The Effect of Mind Mapping Technique on the Eleventh Grade of Senior High School Students' Descriptive Writing Achievement.

Like W. Wibowo

Abstract. In this study, the writer used a quasi experimental nonequivalent-groups pretest-post test design. The subjects of this study were the eleventh grade students of Senior High School. The writer took two classes as the sample of this experiment. The experimental group was taught using mind mapping and another was taught using semi-controlled writing. Then, the writer gave a pre test, post test and even questionnaire to the two groups. The pre test was intended to measure the students' descriptive writing ability in some criteria before the treatments. The treatments were given three times ninety minutes each. The writer used post test as one of the instruments to see the students' descriptive writing achievement in some criteria and questionnaire to know the students' response of two techniques used. After that, the writer evaluated the students' pre and post test of the two groups by using the analytic scoring technique, ESL Composition Profile. Their means differences were analyzed using the t-test formula to see whether there is a different significant effect of students' writing achievement in their content, organization, vocabulary, and language use criteria.
Basing on the calculation of t-test, the writer found the t observation of both groups. The t observation of content, organization, vocabulary, and language use criteria of the two groups were 1.88, 1.7, 11.49, and 1.22 while the t-table of both was 1.671. In conclusion, the result of the calculation of the students' test in both experimental and control group shows that mind mapping yields a significant effect of writing achievement in content, organization and vocabulary criteria and gets good response in teaching writing with enjoyable and interesting atmosphere.

Key words : Writing, Prewriting, Semi-Controlled Writing, Mind Mapping and Descriptive Writing.

Background of the Study

In learning English, writing is one of the four language skills that needs to be achieved in order to acquire the target language. It plays an important role since it is often needed for formal and informal testing in the school (Bryne, 1991:6-7). Furthermore, Rivers (1968:241) states that writing is an essential classroom activity as it is of considerable importance for consolidating learning in the other skill areas. Therefore, students have to master it. According to Paulston and Bruder (1979:236), writing is a thinking process which organizes thought and argument into a

coherent and logical whole. It means that in writing the students express their ideas through written symbols.

In teaching writing, teachers should vary the techniques used as Maria Eugene (1982) states that variety is one of the most important factors in maintaining a high level motivation and interest among the students. One of the techniques mostly applied in Senior High School is Semi-Controlled Writing. Chastain (1976:376-377) says that Semi-Controlled Writing is a writing where by less controls, students are given written, oral, or visual guides to assist the students in composing as well as to provide ideas to stimulate their thinking. In brief, it is the technique where the students are given the guidance in the form of guidelines to help them compose a good piece of writing. The advantage of using this technique is that it can make the students easily compose an essay specifically because the guidelines assist them in the process of writing. However, this technique makes the students give much focus on the language use rather than developing their writing quality. Werner (1992:347) states that writing is learning and thinking strategy. Nevertheless, many students mistakenly think of writing as a mechanical process, focusing on features of correctness, grammar, and spelling which actually are only functional rules that provide vehicle for the expression of ideas.

On the other hand, there is another technique in teaching writing that can make the students develop their critical thinking. This technique is called Mind Mapping. According to Byrne (1991), mind mapping is the visual representations of the relationships among ideas underlying a concept. In brief, it is the technique where the students have to develop their ideas which relate to the central idea in a form similar to the spokes of a wheel. Through this technique, the students are free to pour their ideas because they are not bound with the guidelines given by the teacher.

There have been experts that deal about Semi-Controlled Writing and Mind Mapping. Toni Buzan (2007), the inventor of mind mapping, states that mind mapping is an effective way because it involves the work of both sides of human brain naturally. Diane Hacker (1942) emphasizes that mind mapping is a creative method of generating, organizing and remembering ideas. Paulston and Bruder (1976) characterize semi-controlled writing as a common procedure which is to present the students with a model passage and ask them to paraphrase it, to write a summary of it, to add a beginning, middle or end to it, or to outline it. Despite many experts have been conducted researches about semi-controlled writing and mind mapping, more researches still need to be conducted to ensure the more effective technique among those two techniques.

According to KTSP (2007), there are a lot of kinds of genre in writing for Senior High School students, such as procedure, descriptive, recount, narrative, report, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, and spoof. Among these various genres of writing, the writer selects descriptive writing as a type of writing in conducting her study. The

121

writer chooses descriptive writing since Goffman (1956:35) states that descriptive is one type of writing which is difficult since it demands students' ability in finding vivid appropriate ideas and words to make the composition alive. Hence, the students can make a descriptive writing easier by using the help of semi-controlled writing or mind mapping.

The writer selects teaching writing since Chastain (1976:363-364) states that writing helps to solidify the students' grasp of vocabulary and structure and complement to other language skills. In addition, writing is considered to be difficult for most students as Hawley and Tilghman (1992:3) states that writing is difficult because it involves a complex process of thinking, composing and revising. The writer takes eleventh grade students as the samples of her study since the students in this level have adequate descriptive writing ability. She does not choose the tenth grade considering that the students in this level might not have the sufficient skills. Moreover, she does not choose the twelfth grade either since the students in this level are preparing themselves for the national examination.

The study is conducted with the aim of finding out the effect of using mind mapping to the students' descriptive writing achievement. The writer emphasizes more on the effectiveness of the use of mind mapping since the semi-controlled writing has been long used in school. This study is conducted with the expectation of giving contribution to teachers in varying the technique of teaching writing used in school.

Statement of the Problems

Basing on the background of study, the writer formulated the problems of the study as follows:

1. Is there any significant difference between those who are taught using mind mapping and those who are taught using semi-controlled writing on the students' descriptive writing achievement?

    To answer this question, the following sub-questioned are stated:

    a. Do students working with mind mapping have better scores in content achievement than those working with semi-controlled writing?

    b. Do students working with mind mapping have better scores in organization achievement than those working with semi-controlled writing?

    c. Do students working with mind mapping have better scores in vocabulary achievement than those working with semi-controlled writing?

    d. Do students working with mind mapping have better scores in language use achievement than those working with semi-controlled writing?

    e.   Do students working with mind mapping have better scores as a whole in the descriptive writing achievement than those working with semi-controlled writing?

2. What is the students' response to the use of mind mapping in the experimental group and the use of semi-controlled writing in the control group?

Research Design

In this study, the writer used a quasi experimental nonequivalent-groups pretest-post test design. The writer took two classes from the eleventh grade students of Senior High School as the sample of her research. The writer gave a pre test, post test and even questionnaire to the two groups. The two groups were considered having the same level of mastery. The writer did not randomize the samples into their classes but she only used the classes as they are. Group A was the control one and group B was the experimental one which has the same material, teacher and test. The students of the experimental class were given treatment in the form of teaching descriptive writing by using mind mapping while the students of control class were taught descriptive writing by using semi-control writing. The writer gave two groups treatments for 3 x 90'.

The experimental study was undertaken to find out the effect of using mind mapping on the teaching of descriptive writing to the eleventh grade students of Senior High School in some writing achievement criteria such as content, organization, vocabulary, and language use development. Overall, both the experimental and control class could have the same treatment from beginning until the end.

Population and Sample

The population of the study is the students of SMAK Stella Maris, and two classes of eleventh grade of Senior High School students become the samples. The writer took eleventh grade students as the samples of her study since the students in this level have adequate descriptive writing ability. She did not choose the tenth grade considering that the students in this level might not have the sufficient skills. Moreover, she did not choose the twelfth grade either since the students in this level were preparing themselves for the national examination.

Treatment and Instruments

In this study, the students got the treatment in three meetings and ninety minutes for each. Both groups were taught by the same teacher that is the writer herself and given the same materials and test. The teacher taught the material of descriptive writing to both groups, but the technique was different. In experimental group, the writer taught them writing by using mind mapping. In control group, the writer used the most applied
Analysis and Discussions

123

Results of Data Analysis

Based on the data, the writer examined their tests according to ESL Composition Profile into five criteria. However, in her study, the writer only analyzed their four writing criteria such as content, organization, vocabulary and language use. Next, the writer counted the mean of the students' scores in four criteria and their total score in order to see whether there is a significant difference between the two classes. The mean score of content criteria in class XIA 3 is 23.51, while in another class, XIS 4, is 22.8. The mean score of organization criteria in XIA 3 is 15.5 and so is 15.5 in XIS 4. The mean score of vocabulary criteria in class XIA 3 is 15.5, while in another class, XIS 4, is 15.28. The mean score of language use score criteria in class XIA 3 is 18, while in another class, XIS 4, is 17.27. The last is the mean score of the total score in class XIA 3 is 76.3, while in another class, XIS 4, is 74.8.

A summary of the t-test for the similarity of ability between the students in experimental group and control group is presented below:

The mean score and the standard deviation of the pre-test of the content score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	23.51	2.4			
Control	37		22.8	3.2	0.9	1.671	Insignificant

The mean score and the standard deviation of the pre-test of the organization score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	15.5	2.04			
Control	37		15.5	1.98	0	1.671	Insignificant

The mean score and the standard deviation of the pre-test of the vocabulary score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	15.5	1.48			
Control	37		15.28	1.42	0.58	1.671	Insignificant

The mean score and the standard deviation of the pre-test of the language use score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	18	2.9			
Control	37		17.27	2.73	0.99	1.671	Insignificant

The mean score and the standard deviation of the pre-test of the total

score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	76.3	6.23			
Control	37		74.8	7.51	0.81	1.671	Insignificant

After giving the pre-test, the writer gave treatments to both groups. Class XI IPA 3 is the experimental group taught by mind mapping and XI IPS 4 is the control group taught by semi-controlled writing. They received the treatments three times. After three-time treatments, the writer gave post-test to them. It was done to compare whether there is a significant difference between the group who are taught writing by mind mapping and those who are taught by semi-controlled writing in terms of their gain score. The gain score is obtained by subtracting their post test score in each criteria by their pre-test score in each criteria.
A summary of the t-test for the post-test between the students in the experimental group and control group is presented below:

The gain score of the post test of the content score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25		3.02	2			
Control	37	60	2.068	2.63	1.88	1.671	Significant

The gain score of the post test of the organization score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	1.7	1.83			
Control	37		0.8	2.12	1.7	1.671	Significant

The gain score of the post test of the vocabulary score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	1.96	1.47			
Control	37		0.96	1.6	11.49	1.671	Significant

The gain score of the post test of the language use score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	2.12	3.32			
Control	37		1.027	3.43	1.22	1.671	Insignificant

The gain score of the post test of the total score

Groups	Number of Students	df	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation	to	tt	Note
Experimental	25	60	9.16	5.53			
Control	37		4.45	5.519	15.2	1.671	Significant

Hypothesis Testing

The writer formulated the hypothesis to analyze the data as follows:

Ho : $\mu A < \mu B$, there is no significant difference between the experimental group and control group.

Ha : $\mu A > \mu B$, there is a significant difference between the experimental group and control group.

Then the writer determined the level of significance of the test. The level of significance in this study is 5%. Subsequently, the writer determined the degree of freedom of the test and t-observation (to). If the t-table is greater than t-observation, it means that Ho is accepted and there is no significant difference between the experimental group and control group. But if t-observation is greater than t-table, it means that Ho is rejected and there is a significant difference between the experimental and control group.

In order to answer the problems, the alternative hypotheses (Ha) and the null hypothesis (Ho) are formulated. The alternative hypotheses (Ha) and the null hypothesis (Ho) stated that:

1. There is a significant difference between the content achievement average scores of the students who are taught by mind mapping and those who are taught by semi-controlled writing.
2. There is a significant difference between the organization achievement average scores of the students who are taught by mind mapping and those who are taught by semi-controlled writing.
3. There is a significant difference between the vocabulary achievement average scores of the students who are taught by mind mapping and those who are taught by semi-controlled writing.
4. There is no significant difference between the language use achievement average scores of the students who are taught by mind mapping and those who are taught by semi-controlled writing.
5. There is a significant difference between the descriptive writing average scores of students who are taught by mind mapping and those who are taught by semi-controlled writing.

Discussion

From the analysis of the data, it is found that the post test result of the t-calculation of content score 1.88 is higher than the result of t-table 1.671. It means that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Thus, it is proved that "Mind Mapping" influences the teaching of writing in achieving the students'

content criteria.

It is also found that post test result of the t-calculation of organization 1.7 is higher than the result of t-table 1.671. It means that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Thus, it is proved that "Mind Mapping" influences the teaching of writing in achieving the students' organization criteria.

On the other side, the post test result of the t-calculation of vocabulary 11.49 is higher than the result of t-table 1.671. It means that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Thus, it is proved that "Mind Mapping" influences the teaching of writing in achieving the students' vocabulary criteria.

Based on the theories of Diane Hacker (1942), she emphasizes that mind mapping is a creative method of generating, organizing and remembering ideas and Tribble (1996:107) which says by using mind mapping, the students can prevent the imaginative block because it allows students to write freely and use their creativity in composing an essay. Moreover, as Byrne (1991) states that mind mapping is most often used visual aid for helping the writer to categorize and classify important information relative to the vocabulary under study.

While the calculation of the t-test for the language use shows that there is no significant difference between the language use achievement average scores of the students who are taught using mind mapping and those who are taught using semi-controlled writing. It is indicated by the value of t-observation 1.22 is lower than the value of the t-table 1.671. It means that mind mapping does not give the influence on language use achievement as its function does not focus to the language use but it engages students of all ages in creative thinking, organizing ideas and problem solving according to Tony Buzan (2007).

It is found that post test result of the t-calculation of total score 15.2 is higher than the result of t-table 1.671. It means that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Thus, it is proved that "Mind Mapping" successfully improves students' writing scores and yields a good quality of writing composition

From this result, it shows that "Mind Mapping" pre-writing technique really helps the students in improving students' writing ideas, writing organization, and writing vocabulary. It still did not contribute a significant effect to the students' grammar or language use, though.

Although the contribution of "Mind Mapping" pre-writing technique in teaching writing can not influence the language use development, the writer finds that various pre writing techniques applied in the school can be very enjoyable concerning that teaching writing tends to be a boring lesson as supported by Tony Buzan (2007) who states that mind mapping can also make lessons more spontaneous, creative and enjoyable, both for the teacher and the students.

It is also based on the fact that all the students are enthusiastic in joining the writing class and feel interested when the writer uses "Mind

Mapping" prewriting technique. They follow excitedly what their friend presents about their own mapping in front of the class. Through mind mapping, they can create a good writing with a good content and get an interesting writing class.

On another point of view, students in the experimental class say that mind mapping can develop, and make their composition interesting. It also can make their composition well-arranged, easy to be understood. Besides, others say that mind mapping is new for them and it is a solution to generate ideas. Mind mapping also does help them in finding thesis statement in a composition. According to the students' opinion in the experimental group, mind mapping is so interesting and beneficial because mind mapping can make writing process become easier so that the students are easy to pour their ideas. Therefore, from mind mapping, there are a lot of things can be described. However, some of them say that mind mapping is not interesting because it is complicated, bother and needs long time to make a composition. It also needs two times of work to produce a good essay. In the future writing class, students expect that they will be given any longer time to draw their own maps, more examples of mind mapping, a chance to present their mapping more and discuss it more often and put in a group first then in individual to make them more familiar with mind mapping. They are all based on the data gotten by distributing questionnaire in the experimental group students.

On the contrary side students in the control group also enjoy the lesson but they do not like to be limited in their writing. They consider semi-controlled writing is like a boundary between they, themselves and their writing. It is true that semi-controlled writing can make their content and their language use in their writing improve than their writing organization and vocabulary. As the result, they get a boring writing class situation in the end of their treatment. That is all because they still feel that they could not write like what they want. Besides, their organization in their writing can not be as well-arranged as the writing of experimental group has.

Based on the students' response in their questionnaires in the control group who taught by semi-controlled writing, they say that semi-controlled writing can help them to focus about what they are going to write, to expand their description essay, and to create a specific essay. According to their opinion, semi-controlled writing is as a guide in the early writing. On the contrary, it can make their writing become more complicated as it prevents writing development and bound their ideas. They also say that semi-controlled writing makes the students losing the intention to write. Therefore, in the future, the students expect that they will be given games which relate to the writing activity and they will be given more examples of descriptive writing.

According to the writer, the more visual pre-writing techniques done, the more interesting a class is and the better writing quality the students produced.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Conclusion

Teaching writing as a foreign language is essential in second language learning. Achieving writing skill means so much to students concerning that writing can help the learners to strengthen the mastery of other skills (Rivers, 1968:241). However, teaching writing nowadays is not emphasized like teaching other skills. This kind of situation makes the writing lesson done in monotonous way by giving such a simple teaching technique and method. In writing class, the teachers tends to keep giving the exercises to the students, let the students work in writing by giving guidelines or sometimes just let them work by leaving them with some instruction to create the writing composition without knowing the students' ability in composing ideas into a good essay.

By giving semi-control writing technique, the students are expected to encourage their creativeness and pour it in their writing. The problems occurred when the students do not emphasize the purpose of writing itself. They tend to think about something deals with grammar, vocabulary, and others until they ignore the content of their writing itself. Moreover, the limitation of their grammar and vocabulary makes them feel reluctant to develop more ideas. As the result, it reduces the quality of their writing and reduces the teacher's intention to read and examine their works. Therefore, both the teachers and students will be easy to get bored when they have their writing class.

Having known this phenomenon, the writer suggest a prewriting technique to make the teaching and learning activity become more enjoyable, exciting and enhance the quality of writing itself. Through mind mapping, the students can develop their critical thinking by making a brief diagram of their ideas and then connect those ideas into a coherent composition. As its function is to prevent the students from imaginative block by making their writing freely and use their creativity in composing an essay. In order to enable the students to use certain vivid and appropriate words, the writer choose descriptive writing because they can make their writing alive through five senses creatively.

In conducting this research, the writer chose two classes as the experimental and control group. They were given the same treatments with different teaching techniques, mind mapping and semi-controlled writing. The subject was the eleventh grade of SMAK Stella Maris. During their treatment they firstly got pre-test to know their ability in general and then scored by ESL Composition Profile which indicated whether they had the same ability in four criteria such as content, organization, vocabulary and language use.

Based on the statistical calculation of the data obtained after the treatments, the writer found out that there is a significant difference between their content, organization, vocabulary and the whole score in general who were taught by using Mind Mapping pre-writing technique and those who were taught by using guidelines.

129

The finding of the post test score in each writing criteria are described as follows:

Summarizing the Analysis of the Post Test Scores

Writing Criteria	Groups	Mean (x)	to	tt	Note
Content	Experimental	3.02	1.88	1.671	Significant
	Control	2.068			
Organization	Experimental	1.7	1.7	1.671	Significant
	Control	0.8			
Vocabulary	Experimental	1.96	11.49	1.671	Significant
	Control	0.96			
Language Use	Experimental	2.12	1.22	1.671	Insignificant
	Control	1.027			
Total Score	Experimental	9.16	15.2	1.671	Significant
	Control	4.45			

Therefore, teaching the students writing by mind mapping has given the significant impacts to the students for the better learning. Mind mapping proves to give a contribution in improving students' writing in content, organization and language use criteria better than by using Semi-controlled writing. Mind mapping successfully helps the students to get more of ideas and developing them creatively and arrange those ideas in an organized structure. It also can enrich the students' vocabulary from their critical thinking. On the opposite, the statistical shows that there is no significant difference in language use criteria because mind mapping does not concern to mechanical process. In conclusion, mind mapping only works in generating, developing, and organizing the ideas especially to focus the students' ideas to the content of writing.

Suggestion

The writer realizes that this thesis is not perfect. There are many things that should be improved. Therefore, the writer wants to give some recommendations so that the research will be more useful for the future writing teaching.

First of all, mind mapping actually does not give a significant contribution to language use criteria. However, in fact, language use can make the writer's composition become clear and readable with a deeper knowledge about language context comprehension in a composition. So, for the next study, the writer expects that other researchers can provide the students with other interactive writing techniques that involved the development of four criteria as listed in ESL Composition Profile. It will be better if the students are given grammar exercises needed in the descriptive writing before giving the treatments.

Second, since mind mapping is one of the pre-writing techniques that is

not applied at school as often as other techniques, the writer considers that the treatment given for three meetings to the groups is not enough. Basing on the questionnaire given, the students need more time to get used in mind mapping.

Third, the pre test and post test in both experimental and control group will be better to be given in the same instruction.

Fourth, for a class which rarely gets a writing class, better if other researchers try to use mind mapping technique in group first than in individual to make them used to the new writing technique presented. More writing class presentations and examples are good to make them clear and get involved with writing and its technique.

Fifth, the writer also expects that the other researchers can teach mind mapping to students in the Elementary school since they can develop their kinesthetic learning style by drawing and coloring. Better if the other researchers teach mind mapping in order to improve the students' reading or vocabulary skill. Applying more mapping and various shapes of mapping will be advantages for the students' English achievement in Elementary school.

Sixth, games in writing class will be preferred so much in teaching writing to High School. Because learning in fun can create fresh mind and fast learning.

Bibliography

Anonym. 2007. *Writing a Descriptive Essay*. Retrieved on January 12th, 2009 from. http://www.essay-paper.net/descriptive_essay.html.

Anthony, Edward in Allen and Campbell. 1972. *Teaching English as a Second Language*, Bombay: Tata Mc.Graw Hill Publishing Company Ltd.

Arapoff, Nancy. 1967. *Writing: A Thinking Process*. TESOL Quarterly, 1 (7), 33-39.

Barrass, Robert. 1982. *Students Must Write*. New York: Methuen and Co.

Byrne, Dorn. 1991. *Teaching Writing Skills*. London: Longman.

Buzan, Tony. 2007. *Buku Pintar Mind Mapping*. Jakarta: P.T. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Brown, H. Doughlas. 1980. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Cooper, C. and Odell, L. (Eds.). 1978. *Research in Composing: Points of Departure*. Urbana, IL:NCTE.

Chastain, Kenneth. 1976. *Developing Second-Language Skills: Theory to Practice*, 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNadly and Co.

Clause, Barbara. 1983. *Fine Writing: From Inner to Outer World*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Duke, Charles R. 1983. *Writing Through Sequence*:*A Process Approach*. London: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Davis, Jason. 2006. *Effective Academic Writing 3*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dagher, Joseph P. 1976. *Writing a Practical Guide*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Eugene, Maria. 1982. *How I Use Songs*. English Teaching Forum, Volume XX, July.

Flower, Linda and John R. Hayes. *A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing*. College Composition and Communication 32.4 (1981): 365-387. Rpt. in Cross-talk in Comp Theory: A Reader. Victor Villanueva. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1997. 153-166.

Frank D'Angelo. 1976. *Process and Thought in Composition*, 2nd. ed. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers Inc. Englewood Cliffs.

Ford, Marjorie and Jon Ford. 1990. *Dreams and Inward Journeys: A Reader for Writers*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Goffman, E. 1956. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. NewYork: Anchor.

Hacker, Diana. 1942. *Writing with a Voice*. NewYork: HarperCollins Co.

Hawley, James and Charles Tilghman. 1992. *Getting Down to Specifics*. NewYork: HarperCollins Co.

Huot, B. 1990. *Reliability, validity, and holistic scoring: What we know and what we need to know.* College Composition and Communication, 41 (2), 201-213.

Jacobs, H. L., Zingraf, S. A., Wormuth, D.R., Hartfiel, V.F., and Hughey, J.B. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Linggajati. 1997. *The Use of Brainstorming as a Prewriting Technique in Composing a Descriptive Writing*. S-1 Thesis. English Department. Teacher Training Faculty of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.

Miller, Robert Keith. 1949. *Motives for Writing*. NewYork: The McGraw-Hill Co.

Olson, Carol B. 1992. *Thinking Writing: Fostering Critical Thinking Through Writing*. HarperCollins: NewYork.

Oluwadiya, Adewumi. 1992. *Some Prewriting Techniques for Student Writers*. English Teaching Forum.

Paulston, Christina Bratt and Marry Newton Bruder. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers.

Protherough, R. 1983. *Encouraging Writing*. NewYork: Metheun and Co.

Raimes, Ann. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing Skills*. England: Oxford University Press.

Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. New York: Regents/Prentice Hall.

Raimes, Ann. 1996. *Keys for writers*. NewYork: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Rivers, Wilga M. 1968. *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

S, Joanita. 2006. *Picture as a Means of Teaching Writing in English for SMA Students*. S-1 Thesis. English Department. Teacher Training Faculty of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.

Simon&Schuster. 2003. *Essay Writing STEP-BY STEP*. New York: Newsweek, Inc.

Seldess, Jesse.1996-2008. *How to Write a Descriptive Essay*. Retrieved from **www.descriptive_essay.html.**

Sudarwati, M and Grace, Eudia.2005. *Look Ahead an English Course*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Sudibyo, Bambang. 2007. *Materi Sosialisasi dan Pelatihan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) SMA*. Jakarta: Department Pendidikan Nasional.

Tribble, Christopher. 1996. *Writing*. England: Oxford University Press.

White, Ronald V. 1981. *Approaches to Writing*. Guidelines for Writing Activities.

Werner, Kathleen. 1989. *Models for Clear Writing*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.