

International Review of Humanities Studies
www.irhs.ui.ac.id, e-ISSN: 2477-6866, p-ISSN: 2527-9416
Vol. 5, No.2, July 2020, pp. 548-558

**THE USE OF VIDEO
IN TEACHING GRAMMAR TO PRE-SECONDARY STUDENTS**

Ivo Novita S br Silalahi and Sisilia Setiawati Halimi
Universitas Indonesia
ivonovitas@gmail.com and sshalimi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the effectiveness of videos as a teaching medium in a pre-intermediate grammar class in Tangerang, Indonesia. This research adopted a quasi-experimental approach with a posttest control group design. Two pre-secondary classes in Tangerang were selected as subjects of the study. Data were obtained from the pretest and posttest, a questionnaire on student perception of video usage in teaching, and interviews. The experimental class was taught using a video while the control class was taught via textbooks. A pretest and a posttest were given to the experimental class. The improvement in scores was then examined using t-test. To compare the learning results of the two groups, a final posttest was conducted on both classes after the lessons. The scores were then examined using the Mann–Whitney test. Results indicated that students who learned from the video achieved higher scores than those who learned from textbooks. The learning-style questionnaire results revealed that learning with videos was enjoyable. Therefore, this medium is highly recommended as a crucial grammar-teaching tool in the classroom.

KEYWORDS: Video, English Tenses, Pre-Secondary Students

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has been dealing with English language teaching (ELT) for a long time. During the occupation three and a half centuries ago (1600–1942), the Dutch introduced English to Indonesian formal education (Passaung, 2003). When Indonesia achieved independence, English proficiency remained essential along with the development of international communication networks. Consequently, English became the most popular and widely used international language in the country. Many Indonesians attend English courses offered by both government and private institutions. The Indonesian ELT community is said to have been introduced through at least four methods: the traditional/grammar–translation method, the direct method, the audio-lingual method, and communicative language teaching (Passaung, 2003). The traditional/grammar–translation method is still widely used by Indonesian teachers in public schools. Meanwhile, informal institutions apply different methods, including communicative language teaching and the grammar–translation method.

In contrast, the debate about teaching grammar in class emerged as the most controversial issue through the history of foreign language teaching (Richard, 2002). This issue has existed since the rise of the communicative language teaching method, which is a criticism of the grammar–translation method. While grammar–translation scholars believe that grammar is the center of language learning, communicativists argue that it must not be taught to students since it obstructs

language learning. However, the popularity of the communicative approach in the last two decades has led scholars to question the quality of students' output.

Burgess and Etherington (2002) explained that grammar cannot be separated from language use and language teaching. The type of output produced by students is clearly influential to meaning. Borg and Burn (2008) supported this argument by introducing the concept of "embeddedness," which refers to the integration of form and meaning. Richards and Rappens (2014) added that grammar is ideally seen as a skill rather than knowledge and is thus viewed as a tool for using the target language. This raises the significance of learners' exposure to meaningful, contextual, and authentic inputs.

ELT scholars such as Long (1985), Krashen (1987), and Ellis (2008) emphasized the importance of input in the teaching language area. However, in the Indonesian context, where English is used as a foreign language, it is challenging for learners to get exposed to any meaningful, contextual, and authentic inputs in their daily lives. Nowadays, teachers may address this challenge through the use of technology in the classroom, particularly videos. The use of videos in a language classroom has been proven effective in drawing students' attention as well as providing them meaningful, contextual, and authentic inputs (Harmer, 2001). The study of teaching languages using videos has been conducted mostly in the areas of listening, speaking, vocabulary, and writing, as well as intercultural competence (Tomalin, 1990; Cooper et al, 1991, and Allen, 1986). Nevertheless, studies conducted on video activities and grammar ability remain scarce.

METHODOLOGY

This is a quasi-experimental study that seeks to determine how effective videos are in teaching the simple past tense to pre-intermediate students in an informal English course center in Tangerang. This study intends to reveal the role of videos played in a grammar classroom. It also attempts to find out how student notice and learn specific grammatical points by providing meaningful contextual input through videos. It also aims to explore the students' perspective toward the use of videos in the grammar classroom.

The subjects of the study consist of students in two pre-intermediate classes. There are 31 students in the experimental class and 33 students in the control class. The researcher observed that the students in these classes had difficulty paying attention to grammar in their composition, especially in terms of using proper tenses.

For the experimental class, a pretest and a posttest were given. To ensure that the treatment shapes students' proficiency, the pretest and posttest were conducted seven days before and after the treatment. In the tests students were shown videos of activities that a character did "yesterday." The character had no utterances in the video. To avoid reproducing the students' previous output, the video in the pretest was different from that in the posttest. Both videos had been tested in a pilot project for another pre-intermediate class in a different course to ensure the same level of difficulty. In this study, each video was played three times. During the first play, the students were asked to watch the video only. Next, they were asked to note the activities the character did. On the third play, the students were asked to write sentences and to check the notes they had written. Finally, students were asked to compose a paragraph based on the video. Their scores were

calculated by observing the students' consistency in the use of verb forms. This can be achieved by applying the following formula:

$$(1) C = Vc/Vt * 100$$

C = consistency
 Vc = verbs used correctly
 Vt = total verbs used in the paragraph

To determine the effectiveness of the method, the results of the experimental class were then compared with those of the control class, who had been taught grammar through textbooks. Both classes were given a posttest, which was a paper-based test showing eight actions performed by a character.

In line with the course syllabus, two meetings were held for learning simple past tense in the grammar class. Thus, the researcher used the two meetings to teach the lesson using the videos as the learning media. Two videos were used in this study: the first was 14 minutes long with 3 scenes, and the second was 3 minutes long. The videos had been previously tested in a different class but with the same level of proficiency. The videos were played per scene, and then the students took note of the verbs in the activities after watching the videos. Afterward, they were asked to write a paragraph about what the character in the videos did. No feedback was given regarding the students' output to ensure that the learning succeeded only by video exposure. The posttest was given after the last meeting to see whether the students learned the simple past tense. On the other hand, in the control class, the lesson was taught using textbooks, and the students were given activities which used the texts and pictures provided by the books.

Besides conducting the pretest and posttest, data were collected from interviews and from a questionnaire on students' perceptions toward video usage as grammar-teaching medium. The questionnaire consisted of 22 questions divided into four themes: attitudes toward the idea of using videos as materials, attitudes toward the tasks, attitudes toward the videos used in the treatment, and attitudes toward the use of such a method in the future.

Lesson Design

Three different activities were designed to teach simple past tense. In the first meeting, the first video was used to introduce the use of the auxiliary verbs "was/were" and the use of "regular" verbs. The video contained a conversation in which critical features were highlighted so that students could notice and reflect on them in the learning process. There were three scenes in this video, and the researcher designed a task based on each scene. The first scene was a morning conversation between a woman and her two children. The students were first asked to watch the video only. Then, when the video was replayed, the students were given the transcription of the conversation and were asked to underline all the auxiliary verbs "was" and "were" that they found in the video. Next, the students were asked to fill in the blanks in the second paper given. The teacher then assisted the students in checking the answers to the questions.

The second scene was used for the second activity. In this phase, the teacher asked students to watch the second scene of the video. The duration of scene 2 was about 2 minutes, showing a

reporter who asked some people in the street about what they did yesterday. This scene was played three times. In the first play, the students only needed to watch the video. The teacher asked the students whether they could understand the video and played it 20% slower so the students could identify what the speakers were saying in the video. In the second play, the students are asked to write as many past verbs they could find from the video. To prevent discussions among students in this individual task, the teacher announced that the paper would not be scored but reminded the students to do their best. The students were given two minutes to write all the past verbs they could remember. In the third play, the students were asked to recheck their work to see whether they noticed the use of the verbs. Next, the students were asked to write sentences about the scene they had watched.

The third activity involved a scene in the movie *Despicable Me*. The video provided many past verbs, so students were asked to take note of any past verbs as watched the video. Afterward, with their partners, the students were asked to talk about the movie and about what the character did in the scene.

During the teaching and learning process, the teacher did not explain the rules of using the simple past tense but did tell the students that they would learn about it along with the activities they did “yesterday.” Since the students have learned the simple past tense in elementary class, the teacher also asked the students whether they remembered its use. The teacher hinted at the requirement to take note of the use of the verbs and auxiliary verbs in the video, but no explicit explanation of the linguistic features was provided.

FINDINGS

Findings in the Experimental Class

Students’ learning outcomes were evaluated from the analysis of the pretest and posttest results as well as the analysis of the tasks performed by the students. The same type of test, but with a different video, was administered to the students one week before the first lesson began and one week after the lesson finished. The pretest results served as the baseline data. Thus, the range between pretest and posttest scores indicated the effectiveness of using videos as a language resource in a class to learn grammar, in this case the simple past tense. The posttest scores of the control class were used to gauge whether the result of the teaching that used videos outperformed the one that used textbooks.

The descriptive statistics results of the pretest and posttest are shown in Table 1, where students in the experimental group showed higher posttest scores than pretest scores. The scores were determined by considering the consistency of the students’ writing output using the simple past tense. The consistency of scores was drawn by dividing the number of correct past verbs by the total number of verbs used in their compositions. Then, the pretest and posttest results were compared. The mean was found to have increased by 35.13 points, from 51.17 to 86.30. In the pretest, the range of students’ scores varied, with the lowest at 0.00 and the highest at 100. This shows that some students were unaware of past tense usage in their writings. However, after the experiment, the students tended to be more aware of the tense in their paragraphs.

Table 1.
 Descriptive Statistics Results

	Pretest	Posttest
N	31	31
Maximum	100.00	100
Minimum	0.00	50.00
Range	100.00	100.00
Mean	51.1719	86.3097
Std. Deviation	31.07	14.40776
Variance	965.317	207.584
Kurtosis	-1.176	-0.140

To examine whether the difference of the mean between the pretest and posttest was significant, a dependent t-test was performed. Table 2 shows the result of t-test analysis of the pretest and posttest of the experimental class.

Table 2.
 T-Test Analysis of Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Class

	Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
			Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Pre- and Posttest	35.138	29.800	24.206	46.064	6.565	30	.000

In the table above, the Sig. (two-tailed) value of the t-test was 0.00 (< 0.05). This means that the increase in means from the pretest to the posttest was significant and statistically accepted.

Table 1 shows that the treatment benefits the students in various levels of increase. It is shown that highest improvement is 87.5% while the smallest is 20%. Several students got 0% in their pretest, showing that they were previously unaware of the use of past form in their writings. As an example, SDY wrote,

At 06.30, Gavin wake up. After that, Gavin eat cereal and milk. Gavin work to school. After that, Gavin sleep in front of the computer when he work. At the 01.00 o'clock Gavin eat fried rice and soup. After that, Gavin go home to the house. After that, Gavin watch laptop with the title "Little Pororo" and then Gavin go to bed for sleep at night.

It should be pointed out that the pretest instructions were as follows: “*The video is about the activities Gavin did yesterday. Please write a paragraph about what Gavin did yesterday.*” While giving the assessment, the researcher, as the assessor, provided hints to the students that they should be aware of the word “yesterday” but did not explain the verb forms used in the writing. It is seen above that although SDY produced nine verbs, SDY was unaware of the hints given in the question, resulting in a grammatical verb score of 0%. However, in the posttest, SDY wrote,

Gavin woke up yesterday. After that, Gavin ate cereal and milk after taking bath. Gavin walked to school in the afternoon. Then, Gavin slept in front of the computer. After that Gavin has lunch and went home on walk. At home, Gavin watched laptop with the title “Pororo” and then Gavin slept at night.*

Here, SDY produced eight verbs, 87.5% of which were written in their correct past form. It seemed that SDY was more aware of the past tense while writing the paragraph. Most of the verbs correctly used the past form.

The second highest improvement was from SH, who also got 0% in the pretest. SH wrote the following:

He wake up. After that Gavin have a breakfast. He (. . .) breakfast with cereal and milk. He go to school to teach the students. After that he play computer and he sleep when computer (. . .) still working. He (. . .) lunch with vegetable. He go to home. After that he open his Macbook and watch cartoon. He go to bed.

It is clear that SH did not consider the use of tenses. This writing was influenced by the structure in his native language, Bahasa Indonesia, which does not conjugate verbs to express the time of events. It is obvious that SH uses Bahasa Indonesia’s structure in the phrase “*breakfast with cereal and milk*” and “*lunch with vegetable.*” SH considered “*breakfast*” and “*lunch*” as verbs, not nouns. However, in the posttest, SH showed a significant improvement as presented below:

Gavin woke up. After that, he had breakfast with cereal and milk, but the cereal box is empty. After that, he went to school but the school is free. He worked and he slept when he worked. He had a launch after that he returned to home. He watched movie in his laptop. He went to bed.

By highlighting the use of the phrasal verb “*had breakfast,*” it is concluded that SH has become aware of the correct form and fixed his previous mistake by using verb “had.” Although SH’s posttest presents some inconsistency in the use of the correct auxiliary verb form, a considerable improvement was found in the consistency of the use of correct verb forms in his writing.

The slightest improvement was from JB, who had already been aware of the use of the simple past tense in his pretest, with 80% correct verbs, as presented below:

Yesterday, Gavin woke up in the morning and had a morning breakfast (which is so disappointing) and he went to school by walking. When he arrived, he knew that he is the first person who stood in that school. In the afternoon, he went to sleep when everybody is busy! And he had lunch in the afternoon. After that, he went to his apartment in the evening, and watched Pororo in the laptop when the sun is drowned and last but not least, he went to bed with his feet on the top of the bed and his head on the bottom of the bed.

The text above shows that JB already knew how to apply the simple past tense form in his writing. Nevertheless, JB had problems with the auxiliary verb “is,” which he consistently used in his writing. However, in the posttest, although JB’s consistency did improve (20%), the verbs he used did not vary, as shown below:

He woke up. He had a small breakfast. He went to school by walk after he arrived. He searched for the light switch. When teaching time he fell asleep in the office and in the afternoon, he had lunch. He went home by walk. He watched movie in the night and, last but not least, he went to sleep again

While in the pretest JB used 15 verbs including incorrect ones (*woke up, had, is, went, arrived, knew, is, stood, went, is, had, went, watched, is, went*), the number of verbs slightly decreased in the posttest, where only nine verbs were identified (*woke up, had, went, arrived, searched, fell, had, went, watched, went*). JB also did not use the correct auxiliary verb ‘was’ in the posttest despite the topic being presented in the treatment.

Findings in the Control Class

To determine whether the students’ scores in the experimental and control group significantly differed before treatment, the Mann–Whitney test was performed. This is because the results of the analysis did not show a normally distributed data. This means there was a variation in the students’ scores. A significant difference between the groups was found (Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) $p = 0.00$) as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3.
Mann–Whitney Test Results for the Posttest Control Group and Experimental Group

Report Score			
Method	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Book	59.47	33	25.585
Video	85.48	31	23.738
Total	72.07	64	27.794

Ranks

Method	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Book	33	23.55	777.00
Score Video	31	42.03	1303.00
Total	64		

Test Statistics

	Score
Mann-Whitney U	216.000
Wilcoxon W	777.000
Z	-4.097
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000

^a Grouping Variable: Method

DISCUSSION

In this study, the tasks were repeated three times at a fixed order: watching, noticing, writing the verbs, forming the sentences, and writing the paragraph. According to the qualitative data, the students with low writing fluency benefited more than those with high competence. This supports the finding of previous studies (Skehan, 1998; Prihartini, 2015) that a trade-off exists when doing a repetitive task: while students' accuracy of writing improved, their vocabulary fluency and complexity declined. Students who improved in accuracy tended to be careful while writing and noticing grammar use; consequently, the aspect of fluency and complexity did not improve. This is supported by the above findings.

In addition, this research supported the noticing hypothesis proposed by Schmidt (1990): as the students watched the video, they noticed the correct simple past form. The process of noticing is the factor that stimulates a learner's awareness of the gap between what they have produced and what they should produce correctly (Schmidt, 2001). Previously, Schmidt (2010) also pointed out that the input to which the students are exposed will only become intake, that is, what students acquire, if the input is consciously noticed or understood. This is shown by the experimental class's posttest results (mean = 85.48), which is higher than those of the control class (mean = 59.47). This reveals that of the 33 students given the questionnaire, 27 agreed that the video helped them notice the correct form of the simple past tense.

The answers to the questionnaire items revealed the students' positive attitude toward the treatment. The questionnaire consisted of 22 questions, which were grouped into four big themes: attitudes toward the idea of using videos as teaching materials, attitudes toward the tasks, attitudes toward the videos used in the treatment, and attitudes toward the use of such method in the future.

As many as 87% of the 33 students showed a positive attitude toward the idea of using videos as a learning medium, which they agreed was a good idea for teaching grammar, as this study showed that the students understood the simple past tense better through video than through an explicit explanation. The video helped them notice the simple past form.

As much as 82% of the 33 students thought that the activity was fun to do. The questionnaire revealed that 30 of the 33 students favored the task of noticing verbs while watching a video. One of the interviewed students stated that the task was “*easy to do and unlike writing, it was not boring.*” This supports Chen’s finding that the use of videos increases students’ motivation to learn (Chen, 1998). When used precisely, videos develop students’ confidence, building a sense of success.

As many as 24 students thought that forming sentences was important to do after finding the verbs, and 21 students agreed that the task was easy. Writing a paragraph was the least preferred activity. Of all the students, 30% agreed that although it was easy to compose a paragraph using the sentences made in the previous activities, it was an unnecessary task. The interview revealed that the paragraph writing task was disfavored because “*[it] was boring.*”

The questionnaire results revealed remarkable findings. The learners preferred video learning in the classroom rather than doing it by themselves outside the classroom. As much as 67% of the students stated that they would not try to find verb forms while watching videos outside the classroom. According to the interviews, the students preferred watching a video although they were also required to focus on the language. Despite this, the questionnaire results showed that the students hoped videos could be used in their next grammar learning activity. This implies an acceptance of the medium as part of the English grammar class.

The findings of this study showed the students in the experimental class significantly exceeded those in the control class. Besides using videos, another significant difference between the teaching methods for the two groups was the absence of an explicit explanation in the experimental group. Instead, various noticing tasks were given during the teaching process, which included repetitive activities: writing verbs, using verbs in a sentence, and forming paragraphs. In other words, not only were the students exposed to rich verbs; they also used the verbs frequently. As a result, they remembered not only the verbs but also the context and how to use the simple past tense.

CONCLUSION

The descriptive statistics of the pretest and posttest in the experimental class showed a significant improvement in those students with minimum scores. This indicates that using videos as a medium of learning increased the students’ attention to the past tense. The results of the t-test analysis on the pretest and posttest results in the experimental class showed that videos played a significant role in improving the students’ scores.

It can be concluded that the experimental classroom learners have a positive perception of using videos as a resource in teaching the simple past tense. The results of the questionnaire revealed four aspects concerning the study. First, the learners liked the idea of using videos as a learning medium for the simple past tense. Next, the experimental learners liked some of the activities done in class, that is, writing verbs and composing sentences using the verbs. Third, the

learners tended to prefer learning by video in the classroom rather than outside the classroom by themselves, and the students hoped that such a medium could be used for their next grammar learning activity. Fourth, the experimental classroom learners had a positive outlook toward the videos presented. They agreed that the expressions and body language in the videos helped them understand the meaning conveyed by the speakers.

The assessment in the present study was conducted to investigate the effects of the experiment on the students' writing skills only; no assessment was done on the effect of the experiment on other skills such as listening, speaking, reading vocabulary, or acquiring cultural knowledge. Therefore, this study suggests investigating the effects of the treatment with a holistic assessment in the future. Also, the treatment was conducted only in two meetings in accordance with the curriculum of the course where the research took place. However, to ensure that the treatment shapes students' proficiency, the pretest and posttest were conducted seven days before and after the treatment.

REFERENCES

- Borg, S., & Burns, A. (2008). Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 29(3):456-482.
- Burgess, J., & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *SYSTEM* 30:433-458.
- Chen, Y. 1998. Integrating authentic video into junior college English: An empirical study for situation comedy. *Humanity and Social Science, Journal of National Taiwan Normal University* 43(2):21-35.
- Ellis, R. (2008). Explicit form-focused instruction and second language acquisition. In *The handbook of educational linguistics*, eds. by B. Hult, & S. & F.M., pp. 437-455. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Kuala Lumpur: Pearson Education Limited.
- Long, H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In *Input in second language acquisition*, eds. by S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden, pp.377-393. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Long, H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In *Foreign language research in a cross-cultural perspective*, eds. by D. C. K. de Bot, & R. Ginsburg, pp. 39-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Passaung, N. (2003). *Teaching English in and "acquisition-poor environment": An ethnographic example of a remote Indonesian EFL classroom*. Australia: University of Sydney.
- Prihartini, S. (2015). *The effect of task repetition and focused feedbacks on students' accuracy: A study case of Indonesian EFL*. Depok: Universitas Indonesia.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In *Implicit and explicit learning of languages*, eds. by E., pp.165-209. London: Academic Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In *Proceedings of CLASIC 2010*, eds. by S. C. W. M. Chan, pp.721-737. Singapore: Singapore.

Simon, B., & Burns, A. (2008). Integrating Grammar in Adult TESOL Classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 29:456-482.