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The objectives of this research were to find out (1) whether or not the use of video significantly improve the students’ argumentative writing achievement, and (2) whether or not the student interest to use video in writing argumentative essay.

This research applied a Quasi-Experimental design. It was designed into two groups: experimental group and control group. The population of this research was the second semester at eleventh year students of SMA 9 Makassar in academic year 2016/2017. The researcher used a cluster random sampling by applying a lottery technique to take the samples. The data of this research were collected through writing test, pretest and posttest.

The statistical results of the findings showed that the mean score of posttest for the experimental group was 72.82, while the mean score of posttest for the control group was 46.56. It means that the mean score of the experimental group was greater than the control group, and the use of video in teaching argumentative writing was effective to improve the students’ writing skill. Moreover, the students more pleasure and interested in writing their arguments using video than other media.
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1. **Introduction**

Writing is one of the way to express and make message in written for a reader. Through writing, people can describe things and can get information by reading message because writing is very important not only from its role but also from its useful and contribution for human life development.

There are many kinds of writing, such as: narrative, recount, exposition argumentative and etc. It seems that argumentative writing is more difficult than other topics requires to be well armed with strong and convincing arguments concerning one of the chosen strategy for argumentative essay. Based on these phenomena, one media of teaching argumentative essay through video is significantly improving students argumentative writing achievement. Based on the background above, the researcher formulated the research questions as follows:

1. Does the use of video significantly improve the students’ skill in writing argumentative essay?
2. Are the students interested to use video in writing argumentative essay.
3. **Literature Review**

**2.a Argumentative Essay**

Argumentative essay is attemps to persuade a reader to adopt a certain point of view or to take a particular action. In other words, argumentative essay is a composition, the art of writing, in which the writer give reason for againts something, especially with the aim of persuading. Argumentative essays look at an idea or an issue and present each side while making a case for one side in particular.

**2.b Video as Instructional**

Video is recognized by most educators as powerful communications medium which, in combination with other learning resources and instructional strategies, can perform a vital role in modern education. Essentially, a video by itself is unlikely to be more effective for teaching information than a book or programmed learning device on the topic. Video as instructional strategies is a communications medium which in combination with other learning resources.

1. **Research Method**

This research applied quasi experimental method using two groups’ namely pretest and posttest design. The population of this research were the eleventh year students of SMA Negeri 9 Makassar in academic year 2016/2017. The sample of this research has been selected through cluster random sampling. The data were analyzed quantitatively by applying descriptive and inferential statistics.

1. **Findings and Discussion**

**4.a Findings**

This research was conducted at SMA Negeri 9 Makassar. Data were collected by writing test with pretest and posttest, the researcher found that the distributions of the mean score of the students’ argumentative writing which deals with five components, namely content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary and language use. Each component of argumentative writing both of experimental and control groups got an improvement.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Argumentative Essay Writing Score in Terms of Content in Posttest

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NO | Classification | Score | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
|   |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |
| 1 | Very Good | 82 - 100 | 3 |  |  | 8.6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 64 - 81 | 16 |  |  | 45.7 |  | 3 |  | 9.3 |
| 3 | Average | 46 - 63 | 16 |  |  | 45.7 |  | 14 |  | 44 |
| 4 | Poor | 28 - 45 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 15 |  | 47 |
| 5 | very poor | 10 - 27 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|   |   | Total  | 35 |  |  | 100 |  | 32 |  | 100 |

In posttest of experimental group, there were 3 students (86%) who achieved very good classification, 16 students (45.7%) who achieved good classification and 16 students (45.7%) who achieved average classification.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Argumentative Writing Score in Terms of Organization in Posttest

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NO | Classification | Score | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| Frequency | Percent | Frequency |  Percent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Very Good | 82 - 100 | 3 |  | 8.7 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | Good | 64 - 81 | 18 |  | 51.4 |  | 5 |  | 15.6 |  |
| 3 | Average | 46 - 63 | 11 |  | 31.4 |  | 15 |  | 46.8 |  |
| 4 | Poor | 28 - 45 | 2 |  | 5.7 |  | 12 |  | 37.5 |  |
| 5 | very poor | 10 - 27 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|   |   | Total  | 35 |  | 100 |  | 32 |  | 100 |  |

None of students got very poor category. Otherwise, in control group none of the students got very good score, there were 5 students (15.6%) who achieved good classification, 15 students (46.8%) could reach average category and 12 students (37.5%) in the posttest of control group in poor classification.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Argumentative Writing Score in Terms of Mechanics in Posttest.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NO | Classification | Score | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Very Good | 82 – 100 |  | 7 |  | 20 |  0 |  |  | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 64 – 81 |  | 27 |  | 77.1 |  8 |  |  | 25.0 |
| 3 | Average | 46 – 63 |  | 1 |  | 2.8 |  8 |  |  | 25.0 |
| 4 | Poor | 28 – 45 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 15 |  |  | 46.8 |
| 5 | very poor | 10 – 27 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 3.1 |
|   |   | Total  |  | 35 |  | 100 | 32 |  |  | 100 |

There were 7 students (20%) could reach very good classification, 27 students (77.1%) who achieved good classification, and 1 student (2.8%) got average category. There were 8 students (25%) who were categorized as good classification and there were also 8 students (25%) achieved average classification. Nevertheless, 15 students (46.8%) who achieved poor classification.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students Argumentative Essay Writing Score in Terms of Vocabulary in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NO | Classification | Score | Experimental Group |  Control Group |
| Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Very Good | 82 – 100 |  12 |  |  34.2 |  | 1 |  | 3.1 |  |
| 2 | Good | 64 – 81 | 18 |  | 51.4 |  | 3 |  | 9.3 |  |
| 3 | Average | 46 – 63 | 5 |  | 14.2 |  | 11 |  | 34.3 |  |
| 4 | Poor | 28 – 45 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 17 |  | 53.1 |  |
| 5 | very poor | 10 – 27 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 3.21 |  |
|   |   | Total  |  35 |  | 100 |  | 32 |  | 100 |  |

 The results reveal that in experimental group there were 12 students (34.2%) could reach very good classification, 18 students (51.4%) who achieved good classification and 5 students (14.2%) who achieved average classification. None of students got poor and very poor category. Otherwise, in control group there was 1 of 32 students (3.1%) could reach very good classification. There were 3 students (9.3%) who achieved good classification and 11 students (34.3%) got average category.

The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Argumentative Essay Writing score in Terms of Language Use in Posttest.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NO | Classification | Score | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Very Good | 82 – 100 |  8 |  |  22.8  |  |  0 |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | Good | 64 – 81 | 23 |  | 65.7 |  | 2 |  | 6.2 |  |
| 3 | Average | 46 – 63 | 1 |  | 2.8 |  | 12 |  | 37.5 |  |
| 4 | Poor | 28 – 45 | 1 |  | 2.8 |  | 17 |  | 53.1 |  |
| 5 | very poor | 10 – 27 | 2 |  | 5.7 |  |  1 |  | 3.1 |  |
|   |   | Total  | 35 |  | 100 |  | 31 |  | 100 |  |

The fact shows that 8 of 35 students (22.8%) could reach very good category score. 23 students (65.7%) who achieved good classification. Nevertheless, there was 1 student (2.85) who got average category, 1 students in poor classification and 2 students (5.7%) were categorized very poor classification. Besides, in control group none of students could reach very good classification, 2 students (6.2%) who achieved good classification and 12 students (37.5%) who got average classification.

Besides, in order to know the students’ improvement on their argumentative writing skill, the results can also be seen in the descriptive analysis of the mean score and standard devision. The improvement is marked by the results of the posttest which are difference from pretest in both of experimental and control groups. The researcher presents the mean score and standard deviation of the improvement of the students’ argumentative writing in pretest and posttest.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NO | The Components of Writing | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| Pretest | Posttest | Pretest | Posttest |
| 1 Content | 2.45 | 6.25 | 2.46 | 4.59 |
| 2 | Organization | 2.84 | 6.64 | 2.71 | 4.98 |
| 3 | Mechanics | 2.89 | 7.61 | 2.65 | 4.92 |
| 4 | Vocabulary | 2.81 | 7.35 | 2.42 | 4.59 |
| 5 | Language Use | 2.67 | 9.06 | 2.67 | 4.35 |
|  Total (**∑**) 13.66 36.91 12.91 23.43 |
|  Mean of Converted score (X) 27.32 72.82 25.82 46.86 |
|  |

The table above descibed of the mean score of the students’ argumentative writing which deals with five components, namely content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary and language use. Each component of argumentative writing both of experimental and control groups got an improvement. In experimental group, the mean score for each component of the writing improved from poor classification to average and good classifications even few of them were in very good classification. The improvement of content were in average classification, while the improvement of organization, mechanics and vocabulary were in good classification. Moreover, language use were in very good classification. Meanwhile, in control group, the mean score for five components improve from poor classification to average classification.

Besides, the total of the mean scores of the students’ argumentative writing both of experimental and control groups, which were 27.32 and 25.82, were classified in poor classification. In fact, it can be stated that the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group is nearly same as control group. On the other hand, after giving the treatments, the total of mean scores of posttest both of the groups show an improvement. In experimental group, the mean score of posttest was 72.82, which categorized in good classification. Meanwhile, in control group, the mean score of posttest was 46.86 which categorized in average classification. It means that the improvement of the students’ argumentative writing in experimental group is greater than in control group where the improvement increases from poor to good classification. Therefore, there was a significant difference of the improvement of the students’ argumentative writing scores between the students who were given treatments by using the video than the students who were given treatments by using sequence pictures. Futhermore, it can be stated that the use of video effectively improve the students’ argumentative writing skill.

In addition, the researher presented the statistical significant difference of the students’ argumentative writing improvement on pretest and posttest both of experimental and control groups can be seen in statistical

**4.b Discussion**

The interpretation which deals with students’ argumentative writing in terms of five components, namely content, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and language use. Comparing with the students’ pretest and posttest, the result of the pretest for both of the groups. The differences between the two groups can be seen from the mean score of the students’ pretest was 27.32 and 25.82 while the posttest was 72.82 and 46.86.

1. **Conclusion and suggestion**

**5.a Conclusion**

 Based on the findings and discussion, the results show the use of video in teaching writing is more effective. The students’ score in each component was improved and it can be seen from the results of student’s post-test.

**5.b Suggestions**

1. To the teachers should be creative and innovative in teaching and learning process by using video as a media in improving the student’s ability, particularly in argumentative writing.
2. To the next researchers to conduct some research by using video as an instructional media to the other kinds of writing text.
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