


## Vlog as a Media in the Students' Speaking Skills Development: A Classroom Action Research Study

Rinaldo Paulus Bolang<sup>1</sup>, Neni Nurkhamidah<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1,2</sup>MNC University

<b>Article Info</b>	<b>Abstract</b>
<b>Article history:</b> Received 2 Agustus 2022 Publish 8 November 2022	<i>This research study investigated the impact of the use of vlog as a media on the students' speaking skills development. The objective of this research is to determine whether there is a significant development in the implementation of vlog as media in the students' speaking skills or not. This is a Classroom Action Research (CAR), conducted in SMKN 6 Jakarta with 17 participants (students) in a classroom. The participants are X-grade students of animation. This research study used two cycles to find the students' speaking skills development. The findings show that the mean score from pre-test up to post-test increased each. Post-test (79) mean score is higher than the pre-test (61). This indicates that there is a significant difference between pre-test and post-test after conducting this PBL.</i>
<b>Keywords:</b> Vlog CAR PBL Speaking Vocational high school	
	<p>This is an open access article under the <a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/">Lisensi Creative Commons Atribusi-BerbagiSerupa 4.0 Internasional</a></p> 
<b>Corresponding Author:</b> Rinaldo Paulus Bolang, MNC University Email: rinaldo.bolang@mncu.ac.id	

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Based on the observation researcher conducted in SMKN 6 during the work field practice, many students still have difficulties in English, especially speaking. For instance, students less focus, they did not enthusiast, afraid to speak in answering teacher's questions in English. In addition to this, students cannot deliver their ideas fully: they did lot of pause and switch to their mother tongue, Indonesian. The indicators of this problem are: (a) students have limited vocabularies so that they cannot convey their ideas completely; (b) students do not have fluency in speaking English, they do a lot of pause; (c) students are unable to arrange the sentences structure well when they are speaking such as the suffix -s usage; (d) students still have mispronounced of words; (e) students do not have the courage to speak.

In Indonesia, there are many teachers, especially English teachers, who implement teacher-centered approach when they are teaching English as Foreign Language (EFL) in classrooms [1]. According to Susanti et al., (2020), it is found that the use of teacher-centered approach strategies never help students develop collaboration, creativity, communication, and critical thinking. With the implementation of teacher-centered approach, it could cause students to have less motivation and creativity in doing their work since in the process of teaching English, it tends to be textbook-oriented [1]. This is also cause students to be passive since they just will wait what kind of knowledge to be filled and make them unmotivated. "Teacher-dominated interaction" as Broughton et al., (2002) claimed as one of disadvantages of traditional teaching-learning method. In other words, traditional teaching-learning method focuses on teacher-centered where students less active or tend to be passive rather than the teacher. In the classroom of traditional teaching-learning method or teacher-centered, teacher provides everything including the explanation of the materials given. It can also be found in SMKN 6, South Jakarta, that one of English teachers still implements the conventional teaching-learning method. Therefore, teachers should be aware of this situation and use more interactive method.

Project-based Learning is a learning method that allow students to design, plan, and bring out an extended project that produces a publicly exhibited output such as a product, publication, or presentation [4]. Students are at the center of project work, which is motivated by the need to produce a finished result [5]. Fauziati (2014) mentioned that PBL allows the student to work on the project that gives the students chances not only to learn and practice English but also to develop varied important skills such as teamwork, critical thinking, and presentation. It turns out, the Project-based Learning can overcome the conventional teaching-learning model. This is in line with Susanti, Rofidah, et al., (2020) who said on their journal that PBL is an innovative learning style in the process of teaching English. According to Condliffe (2017), PBL can also apply creativity of thinking. In Project-Based Learning, students will create, plan, and conduct a long-term project that will result in a publicly displayed output such as a product, publication, or presentation [4].

Several studies have been conducted regarding the Project-Based Learning and its relation to the improvement of students' speaking skills. Rohmahwati (2016) also conducted research regarding the effect and implementation of Project-Based Learning to raise students' speaking ability. The result revealed that students' speaking ability is influenced by the application of the Project-Based Learning. She also found the effective method for the implementation of PBL are (a) dividing the class into groups; (b) explaining the project; (c) performing the project. Marisah & Robiasih (2017) conducted "The Implementation of Project-Based Learning to Improve Students' Speaking Skills" and the result of the research showed that (1) students have their opportunity to speak English during PBL and students' interest in learning English increased significantly, (2) students get into team work as the stimulation to start conversation with others and integrate their language ability to social skill and technology. They also stated that PBL can be an alternative learning model for its integration towards social and technological skills. [10] also stated on their journal that the implementation of technology-usage in classroom activity able to get students to participate, increase students' motivation/interest compared to not using technology.

It can be seen that those previous studies mostly observed about the use of PBL to improve students' speaking skills by using pre-test and post-test using some media. Despite that, there is still minimum research which investigates the implementation of Project-Based Learning by using vlog in the classroom to improve students' speaking skills as well as the challenges faced by students during the implementation of PBL by using vlog in the classroom.

In reality, vlog can be important for students. Wulandari (2019) suggests that through Instagram vlogging, it assisted students in learning more words or vocabularies and how to apply them in particular contexts. Study has shown that integrating video projects into the classroom could assist students' cognitive and emotional improvement as well as the development of their 21st-century skills [12], [13]. Watkins (2012), as cited by [14], argued that vlogging will help students in mastering new vocabularies, grammar, terms, decreasing shyness, increasing the level of confidence, and developing fluency in speaking English. In line with this statement, [15] and [16], found that vlogging improves students' interest and confidence in using the language.

The objective of this research is to find out whether or not the implementation of Project-Based Learning by using vlog-based in speaking class can improve speaking skills and to find solutions to challenges that students encounter in the classroom by conducting Classroom Action Research. The research will utilize vlog as the media of this research study. It is because vlog is a technology device that can be used for education field. Moreover, vlog is media for us to start speaking, especially English. This is in line with Mandasari & Aminatun (2020), who stated that Videoblog (Vlog) is one of media used in education to simplify students in learning English, especially in speaking skills. Since students have difficulties to speak English in speaking class, thus vlog is chosen to see whether or not can improve students' speaking skills. It agrees with Latief (2010), who stated that Classroom Action Research is a research design built to improve the quality of learning in the classroom. Furthermore, according to McNiff & Whitehead (2011),

action research is an inquiry form that allows practitioners all over the world to study and evaluate their work.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design that will be used is Classroom Action Research with Descriptive Qualitative Research. Classroom Action Research defines as a process to assist teacher to discover and investigate teaching and learning aspects. Specifically, this can develop teaching environment. As conceptualized by Kemmis et al. (2013), Classroom Action Research basically includes the implementation of qualitative, interpretive modes of inquiry and data gathering by teachers (also helped by collaborator) with teachers' judgement related to improving their teaching practice. Classroom Action Research is employed to overcome the obstacles happened in teaching-learning process.

The research will be conducted in SMKN 6 Jakarta. The research will be conducted from the last week of May 2022 to the middle week of June 2022. Cycle 1 and 2 will be done which will last for about 1-2 hour in one meeting of every week.

The participants that will be involved in this study are the students in SMKN 6 Jakarta. More specifically, the tenth grade students of animation of SMKN 6 Jakarta.

In order to obtain the results of the study, the tools will be used in this study are speaking tests, interview, and observation. The students' speaking skills (fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and intonation) will be evaluated. The researcher will be involved as the collaborator in this Classroom Action Research and will be conducted the teaching-learning process, collecting and analyzing data, and making a conclusion and report.

The data will be collected through observation (field notes) during the class as well as the pre-test up to cycle 2. Besides, interview will be conducted before & after CAR implemented to support the data collected.

As the first step, the researcher will observe the implementation of project-based learning by using vlog in speaking class. Second, the researcher will have two times interview with the students before conducting CAR and after conducting CAR. The each answer will be recorded by using digital recorder so that it can be transcribed and then analyze the challenges. Besides, the researcher will make a table to put the responses from the students during the interviews were conducted. Meanwhile, regarding the quantitative data, the researcher will calculate and present the mean of each test to figure out whether or not PBL using vlog could improve students' speaking skills. The formula of the students' speaking test score and average speaking test score is as follow.

### Figure 1. Students' speaking test score formula

$$\text{Student's score} = \text{fluency} + \text{accuracy} + \text{pronunciation} + \text{intonation}$$

### Figure 2. The formula of mean score.

$$\text{mean score} = \frac{\text{total score}}{17 \text{ students}}$$

Source triangulation, investigator triangulation, methodological triangulation, and theoretical triangulation are the four types of triangulation (Denzin, 1978; and Patton, 1999, as referenced in Carter et al., 2014). The researcher will use all of the different types of triangulation. Thus, there will be source triangulation, investigator triangulation, methodological triangulation, and theoretical triangulation.

## 3. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1. Research Findings

This table below shows the mean score of each indicator of students' speaking test in pre-test through a vlog project-based learning.

**Table 3.1.** Pre-test mean score.

<b>SPEAKING PRE-TEST AVERAGE SCORE</b>				
	<b>FLUENCY</b>	<b>ACCURACY</b>	<b>PRONUNCIATION</b>	<b>INTONATION</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	15	17	15	14
<b>HIGHEST</b>	22	23	24	24
<b>LOWEST</b>	10	11	10	10

This table below shows every participant’s score during the cycle 1 post-test using a folk entitled “Ande Ande Lumut”.

**Table 3.2.** Students’ score in cycle 1.

<b>ANDE ANDE LUMUT (CYCLE 1) SCORE IN X GRADE OF ANIMATION SMK NEGERI 6 JAKARTA</b>			
<b>NO</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
1	AL LINGGA KHANDAFFA AZEEM	80	LULUS KKM
2	ALIYA ZAHRA DARMIANTO	94	LULUS KKM
3	CALLISTA SYAIRINA JASMINE	72	TIDAK LULUS KKM
4	EVRAIM SIMON LEONARD SIJABAT	70	TIDAK LULUS KKM
5	FAIZ FATTAN SATRAYANA	87	LULUS KKM
6	FERDY ANANDITYA	50	TIDAK LULUS KKM
7	GRACIAZ INDYRA WHELMIN WOHINGTIAS	73	TIDAK LULUS KKM
8	MUHAMMAD KAKA JULIANSYAH	57	TIDAK LULUS KKM
9	MUHAMMAD FADEL WICAKSONO	48	TIDAK LULUS KKM
10	MUHAMMAD FATHAN FAHREZI	56	TIDAK LULUS KKM
11	MUHAMMAD RIFQI MAULANA	55	TIDAK LULUS KKM
12	MUHAMMAD WUDDY NUR EL JINAN	73	TIDAK LULUS KKM
13	NADYA RAMADHINA	60	TIDAK LULUS KKM
14	RAO PINUS DZAKY	57	TIDAK LULUS KKM
15	RIZKI AZIDAN	61	TIDAK LULUS KKM
16	SASKIA RAJWA KAMILA	60	TIDAK LULUS KKM
17	SAVANNA ARIEN WIBISONO	75	LULUS KKM

The table below shows the mean score of cycle 1 post-test.

**Table 3.** Cycle 1 mean score.

<b>SPEAKING CYCLE 1 TEST AVERAGE SCORE</b>				
	<b>FLUENCY</b>	<b>ACCURACY</b>	<b>PRONUNCIATION</b>	<b>INTONATION</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	16	17	17	16
<b>HIGHEST</b>	23	23	24	24
<b>LOWEST</b>	11	13	12	12

The table below shows every participant’s score during the cycle 2 post-test using a folk entitled “Si Pitung”.

**Table 4.** Students’ score in cycle 2.

<b>SI PITUNG (CYCLE 2) SCORE IN X GRADE OF ANIMATION SMK NEGERI 6 JAKARTA</b>			
<b>NO</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
1	AL LINGGA KHANDAFFA AZEEM	85	LULUS KKM
2	ALIYA ZAHRA DARMIANTO	96	LULUS KKM
3	CALLISTA SYAIRINA JASMINE	82	LULUS KKM
4	EVRAIM SIMON LEONARD SIJABAT	83	LULUS KKM

5	FAIZ FATTAN SATRAYANA	73	TIDAK LULUS KKM
6	FERDY ANANDITYA	76	LULUS KKM
7	GRACIAZ INDYRA WHELMIN WOHINGTIAS	84	LULUS KKM
8	MUHAMMAD KAKA JULIANSYAH	78	LULUS KKM
9	MUHAMMAD FADEL WICAKSONO	50	TIDAK LULUS KKM
10	MUHAMMAD FATHAN FAHREZI	76	LULUS KKM
11	MUHAMMAD RIFQI MAULANA	75	LULUS KKM
12	MUHAMMAD WUDDY NUR EL JINAN	84	LULUS KKM
13	NADYA RAMADHINA	77	LULUS KKM
14	RAO PINUS DZAKY	79	LULUS KKM
15	RIZKI AZIDAN	78	LULUS KKM
16	SASKIA RAJWA KAMILA	79	LULUS KKM
17	SAVANNA ARIEN WIBISONO	90	LULUS KKM

The table below shows the mean score of cycle 2 post-test.

**Table 5.** Cycle 2 mean score.

CYCLE 2 SPEAKING TEST AVERAGE SCORE				
	FLUENCY	ACCURACY	PRONUNCIATION	INTONATION
<b>AVERAGE</b>	19	21	20	20
<b>HIGHEST</b>	23	24	25	24
<b>LOWEST</b>	11	14	13	12

This table below shows the mean score of every aspect in pre-test, cycle 1, and cycle 2.

**Table 3.6.** Mean score of each indicator of pre-test, cycle 1, and cycle 2.

MEAN SCORE OF SPEAKING TEST				
	FLUENCY	ACCURACY	PRONUNCIATION	INTONATION
<b>PRE-TEST</b>	15	17	15	14
<b>CYCLE 1</b>	16	17	17	16
<b>CYCLE 2</b>	19	21	20	20

The table below shows the mean score of pre-test, cycle 1, and cycle 2.

**Table 7.** Mean score of overall speaking test

MEAN SCORE OF OVERALL SPEAKING TEST		
PRE-TEST	CYCLE 1	CYCLE 2
61	66	79

### 3.2. Discussion

#### *Preliminary*

Based on the observation had been done by the researcher during the work field practice, it is found that students have some problems regarding the English class, especially in terms of speaking, such as students did not pay attention to the teacher, students felt bored with the monotonous activity, text book, and less speaking activity. Furthermore, other things came from an interview with the students conducted by the researcher before the classroom action research was implemented. Students said they did not love how the English class ran through because of the monotonous activities and the limited time. Thus they needed more variety of activities. However, based on the performance test conducted in pre-test, the result of students' speaking test still did not meet the minimum criteria set by the school which is 75. The average score from 17 students was 61.

### *Cycle 1*

Cycle 1 had been done for two meetings in offline class on 30 May – 3 June 2022. After two meetings, the score from the students' first vlog increased compared to the pre-test. In cycle 1, the overall average of students was 66, which means an increase of 5 points from the pre-test but not yet significant. The trend was good, but the mean score was still not fulfill the minimum criteria of completeness yet. There were also some students who did not pay attention and not being involved during the cycle. So, in order to overcome this problem, the researcher needed to improve this in the next cycle.

### *Cycle 2*

After conducting the pre-test and cycle 1, the researcher reflects on what has happened regarding the students' progress and problems faced during the project was being implemented.

The result of the speaking test in the cycle 2 was improved. The average score is higher than the average score in cycle 1 and pre-test. The average score in cycle 2 was 79. The improvement/development of the score of students' speaking test indeed was a significant one. It shows a constant improvement of their speaking skills in English based on the score. Hence, the average score in cycle 2 meets the minimum criteria and the classroom action research method was considered successful. Thus, the research study was stopped at cycle 2.

During the cycle was conducted by the researcher, students experienced some progress. Based on the result of the average score in pre-test until cycle 1, the trend was increased. But, it did not meet the minimum criteria yet. While for students, most of them feel interested in this method of teaching, so there is a self-interesting with this method that admitted by the students itself, which then helped them to a better speaking through vlog performance day by day. Some of them revealed that this kind of method is unique, fun, refreshing, and progressive for them because it's related to the technology-usage. While in cycle 2, the average score was significantly improved from the cycle 1 and it did pass the minimum criteria of completeness. Regarding the students' achievement, from pre-test, post-test of cycle 1, and post-test of cycle 2, it has been shown that students achieved better performance at speaking. There was a development in their speaking performance from pre-test, cycle 1, and cycle 2 during the implementation of project-based learning through vlog activities. Moreover, after giving treatment in every cycle, students have better confidence in classroom when they needed to speak in English, whether from being asked by the teacher or in sharing their ideas during the class. Not only that, students also learnt a lot of English words pronunciation, thus they also got a slightly better pronunciation than before the Classroom Action Research was implemented.

## **4. CONCLUSION**

Based on the score in findings and discussion, students' speaking skills developed after being treated through 2 cycles. In the pre-test, where students did retell the story of Timun Mas using only a voice recorder, from speaking elements scored, such as fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and intonation, the average score of 17 students was 61. While in cycle 1 the average score was improved to 66. The improvement is not significant and still below the minimum criteria of completeness. Meanwhile, the average score of the speaking test in cycle 2 showed significant improvement from cycle 1, which was 79. This score increased after resolving several obstacles faced by students in cycle 1. Furthermore, the students' problems, such as lack of confidence, vocabulary, and pronunciation were resolved in cycle 2 and students also enjoyed the class and felt enthusiastic because of the supported atmosphere.

Another thing that also supports the proof that students really enjoyed the class and felt that their speaking skills had improved was the interviews before and after the CAR was implemented. In the interview before the CAR, students revealed that they had problems when speaking in English in class, such as the class atmosphere that did not support them where if they made a slight mistake they will be laughed at by their classmates. Furthermore, monotonous activities are

also one of the factors that made them unable to like speaking class. Therefore they expected more varied activities. However, after CAR was implemented, interviews with students were conducted again. In this interview, the students had different answers. They could really enjoy this English class because the problems they faced have been controlled, such as the class atmosphere that has started to support them. Giving rewards of compliments was considered very helpful for students in increasing their self-confidence when others laughed at them. They also thought that they loved learning to speak English using vlog as the media because it was considered unique and related to technology where they felt the need to connect today's learning with technology usage. Overall, PBL through vlog brought many benefits for students.

## 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank all parties that involved and supported, especially to my beloved family, the Head of English Department of MNC University, my supervisor, all the lecturers, and all colleagues who also made this research possible. I am thankful for the advice they gave for this paper.

## 6. DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- [1] A. Susanti, P. Retnaningdyah, and A. Trisusana, "Students' Perception Toward the Implementation of Project Based Learning for EFL Vocational High School.," in *International Conference on Research and Academic Community Services (ICRACOS 2019)*, 2020, pp. 115–119.
- [2] A. Susanti, N. Rofidah, A. Trisusana, and P. Retnaningdyah, "Improving Students' Writing Skill Through Project Based Learning For EFL Students," *Int. J. English Linguist. Lit. Educ.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 102–115, 2020.
- [3] G. Broughton, C. Brumfit, A. Pincas, and R. D. Wilde, *Teaching English as a foreign language*. Routledge, 2002.
- [4] A. Patton, *Work that matters The teacher's guide to project-based learning*. Paul Hamlyn Foundation, 2012.
- [5] S. Bell, "Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future," *Clear. house*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 39–43, 2010.
- [6] E. Fauziati, "Methods of teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL): Traditional method, designer method, communicative approach, scientific approach," *Surakarta Era Pustaka Utama*, 2014.
- [7] B. Condliffe, "Project-Based Learning: A Literature Review. Working Paper.," *MDRC*, 2017.
- [8] P. Rohmahwati, "Project-based learning to raise students' speaking ability: its' effect and implementation (a mix method research in speaking II subject at STAIN Ponorogo)," *Kodifikasia*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 199–222, 2016.
- [9] A. Marisah and R. H. Robiasih, "THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT-BASED LEARNING TO IMPROVE VOCATIONAL STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILLS," *JELLT (Journal English Lang. Lang. Teaching)*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 27–32, 2017.
- [10] I. Santosa, N. Nurkhamidah, and R. Wulandari, "Identifying The Criteria of Designing Augmented Reality for Vocabulary Learning in Primary School," *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sos. dan Pendidikan)*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2021.
- [11] M. Wulandari, "Improving EFL learners' speaking proficiency through instagram vlog," *LLT J. A J. Lang. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 111–125, 2019.
- [12] I. Anas, "Behind the scene: Student-created video as a meaning-making process to promote student active learning," *Teach. English with Technol.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 37–56, 2019.
- [13] M. S. Perry, "21 st Century Skills through Film Production in Tertiary Education: A Transformative Assessment in a Literature and Media Course.," *3L Southeast Asian J. English Lang. Stud.*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2018.
- [14] N. Mahmud, "ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF MALAYSIAN ESL

- UNDERGRADUATES TOWARDS THE USAGE OF VLOGGING IN ENHANCING THEIR SPEAKING SKILLS,” *LET Linguist. Lit. English Teach. J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 43–58, 2021.
- [15] P. Sari, “Using vlog in the youtube channel as a means to improve students’ motivation and confidence to speak english in intermediate 1 level of LB-LIA Jambi,” *Int. J. Lang. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 38–44, 2017.
- [16] A. Rahmawati, B. Harmanto, and N. R. Indriastuti, “THE USE OF VLOGGING TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS’ SPEAKING SKILL,” *EDUPEDIA*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 87–95, 2018.
- [17] B. Mandasari and D. Aminatun, “VLOG: A TOOL TO IMPROVE STUDENTS’ ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL,” *Proc. Univ. PAMULANG*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2020.
- [18] M. A. Latief, “Tanya Jawab Metode Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa.” Malang: UM press, 2010.
- [19] J. McNiff and J. Whitehead, *All you need to know about action research*. Sage Publications, 2011.
- [20] S. Kemmis, R. McTaggart, and R. Nixon, *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.