Research Paper

The Effectiveness of VAK (Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic) Model in Learning of Summary Writing

Maulidia Tifani Alfin Nur Hardiana[1], Prof. Pujiati Suyata[2]

[1]Graduate Student Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia
[2]Lecturer of Yogyakarta State University

Corresponding Author: Maulidia Tifani Alfin Nur Hardiana

ABSTRACT

This study aims to reveal the effectiveness of VAK model in learning of summary writing. This research was quasi experiment with pretest-posttest control group design. The population was 331 students of class VIII SMP Negeri 15 Yogyakarta. Determination of sample was done using simple cluster random sampling technique. Based on the determination, it was found that class VIII-J as experimental group and class VIII-A as control group. The data were collected through students' summary writing and observation. The validity of the instrument was the content validity consulted to the expert. The reliability of the instrument was analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha formula and the calculation result showed a value of 0.785. The data analysis technique was t-test with respect to normality and homogeneity. The results show that VAK model is more effective than conventional model in learning of summary writing. This is proved from the t-test with a t value of 2.674 and significant with p (p<0.05). Based on these results, the VAK model is effective in learning of summary writing.

Keywords: Effectiveness, model, summary, VAK, writing.

INTRODUCTION
Background of Study

Language learning is one of the learning that must be taught and controlled by the students. This learning includes four capabilities, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Ghazali (2010: 18) states that there are four areas of language proficiency that are reflected in the skills guidance of *American Council on The Teaching of Foreign Language* (ACTFL), listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Writing can be used as a means to express ideas, feelings, and thoughts owned by the students. In addition, this ability becomes a means of written communication that can not be separated from the use of linguistic rules. Patel and Jain (2008:125) state that writing is a skill that must be taught and practiced.

Similarly, summary writing, summary writing is a must-have ability for the students. The ability to write summaries can be effectively taught by engaging in an in-depth and ongoing reading comprehension. In addition, the use of learning models also influences student outcomes and achievements. Banzer, et. al. (2016:164) declares summary writing is not only connected to reading ability, but is also related to understanding and critical thinking.

In this regard, a new innovation is needed in learning to write a summary in the class. Teachers should be able to build a motivation for the students by creating a

conducive learning atmosphere. Iskandawassid and Sunendar (2013:159) state that as a learning manager, teachers have a responsibility in creating a conducive learning environment so that the students can learn both effectively and efficiently.

Currently, many learning models are developed in the world of education. The model developed is expected to be an alternative to assist the students in summary writing, one of the alternatives is VAK model. VAK model assumes that learning will be effective by giving attention toward learning styles and exploring the potential that the students have. Learning is focused on providing direct and fun learning experience. It is done by learning to remember (visual), learning by hearing (auditory), and learning with movement and emotion (kinesthetic). Students should be able to utilize the three components in learning activities. A teacher should also be able to collaborate on the three components in teaching (DePorter, Reardon, & Nourie, 2002:85).

Based on the exposure it can be concluded that the VAK model can be applied in learning writing summaries. This model takes advantage of student learning styles. Thus, the VAK model is very important to be applied in learning of summary writing.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Summary Writing

Urquhart & Mclver (2005:3) state that writing is an exploratory process of ideas that is useful for both the students and the teachers. Through this activity, students can show all ideas owned by them. Writing activities do not actually require special skills because this ability will flow by itself. However, the important thing to note is the rules that match the type of writing.

Flynn & Stainthorp (2006:54) state that writing is the process of information processing that is performed within action. Basically, writing is a whole series of one's activities in order to express ideas and pass

them through written language to others in order to be easily understood.

Furthermore, Wormeli (2011:2) states that summary writing is to state the essence of a reading or experience by using as few words as possible in an efficient form. Summary writing is an attempt to write down the key points of a reading. This effort is made to facilitate the reader's understanding of the text content. Summary writing is also used as a measure of a person's understanding of a text. If he understands the contents of the text well, then he can write a summary of the text well and vice versa.

Abbasi & Akbari (via McDonough, Northern, & Vleeschauwer, 2014:21) state that summary writing is used to assess reading comprehension or reading content that may encourage the students to reproduce information. Through the summary, an author will hone his ability to reproduce information appropriately.

The VAK Model

Huda (2015:289) states that visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles (VAK) are multi-sensory learning styles that involve three elements of learning style: sight, hearing, and movement. This model seeks to combine these three components in developing students' skills in learning activities.

DePorter & Hernacki (1999:112) state that in learning VAK, the first step to do is to identify a person's modalities, namely visual, auditory, or kinesthetic modalities. Each individual can use these three modalities, but most are more likely to be one of these three. This modality is concerned with the provision of a hands-on learning experience. The experience of learning is directly done by learning to see (visual), learning by listening (auditory), and learning with motion and emotion (kinesthetic).

Gholami (2013:700) states that visual learners prefer learning through visual channels, such as reading and viewing. The auditory learners enjoy learning channels such as discussion,

conversation, and group work. These learners usually only need verbal instructions. Kinesthetic learners are those who imply total physical involvement with the learning environment such as field visits, dramatizing, pantomime, or interviewing.

Russell (2011:45) states the learning steps using the VAK model as follows.

a. *Stage of preparation*

At this stage, the teacher provides motivation to generate interest and motivation of the students in following the learning process.

b. *Stage of delivering and training*

At this stage, the teacher directs students to take an active role in learning independently, fun, relevant, and involving the senses in accordance with the VAK learning style.

c. *Phase performance of results*

At this stage, students deliver the results of writing text. Teachers provide reinforcement of conclusions about student work outcomes and learning materials. In addition, the teacher gives information about the upcoming material and then the teacher ends the lesson.

Russell (2011:47) also explains the advantages and disadvantages of the VAK model. The advantages of VAK learning model as follows.

a. Learning will be more effective because it combines the three learning styles.

b. It is able to train and develop the potential that the students have.

c. Provides a hands-on learning experience.

d. It is able to involve students maximally in finding and understanding a concept through physical activity such as active discussion.

e. It is able to reach every style of student learning.

The weakness of VAK model is not many people able to combine the three learning styles. Therefore, people who are only able to use one learning style will understand the material only if one focused learnings style is dominantly used.

MATERIALS & METHODS

This research uses a quantitative approach with the type of experimental research, which is a quasi experiment. The experimental design used was pretest-posttest control group design (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007: 276). There were two randomly selected groups, the experimental group and the control group. Each group is given pretest and posttest. The experimental group was given treatment using the VAK model, but was not with the control group. The populations in the study were all students of class VIII in SMP Negeri 15 Yogyakarta with a total of 331 students. The sample is 59 students.

Data collection is done by non-test method of summary writing. In addition to the non-test method, data collection is also done through observation techniques. The research instrument used is an appraisal sheet accompanied by a summary writing assignment sheet and observation sheet.

Instruments used in this study must fulfill the requirements to be regarded as a viable instrument. Eligible instruments must be valid and reliable. The validity used is content validity or using expert opinion. Meanwhile, the reliability used is interrater technique and analyzed by Alpha Cronbach. Furthermore, the data analysis technique is done by t-test by taking into account the normality and homogeneity requirements.

RESULT

This study aims to test the effectiveness of the VAK model in learning summary writing. The data in this study were obtained from the value of pretest and posttest values, both experimental and control groups. Data calculation was done using SPSS 21.00 computer program help. The following descriptions of the results of the study were given.

Table 1. Comparison of Data Pretest and Posttest

Data	Pretest		Posttest	
	Experimental group	Control group	Experimental group	Control group
N	30	29	30	29
Highest Score	80	80	87	81
Lowest Score	57	55	63	58
Mean	64.30	64.83	74.77	70.17

From table 1, it can be seen an increase in the average score count of 5.34 in the control group and 6.47 in the experimental group. The difference in the average score between the two groups was 1.13.

Furthermore, the data are tested for normality and homogeneity. The summary of normality test result of data distribution of experimental group and experiment group is presented in the following table.

Table 2. Summary of Normality Test Results Data Pretest and Posttest

Data	N	Taraf Significance of	sig (2-tailed)	Criteria	Description
Pretest Experiment Group	30	5%	0.200	p> 0.05	sig 0.200> 0.05: Normal
Pretest Control Group	29	5%	0.106	p> 0.05	sig 0.106> 0.05: Normal
Posttest Experiment Group	30	5%	0.182	p> 0.05	sig 0.182> 0.05: Normal
Posttest Control Group	29	5%	0.200	p> 0.05	sig 0.200> 0.05: Normal

Based on table 2, it is known that sig (2-tailed) data pretest and posttest experimental group and control group is greater than 0.05. Thus, it can be said that these data have a normal distribution. The data is eligible for

analysis. Furthermore, the data are tested homogeneity. The summary of the homogeneity test results of prestigious data is presented as follows.

Table 3. Summary of Test Results Homogeneity Pretest

Data	Levene statistic	df1	df2	sig(2-tailed)	Description
Pretest	0.613	1	57	0.437	sig 0.437>0.05: Homogeneous
Posttest	0.246	1	57	0.622	sig 0.622>0.05: Homogeneous

Seen from table 3, it is known that the value of sig (2-tailed) data pretest and posttest was greater than 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded the data of pretest and posttest of both groups comes from the same variance.

Furthermore, data analysis was done to test the research hypothesis by using t-test. T-test data pretest between the experimental and control groups were conducted to determine the initial capabilities of both groups. Meanwhile, t-test data posttest was conducted to determine the second end ability of both groups. The summary of the results is t-test presented in the following table.

Table 4. Summary of Results T-test Data Pretest and Posttest Group Experiments

Data	t	df	sig (2-tailed)	Description
Pretest and Posttest Experiment Group	-8.621	29	0.000	sig <0.05 0.000 <0.05: Significant

Table 4 shows t as -8,621 and significant with p (p <0.05). Thus, the t-test results indicate that there are significant differences in the results of pretest and posttest summary writing abilities in the experimental group.

The following summarizes the results of the t-test data pretest and posttest in the control group.

Table 5. Summary of Results T-test Data Pretest and Posttest Control Group

Data	t	df	sig (2-tailed)	Description
Pretest and Posttest Control Groups	-1.177	28	0.249	sig>0.05 0.249> 0.05: Not Significant

Table 5 shows t of -1.177 and significant with p (p>0.05). Thus, the results of the t-test show that there is no significant difference in the results of pretest and posttest summary writing skills in the control group.

The summary result of t-test data of the ability to write a summary by control

groups and experimental groups is presented in the following table.

Table 6. Summary of Results T-test Data Posttest Control Groups and Experimental Groups

Data	t	df	sig (2-tailed)	Description
Posttest Experiment and Control Group	2.674	57	0.010	sig<0.05 0.010 <0.05: Significant

Table 6 shows t as 2.674 and significant with p (p <0.05). Thus, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in posttest results between the experimental group and the control group.

DISCUSSION

The effect of VAK model in learning summary writing can be seen from the result of t-test showing that t value is 2.674 and significant with p (p <0.05). The t-test results show that there are significant differences between the experimental group and the control group. The VAK model has an influence on the ability to summary writing because students also understand the text based on images and recordings so that students learn visually, auditorily, kinesthetically. Ghaedi & Jam (2014:1234) state that the VAK model is based on the use of sight, hearing, and touch. This model accommodates the overall learning style of students so that it can be applied in all learning activities.

Steps of VAK model consist of the preparation stage, the delivery and training phase, and the performance stage of the outcome. The model is able to assist students in improving the ability to write summary by utilizing visual, auditory, and kinesthetic sources. This is in line with DePorter & Hernacki (1999:112) which state that VAK learning provides a direct experience of learning by seeing, listening, and learning in motion.

Stage of Preparation

Preparatory activities in the VAK model can help students with low interest and motivation to participate actively in learning. In this activity, the teacher tried to motivate the students to be interested in learning. Therefore, the theme presented is also tailored to the knowledge level of the students, so that they are interested to understand the contents of the text. Ngalimun (2012:6) states that in the preparation stage, the teacher gives positive feelings about the learning experience and puts the students in optimal situations to make the students more ready to receive the lesson.

Stage of Delivering and Training

Delivery and training activities in the VAK model can help the students explore their learning styles. In this activity, the students are not only given text, but are also given images, recordings, and videos that fit the text. In addition, students are also given the freedom to observe images presented by teachers. It aims to accommodate student learning styles that include visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles. DePorter, et. al. (2002:85) states that a teacher should also be able to collaborate on three components (visual, auditory, kinesthetic) in teaching.

In training activities, teachers provide training for the students to understand the text, images, and recordings. Teachers also guide the students to find the key ideas or points of text, images, and texts. Thus, students who have a visual learning style will enjoy learning by reading the text content and understanding the images, students who have an auditory learning style will enjoy learning from text recording and students who have a kinesthetic learning style will enjoy learning in groups and they are given the freedom to learn while observing the text in front of the class. After that, students are guided to craft the essentials into paragraph form using a simpler vocabulary. By utilizing text, images, recordings, and videos, it will enrich the vocabulary of the students related to the topic. This is in line with Russell (2011:45) stating that the delivery and training phase lead the students to play an active role in learning independently, fun, relevant, and involving the senses in accordance with the learning style of VAK.

Phase Performance of Results

The performance of results in the VAK model can train self-esteem and cultivate a critical attitude of the student. In this activity, the students present the results of their work and the other students give an opinion regarding the results of the submitted summary. This stimulates the students to express their opinions democratically regarding to the understanding of the text content. In addition, teachers also provide feedback and conclusions related to the activities and learning materials. Ngalimun (2012:6) states that in the performance of results, teachers guide students in applying and extending the knowledge and skills acquired so that the learning outcomes increased.

The results of this study are consistent with Gilakjani's (2012) research entitled "Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic Learning Styles and Their Impacts on Language Teaching". The results of this study indicate that the VAK model can improve learning outcomes the students' understanding of vocabulary. In addition, Le's (1989) study concludes that visual, auditory, kinesthetic learning styles have correlations to language learning strategies.

CONCLUSION

The VAK model is effective in learning to summary writing. This is proved by the t-test obtained t equal to 2.674 and significant with p (p<0.05). Based on these results, the VAK model is more effective than the conventional model in learning to write a summary.

REFERENCES

- Benzer, A., Sefer, A., Oren, Z., & Konuk, S. A student-focused study: strategy of text summary writing and assesment rubric. *Journal of Education and Science.* 2016; 41 (186):163-183.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education (2nd edn).* New York: Routledge.
- DePorter, Bobbie & Hernacki, Mike. (1999). *Quantum learning.* Bandung: Kaifa.
- DePorter, B., Reardon, M., & Nourie, S.S. (2002) *Quantum teaching.* Bandung: Kaifa.
- Flynn, Naomi & Stainhorp, Rhona. (2006). *The learning and teaching of reading and writing.* West Sussex: Wiley.
- Ghaedi, Zahra & Jam, Bashir. Relationship between learning styles and motivation for higher education in efl students. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Languange Studies.* 2014; 4, (6):1232-1237
- Ghazali, A. S. (2010). *Pembelajaran keterampilan bebahasa dengan pendekatan komunikatif-interaktif.* Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Gholami, Shahin & Bagheri, Mohammad S. Relationship between vak learning styles and problem solving styles regarding gender and students' fields of study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* 2013; 4 (4):700-706.
- Gilakjani, Abbas P. Visual, auditory, kinesthetic learning styles and their impacts on english language teaching. *Journal of Studies in Education.* 2012; 2 (1): 104-113.
- Huda, Miftahul. (2015). *Model-model pengajaran dan pembelajaran: isu-isu metodis dan paradigmatis.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Iskandarwassid & Sunendar. (2013). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Jain & Patel. (2008). *English language teaching (methods, tools, & techniques).* Jaipur: Sunrise Publisher & Distributors.
- Le, Laura Rossi. (1989). Perceptual learning style preferences and their relationship to language learning strategies in adult students of English as a second language. *Disertasi.* Drake University, Des Moines.

- McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & Vleeschauwer, J. D. Summary writing in a Thai efl university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing.* 2014; 24; 20–32.
- Ngalimun. (2016). *Strategi dan model pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Aswaja Pressindo.
- Russel, Lou. (2011). *The accelerated learning fieldbook*. Bandung: Nusa Media.

- Urquhart, V. & Mclver, M. (2005). *Teaching writing in the content areas*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Departement.
- Wormeli, Rick. (2011). *Meringkas mata pelajaran 50 teknik untuk meningkatkan pembelajaran siswa*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

******