

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VISUAL, AUDITORY, KINESTHETIC (VAK) MODEL IN TEACHING WRITING ON PROCEDURE TEXT FOR THE SEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS AT SMP MUHAMMADIYAH 2 TARAKAN

Dian Permatasari¹, Ridwan², Taqvim Almustaqim³

¹Borneo Tarakan University

dianpermatsari@gmail.com

²Borneo Tarakan University

ridwan.fkipubt@gmail.com

³SMP 2 Muhammadiyah Tarakan

wimust@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research was to investigate whether there was any significant difference between the students who were taught by using Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK) model and those who were taught by using Mind Mapping model in teaching writing on procedure text for the seventh-grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Tarakan. The method used in this research was quasi-experimental, and the design of this research was a nonequivalent group design. The sample of this research was class VII A as the experimental class and VII C as the control class by using a purposive sampling technique. The research instrument was a writing test. The Independent Sample of T-test was used to analyze the data. The result of this research showed that there was a significant difference between the students who were taught by using Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK) model and those who were taught by using Mind Mapping model in writing procedure text. It was proven by the result of the students' mean score in the pretest and posttest. The students' mean score in the pretest in the experiment class was 32.83 and the students' mean score in the pretest in the control class was 36.83. The students' mean score in the posttest in the experiment class was 55.83 and the students' mean score in the posttest in the control class was 46.50. The students' mean score in the posttest in the experiment class was higher than that of the control class. The result of the Independent sample of T-test obtained $t_{count} = 2.095$ and t_{table} with $df = N - 2 = 46$ at the level of significance 5% or 0.05 was 2.013. It can be concluded that $t_{count} > t_{table}$ was $2.095 > 2.013$. Then, there was a significant effect of the implementation of Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK) model in teaching writing on procedure text for the seventh-grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Tarakan.

Keywords: Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK), Procedure Text, Writing

INTRODUCTION

In English there are four basic skills. Those skills are speaking, reading, listening, and writing. Among those skills, writing is considered the most complicated language skill to be learned. According to Jonah (2006: 14) writing is a series of activities involving several phases: the preparatory phase, the content vocabulary, arranging words to be a sentence, and developing it to be a paragraph. In addition, students must consider tenses to express an event at a certain time, and also about the use of capital, marking, and so on. Based on the Curriculum 2013 or Kurikulum 2013, seventh junior high school students are expected to have the ability in understanding and create oral or written text based on basic language skills, and the students are expected to have the ability to understand and create various short functional texts such as greeting, invitation, announcement, advertisement and personal letter, monolog and essays in the form simple monolog text of descriptive, narrative, recount, report and procedure text. It

should also be considered the learning needs and language needs of students as learning subject (Arifin et al, 2017).

Based on the observation that was held on March 14th, 2017 in class VII-A and the interview with the English teacher that was held on March 15th, 2017, it was found that the students had limited vocabulary so the students got difficulty developing writing in detail because they did not have any idea when the teacher asked them to write. The students were lack of motivation in writing, it was proven when the teacher asked them to write, students only wrote the same thing as the examples that were given by the teacher. In addition, students had a lot of mistakes in the use of grammar, the students had a lot of mistakes in using the simple present tense. Students had limited vocabulary, students had problems remembering new vocabulary and some students did not bring their dictionaries to help the students in learning new vocabulary. When the students created simple monologue text, they had problems in generating ideas, they were lack of ideas to write new content. Moreover, the teacher only focused on speaking and reading skills so the students had lack in writing because they seldom asked to do writing practice.

Based on the explanation above the researcher found a gap between the expectation that students should have and the facts that the researcher found in the field. The researcher will use Visual, Auditory, and Kinaesthetic (VAK) model as a way to narrow the gap found in the preliminary study. Implementing the Visual, Auditory, and Kinaesthetic (VAK) model is considered as one of the ways to make the students' writing easier. Based on the previous research, Rambe (2014) who conducted research using VAK model on students' achievement in writing recount text, the score of students in the experimental group were significantly higher than the score of students in the control group. It was also stated that the students' achievement that were taught by VAK model was better than the students' achievement that are taught by using without VAK model in SMP Negeri 1 Tg. Moraga. Students had a chance to learn about pieces of the material in the dimension of learning style.

This model gives the students' needs and students' learning styles. The research was focused on procedure text. So, it was expected that there was an effect on students' writing of procedure text by implementing Visual, Auditory, Kinaesthetic (VAK) model. VAK is a model that can exercise and explore students' potential to the students who have and reach every student's learning style. As a control in this research, a mind mapping model was used in the control class. The model can develop students' ideas by connecting maps.

In this case, VAK and mind mapping models were applied in two different classes in teaching writing the procedure text. The research aimed to investigate whether there was any significant difference between the students who were taught by using Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK) model and those who were taught by using Mind Mapping model in writing procedure text .

METHOD

The method of this research applied a quasi-experimental design with a nonequivalent control group design. In this design, two (or more) treatment groups were pretested, administered treatment, and posttested. There were four classes for the seventh-grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Tarakan. The samples were chosen by purposive sampling technique in

which class VII-A and class VII-C were taken. The writing test was the main instrument in this research. The procedures of research were firstly given a pretest in the first meeting in order to know the students' ability in writing procedure text. Then, the treatment was conducted in three meetings. The experimental class was taught by using Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic model and the control class was taught by using Mind Mapping model. Both of the classes were taught with the same materials. Lastly, a posttest was administered. It was distributed to both classes in order to measure the students' improvement in writing skills of procedure text.

In analyzing the data, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 24.0 was used to aid in analyzing the data. The data were analyzed using the normality test, homogeneity test, and independent sample t-test.

FINDINGS

In measuring the students' writing scores, the scoring rubric comprised of ideas, organization, word choice, sentence structure, and mechanics was used. Each aspect had points 1 to 5, the scoring rubric was adopted by Regina and Saskatchewan (2013: 66).

Based on the students' writing scores in the pretest, it was found the result of each aspect in the experimental class and in the control class as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Students' Pretest Score

Classification Score	Score Range	Experimental Class		Control Class	
		Frequency	Percentages	Frequency	Percentages
Very Good	86-100	0	0%	0	0%
Good	71-85	0	0%	0	0%
Fair	56-70	3	12.5%	5	20.8%
Poor	41-55	1	4.2%	4	16.7%
Very poor	0-40	20	83.3%	15	62.5%
Total		24	100%	24	100%

Table 1 shows the percentage of the students' scores from experimental class and control class, for experimental class 12.5% of students got fair score which was achieved by 3 students and 20.8% in control class was achieved by 5 students. In addition, for the experimental class 4.2% of them obtained poor score which was achieved by only 1 student and 16.7% in the control class was achieved by 4 students. Moreover, for the experimental class, 83.3% got very poor score which was achieved by 20 students and in the control class 62.5% was achieved by 15 students. Furthermore, none of the experimental class and the control class got very good score. The students' writing scores in posttest were also evaluated into five aspects of scoring. Those were ideas, organization, word choice, sentence structure, and mechanics. Based on the students' writing scores in the posttest, the result of each aspect in the experimental class and in the control class are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Students' Posttest Score

Score Classification	Score Range	Experimental Class		Control Class	
		Frequency	Percentages	Frequency	Percentages

Very Good	86-100	0	0%	0	0%
Good	71-85	5	20.8%	2	8.3%
Fair	56-70	8	33.3%	5	20.8%
Poor	41-55	4	16.7%	6	25%
Very poor	0-40	7	29.2%	11	45.8%
Total		24	100%	24	100%

Based on Table 2, the students' writing scores in the experimental group showed that there were 5 students who got good score with a percentage of 20.8%. In addition, 33.3% got fair which was achieved by 8 students. Furthermore, 4 students got poor score with a percentage of 18.7%, and 7 students got very poor with a percentage of 29.2%. Meanwhile, the students' writing scores in the control group showed that there were 2 students who got good score with a percentage of 8.3%. Furthermore, 20.8% got fair score which was achieved by 5 students. Then, 6 students got poor score with a percentage of 25%. Moreover, 45.8% of students got very poor score which was achieved by 11 students. Unfortunately, none of the experimental class nor the control class got very good and good scores. Overall, the highest percentage for the experimental class was classified in fair category, while, in the control class, the highest percentage was classified in very poor category.

The following table is a descriptive analysis. The results of descriptive statistics of the pretest and posttest scores were presented in Table 3:

Table 3. Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Pretest and Posttest Score

	Score	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	Control	24	36.83	15.423
	Experiment	24	32.83	13.134
Posttest	Control	24	46.50	15.861
	Experiment	24	55.83	14.989

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that the result of the pretest and posttest's mean and standard deviation. There were increases from pretest to posttest results in both the experimental class and the control class. In the pretest, the mean score of students' writing in the experimental class was 32.83 with standard deviation 13.134, then improved to 55.83 for the mean score with standard deviation 14.989 in the posttest. On the other side, in the control class, the mean score and standard deviation in pretest were 36.83 and 15.423 respectively and also improved to 46.50 for the mean score and 15.861 for the standard deviation. However, the mean score in the experimental class was higher than in the control class. The insignificant difference in the pretest of the experimental and control group is illustrated in Table 4 as follows:

Table 4. Independent Sample T_{test} of Pretest in Experimental and Control Class

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances
t-test for Equality of Means

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Pretest	Equal variances assumed	1.860	.179	-0.967	46	.338	-4.000	4.135	-12.324	4.324
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.967	44.861	.339	-4.000	4.135	-12.324	4.329

Based on Table 4, it shows that two ways to interpret the hypothesis, the first way was the sign. (2 tailed) which was higher than the level of significance ($0.967 > 0.05$) and the second way was based on the result of the t-test (T) -0.967 which was smaller than the t-table in which the T_{table} with a degree of freedom 46 at the level of significance 5% obtained 2.013. It means that the two variances had no differences before the treatment was given.

Meanwhile, the significant difference in the posttest of the experimental and the control group is illustrated in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Independent Sample T_{test} of Posttest in Experimental and Control Group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	.049	.825	2.095	46	.042	9.333	4.455	.367	18.300
	Equal variances not assumed			2.095	45.854	.042	9.333	4.455	.367	18.301

Table 5 depicts the results of Sig. (2-tailed) which was 0.42 and the t-test which was 2.095. Both resulted in the interpretation of hypothesis testing in which H_0 (Null Hypothesis) was rejected by accepting the H_a (Alternative Hypothesis). It means that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in writing the procedure text. In other words, the students in the experimental group performed better in writing the procedure text than those in the control group.

DISCUSSION

The objective of the research was to investigate whether there was any significant difference between the students who were taught by using Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK) model

and those who were taught by using Mind Mapping model in writing procedure text or not. In answering the research objectives, the researcher did a pretest to the students both of class in order to know students' ability in writing procedure text. After that the researcher gave the treatment for three meetings to each class. The experimental class was taught by using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model and those who are taught by using mind mapping model. After giving the treatment then the researcher gave the posttest to the students from both of class in order to know the effectiveness of visual, auditory, kinesthetic model.

The scoring rubric was used to assess the students' writing on the pretest and posttest. The scoring rubric contained ideas, organization, word choice, sentence structure, and mechanics. Each category had the score 1 until 5 score. Then, amount of each student's score was classified into five criteria. They were very good for the students who got 81-100, good for the students who got 71-80, fair for the students who got 56-70, poor for the students who got 41-55, and very poor for the students who got 0-40.

The students who got good score based on the aspect of most ideas support the topic sentence, logical sequence clear to the reader, strong verbs, and generally clear correct sentences and got the mistake of spelling the word but not making the sentence change the meaning. The students who got fair score based on the aspect some ideas support topic sentence, sequences not clear to reader, limited word choice, writing unclear and spelling mistakes, capitalization mistake often occur. The students who got poor score based on the aspect of few ideas support topic sentence, disjointed sequence, limited and inappropriate word choice, writing is unclear, the meaning is confusing and serious errors in spelling and capitalization. The students who got very poor score based on the aspect of least ideas not supporting topic sentence, serious vocabulary, and many errors in writing.

In the implementation of visual, auditory, kinesthetic model, the students made a group, each group consisting of 4 or 5 students. The students made a text after looking at the picture, hearing the explanation, and practicing. The result of data analysis showed that visual, auditory, kinesthetic model was effective way to teach writing procedure text.

It took three meetings to implement VAK model. In the first meeting, the students were asked to write procedure text about how to make a sandwich in groups. For visual steps, the teacher gave a picture of a sandwich, then the students discussed the picture. For auditory steps, the teacher explained the picture. For Kinesthetic steps, the students practiced making a sandwich. In the second meeting, the students were asked to fill in the blank text of the procedure text about how to make a paper fidget spinner. For visual steps, Students watched the video by looking at the picture that the video showed. For auditory steps, the students watched the video by paying attention to what students heard. For Kinesthetic steps, the students practiced making a paper fidget spinner. In the third meeting, the students were asked to write procedure text about how to make a birthday card. For visual steps, the students looked at the pictures that were given by the teacher. For auditory steps, students heard the instructions. For Kinesthetic steps, the students practiced making a birthday card.

In the control class, the students were taught by using mind mapping model in writing procedure text. In this model, the teacher asked the students to make a map based on the topic given by the teacher. Then the students had to write sentences using words on their map. In

implementing the mind mapping model, the teacher also taught three meetings. In the first meeting, the students were asked to write procedure text about how to make a sandwich in groups. In the second meeting, the students were asked to fill in the blank text of the procedure text about how to make a paper fidget spinner. In the third meeting, the students were asked to write procedure text about how to make a birthday card.

The result of the posttest showed an improvement in the students' writing. According to DePorter in Shoimin (2016: 62), VAK has three modalities namely visual, auditory, kinesthetic. Three of that modalities are learning styles in which the combination of persons can pervade and then arrange and process the information. So, visual, auditory, kinesthetic are modalities that every student has in themselves. The modality can process the information that students get. Visual, auditory, kinesthetic model is one of the models that are appropriate to use in teaching writing. It is because the steps of visual, auditory, kinesthetic model in teaching writing procedure text is able to help students to make text. The visual, auditory, kinesthetic model makes the students interested and also makes the students active during the learning process because the students explore, elaborate, and confirm, so the students can increase their knowledge (Arifin & Gultom, 2016).

The result of hypothesis testing by using an independent sample T-Test showed that using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model was effective in teaching writing procedure text for seventh-grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Tarakan. In addition, there was a significant improvement between the mean score of the experimental class and the control class. The result shows that the improvement of the mean score of the students who were taught by visual, auditory, kinesthetic model (55.83) was higher than those who were taught by using mind mapping model (46.50). Based on that result, it can be concluded that the students who were taught by using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model had better writing competence than those who were taught by using mind mapping model.

The result of the computation of the t-test which was 2.095 was higher than the t-table which was 2.013 at the degree of freedom (df) 46 and at the level of significance 5% indicated that H_a was accepted and H_o was rejected. The result implied the H_a that "the hypothesis of two variables indicating that there was a significant difference between the mean scores to both classes". It means that teaching using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model was better than using mind mapping model. So, teaching by using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model was an effective way to enhance students' writing ability in procedure text. Visual, auditory, kinesthetic model is a model which is focused on students' activeness so that it can increase the students' motivation and interest in writing.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the research on the use of visual, auditory, kinesthetic model in teaching writing on procedure text for the seventh-grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Tarakan, it was concluded that teaching by using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model was more effective to increase the students' writing procedure text than teaching using mind mapping model. It was proven by the result of the mean score of students' writing and the Independent sample T-test in which the experimental class was higher than the control class.

It was found that the mean scores of the students' procedure text writing between the students who were taught by using visual, auditory, kinesthetic model and those who were taught by using mind mapping model were different significantly. Before giving the treatment the pretest score from the experimental class was 32.83 and the control class was 36.83. After giving the treatment the mean score from the experimental class was 55.83 and the control class was 46.50. The result of computation by using the independent sample of t-test in SPSS 24.0 between the experimental group and the control group was 2.095. According to the table of t (t-table) at the degree of freedom 46 and the level of significance 0.05, the t-table score was 2.013. This result indicates that $T_{test} > T_{table}$ or $2.095 > 2.013$. It means that visual, auditory, kinesthetic model was an effective way of teaching procedure text to the seventh-grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Tarakan.

SUGGESTION

The researchers would like to deliver some suggestions concerning with the research result as follows:

1. The English teachers should use a teaching model or a technique to increase students' writing skills. Based on the result, the teacher can use visual, auditory, kinesthetic model as one alternative in teaching writing to help students in learning writing text. The teacher should pay attention to implementing visual, auditory, kinesthetic model. The teacher must also give clear instructions to the students carefully.
2. The students must enhance their ability and knowledge in writing because it is very important if they want to be good writers.
3. Further researchers can study the use of visual, auditory, kinesthetic model with other course materials. In addition, they can also implement this model for another grade of junior high school or senior high school students.

REFERENCES

Arifin, & Gultom, U. (2016). LESSON STUDY: PENINGKATAN KOMPETENSI PEDAGOGIK MAHASISWAPRAKTIK PENGALAMAN LAPANGAN (PPL) DI SMP KOTA TARAKAN. *Journal of Educational Science and Technology*, 2(3).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26858/est.v2i3.3217>

Arifin, Yansar, Fathonah, S. (2017). *Model of Writing Materials Based on Experiential*

Language Learning Approach For Second Grade Students of University Of Borneo Tarakan. July, 22–23.

Arifin, & Gultom, U. (2016). LESSON STUDY: PENINGKATAN KOMPETENSI PEDAGOGIK MAHASISWAPRAKTIK PENGALAMAN LAPANGAN (PPL) DI SMP KOTA TARAKAN. *Journal of Educational Science and Technology*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26858/est.v2i3.3217>

Anderson Mark and Kathy Anderson. (1997). *Text Types in English*. South Yarra: Macmillan Education Australia.

Aris, S. (2016). *Model Pembelajaran Inovatif Dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz media.

Bobbi DePorter and Mike Hernacki. (2007). *Quantum Learning: Membiasakan Belajar Nyaman dan Menyenangkan*. Bandung: Kaifa.

Byrne, D. (1997). *Teaching Writing Skills*. New York: Longman, Inc.

Cox, M. H. (1992). *Writing Form Process Purpose*. California: Chandler Publishing Company.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Fourth Edition Educational Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Halimatun Husna Rambe and Zainuddin. (2014). *The Effect of Using Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic (VAK) Learning Model on Students' Achievement in Writing Recount Text*. UNIMED.

Hammond, E. R. (1985). *Informative Writing*. USA: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Huda, M. (2013). *Model-Model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

(2013). *Keefektifan Model Pembelajaran VAK (Visual, Auditori, Kinestetik) Dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Deskriptif Pada Siswa Kelas X SMA Negeri Lawang Kidul*. UP.

Linse, C. T. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: PELT young learners*. New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Lorraine Rumbel Gay; Geoffrey E. Mills and Peter Airasian. (2012). *Educational Research Competencies Analysis and Applications*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Mayers, A. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Effective Sentences Paragraph and Essay*. New York: Longman.

McCrimmon, J. M. (1998). *Writing with a Purpose*. Boston: Houghton miffin.

Megan Watkins and Peter Knapp. (2005). *Genre, Text, Grammar*. Sidney: University of New South Wales.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching: ELT Text*. New York: McGraw Hill Companies .

Rise Axelrod & Charles R Cooper. (2010). *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suhara and Alfa Mitri. (2013). *Keefektifan Model Pembelajaran VAK (Visual, Auditori, Kinestetik) Dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Deskriptif Pada Siswa Kelas X SMA Negeri Lawang Kidul*. UP.