THE EFFECT OF VISUALIZATION, AUDITORY AND KINESTHETIC (VAK) MODEL TOWARD THE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING PROCEDURE TEXT AT GRADE IX MTsN 1 REGENCY OF INDRAGIRI HULU

Maysa Witari ([1]), Destri Wahyuningsih ([2])
STKIP Insan Madani Airmolek
Email: maysawitari04@gmail.com([1])
Email: destri070@gmail.com([2])

Abstract *:The purpose of this research were to find out is there any significant effect of Visualization, Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) Model toward Writing Skill of Procedure Text at Great IX Mtsn 1 Regency of Indragiri Hulu. This is an Experimental research. The research was carried out in MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu from September 20th 2018 at grade IX MTsN 1 Regency of Indragiri Hulu. The data collection techniques in this research are observation, test, and documentation. Technique sampling in this research is simple random sample technique. The samples of this research were class IX.4 (Experimental Class) and IX.6 (Control Class) of School at MTsN 1 Regency of Indragiri Hulu. Every class consisted of 30 students. The instrument used to collect the data is test (Pretest and Post test). The data analysis in this research is used t-test. Based on the calculating of t-test that the out put independent samples Test shows Equal Variances Assumed which can be seen from the number of the "t" test result of 20,754 with df = 59, the mean difference = 0.000 is the difference of Standard Error =1,94819. The difference in the use of Visualization, Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) Model is lowest = 44,33306 and the highest is 36,52036. If tobservation (t observation) = 20,754 compared to ttable is obtained the price of criticism "t" at a significant level of 5% = 2.04. It can be seen the price of tobservation> ttable which means. Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected. It means that there is a significant effect ont the students' writing skill procedure text at grade IX MTsN 1 Regency of Indragiri Hulu was succesfull.*
Key words: Writing skill, Procedure text, VAK

Abstrak :Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah ada pengaruh penggunaan model pembelajaran visualization, auditory and kinesthetic (VAK) terhadap keterampilan menulis siswa pada prosedure text dikelas IX MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu. Jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimen. Penelitian ini dimulai dari 20 September 2018. Tekhnik pengumpulan data pada penelitian ini adalah dengan observasi, tes dan dokumentasi. Tekhnik pengambilan sampel pada penelitian ini yaitu dengan teknik simple random sampling. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas IX.4 (kelas eksperiment dan IX.6 (kelas kontrol) terdiri dari 60 siswa. Instrument pada penelitian ini menggunakan tes. Penelitian ini menggunakan uji t untuk menganalisis data. Berdasarkan perhitungan t-test bahwa sampel independent menunjukkan equal variances assummed dari t-test dengan jumlah 20,754 dengan df = 53 itu berarti bahwa = 0.000 ada perbedaan dengan standar error = 1,94819. Perbedaan ini menggunakan Model Visualization, Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) dengan nilai terendah 44,33306 dan nilai tertinggi 36,52036. Jika tobservation (t observation) = 20,754 dibandingkan ttable diperoleh nilai kritik "t" dengan taraf 5% = 2.04. bisa dilihat dari nilai tobservation> ttable . Ha diterima and Ho ditolak. Jadi dengan model

pembelajaran Visualization, Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) memberikan pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap keterampilan menulis siswa kelas IX MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu.

A. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a linguistic activity that plays an important role in the dynamics of human civilization. In addition, writing is the way people communicate, express ideas, both from within and outside themselves and able to enrich the experience. Through writing activities also people can benefit for its development. Hasani (2005) states that " writing is the process of expressing thoughts, feelings, sensations, fantasies, wills, beliefs and experiences compiled with graphic symbols in writing for communication purposes".

Furthermore, writing skills is a mechanistic skill. Writing skills are impossible to master only through just theory but are also exercised through regular practice and practice to produce well-structured writing. The clarity of the writing organization depends on the way of thinking, precise arrangement and good sentence structure. Writing skills is the last order in the language learning process after listening, speaking, and reading skills. Among the four language skills, writing skills are the most difficult to master. This is because writing skills require mastery of the various elements of language and outside the language itself that will be the contents of the essay. Writing skills are usually associated with learning to compose. Writing and writing exercises can familiarize students to apply linguistic knowledge, such as grammar, vocabulary, style, spelling and so on.

Basically writing is not as easy as it is imagined. A person often experiences a desire to write but is unable to do so. Then the person will experience a delay in expressing his thoughts or ideas through a good and correct language that has difficulty in writing.

Can be said, not only students who have difficulty in writing, Teachers also have difficulty in teaching students writing. Teachers feel not maximal in teaching writing because most students who are in the class are not enthusiastic and tend to think he is not good at writing.

According to Tarigan (2008) states that writing is important because writing is a feature of an educated person. In general writing is a language skill that is used to communicate indirectly, not face to face with others and is a productive and expressive activity because in this case, the writer must be skilled use grapholegi, language structure, and vocabulary.

The reason the researchers took this title because based on observations that have been done by researchers there is a problem of education in English subjects material text procedures that occur in MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu. Researchers found that students in MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu grade not able to understand the material English well, especially in writing materials because the subject teachers use the speech method in conveying the text of the procedure. This is evident when the researcher gives the task, most of them are not able to respond and do not understand what is explained. This makes the learning outcomes in the classroom low and not reaching the KKM 75.

With the above problems, researchers conducted research by using Visualization model, Auditory, Kinestetic (VAK) on English subjects of text material procedure so that the learning process can be evaluated properly. According to Sugeng (2015) states that Learning Model Visualization, Auditory, Kinestethic (VAK) learning model is a learning model that optimizes all three learning modalities to make the learners feel comfortable. This learning model is the child of a quantum, principled model to make the learning situation more comfortable and promise success for the future learner.[1] Based on research

title that is Influence Application of Learning Model of Visualization, Auditory, Kinestetic (VAK) on Student Writing Result on Text Procedure in class MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu.

B. METHOD

This research is an experimental research, this study uses True Experimental in the form of a pretest-posttest control group design. There are two groups selected by Simple Random Sampling technique. In this technique, there are two groups of students. One group belongs to the experimental group. Other groups include the control group.

The experimental group was treated with Model Visualization, Auditory and Kinestethic (VAK). While in the control group only given the method of conventional teaching. This study consists of two variables, namely the independent variables given the symbol "X" Model Visualization, Auditory and Kinestethic (VAK) and the dependent variable with variable "Y" Writing Text Procedure in Class IX MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu.

C. RESEARCH FINDING

This research aims to perform different learning in the experimental class used Visualization , Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) model and control class the researcher used conventional method. The researcher has given the test to the students. This research was conducted at MTs N 1 Indragiri Hulu. They were 182 students of Grade IX in this school they spread into six classes, every class consist of 31 students and 30 students. This research used *pre-test post-test control group design*. Visualization , Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) model on the experiment class, meanwhile control class did not use Visualization , Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) model. Before giving treatment, the questions were given to both classess to see the students' understanding procedure text. The data analysis in this research was t-test. Some information was used for finding the research result are :

The researcher used the following formula to calculate the students' final score of their writing skill in procedure text:

1 Topic 150 word, there were 2 Topic and 300 word, and every writing has 30 score.

So the formula $\frac{t_1 \quad c \quad w}{t_1}$ X 100

1. The Data Presentation of the Pre-test and Post-Test

The researcher had conducted the score of students in posttest, to make this explanation clear, the researcher would give the differences of students' score in pretest and posttest such as :

Table 4.1

The Score of Students' Writing Skill in Experimental Class

No	Name	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	Aldian Cipta Nugraha	50	70
2	Alpandri	33	76
3	Andrian Saputra	43	76
4	Ayu Lestari	50	70
5	Dedek Safta Deva	43	80
6	Fadiah Amanda	30	80
7	Indah Lisyandi	36	76
8	Jeihan Firmansyah R	56	86
9	Jumadi Saputra	43	80
10	M. Kholfin Aska	53	76
11	M. Zuhri Alfalah	40	83
12	Mailani Windriyani	46	80
13	Muzzatar Alif	33	73
14	Niken Yulia Marsanda	40	76
15	Nindy Bella Putri	43	83
16	Nurdin	26	76
17	Nurul Agustina	56	80
18	Putri Anggraini	33	80
19	R. Deski	40	76
20	R. Syahnia Radhani	36	83
21	Rafgandi	33	76
22	Rian Sukma Dermawan	63	96
23	Rima Amelia	43	86
24	Risky Prawira Admaja	40	80
25	Shinta Kurnia Wati	33	80
26	Sri Kumala Sari	40	63
27	Susilowati	40	80
28	Tyara Angelita Cindy R	53	76
29	Waisyar Maulana P	40	83
30	Yazid Hardian	30	80
	TOTAL	**1251**	**2360**
	MEAN	**41,7**	**78,7**

From table above, it can be seen that in pre-test the student who got score of 26 were 1 student. The student who got score of 30 were 2 students. The student who got score of 33 was 5 students. The student who got score of 36 were 2 students. The student who got score of 40 were 7 students.

The student who got score of 43 were 5 students. The student who got score of 46 was 1 student. The student who got score 50 were 2 students. The student who got score 53 were 2 students. The student who got 56 were 2 students. The student who got 63 were 1 student. From pre-test, it can be seen that the higher score was 63 and the lowest score was 26.

And in post-test, The student who got score of 63 were 1 student. The student who got score of 70 were 2 students. The student who got score of 73 were 1 student. The student who got score of 76 was 9 student. The student who got score of 80 were 10 students. The student who got score of 83 were 4 students. The student who got score of 86 were 2 students. The student who got score of 96 was 1 student. It can be seen that

the higher score was 96 and the lowest score was 63. It means the students in experimental class have the progress from pret-test and post-test. The mean of the result of experimental class in pre-test was 41.7 and in post-test was 78.7

Table 4.2

The Score of Students' Writing Skill in Controlled Class

No	Name	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	Andrienta Nayasyah	56	56
2	Amelia Rozzana	40	33
3	Andi Mario	56	46
4	Cerly Juwanti	50	30
5	Cheni Yulia Anggi	26	26
6	Eka Istjunia	46	46
7	Erwanto	43	40
8	Ferji Oktaviani	43	30
9	Fibra vinoti anandi	26	46
10	Firdaus	26	32
11	Fitriyani	40	33
12	Habib Fahrezi	46	46
13	Iksan Maulana	40	36
14	Johan Firmansyah	43	40
15	Linda Sartika Sari	43	26
16	Lusi	26	26
17	M. affandi	30	53
18	M. Hafidz	46	36
19	Marshadilla M.A	46	23
20	Ma'ruf Hidayah	33	46
21	Melda Pramesti	36	43
22	Mulia Junafri Tika	46	46
23	Nabiel aldien Muzaki	30	50
24	Nadia Alpian	36	43
25	Ponirah	43	32
26	Ridhotul Fuadi	36	40
27	Umi salamah	50	33
28	Winda Mariska	40	40
29	Yazid al hafidz	33	50
31	Yusuf Gustiansyah	56	40
TOTAL		**1244**	**1193**
MEAN		**40,1**	**38,5**

From the table, it can be seen that in pre-test the student who got score of 26 were 4 students. The student who got score of 30 were 2 students. student who got score of 33 were 2 students. The student who got score of 36 were 4 students. The student who got score of 40 were 3 students. The student who got score of 43 was 5 students. The student who got score of 46 was 5 students. The student who got score of 50 was 2

students. The student who got score of 56 was 3 students. From pre-test, it can be seen that the higher score was 56 and the lowest score was 26.

And in post-test, The student who got score of 23 were 1 student. The student who got score of 26 was 4 students. The student who got score of 30 were 2 students. The student who got score of 32 were 2 students. The student who got score of 33 were 3 students. The student who got score of 36 were 2 students. The student who got score of 40 were 5 students. The student who got score of 43 were 2 students. The student who got score of 46 were 6 students. The student who got score of 50 were 2 students. The student who got score of 53 was 1 student. The student who got score of 56 was 1 student. It can be seen that the higher score was 56 and the lowest score was 23. The mean of the result of controlled class in pre-test was 40.1 and in post-test was 38.5.

From the score of pre-test and post-test of experimental class and controlled class. It can be seen that the higher score was gotten by experimental class and it means that the experimental class was better than controlled class. And it means the has an Visualization , Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) model effect to the students.

Data Analysis

Since the F test on the Group data the pos-test value between the experimental class and the controlled class has the same variant then the t-test uses the Equal Variance Assumed value.

1. Normality test

Normality test is done to see whether the data from sample is normal or not so that the *Lilliefors* test has to be done. Lilifors is the method that used basic data is not processed in the frequency distribution tabel. This is the normality test that was done :

Table 4.3

Normality Test Result

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		CONVENTIONAL	MODEL VAK
N		31	30
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	38,4839	78,6667
	Std. Deviation	8,88396	5,85063
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,124	,191
	Positive	,119	,177
	Negative	-,124	-,191
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,689	1,046
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,729	,224

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data

The basis for taking results is through probability.

If the probability value > 0.05 then Ho is accepted.

If the probability value is <0.05, Ho is rejected

Based on the results of testing through Kolmogorov-Smirnov above, the data using the VAK Model is = 0, 224 which means > 0.05, the sample is normally distributed. Then the conventional data is = 0, 729 which means> 0.05, the sample is normally distributed. It can be concluded that data from both classes were normal.

2. Homogenity Test

Tabel. 4.4

Homogenitas test Result

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

CONVENTIONAL

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2,452	4	22	,076

It turns out testing with statistics Sig. obtained 0,230 then the test results showed greater than 0.05 (0,076 > 0.05). This data is homogeneous. This means that this data is homogeneous, so that data can be analyzed using the "t" Test.

3. The H ypothesis Test

From the normality and homogeneity test, both samples were normal and homogeny, the t-test was needed to test the hypothesis, and the explanatios as follows :

Table 4.5

Hypothesis Test Result

Independent Samples Test

		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
NILAI	Equal Variances Assumed	9,271	,003	-20,754	58	,000	-40,43333	1,94819	-44,33306	-36,53361
	Equal variances not Assumed			-20,754	50,043	,000	-40,43333	1,94819	-44,34630	-36,52036

Based on the table above it can be seen that the out put independent samples Test shows Equal Variances Assumed which can be seen from the number of the "t" test result of 20,754 with df = 58, the mean difference = 0.000 is the difference of Standard Error =1,94819.

The difference in the use of VAK Model is lowest = 44,33306 and the highest is 36,52036. If $t_{observation}$ (t observation) = 20,754 compared to t_{table} is obtained the price of criticism "t" at a significant level of 5% = 2.04. It can be seen the price of $t_{observation} > t_{table}$ which means. Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected.

The Presentation of Data Analysis

Based on students' score has explained that experimental class got the better result than the controlled class. The data was analysed with normality test, homogenity test and t-test. The research used two kinds of test (pre-test and post-test) which were given to same level of classes to determine which class become the experimental class and which class become the controlled class. In experimental class the researcher used VAK Model and in the controlled class the researcher used Conventional Method.

VAK Model Visualization, Auditory, Kinestetic (VAK) Model is a learning model that emphasizes a direct and enjoyable learning experience for students. Experience learning directly by way of learning by remembering (Visual), learning by listening (Auditory), and learning with motion and emotion (Kinesthetic).

After the research apply the VAK model the researcher gave a post-test. Post-test is test that has given after applied learning model. The purpose to gave the post-test was to looked what had significant effect after used the VAK learning model.

So, based on used the VAK learning model the researcher got the significant effect. So VAK learning model is the good model for students' writing procedure text. It can be proved from the score that were gotten by the students in posttest. The higher score was 96 and the lowest score was 63. It was difference when in pretest, in pretest the lower score was 26 and the higher score was 63.

Then from the data that was analyzed by using t-test, it proved that this model can be used to teach procedure text, the final test showed that with the 30 students of experimental class, above it can be seen that the out put independent samples Test shows Equal Variances Assumed which can be seen from the number of the "t" test result of 20,754 with df = 58, the mean difference = 0.000 is the difference of Standard Error =1,94819.

The difference in the use of VAK Model is lowest = 44,33306 and the highest is 36,52036. If $t_{observation}$ (t observation) = 20,754 compared to t_{table} is obtained the price of criticism "t" at a significant level of 5% = 2.04. It can be seen the price of $t_{observation} > t_{table}$ which means. Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected.

So the conclusion Is there any significant between Visualization, Auditory, Kinestetic (VAK) Learning Model on Student Writing Result on Text Procedure in Class IX MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

After finishing and conducting this research with the title "The Effect of Visualization , Auditory and Kinesthetic (VAK) Model toward Students' Ability in Writing Procedure Text at Grade IX MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu**"**, it can be conclude that this model is effective to teach, because **i**n pretest of experiment class the mean is 41,7 And in controlled

class the mean in pretest is 40,1. Then, **i**n posttest the mean score of experimental class is 78,7. and in controlled class is 38,5. Based on statistic analysis, the difference of VAK Model is lowest = 44,33306 and the highest is 36,52036. If $t_{observation}$ (t observation) = 20,754 compared to t_{table} is obtained the price of criticism "t" at a significant level of 5% = 2.04. It can be seen the price of $t_{observation} > t_{table}$ which means. Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected. So the conclusion Is there any significant between Visualization, Auditory, Kinestetic (VAK) Learning Model on Student Writing Result on Text Procedure in Class IX MTsN 1 Indragiri Hulu.

Based on the research finding, some suggestion are given for the teachers, the students, the school and further the researcher. VAK model can provide new innovations to teachers in learning process to become successful and more effective. VAK model also to develop their thinking pattern of the studens in English learning after experience experience using Visualization, Auditory, Kinestetic (VAK) model. It is expected to be used as an alternative learning method, and contribute to the achievement of passing standards in the UN so as to improve school performance. This research can also serve as a reference for researchers to conduct further research. Finally, VAK can be used for the students, so the researcher suggests that VAK can to help them in their writing skill.

E. REFERENCE

Arikunto, Suharsimi,2013. ***Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik***. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Alice Oshima And Ann Hogue.2007. ***Introduction To Academic Writing Third Edition***. Pearson Longman

Crowther, Jonathan.1995. ***Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary, International New Students Edition***.

Guntur Henry.2008. ***Menulis Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa***. Angkasa: Bandung

Harianto,Sugeng.2015. ***Metode Quantum Learning Style Vak (Visualization, Auditory, And Kinesthetic)***. Surabaya: Kresnabina Insan Prima

Hasani, Aceng. 2005. ***Ihwal Menulis***. Jakarta: Untirta Press

Shoimin,Aris.2014. ***68Model Pembelajaran Inovatif Dalam Kurikulum 2013***. Yogyakarta: Arruz Media