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Abstract
This research aims to find out the impact of video as an authentic material on the writing ability. Also, this research aims to find out the use of video as an authentic material to created exciting writing for the secondary school students. The research employed a quasi-experimental method. Experimental group and control group were assigned different treatment. Each group consisted of 30 students. The sample was chosen by applying a cluster random sampling technique. The researcher used writing test both for control and experimental group. The data were analyzed using inferential statistics. In conducting the research, the writer used video as an authentic material as an instrument to improve the students’ writing ability particularly in writing a narrative paragraph which covered the five components of writing namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Besides, the researcher used a questionnaire to investigate the students’ interest in the use of video as authentic material. The research result showed that there was an improvement in the students’ writing ability between pretest and posttest in the experimental group after the treatment. This research reveals that the use of video as an authentic material was able to give a greater contribution to the students’ writing ability.
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1 INTRODUCTION
English is fundamentally required for global communication, international study, and job interview. English is widely used throughout the world and to communicate. English should be taught in ways that allow the person to be able to communicate appropriately. Writing skill is one of four language skills (listening, reading, writing, and speaking) in learning English which is imperative to become proficient because it plays an essential role in communication to deliver a message to a reader or audience for a particular purpose. The writer can explain things through writing, and as a result, readers or audience can get information by reading the message.

Writing skill could be taught as one of four language skills in language teaching through writing assignments. Students could express their ideas, respond to other ideas, tell stories, and convey information. Writing skill also can be the ticket to better college grades and higher academic achievement (Patak, 2018). Writing skill could be noteworthy criteria for the enhanced educational position and better educational success (Hosseini, Taghizadeh,
Abedin, & Naseri, 2013; Patak, Naim, Said, & Asik, 2013). Writing skills are the primary tool for knowledge sharing.

Moreover, Suleiman (2000) emphasized that writing is an essential factor in language. Hence, language curriculum should emphasize the multidimensional nature of writing in teaching practices, evaluation system, and language development. Also, the ability to write well can have a profound impact on the life of learners. Writing could be an art to create the masterpiece with the competency and practice of fundamental writing skills (Currier, 2010). Nevertheless, numerous learners find difficulty in writing because they have to think about many things at once. Students have to construct the content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics to the page.

The teacher could use teaching materials in the form of audio-visual as the authentic material for teaching writing to make writing interesting for students based on the given topic. One of the audio-visual materials is video. Teaching using video could be very suitable to be applied to the students of the senior high school as a technique in writing and also could be very useful for the students in organizing ideas in writing using video. By considering the problem above, the researcher is interested in researching the title the use of video as an authentic material in improving students’ writing ability.

There are some related studies used and found about the use of video as an authentic material in improving students writing skill and make them interest to write by using video — the study of Tarvers (1988) and Williams (2003) about teaching writing in theory and practice. The main goal of this research is to take a closer look at how teachers work with writing and to examine some theories on the teaching of writing. Five teachers in two schools in Swedish are included in order to get an insight into teachers’ practical work with EFL writing. The researchers agreed that writing is a social artifact that is affected by a social setting, social conventions, and social interaction. The majority of the writing assignments mentioned could be tasks that the students would have use of in a real social setting; for work or future studies. The researchers also found that in today’s social communication and the ability to express oneself through written language plays a huge role. That is how the teachers need to establish and maintain useful contacts. Moreover, it is found that whatever the writing assignment is, it is essential to present it within some context. Sometimes by showing a film, and other times the class reads a text before starting the writing, in order to create understanding for the assignment among the students.

The study about writing also found in Salma (2015) attempts to examine the problems of writing skill in EFL (English as Foreign Language) context concerning Iranian students of Aligarh Muslim University (A.M.U.) and also identify the practical needs of it. Writing skill should get more emphasis and practice in the EFL context. The curriculum designers of EFL setting should feel the immediate need for writing skill because of its international demands, and they have to focus on it by stepwise plan so that learners make them able to write effectively. King (2002) revealed that video material could be a very useful source and asset for the language teaching-learning process because it combines both fun and pedagogic instructions in authentic material that reflect
real interaction. By employing videotaped material, teachers can always create an indefinite number of language teaching activities.

The use of video as one of authentic material in learning and teaching English, particularly in English writing could impact the students’ achievement and interest. The use of video as audio-visual materials has good advantages in teaching and learning English course, particularly in writing narrative text, the same as the concept of using legend movies, pictures, and pictogram in improving the four skills in English especially in writing. The video is very suitable to be applied to the senior high school students, and it is also constructive and useful strategies for the students to give comprehension about the components of writing. From the previous studies above, we can also conclude that the use of video as an authentic material in English teaching and learning can make the students interesting especially in writing their idea about the story in the video.

Writing could communicate ideas by regarding each symbol as corresponding roughly or precisely to each of the sounds in the language. A writer is involved in the process of building the large units of ideas from a smaller one to be linked to form a sentence. The sentence is also linked to form a piece of composition. Muciaccia (2012) stated that writing is much more than the product of graphic symbol as speech is more than the production of sounds. The symbols have been arranged according to certain conventions, to form words, and words have to be arranged to form a sentence. However we not write just one sentence or some sentences arranged in particular order and linked together in certain ways. Writing involves the encoding of the message of some kind that is to translate throughout into language.

The essence of writing is a composing to give a form what we thought, felt in word sequences, mainly the words have been written and arranged well that can be understood and easy to get the advantages by people who have read it. Thus, the writers pour off what they thought with engaging readers’ attention. In connection with this, writing is a combination between process and product. The process is timing to collect the data until readers can read the writing that is produced from the writers’ activities while the product is a purpose of the author and also the reason of process of pre-write, draft revision, and editing phase (Brown & Lee, 2015). By following these steps, the students are expected to produce the text quality.

Writing is a kind of activity where the writer expresses the ideas in his/her mind, thinking, and feelings in the form of words to sentences, sentences to a paragraph, and from paragraph to the essay. A writer has to have the ability in writing by using language patterns by written notice to express an idea and a message. The ability of writing means can understand what will be communicated, used in language patterns, organized in composing form, and also about used in diction correctly. The different situation calls for a different kind of writing. Each of the paragraphs serves a different purpose, and each is in a different mode. Each mode of writing has its characteristics and techniques.

Lonergan (1984) revealed that generating interest and motivation; video can create a climate for successful learning. Video has an immediate impact,
and the language is supported by visual clues and can be re-played. Authentic material can include audio, visual, and printed material. Multimedia materials involving audio, video and graphical presentations can also be included. The video as an authentic material can be taken from many sources such as downloaded from the internet, using cassettes, or TV program and there many kinds of video can be used in language teachings such as movie or film, and video clips. About this research, the researcher will take the video by downloading from internet website namely www.youtube.com and by considering the limitation of time at school, the researcher will use a short movie as a kind of video to be shown to the students in improving their writing ability

When we try to judge whether or not an individual has a desire to an object, then we are dealing with something called interest. Interest usually refers to an activity that a person prefers to engage in, would not avoid and would not choose in preference to many other activities. Interest also refers to the kinds of things we appreciate and enjoy. Interest is mentally conditioned of someone that produces a response to a particular situation or object that gives pleasure as well satisfaction. Gove (1986) defined interest as a feeling that accompanies or causes special attention to some objects or readiness to attend to and be stirred by a specific class of object. Hilgard and Atkinson (1967) see interest as a part of the personality that is usually defined according to objects or activities: that is one may be interested in writing, music, or sport. Charters and Good (1945) and Wallace (2015) also states that interest is a subjective-objective attitude, concern, and condition involving a perception or an idea by attention and a combination of feeling consciousness.

In particular, interest is a mental condition of someone that gives pleasure as well as satisfaction. In this case, interest should be considered because of whatever students do; they would not do it well unless they are interested in what they are doing. The relationship between interest and learning is further fleshed out by the observation that depends upon interest. Learning cannot occur unless the learner is interested in learning. The research of interest is complex and diverse because when we think about it, we find that our interest or determinants of our actions are a complex and diverse problem with the term interest is that it encompasses so much. Especially when we speak of interest, we refer to factors we initiate and direct behavior and to those that determine the intensity and the persistence. Thus interest gets up and going to energize us (Schmidt & Lee, 2018).

2 Method of the Research

2.1 Research Design

In this research, the researcher applied quasi-experimental design to know the student's ability in writing. This design involved two groups, namely the experimental group, and control group in which the experimental group received treatment by using video while the control group was treated as the usual or conventional way. The control group was needed as a comparison to see whether the treatment was more effective than other or not (Mills & Gay, 2015).
Both groups were given pre-test and post-test in which the pre-test was administered to measure prior competence of writing while the post-test was administered to measure the effect of the treatment. The design was presented in the following Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where:
E: Experimental Group
C: Control Group
O₁: Pre-test
O₂: Post-test
X₁: The treatment by using video
X₂: The treatment without using video

2.2 Research Subjects
The subjects of the research were the tenth-grade students of the secondary school in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. It consisted of 7 classes, and the classes were classified based on the students’ registration number when they registered to enter the school. Every class consisted of about 30 students, so the total number of population was about 150 students. In this research, the researcher employed a cluster random sampling technique meaning two classes from 7 classes in the population were taken as the sample which represented the experimental and control group. The classes were selected randomly. The number of total samples was 60 students.

2.3 The Instrument of the Research
The researcher used two kinds of instruments in collecting data namely writing test and questionnaire.

2.3.1 Writing test
The instrument of the research was writing narrative text. The test was done in two sections. The pre-test was given before the treatment to get the data on the students’ prior knowledge, and the post-test was given to know the student's ability in writing narrative text after the treatment. The function of this test was to know the students’ content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics in narrative writing.

2.3.2 Questionnaire
The Questionnaire in which the students had to answer honestly what they felt about the questions or statements. Each item was used to find out the students’ interest in writing narrative text from the students’ perception about the use of video as an authentic material in the questionnaire. The questionnaire used a Likert Scale that consisted of five options namely strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. The questionnaire was distributed to the students after the post-test.

2.4 The procedure for Collecting Data
The researcher collected the data by covering administration of pre-test, post-test, and questionnaire. Before giving treatment, the researcher gave writing a test to the students with some steps. The pre-test was done for ninety minutes and given to both experimental and control groups. The researcher gave a post-test to respondent after the treatment. The researcher applied posttest to highlight students’ achievement in writing skill using video as authentic material. The post-test was done for 90 minutes. The students were given the questionnaire about students’ interest after posttest or the last section of data collection procedures. Collecting data from the questionnaire was very important to know and to understand the students’ interest by filling the answer from written questions that were distributed by the researcher to the respondents. In this connection, the question items were divided into positive items and negative items.

2.5 Treatment
The researcher gave treatment to the students, both experimental and control group. Video as authentic material was taught for experimental group in six times. They were treated in order to find out students’ achievement and interest in English writing text by using the video. The control group received treatment without using video as an authentic material and used conventional method. Both of the groups learned the same materials. The researcher used video to be shown to the students. The researcher taught the control class with conventional treatment without using video as authentic material.

2.6 The Technique of Data Analysis
In analyzing the data collected through the writing test and questionnaire. In this research, the data was collected after giving instruments of collecting data to the respondents (students). The data was analyzed through quantitative analysis. To get the score, the researcher used a scoring scale which includes the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics on the students’ pieces of writings. The data analysis of questionnaire used Likert Scale and then analyzed in percentage to see the students’ interest. The items of the Likert Scale that divided into positive statements to negative statements.

3 RESULTS
As the researcher explained in the previous chapter that the way to collect the data in this research used pre-test and post-test in which these tests aimed at collecting data of the students’ ability to write a narrative of two groups, the experimental group, and the control group. The questionnaire was meant to get information about the students’ interest in English writing class. To analyze the data obtained from the test, the researcher used the t-test (test of difference) formula for independent sample, and the underlying statistical formula was used to analyze the percentage of data through a questionnaire.

3.1 The Students’ Ability to Write the Narrative
This section deals with the presentation of the result of the students’ ability to write a narrative in pretest and posttest of the experimental group by using video as authentic material.
3.1.1 Scoring classification of the students’ pretest and posttest in the control group

The raw score of students’ writings is tabulated emphasizing on the five components of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics while the range scores were classified into five levels. The frequency and the rate percentage of the students’ score of pretest and posttest in the control group are presented in the following Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>86-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>71-85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>56-70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison between pretest and posttest result showed that there was no significant improvement in posttest result. It was proved by the result of pretest and posttest on “average” score. In the pretest, there were 13 students got “average” score, and there were 16 students got “average” score in posttest, while in posttest also shown that there were only 5 or 17% of students got an improvement to the “good” category. It means that there was no significant improvement in the students’ test result. The following table shows the specific result of the students’ pretest and posttest in each component of writing in the control group. The table shows the difference of mean score in the five aspects of scoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>61.44</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data in Table 3 above, the mean score of all components namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics increased. Among the all components of writing, content improved significantly which is proved by the P-value (0.004) lower than α (0.05), while the other four components namely organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics improved but not significant which are proved by the p-values of them that greater than α (0.05). The mean score of overall analytical aspects
shown the positive difference on 3.61 points which meant the five analytical aspects increased although they were not significant.

3.1.2 Scoring classification of the students’ pretest and posttest in the experimental group

Students’ score of pretest and posttest were classified into some classification. The frequency and the rate percentage of the students’ score of pretest and posttest in the experimental group are presented in the following Table 4:

Table 4. The rate of students’ scores in the experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>86-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>71-85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>56-70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison between pretest and posttest result shown that there was a significant improvement in posttest result in the experimental group. It was proved by the result of pretest and posttest on “very good” and “good” score. In the pretest, none of the students got “very good” and “good” score, while in posttest in Table 4 shown that there were 3 or 10% students got “very good” score and 14 or 47% were classified into “good.” The significant improvement was also proved by the decrease of the posttest score on “very poor” and “poor” score in which 1 or 4% of students were classified into “very poor” in pretest result. Whereas, in posttest result none of them was classified into “very poor” anymore, and 13 or 43% of students got “poor” score in pretest decreased significantly to 2 or 7% of students got “poor” score. Although there were 16 or 53% of students got “average” score decreased to 11 or 36% students, but overall it indicated that there was a significant improvement on the students’ test result in the posttest. The following Table 5 shows the specific result of the students’ pretest and posttest in each component of writing in the experimental group. The table shows the difference of mean score in the five aspects of scoring.

Table 5. The difference of mean score of the experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56.24</td>
<td>71.56</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 5 above shows that the mean score of the five analytical aspects increased up to 15.32 points. The increasing of the students’ score on writing ability especially narrative writing was 15.32 that was gotten from a mean score of posttest (71.56) subtract the mean score of pretest (56.24). Therefore, the mean score of five analytical aspects of scoring showed a positive difference which meant the five components of writing significantly increased. It is also proved by the p-value of the five components (0.000) that lower than α (0.05) which mean that there is a significant improvement of the five components.

3.1.3 The students’ scores of pretest and posttest in the control group
To the following, the researcher presents the difference of the students’ writing ability before treatment and after treatment (pretest and posttest) in the control group. The control group was not treated as an experimental group but in a conventional way. The table below shows the result that was calculated through the SPSS program version 15.0.

Table 6. The mean score and standard deviation of the students score in the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>5.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>8.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6, the mean score of students’ pretest in control group was 57.83, and the standard deviation was 5.509, while in posttest the mean score was 66.43, and the standard deviation was 8.764. The mean score and the standard deviation of students’ pretest lower than the mean score and the standard deviation of students’ posttest. This meant that teaching writing without using video as an authentic material has improved although it was very poor.

3.1.4 The students’ scores of pretest and posttest in the experimental group
In the table below, the researcher presents the difference of the students’ narrative writing ability before and after treatment (pretest and posttest) in the experimental group. The experimental group was treated using video as an authentic material and then using it to have an improvement in the students’ narrative writing ability. The result was shown in the following Table 7.

Table 7. The mean score and standard deviation of the students’ score in the experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>56.23</td>
<td>6.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>71.57</td>
<td>9.995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 above shows that the mean score of students’ pretest for the experimental group was 56.23, and the standard deviation was 6.642, while in posttest the mean score was 71.57, and the standard deviation was 9.995. From
the table above, we can see that the mean score and the standard deviation of students’ posttest were greater than the mean score and the standard deviation of students’ pretest. This meant that the ability of the students in the experimental group either of pretest or posttest statistically improved. Based on Table 7, it is concluded that the students had an improvement in their writing ability after giving treatment.

3.1.5 The students’ scores of pretest and posttest in the control and experimental group.

The following Table 8 is the result of the students’ score of pretest and posttest in the control and experimental group. The table shows the difference score on the mean score and standard deviation of both groups.

Table 8. The mean score and standard deviation of the students’ pretest score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>5.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.23</td>
<td>6.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 8 above, the mean score of students’ pretest of the control group was 57.83, and experimental group was 56.23. From the table above, it can be concluded that the students mean score of the experimental group was statistically the same with the control group. The difference between close score is essentially the same to the students mean score between the experimental and control group was relatively the same when the variables have equal intervals. In line with this, we can conclude that both experimental and control group had the same or relatively the same baseline knowledge in writing ability.

Furthermore, the researcher presents the difference of the students’ writing ability after giving treatment to both experimental and control group. The experimental group was taught by using video as an authentic material while the control group was taught without using video. Further explanation for students’ achievement on the posttest score after the treatment was done in order to find a significant difference; the researcher applied t-test formula to analyze whether or not it is significant. In this case, the posttest score was analyzed at the significant level 0.05 or $\alpha$ equals to 0.05 by using inferential statistic through SPSS program version 15.0. The result of posttest as follows.

Table 9. The Mean and Standard Deviation of the students’ posttest score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.57</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that the mean scores of both experimental and control group were different after treatments. The mean score of the experimental group was 71.57 (56.23 < 71.57) whereas the control group was 61.43 (55.50 < 61.43).
The mean score of posttest for the experimental group is higher than the control group \((71.57 > 61.43)\) and the standard deviation for the experimental group was 9.99 and control group was 8.76. It meant that after giving the treatment, the result of the experimental group on the mean score was higher than the control group. It proved that the treatment by using video as an authentic gave improvement to students’ writing ability.

3.1.6 Test of significance (t-test)
The hypotheses were tested by using inferential analysis. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) for independent sample test, that is, to test know the significant difference between the result of students' scores in pretest and posttest in control group and experimental group. The level of significance \((0.05)\) with degrees of freedom \((df) = n1+n2-2\), where \(n = \) number of subject \((30)\).

Based on the result of data analysis, the researcher found that the probability value is higher than alpha \((\alpha)\) \((0.314 > 0.05)\) which means that there is no significant difference in pretest. The researcher found that the probability value is lower than alpha \((\alpha)\) \((0.000 < 0.05)\) and the degree of freedom 58 which means that there is a significant difference in posttest. It indicated that the null hypothesis \((H1)\) was accepted and, of course, the alternative hypothesis \((H0)\) was rejected. It showed that the use of video as an authentic material significantly improve the students' writing ability.

In line with the previous table, the following table also used to see the difference between pretest and posttest in the experimental group. Based on a statistics test, it indicates that the probability value is lower than alpha \((\alpha)\) \((0.000 < 0.05)\). It means that \(H1\) was accepted and \(H0\) was rejected. This research found that there was an improvement in the students’ writing ability between pretest and posttest in the experimental group after the treatment. Then, it is concluded that the use of video as an authentic material can give a significantly greater contribution to the students’ writing ability.

3.2 The Students’ Interest
One of the popular media for collecting data in education and social research is questionnaire analysis. The primary principle to hand out the questionnaire to the students in this research is to find out whether they are interested in studying writing by using video as authentic material. The questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group after treatment given.

The questionnaire contained 20 items, which were hoped to know the students’ interesting in learning writing using in which the researcher gave optional those are: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Disagree, (5) Strongly disagree. The researcher itemized ten positive statements and ten negative statements. The questionnaire responded individually based on the students’ opinion after the following treatment using video as authentic material. The students’ interest in learning writing of the tenth-grade students by using video as an authentic material was positive. The mean score of the questionnaire was 79.00 which classified in the interested classification as Table 10.

Table 10. The percentage of students’ interest
Table 1 above indicates that there is no student stated negative statements to the use of video as an authentic material, 6 or 20% of students stated undecided, 12 or 40% of students were interested, and the students got score 85-100 interval, and 12 or 40% of students were strongly interested got score 69-84 interval. This research found that the highest score is 92 which is categorized as strongly interested, and the lowest score is 60 which is categorized as an undecided category and most of the students indicated strongly agree and agree for the use of video as an authentic material in teaching writing. Then, it can be concluded that the use of video as an authentic material is interesting to the students’ in learning writing.

4 DISCUSSION

The discussion section deals with the findings that derived from descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, some theories, and interpretation of test result both of the groups. After doing that, the researcher presents the description of the data that gained from the questionnaire based on students’ interest in using video as an authentic material in teaching writing.

4.1 The Students’ Ability to Write a Narrative

Based on the data above, it showed that the writing ability of the tenth-grade students improved, especially for the experimental group. It also supported by the students’ frequency and rate percentage of the students’ pretest and posttest result. Students score for the experimental group by using video as an authentic material in teaching writing was better than before treatment was given to the students.

Based on the students’ work in the pretest of both experimental and control group, the researcher analyzed that on the five components of writing, most students had low ability to express their idea in constructing narrative writing. Most of them had difficulty in pre-writing stage; it could be the most important thing if the students can gather their information and begin to organize it into a cohesive unit while most of the students had difficulty to start the writing task and some of them also confused how to construct their paragraph. It was because some of them were poor of an idea about the topic and also they do not know what and how to tell their idea. Besides that, they also still had low comprehension about how to write especially about the five components of writing.

After classifying the rate percentage and frequency of students’ score in the control group, the researcher found that all of the students’ pretest were classified into ‘poor’ and ‘average’ classification, and most of them were still classified into ‘average’ classification in posttest while only a few of them had
improvement to the ‘good’ classification. It can be concluded that the students’ writing in the control group increased but not significant.

All the components of writing namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic in the control group also increased. The mean score of overall analytical aspects shown the positive difference on 3.61 points which meant the five analytical aspects increased although they were not significant. Among all the components of writing, only the content aspect increased significantly and also the content of students writing in posttest that comprehensible enough. The content of writing should be clear to the readers so that the readers can understand the message that is conveyed and gained from the content of information itself (Leki, 1991). While the other four components namely organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics also improved but not significant.

After analyzing the score of the control group by using inferential statistic through the SPSS program, surprisingly the students’ score in all components of writing was in a positive difference that is 3.61. This means that, in overall, the students had improvement in their writing but not significant or it is said that the students had almost equal ability before and after treatment. It was also proved by mean score and standard deviation of pretest and posttest. In the pretest, the students’ mean score was 57.83, and the standard deviation was 5.509, while in posttest the students’ mean score was 61.43, and the standard deviation was 8.764. The difference between close score is essentially the same to the students mean score between pretest and posttest was relatively the same when the variables have equal intervals (Mills & Gay, 2015). Both pretest and posttest had the same or relatively the same knowledge in writing ability especially in writing narrative text before and after the treatment.

On the contrary, in the experimental group, based on the description of the data collected through the test as explained in the previous section shows that the student ability to write increases significantly. It was indicated by the mean score rate of the students’ pre-test and the post-test result of the experimental group. The mean score of pre-test was 56.23 and post-test of the experimental group was 71.57, while the standard deviations were 6.642 and 9.995. This means the students’ writing ability by using video as an authentic material was increased significantly. Specifically, it was also supported by the mean score of the students in pretest and posttest in each component of writing. The students got improvement in each component of writing in which all the components increased significantly with the mean difference 15.32. In line with the students’ pretest and posttest in the experimental group, most of the students’ pretest score were classified into ‘poor’ and ‘average’ classification improved to the ‘good’ classification in posttest score, and some of them were in ‘very good’ classification.

In analyzing the students’ achievement in both groups, the researcher also compared the students’ result in pretest and posttest of each group. Firstly, the researcher compared the students’ result of pretest in the control and experimental group and found that in pretest both control and experimental group had equal ability. It was indicated by the mean score of control (57.83)
and experimental group (56.23) that were still around on 50.00 points and were classified into ‘average.’

After comparing the students’ result of pretest in the control and experimental group, then, the researcher compared the students’ result of posttest in both groups. Different with the pretest score, in posttest of both control and experimental group, the students’ mean score were 61.43 and 71.57 (Table 12). It means that the ability of the students both groups were different after given treatments in which the students’ ability of the experimental group was greater than the students’ ability of the control group. It is concluded that using video as an authentic material improves the students’ writing better than using the conventional way that applied in the control group.

Based on the students’ result obtained and stated in findings and discussion above, the researcher used t-test in inferential statistic through SPSS version 15.0 program to test the hypothesis. On statistics, the test result in table 13 and 14, shown that the Probability Value is lower than alpha (α) (0.000 < 0.05). It means that H1 was accepted and H0 was rejected. It is concluded that there was a significant difference before treatment in pretest and after treatment in posttest. In other words, there was an improvement on the students’ writing ability between posttest in both experimental and control group after the treatment. Finally, the researcher states that the use of video as an authentic material is better in increasing the students’ writing skill than the conventional one. It is supported Lonergan (1984) who stated that by generating interest and motivation, video could create a climate for successful learning. Video has an immediate impact, and the language is supported by visual clues and can be replayed.

4.2 The Students’ Interest
This research indicates that the tenth-grade students were mostly interested in the learning writing process by using video as authentic material. Most of the students’ responses in the experimental group were categorized as ‘interested’ and ‘strongly interested’ category. The students have high interest to learn English writing by using video as authentic material indicated by the mean score of the questionnaire was 79.00 which classified into ‘interested’ category. The aggregate percentage of the students also proved this got from the questionnaires on item 1 up to 20 that show the students positive responses about the items.

The analysis showed that the use of video as an authentic material influenced the students’ interest significantly to write English. This means that there is good applicable material in teaching writing skill. In other words, the students’ interest is the indication of success a foreign language student is likely to have in reality given foreign language setting. In this research, the interest of students was considered as output because they were expected to have interest category toward the use of video as an authentic material in learning writing. Most of the students agree to the use of video as an authentic material to encourage interest in English writing. It means that teachers have to explore the learning process with the students’ need.

Furthermore, comparing with the result of writing achievement and interest in learning writing by using video as an authentic material, it shows that this
the teaching writing process by using video as an authentic material is more effective and useful to increase the students’ achievement as well as the students’ interest. It is indicated by the mean score of the experimental group in post-test was 71.90 which is classified as ‘good’ category, while the mean score of interest was 79.00 which is classified as ‘interest’ category. Interest could influence the process and the achievement of the students (Abrantes, Seabra, & Lages, 2007; Harackiewicz, Durik, Barron, Linnenbrink-Garcia, & Tauer, 2008).

5 CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, the researcher put forward conclusion that the use of video as an authentic material can improve the students’ writing ability. The writing ability of students who used video as an authentic material and those who had just used conventional way had a significant difference. Therefore, it can be concluded that the tenth-grade students have better writing ability by using video as authentic material. The researcher result also revealed that from the five components in writing namely content, organization, vocabulary, language, and mechanics, the content aspect was the highest increasing than all, and the mechanic was the lowest. Finally, the researcher concluded that the use of video as an authentic material in teaching process particularly in writing skill was interesting and effective to avoid the students’ boredom in learning English writing. It was proved by the finding in which most of the students were categorized as interested in the learning process.

English teacher should be created to manage the materials or the new ways for the process of learning and teaching English to the students such as by using video as an authentic material in teaching writing. English teacher should give opportunities and motivations to the students to enhance their writing ability such as by using video as an authentic material that was proved to be an interesting media applicable in learning English. It is strongly suggested that the teaching of writing skill by using video as an authentic material should be continually implemented to the tenth-grade students. The teacher also suggested giving more attention to the students’ on five components of writing by using video as an authentic material, so that the students can compose and organize their narrative writing correctly.
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