

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING WRITING BY USING VIDEO**  
(An Experimental Research at English Department of Islamic University of Kadiri  
in the Academic Year of 2014/2015)

**By: Kristanti Yuntoro Putri**

**ABSTRACT**

The objectives of this research are (1) to describe the students' ability in writing before and after being taught by using video; (2) to know whether there is any significant difference between the students' writing ability before and after being taught by using video; and (3) to know whether teaching writing by using video is effective or not. The research design used was quantitative and the method was *one group pre test and post test experimental design*. The subject of research was class 1.B1 whose members were the first year students of English Department, Islamic University of Kadiri. The instrument was test and the data obtained was analyzed using t-test. The result showed that teaching writing by using video is effective.

---

Keywords: *Effectiveness, Teaching Writing, Video*

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Writing needs complex and long process. Those, in fact, make students feel bored to write. In writing process, they must combine words so they become a good sentence and paragraph as well. Students also have to find many new vocabularies that they had not known before. Students also should think about how to apply appropriate tenses. Those steps absolutely seems as like the hardest process that make them bored to face writing matters. Besides, another problem that is faced by the students when they join writing class is that they often do not have any idea for writing. They are confused how to start their writing. They have nothing for writing although the teacher often gives them a certain topic in order to help the students starting their word. Students may be able to understand the topic itself but they do not know how to start writing.

Facing this problem, a teacher should be able to play her role well. Two major roles that teachers can play are as learning manager and mediator during the teaching learning process. As the learning manager,

the teacher should be able to manage the class, which is as learning environment and also as the aspect of school environment. A good learning environment has challengeable characteristics, can stimulus students to learn, and can give safety and satisfaction in achieving the objectives. Besides, teacher has responsibility to guide students' experiences toward self directed behavior so they will not depend on the teacher. Meanwhile, as mediator, teacher should have enough knowledge and understanding about educational media because it is the tools of communication that can make teaching learning process more effective. Those teacher's roles marginally lead the teacher to be able to give various techniques for stimulating students' motivation in order they do not give up in learning writing.

In this research the writing material was spoof text. Spoof is a writing matter which is given to the second year student of senior high school. Doddy (2008:167) stated that spoof text is a text which social function is to share with others a real story of which the ending is funny to amuse the

audience or readers. The generic structures of spoof text are orientation, events, and twist (Doddy, 2008:167). Orientation is the opening of the story which sets the scene. It presents the beginning story which becomes background of the next parts. In this part, it tells the subjects and the causes of the story happened. Events are the details of the events in the story. In *events*, the main idea which is written is about the incidents that happened before reaching unpredictable moment. Meantime, twist is the funny or unpredictable ending of the story. This is the most important part which becomes the characteristic of spoof text. It tells about the ending which has not been ever thought before by the readers.

Together with the technology advance, teacher can take technology assistance as the media for being applied in their classroom in order to create a fun atmosphere during learning. To take this kind assistance is hoped so the students will be helped especially in learning writing skill. The teacher can choose one of learning media which can be able to be used to make the students understand with the writing matter which the teacher wants to deliver. The benefit of the learning media usage has been strengthened by Hamalik (1994:12) whose stated that *media pembelajaran merupakan alat, metode, dan teknik yang digunakan dalam rangka lebih mengefektifkan komunikasi dan interaksi antar guru dan siswa dalam proses pendidikan dan pengajaran di sekolah* (media is a mean, method, technique which is used in order to make communication and interaction between teacher and students in teaching and learning process in school effective). It means that the existence of media itself should assist the students for understanding the matter that they get during teaching-learning process in the classroom. Finocchiaro and Bonomo (1973:155) stated that it was what we as the teacher to promote a friendly environment in the classroom, to create and organize materials, to overcome

shortcoming in the textbooks, to stimulate and maintain interest through varied practice activities, to emphasize enjoyable aspect of learning, and to give students' necessary feeling of success which will determine their growth towards communication. The theory clearly supports that media is a good mean for teacher in delivering her lesson matter without making the students bored, confused, or stress when they get it. Finocchiaro still adds about the various media in teaching. He said that the teaching media can be the visual such as radio, photo the real thus, the audio such as radio, tape recorder, and language laboratory and the audio visual such as television, VCD, and film. From those media, videos are taken as the learning media in this research. Videos were used to deliver writing matter. Because in this research the writing material was spoof text, the videos used were videos which had spoof characteristics; they had unpredictable ending.

The implementation of videos in teaching writing was: (1) giving opening for the program; (2) greeting the students; (3) giving leading questions by giving quiz; (4) giving reinforcements of answers and knowledge which were gotten from the quiz; (5) playing a video for giving a spoof event in the real life; (6) inviting students to identify the generic structure of the spoof video; (7) asking students to make some groups; (8) inviting the groups to do *pre-writing, composing, and drafting* based on the video; (9) asking a representation of group to read their composing and drafting result while another group gives opinion; (10) inviting the groups to continue their writing by *revising and editing* their spoof text; (11) asking students to make a spoof text based on the video individually; (12) asking some students to read their work loudly while another gives opinion; (13) giving students chance for asking and answering; (14) asking the students to conclude what matter they have gotten in this meeting; and (15) closing the program.

By using those videos, the students should be able to get positive change of their writing skill. Having above as a background, the researcher would like to find out the answers of the following questions:

1. How is the students' ability in writing before and after being taught by using video?
2. Is there any significant difference between students' writing ability before and after being taught by using video?
3. Is teaching writing by using video effective?

## II. RESEARCH METHOD

This research used quantitative design and the method was one group pre test and post test experimental design. The subject of research was class I.B1. The members of class I.B1 were the first year students of English department, Islamic University of Kadiri, in the academic year of 2014/2015. The total students were 36 students.

The instrument of this research was test. Test is a series of question or practice and another device which is used to measure skill, intelligence, capability or talent which is belonged to individual or group (Arikunto, 2006:151). The test in this research required the students to make spoof writing. The topic was free and the students had to make minimally three paragraphs which contained of introduction, events, and twist, that are the

generic structure of spoof text. They had 90 minutes (2x45 minutes) to finish their work. There were two tests; pre test and post test. Pre test was given once in the first meeting before teaching writing by using video. It was a test to know the students' ability in writing spoof before video used. Meanwhile, post test was given once in the last meeting after teaching writing by using video. It helped showing how far the students got their writing improvement.

From the students' writing in pre test and post test, the researcher took a value based on the scoring rubric of writing. If the students made a good writing, total value which they could get was 100. That value contained the score of content (30 points), organization (20 points), vocabulary (20 points), language use (25 points), and mechanics (5 points). Meanwhile the lowest score if they made a poor writing is 34. The criteria of scoring were still same with the highest value. That value contained the score of content (13 points), organization (7 points), vocabulary (7 points), language use (5 points), and mechanics (2 points). Table 1.1 shows the scoring rubric of writing which was used as the standard score in valuing the student's spoof writing. This scoring rubric is adapted from ESL Composition Profile by Holly L. Jacobs, V. Faye Hartflel, Jane B. Hughey, and Deanna R. Wormuth.

Table 1 The Scoring Rubric of Writing Based on ESL Composition Profile

Criteria	Score Range	Level	Characteristics
<b>CONTENT</b>	30-27	Excellent to very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Knowledgeable</li> <li>◦ Substantive</li> <li>◦ through development of thesis</li> <li>◦ relevant to assigned topic</li> </ul>
	26-22	Good to average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ some knowledge of subject</li> <li>◦ adequate range</li> <li>◦ limited development of thesis</li> <li>◦ mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail</li> </ul>
	21-17	Fair to poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ limited knowledge of subject</li> <li>◦ little substance</li> <li>◦ inadequate development of topic</li> </ul>
	16-13	Very poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ does not show knowledge of subject</li> <li>◦ non-substantive</li> <li>◦ not pertinent</li> <li>◦ not enough to evaluate</li> </ul>
<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	20-18	Excellent to very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ fluent expression</li> <li>◦ ideas clearly stated/supported</li> <li>◦ succinct</li> <li>◦ well-organized</li> <li>◦ logical sequencing</li> <li>◦ cohesive</li> </ul>
	17-14	Good to average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ somewhat choppy</li> <li>◦ loosely organized but main ideas stand out limited support</li> <li>◦ logical but incomplete sequencing</li> </ul>
	13-10	Fair to poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ non-fluent</li> <li>◦ ideas confused or disconnected</li> <li>◦ lacks logical sequencing and development</li> </ul>
	9-7	Very poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ does not communicate</li> <li>◦ no organization</li> <li>◦ not enough to evaluate</li> </ul>
<b>VOCABULARY</b>	20-18	Excellent to very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ sophisticated range</li> <li>◦ effective word/idiom choice and usage</li> <li>◦ word form mastery</li> <li>◦ appropriate register</li> </ul>
	17-14	good to average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ adequate range</li> <li>◦ occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured</li> </ul>
	13-10	Fair to poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ limited range</li> <li>◦ frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage</li> <li>◦ meaning confused or obscured</li> </ul>
	9-7	Very poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ essentially translation</li> <li>◦ little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form</li> <li>◦ not enough to evaluate</li> </ul>

Criteria	Score Range	Level	Characteristics
<b>LANGUAGE USE</b>	25-22	Excellent to very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ complex constructions</li> <li>◦ few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions</li> </ul>
	21-18	good to average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ effective but simple constructions</li> <li>◦ minor problems in complex constructions</li> <li>◦ several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured</li> </ul>
	17-11	fair to poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ major problems in simple/complex constructions</li> <li>◦ frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions</li> <li>◦ meaning confused or obscured</li> </ul>
	10-5	Very poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules</li> <li>◦ dominated by errors</li> <li>◦ does not communicate</li> <li>◦ not enough to evaluate</li> </ul>
<b>MECHANICS</b>	5	Excellent to very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ demonstrates mastery of conventions</li> <li>◦ few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing</li> </ul>
	4	good to average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ occasional errors of spelling, punctuation capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured</li> </ul>
	3	fair to poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization paragraphing</li> <li>◦ poor handwriting</li> <li>◦ meaning confused or obscured</li> </ul>
	2	Very poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ no mastery of conventions</li> <li>◦ dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing</li> <li>◦ handwriting illegible</li> <li>◦ not enough to evaluate</li> </ul>

(Adopted from Jacobs, H.J. et al., 1981)

After having had the values, the researcher classified them into the criteria that had been presented in Table 2.

Table 2  
The Criteria of English Writing Value

No.	Score	Criteria
1.	80 – 100	Very Good
2.	70 – 79	Good
3.	56 – 69	Fair
4.	45 – 55	Less
5.	0 – 44	Poor

Khotimah's (2008)

The criteria helped the researcher to know the students' spoof writing ability. The classification gotten could show how many percent of the students who had very good skill and the others. After all of elements in students' worksheet was evaluated and counted, the data from pre test had been already to be compared with the value of students' spoof writing in post test which was gotten from the same ways.

Data analysis used was statistical calculation and each data were formed into grouped data. Pre test and post test provided the score of students' spoof writing. This data analysis helped knowing the differentiation result between students' writing achievement before and after they were taught by using video aid. To know the significant difference between students' writing achievement before and after they were taught by using video aid and the effectiveness of teaching spoof writing by using video, the calculation used t-test.

### III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### I. The Students' Ability in Writing Before and After Being Taught by Using Video

The results of pre test were 66, 48, 64, 65, 48, 49, 58, 59, 70, 63, 50, 56, 46, 55, 48, 46, 68, 72, 79, 61, 58, 76, 69, 82, 59, 65, 64, 54, 35, 56, 74, 53, 58, 51, 72, and 87. From the pre test data, Mean ( $M_2$ ) was 60.45, Standard Deviation ( $SD_2$ ) was 11.15, and Standard Error Mean ( $SE_{M_2}$ ) was 1.88. The result showed that there were 2 students (6%) who got *very good* category whose range was 80 – 100. *Good* category whose range was 70 – 79 had 6 students from 36 students or 17% from 100% that joined pre test. The biggest member was in *fair* category which had 16 students (43%) whose spoof writing value was in range 56 – 69 while 11 students (31%) got value in range 45 – 55 with category *less*. The rest was 1 student who got value with *poor* category in range 0 – 44.

The results of post test were 82, 68, 76, 80, 67, 51, 76, 76, 71, 68, 58, 67, 66, 55, 57, 62, 75, 79, 86, 81, 83, 78, 72, 93, 76, 66, 81, 74, 60, 63, 72, 81, 67, 68, 75, and 87. From post test data, Mean ( $M_1$ ) was 72.34, Standard Deviation ( $SD_1$ ) was 9.48, and Standard Error Mean ( $SE_{M_1}$ ) was 1.60. The data showed that there were 9 students or 25% who got score in range 80 – 100 with *very good* category. 33% from 36 students, that was 12 students, got score 70 – 79 while 36% from 36 students, that was 13 students, included in *fair* category. 2 students (6%) were in range 45 – 55 or *less* category. Besides, no student was in range 0 – 44 or was included in *poor* category.

From those data, it can be found that there was difference between pre test Mean and post test Mean, that was 11.89. This difference showed that videos made students' writing skill change.

#### II. The Significant Difference between The Students' Writing Ability before and after Being Taught By Using Video

After the score of pre test and post test had been gotten, the next was to find the significant difference between the students' writing ability before and after being taught by using *video*. For finding this significant difference, the calculation used was t-test. T-test result was 8,68 with df. 35(df. = 36 – 1). The significance level 1 % of this degree of freedom is 2,72 while 5 % is 2,03. From those data, it is known that  $2,72 < 8,68 > 2,03$ . The result showed that  $t_0$  is higher than  $t_0$ , it means that there is significant difference between the students' writing ability before and after being taught by using video.

#### III. The Effectiveness of Teaching Writing by Using Video

Having known that there is significant difference between the students' writing ability before and after being taught by using video, it could be concluded that teaching writing by using video was

effective. This condition has proved the theory of the advantages learning media such as one of the roles of media is to attract the students' attention and to deliver the information, beside that media not only provide the necessary concrete experiences, but also help children integrate prior experiences and relate concrete to abstract (Kasbolah,1995).

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

##### A. Conclusion

1. The students' ability in writing before being taught by using video is lower than after being taught by using video.
2. There is any significant difference between students' writing ability before and after being taught by using video.
3. Teaching writing by using video is effective.

##### B. Suggestion

1. For the teachers

The suggestions for the teachers related with the usage of video for teaching writing are: (a) Teachers are suggested to use video as learning media for teaching writing because it has been proved that it is effective. The procedures used were

teacher played the video, teacher asked students to identify generic structure of spoof text taught by video, teacher asked students to do steps of writing –those are pre-writing, composing and drafting, revising, and editing; and (b) Teachers should be more creative in using video as learning media, not only using video which researcher used in this research.

2. For the students

The suggestions for the students are:

- (a) the students are suggested to use video when they want to make spoof text because video helps students to get clear idea of a spoof event so it can ease students to build a spoof writing, and (b) the students are suggested to be active in writing spoof text by using other videos because it can improve their spoof writing ability.

3. For the next researcher

The suggestions are: (a) It is hoped that the next research can be more detail and complete in analyzing the usage of learning media especially video, and (b) the next researcher is hoped to do research of the usage another media so it will enrich the media research in improving students' writing skill.

#### REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik (Edisi Revisi VI)*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.
- Doddy, A. Team of Setia Purna Inves (Ed.). 2008. *Developing English Competencies 2: for Senior High School (SMA/MA) Grade XI/Achmad Doddy, Ahmad Sugeng, Effendi*. Jakarta : Pusat Perbukuan, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Finocchiaro, M and Bonomo, M. 1973. *The Foreign Language Learner: A Guide for Teachers*. New York: Regent Publishing Co. Ltd
- Hamalik, O. 1994. *Media Pendidikan*. (Cetakan ke-7). Bandung: Penerbit PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Jacobs, H.L., Hartflel, V.F., Hughey, J.B., and Wormuth, D.R. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA.
- Kasbolah, K. 1995. *Instructional Media of Young Learners of EFL*. ELE.I(1): 68-73.
- Khotimah, A. 2008. *The Effectiveness of Teaching Writing Narrative Text Using Mind Map Technique In The First Year Students Of MAN 3 Kediri*. Unpublished Thesis. Kediri: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Islam Kadiri.