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ABSTRAK

Abstract: Investigating the effect of using Youtube videos toward student’s writing descriptive text across student’s learning styles is the objective of this research. The research is quasi-experimental factorial research. Non-randomized sampling technique was applied in this research. The sample of the research were 10th grade of Multimedia 1 class student. The Instrument used in this research were pretest and posttest as means to measure students’ writing achievement, and questionnaire as means to identify students’ learning styles. Two way Anova (Analysis of Variance) was used to analyze the data. It was found that the achievement of students who were taught using Youtube videos were higher than the students who were not taught by using Youtube videos. Writing achievement of visual learning style students were better than auditory learning style students in experimental class. It was also found that the significant value of interaction between the usage Youtube videos and student writing achievement was .04. The significant level was less than .05 (04< .05). However, learning style has no effect to writing achievement.

ABSTRAK: Meneliti pengaruh penggunaan video YouTube terhadap prestasi menulis siswa descriptif siswa dihambat dengan gaya belajar mereka adalah tujuan dari penelitian ini. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuasi eksperimental. Sampel non acak diterapkan dalam penelitian ini. Sampel dari penelitian adalah siswa kelas 10 Multimedia. Instrument yang dipakai dalam penelitian ini adalah pretest dan posttest sebagai alat mengukur prestasi menulis siswa dan angket sebagai alat mengidentifikasi gaya belajar siswa. Two way Anova digunakan untuk menganalisa data. Ditemukan bahwa prestasi siswa yang diajar menggunakan video YouTube lebih baik prestasinya daripada siswa yang tidak menggunakan video YouTube. Prestasi menulis siswa yang belajar visual lebih baik daripada siswa yang belajar audio. Level signifikan kurang dari .05 (04< .05). Akan tetapi, learning style tidak berpengaruh kepada prestasi menulis.

INFO ARTIKEL

Kata kunci:
youtube videos;
learning styles;
descriptive text;
video Youtube;
gaya belajar;
teks deskriptif

Alamat Korespondensi:
Rakhmad Felanie
Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Universitas Negeri Malang
Jalan Semarang 5 Malang
E-mail: fel4ni.80@gmail.com.

Four skills that should be mastered by the students: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Writing promotes students’ ability to generate their ideas, to communicate words, sentences, paragraph, and to increase the awareness of using appropriate grammar and words. The acquisition of vocabulary influences students writing skill in generating ideas. A student who has low vocabulary will have difficulty in generating ideas. In producing a proper essay, correct word selection has to be considered by the writer (Nik et al., 2010).

In Indonesia, English has been taught from Junior high school to University. English becomes an important subject to study. However, Indonesian students consider English as a difficult subject. English teachers are demanded to be creative and create the process of teaching and learning fun, interesting and match to the target of the lesson. In writing, students take much time to brainstorm ideas and to generate more ideas. It makes writing process slow and difficult for them. The problem gets worse when the students should consider the proper word and correct grammar to write their writing composition. The right choice of word and grammar are important to help readers understand the content of the composition. Then, students elaborate the ideas to a good text. Kane (2000) states that the important elements in writing are grammar, vocabulary, spelling, organization, and content.

Those problems also happened to students of SMK Negeri 1 Amuntai. The students needed much time to find the right ideas to write an essay. The students often opened dictionary to find a word that is suitable for the sentence in their composition. It indicated the limitation of vocabulary they acquired. If they did not bring a dictionary or could not find the word on their
dictionary, they would ask their friend. Their friend told the word. The students then wrote the word in their composition. Sometimes the word that is written by the students was not the word that their friend refers to. It means that the students had problem with spelling after they got the ideas to write a sentence. So, they often directly translated Indonesian sentences into English. Then, students had to combine a sentence to another. Incorrect punctuation, preposition or conjunction was found on their composition.

Regarding the problems above, it is necessary to find a solution to be utilized in the learning process of writing to improve their writing ability. Roger et al (2003, as cited in Purna, 2014) state the teachers have to set their teaching appropriate to the class, organize their class systematically, and exciting. Appropriate means that teacher prepares and selects materials of teaching to establish teaching process that cover the target of the lesson. In writing a descriptive text, if the target of the lesson is student can compose a short descriptive text of historical places in not less than 200 words, teacher should try to make the class exciting by preparing interesting materials and giving fun activity that aims to pursue the target of the lesson. Organizing the classroom systematically means that the teacher should know for every activity that students will do during the lesson. The teacher can predict what each students’ behaviour if they work individually or in group. The teacher knows each of his/her student’s character. If they work in group, they will solve the problem together, but the class might be noisy because they tend to chat or play around. The teacher should also consider the techniques she/he uses in teaching in order to make the atmosphere of the classroom exciting.

In favour of making the teaching of English exciting, the teacher can use technology. Internet is part of the technology of information that can be used in the teaching and learning activity. One of the Internet contents which is well known and used by many people is YouTube. YouTube was introduced in 2005, it is a place where anyone could record and share their own videos for free (Terantino, 2011). Millions of people all over the world view YouTube every day. Entertainment, news, and educational are the purpore of it content. YouTube shares a variety of videos with many kinds of themes and languages. Nejati (2010) cite in alwehaibi (2015) states that everybody can listen to all kinds of spoken language on YouTube, it has unlimited resource for language acquisition/learning.

YouTube is an application which gives opportunity for everyone in the world who wants to share his/her videos. Youtube for Press mentioned that almost one-third of all people on the Internet use YouTube. There are 10 to 20 hours of video footage which were posted to Youtube every minute (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010:59). It was reported by Kaplan and Haenlein (2010:59) that 50% of YouTubers login the website weekly. The videos were posted by 52% youtuber who were 18—34 years old. Thus it can be assumed that YouTube videos are easy to access and youngsters love to access it. (Fleck et al., 2014) conducted a survey on 85 psychology students consisting of 19 males and 66 females with the age of 17—46 years. The study found that 80.7% of students stated the video were helpful for academic purposes and 8.2% students did not agree with the idea, while 97.3% of students said that Youtube made them enjoy all the activities in the classroom. It can be concluded that Youtube promotes student learning motivation.

YouTube shares various videos from all over the world. Some of videos are made by native English speakers. It is worth to use it. Video serve picture, motion and audio at the same time. It gives listener multiple form of comprehensible input. Krashen (1985) as it is cited in (Whiting & Granoff, 2010) stated that multiple form of comprehensible input facilitate acquisition better than a single mode. Video has audio and visual component that make English easier to understand. Students understand the concept of the English dialogue on the video without understanding all the words and structures. (Harmer, 2007) explains that sound, moving picture were produce on the video; the speaker can be seen, the body movement gives hints as to meaning, the location, etc. visual can states background information of the story. It is supported by (Meskill, 1996) “Video is considered as more prominent, more powerful and more comprehensible than any other media used in teaching second language.” Video also motivates student in learning language (Keihaniyan, 2013). The use of video can motive students and attract their attention. (Çakir, 2006) also stated that video use was preferred by language teachers. The reasons were; it motivates students, takes the real world into the classroom, contextualizes language naturally and enables them to experience authentic language in a controlled environment.

As we know, many Youtube videos are made by English native speakers and not intended to be used as a teaching and learning media. It is in line with education term authentic material; (Morrow, 1977) defined authentic material as a “stretch of real language, produced by a real speaker or writer for a real audience and designed to carry a real message of some sort”. Richards (2001) stated that photographs, choice of video, and other teaching resources which are not made for pedagogical purposes as authentic materials, (Brown, 2015) mentioned one of authentic materials is video. The video provided language input in a meaningful context. Therefore, YouTube is one of authentic materials that can be used in teaching English.

Utilizing YoutTube video can help students to study English easily. (Berk, 2009) manage a study on multimedia teaching with video clips, TV, movies, YouTube, and movie in college classroom. He found that the use of clips could help student learning English better. (Fleck et al., 2014) found that students associated Youtube with fun, entertaining, beneficial for learning, and engaging. With Youtube, students and teacher could thoroughly examine any of these scenes with a deep focus on speech cadences, tonal shifts, grammatical nuances, conversational roles, or almost any other topic currently being examine in class (Watkins & Wilkins, 2011). (Oddone, 2011) used videos from Youtube and websites in the classroom. Low-level learners were taught other subject through English using YouTube video as audiovisual material. He found that the students increased their performances in language, learning skill, and self-confident.
The other consideration of using YouTube video is; it is easy to use. Teacher can only ask the student to open and watch the video. The video can be played, paused and repeated as much as teachers want to make their student understand the story on the video. Then, give the student task or exercise based on the videos they watch. We can even download and save the video for the later usage.

Some other previous studies use video as medium of teaching and learning in the classroom. Alwehaibi (2015) in his study found a significant positive effect of using Youtube videos on EFL students’ learning. Stated that experimental class was highly motivated to watch, read, write, discuss, interact and participate in the diverse activities around the learning process. The learning outcome of the students of experimental class was significantly higher than control class. (Savitrie, 2012) found 70% of student of nine graders of SMP Negeri 12 Jember felt convenient and enjoyed the lesson with the help of YouTube videos in English teaching and learning. They feel familiar with the use of English because it is a language used in common conversation that they listen and read on the radio, television or Internet. In the end, it made them to be more active.

Study of using video as media on English skill are also conducted by several researchers. Alqahtani (2014) investigate the impact of YouTube videos as a teaching media to improve listening comprehension skills of Saudi EFL students. The third secondary grade of Al Arqam Saudi Private Female School were the subjects of the study. There were 26 students are taken as sample. The experimental class consisted of 14 students who were taught by using YouTube and the control class consisted of 12 students who used traditional audio method. YouTube listening/viewing activity had significant effect on the listening comprehension skills of experimental class subject. This activity was regarded as a motivating factor deepens understanding of the foreign language.

In Indonesian context, (Martì, 2011) in her study found that there was a significant improvement of students of MTs Negeri Jember II who were taught listening by using YouTube. The average score of the cycle 1 was 69.4 while the average score of the cycle 2 was 78.1. There were 21 students out of 40 who got score higher than or equal to 70. Syati (2016) set students into experimental class and control class. Students who were taught using YouTube videos as an experimental class while the students who were taught using pictures as control class. The result of the study was students’ writing performance of control class was better than experimental class. Purna (2014) found that using video in classroom activity improve the writing descriptive text ability and make the lesson interesting to the students.

Although Youtube video is beneficial, there is also limitation that should be put as consideration. Pigg (2017) in her study of ninth grade of Finish students found that using YouTube in English classroom took time and needed adequate technical equipment. Bastos & Ramos (2009) found that in order of learning, the teacher must prepare the beamers or computers in advance. The appliances didn’t work sometime. The other finding was all videos that were founded on YouTube had to be sort first in order to fit the lesson and the level of student.

As previously stated, the researcher would investigate the effect of using YouTube videos across learning style. (Brown, 2000) defines “learning styles as the manner in which individuals perceive and process information in learning situations”. “Learning style is defined as the characteristic cognitive, affective, social, and physiological behaviours that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment”. (Lightbown & Spada, 2017). There are three types of learning style, namely Visual, Auditory and Kinesthetic. A Student who learns by using their eyes is called visual learning student and a student who learns by using their ear is called auditory learning style student. Since YouTube videos serve picture and sound, YouTube videos may promote student performance as it covered visual and auditory student.

Bobbi & Hernacki (2016) were covering the characteristic of visual and auditory learning style students. Visual learners are the students who are neat, orderly and good in performance and appearance. They talk vastly and are good planners and managers. They are diligent and good in reading speed. They write meaninglessly while talking on the phone and in meetings, memorize using visual association and are usually not bothered by noise. Visual learners prefer reading to listening, prefer demonstrations to speech, prefer art to music, and remember what is seen than what is heard. The drawbacks of visual learners are that they know what need to be said but are difficult to choose the diction. Remembering verbal instructions is a problem for them. They often ask for help from others to repeat the instructions. The other drawbacks are that they are easy to forget to convey verbal message to others and often answer questions with short answers ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

Auditory learning style students are characterized by talking to own self while working, making lips movement when reading, repeating and imitating the tone and sound of others. They have difficult in writing but great at telling stories and usually fluent speakers. They like talking, discussing, and explaining something at length. However auditory learning style students are easy to be disturbed by noise and having problem with work that involve visualization. They think it is better to spell aloud than to write it down. They prefer reading aloud to listening, prefer music to art, like learning by listening and remembering what was discussed rather than seeing. Oral jokes are more interesting for them than reading comics.

Some researchers had conducted study on student learning style related to teaching and learning English. Kassaian (2007) found that visual students who are taught visually achieve better than student who are taught aurally in retaining vocabulary. On the other hand, auditory students who are taught aurally did not show better vocabulary retention. The greatest academic achievement is achieved by visual learning style student of Payame Noor University, Iran (Kia et al., 2009). Peacock (2001) found that auditory were the most chosen learning style by students but the teachers were not chosen it as theirs teaching style. Mismatch between teaching style and leaning style happened. Based on the study found that 70% of student unhappy if
the teaching style is not match with their learning style. Based on the result of study above it can be inferred that matching teacher teaching style with student learning style is important. Every student has a different capability in processing information. Each of them has own way to process information easily. It means that they have different learning styles. Knowing students’ learning style will help the teacher to serve supportive environment to student in learning and ease student to absorb the information. Lightbown & Spada (2017) stated that learning style is one factor that interfered the success of student in language learning. Awareness of students’ learning styles differences will assist teachers to adjust their lessons properly and synchronize to the conditions (Coffield et al., 2004). One way to cover these matters is using Youtube video as media of teaching and learning.

YouTube videos were rarely used as a medium of teaching and learning in the classroom activity at schools in Hulu Sungai Utara region, particularly SMKN 1 Amuntai. The teacher used picture, audio material and text that is available on the text book as medium of teaching English. In writing lesson, the teacher showed it as example or a task to be accomplished by the students. Then, the teacher asked them to write their own text. All media were pick or made to fit the curriculum that were obligated by government. This activity was common in every English class. It made teaching learning writing English uninteresting. Therefore, the students were bored with the activity. On other hand YouTube video is made by native speaker. The conversation or the sentences that are used in video are common conversation of English nowadays. The teacher can choose a video from various sources. The students will know the content of the spoken text more easily by listening to the sound and watch the moving picture than only hearing the sound from the audio material. It will be easier for them to write their own Essay because the video give information and ideas to compose an essay. The writer believes that using YouTube video will increase student writing achievement better than using non video material.

The stated possibility leads the writer to investigate whether students’ learning style is accommodated by YouTube videos, significantly affect their writing and to find whether there is any difference achievement of visual and auditory students in writing descriptive text. Furthermore, the study about the effect of technology especially YouTube video in writing as viewed from students’ learning style is rarely investigated. Based on the previous theories, empirical evidence and considerations, the researcher was conducted a study.

METHODS

This study was aimed to investigate the effect of YouTube videos on students’ writing descriptive text across learning style whether or not it has significant effect on the students’ writing achievement. In order to investigate the effect of YouTube videos, a Quasi experimental research was conducted to find out the students’ writing achievement. Based on the target of the study, there are two independent variables and one dependent variable. The former contains from active and attribute variable. The active variable consists of YouTube video and non-video, while visual and Auditory learning style student as attribute variable.

Since this study was conducted in the school which the level of the students was divided into grade X, XI, and XII. Samples of students were not be chosen randomly from several classes of the same level. It could only be done by randomly choosing two classes of the same level that were already set up by the school. Then two of the classes were determined as experimental and control class.

This study not only investigate the effect of YouTube videos on students’ writing descriptive text, but also interaction between the students’ writing descriptive text ability, the use of YouTube videos and students’ learning styles. Therefore 2 x 2 factorial design was employed to measure the effect of a number of independent variables in the samples toward the dependent variable.

| Variable | Visual (A1) | Auditory (A2) |
|----------|------------|---------------|
| Youtube Videos (Experimental class) (B1) | Cell 1 | Cell 2 |
| Non video (Control class) (B2) | Cell 3 | Cell 4 |

Notes:
Cell 1: Visual students taught by using YouTube videos in experimental class.
Cell 2: Auditory students taught by using YouTube videos in experimental class.
Cell 3: Visual students taught by using non video in control class
Cell 4: Auditory students taught by using non video in control class.

The target population was tenth grade students of SMKN 1 Amuntai, at the first semester in the school year 2019—2020. Total number of male students is 433 and the 580 female students. The total number of classes is 36 which consist of six major skills. Grade X and XI divide into thirteen classes and ten classes for grade XII. The majors of SMKN 1 Amuntai are: Akuntansi, Administrasi Perkantoran, Pemasaran, Multimedia, Teknik Komputer Jaringan and Farmasi.
The non-randomized cluster sampling was used in this study to select the sample. The researcher picks X Multimedia classes as the sample classes because students of Multimedia classes had the same English teacher. They were more familiar with technology than the other class. Tenth grade of Multimedia class consist of three classes, so the class was chosen randomly as experimental class and control class. X MM 1 was chosen as Experimental class and X MM 1 as control class. X MM 1 class consist of 34 students and X MM 2 consist of 33 students.

There were 2 kinds of instrument that were constructed to collect the data in this study, namely writing test and questionnaire. The writing test consists of pre-test and post-test to measure the achievement of the student before and after treatment. The questionnaire was managed to classify student learning style whether he/she belong to visual or auditory. Both of the instruments were validated to the expert of the former lecture of Universitas Negeri Malang who has experiences in dealing with teaching English and instruments validation. After being checked and get feedback from the lecture, it was revised by the writer.

The writer use YouTube videos of historical places in the world and Indonesia. The videos are obtained from many sources in YouTube. The criteria that put as consideration of choosing the videos are (1) characteristic of students (2) the offensiveness of the video, (3) the video structure (Berk, 2009:7). Relating to criteria, the historical place video that was used was well known place in the world. It will recall their background knowledge. The video was only show the place and its’ history. There was no offensive thing were portrayed in the video. The duration of the videos was less than ten minutes. It means there is plenty of time for student to work on their activity. The speakers of the video spoke English in a clear voice and the video was that was talked in the video relate to Basic competence (Kompetensi Dasar) in SMK syllabus. The Youtube video played in the classroom before the students begin to write their own descriptive essay. The students watched the motion picture of historical place. They recognized the structure, ornament, atmosphere of the building. It was complemented with the voice and the sound of the video that they hear. The voice added information of the historical building in form of English sentences. All of it gave them information that they could use in their own descriptive essay. The motion picture and the sound of the video enhanced their background knowledge about the places and motivate them to write more about the places. On the other hand, the voice in the video give them example of vocabulary and tenses that they could use on their essay. The adversial that is usually used in descriptive text, such as quite, very, extremely. Singular or plural noun such as a, the, this, those, their, etc.

Writing test consists of pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was conducted in the first meeting of the research. It was done to test the homogeneity of the group and students’ writing ability. Post-test was conducted to portray students writing performance after the treatment. Post-test tested the hypothesis whether YouTube videos affects students’ performance in writing a descriptive essay. In order to cope students’ different background knowledge, the test consists of three options as topic of student writing composition. The topic was about historical places. Student choose a familiar topic to her/him. The test was developed based on the syllabus and standard of competence of tenth grade student of SMK Negeri 1 Amuntai.

To get identify students’ learning styles, students were given a questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 28 items which concerned about students’ learning styles. The questionnaire in this instrument use liker scale tidak pernah (never), Jarang (scarcely), sering (often), selalu (always). Each answer had different score. Given answer “never” had 1 score, “scarcely” had 2 score, “often” had score 3 and “always” had score 4. The indicators were used to identify the learning styles were adapted from (Bobbi & Hernacki, 2016). The indicators were transformed in the form of statements in the questionnaire.

The study was conducted in 7 meetings. First meeting was Pre-test of writing on Monday, 21 and 22 January 2019, 2nd to 5th was conducted on as treatment of the study and post-test at the last meeting. Treatments for control class were held on 23, 28, 30 of November and 4, 6 January. Treatments for experimental class was held on 24, 29, 31 of November and 5, 7 of January. The study is suited with the portion of English lesson at school. English lesson in SMK Negeri 1 Amuntai is only 3 hours a week.

The technique of collecting data in this study was gathered through two instruments, namely writing test and questionnaire. The test was conducted in the first meeting as pre-test and in the end of lesson as post-test. Students were given 90 minutes to write their composition in the pre-test. Students’ compositions were assessed by using scoring rubric adapted from (Brown, 2007). There were five aspects that are measured in this scoring rubric, namely content, organization, vocabularies, grammar and mechanics. Each aspect was valued from 1 to 4. The score from each aspect was calculated and summed to find the final score of students’ writing. The data from pre-test and post-test were calculated to measure the effect of the treatment of control and experimental class.

Questionnaire was conducted before pre-test. The score of the questionnaire determine whether the students belong to visual learning style or auditory learning style students. The researcher classified the categorization of learning styles from the questionnaire. In this study there are 28 items of questionnaire and 14 items for each type of learning styles. The sum of all of the score of questionnaire items for each categorization of learning style determined students’ learning styles. The highest score from two categorizations of learning styles was the major of learning styles that the students have. Then, the writing score of students was analyzed whether the higher score belong to the auditory or visual learning style students or vice versa.
In gaining the answer of the research problems, the technique that was used in this study was ANOVA 2 (two) way analysis of Variance. The purpose of the using it was to obtain the conclusion of significance differentiate from two independent variables and dependent variable. The independent variables were A factor which were Youtube video (A1) and Non video. The other independent variables were B factor which were Visual (B1) and Auditory (B2). Meanwhile, student writing is dependent variable.

**FINDINGS**

| Writing Achievement | Mean   | Std. Deviation | N  |
|---------------------|--------|----------------|----|
| Total               | 0.0905 | 1.18863        | 29 |
| Control             | 0.6792 | .97528         | 30 |

Table 1 presented that mean score of control class was .0905 and mean score of experimental class was .6792. The standard deviation of both of class were 1.18863 and .97528. It can be inferred that mean score of experimental class was higher than mean score of control class. The difference of the mean score from both of the classes was .118 points. As the conclusion, the mean score of control class was less than the mean score of the experimental class.

| Learning Style | Writing Achievement | Mean   | Std. Deviation | N  |
|---------------|---------------------|--------|----------------|----|
| Visual        | Control             | 6.9917 | .62046         | 15 |
|               | Experiment          | 6.9286 | .69806         | 14 |
| Audio         | Control             | 6.6607 | .87215         | 14 |
|               | Experiment          | 6.9688 | .73669         | 16 |

The table 2 showed that the number students of control and experimental class were 59 students. Student that were detected as visual learning style students were 29 students and 30 students as audio learning style students. The number of visual learning students who belonged to control class were 15 and audio learning style students were 14 students. On the other hand, experimental class consisted of 14 visual learning style students and 16 audio learning style students.

The table also showed that visual learning style students’ mean score of visual learning style of control class (6.9917) was higher than audio learning style (6.6607). However, in experimental class, mean score of audio learning style was higher than visual learning style which is 6.9688 and 6.9286. Mean different score between visual learning style and audio learning style students of control class is .331. However, mean different score of visual learning and audio learning style students of experimental class is .0402. It can be inferred the highest mean different of writing in control class were higher than experimental class.

Even though different learning style which was superior on control and experimental class, the mean different score of all class was gained by visual learning student. The mean score of visual learning style of all class was 6.9612 and main score of audio learning style of all class was 6.8250. Mean different score between visual learning style students and audio learning style student of all class was .1362.

The normality test was utilized to check whether or not the data on the students’ post-test scores shared normally. If the \( p \) values were greater than .05 level of significance, then the data was stated normally distributed. The following table 3 shows the result of Normality Testing using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

The Normality Test using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test gained significant score .346. The score is higher than .05 \( (p > .05) \) which mean the data that is used distributed normally. Homogeneity test was conducted to examine whether the data in the posttest of the students’ experimental and control class are equal and homogenous. The test using Leven’s technique. The result of Homogeneity Variance Test is displayed on the following table 4.
Table 3. The Result of the Normality Test
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|                | Gain score |
|----------------|------------|
| N              | 59         |
| Normal Parameters$^{a,b}$ |           |
| Mean           | .3898      |
| Std. Deviation | 1.11613    |
| Absolute       | .122       |
| Positive       | .122       |
| Negative       | -.112      |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | .935      |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .346      |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Table 4. The Result of Homogeneity Variance Test
Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances$^a$

| F   | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-----|-----|-----|------|
| 2.050 | 3   | 55  | .118 |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

$^a$ Design: Intercept + Style + Group + Style * Group

The result of Homogeneity Variance Test based on Levene’s technique shows significance score 118. This score is higher than .05 ($p > .05$), therefore the two groups are homogenous.

Table 5. Descriptive Data of Posttest Scores in the Experimental and the Control Group Learning Styles.

| Learning Style | Class     | Mean   | Std. Deviation | N  |
|----------------|-----------|--------|----------------|----|
| Visual         | Control   | .0583  | 1.03280        | 15 |
|                | Experiment| .7679  | 1.20581        | 14 |
|                | Total     | .4009  | 1.15698        | 29 |
| Audio          | Control   | .1250  | 1.37544        | 14 |
|                | Experiment| .6016  | .75169         | 16 |
|                | Total     | .3792  | 1.09490        | 30 |
| Total          | Control   | .0905  | 1.18863        | 29 |
|                | Experiment| .6792  | .97528         | 30 |
|                | Total     | .3898  | 1.11613        | 59 |

Table 5 explains the description data of the research variables, namely writing achievement which is affected by treatment and students’ learning style factor. Mean score of writing achievement were gained from pretest and mean score posttest reduction. The total mean score of control class was .0905 and experimental class was .6792. It can be concluded that the increasing of average writing score of experimental class is higher than control class. It confirms that writing descriptive score of students who were taught by using YouTube were better than students who were not taught by using Youtube. Based on the Table 3.5, Visual learning style students obtained mean score .7679 and mean score of audio learning style students was .6016. This result shows the increasing of average writing achievement score of visual learning style students is higher than audio learning style students. It confirmed the hypothesis.
Table 6. The Result of Interaction Analysis between the Youtube Video Medium and Students’ Learning Styles on Students’ Writing Descriptive Text

| Tests of Between-Subjects Effects | Gain score |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Source                           | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F  | Sig.  |
| Corrected Model                  | 5.348<sup>a</sup>       | 3  | 1.783       | 1.466 | .234  |
| Intercept                        | 8.863                   | 1  | 8.863       | 7.286 | .009  |
| Style                            | .036                    | 1  | .036        | .036  | .863  |
| Group                            | 5.172                   | 1  | 5.172       | 4.251 | .044  |
| Style * Group                    | .200                    | 1  | .200        | .164  | .687  |
| Error                            | 66.904                  | 55 | 1.216       |       |       |
| Total                            | 81.219                  | 59 |            |       |       |
| Corrected Total                  | 72.253                  | 58 |            |       |       |

Table 6 showed that writing descriptive text achievement was gained significance score .044. This score less than .05 ($p < .05$). It means that there was significant effect of class treatment toward writing achievement. It can be assumed that using Youtube in English classroom interfered to student achievement. On the other hand, learning style factor toward students’ writing achievement was gained significant score .863. The score was more than .05 ($p > .05$). Therefore, significant effect of learning styles toward students’ writing achievement was not found.

**DISCUSSION**

The discussion section answers the research question such as do the students who are taught using YouTube video achieve better score than students who are not taught by using video in writing descriptive text? Is there any difference in writing achievement between visual and auditory students who are taught using Youtube in writing descriptive text?

**The Difference in Writing Descriptive Text Achievement of Students across Class**

This research investigated the impact of using Youtube videos in teaching compared to non Youtube videos on students’ writing scores as observed from students’ learning style which was video and audio learning style students. Regarding to the first research problem, this research uncovered that the students who were taught writing using YouTube videos performed better than students who were not taught writing using Youtube videos. The mean score difference in posttest between the students taught by using YouTube videos and those who were not was .5887, which favours of the class receiving Youtube videos treatment. The mean score from experimental class was higher (.6792) than the mean score from the control class (.0905). The evident above confirm the hypothesis testing and answer the first research question.

The finding is similar to the previous study managed by (Alwehaibi, 2015). He found that there was significant effect of using YouTube videos on student learning. Students’ learning outcome was significant. Achievement of experimental class is higher than control class. Significant result also happened on research which is done by Oddon (2011), Alqahtani (2014), and Marti (2011). It is believed that learning English using Youtube videos is convenient and enjoyable for the students. Like it was found by (Savitrie, 2012) in her research.

**The Difference in Writing Descriptive Text Achievement of Students across Learning Styles**

The second research question related to the effect of using YouTube videos on students’ writing achievement across learning style. The mean score of visual Learning (7679) student is higher than score obtained by audio learning style students (6016) However, the difference was only .0276 points which favors on visual students. The comparison on further analysis of the mean score between visual and audio learning style students in each class also yielded insignificant difference. It can be inferred that both of visual and audio learning style students shown only small gains of difference. The finding similar to the study conducted by Kia, et al (2001) and Kassaian (2007). They found that visual learning style students achieve better than audio learning style students.

**The Interaction between Variables on Writing Descriptive Text Achievement**

Regarding to interaction between variable on writing descriptive text achievement, this research aiming on the interaction between treatments of using Youtube videos and students’ learning styles toward students’ writing descriptive text achievement. This research informed that there was no interaction between treatments and students’ learning styles toward writing descriptive text achievement. Interaction effect between students’ learning style toward writing descriptive text achievement was not found either. The only interaction effect found was between treatments and writing descriptive text achievement in which using YouTube videos was it is proven able to help the students performed better than those were not taught by using YouTube on writing descriptive text post-test.
The similar finding was also found by (Gohar & Sadeghi, 2015), final term scores of different learning styles were not show significant different of learning achievement. Similar finding also reported by (Ahmad et al., 2014) and (Cimermanová, 2018). Although both of them investigate different field, mathematics and English. They found insignificant finding between learning style and achievement.

Absence of interaction between writing descriptive text achievement and students’ leaning styles does not confirm that there is no contribution of using YouTube videos as treatment in improving students’ writing achievement. Despite of absence of two factor interaction, YouTube is worth to be consider as teaching and learning English medium that is able to improve student achievement.

CONCLUSION

This research concludes that there was significant difference between average writing achievement score of experimental class and control class. Writing achievement of experimental class was higher than control class. YouTube videos as media for teaching and learning at the class are believed as a factor that affected students’ writing achievement.

Another conclusion is the average score of students’ writing achievement of visual learning style students was higher than audio learning style students. Nevertheless, the learning style had no impact to the writing achievement of the students. Significance score was .863. It was more than .05. Learning style preferences cannot be considered as factor that interfered student writing achievement.

Some suggestions are addressed to teacher as a respect of the implementation of YouTube video on writing class. It is worth if the teacher spares his/her time in selecting video and prepare the electronic tools to avoid unexpected problems in operating its. In addition, it is recommended that the future researcher employ YouTube videos in other language skills to see the potential usage of YouTube videos in language learning.
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