (2013). Development and implementation of the 2013 Curriculum. Rosdakarya Youth.
Mulyaningsih, S. (2020). Learning descriptive text. Language Ark.
Moleong, LJ (2019). Qualitative research methodology. Rosdakarya Youth.
Nurgiyantoro, B. (2001). Assessment in language and literature teaching. BPFE.
Nurgiyantoro, B. (2014). Theory of Fiction Studies. Gadjah Mada University Press.
Nurjamal, M. (2010). Strategies for writing descriptive text.
Nurhayati, E. (2020). Mind mapping improves writing creativity. Creative Journal, 4(1), 20–29.
Nurlaela, L. (2023). Basic concepts of PTK. Journal of Innovative Education, 9(1), 45–55. Oxford, R. (2016). Language learning strategies. Heinle.
Pudjiati, SN, Usman, B., & Harefa, D. (2022). Mind mapping improves descriptive writing skills. Indonesian Journal of Elementary Education, 7(2), 77–85
Putri, AF (2021).*Application of the Kemmis & McTaggart model in improving Indonesian language learning outcomes of elementary school students.*Indonesian Journal of Elementary Education, 7(1), 12–22.
Rahmah, R. (2023). Improving descriptive writing through mind mapping media. Indonesian Journal of Elementary Education, 10(1), 19–28.
Septiana, N. N., Prastowo, A., & Latuheru, S. C. (2025). The use of mind mapping method to develop elementary school students' writing skills in the Cambridge curriculum. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar, 9*(1), 104–113. https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v9i1.89498
Samsu Somadayo. (2011). Indonesian language learning strategies in elementary schools. Graha Ilmu.
Santoso. (2008). Learning to write: Theory and practice. Grafindo.
Sanjaya, W. (2016). Learning strategies oriented to educational process standards. Kencana.
Soliantini, Wardiah, D., & Rukiyah, S. (2023). The mind mapping method improves persuasive writing skills. KIBASP, 6(2), e4883.
Sudjana, N. (2017). Assessment of the results of the teaching and learning process. Rosdakarya Youth. Suyadi. (2020). Classroom action research. Student Library.
Suyono, & Hariyanto. (2011). Learning and teaching. Rosdakarya Youth.
Tarigan, HG (2008). Writing as a language skill. Angkasa. Tarigan, HG (2008). Speaking as a language skill. Angkasa.
Tobing, EKNL, & Gafari, OF (2023). Development of mind mapping-based descriptive writing materials. Journal of Language Education Innovation, 5(1), 112–123.
Trianto. (2018). Innovative constructivist-oriented learning models. Pustaka Prestasi.
Wahyuningsih, R. (2023). Image-based mind mapping improves writing skills. Journal of Applied Education, 11(3), 265–276.
Widyastuti, A. (2021). Mind mapping improves descriptive writing skills. Indonesian Journal of Elementary Education, 8(1), 44–52.
Weiner, C. (2010). Mind mapping for education. Routledge.
Yunita, R. (2022). Mind mapping strategies for young learners. Journal of Primary Education, 5(2), 201–210.