

## **ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO DEVELOPED FOR Z GENERATION AT BASIC SPEAKING CLASS**

**Sri Fatmaning Hartatik, Ike Dian Puspitasari**

*IKIP Budi Utomo Malang*

E-mail: fatmaninghartatik@gmail.com, dyanike@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

*This content analysis was intended to analyze the physical and cognitive designs of a teaching video for Basic Speaking course developed for Z generation at IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. In order to get precise analysis, the researchers involved four English teachers, who teach Basic Speaking, to observe and score the video. To get objective scores, the four teachers were requested to use scoring rubric assessment adapted from (Morain and Swarts, 2012 in Tolentino 2016:109); besides they were also asked to give additional comments on the quality of the video. After the scores and comments were gathered and interpreted, it can be noticed that the video entitled "Dare to Speak Up" was categorized as a good video. Therefore, those who teach Speaking for beginners are suggested to use this video as one of learning sources. Even though the video was declared to be good, its effectiveness still remained unanswered. Accordingly, further researchers are motivated to do an experimental research to measure the effectiveness of the video.*

**Keyword: Video, Speaking, Teaching Material, Z Generation**

### **Abstrak**

*Studi analisa konten ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa video yang berjudul 'Dare to Speak' yang dikembangkan untuk generasi Z di IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. Untuk mendapatkan analisa yang tepat, peneliti melibatkan empat dosen pengajar mata kuliah Basic Speaking untuk memberi penilaian terhadap desain fisik dan kognitif video. Agar penilaian objektif, keempat dosen tersebut diminta untuk memberi penilaian dengan mengacu pada rubrik penilaian video yang diadaptasi dari Morain dan Swarts, 2012 dalam Tolentino 2016:109. Selain memberi nilai dalam bentuk angka, para dosen juga diminta untuk memberi komentar tambahan. Setelah nilai dan masukan dari keempat dosen tersebut diinterpretasikan, video 'Dare to Speak Up' dapat dikatakan sebagai sumber belajar audio-visual yang baik. Oleh karena itu, guru maupun dosen yang sedang mengajar keterampilan berbicara bahasa Inggris pada siswa dengan tingkat kemahiran pemula bisa menggunakan video ini sebagai bahan ajar alternatif. Meskipun demikian, keefektifan dari video ini belum teruji.*

**Kata Kunci: Video, Berbicara, Materi Pembelajaran, Generasi Z**

## A. Introduction

So far, it has been a challenge for English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers to teach English as one of the international languages; moreover, when it comes to teaching productive skills as Writing and Speaking. This is so because, since communicative era, it is inevitable that these two skills are claimed to be remarks that one is believed to have mastered a language when they can communicate both in written and spoken discourses. In this communicative era, the main objective of teaching language is to enable learners to use the target language in real communication; that is communication which covers learners' daily talk. To be able to communicate effectively, language learners need to possess communicative competence as socio cultural competence, discourse competence, linguistic competence, formulaic competence, interactional competence, and strategic competence (Celce-Murcia, 2007:45). Further, she explains that socio cultural competence deals one's knowledge on how to communicate appropriately with regard to whom she is speaking to, and what register that s/he is going to use to communicate with people with different ages, genders, and social backgrounds. Next, Celce-Murcia (2007:46-47) puts discourse competence as one's ability to sequence words and sentences in order to deliver unified and meaningful messages; this involves one ability to use cohesive devices, using appropriate generic structure of certain various genres, and keep the message coherence. Still according to Celce-Murcia (2007:47), linguistic competence is knowledge of phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactic knowledge as the components of communication. Different from linguistic competence, which is sometimes more predictable, Celce-Murcia (2007:47-48) claims that Formulaic competence is fixed entities, so one obtains this competence when s/he recognizes prefabricated language chunks as collocation, idioms, and lexical frames. Discussing about interactional competence, Celce-Murcia (2007:48-49) defines this competence as knowledge on how to conduct certain speech, to start and end conversation, to cut in conversation and else. The last communicative competence proposed by Celce-Murcia is strategic competence which involves learners' ability to explore different strategies to learn language as well as to

maintain communication to go on (2007:50). From the communicative competence elaborated by Celce-Murcia (2007) it can be inferred that to be able to deliver meaningful messages, learners are not only limited to know how chunk of languages as well as utterances are constructed and pronounced but they are also toknow when and how to transfer the unified utterances to different responders coherently and effectively. As communicative language teaching is intended to enable learners to use language in everyday communication, the use of authentic materials are highly recommended (Al Mamun, 2014).

From the aforementioned description of communicative teaching objectives, ELT seems to be a complex matter. The complexity is bolder when teachers face Z generation whom people believe to be the native digital in today's era (Rini, 2016:3). Further, shefound that this generation tends to be interested in something applicative rather than to something which needs process. This current phenomenon does not only demand English language teachers to be able to be creative and adaptive in sorting out appropriate teaching techniques but also need to be selective in determining which teaching materials and media they are going to implement.

## **B. Literature Review**

Basically, the rapid growth of technology and the internet in today's era can support teachers to embody extra aids along with teaching materials which are traditionally poured in textbooks. For example, they can utilize teaching materials which are presented in audio-visual material. Common audio-visual materials which are widely used by language teachers are videos. The use of videos opts to teach productive skill like speaking. This is so because teaching and learning materials presented in audio-visual, like video, do not only expand its delivery flexibility but also provide learners with linguistics as well as non-verbal and cultural aspect of the target language (Crawford, 2002:85). In addition to this, Al Mamun (2014:10) claims that videos can facilitate teaching and learning process in various ways; it can create interesting classroom atmosphere, eliminate a monotonous activity, and trigger an interactive and effective teaching and learning process. These insights are supported

by some research conducted by some researchers as Wahyuningsih *et.al* (2014:79) who proved that the use of audio visual or video improved learners' speaking skill.

Even though the use of audio visual or videos are claimed to be good media to accommodate teaching materials, teachers still need to be careful in electing this specific medium in order to meet effective teaching and learning process. Therefore, careful analysis and evaluation on audio-visual aids should be performed by teachers before they bring them into classroom. According to Thomson *et al* (2014 in Tolentino, 2016:40), effective instructional video should at least covers four criteria. First, the videos should provide context and content which support the purpose of the course. Second, the videos should show stories that display narrators' experience in order to help learners understand the concept. Third, the audio need to present authenticity of the narrators to ensure the learners that the narrators are expertise and credible. Forth, the length of videos should be short but precise, only contains the points of the course.

Study on video analysis has been carried out by Tolentino (2016). By implementing content analysis, he rated two different videos, TeacherTube and YouTube. He found out that TeacherTube had moderate to high rating in term of physical design quality. In the contrary, YouTube had higher rating on its quality and design. Further, he revealed that videos which contained better content seemed to have better affective design quality which simultaneously attracted the viewers to view the videos.

Similar to the above previous study, this current study was also intended to analyze the content of video entitled "Dare to Speak Up" developed for Z generation at *Basic Speaking* class in one of private higher education institutions in Malang, East Java-Indonesia. Different from the previous study, this study was only limited to analyze the content and the quality of the videos and was not aimed at measuring the correlation of the quality of the videos with students' performance. Referring to the similarity and differences between this current study and the previous one, the researcher believed that this study was worth-doing.

### C. Method

This particular study applied qualitative content analysis method. Graneheim and Lundman (2003:106) put content analysis method of the study relies on the unit of analysis which includes all interviews and observable protocols, for example, programs, organizations, communities, and texts. Discussing about texts, Krippendorff (2013 in Tolentino, 2016:47) says that the word ‘text’ is not limited to written discourse but also refers to art works, images, maps, and sounds. Referring to the given definition, qualitative content analysis is the suitable method to this study. To gain deeper analysis results, the researcher involved four teachers who teach *Basic Speaking* class. To get the data, the researchers involved four teachers, who teach *Basic Speaking*, to share their insights on the content and physical quality of the video. To gain the teachers’ feedback, a scoring rubric modified from Morain and Swarts, 2012 (in Tolentino, 2016:109). The modification was made by dropping off the affective aspects of the video. This was done because the criteria addressed to the affective aspects focused on fluency to indicate narrators’ credibility. Referring to studies conducted by Rukmini (2009) and Faucette (2001) who claimed that speaking materials should also provide effective models of communication strategies to negotiate meaning, the existence of pauses, paraphrasing, and self repetition in the video are not considered as incredibility of the narrators but claimed to be strategies to sustain communication. After all the scores were collected from the teachers, the researchers then calculated the mean scores. Last, the scores were interpreted to determine whether the video had good quality to be used as Basic Speaking learning resources or not.

### D. Result

After the teachers were asked to observe and score the video by using scoring rubric, some quantitative findings and qualitative findings were revealed. The quantitative findings were elicited from the scores and the qualitative findings were dug from the comment and suggestion proposed by the four teachers. The summary of the scores given by the teachers is presented in Table. 1

**Table 1 The Summary of the Scores Given by Colleagues**

No	Teachers	Given Scores	Category
1	T1	83.3	Very good
2	T2	83.3	Very good
3	T3	94.4	Excellent
4	T4	88.89	Very good
<b>Mean Score</b>		<b>87.47</b>	<b>Very good</b>

Source: Output Result. 2018

From the displayed data, it can be inferred that the video developed for Z generation in Basic Speaking class have very good quality in term of physical and cognitive design. This is so because it has met criteria of good audio visual learning resources determined by (Morain and Swarts, 2012 in Tolentino, 2016:109)

In addition to the scores, the four teachers also gave additional comments related to the physical and cognitive design of the video. Teacher 1, for example, noted that the physical and cognitive designs quality of Chapter 5 was good. However, in this chapter, the narrator did not demonstrate any communication strategies; she spoke flawlessly. He added that it was not a big deal; however, it would be perfect if the chapter also provides models of communication strategies in order to be in line with one of the objectives of the communicative teaching principles hold by the Department; it is equipping the students with communicative competence as linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Curriculum of English Department, IKIP Budi Utomo Malang 2016).

Similar comments were stated by Teacher 2, Teacher, 3 and Teacher 5. They stated that, overall the quality of sound of the video is very good. Chapter 3, however, was little bit noisy because some irrelevant sounds, like motor bike or any other unrelated sound, were more dominant than the content of the video. Teacher 3 suggested the video makers revise the quality of the sound in chapter 3 before presenting the video to the class or substitute the video in chapter 3 with more audible video to present the topic. Different from Teacher 1, 2 and 5, Teacher 4 claimed that the video was perfect for beginner because she saw the video as authentic. She wrote ‘...the topic presented throughout all the chapters reflect students’ daily

*communication..*'She added '*...the video does not only contain communication strategies but also implicitly teach learners about world Englishes-it is OK to speak English even though not as perfect as native speakers of English..*' In addition to her positive comment, Teacher 4 also criticized that the animation in chapter 3 was too abundant; she was afraid that it would distract the students' attention; the students would focus on the animation and sound effect instead of the content of the topic.

## **E. Discussion**

From the above data, we can conclude that in general the video entitled '*Dare to Speak Up*' developed for Z generation in *Basic Speaking Class* is a very good learning resource. The physical and cognitive quality of the video has met some qualification of good videos proposed by (Morain and Swarts, 2012 in Tolentino 2016:109). Besides, The availability of communication strategies in the video answered one of suggestions made by Rukmini (2009) and Faucette (2001) who insisted on the availability of communication strategies in speaking teaching materials. This aimed at motivating learners that it is common to miss ideas when we are speaking because this does not only happen when one speaks in second or foreign language but also it happens in native language communication. In addition, the video has also provided audiences with linguistics items as well non verbal and cultural aspect of the target language as it was proposed by Crawford (2002:85). The linguistics items were clearly demonstrated through the way narrators utter their utterances along the chapters. The non-verbal items were also performed by all narrators to help audiences digest the content. Similarly, the cultural aspects were also reflected in the dialogues delivered by different narrators from different regions and countries.

## **F. Suggestion**

Based on the finding and discussion mentioned previously, some suggestions are made for several parties. This analysis has provided feedback for materials developers and English teachers in general. Such positive feedback is believed to

enhance one's professional development. Therefore, any education institutions are suggested to facilitate their teachers with routine collegial sharing or meeting in order to help them get positive feedback. Next, the findings of this study has showed that physically and cognitively, video developed for Z generation at *Basic Speaking* class possessed good quality. Therefore, those who teach speaking for beginners are suggested to use this video as one of alternatives of teaching and learning resources. Even though four teachers claimed the video to be good, its effectiveness, however, is still a question. Therefore, an experimental research needs to be carried out to measure the exact effectiveness of the video. Last but not least, this content analysis was limited to analyze a video developed for beginners, so further researcher are encouraged to conduct similar research but different objects in order to enrich the insights of teaching material analyses. By so doing, it is expected that there will be more references that can be used by teachers to evaluate and select teaching materials.

## References

- Al Mamun, M.A.. 2014. *Effectiveness of Audio-Visual Aids in Language Teaching in Tertiary Level. Post Graduate Thesis*. Brac Institute Of Language (online) Retrived From <https://dspace.dracu.Ac.Bd/13177014.Pdf> on August 1<sup>st</sup> 2018
- Celce-Murcia, M. 2007. Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching (41-57) *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*. E. Alc n Soler and M.P Safant Jord  (eds) Online Retrieved from <https://canvas.harvard.edu/download> on August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018
- Crawford, J. 2002. The Role of Materials in Language Classroom: Finding the Balance in .C Richards & W.A Renandya (Eds) *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (80-91) Cambridge University Press
- Faucette, P. 2001. *A Pedagogical Perspective on Communication Strategies: Benefits of Training and An Analysis of English Language Teaching Materials*. Online. *Second Language Studies* 19 (2) Spring 2001 1-40
- Graneheim, U. H and Lundman, B. 2014. *Qualitative Content Analyses in Nursing Research: Concepts, Procedures, and Measures to Achieve Trustworthiness* (105-122). *Nurse Education Today*. (an online Journal). 24. Retrieved from <http://intl.elsevierhealth.com/journals/nedt> on August 2nd 2018.
- Rini, D.P. 2016. *Pengaruh Karakter Generasi Z dan Peran Guru dalam Pembelajaran terhadap Motivasi Belajar Akuntansi Siswa Kelas X*



- Akuntansi SMK Negeri 1 Godean Tahun Ajaran 2016/2016*. Undergraduate Thesis. (Online) retrieved from <https://eprints.uny.ac.id> on April 25 2018.
- Rukmini, D. 2009. *Speaking Model Texts in Textbooks for Senior High School*. Bahasa dan Seni 37 (1) 2009 45-53
- Tollentino, C.L. 2016. *Content Analysis of Teachertube And Youtube Videos for Instructing English Language Learners*. Desertation. Graduate devision of the university of Hawai' Imánoa (online) Retrieved from <http://solarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu-2016-12-phd-tolentino.pdf> on August 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018
- Wahyuningsih, M.G.S, Mudjiman, H &Haryanto, S. 2014. *Penerapan Audio Visual dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris (Study Kasus di SMP 3 Bawen)*. Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran (79-91).Vol 2 (1). (online) Retrieved from <http://jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id> on August 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018

**Appendix A: Video Content Scoring Rubric adapted from (Morain&Swarts, 2012 in Tolentino2016 :109)**

No	Variable	Score	Criteria
1	<b>Physical Design</b>		
	1.a. Audio	1	The video is not equipped with clear voice so the core of the video cannot be caught.
		2	The video is presented clear but not specific to the center point of the subject.
		3	The video is presented with clear voice to help the audience understand what to pay attention to.
	1.b View ability	1	The video is not presented in HD.
		2	The video is displayed in HD but there are still some irrelevant pictures presented in the video.
		3	The HD Video is well edited so it only presents relevant pictures and items.
	1.c. Timing	1	The video is too fast so frequent pause is needed to digest the content
		2	Some parts overly fast or slow.
		3	The talk in the video is in moderate pace
2	<b>Cognitive Design</b>		
	2.a. Accuracy	1	The narrators in the video consistently made linguistic errors and ignored to repair the errors.
		2	Narrators made some mistakes but acknowledged and manipulated the mistakes with communication strategies.
		3	Narrators did not make any mistakes or make little mistakes that they corrected immediately by employing communication strategies to make the audience understand the intended messages
	2.b Organization	1	The narrators did not declare the objective of the video.
		2	The narrators introduced the purpose the video but not explicitly stated.
		3	The narrators stated the topic clearly (introduction, content, and closing).
	2.c Pertinence	1	The Narrators eliminated main details and made too long pauses .
		2	Narrator spent less time presenting details.
		3	Narrator took time to explain every detail to enhance the audience understanding.

$$N = \sum x \frac{100}{\sum max}$$

Category:

>91 = Excellent

81-90 = Very Good

71-80 = Good

65-70 = OK

>65 = Poor

## Appendix B: Scores and Comment Form for Basic Speaking Teachers

### Guidance

Dear Teachers,

You are kindly requested to contribute your thoughts on the quality of video which will be used in the upcoming semester. To assure your identity, your name will not be mentioned and shown to any parties.

Please kindly give the video scores by referring to the enclosed scoring rubric. Your additional comments on the video will also be highly appreciated. Please write your scores and comments in the provided space below

No	Variable	Score	Additional Comments
1	<b>Physical Design</b>		
	1.a. Audio		
	1.b View ability		
	1.c. Timing		
2	<b>Cognitive Design</b>		
	2.a. Accuracy		
	2.b Organization		
	2.c Pertinence		
<b>Total Score</b>			

Thank You