

The Mind Mapping: A Method to Improve Student Writing Skills

Edyson Baroes
edysonbaroes@jagakarsa.ac.id

Aleksandria Bangun
aleksandriabangun @jagakarsa.ac.id

Abstract

This study discusses improving students' writing skills through the mind mapping method. Students, as someone who gets learning material from the teacher at school, often do note-taking activities so that what is conveyed is not missed. Taking notes, especially noting subject matter, has the goal of getting key words from the subject matter. However, problems arose when students re-read their notes at a later time. The students had difficulty in learning the whole subject matter, but they only understood a little. This is because they do not understand how to study the notes they have made. To make the teaching and learning process clear and relevant, teachers should know about the Mind Mapping method. In this study, the authors analyse the Mind Mapping method as a method that can be used in various ways for various purposes. In the end, this study concluded that there was an influence of the Mind Mapping Method on students' ability to write narrative texts. Students feel enjoy in the teaching and learning process. That is, the Mind Mapping Method can be used as an alternative to teaching writing.

Keywords: *Mind Mapping; Writing Skills; Role-Play Technique; Students' ability*

INTRODUCTION

In the educational process, the position and existence of a method is very important. A method is used to assist teachers in teaching. In addition, the method can also be used to assist students in learning subject matter easily. This also applies to learning English.

English, which is an international language, can be said as a language to communicate with all people in the world. Without the ability to speak English, someone will be out of date. Someone will have difficulty communicating with co-workers when the office where someone works requires that every worker must use English. Especially for students, if they are not taught English from an early age, they will have difficulty communicating if they enter a community that uses English as the language of instruction.

Learning English, in general, is the same as learning other languages, including Indonesian. In English material there are also four language skills that are taught. The four skills are listening skills, speaking skills, reading skills, and writing

skills. Listening skill can be said as a natural skill. This is because listening skills have been carried out and honed since infancy. Slowly, when a human grows with his listening skills, he will also naturally learn the skills to speak with people around him such as with his parents and siblings.

After that, the skill that requires extra effort because it is not formed naturally is reading skill. This skill can be started if a human gets teaching either from a teacher or from parents. And finally, writing skills, are skills that are honed and developed through education in schools. Writing skills always start with the skills to write letters, then develop into writing words, sentences, paragraphs, a complete piece of writing, to become good writing in the form of articles and so on.

In this study, the main topic raised by the researcher was students' writing skills. Students, as someone who gets learning material from the teacher at school, often do note-taking activities so that what is conveyed is not missed. Taking notes, especially noting subject matter, has the goal of getting key words from the

subject matter. However, problems arose when students re-read their notes at a later time. The students had difficulty in learning the whole subject matter, but they only understood a little. This is because they do not understand how to study the notes they have made.

Sutanto Windura (2013: 3) states that, *“Children just need learn 75% from whole subject matter but 100% understand from what they learned”*. And Sutanto Windura proposes that according to survey from the whole subject matter the students learned, only about 15-25% important matter in the form of keyword. Remain, about 75-85% in the form of unimportant filler words. Ironically, according that survey, majority 75-85% children' time is spent to read, note, review, and memorize 75-85% unimportant filler words.

It means, the students just learn the keyword or important points from subject matter. It is useful in order to students become faster to understand in absorbing subject matter. Beside, almost whole time that is used by the students when review their notes, majority they absorb points a bit from their notes. Actually, the students can absorb 75% the points of their notes if the students note the keyword or important points from the subject matter.

The way of students' noting that researcher met in the research place, still in the form of traditional note, that is only written which is managed tidily and arranged. This traditional note incline make the students bore quickly when reread (review) the note they have made. Because, when the students are writing and review the note, the left brain is active.

The left brain has job in everything related with numbers, words, analysis, list, and line. The left brain is also called logic brain. And the right brain has job in everything related with color, dimension, imagination, rhythm, conceptual, and daydream. So it means that students only use left brain when noting. The right brain not active in noting activity. This case of

course make the left brain get burdened so the students become bore.

The curriculum that is used is curriculum 2013. English lesson material at eighth grade is about narrative text. The researcher's reason choose the topic about writing narrative text because the researcher found the data that the students lack of understand how to create a narrative text. It because of lack in mastery vocabulary in English so they difficult to make sentence in English.

In addition, the lack of the students' interest in activity of writing narrative text also affects. Learning method is used by teachers using conventional method so that students get bored quickly in learning writing narrative text. Narrative text itself is a kind of text in English like descriptive text, recount text, procedure, report, etc. Narrative text is defined as a text that is told appropriate the chronological and aims to entertain readers/listeners.

Narrative text is basically text that tells about something that did not really happen, but only made up by the author. Narrative text aims to entertain, to gain and maintain the attention of reader/listener. Narrative text aims also to educate, inform, deliver the reflections of the author's experience, and one important thing is to develop the imagination of the reader/listener. Narrative text generally is imaginary, but there is factual also, it tells the true incidence.

METHOD

The researcher uses Mind Mapping method. The method that can help students noting the subject matter creatively and not only the written, but there are images, lines, and colours. This method involves the right brain and the left brain. So that students will not get bored, even happy. With this mind mapping method, the way of noting will involve both left brain and right brain. Mind Mapping Method will have a positive impact on improving brain memory up to

78% due to the combination of the left brain and the right brain.

With the mind mapping method, can provide advantages in aspect of life. One of them in the family, mind mapping has usage in planning a holiday, a birthday party, and create a family tree. Mind mapping method is also useful for students in writing narrative text, by using imagination and creativity, students will be able to create a simple text narrative that is good and right. Moreover, with this method not only encourage students to learn but also play while refreshing the brain. It is said so, because students are invited to play with the colors and symbols on the mind mapping method. The previous methods that is used by teachers, is lack generate students' enthusiastic and lack of improve the ability of students in the teaching learning process, now become enthusiastic and improve the students' ability.

Based on the background, the writer identifies the following problems: first, the lack of interest of students towards learning to writing Narrative text; second, the lack of mastery of English vocabularies; third, students seldom to write the narrative text; forth, the teacher always corrects students' errors when write something; and fifth, application of old methods to make students bored while learning to writing Narrative text.

For this research, writer restrict the problem on whether there is a change in improving student's ability in writing narrative text by using the Mind Mapping method. Therefore, this research has two research problem. First, how the student's ability in writing narrative text who are taught by using the Mind Mapping method at eighth grade SMP Jayakarta; and how the student's ability in writing narrative text who are taught without using the Mind Mapping method at eighth grade SMP Jayakarta.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The writer did the observation in SMP Jayakarta. The writer tried to teach English use Mind Mapping Method in experiment class. The writer used Mind Mapping Method to build creative class. In this research the writer took the populations in the whole students of the eighth grade are 249 students. For the research, the writer took sample 30 students from class VIII-A and VIII-E, and total of sample was 60 students.

The procedure of the experiment was as follows:

1. The teacher divides six groups for making a Mind Mapping consisting of five students in a group.
2. The teacher give a model and steps to make a Minds Mapping to the students.
3. The teacher give example how to make a paragraph from mind mapping related to the subject matter about narrative text correctly in grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation.
4. Five students in each group make one Mind Mapping, so there are 6 paper of Mind Mapping, but every students also make one paragraph narrative text and must not same with others. Students try to make mind mapping silently based on the theme. During this step, the teacher tried to make the atmosphere calm and not noisy classroom so that students concentrate on making Mind Mapping and paragraph.
5. The students had their post-test. Each student in a group submit the narrative text. The teacher get marks of grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation from it.

The Data of Teaching Writing by Using Mind Mapping Method: The Description of Data

To find the result of test the writer makes the table of the students score to each group. The result of experiment class is tabulated and calculated in the following table.

After getting the data, researcher used the achievement test in the process of collecting the data. The writer gave test to the experiment class. Table 4.1 show that the highest score result of experimental class is 90, the lowest score of experiment class is 50. The total score of experimental class is 2482. The mean of experimental class is 78.60.

From the table 1(see appendix 1) shows that the result of experimental class is greater than control class. The total of experimental class is 2358 and the total score of control class is 2121. The mean of experimental class is 78.60 and mean of control class is 70.70. The differentiate result of experiment class and control class is 237.

List of students' writing value for experiment class (VIII-A)

No.	NAME OF STUDENTS	FINAL SCORE (X ₁)
1	AJI BIMANTORO	75
2	ARINDA TRIA DESTIANI	75
3	ARUM RAHMASARI	75
4	AUDIA MARETAGARI SUKRY	80
5	DIAH RAHMAWATI	80
6	HAZBI SANTOSO	90
7	HIJRI RAHMAWATI ANDHINI	90
8	IRHAM TRI ATMOJO	75
9	KHURROTUL JANNAH	85
10	LINDA PUTRI AULIA	90
11	MUTIARA ZANKY	75
12	NASYITHA AMELIA	75
13	NAUFAN DAFANTO	60
14	NOVHALJRI DWI PUTRA AMIN	85
15	NOVIA BERLIANA SARI	75
16	NOVIA RAMADHANI	85
17	NOVIA WIJAYANTI	85
18	NUR FADLA RIZKI	65
19	PANCAWALA PUTRA YUDISTIRA	78
20	PUTRI KOMALASARI	80
21	RACHMAT ARYA DIPA	90
22	RAFII BAGUS PRASOJO	70

23	RAHMA NURFADILAH	80
24	RAHMAH FEBRIANTY	82
25	RANI APRILIA ASTRIANTY	50
26	REZA GERALDI	80
27	RISKA AYU SETIANINGSIH	78
28	SALSABIL THALIA JULIETA TANJUNG	80
29	SARA ELISABETH LUTTERS	85
30	SATRIA MAULANA RENDYTO	85
	Σ	2358

Data analysis for an Experiment class

NO	Value of variables X ₁	Deviation from mean (X ₁ - \bar{X})	Deviation from mean (X ₁ - \bar{X}) ²
1	75	-3.60	12.96
2	75	-3.60	12.96
3	75	-3.60	12.96
4	80	1.40	1.96
5	80	1.40	1.96
6	90	11.40	129.96
7	90	11.40	129.96
8	75	-3.60	12.96
9	85	6.40	40.96
10	90	11.40	129.96
11	75	-3.60	12.96
12	75	-3.60	12.96
13	60	-18.60	345.96
14	85	6.40	40.96
15	75	-3.60	12.96
16	85	6.40	40.96
17	85	6.40	40.96
18	65	-13.60	184.96
19	78	-0.60	0.36
20	80	1.40	1.96
21	90	11.40	129.96
22	70	-8.60	73.96
23	80	1.40	1.96
24	82	3.40	11.56
25	50	-28.60	817.96
26	80	1.40	1.96
27	78	-0.60	0.36
28	80	1.40	1.96
29	85	6.40	40.96

30	85	6.40	40.96
Σ	2358		2303.2

The Table of Frequency: Distribution Data

Description of Frequency Distribution Data of Increasing students' ability in writing narrative text by using Mind Mapping Method.

The score in Experimental class

1. Calculating Range data with the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} R &= H - L \\ &= 90 - 50 \\ &= 40 \end{aligned}$$

Explanation:

H = Highest score

L = Lowest score

R = Range

2. Calculating classes (K) with the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} K &= 1 + 3,3 \log n \\ &= 1 + 3,3 \log 30 \\ &= 1 + 3,3 (1,48) \\ &= 5,87 \\ &= 6 \end{aligned}$$

3. Calculating interval classes (I) with the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{R}{K} \\ &= \frac{40}{6} \\ &= 6,6 \\ &= 7 \end{aligned}$$

Frequency of score in Experiment Class

INTERVAL	F	Cumulative frequency
50-57	1	1
58-65	2	3
66-73	1	4
74-81	15	19
82-89	7	26
90-107	4	30
Σ	30	

The table shows that students who scored 50-57 are 1 student with CF is 1, scored 58-65 are 2 students with CF is 3, scored 66-73 are 1 student with CF is 4, scored 74-81 are 15 students with CF is 19, scored 82-89 are 7 students with CF is 26, and scored 90-107 are 4 students with CF is 30.

The Data of Teaching Writing by Using Conventional Method: The Description of Data

In this research the total score of control class for the students' score by using conventional method is 2121, and mean of control class is 70.70. Table 5 (see appendix 2) show that the highest score result of control class is 80. The lowest score of control class is 60.

List of students' writing value for control class (VIII-E)

NO	NAME STUDENTS	FINAL SCORE
1	ACHMAD RENDRA SIHOMBING	70
2	ADE OVIYANTI	65
3	AJENG MIETAWSWARY ANNISA	75
4	ALMA NADIA ANWAR	75
5	ANISA NOVIANTI	80
6	ANZALI NOVYANTI	70
7	ARBA SA'BAN	70
8	AULIA WIDYAMURTI	80
9	BIMA SURYA CAHYANA	65
10	DENNY NUGROHO	65
11	DESTRA RAMADHIKA	70
12	DHEA FEBIYANTI	75
13	DINAR HIKMAH	75
14	EGY APRIADI	75
15	ERLIAN PUTRI AYUNANI	65
16	FATHIA AZIZAH	65
17	FIKRI VIRGIWAN	78
18	GILANG ADJI RIVANI	75
19	INTAN NUR FATHONIA	75

20	ISKANDAR OASIS	80
21	KHAIRANI FAISAL VARIE	65
22	MAHESA AIRLANGGA	60
23	MOHAMMAD FIKRI MAULANA	60
24	MOHAMMAD FARIZ AL GHIFARI	70
25	MUHAMMAD ADDITS RIZKI	75
26	MUHAMMAD DIMAS PRASETIA	68
27	MUHAMMAD INDRA SETIAWAN	60
28	MUHAMMAD WENDY DWI ANUGRAH	60
29	NADYA PERMATA PUTRI	80
30	PUTRI KHAIRUNISYA	75
	Σ	2121

24	70	-0.7	0.49
25	75	4.3	18.49
26	68	-2.7	7.29
27	60	-10.7	114.49
28	60	-10.7	114.49
29	80	9.3	86.49
30	75	4.3	18.49
Σ	2121		1228.3

The Table of Frequency Distribution Data

Description of Frequency Distribution Data of Teaching Writing by using Conventional method:

The score in Control Class

Calculating Range data with the formula:

$$R = H - L$$

$$= 80 - 60$$

$$= 20$$

Explanation:

- H = Highest score
- L = Lowest score
- R = Range

Calculating classes (K) with the formula:

$$K = 1 + 3,3 \log n$$

$$= 1 + 3,3 \log 30$$

$$= 1 + 3,3 (1,48)$$

$$= 5,87$$

$$= 6$$

Calculating interval classes (I) with the formula:

$$I = \frac{R}{K}$$

$$= \frac{20}{6}$$

$$= 3,33$$

$$= 3$$

Frequency of score in Control class

INTERVAL	F	Cumulative frequency
60-63	4	4

Data analysis for a Control Class

No	Value of variables X ₁	Deviation from mean (X ₁ - \bar{X})	Deviation from mean (X ₁ - \bar{X}) ²
1	70	-0.7	0.49
2	65	-5.7	32.49
3	75	4.3	18.49
4	75	4.3	18.49
5	80	9.3	86.49
6	70	-0.7	0.49
7	70	-0.7	0.49
8	80	9.3	86.49
9	65	-5.7	32.49
10	65	-5.7	32.49
11	70	-0.7	0.49
12	75	4.3	18.49
13	75	4.3	18.49
14	75	4.3	18.49
15	65	-5.7	32.49
16	65	-5.7	32.49
17	78	7.3	53.29
18	75	4.3	18.49
19	75	4.3	18.49
20	80	9.3	86.49
21	65	-5.7	32.49
22	60	-10.7	114.49
23	60	-10.7	114.49

64-67	6	10
68-71	6	16
72-75	9	25
76-79	1	26
80-83	4	30
Σ	30	

The table above shows that students who scored 60-63 are 4 students with CF is 4, scored 64-67 are 6 students with CF is 10, scored 68-71 are 6 students with CF is 16, scored 72-75 are 9 students with CF is 25, scored 76-79 are 1 student with CF is 26, and scored 80-83 are 4 students with CF is 30.

To know the result of the test, the writer makes table of students score for each class, both experiment class and control class test.

The Calculation Of Both Control Class and Experiment Class Test

Student (N)	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1	75	70	5250	5625	4900
2	75	65	4875	5625	4225
3	75	75	5625	5625	5625
4	80	75	6000	6400	5625
5	80	80	6400	6400	6400
6	90	70	6300	8100	4900
7	90	70	6300	8100	4900
8	75	80	6000	5625	6400
9	85	65	5525	7225	4225
10	90	65	5850	8100	4225
11	75	70	5250	5625	4900
12	75	75	5625	5625	5625
13	60	75	4500	3600	5625
14	85	75	6375	7225	5625
15	75	65	4875	5625	4225
16	85	65	5525	7225	4225
17	85	78	6630	7225	6084
18	65	75	4875	4225	5625
19	78	75	5850	6084	5625
20	80	80	6400	6400	6400
21	90	65	5850	8100	4225

22	70	60	4200	4900	3600
23	80	60	4800	6400	3600
24	82	70	5740	6724	4900
25	50	75	3750	2500	5625
26	80	68	5440	6400	4624
27	78	60	4680	6084	3600
28	80	60	4800	6400	3600
29	85	80	6800	7225	6400
30	85	75	6375	7225	5625
Σ	2358	2121	166465	187642	151183

According to the table 9 it has been calculated the result of $\Sigma X = 2358$ and $\Sigma Y = 2121$ then the writer tries to find out the mean variable X and variable Y with formula:

Mean

a. Mean of Experiment class

$$x = \frac{\sum x}{n} = \frac{2358}{30} = 78.60$$

b. Mean of control Class

$$x = \frac{\sum x}{n} = \frac{2121}{30} = 70.70$$

Median (Me)

Median of Experiment Class

50 60 65 70 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 78 78 80 80
80 80 80 80 82 85 85 85 85 85 85 90 90 90 90

$$\text{Median} = \frac{80+80}{2} = 80$$

Median of Control Class

60 60 60 60 65 65 65 65 65 65 68 70 70 70 70
70 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 78 80 80 80 80

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Median} &= \frac{70 + 70}{2} \\ &= 70 \end{aligned}$$

Mode (Mo)

Mode of Experiment Class

$$\begin{aligned} Mo &= b + \left(\frac{b_1}{b_1 + b_2} \right) p \\ &= 73.5 + \left(\frac{14}{14 + 8} \right) \times 7 \\ &= 76.5 + (0.6363) \times 7 \\ &= 76.5 + 4.45 \\ &= 80.95 \end{aligned}$$

Mode of Control Class

$$\begin{aligned} Mo &= b + \left(\frac{b_1}{b_1 + b_2} \right) p \\ &= 71.5 + \left(\frac{3}{3 + 8} \right) \times 3 \\ &= 71.5 + (0.272) \times 3 \\ &= 71.5 + 0.818 = 72.31 \end{aligned}$$

Explanation:

Mo = mode

b = lower limit of the class interval with

the highest frequency

p = length of the class interval

b_1 = the frequency of the highest frequency

minus the previous class

b_2 = highest frequency minus the frequency

of the class afterward

Based on the table above, it has been known the result of $\sum X^2 = 187642$ and $\sum Y^2 = 151183$ the values of deviation standard of variable x and variable y are calculated by using this formula:

Deviation Standard

Deviation standard for Experiment Class

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$

$$= \sqrt{2303.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sqrt{\frac{30 - 1}{79.42}} \\ s &= 8.91 \end{aligned}$$

Deviation Standard of Control Class

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{1228.3}{30 - 1}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sqrt{42.35} \\ s &= 6.50 \end{aligned}$$

Deviation Standard of the Combined (S)

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1) S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1) S_2^2}{(n_1 + n_2) - 2}$$

Explanation:

S_1 = Deviation standard Control class

S_2 = Deviation standard Experiment class

n_1 = Number of Samples Control class

n_2 = Number of Samples Experiment class

$$S^2 = \frac{(30 - 1) (8.91)^2 + (30 - 1) (6.50)^2}{(30 + 30) - 2}$$

$$= \frac{(29) (79.38) + (29) (42.25)}{58}$$

$$= \frac{2302.02 + 1225.25}{58}$$

$$= \frac{3527.27}{58}$$

$$= 60.81$$

$$S = \sqrt{60.81} = 7.79$$

Results of the data obtained

No.	Kinds of Data	Experiment class	Control class
1.	Number of	30	30
2.	Samples (N)	78.60	70.70
3.	Mean	80.95	72.31
4.	Modus (Mo)	80	70
5.	Median (Me)	79.42	42.35
6.	Variance	8.91	6.50
7.	Deviation Standard	7.79	7.79

	Deviation Standard of the combined		
--	------------------------------------	--	--

Hypothesis Testing

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{78.60 - 70.70}{\sqrt{\frac{(8.91)^2}{30} + \frac{(6.50)^2}{30}}}$$

$$= \frac{7.90}{\sqrt{\frac{79.38}{30} + \frac{42.25}{30}}}$$

$$= \frac{7.90}{\sqrt{2.64 + 1.40}}$$

$$= \frac{7.90}{\sqrt{4.04}}$$

$$= \frac{7.90}{2.01}$$

$$= 3.93$$

Based on the above calculation and obtained t_{count} 3.93 with degrees of freedom (df) 58 and 5% significance level obtained, t_{table} 2.001 so t_{count} higher than t_{table} ($3.93 > 2.001$). It can be concluded that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. So it can be said that there is influence between students' ability in writing narrative text who are taught using the Mind Mapping Method and who are taught using the Conventional Method at eighth grade.

Along the process of the research and the observation directly to the school that has been object of the research activity, the writer also gets some findings from the students and the teacher, such as: There are some students who have low motivation in the following the kind of activities in the learning English process, it is shown by some of the students lazy to learn English, and they are limitation of the knowledge and experience of English.

While from the teacher, there are also found some findings such as: the method used in teaching is monotonous that is caused boring for the students, beside that the teacher tends that she does not have creativity in teaching English and lack of methods used in the teaching – learning activity in the classroom.

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation in the previous chapters, here the writer wants to give some conclusions of the contains of this research paper, it is hoped that the readers will be able to know much about this research paper easily, the conclusion such as below:

4. The teacher is not only as the information giver but also as a facilitator she has to give students guidance and direction how to competence speaking.
5. The effect of using Mind Mapping Method in teaching writing has given impact to students. The students are more motivated. It can be concluded that using Mind Mapping Method motivated the student's achievement on writing narrative text test
6. Teaching writing by using Mind Mapping Method is effective rather than Conventional Method. It can be seen from the result of computation. It indicates that the average score of experimental group (m) mean is 78.60. It is higher than control group (m) mean which is 70.70 The experimental has standard deviation (sd), which is 8.91 and the standard deviation of control group is 6.50. The data above show that there is significant difference between the experimental and the control group
7. Mind Mapping method is a method which students work in group or individuals, can be used in a variety of ways for variety goals, but it is primarily used to make easy in noting subject matter, planning family's plan,

review a note with a simple and many picture.

8. The writing ability becomes very important in education field, students need to be trained in order to have a good writing ability. Writing is also very important for students, besides listening, speaking, and reading ability. The good English writing is reflection from the smart student.
9. Based on the data analysis, there is an influence of Mind Mapping Method on students' ability in writing narrative text. The students feel enjoy in the teaching learning process. It means that Mind Mapping Method can be used as one of the alternative to teach writing

language. International Journal of Instruction, 6(2).

- Njie, B., & Asimiran, S. (2014). *Case study as a choice in qualitative methodology*. Journal of Research & Method in Education, 4(3), 35-40.
- Nurlaila, A. P. (2013). *The use of mind mapping technique in writing descriptive text*. Journal of English and Education, 1(2), 9-15.
- Shapiro, E. S., Fritschmann, N. S., Thomas, L. B., Hughes, C. L., & McDougal, J. (2014). *Concurrent and predictive validity of reading retell as a brief measure of reading comprehension for narrative text*. Reading Psychology, 35(7), 644-665.

REFERENCES

- Agustin, Mubiar. (2011). *Permasalahan Belajar dan Inovasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama
- Bakhtiar, Amsal. (2010). *Filsafat Ilmu. Revised edition*. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada
- Cook, A. E., & O'Brien, E. J. (2014). *Knowledge activation, integration, and validation during narrative text comprehension*. Discourse Processes, 51(1-2), 26-49.
- Corballis, M. C. (2014). *Left brain, right brain: facts and fantasies*. PLoS biology, 12(1), e1001767.
- Fedorenko, E., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2014). *Reworking the language network*. Trends in cognitive sciences, 18(3), 120-126.
- Jafari, Z. (2014). *A comparison of conventional lecture and team-based learning methods in terms of student learning and teaching satisfaction*. Medical journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 28, 5.
- Javed, M., Juan, W. X., & Nazli, S. (2013). *A study of students' assessment in writing skills of the English*