

# mh hasbi

## 4983-Article Text-33696-1-2-20260927

1. 논문 및 과제 검사 - 유사도 검사시 DB 미저장 (Originality Check - No Repository)

### Document Details

**Submission ID**

trn:oid::3618:145148613

**Submission Date**

Jul 8, 2026, 3:46 PM GMT+8

**Download Date**

Jul 8, 2026, 3:51 PM GMT+8

**File Name**

4983-Article Text-33696-1-2-20260927.docx

**File Size**

253.8 KB

**14 Pages****5,413 Words****33,433 Characters**

# 8% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

## Filtered from the Report

- Bibliography

### Match Groups

-  **23 Not Cited or Quoted 5%**  
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **15 Missing Quotations 3%**  
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **0 Missing Citation 0%**  
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0 Cited and Quoted 0%**  
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

### Top Sources

- 6%  Internet sources
- 4%  Publications
- 4%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

## Match Groups

- 23 Not Cited or Quoted 5%**  
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 15 Missing Quotations 3%**  
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 0 Missing Citation 0%**  
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 0 Cited and Quoted 0%**  
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

## Top Sources

- 6% Internet sources
- 4% Publications
- 4% Submitted works (Student Papers)

## Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

|    |                |                                                                                    |     |
|----|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1  | Internet       | jurnal.smpharapanananda.sch.id                                                     | <1% |
| 2  | Publication    | Marino Sihombing, Dumaris E. Silalahi. "Enhancing Students' Narrative Writing S... | <1% |
| 3  | Internet       | etdci.org                                                                          | <1% |
| 4  | Internet       | kipdf.com                                                                          | <1% |
| 5  | Internet       | files.eric.ed.gov                                                                  | <1% |
| 6  | Internet       | ducator.tech4learning.com                                                          | <1% |
| 7  | Internet       | jurnal.fs.umi.ac.id                                                                | <1% |
| 8  | Internet       | www.asianinstituteofresearch.org                                                   | <1% |
| 9  | Student papers | University of Wales, Bangor on 2022-12-05                                          | <1% |
| 10 | Student papers | University of Central England in Birmingham on 2024-01-12                          | <1% |

|    |                |                                                                                    |     |
|----|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 11 | Internet       | edupij.com                                                                         | <1% |
| 12 | Internet       | minds.wisconsin.edu                                                                | <1% |
| 13 | Student papers | University of Edinburgh on 2026-01-06                                              | <1% |
| 14 | Internet       | repository.unmuhjember.ac.id                                                       | <1% |
| 15 | Student papers | Management & Science University on 2025-03-23                                      | <1% |
| 16 | Publication    | Shujing Jiang, Junjie Gavin Wu, Wenxi Xie, Mark Feng Teng, Chan Tong Lam, Wei L... | <1% |
| 17 | Internet       | ijehss.com                                                                         | <1% |
| 18 | Internet       | kpd.ejournal.unri.ac.id                                                            | <1% |
| 19 | Student papers | American College of Education on 2025-10-22                                        | <1% |
| 20 | Student papers | Trevecca Nazarene University (Nashville) on 2025-04-10                             | <1% |
| 21 | Student papers | University of Hong Kong on 2025-07-29                                              | <1% |
| 22 | Internet       | e-journal.unimudasorong.ac.id                                                      | <1% |
| 23 | Student papers | Mae Fah Luang University on 2025-12-18                                             | <1% |
| 24 | Student papers | The Hong Kong Polytechnic University on 2025-10-30                                 | <1% |

|    |                |                                                                                      |     |
|----|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 25 | Publication    | Yertay Sultan, Kalbike Yessenova, Bagdagul Seyitova, Zhanalik Baltabayeva, Aima...   | <1% |
| 26 | Internet       | eprints.unibba.ac.id                                                                 | <1% |
| 27 | Internet       | jurnal.umk.ac.id                                                                     | <1% |
| 28 | Internet       | scholars.ncu.edu.tw                                                                  | <1% |
| 29 | Internet       | usnsj.com                                                                            | <1% |
| 30 | Publication    | Mutiara Hendrastuti, Fitri Puji Rahmawati. "Habituation of News Text Writing Skil... | <1% |
| 31 | Student papers | University of Sunderland on 2025-11-16                                               | <1% |

# Students' Poetry Writing Skills Through the Mind Mapping Method: A Remote Indonesian Elementary School

Martha Sendi Laurika<sup>1</sup>, Zainudin Notanubun<sup>2</sup>, Stelie D. Ratumanan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1, 2, 3</sup> Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universitas Pattimura, Indonesia

## Article Info

### Article history:

Received April 26, 2026

Accepted June 16, 2026

Published July 08, 2026

### Keywords:

Classroom Action Research;

Divergent Thinking;

Elementary Education;

Mind Mapping;

Poetry Writing.

## ABSTRACT

Poetry writing is a highly demanding literacy competency for young learners, yet conventional instruction in Indonesian elementary schools often lacks the necessary scaffolding. This collaborative classroom action research (CAR) study investigated whether the mind mapping method could enhance poetry writing ability by stimulating divergent thinking during the prewriting stage. Following the Kemmis and McTaggart spiral model, the intervention was conducted across two instructional cycles involving all 14 fifth-grade students at SD Inpres Naumatang, a remote public elementary school. Data were gathered through structured observations, documentation, and performance-based tests evaluated across three core rubrics: title, diction, and figurative language. The results demonstrated progressive improvement: the class mean rose from 61.10 (pre-test) to 66.00 (Cycle I), and ultimately to 73.29 (Cycle II). Crucially, classical mastery skyrocketed from 28.57% to 100.00% by the end of Cycle II. The most significant gains occurred in diction selection and figurative language, driven by optimized mind map exemplars, intensified individualized guidance, and enhanced thematic autonomy. This study extends the literature by applying mind mapping to the cognitively demanding domain of poetry in an under-researched remote-school context. It reframes mind mapping as a critical cognitive scaffold mediating divergent thinking and creative linguistic expressions, providing elementary educators with a replicable pedagogical sequence.

Copyright © 2025 ETDCI.  
All rights reserved.

## Corresponding Author:

Martha Sendi Laurika,

Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universitas Pattimura, Indonesia

Email: [athasendilaurika@gmail.com](mailto:athasendilaurika@gmail.com)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely regarded as the most cognitively demanding language skill, as it requires learners to integrate cognitive, affective, and expressive capacities to articulate ideas in a structured written form (Aprinawati & Fitri, 2023). Among the various genres taught in elementary school, poetry occupies a strategic position because it functions as a medium of aesthetic expression that cultivates emotional sensitivity, imagination, and creativity from an early age (Julianto et al., 2025).

Indonesian language instruction is explicitly directed toward sharpening learners' affective sensitivity, and teachers are correspondingly expected to foster students' interest in literary works, including poetry (Prawoto et al., 2024). Despite this mandate, empirical observations in the field consistently indicate that elementary students' poetry writing ability remains at a concerning level.

A growing body of classroom action research suggests that this weakness is not merely a technical linguistic issue but stems from the absence of instructional methods that help students organize ideas and develop creative expression. Sasmita and Sujarwo (2021) attribute low poetry writing competence to instructional models that fail to scaffold the writing process itself, underscoring the need for innovative pedagogical approaches. Rahmawati and Citrawati (2023) further mapped the specific difficulties elementary students encounter when writing poetry, including determining themes, selecting diction, and developing imagination independently. In practice, teachers frequently ask students to compose poetry purely from imagination, without presenting concrete stimuli, leaving students confused about how to begin arranging words (Pangesthika et al., 2021).

A comparable condition was identified at Elementary School Inpres Naumatang, where preliminary observations revealed that most fifth-grade students scored below the Minimum Mastery Criterion (*KKM*) in poetry writing. Students struggled to generate ideas, determine themes, select aesthetically appropriate vocabulary, and develop imagination autonomously. Instruction had remained largely conventional: teachers explained the definition of poetry and immediately required students to write, without scaffolding to help them map their thoughts. The central weakness of this approach is its neglect of divergent thinking and idea generation—processes that form the foundation of meaningful poetic work.

Mind mapping offers a promising pedagogical response to this gap. First introduced by Tony Buzan in the 1960s as a diagram emulating the branching structure of brain cells, mind mapping begins from a single central theme and expands outward through hierarchical branches that combine images and words (Erdem, 2017; Shi et al., 2023). As a visual thinking tool, it enables students to organize information systematically, transforming scattered ideas into coherent written structures (Kachak & Kachak, 2022). Because poetry composition is essentially a process of expanding and deepening a single core idea into an array of images and expressions, mind mapping is particularly well suited to poetry writing instruction.

International evidence supports this rationale. Mind mapping has been shown to help learners organize ideas, develop thinking skills, and understand the relationships among problem components, yielding written outputs that reflect stronger idea development and fluency of expression (Al-inbari et al., 2023). As a prewriting activity, mind mapping also carries substantial potential for enhancing elementary students' creative writing skills; when students are explicitly taught to interpret and construct mind maps, they show significant gains in summarizing and recalling information, and mind maps reinforce comprehension, memory, and deeper thinking through the visual organization of ideas (Boerma et al., 2022; Mustika et al., 2025).

Within Indonesian language instruction specifically, research on mind mapping and poetry writing has yielded consistent findings (Sanjiartha et al., 2026). A literature review of classroom action research articles found that the mind mapping technique consistently enhances elementary students' poetry writing ability (Utami & Sanjaya, 2025), and empirical classroom action research indicates that mean scores increase significantly following its implementation, progressing from a very low category at baseline to exceeding mastery targets by the final cycle (Harefa et al., 2023). A mind-mapping-based poetry writing guidebook for fifth-grade students has likewise been developed and shown to improve learning outcomes (Mutia & Silalahi, 2022).

Beyond its direct benefits for writing quality, mind mapping has also been shown to cultivate higher-order thinking skills that underline twenty-first-century competencies, including collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking (Rahim et al., 2025; Wansyah et al., 2025). This aligns with the direction of Indonesia's *Merdeka Curriculum*, which emphasizes developing students' creative and critical thinking through meaningful, student-centered learning. Integrating mind mapping into poetry writing instruction therefore represents not merely an effort to improve short-term outcomes, but an investment in students' broader creative thinking capacities.

Although research on mind mapping in writing instruction has developed considerably, studies that specifically examine its use for improving poetry writing in remote elementary school settings remain scarce. This gap is consequential: remote schools such as Elementary School Inpres Naumatang often face constrained access to instructional media and professional development, conditions under which a low-cost, easily implementable visual strategy such as mind mapping may be especially valuable. The present study addresses this gap by systematically examining the implementation of the mind mapping method among fifth-grade students at Elementary School Inpres Naumatang through a classroom action research approach. Specifically, the study sought to: (1) describe the implementation of the mind mapping method in fifth-grade poetry writing instruction; (2) analyze the improvement in students' poetry writing ability following its implementation; and (3) identify the factors that supported and inhibited its implementation. The findings are intended to contribute empirically to the development of Indonesian language learning practices in elementary schools, particularly regarding the use of innovative, visually based instructional methods to enhance poetry writing skills.

## 2. METHOD

This study employed Classroom Action Research (CAR), conducted collaboratively between the researcher and the classroom teacher, because this design aligns directly with the objective of improving both the process and outcomes of poetry writing instruction through the direct implementation of the mind mapping method. The collaborative structure allowed the researcher and teacher to jointly engage in critical reflection on instructional practice and to design and implement systematic, iterative remedial actions until the research objectives were attained. The study followed the Kemmis and McTaggart spiral model, comprising four stages within each cycle: (1)



- Observing. Observation was conducted concurrently with implementation. The researcher, acting as observer, recorded teacher activity and student engagement throughout the lesson using predesigned observation sheets, with each observed aspect scored against a pre-agreed rubric.
- Reflecting. The researcher and teacher jointly reviewed the observation results and students' end-of-cycle poetry writing scores. This reflection informed refinements to the planning and implementation of Cycle II.

## Cycle II

The Cycle II procedure mirrored that of Cycle I, with refinements informed by the Cycle I reflection. These refinements targeted aspects that had not yet been optimized, namely: (a) providing more varied mind map exemplars; (b) strengthening individualized guidance during the prewriting process; and (c) granting students greater autonomy in determining poetry themes independently. Cycle II was undertaken because the classical mastery target had not been met at the end of Cycle I.

Data collection was carried out through three primary techniques: structured observation to monitor student and teacher activities during the mind-mapping-guided poetry instruction, documentation to record the overall learning process, and performance testing to evaluate students' poetry writing outcomes using a specific rubric that assessed poetry title (0–30), diction (0–35), and figurative language (0–35).

Data were analyzed quantitatively using descriptive statistics, including the mean, highest score, lowest score, and percentage of classical mastery. The class meaning was calculated as follows:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \times 100$$

Where  $\bar{X}$  is the mean score,  $\sum X$  is the sum of all students' scores, and  $N$  is the total number of students. The percentage of classical mastery was calculated by dividing the number of students achieving the KKM (score  $\geq 65$ ) by the total number of students, multiplied by 100%. Student achievement scores were classified as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Classification of Student Achievement Scores

| No. | Score Interval | Final Grade | Classification |
|-----|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1   | 85–100         | A           | Excellent      |
| 2   | 70–84          | B           | Good           |
| 3   | 55–69          | C           | Fair           |
| 4   | 40–54          | D           | Poor           |
| 5   | < 39           | E           | Very Poor      |

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Pre-Test Results

Prior to implementing the mind mapping method, all 14 fifth-grade students were administered a pre-test to establish baseline poetry writing ability. Results,

summarized in Table 2 and 3, cover three assessment aspects: determining the poetry title (max. 30), selecting appropriate diction (max. 35), and using figurative language (max. 35).

**Tabel 2.** Overall Pre-Test Performance Summary

| Metric                             | Score / Count | Percentage | Category / Details                             |
|------------------------------------|---------------|------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Class Mean                         | 61.10         | -          | Fair (55–69 interval)                          |
| Highest Score                      | 76            | -          | Good (Achieved by student H.J)                 |
| Lowest Score                       | 48            | -          | Poor (Achieved by student I.S)                 |
| Students Meeting KKM ( $\geq 65$ ) | 4 students    | 28.57%     | A.M.D (68), C.J.M (73), H.J (76), J.F.D.A (67) |
| Students Below KKM ( $< 65$ )      | 10 students   | 71.43%     | Below the required passing score               |

The class mean at pre-test was 61.10, within the Fair category (55–69 interval). The highest score was 76 (student H.J, Good category); the lowest was 48 (student I.S, Poor category), reflecting substantial heterogeneity in baseline ability. Only four students (28.57%) reached the KKM ( $\geq 65$ ) — A.M.D (68), C.J.M (73), H.J (76), and J.F.D.A (67) while the remaining ten students (71.43%) scored below it.

**Tabel 3.** Performance by Assessed Poetry Aspects

| Assessed Poetry Aspect   | Mean Score | Percentage | Performance Insight                                             |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Determining Poetry Title | 24.00 / 30 | 80.00%     | Highest relative achievement; most mastered by students.        |
| Diction Selection        | 18.14 / 35 | 51.83%     | Markedly below optimal levels; students found it challenging.   |
| Figurative Language      | 17.71 / 35 | 50.60%     | Lowest achievement; represents the greatest area of difficulty. |

Across the three assessed aspects, the mean for determining the poetry title was 24.00/30 (80.00%), the highest relative achievement. Diction selection yielded a mean of 18.14/35 (51.83%), and figurative language yielded 17.71/35 (50.60%) both markedly below optimal levels, indicating that students experienced the greatest difficulty in selecting aesthetically suitable vocabulary and applying figurative language.

## Cycle I Results

Following Cycle I, in which the mind mapping method was applied with teacher-determined themes and full guidance, students were re-evaluated through an end-of-cycle test (Table 4 and 5).

**Table 4.** Overall Performance and Comparison (Pre-Test vs. Cycle I)

| Metric        | Pre-Test | Cycle I | Gain / Shift      | Category / Details             |
|---------------|----------|---------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Class Mean    | 61.10    | 66.00   | +4.90<br>(+8.02%) | Fair Category (Both phases)    |
| Highest Score | 76       | 81      | +5 points         | Good (Achieved by student H.J) |

## 2296 Laurika et al., Students' Poetry Writing Skills Through the Mind Mapping ...

| Metric                          | Pre-Test   | Cycle I    | Gain / Shift          | Category / Details                                                               |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Lowest Score                    | 48         | 53         | +5 points             | Score rose for student I.S                                                       |
| Classical Mastery ( $\geq 65$ ) | 4 students | 7 students | +3 students (+21.43%) | 50.00% total mastery in Cycle I                                                  |
| Students Passing KKM            | 4 students | 7 students | -                     | A.B.D (70), A.M.D (73), C.J.M (78), H.J (81), J.F.D.A (72), A.A (67), G.D.D (68) |

The class mean increased from 61.10 to 66.00, a gain of 4.90 points (8.02%), remaining within the Fair category. The highest score rose to 81 (student H.J, Good); the lowest rose to 53 (student I.S). Classical mastery increased from four to seven students (50.00%), a gain of 21.43 percentage points; students newly achieving mastery were A.B.D (70), A.M.D (73), C.J.M (78), H.J (81), J.F.D.A (72), A.A (67), and G.D.D (68).

Gains were observed across all three aspects: poetry title rose from 24.00 to 25.86 (80.00% to 86.20%), diction from 18.14 to 20.57 (51.83% to 58.77%), and figurative language from 17.71 to 19.57 (50.60% to 55.91%). As classical mastery had reached only 50.00% — below the established success indicator — the study proceeded to Cycle II with refinements informed by reflection.

### Cycle II Results

In Cycle II, refinements included more varied mind map exemplars, strengthened individualized guidance, and greater student autonomy in determining poetry themes. Results are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Cycle II End-of-Cycle Test Results of Poetry Writing Ability**

| Metric               | Pre-Test   | Cycle I    | Cycle II    | Total Progress (vs. Pre-Test) | Category / Details in Cycle II           |
|----------------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Class Mean           | 61.10      | 66.00      | 73.29       | +12.19 points                 | Good Category (70–84 interval)           |
| Highest Score        | 76         | 81         | 87          | +11 points                    | Excellent Category (85–100, student H.J) |
| Lowest Score         | 48         | 53         | 65          | +17 points                    | Met the KKM exactly (student I.S)        |
| Classical Mastery    | 28.57%     | 50.00%     | 100.00%     | +71.43%                       | All 14 students successfully passed      |
| Students Passing KKM | 4 students | 7 students | 14 students | +10 students                  | Every student reached minimum mastery    |

The class mean rose to 73.29, an increase of 7.29 points from Cycle I and 12.19 points from the pre-test, now surpassing the KKM and falling within the good category (70–84). The highest score reached 87 (student H.J), the first instance in the Excellent category (85–100); the lowest score rose to 65, exactly at the KKM, indicating that every student had reached at least minimum mastery.

Classical mastery reached 100.00% (14 of 14 students), up from 50.00% in Cycle I and 28.57% at pre-test. All seven students who had not achieved mastery in Cycle I —

M.Y (70), M.Y.Z (67), B.K (70), C.D (65), E.R.S (67), F.W (70), and I.S (65) — surpassed the KKM in Cycle II.

Improvements across aspects continued: poetry title reached 27.57/30 (91.90%), a 5.71-point gain from Cycle I; diction reached 23.36/35 (66.74%), a 2.79-point gain; and figurative language reached 22.36/35 (63.89%), also a 2.79-point gain. The most pronounced relative improvements between Cycle I and Cycle II occurred in diction and figurative language — the two aspects that had remained weakest throughout the intervention.

### Summary of Findings Across Cycles

Table 6 summarizes the progression of all indicators from the pre-test through Cycle II, illustrating a consistent, cumulative upward trajectory in both overall performance and classical mastery.

**Table 6.** Summary of Poetry Writing Performance Across Measurement Points

| Indicator                           | Pre-Test       | Cycle I        | Cycle II       |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Class mean score                    | 61.10          | 66.00          | 73.29          |
| Category                            | Fair           | Fair           | Good           |
| Highest score                       | 76             | 81             | 87             |
| Lowest score                        | 48             | 53             | 65             |
| Classical mastery (%)               | 28.57%         | 50.00%         | 100.00%        |
| Mean – poetry title (max 30)        | 24.00 (80.00%) | 25.86 (86.20%) | 27.57 (91.90%) |
| Mean – diction (max 35)             | 18.14 (51.83%) | 20.57 (58.77%) | 23.36 (66.74%) |
| Mean – figurative language (max 35) | 17.71 (50.60%) | 19.57 (55.91%) | 22.36 (63.89%) |

### Discussion

Overall, the findings demonstrate that implementing the mind mapping method improved the poetry writing ability of fifth-grade students at Elementary School Inpres Naumatang gradually and significantly. The class mean progressed from 61.10 at pre-test to 66.00 after Cycle I and 73.29 after Cycle II, while classical mastery rose from 28.57% to 50.00% and ultimately to 100.00%. This consistent, cumulative pattern of improvement warrant interpretation within a broader theoretical and empirical framework.

### Initial Condition of Students' Poetry Writing Ability

The pre-test mean of 61.10 (Fair category) and classical mastery of only 28.57% confirm a tangible gap between expected competencies and actual classroom conditions, reflecting the dominance of conventional approaches in which teachers explain the definition of poetry and immediately require students to produce work without adequate scaffolding. This finding aligns with the systematic review by Barton et al. (2024), which emphasizes that teaching creative writing in elementary schools is a complex process that cannot be fully facilitated through formal instruction grounded solely in linguistic conventions; a more open, reflective approach is needed to help students make imaginative choices autonomously.

The comparatively low achievement in diction selection (51.83%) and figurative language use (50.60%) reveals the most fundamental weakness in students' expressive ability. This corresponds with [Kristiantari et al. \(2023\)](#), who found that elementary students' poetry writing ability is strongly influenced by limited vocabulary and insufficient exposure to contextualized aesthetic language. Without pedagogical interventions that explicitly facilitate word and imagery exploration, students tend to repeat generic expressions that do not reflect the stylistic sensitivity central to poetry.

### **Improvement in Poetry Writing Ability in Cycle I**

Implementing the mind mapping method in Cycle I raised the class mean to 66.00 and classical mastery to 50.00%. This improvement can be explained through the cognitive mechanism underlying mind mapping as a prewriting tool: it stimulates divergent thinking by enabling students to express and connect ideas non-linearly, without being constrained by rigid writing rules ([Yan et al., 2022](#)). When students explore free associations from a theme through a mind map, the cognitive load of writing is reduced, as the visual structure functions as an external scaffold that helps organize creative material prior to its articulation in poetic form.

The improvement in determining poetry titles (from 80.00% to 86.20%) suggests that the mind map structure helps students identify central themes with greater focus; once a network of concepts around a theme is visualized, an appropriate and representative title becomes easier to formulate. The gains in diction (18.14 to 20.57) and figurative language (17.71 to 19.57) indicate that the thought-mapping process opened avenues for lexical exploration not facilitated under conventional methods, although both aspects remained suboptimal, signaling the need for further reinforcement. Although classical mastery of 50.00% had not yet met the established success indicator, the observed shift in learning patterns provided grounds for optimism, consistent with [Marcos et al. \(2020\)](#), who emphasize that creative learning promoting active student engagement in thinking and expression lays an essential foundation for deeper writing ability. The Cycle I reflection subsequently informed the refinements implemented in Cycle II.

### **Improvement in Poetry Writing Ability in Cycle II**

Cycle II produced improvements exceeding those of Cycle I, with the class mean reaching 73.29 (Good category) and classical mastery reaching 100%. The refinements implemented — more varied mind map exemplars, strengthened individualized guidance, and thematic autonomy — empirically accelerated comprehensive improvement in poetry writing ability. This corresponds with [Kangasharju et al. \(2024\)](#), who found that expressive freedom in poetry writing instruction is directly related to students' engagement and the quality of their work; when students determine themes autonomously, the resulting poetry reflects more authentic personal experience and imagination than when themes are entirely teacher-determined.

The most striking Cycle II gains occurred in diction (20.57 to 23.36) and figurative language (19.57 to 22.36), confirming that theme ownership encouraged students to

explore vocabulary more boldly and to employ figurative language more contextually. This is consistent with Cisneros et al. (2023), who found that creative writing activities significantly enhance elementary students' linguistic skills and vocabulary: greater autonomy tends to produce richer linguistic choices, as expressions emerge from students' own experiences and aesthetic sensibilities.

The attainment of 100% mastery in Cycle II can also be understood through a constructivist lens. Zhang et al. (2025) emphasize that children's writing skills develop through interrelated thematic and cognitive processing, in which students actively construct meaning by exploring concepts and their relationships. Iterated across two cycles of increasing complexity, this process enabled a gradual but comprehensive internalization of poetry writing skills, such that by the end of Cycle II even the students who had lagged furthest behind at pre-test surpassed the KKM.

### Mechanism of Mind Mapping in Enhancing Poetry Writing Ability

Mechanistically, the effectiveness of mind mapping in this study can be explained through two principal pathways. First, mind mapping functions as a cognitive scaffold that helps students overcome initiation barriers, or "writer's block." Love et al. (2023) emphasize that integrating poetry into instruction facilitates creative connections and helps students overcome the initial barriers of the writing process; mind mapping's non-linear visual structure fills this gap by providing a low-barrier entry point for articulating initial ideas.

Second, mind mapping functions as a mediator between divergent thinking and poetic expression. Mustika et al. (2025) empirically demonstrated that using mind maps as a prewriting activity significantly enhances the fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration of elementary students' creative written work. Because mind mapping minimizes constraints during idea exploration, ideas flow and connect freely without being restricted by rigid writing rules, generating conditions conducive to creative incubation. This is especially relevant to poetry writing, whose composition process essentially involves expanding a core concept into a network of mutually reinforcing images, diction, and figurative language; the mind map, as mediator, renders this non-linear process visually structured without sacrificing the richness of its associations.

This finding also accords with conceptions of creative writing as a personal, reflective process. Maspul (2024) found that a poetry-rich learning environment fosters student growth and empowerment through authentic linguistic exploration. The mind mapping method, particularly in Cycle II when students were granted full autonomy in determining themes, succeeded in creating a learning climate conducive to such authentic expression — producing poetry that satisfies formal criteria (appropriate titles, carefully selected diction, and appropriate figurative language) while also reflecting the depth of personal expression central to meaningful poetic work.

### Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretically, these findings extend the evidence based on mind mapping beyond descriptive and narrative writing genres — where its benefits are already well documented — to poetry, a genre that additionally demands aesthetic and figurative sensitivity. The results support reframing mind mapping not merely as a graphic organizer but as a cognitive scaffold that mediates between divergent thinking and creative linguistic expression, consistent with, and extending, prior accounts of its role in writing instruction (Al-inbari et al., 2023; Yan et al., 2022; Mustika et al., 2025).

Practically, the findings suggest that elementary teachers, including those in remote or resource-constrained schools, can adopt a two-phase instructional sequence: an initial phase using teacher-guided themes and exemplars to build familiarity with mind mapping, followed by a phase that progressively transfers thematic ownership to students. The pronounced gains in diction and figurative language following the introduction of thematic autonomy in Cycle II suggest that autonomy-supportive scaffolding, rather than exemplar provision alone, may be a key lever for advancing the most cognitively demanding aspects of poetic expression.

### Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study has several limitations that should temper the generalizability of its findings. First, the sample was limited to a single class of 14 fifth-grade students at one school, without a comparison or control group; the observed gains therefore cannot be fully disentangled from maturation, test familiarity, or other concurrent classroom influences. Second, the intervention spanned only two short cycles, which does not permit conclusions about the durability of the improvements observed. Third, outcomes were assessed using a single performance-based writing rubric; triangulation with qualitative measures of students' creative or affective engagement was limited to observation and documentation rather than in-depth interviews. Future research should employ larger, multi-site samples with comparison groups, assess the retention of poetry writing gains over time, and explore how mind mapping interacts with other variables such as students' reading exposure, socio-economic background, and digital mind-mapping tools.

## 4. CONCLUSION

This classroom action research demonstrates that the mind mapping method is effective in enhancing the poetry writing ability of fifth-grade students at SD Inpres Naumatang, doing so gradually and significantly. The class mean increased from 61.10 (Fair) at pre-test to 66.00 after Cycle I and 73.29 (Good) after Cycle II, while classical mastery increased from 28.57% to 50.00% and ultimately to 100%. The most substantial improvements occurred in diction selection and figurative language use, indicating that mind mapping supports students in exploring vocabulary and employing figurative language more contextually.

Factors supporting successful implementation included: (a) students' enthusiasm and active engagement in a more interactive and enjoyable learning process; (b) the

visualization provided by mind maps, which helped students organize ideas systematically prior to writing; and (c) the thematic autonomy granted in Cycle II, which enhanced students' sense of ownership over their work. Inhibiting factors included: (a) time constraints for some students in completing detailed mind maps; and (b) the need for intensive individualized guidance, particularly for students with low initial ability.

Taken together, these findings confirm that the mind mapping method is an effective instructional alternative for enhancing elementary students' poetry writing ability, particularly in facilitating divergent thinking, idea exploration, and the creative expression that lies at the core of meaningful poetry writing. Given the limitations noted above, replication in larger and more diverse settings, with longer-term follow-up, is recommended before the approach is generalized as standard practice.

## REFERENCES

- Al-inbari, F. A. Y., Al-wasy, B. Q., Mahdi, H. S., & Al-nofaie, H. (2023). Electronic and Manual Mind Mapping as Mediating Tools in the EFL Writing Process. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 7(5), 208–222. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202323690>
- Aprinawati, I., & Fitri, L. J. (2023). Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Puisi menggunakan Model Problem Based Learning pada Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Indonesian Research Journal on Education: Jurnal Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 3(3), 1211–1216. <https://doi.org/10.31004/irje.v3i3.1283>
- Barton, G., Khosronejad, M., Ryan, M., Kervin, L., & Myhill, D. (2024). Teaching creative writing in primary schools : a systematic review of the literature through the lens of reflexivity. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 51(4), 1311–1330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00641-9>
- Boerma, I., Wilt, F. Van Der, Bouwer, R., & Schoot, M. Van Der. (2022). Mind Mapping during Interactive Book Reading in Early Childhood Classrooms : Does It Support Young Children ' s Language Competence ? Mind Mapping during Interactive Book Reading in Early Childhood Classrooms : Does It Support Young Children ' s Language. *Early Education and Development*, 33(6), 1077–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2021.1929686>
- Cisneros, A. G., Roussey, J., Inbar, T., Fratacci, A., & Frey, A. (2023). Impact of Daily Choral Singing and Creative Writing Activities on the Cognitive Development of Second-, Third-, and Fourth-Grade French Children from Low Socioeconomic Backgrounds. *Children*, 10, 1515. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children10091515>
- Erdem, A. (2017). Mind Maps as a Lifelong Learning Tool. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(n12A), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.051301>
- Harefa, I. N., Daeli, H., Maru, N., & Zebua, E. P. (2023). Improving Students ' Writing Skill By Using Mind Mapping Technique At The Tenth Grade Of SMK Swasta Kristen BNKP Luzamanu In 2022 / 2023. *Journal on Education*, 06(01), 7960–7970. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i1.4205>
- Julianto, I. R., Saputro, P. W., Hayati, R. A., Gusvita, W., & Sintasari, D. P. (2025). Image Media to Improve Students Poetry Writing Skills in Elementary School. *Cognitive Insight in Education*, 1(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.64850/cognitive.v1i1.3>
- Kachak, T., & Kachak, K. (2022). Mind Maps as a Tool for Visualization and Structuring of Linguistic and Literary Material in the Process of Teaching Students. *Journal of Vasyk Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, 9(1), 92-100. <https://doi.org/10.15330/jpnu.9.1.92-100>

- Kangasharju, A. I., Ilomäki, L., & Toom, A. (2024). Online poetry writing at school – comparing lower secondary students' experiences between individual and collaborative poetry writing. *Frontiers in Education*, 9(May), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1380790>
- Kristiantari, M. G. R., Widiana, I. W., & Artawan, G. (2023). Enhancing the ability to write poetry and creative thinking skills with rural nature-inspired contextual approach. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i2.23194>
- Love, T. S., Lee, D., & Napoli, M. (2023). Integrating Science Concepts Through Poetry: A Study Comparing Online and Face-to-Face Teaching Methods Courses for Pre-Service Elementary Educators. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-023-10073-w>
- Marcos, R. I. S., Ferández, V. L., González, M. T. D., & Phillips-Silver, J. (2020). Promoting children's creative thinking through reading and writing in a cooperative learning classroom. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 36(January), 100663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100663>
- Maspul, K. A. (2024). Nurturing Student Growth and Empowerment through a Poetry-Rich Classroom. *Eduscape: Journal of Education Insight*, 2(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.61978/eduscape.v2i1.130>
- Mustika, M., Yeh, C. Y. C., Cheng, H. N. H., Liao, C. C. Y., & Chan, T.-W. (2025). The Effect of Mind Map as a Prewriting Activity in Third Grade Elementary Students' Descriptive Narrative Creative Writing With a Writing E- Portfolio. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learnin*, 41(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.70006>
- Mutia, M., & Silalahi, B. R. (2022). Development of Poetry Writing Guidebook Using Mind Mapping Model for Primary School Students. *International Journal of Educational Research Excellence (IJERE)*, 01(02), 174–178. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijere.v1i2.207>
- Pangesthika, N. W., Umayana, N. M., & Suciati, S. (2021). The Development Of Environment-Based Poetry Teaching Material is Living With the Tourist Works Methods Class V SD in The City of Magelang. *TEKS: 68 Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia Program Pascasarjana Universitas PGRI Semarang*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.26877/teks.v6i1.8235>
- Prawoto, E. C., Pramulia, P., & Rohmah, N. (2024). Improving Poetry Appreciation Ability Through Demonstration Methods in Indonesian Language Students. *Jurnal Disastri*, 6(1), 96-105. <https://doi.org/10.33752/disastri.v6i1.6040>
- Rahim, C. A., Ashadi, A., Abidin, M. Z., Malisa, M., Boi, R., & Nazira, A. (2025). Mind Mapping in Learning Models: A Tool to Enhance EFL Students in Descriptive Text Writing. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengkajian Ilmu Pendidikan: E-Saintika*, 9(2), 127–145. <https://doi.org/10.36312/e-saintika.v9i2.2899>
- Rahmawati, D., & Citrawati, T. (2023). Jenis Kesulitan Menulis Puisi bagi Peserta Didik di Sekolah Dasar. *DIDAKTIS Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(2), 45–50. <https://doi.org/10.33096/didaktis.v1i2.299>
- Sanjiartha, I. G. D., Handayani, N. N. L., & Yudaparmita, G. N. A. (2026). Fostering literary creativity through emotional experience: a systematic review of poetry writing instruction in elementary education. *Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan*, 14(1), 382-391. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Sasmita, A., & Sujarwo. (2021). Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Puisi Melalui Model Picture and Picture Dengan Media Gambar Pada Siswa Kelas V SDN 104250 Perk.

- Rumunia. *Indonesian Journal of Elementary Education*, 3(1), 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.31000/ijoe.v3i1.5622>
- Shi, Y., Yang, H., Dou, Y., & Zeng, Y. (2023). Effects of mind mapping-based instruction on student cognitive learning outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 24(3), 303-317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09746-9>
- Utami, N. P. A., & Sanjaya, D. B. (2025). Civic Education as a Development of Character Education for Elementary School Students. *Indonesian Journal of Instruction*, 6(1), 89–97. <https://doi.org/10.23887/iji.v6i1.95784>
- Wansyah, R., Fiteriani, I., & Erfayliana, Y. (2025). Project Based Learning Model Assisted by Mind Mapping Media: Student Creativity in IPAS Lessons at Public Islamic Elementary. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 4(4), 1336-1351. <https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v4i4.3825>
- Yan, Z., Lee, J. C., King, S., Hui, F., & Lao, H. (2022). Enhancing Students ' Self-Efficacy in Creativity and Learning Performance in the Context of English Learning : The Use of Self-Assessment Mind Maps. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 13(May), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.871781>
- Zhang, J., Goh, T.-T., Chen, D., Gong, Y., Yang, B., Pan, L., Song, T., Yu, S., & Li, H. (2025). A thematic-cognitive perspective for exploring the writing skills of children : a textual analysis using ENA. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 16(August), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1494111>