WHICH IS MORE EFFECTIVE, A MIND MAP OR A CONCEPT MAP LEARNING STRATEGY?

I Wayan Redhana*1, Kadek Widiastari1, Achmad Samsudin2, Irwanto3

1Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Indonesia
2Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia
3Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
*email: wayan.redhana@undiksha.ac.id

Abstract: A mind map and a concept map learning strategy are two learning strategies that are often used to improve students’ learning achievement. This study aimed to describe the differences in learning achievement between students who studied with a mind map learning strategy and those who used the concept map learning strategy, as well as the students’ responses toward the learning strategy applied. This type of study was a quasi-experiment with a pretest-posttest control group design. The methods used in this study were a test and a questionnaire. Data of students’ learning achievement were analyzed using inferential statistics of covariance analysis, while data of students’ responses were analyzed by descriptive statistics. The results of the study indicated that there were significant differences in the learning achievement between students who used the mind map learning strategy and those who studied with the concept map learning strategy. Those who used the mind map learning strategy had better achievements than those using the concept map learning strategy. In addition, the students’ responses were more positive toward the mind map learning strategy than to the concept map learning strategy.
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INTRODUCTION

The learning process is an important component in the educational system. The learning process is an effort to apply learning approaches, models, strategies, methods, and techniques to present subject matter content so that students can understand it properly. Assessment is also an integral part of the learning process. Through a good learning process, inputs can be transformed into qualified graduates (human resources). The quality of human resources will be able to drive a country’s economy. Thus, the quality of human resources has a very important position for the progress of a country.

Given the importance of the learning
process in producing the quality of human resources, all parties, especially teachers, must pay special attention to the learning process. Efforts to improve the quality of the learning process can be done in several ways. One of them is by applying appropriate learning approaches, models, strategies, methods, and techniques.

A mind map and a concept map learning strategy are two learning strategies that concern researchers (Chiou, Lee, Tien, & Wang, 2017; Fadillah, Dewi, Ridho, Majid, & Prastiwi, 2017; Herlanti, Mardiati, Wahyuningtyas, Mahardini, Iqbal, & Sofyan, 2017).

The mind maps are recording techniques developed by Tony Buzan in the late 1960s (Adodo, 2013). They illustrate the relationship among ideas involving the thickness of lines, colors, images, and diagrams creatively (Adodo, 2013). They can help students utilize their knowledge to build new knowledge in their minds so that they can make conceptual changes (Liu, Zhao, Ma, & Bo, 2014). In addition, they are known to increase memory retention and increase students’ motivation (Liu et al., 2014). On the other hand, the concept maps are schemes that show relationships between concepts (Brinkerhoff & Booth, 2013). They are learning strategies that are compatible with meaningful learning (Kilic & Çakmak, 2013). They are made by writing concepts in a box or circle and showing relationships between concepts using labeled lines (Karakuyu, 2010; Brinkerhoff & Booth, 2013; Kilic & Çakmak, 2013). In addition, they also allow students to receive and store information more efficiently (Arokoyu & Obunwo, 2014).

Creating the mind and the concept maps can be done by asking questions 5W1H (what, why, when, where, who, and how). These questions help to create active learning activities because students can find information through reading books or other information media and discussing them in a group to find answers to questions. This is in accordance with the theory of constructivism, namely, understanding of contents of subject matters based on the experience of students themselves (Ültanır, 2012). In addition, active learning can help students in (a) thinking critically or creatively, (b) talking to classmates in small groups or in the whole class, (c) expressing ideas through writing, (d) exploring personal attitudes and values, (e) giving and receiving feedback, and (f) reflecting the learning processes (Eison, 2010).

To optimize the application of mind maps or concept maps, these learning strategies are often combined with several learning models, such as lesson study-based contextual learning models with mind maps (Fadillah et al., 2017), project-based learning models with mind maps (Susilawati, Hernillah, & Sinaga, 2017), guided inquiry learning model with mind maps (Prastiwi, Haryani, & Lisdiana, 2018), computer-assisted concept map learning model (Liu, Chen, & Chang, 2010), technology-based concept map learning model (Hwang, Wu, & Kuo, 2013), an integrated concept map learning model (Hwang, Kuo, Chen, & Ho, 2014), and a problem-based learning model with concept maps (Si, Kong, & Lee, 2018).

Measuring the effectiveness of mind map or concept map learning strategies in improving the students’ learning achievement is done by comparing each of these learning strategies with the conventional or traditional learning strategy. The results showed that the mind map learning strategies are more effective than the conventional learning strategy in increasing the students’ learning achievement (Awad & Hegazy, 2015; Tarkashvand, 2015; Herlanti et al., 2017; Mahasneh, 2017). Likewise, the mind map learning strategies are more effective than the conventional learning strategy in improving programming performances, problem solving skills, and metacognitive knowledge (Ismail, Ngah, & Umar, 2010), cognitive knowledge structures (Dhindsa, Kasim, & Anderson, 2011), critical thinking skills (D’Antoni, Zipp, Olson, & Cahill, 2010; Khodadady & Ghanizadeh, 2011; Adodo, 2013), creative thinking skills (Adodo, 2013; Zubaidah, Fuad, Mahanal, & Suarsini, 2017), learning motivation (Tanriseven, 2014; Prastiwi et al., 2018), independent learning (Tanriseven, 2014), scientific process skills (Prastiwi et al., 2018), and collaborative learning (Chang, Chiu, & Huang, 2018).

On the other hand, the results showed that the concept map learning strategies are more effective (Chawla, 2015; Tarkashvand, 2015; Chiou et al., 2017). Other research results also showed that the concept map learning strategies are better than the conventional learning strategy in increasing attitudes towards science (Karakuyu, 2010), learning motivation (Hwang,
Shi, & Chu, 2011), critical thinking skills (Lestari, Saryantono, Syazali, Saregar, Madiyo, Jauhariyah, & Umam, 2019), and learning interest (Lestari et al., 2019). In addition, the concept map learning strategies can reduce cognitive load (Hu & Wu, 2012).

However, research results related to the comparison of mind map learning strategies and concept map learning strategies in improving the students’ learning achievement are still limited and have not shown consistent results. Abbas, Sharaf, & Elsayed (2018) reported that there was no significant difference in concept understanding between students who were taught with the mind map learning strategies and students who were taught with the concept map learning strategies. This is probably due to the researchers assumed that by knowing the advantages or effectiveness of the proposed new learning models or strategies against the conventional learning models or strategies, the study has been considered complete. Or, the researchers may also be less interested in comparing two or more learning models or strategies that have common advantages.

This study aims to compare the effectiveness of two learning strategies, namely, mind maps and concept maps, which are both more effective in increasing the students’ learning achievement than the conventional learning strategy. By knowing which learning strategy is more effective in increasing the students’ learning achievement, teachers can choose the right learning strategy in making lesson plans. In addition, students will get better learning experiences in increasing their learning achievement.

**METHOD**

**Types of Research**

This type of study was a quasi-experiment using a pretest-posttest non-equivalent control group design. In this study, two experimental groups were used, namely Group 1 and 2, and both groups were given the test before treatment (pretest) and after the test after treatment (posttest).

**Population and Samples**

The study was conducted at one of the high schools in Buleleng district, Bali, Indonesia. This school is located in Singaraja city and is a private school which is quite a favorite in which there are quite a lot of prospective students. This study was conducted in class X. This school had class X as many as nine classes. For the purposes of experimental research, two existing classes were needed so as not to interfere with the ongoing learning process. Sampling was done using a cluster sampling technique. Based on the technique, it was obtained two classes which would be assigned respectively as Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2. The Experimental Group 1 consisted of 26 students (10 boys and 16 girls), while the Experimental Group 2 consisted of 24 students (11 boys and 13 girls). Students who participated in this study were 15-16 years old. They come from a city environment. Students’ understanding of chemistry was still quite limited. This was because they were still in the early class (class X) in high school.

**Procedures of Data Collection**

Before learning, both the Experimental Group 1 and 2 were given a learning achievement test (pretest). The test execution time was 90 minutes. This test had met the criteria of validity, reliability, difficulty level, and different power index.

In the implementation of learning, the Experimental Group 1 and 2 were taught respectively with a mind map and a concept maps learning strategy. Both groups were taught by the same teacher on the topic of hydrocarbons. Overall there were six stages of learning of these two learning strategies. The implementation of these two learning strategies lasted 6 x 45 minutes.

The learning stages of the mind map learning strategy were as follows. First, the teacher conveyed the learning objectives and the scope of the materials to be studied. Second, students make questions using the 5W1H strategies (what, when, who, where, why, and how) in accordance with the learning objectives and the materials being studied. Third, students found ideas and conceptual explanations through discussion activities in small groups (4-5 students) to answer the questions posed in Stage 2. This information gathering was done through various sources. Fourth, one of the groups presented their ideas in a class discussion and the other groups responded. Fifth, students
mapped answers to questions in the form of a mind map. Finally, students displayed the results of their mind maps.

On the other hand, the learning stages of the concept map learning strategy were as follows. First, students listen to the learning objectives and material coverage. Second, students generated a number of questions to understand the learning materials being studied and these questions were in accordance with the learning objectives. Questions were made using the 5W1H concept. Third, students discussed in small groups (4-5 students) to find answers to questions in stage 2 using various learning resources. Fourth, students reported the results of their group discussions in class discussions to get responses from other groups. Fifth, students created a concept map based on the answers to the questions. Finally, students showed off the concept maps that were generated from group discussions.

After implementing the two learning strategies in each experimental group, students’ learning achievement was measured by a learning achievement test (posttest). The test used after treatment was the same as it used before treatment. The test ran for 90 minutes.

### Learning Tools and Research Instruments

Learning tools used were learning implementation plans and students’ worksheets. Meanwhile, an instrument used to collect data of learning achievement test for the topic of hydrocarbon compounds. This test was developed by researchers. The blueprint of learning achievement test is shown in Table 1. Based on Table 1, it appeared that the test consisted of 15 objective items and 10 essay items.

Before it was used to measure the students’ learning achievement, this test was tested validities, reliability, levels of difficulties, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Competencies</th>
<th>Indicators of Competency Achievement</th>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describing the peculiarities of carbon atoms in forming hydrocarbon compounds</td>
<td>Analyzing the elements C, H, and O in carbon compounds</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describing the peculiarities of the carbon atom in carbon compounds</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying primary, secondary, tertiary, and quaternary C atoms</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grouping hydrocarbons based on bond saturation</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describing the structure of alkanes, alkenes, and alkyn compounds based on their IUPAC names</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naming the compounds alkanes, alkenes, and alkynes</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deducing the relationships of the boiling points of hydrocarbons to their relative molecular masses and structures</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determining structural isomers and geometric isomers</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing down the equations for the oxidation reactions for alkanes, alkenes, and alkyn compounds</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing down the equation for the substitution reaction for alkanes</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing down the equation for the elimination reaction equation for haloalkane compounds</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing down the addition reaction equations for alkenes, and alkyn compounds</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indexes of the discriminating power. The results showed that for objective test items, the item validities were .31 – .66, the reliability was .77, the levels of difficulties were .34 – .83, and the different power indexes were .17 – .72. On the other hand for essay test items, the item validities were .38 – .81, the reliability was .91, the levels of difficulties were .12 – .84, and the different power indexes were .30 – .68. Meanwhile, a questionnaire was used to collect data related to students’ responses to the learning strategies applied. The questionnaire consisted of four dimensions, including motivation, activities, conceptual mastery, and group collaboration. It was in the form of closed questions with four response options, namely, strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. It was validated by two content experts and classified as valid.

Data Analysis

The research data consisted of students’ learning achievement and students’ responses to the learning strategies applied. Data of students’ learning achievement were analyzed by inferential statistical techniques, namely, analysis of covariance, at a significant level of 5%. The assumption tests were done as prerequisites for the analysis of covariance. The assumption tests included the tests of normality, variance homogeneity, linearity, and slope homogeneity of regression lines. Meanwhile, data of students’ responses were analyzed by descriptive statistical techniques.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Data of Pretest and Posttest

The learning achievement of students who learned to use the mind map learning strategy and the concept map learning strategy was in the form of pretest and posttest scores. Average scores and standard deviations of students’ pretest and posttest scores in the Experimental Group 1 and 2 are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>20.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>73.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: X1 = Experimental Group 1; X2 = Experimental Group 2

Assumption Test Results

The normality test of data distribution was carried out using the Shapiro-Wilk technique. The results of the normality test are presented in Table 3. Data in Table 3 showed that all the significant values were more than .05. These results supported that all data were normally distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The homogeneity variance test between groups was carried out using the Levene test. The homogeneity variance test results are presented in Table 4. Data in Table 4 indicated that all the significant values were more than .05. These results supported that the variances of data for both the pretest and the posttest in both groups were homogeneous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Based on mean</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on median</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.470</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Based on mean</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on median</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.317</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The linearity test was conducted to determine the linear relationship between students’ prior knowledge (pretest scores) and the students’ learning achievement (posttest scores) in each group. The significances of the direction of the regression were shown by the significant values in rows of linearity in Table 5 and the linearities of the regression lines were indicated by the significant values in rows of the deviation from linearity in Table 5. All the significant values of the linearity were less than .05. These results supported that the direction of regression was significant. Then, all the significant values of the deviation from linearity were more than .05. These results also supported that the relationship between pretest and posttest was linear.

The slope homogeneity test of the regression lines was evidenced by the absence of interaction between covariate variables (pretest) and independent variables (the learning strategies). The significant value in the row of the strategy*pretest in Table 6 was more than .05. This result evidenced that there was no interaction between covariate variables (pretest) and independent variables (the learning strategies).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Linearity</td>
<td>1478.193</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1478.193</td>
<td>48.821</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deviation from linearity</td>
<td>287.590</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.966</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Linearity</td>
<td>472.349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>472.349</td>
<td>8.237</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deviation from linearity</td>
<td>727.401</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55.954</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected model</td>
<td>2404.497</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>801.499</td>
<td>19.995</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>22389.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22389.098</td>
<td>558.537</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>10.443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.443</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1908.896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1908.896</td>
<td>47.621</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy*pretest</td>
<td>154.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154.400</td>
<td>3.852</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1843.923</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297167.000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected total</td>
<td>4248.420</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Test Results

The assumption tests that had been done showed that all data met the requirements to be analyzed using the covariance analysis test. The significant value in the row of strategy in Table 7 was less than .05. Thus, a decision could be made that the null hypothesis was rejected or the alternative hypothesis was accepted. In other words, there was a significant difference between the learning achievement of students who learned with the mind map learning strategy and the learning achievement of students who learned with the concept map learning strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected model</td>
<td>2250.097</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1125.048</td>
<td>26.461</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>22523.121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22523.121</td>
<td>529.737</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1846.625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1846.625</td>
<td>43.432</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>563.301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>563.301</td>
<td>13.249</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1998.323</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297167.000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected total</td>
<td>4248.420</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students’ Responses

Students’ responses to both learning strategies applied in this study were measured by the questionnaire containing 24 statement items. The dimensions measured in students’ responses included four aspects, namely, (1) motivation, (2) activities, (3) mastery of concepts, and (4) group collaboration. The results of students’ responses are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Students’ Responses to the Learning Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of student responses</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of concepts</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group collaboration</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

In both learning strategies, students made questions in their groups through 5W1H strategies (what, why, where, when, who, and how) in accordance with the learning objectives at each meeting. This step was intended to help students develop their understanding of the contents of subject matters. Next, students looked for answers to the questions they made by reading various information sources and conducting group discussions. These steps helped students to find the concepts learned so that the concepts constructed could be remembered longer (Vallori, 2014). In addition, in group discussions, students interacted more intensively with their peers to find and deepen new concepts. This is consistent with the view of student-centered learning.

After group discussions, students conducted class discussions. At this step, one group presented the answers to the questions generated in the group, which were then responded by other groups. This step was intended to confirm and to test the findings of students in group discussions.

Next, both learning strategies had different steps. In the mind map learning strategy, students mapped their answers in the form of concept maps in groups. At this step, students used the Cmaptools software to create concept maps. The purposes of using this computer softwares were to help students mapped ideas and concepts so that they were easier to learn. The steps in creating mind and concept maps were focused on the way students think in processing the information they got during group discussions. Next, the results of mind and concept maps created by students were exhibited at the end of the meeting in each class. The mind and concept map exhibitions were intended to clarify the maps made by students. With the exhibitions, teachers could see a picture of students’ content understanding.

The mind and concept maps were both graphical tools for describing and linking knowledge that was fully learned by students so that they understood the contents more easily. The mind maps were created by writing the main topic in the middle then followed by branches out of the main topic. Branches on mind maps were made in various shapes and colors generated from questions and answers by students. Meanwhile, concept maps were created by determining important concepts by students while searching for answers and then creating relationships between concepts. Each concept was written in a box or circle that was connected by lines containing connecting words.

It is important to map the ideas or concepts found by students during the learning process. Students who are able to describe complex relationships in the diagrams or maps tend to understand these relationships, remember them, and can analyze their parts (Davies, 2011). It is also supported by research results which reveal that the concept maps can help students understand, integrate, and clarify concepts and increase students’ interest in learning (Chiou, 2014). The concept maps help low-achieving students to improve their learning outcomes (Karakuyu, 2010), encourage students to master contents at a high cognitive level, enable students to build a knowledge base (Awofala, 2011), enhance students’ academic achievement (Cheema & Mirza, 2013; Arokoyu & Obunwo, 2014), improve students’ retention (Adeniran, Ochu, & Atoo, 2018). On the other hand, the mind maps can help students make their cognitive structure connections broader, more thematically
organized, and richer (Dhindsa et al., 2011). The mind maps also allow students to understand contents more easily, connect between contents, and understand the whole concepts (Tungprapa, 2015).

In addition, the mind and concept maps can change the shapes of the contents that were originally in the forms of a long description into concise map forms that can help students remember contents that are learned more easily. Students understand the visual forms more easily than written descriptions or oral forms (Davies, 2011; Jackson, 2016). Therefore, the concept and mind maps in learning can make students remember and understand the contents more easily.

The results showed that students’ learning achievement was better in the classes taught with the mind map learning strategy than the classes taught with the concept map learning strategy. This could be viewed in terms of graphics. The mind maps are more interesting than the concept maps because the mind maps are made free according to students’ way of thinking and use many colors (Balim, 2013; Aydin, 2015). In addition, there are no restrictions on ideas created and there are no requirements to create particular structures or formats (Davies, 2011). When viewed from the creating process, the mind maps are easier to make than the concept maps because students only need to write questions, answers of questions, and all information obtained in learning as branches of the main topic, while on the concept maps students must first determine the important concepts and find relationships between concepts.

In the process of creating mind maps, both parts of the brain work because the mind maps involve visual aspects, nonverbal thinking, and creative thinking (the left parts of the brain) together with analytical thinking (the right parts of the brain). On the other hand, in the process of creating concept maps, students only use the left parts of the brain (Spoorthi, Prashanthi, & Pandurangappa, 2013). If both parts of the brain are used together, students will easily concentrate and understand the contents of subject matters (Spoorthi et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2014). This is in line with the opinion of (Balim, 2013) which states that the mind maps are visualization tools and they are very helpful for students in remembering information in the learning process. Other researchers reported that mind maps can develop students’ critical thinking skills (Ellozy & Mostafa, 2010; Fuad, Zubaidah, Mahanal, & Suarsini, 2017; Rezapour-Nasrabad, 2019; Fitria, Floriasti, Djohan, & Sittiprapaporn, 2020) and creative thinking skills (Miranti & Wilujeng, 2018). Students become more responsive and more motivated in the mind maps learning environment (Wilson, Copeland-Solas, & Guthrie-Dixon, 2016). The selection of learning models or strategies that are in line with students’ learning styles will lead to students’ satisfaction towards the learning done by teachers.

If viewed from the students’ responses, students gave more positive responses to the mind map learning strategy than to the concept map learning strategy. Students felt more positive impacts on the aspects of activeness, motivation, mastery of concepts, and group collaboration in the mind map learning strategy. Students hoped that the mind learning strategy can be continued. These students’ responses indicated that the mind map learning strategy was very feasible to apply and could be the learning strategy that was worth trying extensively on other subjects. It could be seen further that there was a positive relationship between the students’ learning achievement and the students’ responses on the application of the mind map learning strategy.

In the implementation of both learning strategies, there were several obstacles. These were as follows. At the beginning of the implementation of both learning strategies, students were still unable to adapt to the learning strategy applied, such as developing 5W1H questions, finding answers to questions in group discussions and creating the mind and concept maps based on the results of group discussions. For that, students were guided patiently to follow the steps of the learning process. Finally, students could adjust and follow the learning steps applied.

CONCLUSION

The qualified education absolutely must be carried out by every teacher. With the qualified education, the qualified human resources will be generated. To achieve the qualified education, teachers need to apply innovative learning models or strategies. Many innovative learning models or strategies have been developed to improve
the quality of education. Two of the several innovative learning models or strategies are the mind map learning strategy and the concept map learning strategy. Both of these learning strategies are seen as effective in improving students’ learning achievement. However, the big question is which of the two learning strategies is more effective? The results of testing the two learning strategies produce that the mind map learning strategy is more effective in improving students’ learning achievement than the concept map learning strategy. Based on the results of this study, it can be suggested that teachers can apply the mind map learning strategy to improve students’ learning achievement.
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