Check for updates

Acitya: Journal of Teaching & Education, Vol. 5 No. 2, 2023,

Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education

Website: http://journals.umkt.ac.id/index.php/acitya

Research Papers, Review Papers, and Research Report

Kampus 1 UMKT Jl. Ir. H. Juanda No 15, Samarinda, Indonesia 75123

The Use of Ulead Studio Program Products (UVIOPro) to Improve the Students' Writing Skill

Junaid[1], Firman[2]

[1,2]Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar

Jl. Sultan Alauddin no 259 Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding email: junaid@unismuh.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The study aims to find out whether or not the use of UVIOPro is effective to improve the students' writing skill, particularly in terms of content, organization, and mechanics. This study applied a Quasi-Experimental design. The sample of this study was the second semester students of English Education department at Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at University of Muhammadiyah Makassar in academic year 2014/2015. Therefore, the sample was determined with a cluster random sampling by applying a lottery technique. Hence, it consisted of 60 students divided in two groups. The data were collected through writing test, which consisted of pretest and post-test. The data were analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistics through SPSS version 20. The findings show that the students' writing skill, particularly in terms of content, organization, and mechanics improved after giving the treatments. The results of t-test analysis for the students' score improvement in terms of content and organization in experimental and control groups reveals that Sig. (2-tailed) is less than (α) = 0.05. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the use of UVIOPro in teaching writing was effective to improve the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, and mechanics.

Keywords: **Ulead Video Studio Program,Writing, Content, Organization, Mechanics**

ISSN 2655-9722, DOI: 10.30650/ajte.v5i2.3621

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background

Teaching and learning refer to the process of a pedagogical act that includes teachers and students. Teachers possess an important role in the classroom, especially in the instructional context of language learning in EFL classroom. Meanwhile, students are acquired to learn all elements of language that they learn. Hence, there are some essential elements or aspects of language that are needed to learn by students. "Apart from language itself, there are four language skills that students need to learn: listening, reading, writing and speaking" (Pollard, 2008).

Among four language skills, writing refers to as a productive skill. As mentioned by Pollard's statement, "Writing is a productive skill and, as such, the way we treat in class has some similarities with the teaching and learning of speaking" (Pollard, 2008). Writing as a productive skill, it involves and acquires students in producing the language in written term. Therefore, writing deals with many aspects of language that should be covered by students. It requires not only the rule of grammatical systems, patterns, and role devices, but also it requires the conceptual and judgement elements. Hence, some students assumed that writing is more difficult to learn than other language skills. Many students still encounter difficulties in written process. Even many students who are studying in tertiary level still often make errors in writing process.

Regarding to writing difficulties faced by students, Yahya & Hashim (2013) identify five categories of writing difficulties, namely: 1) comprehension and conception of ideas, 2) composition, 3) language accuracy and appropriate, 4) vocabulary, and 5) lack of time. Furthermore, in writing process, the students need good idea in order to produce a composition or written material. If students have not good ideas, they will feel difficult to write. For writing subject, students must have ideas about what they will write and how far they will know the topic. They have to decide theme and then choose one topic in order to find and explore their ideas.

Besides, in teaching and learning process, many lecturers try to establish their class more active and enjoyable with various methods, techniques, and materials in order to stimulate students to write effectively. Based on the preliminary observation that was conducted by the researchers at the University of Muhammadiyah Makassar, it showed that generally most of lecturers taught writing without using multimedia. They only used materials from textbook or the other sources.

Besides, they mostly focused on asking students to arrange jumble words, answer the questions from the text, and complete the paragraph or dialogue. They only gave writing practice in English and guided the students to revise the content and language of their writing.

In relation to the importance of meaningful teaching and learning, the researchers provide one of the alternative media in teaching writing skill. It is the product of Ulead Video studio program. It is expected that the media will facilitate the students to increase their writing skill, particularly in terms of mechanics and language use. According to Chandra (2005), Ulead video studio program product is an editing video program which is easy to use and also this program does not need a computer with high specific features. Moreover, Chandra (2005) stated that Ulead video studio program can be used to integrate a video view setting, transition effect, audio setting, and text view setting. Therefore, it can help the lecturers or teachers to produce the authentic appropriate video learning materials. Hence, UVIOPro is expected to overcome the students' writing difficulties, especially to find and organize their ideas in order to construct a good writing based on the five components of writing, such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. It can create situation that provides opportunities and stimulates the students in writing process. Besides, the products of this program are expected to become one of the media in order to make the students more enjoy and easy in the writing process.

1.2. Research Question

Furthermore, to fulfil the purpose of this study, thus, it is guided by the ensuring following question: "Is the use of UVIOPro effective to improve the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, and mechanics?"

1.3. Significance of the Research

Significance of the research, this research is covered by two kinds of significance, namely theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, this research is expected to give useful information for lecturer and students about innovative media in teaching and learning English particularly in the writing skill.

Practically, the findings of this research are expected to provide useful information or reliable reference for lectures and students in order that they are able to better understand to

appropriate media in learning and teaching writing skill. In this case, UVIOPro are expected as an innovative teaching media. Besides the findings are expected to be useful information about UVIOPro which can make the students more interest and enjoy learning, especially in learning writing. The students can be helpful to get more information about the content of what they are going to write through using UVIOPro. For lectures, using the UVIOPro can develop the strategy instruction and teaching innovative media in order to facilitate the teaching and learning process. In addition, the result of this research are also expected to give information as the basic reference and empirical evidence for further research.

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

The research used a quasi-experimental design. "The quasi-experimental approach introduces considerably more treats by validity than the true experiment" (Creswell, 2008). Referring to situation in this research, the researcher did not allow to randomly assigning individual subject to group sample because of acceptable permission from the institution. "When random assignment is not possible, a researcher still may choose from a number of quasi-experimental designs that provide adequate control of sources in validity" (Gay et al., 2006). In this case, the researcher applied pre and post test design.

2.2 Samples/Participants

The sample of this research was the second semester students of English Education department at FKIP Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in academic year 2014/2015. Therefore, this research used a cluster random sampling by applying a lottery technique. A total number of the sample consisted of 60 students that were divided into 30 students for an experimental group and 30 students for a control group.

2.3 Data Analysis

In this research, the data collected from the students' writing test in pretest and post-test were analyzed by using SPSS version 20 for windows. The data were analyzed quantitatively by applying descriptive and inferential statistics. The researcher used descriptive statistics, which were the frequencies, the mean score and standard deviation, to find out the students score and improvement in students' writing skill. Then, inferential statistic, which was independent sample t-test, was applied to find out the differences between the score of two groups. The steps were undertaken to analyze the data as follows:

1. Scoring the students' writing composition of pretest and post-test

This section dealt with the way to score each student's writing by giving attention to the five components namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The way of getting score was based on the analysis scoring scale for writing adapted from Salija (2004). It can be seen in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1 Scoring Scale of the Five Components of Writing

No	Components of writing	Score	Range and indicators
1.	Content	A (9-10)	Very good: • The ideas are about the topic selected. • The ideas are clearly stated. • The ideas are clearly supported. • The ideas are comprehensible. • The ideas are well developed. • The ideas are fluently expressed.
		B (7-8)	Good • The ideas are about the topic selected. • The ideas are clearly stated. • The ideas are clearly supported. • The ideas are quite comprehensible. • The ideas are adequate relevant. • The ideas are generally well develop
		C (5-6)	Average: • The ideas are about the topic selected. • The ideas are clearly stated, • The ideas are getting enough to support. • The ideas are quiet relevant. • The ideas are generally developed. • The ideas are sufficiently expressed
		D (3-4)	Poor: • The ideas are about the topic selected • The ideas are not clearly stated • The ideas are getting limit to support • The ideas are not quiet limit • The ideas are lack of developing • The ideas are non-fluent expressed
		E (1-2)	Very poor: • The ideas are about the topic selected • The ideas are not enough to evaluate • The ideas are incomprehensible • No communication of ideas • The ideas are irrelevant • It has very poor of development of ideas

2.		A (9-10)	Very good: • The ideas are well organized • The ideas are concise • The ideas are coherent • The ideas are relevant to outline • The ideas are presented in logical sequencing
		B (7-8)	Good • The ideas are adequate organized • The ideas are quite concise • The ideas are adequate cohesion • The ideas are adequate coherence • The ideas are relevant to outline • The ideas are sufficient sequencing
		C (5-6)	Average: • The ideas are generally organized • Few ideas are break out cohesion • The ideas are generally coherent • The ideas are mostly relevant outline • The ideas are in some logical sequencing
		D (3-4)	• The ideas are almost loosely organized • The ideas are inadequate cohesion • The ideas are inadequate coherent • The ideas are confuse and disconnected • The ideas are somewhat relevant to outline • The ideas are lack in logical sequencing
		E (1-2)	Very poor: • Lack of organization • The ideas are incoherent • The ideas are not enough to evaluate • The ideas are not or almost not relevant to outline • The ideas are not or almost not presented in logical sequencing
3.	Mechanics	A (9-10)	Very good: • Almost sentences used in paragraph have correct punctuation, capitalization, and spelling
		B (7-8)	Good: • Some the punctuation, capitalization, and spelling are incorrect.
		C (5-6)	Average: • Half punctuation, capitalization, and spelling are incorrect
		D (3-4)	Poor: • More than half of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling are incorrect
		E (1-2)	Very poor: • Almost the punctuation, capitalization, and spelling are incorrect
4.	Vocabulary	A (9-10)	Very good:

			• Almost paragraph has appropriate and effective words
		B (7-8)	Good: • Some words of paragraph do not use an appropriate words
		C (5-6)	Averange: • Half words of paragraph are not effective and inappropriate
		D (3-4)	Poor: • More than half words of paragraph are not effective and inappropriate
		E (1-2)	Very poor: • Almost words of paragraph are not effective and appropriate
5.	Language Use	A (9-10)	Very good: • Almost paragraph have correct structure (word, order, pronouns, prepositions, articles, conjunctions, tenses,etc)
		B (7-8)	Good: • Some structure of paragraphs are incorrect (word order, pronouns, prepositions, articles, conjunction, tenses, etc)
		C (5-6)	Average: • Half structures of paragraph are incorrect (word order, pronouns, preposition, articles, conjunctions, tenses, etc)
		D (3-4)	Poor: • More than half of structure of paragraph are incorrect (word order, pronouns, preposition, article. conjunction, tenses, etc)
		E (1-2)	Very poor: • Almost structures of paragraph are incorrect (word order, pronouns, preposition, articles, conjunctions, tenses, etc)

2. Calculating and converting the students' writing scores of the five components

In order to calculate and convert the students' writing score based on the five components of writing, the researcher used the formula which was adapted from Anderson in Hughes (2003: 102) where the scores of the five components are calculated or summed. Then, the score was converted in order to examine the students' writing score with the scoring classification of writing. In this case, the researcher signified the converted students' writing score by calculating or sums the

scores of five components, then dividing with amount of writing components, and then it was times with 10. Therefore, the converted scoring formula is presented aa follows:

$$\sum \times = \frac{\times 1 + \times 2 + \times 3 + \times 4 + \times 5}{N} \text{ x10}$$

Where:$\sum \times$ = the converted writing score for five components
x1 = Content
x2 = Organization
x3 = Mechanics
x4 = Vocabulary
x5 = Language Use
N= amount of writing components

(source: modified from Anderson in Hughes, 2003: 102)

3. Classifying the converted scores of the students' writing test

In order to classify the converted of the students' writing scores for each student both of experimental and control class, the researcher used the scoring classification category which was based on the scoring scale category for writing adapted from Salija (2004). The way of the researcher examined the scoring classification of writing was based on the calculation of the highest scoring scale, that is 100 (converted score of 10), is subtracted with the lowest scoring scale which is 10 (converted score of 1). Therefore, the score was 90. Because there are five categories of scoring scale, the score of 90 was divided by 5. Then, the result of the score was 18 which the score was referred as the range or interval score for each category of scoring classification from the lowest to highest scoring scale. Furthermore, the scoring classification of the students' writing score is presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Scoring Classification of Writing

No	Classification	Score

1.	Very Good	82 – 100
2.	Good	64 – 81
3.	Average	46 – 63
4.	Poor	28 – 45
5.	Very Poor	10 - 27

(Source: modified from salija,2004)

4. Examining and concluding the hypothesis testing of the research

In order to examine the hypothesis testing, the researcher used the five steps in hypothesis testing which were stated by Creswell (2008: 196-198), namely: (a) identify a null and alternative hypothesis; (b) set the level of significance or alpha level; (c) collect data; (d) compute the sample statistic; and (e) make a decision about rejecting or to reject the null hypothesis.

Referring to a significance level (or alpha level) in this research, it was typically set at (a) = 0.05 with two-tailed (2-tailed) test of significance. Moreover, in order to make a decision about rejecting or failing to reject the null hypothesis, the statistical test of 1-test analysis, that researcher computed by using SPSS program, was examined with the test of significance by consideration that was mentioned by comparing the resulting in a two-tailed p value with the level of significance (a) = 0.05. According to Creswell (2008: 198), if the p value is less than alpha, the null hypothesis is rejected; if it is greater than alpha, the null hypothesis is accepted. Then, the researcher concluded the result of hypothesis testing.

3.FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Findings

The Improvement of the Students' Writing

The findings reveal the improvement of the students' writing skill after conducting the treatments through using UVIOPro for an experimental group and using sequence pictures for a control group. These findings deal with the results of the students' writing improvement in terms of content, organization, and mechanics through the classification score, the mean score, standard deviation, and t-test analysis of pretest and post-test in the experimental and control groups.

a. The Classification Score, Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Writing in Pretest and Post-test

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Scores in Pretest and Post-test for Experimental and Control Groups in Term of Content

Table 3 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Score in Term of Content in Pretest and Post-test

Classifications	Score	Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Post-test		Pretest		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Very Good	82 – 100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Good	64 – 81	1	3.3	25	83.3	0	0	3	10
Average	46 – 63	2	6.7	5	16.7	9	30	23	76.7
Poor	28 – 45	14	46.7	0	0	7	23.3	4	13,3
Very Poor	10 – 27	13	43.3	0	0	14	46.7	0	0
	Total	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100

Based on the results in Table 2, the results of pretest reveal that most of the students in experimental group fall into poor and very poor classification before giving the treatments. On the other hand, in control group, the classification of the students' pretest score shows that the majority of the students are classified in very poor classification. Moreover, these results indicate that both of the groups still need to improve their writing skill in term of content. The students' writing skill in term of content is still poor.

Comparing with the results of the pretest, the students' scores of post-test in experimental and control groups in term of content show an improvement after giving the treatments. In experimental group, the majority of the students are categorized in good classification. Meanwhile, in control group, the majority of the students are categorized in average classification. Therefore, the improvement of content for the students' writing in experimental group increases from very poor and poor classification to good classification, while in control group, the improvement increases from very poor to average category. Besides, the results of the percentage of the students' writing score improvement, the results of the improvement can be also seen in the mean score and standard deviation of the students' writing scores improvement in term of content in Table 3.

Table 4. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Content in the Students Writing

No	Indicators	Exp. Group		Con. Group	
		Pretest	Post-test	Pretest	Post-test
1.	The ideas which are about the topic selected	2.63	7.92	3.13	5.93
2.	The ideas which are clearly stated	2.33	7.33	3.14	5.48

3.	The ideas which are clearly supported	3	7.21	3.32	5.38
4.	The ideas which are comprehensible	3.41	7.3	3.2	5.01
5.	The ideas which are well developed	3.54	7.44	3.03	4.9
6.	The ideas which are fluently expressed	3.31	7.28	3.16	4.93
	Total ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$)	18.22	44.48	18.98	31.63
	Mean Score ($\bar{X}$)	3.04	7.41	3.16	5.27
	SD	1.27	0.81	1.52	0.86

Table 4 indicates that the mean score of the improvement of content in the students' writing which deal with six indicators of measurement in order to examine the content of the students' writing. In term of content, the content should be clear to the readers and its content should be well unified and completed. The results of pretest indicate that the students have lack of the skill or ability in term of content. It is assumed that it happens because the students faced the difficulties to convey and develop their ideas. Consequently, the content of their writing is not clear, unified and complete. Therefore, generally, the ideas are not clearly stated, incomprehensible, lack of developing and non-fluently expressed.

Regarding to the results of post-test, each indicator of content in the students' writing both of the experimental and control groups get an improvement. It is revealed by the results of the mean score for each indicator in experimental group which are improved from very poor and poor categories to good category. Meanwhile, in control group the means score for each indicator which are improved from poor category to average category. It means that the students' writing skill gets improvement after giving the treatments.

Besides, the sum of the mean scores of the content in the students' writing both of the groups show the improvement where the mean score of pretest for experimental group is 3.04 which is categorized as poor classification. After giving the treatments, the mean score of post-test improves in good classification where it is 7.41. It means that the students' writing skill has improved from poor to good ability. On the other hand, the mean score of pretest in control group is 3.16; it is categorized as poor classification. Then, the mean score of post-test after giving the treatments improves to average classification that is 5.27. It means that the students' writing skill has improved from poor to average ability. In fact, the results show that the improvement in experimental group is greater or better than in control group. Therefore, it can be stated that using the UVIOPro provides the students to get more ideas in writing the descriptive text in order to construct the students to write more fluently.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Scores in Pretest and Post-test for Experimental and Control Groups in Term of Organization

Table 5. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Score in Term of Organization in Pretest and Post-test

Classifications	Score	Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Post-test		Pretest		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Very Good	82 – 100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Good	64 – 81	0	0	25	83.3	0	0	3	10
Average	46 – 63	4	13.3	5	16.7	8	26.7	21	70
Poor	28 – 45	12	40	0	0	6	20	6	20
Very Poor	10 – 27	14	46.7	0	0	16	53.3	0	0
	Total	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100

As shown in Table 5, the results reveal that the majority of the students' writing scores in pretest for experimental group are in very poor and poor classification. Meanwhile, in control group, the majority of the students' writing scores are also classified in very poor classification. Considering these results, it can be concluded that most of the students both of experimental and control groups are as low achievers. Therefore, it implies that both of the groups still need to improve their writing ability or skill, particularly in term of organization. On the other hand, the students' scores in post-test are better than in pretest. In this case, most of the students in experimental group have got the better improvement rather than control group which spread in high achievers who are categorized in good classification. Meanwhile, in control group, most of the students are categorized in average classification.

In the line with these results, it can be concluded that the improvement of organization in the students' writing in experimental group increases from very poor and poor classification to good category, while in control group, the improvement increases from very poor classification to average category.

Table 6. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Organization in the Students Writing

No	Indicators	Exp. Group		Con. Group	
		Pretest	Post-test	Pretest	Post-test
1.	The ideas are well organized	3.37	7.1	3.23	5.61
2.	The ideas are concise	2.93	7.14	3.2	4.87
3.	The ideas are cohesion	3.13	7.27	2.93	5.11
4.	The ideas are coherent	2.85	7.34	3.13	5
5.	The ideas are relevant to outline	2.7	7.42	2.94	5.2
6.	The ideas are presented in logical sequencing	2.73	7.26	3.16	5.23
	Total ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$)	17.71	43.53	18.59	31.02
	Mean Score ($\bar{X}$)	2.95	7.26	3.10	5.17
	SD	1.19	0.82	1.59	0.83

Organization in writing includes coherence, order of important, general to specific or specific to general, chronological order and spatial pattern. As shown in Table 6, the results of pretest indicate that the students seem lack of organization in their writing, where it revealed that the students feel difficult to organize their ideas into coherence, cohesion and chronological order. Generally, their writing showed that loosely organized of the ideas, inadequate cohesion and coherence of the ideas, a break out cohesion of few ideas, confuse and disconnection of the ideas, and lack of logical sequences of the ideas. Therefore, the ideas are not in the right order and not clear. Hence, the paragraphs are not organized chronologically.

Referring to Table 6, each indicator measurement of the organization in the students' writing both of the experimental and control groups shows an improvement. It is proved by the results of the mean score for each indicator in the experimental and control groups. In experimental group, the mean score of each component improves from very poor and poor classification to good classification. Meanwhile in control group, the mean score of each indicator also improves from very poor classification to average classification. Therefore, it can be stated that the students' writing skill in term of organization gets improvement after giving the treatments.

The results also reveal that the sum of the mean scores of organization component in the students' writing both of the groups show the improvement. The mean score of pretest in experimental group is 2.95, which is categorized as poor classification. After giving treatments, the mean score of post-test improves to good classification that is 7.26. It means that the students' writing skill in term of organization has improved from poor to good abilities. On the other hand, the mean score of pretest in control group is 3.10; it is categorized as poor classification. After giving the treatments, the mean score of post-test improves to average classification which is 5.17. It means that the students' writing skill improve from poor to average abilities. Therefore, the results show that the improvement in experimental group is better or greater than in control group. Furthermore, it can be concluded that using the UVIOPro is more effective to improve the students' writing skill in term of organization.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Scores in Pretest and Post-test for Experimental and Control Groups in Term of Mechanics

Table 7. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Score in Term of Mechanics in Pretest and Post-test

Classifications	Score	Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Post-test		Pretest		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Very Good	82 – 100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Good	64 – 81	1	3.3	8	26.7	1	3.3	1	3.3

Average	46 – 63	6	20	18	60	7	23.3	20	66.7
Poor	28 – 45	13	43.3	4	13.3	8	26.7	9	30
Very Poor	10 – 27	10	33.3	0	0	14	46.7	0	0
	Total	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100

Table 7 describes the results of the students' writing scores in pretest and post-test. Before giving the treatments, most of the students in experimental ad control groups are in low achiever category or their range score just spread from very poor and poor classifications. These results signify that the students' writing skill in terms of mechanics is still low and need to be improved. These results are proved by the percentage and frequency of the students' writing score in pretest and post-test. The results reveal that none of students who get score in very good classification both experimental and control groups. Then, there is the same score achieved in the pretest of experimental and in the pretest of control groups. There is 1 student (3.3%) who is categorized as good classification. Meanwhile, there are 8 students (26.7%) in the post-test experimental group and only 1 student (3.3%) who achieves good classification.

In addition, 6 students (20%) in the pretest of experimental and 7 students (23.3%) in the pretest are in good classification. Meanwhile, 18 students (60%) in the post-test of experimental and 20 students (66.7%) in the post-test of control achieve score in good classification. Then, 13 students (43.3%) in the pretest of experimental and 8 students (26.7%) in the pretest of control are in poor classification. Nevertheless, 4 students (13.3%) in the post-test of experimental and 9 students (30%) are categorized as poor classification. Moreover, there are 10 students (33.3%) in the pretest of experimental and 14 students (46.7%) in the pretest of control achieve score in very poor classification. After giving treatment, none of students achieve very poor classification both in the post-test of experimental and in the post-test control groups

Referring to the results of the percentage of the students' pretest and post-test in Table 7, it can be revealed that both groups show an improvement after conducting the treatments. The experimental group gets greater improvement rather than control group. The percentage of the students' writing scores improvement can be seen in the mean score and standard deviation which is described in Table 8.

Table 8. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Mechanics in the Students Writing

No	Indicators	Exp. Group		Con. Group	
		Pretest	Post-test	Pretest	Post-test
1.	Almost all words used in paragraph have correct punctuation	3.05	5.45	3.17	4.67
2.	Almost all words used in paragraph have correct capitalization	2.95	5.51	2.97	4.53
3.	Almost all words used in paragraph have correct spelling	4.01	6.81	3.57	5.61

Total ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$)	10.01	17.77	9.71	14.81
Mean Score ($\bar{X}$)	3.36	5.92	3.23	4.96
SD	1.35	1.02	1.64	0.90

Based on Table 8, there are three indicators of mechanics, namely almost words used in paragraph have correct punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The results show that each indicator of mechanics both experimental and control groups have got an improvement in post-test after giving the treatments. The mean scores of pretest for three indicators both groups are classified in poor classification. Meanwhile, in post-test, the mean scores both of experimental and control groups are classified in average classification. Besides, the total of mean scores of mechanics in pretest both of experimental and control group, which are 3.36 and 3.23, get poor classification while in post-test, the total mean scores in experimental and control groups, which are 5.92 and 4.96, are classified in average category. Therefore, it can be stated that the mean score of the students' pretest in experimental group is statistically the same as control group. It means that the mean score between experimental and control group is relatively the same when the variables have equal interval. Furthermore, the experimental and control groups have relatively the same baseline knowledge in writing, especially in terms of mechanics before treatments.

On the other hand, the mean score of experimental group is greater than control group (5.92 > 4.96). It signifies that after giving the treatments, the improvement of the students' writing skill in term of mechanics in experimental group is better than in control group. Therefore, it can be stated that the use of UVIOPro effectively improves the students' writing skill.

a. The Test of Significance (T-test) of the Students' Writing Improvement

In order to find out the significantly result of the students' writing skill improvement and the hypothesis testing, the researchers also present the results of the inferential analysis. The inferential analysis in this study includes gain-score analysis and test of significance for independent sample t-test for hypothesis testing.

Table 9. The Test of Significance for Content, Organization, and Mechanics Components of the Students' Writing Improvement

Test Statistics[a]

	gain Content	gain Organization	gain Mechanics
Mann-Whitney U	53.500	41.500	253.500
Wilcoxon W	518.500	506.500	718.500

Z	-5.865	-6.048	-2.912
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.004

a. Grouping Variable: Groups

Based on the results of data analysis for the Gain score for content, organization, and mechanics components of the students' writing improvement that is presented in Table 8, it shows that the results of the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in content is .000 that is less than (α) = 0.05 (.000 < 0.05). It means that there is statistically significant difference of mean score of the student's writing improvement in terms of content between experimental and control groups. In terms of organization, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is .000, that is less than (α) = 0.05 (.000 < 0.05). The result indicates that in terms of organization, there is a significant difference of mean score of the students' improvement. Besides, the result of the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in terms of mechanics is .000, that is also less than (α) = 0.05 (.000 < 0.05). This result indicates that there is a significant difference of mean score of the students' improvement in terms of mechanics.

Hence, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference of mean score of the students' writing improvement between experimental group which is taught by using the UVIOPro and control group which is taught by using sequence pictures. Therefore, the use of UVIOPro is more effective rather than the use of sequence pictures to improve the students' writing skill. In other words, the use of UVIOPro is effective to improve the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, and mechanics.

In order to examine the hypothesis testing of this research, inferential statistics analysis is used which applied independent sample t-test analysis. It is a test which is used to know or find out the significant difference between the result of the students' mean score for two groups that are experimental and control group. In this particular analysis along with the statistical analysis is carried out through the research, the statistical significance level is accepted to be sig. alpha level **(α) = 0.05** for the independent sample findings. Furthermore, the interpretation of the hypothesis testing is done by using the row t-test for equality of Means. If the t-test at *p* value (sign-2 tailed) is less than significant alpha level (**α=0.05),** it can be concluded the difference is significant. Meanwhile, If t-test at *p* value (sig-2 tailed) is greater than significant alpha level (**α=0.05),** it means that the difference is not significant. Therefore, the result of the independent sample t-test of the gain score for students' writing improvement is presented in table

Table 9 The result of independent sample t-test of the gain score for the students' writing improvement in experimental and control group.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
gain Final Score	Equal variances assumed	4.043	.049	-5.445	58	.000	-.21233	.03899	-.29038	-.13428
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.445	51.292	.000	-.21233	.03899	-.29060	-.13406

Based on the result of the data analysis as presented in table 8, it shows that the t-test is -5.445 at sig. (2-tailed)or p =.000, which is less than **α =0.05** (.000<0.05). In fact, the hypothesis testing reveals that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. It describes that the difference in the students' writing improvement of experimental and control groups is significant; which is indicated by the findings showing that experimental group is more significantly improved than control group. Therefore, it can be stated that there is a significant difference of mean score of the students' writing improvement between experimental group which is taught by using the UVIOPro and control group which is taught by using sequences pictures. Besides, the result also reveals that the use UVIOPro is more effective rathe than the use of sequence pictures to improve students writing skill. The improvement rate of the experimental group is significantly greater than the control group. Furthermore the researcher concludes that the use of UVIOPro is able to give greater contribution in teaching writing, especially in terms of five components writing. In other words, the use o UVIOPro is effective to improve the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and language use.

3.2. Discussion

In this section of this research, the researcher presents the theoretical arguments and further interpretation of the findings which are presented systematically based on the findings and based on the results of statistical analysis. This section reveals the interpretation of the findings which deals with the students' writing improvement in terms of five components, namely content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and language use.

The data that are presented in the findings are collected and analyzed with SPSS version 20.0. The data obtained from the pretest and post-test given to the experimental and control groups, as well as the subsequent mean score, standard deviation, gain score and t-test analysis. Prior to conducting the treatments, an independent sample t-test analysis is used to determine if there is a significant difference of the students' writing improvement that are taught through the use of

UVIOPro and the students' writing improvement that are not taught through the use of UVIOPro. Based on the previous section of the findings, it shows that using UVIOPro in teaching writing significantly improves the students' achievement. It is proved by the result of the students' score of pretest and post-test for each group. In this case, the mean score and standard deviation are analyzed.

Comparing with the students' pretest and post-test, the result of the pretest for both of the groups, experimental and control groups are almost the same level. The differences between the two groups can be seen from the mean score of pretest and post-test. In the experimental group, the mean score of the students' pretest is 32.02 and the post-test is 64.08. Meanwhile, in the control group, the mean score of the students' pretest is 32.16 and the post-test is 51.32. It means that the students' pretest and post-test scores for both groups are statistically different, where the mean score of pretest for control group was greater than experimental group before giving the treatments, where the result is 32.16> 32.02. However, after giving the treatments, there is a significant difference. The post-test result of experimental is greater than control group, where the result is 64.08> 51.32. In this case, both groups improve their achievement after giving the treatments. Furthermore, the improvement of experimental group is greater than the control group. The result indicates that the use of UVIOPro gave significant progress in order to improve the students' writing skill in terms of five components, namely content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and language use.

The students' improvement in writing is marked in the result of the post-test occurring in the both groups; experimental and control groups. However, the rate improvement of experimental group is significantly greater than control group. The comparison of the improvement of writing by both groups can be proved by analyzing post-test result. The result shows that the mean score of the students' post-test both the groups increase after giving the treatments. The scores between pretest and post-test of experimental group are 32.02 and 64.08. The students' achievement increases or improves from poor classification to good classification. Meanwhile, the pretest and post-test scores of control group are 32.16 and 51.32. It reveals that the students' achievement increases or improves from poor classification to average classification. Therefore, it can be stated that the scores of the two groups have got progress, whereas, the progress of experimental group is greater than control group. Furthermore, it indicates that there is a significant progress before and after giving the treatments, where the use of UVIOPro is more effective to improve the students' writing achievement.

By seeing the result of the students' pretest, the researcher assumes that the prior knowledge or the ability of the students in writing skill is still lack and low, particularly in terms of the five components of the writing, i.e., content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and language use. It is assumed that it happened causing some problems or difficulties in writing activities faced by the students, as it is mentioned by Yahya and Hashim (2013); there are five

categories of writing difficulties, such as comprehension and conception of ideas, composition, language accuracy and appropriate, vocabulary, and lack of time.

In the line with Yahya and Hashim (2013), the findings of the students' pretest reveal that students' writing ability both of experimental and control groups are still low and they are lack of mastery of the five components of the writing. They were proved by the result of the students' score of pretest both of the groups. The first one is the result of the content. In terms of content, Jacob, et al. in Hughes (2003) states that the content of writing should be clear to the readers and its content should be well unified and completed. From the data shown in Table 4.1, most of the students both of the experimental and control groups are in low classification, where in experimental group, there are 46.7% of the students who are in poor classification and 43.3% of them who are classified very poor. Meanwhile, in control group, there are 46,7% of the students who are classified as very poor, 23.3% of them who are classified in poor and 30% of them who are classified in average classifications. This result indicates that the students have lack of the skill or ability in terms of content. It is assumed that it happens because the students face the difficulties to convey and develop their ideas. Consequently, the content of their writing is not clear, unified and completed. Therefore, generally, the ideas are not clearly stated, incomprehensible, lack of developing and non-fluently expressed.

The second component is organization. Jacob, et al. in Hughes (2003) mention that organization in writing includes coherence, order of important, general to specific or specific to general, chronological order and spatial pattern. As shown in Table 4.3, most of the students in experimental and control groups are in low category in terms of the organization. In experimental group, there are 46.7% of the students who are in very poor classification and 40% of them who are in poor classification. Meanwhile, in control group, the majority of the students' writing scores are also classified in very poor classification where 53.3% of the students are classified in this category. This result indicates that they seem lack of skill of writing with regard to the organization, where it is assumed that the students feel difficult to organize their ideas into coherence, cohesion and chronological order. Generally, their writing shows that loosely organized of the ideas, inadequate cohesion and coherence of the ideas, a break out cohesion of few ideas, some logical sequences of the ideas, confuse and disconnection of the ideas, and lack of logical sequences of the ideas. Therefore, the ideas are in the right order and clear, and the paragraphs are not organized chronologically.

The third is mechanics. In terms of mechanics, the result presented in Table 4.5, most of the students both of experimental and control groups are in low classification, where in experimental group there are 43.3 % of the students who are in poor classification and 33.3% of them who are in very poor classification.

Meanwhile, in control group, there are 46.7% of the students who are in very poor classification. Based on these results, the students have lack of writing skill in terms of mechanics,

which they feel difficult to use due to capitalization, punctuation and spelling appropriately. As it is stated by Jacob, et al. in Hughes (2003), the use of mechanics is due to capitalization, punctuation and spelling appropriately. This aspect is very important since it leads readers to understand or recognize immediately what the writer means to express definitely. Referring to this statement, it is assumed that the result of students' pretest, generally, the common and frequently mistakes used by the students are using capitalization and punctuation inappropriately. It reveals that half of punctuation and capitalization are incorrect, even more than half of punctuation and capitalization are incorrect.

The four is vocabulary. In this case, vocabulary refers to the effective and appropriate use of words. Jacob, et al. in Hughes (2003) explain that one requirement of good writing always depends on the effective use of words. Effective use of words also deals with connotative or figurative language. Based on the result of the students' pretest presented in Table 4.7, it reveals that students' writing skill in terms of vocabulary both of experimental and control groups are low and lack of effective use of words in their writing. In experimental group, the majority of the students (53.3%) are classified in poor classification. Meanwhile, in control group, the majority of the students are classified in very poor and poor classifications which are 36.7% of them who are in poor and 33.3% of them who are in very poor classifications. Regarding to these results, it is assumed that generally, the students make mistakes in writing because of using inappropriate and ineffective words. It reveals that most of the students present their writing which half words of paragraph are not effective and inappropriate. Even, some of them use more than half words of paragraph are not effective and inappropriate in their writing.

The last component of writing is language use. Language use in writing involves correct usage of endpoints of grammar, such as verbs, nouns and agreements. Specific nouns and strong verbs give a reader a mental image of description. There are many opportunities for errors in the use of verbs, and mistakes in agreement are very common (Jacob, et al. in Hughes, 2003). As shown in Table 4.9, most of the students are still low and had lack of skill in term of language use for writing. It is proved by the result of the students' pretest both of the experimental and control groups. The result of the students' scores of pretest in experimental group is mentioned that there are 46.7% of the students who are in very poor classification and 40% of them who are in poor classification. Meanwhile, in control group, there are 70% of the students who are in very poor classification. Considering this result, it is assumed that it happens because the students generally make mistakes in using the correct and appropriate grammar or structure in their writing. They frequently use many errors in sentence construction rule, ie, simple and complex sentence constructions. Besides, they also make frequent errors in the use of verb, tense, pronoun, preposition, and mistakes in agreement are very common. Therefore, half structures of paragraph in their writing are incorrect; they are word order, pronouns, preposition, and tense.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study show that the use of UVIOPro in teaching writing is more effective than the use of sequences picture to improve the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, and mechanics. It is proved by the mean score of the students' post-test in terms of content, organization, and mechanics in experimental group is greater than control group. Besides, the results of t-test analysis for the students' score improvement in terms of content, organization, and mechanics in experimental and control groups reveal that Sig. (2-tailed) is less than (α) = 0.05 (i.e., .000<0.05).

In the light of the conclusion, the researchers draw some suggestions and recommendations. The teachers or lecturers are recommended to use the UVIOPro as one of the alternative ways to successfully improve the students' writing skill. In applying the use of UVIOPro, the teachers or lecturers should be creative and innovative in creating the teaching and learning media and materials in using this kind of multimedia program. Besides, the researchers suggest to the further researchers that they conduct more comprehensive researches and investigations on using UVIOPro in order to improve the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and language use. The researchers also suggest to the further researchers that they conduct some researches that maintain the use of UVIOPro to the other kinds of the writing text.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching principles*. P. Ed Australia.

Chandra, H. (2005). *Jam Belajar Ulead Video Studio 9 untuk Orang Awam*. Maxikom, Palembang.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative* (Vol. 7). Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Demir, C. (2018). Hedging and academic writing: an analysis of lexical hedges. *Journal of language and linguistic studies*, *14*(4), 74-92.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Merrill/Pearson.

Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching. *London/New York*, 401-405.

Jacobs, H. L. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach. English Composition Program*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc., Rowley, MA 01969.

Meer, S. H. (2016). Four different types of writing styles: Expository, descriptive, persuasive, and narrative.

Pardiyono, M. P. (2007). Pasti Bisa Teaching Genre-Based Writing. *Yogyakarta: Andi*.

Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. F. (2001). *Reading, Writing, & learnign in ESl*. New York, NY: Longman.

Pollard, L. (2008). Lucy Pollard's guide to teaching English. *A Book to Help You through Your First Two Years in Teaching. London: All Rights Reserved*.

Kasman, S. (2004). The Effect of Using Formal Outlines in Writing Exposition. *Unpublished Dissertation. Malang: Graduate Program, State University of Malang*.

Liu, L., & Jones, P. (2008, June). Create Web-based multimedia learning applications: Ideas for Web 2.0 and e-learning 2.0. In *EdMedia+ Innovate Learning* (pp. 4601-4606). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Yahya, M. Y., & Hashim, N. H. (2013). Difficulties and ways to improve english writing skills among postgraduate ESL Students. In *ICERI2013 Proceedings* (pp. 6245-6252). IATED.