Developing Students' Skill in Writing Procedure Text Using YouTube Videos

Noeris Meiristiani*, Nastasia Agistina
English Education Study Program, Universitas Pancasakti Tegal, Indonesia
*noeris.meiristiani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine whether YouTube videos are effective to use in teaching writing procedure text during the online learning process. It is experimental research with the population of all students of Class XI TMI in the first semester of SMK YPT Tegal in the academic year 2020/2021 with a total of 327 students. The sample was 40 students taken by using the cluster random sampling technique. The samples were grouped into two; (1) control group consisting of 20 students who were not taught using YouTube videos, and (2) experimental group consisting of 20 students who were taught using YouTube videos. The data analyzed using SPSS version 22 obtained the average post-test results of the two groups 78.50> 64.50. Based on the results of hypothesis testing using an independent sample t-test, a significance value of 0.000 was obtained, which was smaller than the significant value of a, which was 0.05, meaning that Ha was accepted. This means that there is a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. In conclusion, the use of YouTube videos in teaching writing has a positive effect on the students' writing skill.

Keywords: YouTube video; teaching writing; procedure text

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a challenging and difficult language productive skill to master and teach as it requires careful attention to accuracy (Parra, 2019). Writing entails translating a concept, feeling, or thinking into written form by paying close attention to the proper use of language (Jusman, 2014) to achieve its purpose such as to entertain, inform, explain, or be able to persuade the reader. To gain a maximum result of students' writing at school, (Caswell & Mahler, 2004) suggests that the process takes some steps starting from prewriting, writing, revising, editing, to finally publishing. This long procedure is possibly done when a teacher has enough time to guide students at school.

In fact, since the Covid-19 pandemic stroke in 2020 in Indonesia, students' opportunity to interact directly with the teacher at school has become very limited. The teacher uses one-way learning, which means the teacher explains materials in front of the

class. As experienced by students at SMK YPT Kota Tegal, they usually listen to the teacher's explanation and note it down during the English lesson. After the learning process is complete, the teacher gives assignments to the students. This one-way learning method is no longer effective in achieving the learning objective. In addition, when online learning is conducted, the teacher is forced to use distance learning technology. It, then, requires a teacher to understand the technology and overhaul learning plans with online methods (Joshi et al., 2020).

On the other hand, in coping with the online learning situation, the teacher needs media to achieve learning goals so that the learning process will be effective and successful (Marpanaji et al., 2018). Students also need media that help them understand the material as well as maintain their learning motivation. It has to be easily accessed and available anytime when they need it. Therefore, using technology-based learning media like YouTube video can be a good alternative since it can provide a more interesting and fun atmosphere for the learning process (Almurashi, 2016). Many students find YouTube useful to solve their academic problems and questions as well as to learn school materials and seek information Moghavvemi et al. (2018).

A number of studies have been conducted on how YouTube videos can be used to support language learning. Researches by Isnaniah (2020) and Jalaluddin (2016) found that YouTube videos used in speaking class could develop the students' English-speaking skills. An experimental research by (Prihatini et al., 2018) showed that using YouTube videos was effective in improving students' mastery of writing narrative text. Compared to printed media in the text book, a study by Siahaan et al. (2021) showed that YouTube as a visual media is more effective in teaching narrative for junior high school students. In line with the previous studies, this experimental research also utilized YouTube videos to teach English but focused on its effect on students' skill in writing procedure text.

In learning procedure text, students need to see how something works or operates step by step since the social function of the text is to describe how something is accomplished through a sequence of actions (Gerot & Wignell, 1995). Muliati et al. (2021) suggest that teacher teaches procedure text using demonstration that allows students to see and hear details related to the skills being taught. As a result, students will have a concept of what they want to write or what type of text they are going to write. Sometimes, students even need repetition of materials on procedure text delivered by the teacher, that without proper media, it will become a problem for the teacher (Rahmawati et al., 2016).

Considering that students experience online learning that needs effective media to support them in the process of writing procedure text, the study on this field is worth conducted. Therefore, this study aimed to find out the effectiveness of using YouTube video in teaching writing procedure text.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

This research applied quantitative approach by using true-experimental design. Vukojević (2016) states that the true experimental design is rigorous and robust because groups are formed through random assignment. The population was eleventh-grade students of SMK YPT Tegal that consist of 11 classes. The samples were taken using cluster random sampling. Two groups were selected randomly from the population using rolled paper. Each group consisted of 20 students. The first group is called the experimental group (R1) and the second group is called the control group (R2). Different treatments (X) were given to both groups by teaching them the same material but different media. After the treatment, a posttest (O2) was given to both groups.

Table 1. Two-Group Design

R1	X	O_2
R2	X	O_2

R1   : Experimental Group

R2   : Control Group

X   : Treatment

O2   : Post-test

The research variables are divided into two categories as follows:

a. Independent variable: the use of YouTube video

b. Dependent variable: students' writing achievement

The treatment for experimental group was done in six online meetings through Zoom platform: first, students were given materials about procedure text through video uploaded on YouTube. The procedure text material includes definition of procedure text, generic structure, language features, and an example of procedure text "how to make soup". Second, students were asked about procedure text. Second, a YouTube video about simple present tense related to procedure text was given. Then, the students were asked to make

some sentences related to the given tense. Third, students were asked to watch a YouTube video about an example of a procedure text on "how to operate a television". After that, the students were given explanation about the parts of the generic structure and language features of the videos watched on YouTube. Fourth, the students were asked to make an example of a procedure text on "how to make watermelon juice" independently. After that, students practiced writing their text. Fifth, the students listened and watched the YouTube video on "how to make sweet tea". Then, the students were asked to rewrite what they had heard by paying attention to the grammar. Sixth, the students were given a post-test for 60 minutes to measure the students' writing skills. The posttest was conducted to obtain the research data.

A posttest was given to students to measure the effect of using YouTube video on students' writing achievement. The students' work can be assessed based on five aspects, namely vocabulary, grammar, clarity of meaning, punctuation marks, and the relationship of ideas between paragraphs. The assessment guide for writing texts is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Scoring Criteria in Writing Test

Aspect of Writing	Score	Criteria
Spelling	4	The text has no mistake in spelling
	3	The text has 1-2 mistakes in spelling
	2	The text has 3-4 mistakes in spelling
	1	The text has more than 4 mistakes in spelling
Grammar and vocabulary	4	True and correct
	3	Sometimes less precise but doesn't affect the meaning
	2	meaning
	1	Less precise and influence the meaning
		Difficult to understand
The clarity of meaning	4	Very clear and very effective
	3	Quite clearly and effectively
	2	Clear but not effective
	1	Less clear
Ideas relationship between paragraphs	4	It is clear
	3	Clear enough
	3	Less clear
	1	It is not clear
Punctuation	4	The text has no mistake in
	3	punctuation The text has 1-2
	2	mistakes in punctuationThe
	1	text has 3-4 mistakes in
		punctuation
		The text has more than 4 mistakes in

punctuation

Adapted based on the writer's need from Brown & Abeywickrama (2004)

The total maximum score can be formulated as follow:

$$\text{Total score} = \frac{\text{Total right x 2 x 10}}{7}$$

To measure the validity of the instrument, the writer used content validity and construct validity. This study uses content validity because the instrument is relevant or related to the topics in the Class XI syllabus. Construct validity is used because the topics in this instrument measure each component or aspect of certain learning objectives in the lesson plans. In other words, the test is designed to assess or measure the ability to write a text.

Reliability test is used to determine the degree of stability of the instrument. Standard assessment is used to assess students' mastery of learning to write. An item is said to have good difficulty, if the item uses not be too easy or difficult for students, then students can answer the item. For this reason, the question can be said to have a good level of difficulty. A test cannot be used as a good evaluation tool if it contains many things that are too difficult or too easy. In this case, the reliability test shows the consistency or stability of the test scores when the test is used.

After all data were collected, the next step was analyzing the data. Data analysis in this study leads to learning outcomes and conclusions to reveal differences in students' writing abilities. The writer analyzed the experimental data using the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 22 statistical test.

Normality Test

The normality test was used to measure the research data was carried out with normal distribution or not. It was calculated using SPSS version 22.

Homogeneity Test

This homogeneity test was used to measure students' writing achievement before treatment. Then, it can be ensured that each group of students has the same ability.

Paired sample T-test

To prove the first hypothesis, a paired T-test was conducted using SPSS version 22. It was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups by comparing the results of the mid-term test and post-test in each group.

Independent sample T-test

The independent sample T-test compares the means of the two independent groups to determine whether there is statistical evidence that the associated positions mean that the independent samples differ significantly. The t-test is used to prove the hypothesis that is whether there is significant difference between students who are taught using YouTube videos and those who are not taught using YouTube videos.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The research experiment was conducted in 6 meetings that applied a two-group design. The two groups were two classes that were given a treatment. Each group consists of 20 students. The first group is the control group which is not taught using YouTube videos and the second group is called the experimental group which is taught using YouTube videos. Both groups were taught the same material but using different media. In teaching procedure text, the steps to guide students in writing suggested by Caswell & Mahler (2004) were used. These include prewriting, prewriting, writing, revising, editing, and publishing.

After the treatment, to collect the data, the students were given a written test for 60 minutes. The test was in the form of an essay with 15 questions which were divided into 3 parts; (1) determine the parts of the procedure text, (2) complete the sentences, (3) choose an image. Then, students were asked to write a procedure text and analyze its generic structure.

The test results from the two groups were compared to find out that students who used YouTube videos as a medium for learning to write got better grades than students who did not use YouTube videos as a medium for learning to write.

Data Description of Control and Experimental Groups

The post-test scores of the control and experimental groups were calculated using SPSS version 22 to produce the mean, median, modus, standard deviation, and variant.

Table 3. Data Description

Statistical Measurement	Score	
	Control Group	Experimental Group
Mean	64,50	78,50
Median	65,00	77,50
Mode	65	75
Std. Deviation	7,763	6,091
Minimum	50	70
Maximum	80	90
Variant	60,263	37,105

Based on table 3, it can be seen that the post-test scores of the control group have a mean value of 64,50 with a median value of 65,00. The minimum score is 50, the maximum value is 80, the modus is 65, the standard deviation is 7,763 and the variant is 60,263.

The post-test scores of the experimental group students have a mean value of 78,50 with a median value of 77,50. The minimum score is 70, the maximum value is 90, the modus is 75, the standard deviation is 6,091 and the variant is 37,105. Based on the data, the histogram description of the distribution of post-test experimental group data is as follows:

Pre-Analysis Testing

Homogeneity Test

In this study, the students' mid-term test scores were used to know the homogeneity of the sample distribution. The test was conducted using the SPSS version 22 statistical test. The results were used to determine statistical test decisions. The basis for decision-making in this homogeneity test is if the significance value is <0.05. It can be said that the variance of two or more data population groups is not the same. Whereas if the significance value is > 0.05, it can be said that the variance of two or more population groups is the same.

The following are the results of the homogeneity test based on the mid-term test scores data processing for the control group and experimental group using SPSS version 22.

Table 4. Homogeneity Test Results

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,018	1	38	,893

Based on the results of the above calculations using SPSS, it is known that the output table results from the homogeneity of variance test. Then it is known that the significance value is 0.893 > 0.05 so that Ha is accepted. Therefore, the variance of the second or more data group is said to be homogeneous.

It can be interpreted that there is no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group. Both groups have the same ability. In other words, the sample is homogeneous.

Normality Test

A normality test is a test conducted to assess the distribution of data in a group of data or variables, whether the distribution of the data is normally distributed or not. The following are the results of calculation using SPSS version 22:

Table 5. Normality Test Results

	Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Mid-term test scores	TMI 1	,182	20	,080	,908	20	,057
	TMI 2	,178	20	,098	,908	20	,059
	Control group TMI 1	,126	20	,200[*]	,967	20	,681
Post Test scores	Experimental group TMI 2	,217	20	,014	,909	20	,062

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on table 4.4, the normal test results show that the value of Sig. on the mid-term test scores of the control group is 0.057, the value of Sig. on the mid-term test scores of the experimental group is 0,059, the value of Sig. in the posttest scores of the control group is 0.681 and the value of Sig. on the posttest scores of the experimental group is 0.062. With the value of Sig. > 0.05 then Ha is accepted. In conclusion, the mid-term test scores for the control group, the mid-term test scores for the experimental group, the posttest scores for the control group, and the post-test scores for the experimental group are data that are normally distributed.

Hypothesis Testing

This test is carried out to find out a conclusion from the results of the posttest data and tested using the paired sample T-test and the independent sample T-test. The test hypothesis is as follows.

Ha: The use of YouTube video has a positive effect on students' writing skill in eleventh-grade students at SMK YPT Kota Tegal.

Ho: The use of YouTube video doesn't have any positive effect on students' writing skill in eleventh-grade students at SMK YPT Kota Tegal.

Paired Sample T-test

Paired sample T-test was done to prove the first hypothesis. The purpose of using the paired sample T-test is to find out whether there is a difference in the mean of the two paired or related groups. The students' mid-term test and post-test scores were used, then calculated using SPSS version 22. The basis for decision making in the paired sample T-test based on the significant value in the SPSS is if the probability or significance value (2-tailed) < 0.05 then there is a significant difference in learning outcomes in the mid-test and post-test score data, which means that there is an effect of using YouTube videos in learning to write. Meanwhile, if the probability or significance value (2-tailed) > 0.05, then there is no significant difference between learning outcomes in the mid-term test and post-test score data, which means that there is no effect of using YouTube videos in learning to write.

Table 6. Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std.	Std. Error Mean

				Deviation	
Pair 1	Mid-Term Test	62.50	20	9.268	1.465
	Post-test scores	71.50	20	9.884	1.563

Table 7. Paired T-Test Result

		Paired Differences							
			Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean			Lower	Upper	T	df	
Pair 1	Mid-Term Test –Posttest scores	-9.000	8.785	1.389	-11.810	-6.190	-6.479	39	.000

Based on table 7, it is known that the value of Sig. (2 − tailed) is 0.000 < 0.05, then H0 is rejected and Hl is accepted. So, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the students' mid- term test and posttest scores, which means that the value of learning outcomes is better after using YouTube video media in students' learning to write. This is evidenced in table 7 that both groups have different results.

Independent Sample T-Test

Independent sample T-test was done to compare the averages of two unrelated groups (two independent samples) so that it can be seen whether significantly the two samples have the same average or not. The basis for taking the independent sample T-test is if the significance value or sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05, then Hl is accepted and Ha is rejected. Meanwhile, if there is a significant value or sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05, then Ho is rejected and Hl is accepted. The data were taken from the students' post-test scores. Then the independent sample T-test was calculated using SPSS version 22.

Table 8. Group Statistics Results

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean

Post Test scores	Control class TMI 1	20	64,5000	7,76293	1,73585
	Experi mental class TMI 2	20	78,5000	6,09141	1,36208

Table 9. Independent Sample T-Test Result

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Differen ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post Test Score s	Equal variances assumed	,75 9	,38 9	-6,345	38	,000	-14,0000 0	2,20645	-18,4667 2	-9,533 28
	Equal variances not assumed			-6,345	35,96 6	,000	-14,0000 0	2,20645	-18,4750 4	-9,524 96

Based on table 9, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is obtained at 0.000 < 0.05, then H0 is rejected, and Hl is accepted. This means that there is a significant difference between the average learning outcomes of the control group and the experimental group.

The Result of Data Analysis

This study was conducted to find out whether the use of YouTube videos has a positive effect on students' writing achievement. To find out which one is more influential on student learning outcomes, a one-way t-test is carried out and the results can be seen in table 4.5.4 that (Sig. 2-tailed) is 0.000 which is known if the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is less than 0.05 then H0 is rejected and Hl is accepted. This is evidenced by the results of the average posttest scores of the two groups; from the control group, the average result is 64.50, while from the experimental group, the average result is 78.50.

The null hypothesis (H0) is not accepted, while the hypothesis of the research Hl is accepted. It means the writer formulates the hypothesis as follows:

Hl: The use of YouTube video has a positive effect on students' writing skill in

eleven-grade students at SMK YPT Kota Tegal.

Ho: The use of YouTube video does not have any positive effect on students' writing skill

in eleventh-grade students at SMK YPT Kota Tegal.

After the research has been carried out, it was found that the experimental group students who studied using YouTube video media had better writing achievements than control group students who were not taught using YouTube video media. YouTube videos are used as learning media to teach procedure texts. YouTube videos make it easier for students to learn to write so that students can to convey their ideas in writing.

CONCLUSION

This study is an experimental study using a true-experimental design and only uses a post-test. There were two groups; the control group and the experimental group. Each group consisted of 20 students as the sample. The sampling technique used cluster random sampling, and the validation used content and constructs to measure the validity of the instrument. Then after being said to be valid the research H1 was accepted. Furthermore, students were given a test to assess their writing in this study. The results show that the learning outcomes of students who are taught using YouTube videos are better than students who are not taught using YouTube videos. The control group has a total score of 1290 and the experimental group has a total score of 1570. Then, the writer performs a t-test with a value (Sig.2-tailed) of 0.000. It is known that if the value is less than <0.05, then H0 is rejected, and Hl is accepted. This can be seen from the average value of the control group and the experimental group. The control group has an average of 64.50 while the experimental group has an average of 78.50. This means that there are differences in results between the control group and the experimental group. Based on these results, the research hypothesis is accepted. This means that students who are taught using YouTube videos get better writing achievement than students who are not taught using YouTube videos. This shows that the use of YouTube in teaching writing has a positive effect on the students' writing skill.

REFERENCES

Almurashi, W. A. (2016). The effective use of YouTube videos for teaching English language in classrooms as supplementary material at Taibah University in Alula. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *4*(3), 32–47.

Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2004). Language assessment. *Principles and Classroom Practices. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education*.

Caswell, R., & Mahler, B. (2004). *Strategies for teaching writing*. ASCD.

Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1995). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Gerd Stabler.

Isnaniah, I. (2020). Utilizing Vlog In Youtube To Increase Students'interesting In Speaking English Learning At The First Semester Students'of English Language Education Universitas Islam Syekh Yusuf. *JISAE: Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, *6*(2), 181–187.

Jalaluddin, M. (2016). Using YouTube to enhance speaking skills in ESL classroom. *English for Specific Purposes World*, *17*(50), 1–4.

Joshi, A., Vinay, M., & Bhaskar, P. (2020). Impact of coronavirus pandemic on the Indian education sector: perspectives of teachers on online teaching and assessments. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*.

Jusman, J. (2014). Developing Students'ability In Writing Procedure Text By Using Sequence Pictures. *E-Journal of ELTS (English Language Teaching Society)*, *2*(2).

Marpanaji, E., Mahali, M. I., & Putra, R. A. S. (2018). Survey on how to select and develop learning media conducted by teacher professional education participants. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1140*(1), 12014.

Moghavvemi, S., Sulaiman, A., Jaafar, N. I., & Kasem, N. (2018). Social media as a complementary learning tool for teaching and learning: The case of youtube. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *16*(1), 37–42.

Muliati, M. A., Yundayani, A., & Mawarni, V. (2021). Teaching Writing Procedure Text Through Demonstration Method. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan STKIP Kusuma Negara III*, 119–124.

Parra, G. (2019). Automated writing evaluation tools in the improvement of the writing skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(2), 209–226.

Prihatini, F., Prihatin, Y., & Sani, N. (2018). The Use of Youtube Videos to Develop Students' Writing Skill in Narrative Text. *English Focus: Journal of English Language Education*, *2*(1), 60–69.

Rahmawati, M. R., Listiyani, A., & Damayanti, S. (2016). The problems encountered by teachers in teaching procedure text. *English Journal*, *8*(1), 45–55.

Siahaan, P. I. P., Santoso, D., & Pulungan, A. H. (2021). The Effectiveness Of Using Youtube Video In Teaching And Learning Process: Writing Narrative For Seventh Grade Students. *Linguistik Terapan*, *18*(3), 245–252.

Vukojević, B. (2016). Creswell JW: Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, London: Sage publications, 2009. *Politeia*, *6*(12), 191–194.