# PRISMA 2020 Main Checklist

| **Topic** | **No.** | **Item** | **Location where item is reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TITLE** |  |  |  |
| **Title** | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | - THE USE OF YOUTUBE TO SUPPORT EFL STUDENT'S LISTENING SKILLS |
| **ABSTRACT** |  |  |  |
| **Abstract** | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist |  |
| **INTRODUCTION** |  |  |  |
| **Rationale** | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | - |
| **Objectives** | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | - investigates how YouTube Video is a teaching tool to improve students' listening skills. |
| **METHODS** |  |  |  |
| **Eligibility criteria** | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | - |
| **Information sources** | 6 | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | - |
| **Search strategy** | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | - |
| **Selection process** | 8 | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - |
| **Data collection process** | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - page 4 (5) |
| **Data items** | 10a | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | - |
|  | 10b | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | - |
| **Study risk of bias assessment** | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - |
| **Effect measures** | 12 | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | - |
| **Synthesis methods** | 13a | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item 5)). | - |
|  | 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | - |
| 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | - |
| 13d | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | - |
| 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | - |
| 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | - |
| **Reporting bias assessment** | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | - |
| **Certainty assessment** | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | - |
| **RESULTS** |  |  |  |
| **Study selection** | 16a | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | - |
|  | 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | - |
| **Study characteristics** | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | - |
| **Risk of bias in studies** | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | - |
| **Results of individual studies** | 19 | For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. | - Regarding the EFL Students’ Listening before Using YouTube, the data was taken from Meeting 1, where students did their listening test without using video. This data aims to know how linguistic advantage and non-linguistic students’ advantage in listening before using video  Moreover, regarding the EFL Students’ Listening after Using YouTube, the data is from Meeting 2 to Meeting 5, where students did their listening test using YouTube video as authentic material. This data aims to know how far students explore using YouTube videos in listening practice  The linguistic aspect starts elaborating how EFL students got some advantages from using YouTube in their listening practice. According to Otte (2006), as cited in Abbasian et al. (2016), linguistics is the effect that influences students’ achievement. Based on the result of class observation, each student showed an improvement of score in every meeting. There were three sub-skills in listening practice questions: listening for main ideas, listening for details, and listening for inferring meaning.  Page 6-8 |
| **Results of syntheses** | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | - |
|  | 20b | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | - |
| 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | - |
| 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | -- |
| **Reporting biases** | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | - |
| **Certainty of evidence** | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | - |
| **DISCUSSION** |  |  |  |
| **Discussion** | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | - This study confirms YouTube's effectiveness in improving students' listening skills, providing real-world language exposure. Linguistic benefits include familiar language use and comprehension through gesture interpretation. Non-linguistically, YouTube motivates and engages students, enhancing interest and achievement in listening skills. Despite advantages, challenges include difficulty understanding diverse accents and controlling speech speed. Overall, YouTube proves beneficial for language learning, fostering proficiency, cultural understanding, and learner motivation. |
|  | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | - Due to the limited time spent and limited participants in this study, future studies can have more time and more participants to get a more profound result. |
| 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | - |
| 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | - Besides, future studies can further explore the benefits, problems, and challenges of using YouTube in other English skills to reveal different and essential results. |
| **OTHER INFORMATION** |  |  |  |
| **Registration and protocol** | 24a | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | - |
|  | 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | - |
| 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | - |
| **Support** | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | - |
| **Competing interests** | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | - |
| **Availability of data, code and other materials** | 27 | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | - |

Authentic material in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom, particularly in listening, encourages students to apply actual language or authentic speech. In this digital era, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) plays a pivotal role for the teacher's resources to support the teaching-learning process in the classroom. The teacher can find free resources on the Internet by browsing Google, Yahoo, and YouTube. Using YouTube videos can improve students' listening skills as it brings many benefits to learners. YouTube is a tool of authentic material to support the student to focus more on listening. The teacher needs to encourage students' motivation in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, this study investigates how YouTube Video is a teaching tool to improve students' listening skills. There were eight participants from the English Department in a private university in Jakarta. The data was collected through class observation and interviews to observe EFL students' progress in the learning process of listening. This study revealed that YouTube video benefits EFL learners, such as improving students' confidence, enjoying the learning process, making the learning process more fun, and increasing students' interest in learning.
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