# PRISMA 2020 Main Checklist

| **Topic** | **No.** | **Item** | **Location where item is reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TITLE** |  |  |  |
| **Title** | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | - The Power of YouTube Videos in Teaching EFL Listening Skills at the Secondary Level in Bangladesh |
| **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. | - page 5 |
| **METHODS** |  |  |  |
| **Eligibility criteria** | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | -page 9 |
| **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. | -page 9 |
| **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. | - |
| **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. | -page 9 |
| **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. | - It was explored that most of the teachers (75%) used this digital materials in the class to varied extent; and 25% teachers occasionally used YouTube in their classes.  Maximum of the teachers (60 %) confirmed that the school did not have technological and internet facilities to operate  50% of the teachers disclosed in the interview that they did not have proper knowledge, skills, and training on the use of modern devices and digital contents in the class.  t was found that the participants T1, T2, T5, T7, T8, T11 and T12 used YouTube videos in the listening class at least once a week covering 15-25 minutes in each class; T7, T9, and T10 confirmed that they used YouTube videos 2/3 times in a month covering maximum 60 minutes (1 hour); and T3, T4,and T6,  It was discovered that teachers irregularly used the YouTube using their Laptop or mobile. A small number of teachers used multimedia projector to show the videos.  The interview found that 66% teachers used the YouTube using their own devices, such as laptop, Smart-phone, and internet connections.  The interview participants of the study commented that excellent educational contents tremendously could benefit the learners. Furthermore, students certainly gain knowledge as well as listening skills because YouTube videos makes the learning situation in the classroom more enjoyable, motivating, interesting, creative, cooperative and productive. The students tend to be excited to complete the task given by the teacher when YouTube is applied to their listening subjects.  Page 13-19 |
| **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 examines students' positive attitudes toward using YouTube videos to improve listening comprehension in academic settings. Teachers recognize the tool's value in alleviating student anxiety. The selection of videos should consider proficiency levels, cultural context, and lesson objectives. In Bangladesh, this study serves as a pioneer, offering insights for future research and suggesting innovative approaches to teaching and learning. |
|  | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | - However, there are some limitations to this study as the study did not cover the activities that happened in the classroom such as the process of negotiation and collaborative work. This limitation is due to the nature of the type of research that is being conducted and is not in control of the researcher. The findings would be more dependable if classroom observation could be conducted as a tool. |
| 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | - |
| 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | - Research should be conducted in the future to investigate the same experiment on a mixed gender population on a larger scale. |
| **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. | - |

The present study aimed to investigate how different YouTube videos would develop English listening skills of the students at the secondary level in Bangladesh. The study was conducted in the mixed-method approach. The study employed in-depth interviews, a pre-test a post-test, and a questionnaire survey to collect relevant data. The participants of the study were 12 secondary (EFL) teacher teaching English, and75students studying at the secondary level. The quantitative data of the questionnaire survey, pre-test, and post-test were analysed through descriptive and inferential statistical methods. On the other hand, the qualitative data were analysed through the constant comparative and inductive methods. The findings showed that both learners and teachers had a positive attitude towards the use of YouTube videos as a means of developing listening comprehension. It was explored that the experimental group outperformed the control group in the listening performance. The limitation of the study is the small sample size that can hardly be generalized to a greater population. The findings would be more dependable if classroom observation could be conducted as a tool.
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