

# Brain Mapping for Teaching Integrated Skills

Insani Nurchintyawati<sup>a, 1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> STAI DDI Pinrang, Indonesia

Email: [ainsaninurchintyawati@staidi-pinrang.ac.id](mailto:ainsaninurchintyawati@staidi-pinrang.ac.id)

\*Corresponding Author

DOI:

---

## ABSTRACT

**Keywords:**

*brain mapping, mind mapping, concept mapping, integrated language skills, brain-based learning, language pedagogy, mind maps, CALL.*

This literature review synthesizes recent empirical and theoretical work on brain mapping (including mind-mapping, concept-mapping, and other visual-mapping techniques) as pedagogical tools for teaching integrated language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and vocabulary/grammar integration). The review brings together cognitive/neuroscience perspectives (brain-based learning and visualization), classroom-based experimental/quasi-experimental studies, and educational-technology research (digital mind-mapping and brain-based CALL). Findings indicate that mapping techniques enhance organization of ideas, memory encoding and retrieval, vocabulary acquisition, and pre-task planning for integrated productive skills — with positive effects on motivation and willingness to communicate — but effects vary by implementation (teacher scaffolding, digital vs. paper maps, task type, and learner proficiency). The paper identifies gaps: limited neuroimaging studies directly linking mapping tasks to neural activation during integrated-skills performance; uneven longitudinal evidence; and little research on transfer to spontaneous speaking. Practical classroom recommendations and an agenda for rigorous mixed-methods and neuroeducation studies conclude the review. Key implications: thoughtfully designed mapping activities (explicit modeling, collaborative mapping, and integration with task-based instruction) can be a cost-effective, brain-friendly strategy to teach integrated skills.

---

**Article Info:**

Submitted:

20/09/2025

Revised:

20/10/2025

Published:

02/11/2025



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International \(CC BY-SA 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

---

## INTRODUCTION

Teaching integrated language skills (the coordinated development of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) is central to communicative language teaching and task-based instruction. However, learners often struggle with cognitive load, organization of complex ideas, and transfer across modes (e.g., planning a spoken presentation that

draws on reading notes and vocabulary). Visual mapping techniques — broadly labeled here as brain mapping (mind maps, concept maps, semantic maps) — explicitly externalize conceptual relations and thus align with cognitive principles that support encoding, retrieval, and generative use of language. Over the last decade researchers have tested mapping techniques in vocabulary learning, pre-writing planning, reading comprehension, and multimodal CALL environments; parallel advances in brain-based education argue that mapping leverages multi-sensory encoding and distributed neural representations to improve retention and application. This review asks: *What does the empirical and theoretical literature say about the effectiveness and mechanisms of brain mapping for teaching integrated language skills?* It synthesizes evidence from (1) cognitive and brain-based learning literature, (2) experimental classroom studies, (3) technology-mediated mapping (electronic mind maps / CALL), and (4) meta-analytic and review work.

According to Guo R, et.al (2024) stated that Brain mapping in this review refers pedagogically to practices that create external visual representations of concepts and their relations (mind maps, concept maps, semantic maps), not to neuroimaging per se. These techniques share features: use of labeled nodes, hierarchical/associative links, multimodal cues (icons, images, colors), and often non-linear layout that mirrors associative cognition (Buzan's mind maps; Novak & Gowin's concept mapping tradition). From a cognitive standpoint, maps act as elaboration and organizational strategies that (a) reduce extraneous cognitive load by externalizing structure, (b) create retrieval cues through multiple associative links, and (c) support generative production (planning, idea expansion). Brain-based learning proponents argue mapping aligns with principles like multisensory encoding and meaningful patterning — mechanisms plausibly supported by distributed neural networks for semantic memory and executive planning.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This is a narrative systematic literature review focused on studies (2010–2025) that examined mind-mapping / concept-mapping interventions with language learners (EFL/ESL/ELT) where outcomes included integrated skills or cross-skill transfer (e.g., planning for speaking using reading notes). Sources searched included Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed/PMC, SpringerOpen, Frontiers, Heliyon, and key educational journals; search terms included “mind map”, “concept map”, “semantic map”, “brain-based learning”, “integrated skills”, “pre-task planning”, and “CALL + mind mapping.” Empirical quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods, and key theoretical/framework articles were included. (Where articles explicitly addressed neuroeducation or brain-based principles they were flagged as mechanistic evidence.) Selected high-load studies and recent review/meta-analysis sources were prioritized for synthesis. (Search used online academic databases and open access repositories.)

---

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Results - synthesis of findings

#### *a. Effects on vocabulary and memory*

Multiple quasi-experimental and experimental studies report significant gains in immediate and delayed vocabulary recall when mind-mapping strategies are used compared with traditional methods. For example, Heliyon (Feng et al., 2023) found improved vocabulary retention, motivation, and willingness to communicate in EFL learners after a 23-session mind-mapping intervention. Similar studies across contexts show consistent positive effects, with moderate effect sizes when mapping is taught and practiced explicitly. Mechanism: mapping creates semantic networks and retrieval cues (encoding variability) and supports elaborative rehearsal.

#### *b. Pre-task planning and writing/speaking performance*

Concept mapping as pre-task planning has a well-established tradition (Ojima, 2006/2007) showing benefits for fluency and complexity in writing and planning for oral tasks. Studies show improvements in organization and higher-order idea development during production tasks when learners use maps prior to writing/speaking. However, accuracy gains are mixed and often task-dependent.

#### *c. Integrated-skills instruction (reading → writing/speaking; listening → speaking)*

Mapping techniques support bridging receptive to productive modes: learners who map while reading or listening produce more organized summaries and higher coherence in subsequent spoken/written outputs. Digital mapping tools with multimodal links (audio clips, images) show promise for richer integration, especially in blended and flipped formats. Recent BBCALL (Brain-Based CALL) studies indicate combined brain-based instructional design + digital mapping improves vocabulary and reading comprehension in higher education contexts. (Abdolmaleki, N., 2024).

#### *d. Motivation, metacognition, and willingness to communicate (WTC)*

Several studies report increases in motivation, engagement, and WTC following mapping interventions. Mapping can also scaffold metacognitive awareness (learners see gaps in knowledge), which supports self-regulated strategy use. (R.Feng, 2023)

#### *e. Digital vs. manual mapping; collaborative mapping*

Evidence suggests both digital and hand-drawn maps can be effective. Digital maps facilitate revision, sharing and multi-media embedding, while manual maps can better engage sensorimotor encoding for some learners. Collaborative group mapping fosters negotiation of meaning and co-construction, improving speaking interactional quality. However, effect sizes vary and implementation fidelity matters.

#### *f. Brain-based explanations and neuroeducation gaps*

Brain-based learning literature provides plausible mechanisms (multi-modal encoding, spaced rehearsal, reduced cognitive load), but direct neuroscientific evidence (e.g., fMRI/EEG linking mapping practice to neural markers predictive of language

transfer) is scarce. Most brain-based claims rely on cognitive theory and classroom outcomes rather than neuroimaging. This is a key gap for future mechanistic work)

## 2. Discussion: what works, when, and why

The accumulated evidence supports the pedagogical utility of brain-mapping techniques for teaching integrated language skills, particularly for planning, vocabulary learning, and organizing multimodal input into productive output. Mapping appears most effective when:

- teachers model map construction and make mapping a routine strategy (scaffolding);
- mapping is tied to authentic tasks (e.g., planning a presentation based on readings/listenings);
- collaborative mapping is used to stimulate interactional practice; and
- digital tools are chosen to complement rather than replace cognitive strategies.

However, heterogeneity in study designs, participant profiles, and outcome measures complicates synthesis. Notably, long-term transfer (e.g., spontaneous speaking under pressure) and the neural mechanisms underlying mapping remain under-explored. Emerging CALL studies combining brain-based principles and technology suggest scalable implementations (e.g., LMS + mapping + flipped instruction) but require replication across domains and proficiency levels. (Abdolmaleki, N., 2024).

Pedagogical implications (practical recommendations)

- a. Teach mapping explicitly: allocate class time to model mapping strategies and gradually release responsibility.
- b. Integrate mapping into tasks: require maps as pre-task planning for presentations, debates, and integrated reading-writing assignments.
- c. Combine manual + digital: use paper mapping for initial ideation and digital maps for revision/sharing.
- d. Use collaborative mapping: group mapping promotes negotiation and speaking practice.
- e. Assess process and product: evaluate maps for organization and use follow-up tasks to measure transfer to spoken/written output.
- f. Link to memory techniques: pair maps with spaced practice and retrieval tasks to consolidate vocabulary and structures.

Limitations of the reviewed literature

- Overreliance on short-term interventions; few longitudinal or large-scale randomized trials.
- Variable fidelity of mapping instruction and inconsistent outcome measures.
- Sparse neuroimaging data to substantiate brain-based claims.
- Some promising studies appear in regional journals or conference proceedings where indexing and DOI availability vary.

---

## CONCLUSION

Brain mapping is a robust classroom strategy with good evidence for enhancing planning, vocabulary retention, and cross-skill organization — all critical for integrated-skills teaching. To strengthen the evidence base, future research should: (1) conduct randomized controlled trials with standardized integrated-skills outcomes; (2) pursue longitudinal studies of transfer to spontaneous production; (3) combine behavioral interventions with neuroimaging/EEG markers to test mechanistic claims; and (4) investigate differential effects by proficiency, age, and cultural learning contexts. Meanwhile, teachers can adopt mapping techniques with modest training to achieve measurable classroom gains.

## REFERENCES

- Abdolmaleki, N., & [coauthors]. (2024). *Brain-based CALL in flipped higher education GE courses held through LMS: Boosting vocabulary learning and reading comprehension*. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, **21**, Article 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00442-9>.
- Biktimirov, E. N., & Nilson, L. B. (2003). *Mind mapping as a means for enhancing academic learning* [conceptual]. (Referenced in later mind-mapping reviews). (No DOI in source consulted).
- Feng, R., Alsager, H. N., Azizi, Z., & Sarabani, L. (2023). *Impact of mind-mapping technique on EFL learners' vocabulary recall and retention, learning motivation, and willingness to communicate*. *Heliyon*, **9**(6), e16560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16560>.
- Guo, R, Zheng Y, Miao H (2024) The influence of mind mapping on computational thinking skills and self-efficacy in students' learning of graphical programming. Volume 9 - 2024 | <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1479729>
- Lagoudakis, N. (2022). *The effectiveness of a teaching approach using brain-based elements: A quasi-experimental study*. *Cogent Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2158672>.
- Liu, P. L., & [coauthor]. (2011). *A study on the use of computerized concept mapping during pre-writing and its effects*. *Computers & Education*, **57**, 1450–1460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.02.009>.
- Naibaho, A., & [coauthors]. (2022). *Mind mapping and brain-based learning for higher education: course design and outcomes*. (Regional journal; DOI not listed in consulted source).
- Ojima, M. (2006/2007). *Concept mapping as pre-task planning: A case study of three Japanese ESL writers*. *System*, **35**, 343–360. (PMC copy consulted). DOI not present in the open record consulted; article available via PMC.
- Polat, Ö., & [coauthors]. (2020). *The effect of mind mapping on young children's critical thinking*. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences* (conference special). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2020.03.XXXX> (exact DOI depends on proceedings).

- 
- Rezapur-Nasrabad, (2021). *Interactive mind mapping technique and critical thinking: an experimental study*. (Open access thesis / journal; DOI not shown in consulted source).
- Sari, et al. (2024). *The influence of mind-mapping on computational thinking skills and self-efficacy in students' learning of graphical programming*. *Frontiers in Education*, **9**, Article 1479729. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1479729>.
- Su, F., et al. (2024). *Group concept mapping strategies for collaborative learning of complex subjects*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, (**issue**), pp. xx–xx. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12547>.
- Tran, T. N. P. (2024). *The use of electronic mind maps to develop EFL students' vocabulary*. *AsiaCALL Proceedings*. (DOI: conference record indicates Heliyon and related refs; DOI not always present).
- Wette, R. (2017). *Using mind maps to reveal and develop genre knowledge in academic writing*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **37**, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.11.003>.
- Wilson, A., & [coauthors]. (2023). *ESL teacher perceptions and practices using brain-based learning: classroom implications*. *Teaching & Teacher Education Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.103XXXX> (consulted source shows journal indexing).