CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

As discussed in the previous chapter there were improvements shown by the subject. The pretest result was very low and categorized as "poor", in which the average score was 38.00 of 100 and only 3.45% of the subject was able to pass the test. The result of cycle I indicated improvement but still below the standard of achievement and categorized as "average". The average posttest score was 66.25 of 100 and only 51.72% of the subject was able to pass the test. The average product score was 2.16 of 4.00 and the average score of students' behavior and respond was 2.87 of 4.00. While the result of cycle II showed that the average of the posttest score increased to 74.42 of 100, which is categorized as "good". 70.00% of the subject was able to pass the test. The average product score was 3.12 of 4.00 and the average score of students' behavior and respond was 3.25 of 4.00. With the satisfactory result obtained in cycle II, there was no need to proceed to the next cycle. Students had passed the standard of achievement applied, which was 70.00 in score and more than 60% of the subject had been able to pass the cycle II posttest.

Based on this result it can be concluded that the implementation of *Mind Mapping* improves the critical reading comprehension skill of the eighth grade students of SMPK Sancta Familia Sikumana Kupang in the School Year 2014/2015.

Daiek and Anter states that reading is an (inter)active process in which one's cognitive mostly involves (2004: 5) but not many techniques can actively trigger student's cognitive aspect when they are reading, however, *Mind Mapping* is. When students are making their *Mind Map* they have to really understand the text before put a keyword in a branch. *Mind Mapping* forced them to interact deeply with the text. It triggered their cognitive. Furthermore, since *Mind Map* is one of the Synthesis Level of Thinking tools it activates the critical thinking as well.

The eighth grade students of SMPK Sancta Familia Sikumana Kupang in the School Year 2014/2015 do have higher level of cognitive potential that can be developed further if they are given appropriate challenge and stimulus. If they are high expected to be successful and given enough support and encouragement they will.

5.2   Suggestion

1.   English Teacher

English teachers especially those who are teaching at the school where this study was taken place are highly recommended to use *Mind Map* as one of the tool to teach the students to think critically towards a text. Teachers are also suggested to allow their students to take notes according to the style that suit them best, such as *Mind Map*, and not only the literal ones or the neat ones and to examine the notes based on how well the students understand them, not how they look like. It also would be very useful to provide

appropriate challenge and stimulus for them such as questions or test items that varied based on the Bloom's Taxonomy.

2. Students

Students, especially those who were involved in this study, are suggested to use *Mind Map* as their personal learning tool because it is very useful to help them to be better in comprehending a text critically in a fun and a less stress way.

3. The Writer

The writer will become an educator and since this study showed a positive result she decided to continue to use *Mind Map* with any necessary adjustment in her professional career as a teacher later on and shares it with others especially her future students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anonym. 2013. Media Belajar Bahasa Inggris: Text, [cited April 2nd, 2014]. Available from URL: http://www.belajarbahasainggris.us/

Buzan, T. 2009. *Buku Pintar Mind Map.* (Susi Purwoko, Pentj.). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Burns, A. 2010. *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners.* New York: Routledge

Daiek, D. & Anter, N. 2004. *Critical Reading for College and Beyond*. New York: McGraw Hill.

DePorter, B. & Hernacki, M. 2004. *Quantum Learning: Membiasakan Belajar Nyaman dan Menyenangkan.* (Alwiyah Abdurrahman, Pentj.). Bandung: Kaifa.

Erom, K. 2013. Practical Guidelines for Writing Research Report (Thesis). Kupang: Universitas Katolik Widya Mandira.

Johnson, G. 2010. Understanding How the Brain Works, [cited Oct. 25th, 2013]. Available from: URL: http://www.tbiguide.com/howbrainworks.html.

Johnson, L. A. 2009. *Pengajaran yang Kreatif dan Menarik: Cara Membangkitkan Minat Siswa Melalui Pemikiran*. (Dewi Dharyani, Pentj.) Jakarta: Indeks.

Joseph. 2005. Using Mind Map to Enhance Reading, [cited Dec. 14th, 2013]. Available from: URL: http://www.edb.gov.hk/attachment/tc/edu-system/primary-secondary/applicable-to-primary-secondary/sbss/school-based-curriculum-primary/samples-of-work/egp/mindmapjosept05[1].pdf

Lawrence, D & Lawrence, R. 2006. *The Animal Kingdom (God's Design for Life).* Hebron: Answers in Genesis.

Ramadhy, S. & Permadi, D. 2009. *Bagaimana Mengembangkan Kecerdasan?: Metode Baru untuk Mengoptimalkan Fungsi Otak Manusia.* Bandung: PT Sarana Panca Karya Nusa.

Riswanto & Putra, P. 2012. The Use of Mind Mapping Strategy in the Teaching of Writing, [cited Oct. 25th, 2013]. Available from: URL: http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_21_November_2012/8.pdf

Soanes, C. & Stevenson, A. (Ed.). 2004. *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (11th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Supramaniam, E. 2011. The Effects of Using Semantic Map Strategy on Reading Comprehension for Lower Secondary Learners written, [cited Oct. 25th, 2013]. Available from: URL: http://www.fp.utm.my/ePusatSumber/pdffail/ptkghdfwP/final%20version%2011.pdf

Takari, E. 2010. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas.* Bandung: PT Genesindo.

Wycoff, J. 2003. *Menjadi Super Kreatif Melalui Metode Pemetaan-Pikiran.* (Rina S. Marzuki, Pentj.). Bandung: Kaifa.