

Dicto-Comp in Indonesian' English Writing Class

^{#1}Nike Angraini, ^{*2}Jaya Nur Iman

^{#1}English Lecturer, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Indo Global Mandiri University, Indonesia

^{*2}English Lecturer, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Indo Global Mandiri University, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: Nike@uigm.ac.id

ABSTRACTS

The present inquiry investigated the dicto-comp' effectiveness on the writing achievement of EFL learners. An experimental research design, chiefly concerned on the non-equivalent pretest-posttest control group design, was taken into the research. Thirty six students were taken as the sample purposively. An English writing test was employed as the primary instrument to assess the writing achievement of EFL learners. The research results found out (1) the EFL learners' English writing achievement level in the group of experimental after the treatment given was in the good and very good category, (2) dicto-comp significantly improved the EFL learners English writing achievement in the experimental group, and (3) dicto-comp made significant difference on EFL learners' English writing achievement than those who were not. In conclusion, implementing dicto-comp improved the writing achievement of the EFL learners significantly. Pedagogical implications for English students and lecturers, stakeholder, and near future researchers were also made in this research.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: November, 2022

Revised: November, 2022

Published: December, 2022

Keywords:

Dicto-Comp,
Writing Achievement,
EFL Writing Class,

How to cite: Angraini, N., & Iman, J. (2022). Dicto-Comp in Indonesian' English Writing Class. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, 9(2), 172-184. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v9i2.6332>

INTRODUCTION

English in Indonesia is taught started from primary to higher education where the EFL learners are expected to master four integrated English language skills. English writing skill is pondered to be one of the most complicated productive skills to be earned in the academic and non-academic context. This requires much practice and exposure on the writing skill activities in the classroom. The urgency of writing competence is very mandatory to have especially for the English language learners in the Indonesian higher education context as this can be the medium of communication with other people not only from Indonesia but also overseas. Moreover, Writing, as one of the productive skills to possess, is viewed as the most complicated and troublesome movement especially for students in EFL or ESL environment. Writing is defined as a difficult discipline and separately most troublesome part of language acquisition and learning (Jahin, 2012). Writing is also pondered as a troublesome language skill to dominate for any EFL students since experience issues while delivering a text of composition (Phonna, 2014; Salima, 2012; Suadah, 2014). The EFL learners also demand a significant amount of time as well as effort to produce a single writing product (Isa, Risdaneva, & Alfayed, 2017).

Additionally, writing is categorized as one part of language which has generally presented issues among other language abilities (for example listening, speaking, and reading). Also, not exclusively to the students who are learning it, yet in addition to the educators who are showing it (Kustati and Yuhardi, 2014). Seeing from the Indonesian context of higher education level, the undergraduate students are expected to have an English scientific paper writing skill as during the courses taken they must be dealing with the writing of academic papers, books, as well as field and lab research. Writing skill is likewise required by undergraduate students as a component of the necessities to acquire a four-year certification or undergraduate degree, specifically scientific paper and thesis and writing. Writing is likewise required for distribution to convey the ideas and thoughts of undergraduate students when they are in university and in the condition they become teachers. Through writing abilities, they can construct solid scholarly and viable connections among examination and autonomous learning (Wardani and Sari, 2017; Sutarman et al, 2019).

Apart from that, writing, being the primary way of communicating feelings, desires, ideas, and goals (Akkaya & Kirmiz, 2010), is primarily intended to assist individuals to communicate successfully in today's communication environment. The importance of writing may be better appreciated by emphasizing its importance in measuring learners' success in many subjects in general, and in teaching as well learning English in particular. Writing, on the other hand, is regarded as the most difficult learning skill by both non-native and native learners (Graham et al., 2005; Jahin & Idrees, 2012). Also, writing demands a high level of productive language control because it involves a continual interplay between expanding knowledge and production (Luchini, 2010). Additionally, writing is defined as an uneasy activity, and when students get involved in the jobfield, they will be expected to clearly explain ideas and facts. This growth in the importance of writing and the ultimate writing skills development, will allow students to graduate with a talent that will serve them for the rest of their lives (Alber-Morgan, Hessler, & Konrad, 2007). Furthermore, Brown (2007) also claims writing is seen as a cognitive process which may be organized and given a limitless number of modifications before publication. Furthermore, Harmer (2004) claims that writing motivates learners to focus more on correct language use. It is because when students engage in their writing process, they evaluate how a language is employed. This practice promotes language development because students tackle challenges that writing brings to mind. Hence, writing is process of thinking that requires much practice in order to express ideas, thoughts, and opinions in which this skill is useful for the students to communicate their mind after graduation especially in the working environment.

Unfortunately, seeing the fact in Indonesian context that the English language learners still earn some English writing complexity particularly in the grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, spelling, and content. Karim (2012) mentioned that the EFL learners still find barriers in writing activity due to the low level of writing competence. He further said that the knowledge constraints related to the English writing aspects such as English vocabulary, spelling, grammar, and punctuation affected on the English language learners writing interest. Additionally, the EFL learners in Indonesia still come across a mandatory barriers in English writing. Besides, undergraduate students studying English Education in Indonesia are obliged to compose articles, tasks, and theses in English (Abas and Aziz, 2016). In spite of learning English for quite some time in secondary school and four years in the college, most undergraduate students' capacity to rehearse English is as yet viewed as low (Abrar et al., 2018). This is on the grounds that most just get an opportunity to rehearse the language during their English classes, and any undergraduate students hardly see the quick need to utilize it outside of the study class (Akbari, 2015). However, confirming the English language lecturers, they mentioned that the English language learners had problematic points in terms

of starting to state what they have in mind pertaining to the English writing topic provided, having English vocabulary sufficiency, having unstructured ideas organization, and having ungrammatical sentence structure. For that reason, it can be stated accordingly that the EFL learners in Indonesia especially on the context of higher education level still got the English writing problems particularly in the writing aspects development. This becomes the major concern of the English language lecturers to seek out the particular and appropriate instructional technique to develop the EFL learners' English writing skill in the EFL settings. One of the instructional technique that can be used by the English language lecturers is that dicto-comp to teach English writing class. This technique is worth applying as this requires the English language learners to listen to the lecturers reading the text for multiple times, then they are required to memorize the text read and note down the ideas as accurately as possible with the reading text.

Dictation composition (mention dicto-comp by then) is a variety of dictation that educators can employ in English writing instruction. It is a basic strategy that needs the EFL learners to pay attention to a text dictated by the instructor that can be rehashed more and more (Nation and Newton, 2009). The EFL learners were not permitted to compose the text before the English language teachers finished mentioning the reading text. In the application of dicto-comp, the EFL learners are needed to memorize the words read out and rewrite with their own version of writing. (Nation & Newton, 2009). It additionally recommends that this procedure can assist the instructor with showing composing for the understudies by fostering their thoughts and their skill of thinking critically in English writing. Essentially, dicto-comp is also defined as a teaching approach that blends dictation activity and composition (Wajnryb & Maley, 1990). Moreover, dicto-comp is also defined as a type of dictation that English teachers may use to assist students to write. This is a basic strategy that needs pupils to listen to a material read aloud by the teacher repeatedly (Nation & Newton, 2009). The learners are not permitted to write out the text until the teacher has completed reading it. In dicto-comp, students must "keep the concepts in mind in a book longer than a hundred words and state them in the original or their own versions" (Nation & Newton, 2009, p. 70). This also implies that the teacher might use this strategy to assist pupils learn to write by strengthening their thoughts and critical thinking skills. Additionally, dicto-comp is also stated as a writing assignment that combines four English abilities (MacKenzie, 2012). During the text reconstruction stage of dicto-comp, students are required to listen to what teachers read or other sorts of auditory materials (listening) and converse orally with their peers (speaking). Then they write out the co-constructed text and then evaluate their version by reading the original (reading). Therefore, it could be vividly said that dicto-comp is a worth-trying instructional technique which can help the EFL students have a better writing in EFL writing classroom.

However, despite the low number of research undertaken in EFL contexts, various researchers have uncovered some significant findings about the usefulness of using dicto-comp. Malmqvist's (2005) studies, for example, provided light on the impact of student involvement throughout the reconstruction process on text quality improvement. She discovered that collaboratively created texts were much longer, more descriptive, and more complicated syntactically than individually reconstructed texts in her study of the influence of group interaction in dicto-comp on written language output. Abbasian and Mohammadi (2013) revealed that dicto-comp was efficient in enhancing general writing abilities of Iranian intermediate EFL learners, particularly in organizational and mechanics domains. Davis and Rinvulcri's investigation (1988) discovered another application of dicto-comp in writing education. They argued that dicto-comp, through text reconstruction, can increase advanced students' writing skills. Bailey (1998) gave a research focus on the usage of dicto-comp in the writing program in terms of qualitative research. Participants in this study felt that dicto-

comp activities helped them acquire confidence in writing under pressure and allowed them the opportunity to test out a variety of English vocabulary, grammatical features, and rhetorical patterns. In Indonesian EFL writing context, Muttakiah (2016) claimed that the students who had writing class with dicto-comp technique got better writing achievement than those who had writing class with no dicto-comp. Rofiqoh (2013) also revealed that dicto-comp gave significant mean difference between those who learnt writing skill with dicto-comp that those who were not. Moreover, Ni'mah (2012) mentioned that the learners who were instructed by using dicto-comp had higher achievement than those who were not taught. Hence, it could be stated that using dicto-comp in EFL writing environment gave the students opportunity to develop their writing skills and its aspects of writing.

On the basis of the rationale mentioned above, the researchers would like to see whether or not dicto-comp gave any significant impact on the Indonesian' English writing achievement level, gave any significant impact of Dicto-Comp on the Indonesian' English writing achievement after the intervention employed as well as made any significant mean difference on the Indonesian' English writing achievement than those who were not instructed. Besides, the current inquiry was expected to provide fruitful insight for the English language teachers on how to apply this technique in improving the EFL learners' writing skill especially in writing class, theoretical knowledge for the English language learners' English writing development, and practical knowledge and different viewpoints for other researchers to carry out the similar research with difference context. Beside that, in order to provide the clarity of the research, this research was currently limited to the following focus such as the main concern was about to see the dicto-comp effect on the EFL learners writing achievement, the significant impact on the English writing of the EFL learners after the treatment employed, and the research was done at the university level in the southern region of Sumatera, Palembang.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

Experimental research design was used in this current investigation which was merely concerned on the quasi experimental research design. The non equivalent pretest-posttest control group design was taken into this research. Two groups required were assigned equally in this research design that were experimental and control. In the group of experimental, the researcher gave pretest, treatment by using dicto-comp, and posttest. On the contrary, the control group was given only pretest and posttest with no dicto-comp intervention. The English language instruction was conducted for one meeting which comprised of 14 teaching sessions excluding pretest and posttest.

Population and sample

This research was carried out at Indo Global Mandiri University. The population was all the fourth-semester students who took English writing class. Thirty-six students were taken purposively as the sample of the present research where each group comprised eighteen students. The students getting involved in the inquiry were in the same year of study and instructed by the English language instructor as well as had no English language course during the treatment performed.

Instruments

Since writing is taken into one of the English productive skills, to collect the data of research, the researcher conducted a test administration in the form of English writing test in which in the class the students were required to write out an English composition on the basis of the writing topics given. The same English writing test was given to both experimental group and control group. To give an assessment on the EFL learners' English writing

achievement, the researcher noted down the EFL learners' writing skill such as vocabulary, grammar, organization, mechanic, and fluency. The rubric of analytical writing suggested by Hughes (2004) was utilized in this research with six point for each description to rate the EFL learners' writing product.

The researcher administered the English writing test in conjunction with measuring the EFL learners' English writing achievement, therefore, the high degree of English writing content validity was taken into account. To see whether the topic of English writing test as the instrument of pretest and posttest was valid, the researcher formulated the English test of writing by pondering English writing textbook and instructional curriculum used by the university concerned.

Apart from that, the reliability calculation of the English writing test was utilized in this recent inquiry. Inter-rater reliability was done to score English writing achievement of the EFL learners. Two raters were asked to assess the results of pretest and posttest both in the group of experimental control. The raters selected were based on some qualifications such as: Having master of magister degree in English language teaching, having a score of TOEFL > 500 or TOEIC score > 750, having > ten years of English instructional experiences, and having experiences in English writing and grammar instruction.

In order to seek out the English writing test reliability coefficient, the inter-rater reliability of the test was used by checking the results of EFL learners' English writing product. After administering the pretesting and posttesting in both groups of experimental and control, the EFL learners' English writing product was scored by the two independent raters and then the results of the data were computed by utilizing pearson product moment to see the coefficient correlation value. Thus, after collecting the results of the test instrument, it was found out that the inter-rater reliability coefficient results were reliable both in the pretest and posttest of both experimental and control group as the coefficient correlation values were much higher than .70, respectively (see table 1).

Table 1
The results of inter-rater reliability

Variable	Pearson Product Moment			
	Experimental		Control	
	Pre-Posttest	Sig.V	Pre-Posttest	Sig.V
EWA	.870	.000	.853	.000

The steps of instructing the EFL learners with dicto-comp were as follows: the researcher provided a picture, as icebreaking activity, associated with the topic learnt then, the students were required to listening the selected topic passage in which it was dictated three times by the researcher. However, getting along with dictating process, no students were permitted to write any notes, afterwrds the researcher read the passage three times sequentially, the students were needed to write out what they listened to as relatable as possible to the wordings of the original passage. Nonetheless, the students may rewrite out the ideas with their own version. This was done in individual and groupwork., in the process of teaching and learning activities, the students were also taught and exposed about vocabulary, spelling, mechanics, grammar, sentence construction, and exercises on controlled composition, after they finished rewriting the passage, the students were instructed to submit their work, ultimately, the researcher explained and gave corrective feedback so that the students had a better controlled composition by then.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data of research, it was taken from the English writing results of the pretest and posttest in both groups of experimental and control accordingly. Group A was the

experimental group in which the results of the pretest and posttest of the EFL learners who were instructed with dicto-comp. Meanwhile group B was the control group where the results of pretest and posttest who learned with no treatment given by the researchers.

To answer research question number 1, researchers employed descriptive statistical analysis to know the significant achievement level of the English writing achievement of Indonesian university students. To answer research question number 2, the researchers utilized paired samples to seek out the significant effect of Dicto-comp on the Indonesian' English writing achievement. To answer research questions number 3, independent samples t-test was used to see the significant mean differences in the Indonesian' English writing achievement after the treatment applied. Moreover, to seek out the EFL learners' English writing score individually, the scoring range of English writing achievement used was as follows: very good (16-20), good (11-15), poor (6-10), and very poor (<6). Thus, after English writing scores were collected properly, the researchers put all the scores into the table and computed them with SPSS program in order to find out the 3 major statistical analyses needed.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Descriptive Analyses (Research Question 1)

Referring to the table 2, it could be clearly described that the results of pretest in the experimental group showed that there were 2 students (11.1%) categorized in the very poor achievement level with the mean score and generated standard deviation (5.00 and .000), 8 students (44.6%) categorized in the poor achievement level with the mean score and generated standard deviation (9.00 and 1.096), 8 students (44.3%) categorized in the good achievement level with the mean score and generated standard deviation (11.62 and .744). It could then be stated that the EFL students' achievement level in the experimental group before the treatment employed was in the very poor and poor category. Besides, the results of the posttest administration in the experimental group showed that there were 12 students (66.7%) categorized in the good achievement level with the mean score and generated standard deviation (13.41 and 1.443), 6 students (33.3%) categorized in the very good achievement level with the mean score and generated standard deviation (16.67 and .816). It could further be said that in the group of experimental the EFL students' achievement level after the treatment done was in the very good and good category.

Table 2
The Result of Pretest and Posttest in the Experimental Group (Achievement Level)

Variable	Achievement Level	Pretest Experimental Group			Posttest Experimental Group		
		Mean score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)	Mean score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)
EWA	Very Good	-	-	-	16.67	.816	6 (33.3)
	Good	11.62	.744	8 (44.3)	13.41	1.443	12 (66.7)
	Poor	9.00	1.096	8 (44.6)	-	-	-
	Very Poor	5.00	.000	2 (11.1)	-	-	-
Total		9.72	2.296	18 (100%)	14.50	2.007	18 (100%)

Seeing the table 3, it could be vividly discussed that the results gained of the pretest in the group of control revealed that there were 3 students (16.7%) categorized in the poor achievement level with the mean score and standard deviation (5.00 and .000), 15 students (83.3%) categorized in the poor achievement level with the mean score and standard

deviation (8.20 and 1.207). Thus, it could be verbalized that the results of the students' achievement levels were in the very poor and poor category. On the other point, the results of the posttest given in control group revealed that there were 11 students (61.2%) categorized in the poor achievement level with the mean score and standard deviation (8.63 and 1.206), 7 students (38.8%) categorized in the good achievement level with the mean score and standard deviation (11.71 and .755). Hence, it could be stated that the results of the students' achievement levels were in the good and poor category.

Table 3
The Results of Pretest and Posttest in the Control Group
(Achievement Level)

Variable	Achievement Level	Pretest Control Group			Posttest Control Group		
		Mean score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)	Mean score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)
EWA	Very Good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Good	-	-	-	11.71	.755	7 (38.8)
	Poor	8.20	1.207	15 (83.3)	8.63	1.206	11 (61.2)
	Very Poor	5.00	.000	3 (16.7)	-	-	-
Total		7.67	1.645	18 (100%)	9.83	1.855	18 (100%)

Results of Test Normality and Homogeneity of Variances test

Before going further with the statistical analyses, the researcher needs to justify whether the data used in both groups of experimental and control were normal and homogenous. To see the results of data normality in pretest and posttest of both groups, Shapiro-Wilk test was used. The significance values of Shapiro-Wilk test in pretest and posttest in group of experimental were .098 and .657. Since .098 and .657 were higher than .05, it could be said that the score of data obtained in the group of experimental was normal. On the other note, the significance values of Shapiro-Wilk in pretest as well as posttest of the group of control were .088 and .297. Since .088 and .297 were higher than .05, it could finally be said that the obtained data score in the control group was normal (see table 4).

Table 4
The Result of the Normality of the Test (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)

Variable	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Shapiro-Wilk			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
English Writing Achievement (EWA)	.098	.657	.088	.297

To see the homogeneity of test variances in the pretest as well as posttest of the group of experimental and control, Levene statistics was utilized. The significance value of Levene statistics in the pretest and also posttest of experimental was .173. Meanwhile, the significance value of Levene statistics in the pretest and posttest of control group was .289. Since the significance values of both groups exceeded .05. It could be vividly stated that the data score obtained in both groups was homogenous (see table 5).

Table 5
The Results of Homogeneity of Test Variances

Variable	Homogeneity			
	Pretest-Posttest in Experimental Group		Pretest-Posttest in Control Group	
	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Levene Statistic	Sig.
English Writing Achievement (EWA)	1.946	.173	1.427	.289

Progressive Analyses (Research Question 2)

In accordance with assessing the progress analyses of the sample in the group of experimental and control after the treatment was done, statistical computation by using paired samples t-test was clicked on in the present inquiry where the data score were taken from the pretest and posttest results of the learners' English writing achievement within both groups (see table 6). In the framework of gaining the significant progress in the English writing achievement, it could be clearly seen from the results of the mean scores obtained. In order to see the significant improvement in the results of the learners' English writing achievement in the pretest and posttest within the experimental group, it pointed out that the mean score of the learners' English writing achievement in the pretest of the experimental group was 9.72 with the generated standard deviation was 2.296. On the other side, the mean score of the learners' English writing achievement in posttest of the experimental group was 14.50 with the generated standard deviation was 2.007. Additionally, the score output revealed that the gained mean difference of the English writing achievement within pretest and posttest of the experimental group was 4.778 with the generated standard deviation was 1.768, and t-obtained was 11.468 ($.000 < .05$). Furthermore since the t-obtained of the English writing achievement was higher than t table distribution score, it stands to the point that null hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis was accepted which justifies that there was a significant improvement made by the English language learners in the group of experimental.

On the other point, the results of the learners' English writing achievement in pretest and also posttest in the control group revealed that the mean score of the learners' English writing achievement in the pretest of the control group was 7.67 with the standard deviation was 1.645. Meanwhile, the mean score of the learners' English writing achievement in the posttest of the control group was 9.83 with the standard deviation was 1.855. In addition, the score output revealed that the gained mean difference of the English writing achievement within the pretest and posttest of control group was 2.167 with the yielded standard deviation was 1.425, and t obtained was 6.453 ($.000 < .05$). Moreover, since the t obtained of the learners' English writing achievement was higher that t table distribution score, thus it could be stated that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted which means that there was a significant improvement made by learners in the control group although the results was much lower than experimental group.

Mean difference Analyses (Research Question 3)

In order to see the significant mean difference of English writing achievement between the experimental group and control group, the statistical computation by using independent samples t-test was utilized (see table 6). The data used were the score results obtained from the posttest of the groups of experimental and control. Seeing from the results of the

independent samples t-test, it showed that the posttest score of mean difference of the English language learners' writing achievement between group of experimental and control was 4.667 and the t obtained was 7.244 ($.000 < .05$). Since the p-value of the English writing achievement was less than the probability value ($.05$) and t obtained was higher than t table distribution score. Thus, it could then be revealed that the null hypothesis made was rejected as well as alternative hypothesis made was accepted. Ultimately, there was a significant mean difference in English writing achievement between students who were taught by using dictocomp and those who were not.

Table 6
The Results of Progressive analyses and Mean difference analyses

Variable	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test	Mean pre and post test Exp within	Mean pre and posttest Cont within	T-value posttest between Exp and Cont	T value of Gain between Exp & Cont	The value of Sig.2-tailed Exp within	The value of Sig.2-tailed Cont within	The value of Sig.2-tailed between Exp and Cont
	Exp	Exp	Cont	Cont							
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean							
EWA	9.72	14.50	7.67	9.83	4.778	2.167	4.667	7.244	.000	.000	.000

Discussion

From the results of the statistical computation and analyses above, it could be generated the following end conclusion that research finding 1 revealed in the experimental group the English writing achievement level of the students after the intervention given was in the good and very good category while in the control group the English writing achievement level of the students was in the poor and good category. Research finding 2 revealed that dictocomp significantly improved the EFL learners' English writing achievement in the experimental group. And research finding 3 revealed that dictocomp significantly made difference in EFL learners' English writing achievement than those who were not.

Based on the results of the research above, some rationale were found out why the implementation of dictocomp made significant improvement and significant mean difference in the English writing achievement level and English writing achievement of the English language learners. First reason, it was due to the picture provision related to the topic that would be studied in which the students were asked to write out any information they saw in the picture. This activated the English language learners' mind and prepared them to associate with the writing topic. Second reason, it was due to the exposure to dictating exercises during the EFL writing class activities. This provided the EFL learners with the aspects of writing such as vocabulary, spelling, grammar, mechanics, and sentence construction. Third reason, it was due to the collaborative writing activities in which the students were allowed to discuss and exchange information with their peers during the class, but they were required to rewrite the ideas out with their own mind. This activity allowed the EFL learners to reconstruct the ideas and organize them into good writing. Fourth reason, it was due to the corrective and positive feedback made by the English lecturer after they finish submitting their writing task. This gave the EFL learners to analyze their mistakes in order to have better writing product in the near future. Fifth reason, it was due to simultaneous writing instruction and task in terms of the aspects of writing concerned. This was employed to require the EFL learners to have main focus with the writing aspects assignment in order that they had a better controlled composition.

The findings of the current research were stated as statistically significant in fostering the English language learners' English writing achievement level and their English writing achievement. This was parallel with the some researchers who claims that the efficacy of the dictocomp application gave positive and significant improvement in the EFL learners' English writing achievement. According to Widiastuti, Sukamerta, and Arsana (2020), after using dicto-comp, approximately 72% of learners attained satisfactory proficiency in writing descriptive texts. Amiati (2019) also verbalized that the dicto-comp method in language instruction can increase students' descriptive text writing skills. In addition, students are obliged to rebuild the original text on their own terms in the current instruction with dicto-comp. This encourages students to actively participate in the process of rebuilding a text, where they must draw on existing knowledge to bridge linguistic and semantic gaps (Prince, 2013). Apart from that, dicto-comp fosters a collaborative learning atmosphere by giving learners understandable inputs, outputs, and feedback, all of which are essential components for language acquisition (Ellis, 2004; Nabei, 1996). It is critical that English instructional strategies include language acquisition, especially when teaching writing in EFL contexts. Also, Jin's (2013) research compiles a plenty of interesting information on the efficacy of writing instruction with dicto-comp. Moreover, Oh and Min (2011) mentioned that the statistical analysis of the pre-posttests in their research demonstrated that dicto-comp was an effective instructional strategy for improving students' writing abilities regardless of English proficiency level. Furthermore, other several research have revealed that cooperation has a positive influence on students' language acquisition, with some studies focusing specifically on the activity of dicto-comp (Alegra de la Colina & Garca Mayo, 2007; Kim, 2009; Storch, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 2001). Hence, it stands to the point that dictocomp statistically and significantly improved the EFL learners' English writing achievement.

CONCLUSION

Pertaining to the above-revealed research findings and discussion, some conclusion and pedagogical implication were properly made: First of all, the EFL learners' English writing achievement level in the group of experimental after the treatment given was in the good and very good category. Second of all, dicto-comp significantly improved the EFL learners English writing achievement in the experimental group. Third of all, dicto-comp made significant difference on EFL learners' English writing achievement than those who were not. Hence, it could be concluded that statistically dicto-comp promoted the English writing achievement of the EFL learners significantly. In addition, on the basis of the conclusive reseach findings above, several pedagogical implications were drawn to the students, English lecturers, stakeholder, and future researchers. Firstly, the students could utilize this technique to have a better writing and listening comprehension in the near future. Secondly, English lecturers have to consider using dictocomp in their EFL writing class by combining with the current technological tool, instructional medium, and other teaching techniques for the better writing product. Thirdly, the stakeholder should ponder this instructional technique as the alternative one to scaffold the EFL learners' English writing skill. Lastly, the future researchers were suggested to conduct similar research with different language skills both productive and receptive skills and to use different instrumentation such as in depth interview and questionnaire dissemination.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was funded by Universitas Indo Global Mandiri, Palembang, Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Abas, I. H., & Aziz, N. H. A. (2016). Indonesian EFL students' perspective on writing process: A pilot study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(3), 221-27.
- Abbasian, G. R., & Mohammadi, M. (2013). The effectiveness of dictogloss in developing general writing skill of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 4(6), 1371-1380.
- Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyraf, F., Makmur, M., & Marzulina, L. (2018). "If our English isn't a language, what is it?" Indonesian EFL student teachers' challenges speaking English. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(1), 129-145.
- Akbari, Z. (2015). Current challenges in teaching/learning English for EFL learners: The case of junior high school and high school. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 394-401. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.524.
- Akkaya, N. & Kirmiz, F. S. (2010). Relationship between attitudes to reading and time allotted to writing in primary education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 4742-4746.
- Alber-Morgan, S.R., Hessler, T., & Konrad, M. (2007). Teaching writing for keeps. *Education and treatment of children*, 30, 107-128.
- Alegría de la Colina, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2007). Attention to form across collaborative tasks by low proficiency learners in an EFL setting. In M. P. García Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 91–116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Amiati, D. R. (2020). Developing writing skill of grade eighth students at Smp Otak Kanan Palu through dicto-comp technique. *Journal of Foreign Language and Educational Research*, 2(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.31934/jofler.v2i2.1348>
- Bailey, K. M., (1998). *Learning about language assessment: dilemmas, decisions, and directions*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Ellis, R. (2004). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, P. & Rinvoluceri, M. (1988). *Dictation: New methods, new possibilities*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, S.; Harris, K. R. & Mason, L. (2005). Improving the writing performance, knowledge, and self-efficacy of struggling young writers: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 30(2), 207-241.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Hughes, A. (2004). *Testing for language teachers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isa, Q. N. M., Risdaneva, R., & Alfayed, A. (2017). An analysis of Acehese EFL students' grammatical errors in writing recount texts. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 5(1), 41-50.
- Jahin, J. H. (2012). The Effect of Peer Reviewing on Writing Apprehension and Essay Writing Ability of Prospective EFL Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(11), 60-84.
- Jahin, J. H. & Idrees, M. W. (2012). EFL major student teachers' writing proficiency and attitudes towards learning English. *Journal of Educational & Psychologic Sciences*, 4, 10–72. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(4), 55-58.
- Jin, S. (2013). A study on the effects of dictogloss on English writing in Korean middle school. *Studies in English Education*, 18(2), 115-134.

- Karim, A. A. (2012). Cooperative Learning Strategies in Enhancing Students' Writing Proficiency: The Case of Second Year LMD Students at Mohamed Khidher University. *Master's thesis*. University of Mohamed Khidher Biskra, Biskra
- Kim, Y. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 114-130.
- Kustati, M., & Yuhardi. (2014). The Effect of the Peer-Review Technique on Students' Writing Ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 1(2), 71-81.
- Luchini, P. L. (2010). Evaluating the effectiveness of a complimentary approach to teaching writing skills. *International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*, 4(3), 73-92.
- MacKenzie, A. (2012). *Using content and language integrated learning for business administration students*. Retrieved from <http://www.toyo.ac.jp/uploaded/attachment/6892.pdf>
- Malmqvist, A. (2005). How does group discussion in reconstruction tasks affect written language output?. *Language Awareness*, 14, (2-3), 128-141.
- Muttakiah, K. (2016). Assessing Recount Text Writing Ability Through Dicto-Comp of the Twelfth-Grade Students of SMK Kharism Mengwi in Academic Year 2015/2016. *Unpublished thesis*. Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar.
- Nabei, T. (1996). Dictogloss: Is it an effective language learning task?. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 12(1), 59-74.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ni'mah, M. (2012). The Ability of Writing Recount Text of Eighth Grade Students of MTs. Miftahul Huda Ngasem Batealit Jepara Taught by Using Dictocomp Technique in the Academic Year 2011/2012. *Unpublished thesis*. Universitas Muria Kudus.
- Oh, Y., & Min, C. (2011). The effects of dictogloss using cooperative learning on the improvement of English writing abilities. *Modern English Education*, 12(4), 237-257.
- Phonna, R. (2014). An analysis of students' free writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 1(2).
- Prince, P. (2013). Listening, remembering, writing: Exploring the dictogloss task. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(4), 486-500.
- Rofiqoh, A. (2013). The Writing Skill of The Eleventh Grade Students of SMK Tunas Harapan Pati Taught By Using Dictocomp Technique In The Academic Year 2013/2014. *Unpublished thesis*. Universitas Muria Kudus.
- Salima, R. (2012). Measures of eliminating EFL students' errors in writing. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 69, 318-327.
- Storch, N. (1998). A classroom-based study: Insights from a collaborative reconstruction task. *ELT Journal*, 52(4), 291-300.
- Sutarman., Sunendar, D., & Mulyati, Y. (2019). Investigating Cooperative Learning Model Based on Interpersonal Intelligence on Language Learners Skill to Write Article. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 201-218.
- Suadah, L. (2014). Enhancing EFL learners' writing skills through blogging. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 2(1), 20-29.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320 – 33.
- Wajnryb, R., & Maley, A. (1990). *Grammar dictation* (Vol. 3). Oxford University Press.
- Wardani, Nila Restu., & Sari, Yuli Ifana. (2017). Pengaruh Model Group Investigation Terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Artikel Mahasiswa [The Influence of Group Investigation Model on Students' Ability to Write Articles]. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Geografi*, 2(1), 160-166.

Widiastuti, N. P. S., Sukamerta, I. M., & Arsana, A. A. P. (2020). Assessing descriptive paragraph writing ability of the eighth grade students of SMPN 2 Denpasar through dicto-comp. *Journal on Studies in English Language Teaching (JOSELT)*, 1(1), 41-48.