The Effect of Dictogloss Technique on the Students' Writing Skill

Dian Pertiwi[*]
Ngadiso
Nur Arifah Drajati

Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, INDONESIA

Abstract

Dictogloss can be considered as way for integrating form and meaning in the learning context. The main objective of this research is to analyze whether: (1) Dictogloss is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing for the eleventh grades students, and (2) students having high motivation have better writing skill than those having low motivation for the eleventh grade students. This article refers to an experimental study on the effectiveness of Dictogloss to teach writing skill at one of Islamic School in Surakarta, Indonesia. The sampling used in this research was cluster random sampling with two classes as sample, namely the experimental class taught using Dictogloss and the control class taught using Direct Instruction. To collect the data, there were two instruments used in this research namely, the writing test and the motivation questionnaire. After treatment was given to both classes in eight meetings, a post test of writing to obtain data was conducted. The data were analyzed by using 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Before conducting the ANOVA test, pre-requisite test namely normality and homogeneity test were conducted. The result of this research shows that: (1) Dictogloss is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing, and (2) students having high motivation have better writing skill than those having low motivation. Therefore, it is recommended for the English teacher to apply Dictogloss in writing activity to promote an effective teaching on writing skill. In conclusion, Dictogloss can be used to improve students' writing skill for the eleventh grade students.

Keywords: Dictogloss, writing, motivation.

---

[*] Corresponding author, email: dianpertiwi957@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the important language skills that should be mastered by the students to convey their ideas or their opinion in written form. In line with this view, Kellogg (2008) states that writing is an important skill for students because of some reasons. First, writing helps to reinforce the grammatical structure. Second, enhance the students' vocabulary. Third, assist other language skills such as reading, listening, and speaking. However, writing is not a simple matter to learn and it has been considered as a difficult task since a large number of students make a lot of mistakes and errors in their written texts and cannot create a coherent in analytical exposition text. There are so many problems faced by the students when they are asked to write. They often do not know how to get started their writing. They often feel difficulty to get ideas to write so they cannot write smoothly to develop the topic and often get stuck in the middle of their writing. Also, they often get difficulties to organize their ideas in writing. In addition, they have limited vocabulary and poor knowledge of English grammatical rules so their written sentences and paragraph are often not good and grammatically incorrect.

Richards (2002) states that writing is the most difficult skill for second or foreign language learners to master. The difficulties are not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating these ideas into a readable text. The difficulty becomes more noticeable if their language proficiency is weak. Moreover, Harmer (2007) argues that some of students are not confident enough to write. The students lose their enthusiastic. The writer thinks that there are some reasons for students not to write, perhaps students have never written much in their first language(s) or they do not have anything to say and cannot come up with ideas.

Based on our observations, in overcoming such problems, most non-native EFL teachers only use the lecture method. The teacher spends much time to explain the materials. He or she does not create learning activities which can make students become active and does not provide much time for students to interact each other during learning. Moreover, the learning activities used for writing practice is often meaningless and not communicative. Also, he or she often asks students to write or compose a text individually or in pair from the topic given after the material is explained, and asks the students to submit it to be assessed directly. As a result, it makes students bored, frustrated, and have the anxiety to practice their writing especially for those whose writing skill is still low. That is why a competent teacher in the classroom is essential. A teacher should be able to implement the teaching technique that can help the students to generate ideas and organize them that finally can produce readable and understandable text for the readers. One of the teaching techniques is Dictogloss, which is a new version of dictation that was first introduced by Wajnryb (1990). Dictogloss is different with the traditional dictation in which the teacher reads the text slowly and repeatedly, and asks students to write exactly what he or she read without doing any thinking.

In Dictogloss, there is a gap between listening and writing phases. A text is read twice to learners. They may not do anything except listening to the text at first reading and they are asked to take brief notes at the second reading. Next, they work cooperatively in a group to reconstruct the text from their shared notes. The task of reconstruction the whole text dictated from their notes requires the students in groups to discuss and recall their prior knowledge about grammar, vocabulary, and language

features of text that they have to use in their reconstructed text. They also have to organize well their shared notes and idea into paragraph form in order their reconstructed version is coherent and have close meaning to the original text. At last, they analyze and compare their various works to the original texts of each other.

By Dictogloss, students can learn and train to write good paragraph/s in different ways. Students are given much time to interact with their friends during learning. Vasiljevic (2010) states that Dictogloss also gives opportunities for students to learn something new from their group because every person in a group has different skill in writing. From the other members of groups, students can get feedback and correction to their mistakes in writing, so that they can identify their strengths and weaknesses in writing to help them produce better writing. Moreover, students can decrease their anxiety in learning writing because they work in a group. Besides, using Dictogloss not only trains students' writing skill but also trains other language skill, such as listening. In other words, using Dictogloss technique to learn writing may give some benefits for the learners.

Smith (2012, p. 2) states that Dictogloss allows learners to process and activate language in a collaborative writing task, promotes writing to learn (meaning making) rather than learning to write (skill), encourages learners to reflect on form, encourages L2 learners to think critically and take risks in their language use. It results in synchronous interaction, which means that students practice the target language more often. Therefore, Dictogloss makes students learn more actively and successfully in the writing class.

Lim and Jacobs (2001) consider the collaboration aspect of the Dictogloss task and based on the journals and questionnaires collected from the students, they found that it has a positive effect on the learners in case of both recognition and effect. They concluded that a collaborative task like Dictogloss can help learners be satisfied with working in groups, have better feelings and therefore learn better. Moreover, Collins (2000) in her article examines the issues of L1 influence and common developmental patterns in the domain of verb tense and aspect. It was found that Dictogloss and interpreting contexts seem to be useful as activities for verb tenses in a Japanese classroom.

Another thing that also influences the students' writing skill comes from other factors besides the teaching technique. It is the students' motivation. Motivation plays an important role on the development of the students' writing as it is a driving force for them to write in a meaningful way (Hamidun et al., 2012). Mahadi and Jafari (2012) define that motivation as a physical, psychological or social need which motivates the individual to reach or achieve his goal and fulfil his need and, finally, feel satisfied owing to achieving his aim. It means that motivation is something arousing us to achieve the goal or fulfilling our need. They believe that motivation is important because it determines the extent of the learners' active involvement and attitude toward learning.

Related to the writing skill, the students who have high motivation will have motivation to learn something. The students become more motivated and have great enthusiasm to accomplish their goals in writing. On the contrary, the students who have low motivation will have no interest in writing and they do not know how to write. They will have difficulty in understanding the text given because they never try to find the solution. They have low desire to learn and very passive. They do not have learning strategies for writing.

From the explanation above, the researchers intend to use Dictogloss in teaching writing skill. This research aims to investigate whether or not Dictogloss is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing skill for the eleventh grade students in Indonesia, specifically in Surakarta, and to reveal whether or not students having high motivation have better writing skill than those having low motivation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Writing

Writing has always been seen as an important skill in ESL classes. It is the area in which learners are expected to be offered adequate time to develop their writing skill. Writing is certainly an important element of learning English as a second language. This importance is eventually derived from the fact that it reinforces grammatical structures, vocabulary and idioms that we have been teaching to our students (Ismail, 2011). It is also supported by Brown (2004) who states that writing skill is an important skill for achieving employment in this global era. Thus, learning how to write for students is crucial as one of the input for them to face the future.

According to Brown (2001), writing is the written products of thinking, drafting, and revising that require specialized skills on how to generate ideas, how to organize them coherently, how to use discourse markers and rhetorical conventions coherently into a written text, how to revise text for clearer meaning and how to edit text for appropriate grammar and how to produce the final product. Nunan (2003) defines writing as the process of thinking to invent ideas, thinking about how to express into good writing, arranging the ideas into good statement and paragraph clearly. It means that writing is viewed as a means of communication which is commonly used to express our thought. Hence, it can be concluded that writing is a complex process of thinking, creating ideas, and organizing them into good statements and paragraphs, and finally polishing the rough draft through editing and revision to produce a final product.

The nature of writing includes writing components that need to be mastered by writers in order to be able to produce a successful writing. Brown (2004) proposes five major aspects of writing that have to be acquired by a writer in producing a written text namely content, organization, vocabulary use, grammatical use, and mechanical consideration such as spelling and punctuation. Meanwhile, there are four common stages in the writing process, they are planning, drafting, editing, and producing final version (Harmer, 2004, pp. 4-5).

2.2 Dictogloss

Vasiljevic (2010) states that Dictogloss is a classroom dictation activity where the students listen to the passage, note down key words, and then work in group to create a reconstructed version of the text in the form of writing. Furthermore, Kooshafar et al. (2012) explain that Dictogloss is a consciousness-raising task which encourages language learners to interact and construct a linguistically acceptable text cooperatively, and this text is similar to the one read to them before and they have taken some notes on, both in case of content and style. Therefore, the constructed text

is not a replication of the original one since students use their notes, share their ideas with their group-mates, and utilize their own background knowledge to create a text.

The steps followed in Dictogloss tasks are described as (taken from Mackenzie, 2011, pp. 137-138):

1. Preparation: students will be prepared for the task by being involved in a discussion and vocabulary presentation related to the topic.
2. Dictation: the teacher will read the text twice at natural speed. Students will take notes while listening in order to be able to reconstruct the text read to them.
3. Reconstruction: students will be arranged in small groups or pairs. They will pool their notes and reconstruct their own version of the passage. During this step, teacher will not provide them with any information.
4. Analysis/Feedback: during this stage, students' writings will be corrected first by the teacher just by giving them some codes, and then students will compare their own version with the original one to be informed about their mistakes and be able to correct them.

Dictogloss procedure is particularly useful in helping students rely on their memory and apply their vocabulary and grammar knowledge in writing. In this connection, Wajnryb (1990) states during the Dictogloss procedure, because of the speed of the reading and the density of the text, the language learners manage to produce a fragmented text where the essential cohesion is missing. As a result there exists an "information gap" which should be filled in the reconstructing process by relying on the memory as well as the creativity of the language learner (Wajnryb, 1990).

2.3   Motivation

Motivation is an important aspect in learning language. It affects students' attitude toward the learning process. In language learning, Gardner (1985, p. 10) describes motivation "as a complex of constructs, involving the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language". Similarly, Kumaravadivelu (2006) states that motivation is an internal feeling that arouses one to do action, triggers one to a certain direction, and pertains one to be engaged in certain activities.

There are two different kinds of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is defined as the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfaction rather than for some separable consequence. When intrinsically motivated, a person is moved to act for the fun or challenge entailed rather than because of external products, pressures or rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000). On the contrary, extrinsically motivated behaviors are carried out in anticipation of reward from outside and beyond itself. The usual extrinsic rewards are money, prizes, grades and even certain types of positive feedback.

According to Williams and Williams (2011, p. 2), there are five factors affecting students' motivation in the teaching and learning process, they are: student, teacher, content, method/process, and environment. For the students, they must have access, ability, interest, and value education. As well as the teacher must be well trained, focus and monitor the educational process, be dedicated and responsive to his or her students, and be inspirational. The more enthusiastic, motivated and qualified teachers are in teaching and evaluating, the greater the capacity to increase learners' motivation to

learn. Moreover, the content must be accurate, timely, stimulating, and pertinent to the student's current and future needs. Also, the method or process must be inventive, encouraging, interesting, beneficial, and provide tools that can be applied to the students' real life. Overall, the environment needs to be accessible, safe, positive, personalized as much as possible, and empowering.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted at one of Islamic schools located in Surakarta, Indonesia. The method used in this research was an experimental study. The design of this research was a simple factorial design 2x2 with post-test only design. This research involved three kinds of variables namely, independent variable (teaching techniques), dependent variable (writing skill), and attribute variable (students' motivation). The target population was the eleventh grade students of the school under study. The sampling used in this study was cluster random sampling. The researchers took two classes from four classes of the eleventh grade students as samples. One class was the experimental group taught by using Dictogloss and the other class was the control group taught by using Direct Instruction. This research was conducted for eight meetings, with four meetings for each class.

The researchers used two instruments in collecting data. They were writing test and motivation questionnaire. Writing tests was used to find out students' writing skill and motivation questionnaire was conducted to know the level of students' motivation. In the written tests, the data of this research are distributed into eight groups: (1) the data of the writing test of the students who are taught using Dictogloss (A1); (2) the data of the writing test of the students who are taught using Direct Instruction (A2); (3) the data of the writing test of the students having high motivation (B1); (4) the data of the writing test of the students having low motivation (B2); (5) the data of the writing test of the students having high motivation who are taught using Dictogloss (A1B1); (6) the data of the writing test of the students having low motivation who are taught using Dictogloss (A1B2); (7) the data of the writing test of the students having high motivation who are taught using Direct Instruction (A2B1); (8) the data of the writing test of the students having low motivation who are taught using Direct Instruction (A2B2). After the writing scores were obtained, they were sorted in accordance with the students' motivation levels: high and low. The techniques used in analyzing the data of this study were descriptive and inferential analyses. Descriptive analysis was used to find out the mean, median, and standard deviation of the writing tests. Before testing the hypothesis, normality and homogeneity tests were conducted. Then, it was followed by testing the research hypothesis using inferential analysis of variance 2x2 (ANOVA).

The questionnaire is in the form of Likert scales. Items on the scales are anchored at 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. The items of questionnaire are in the positive and negative directions. The questionnaire was given to find out the level of students' motivation: high and low. Thus, the questionnaire must be valid and reliable before it was administered in experimental and control classes. Accordingly, both instruments (tests and questionnaire) were assessed by using readability of the test instruction, and validity and reliability of the motivation questionnaire.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

The data from written tests wre analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2. Before that, the normality and homogeneity of the data were tested as the requirement to use ANOVA. The result of normality using Liliefors test shows that all data are normal. As it can be seen by comparing the values gained (L_o) and L_t, where the values (L_o) are lower than L_t. Thus, it can be concluded that the data on both teaching techniques and motivation levels normally distributed. The computation of normality test is divided into eight groups of data are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. The summary of normality test.

No	Variables	N	Lo	Lt	Test Decision	Status
1.	The writing scores of the students taught by using Dictogloss (A_1)	26	0.0782	0.173	H_o is accepted	Normal
2.	The writing scores of the students taught by using Direct Instruction (A_2)	26	0.1286	0.173	H_o is accepted	Normal
3.	The writing scores of the students having high level of motivation (B_1)	26	0.1210	0.173	H_o is accepted	Normal
4.	The writing scores of the students having low level of motivation (B_2)	26	0.1061	0.173	H_o is accepted	Normal
5.	The writing scores of the students having high level of motivation taught using Dictogloss (A_1B_1)	13	0.1070	0.245	H_o is accepted	Normal
6.	The writing scores of the students having low level of motivation taught using Dictoglos (A_1B_2)	13	0.0816	0.245	H_o is accepted	Normal
7.	The writing scores of the students having high level of motivation taught using Direct Instruction (A_2B_1)	13	0.1271	0.245	H_o is accepted	Normal
8.	The writing scores of the students having high level of motivation taught using Direct Instruction (A_2B_2)	13	0.1736	0.245	H_o is accepted	Normal

Besides, the result of homogeneity test show that $\chi_o{}^2$ (1.921) is lower than $\chi_t{}^2$ (7.815) at the level of significance α=0.05 or $\chi_o{}^2 < \chi_t{}^2$ (1.921<7.815), it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous. It means the data obtained from the results for both variables are homogenous. After finding the normality and homogeneity of data, the data are analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2. This test was used to know the effect of the independent variable and attributive variable toward the dependent variable. Besides, ANOVA has a function to know if there is interaction among the variables. The hypothesis is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t ($F_o > F_t$). The results of data analysis is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The mean scores.

Motivation (B)	Teaching Technique (A)		Total
	Dictogloss (A₁)	Direct Instruction (A₂)	
High Motivation (B₁)	82.46 (A₁B₁)	75.69 (A₂B₁)	79.08 (B₁)
Low Motivation (B₂)	73.69 (A₁B₂)	74.15 (A₂B₂)	73.92 (B₂)
Total	78.08 (A₁)	79.92 (A₂)	76.50

Table 3. Summary of a 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance.

Source of Variance	SS	Df	MS	F_O	$F_{t\,(0,05)}$
Between Columns	129.31	1	129.31	4.43	4.08
Between Rows	345.31	1	345.31	11.82	4.08
Interaction	169.92	1	169.92	5.82	4.08
Between Group	644.54	3	214.85		
Within Group	1402.46	48	29.22		

a. Because F_o between columns (4.43) is higher than F_t (4.08) at the level of significance α=0.05, Ho is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the students' writing skill between those who were taught using Dictogloss and those who were taught using Direct Instruction. Based on the computation result, the mean score of students who were taught using Dictogloss (78.08) is higher than that of those who were taught using Direct Instruction (74.92). It can be concluded that Dictogloss is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing skill.

b. Because F_o between rows (11.82) is higher than F_t (4.08) at the level of significance α=0.05, Ho is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that students who had high motivation differs significantly from those who had low motivation in their writing skill. In addition, the mean score of students who had high motivation (79.08) is higher than that of those who had low motivation (73.92). It can be concluded that the students having higher motivation have better writing skill than those who have lower motivation.

4.2 Discussion

The following section discusses findings of the research by considering the result of the data analysis above.

4.2.1 Effectiveness

The research findings reveal that there is a significant difference between Dictogloss and Direct Instruction. The results showed that Dictogloss is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing. The mean score of students who are taught by using Dictogloss is higher than those students who are taught by using Direct Instruction.

Teaching writing skill by using Dictogloss made the students learn more actively and successfully in the writing class. Dictogloss also let the students to do individual and group activities and gave multiple opportunities for peer learning and peer teaching. In the reconstruction stage of Dictogloss, the students work in a group to reconstruct the text dictated through discussion. Moreover, in the analysis and correction stage of Dictogloss, the students' reconstructed texts are analyzed and

corrected by their friends, this enabled the students to see what they have done well and what they need to know more about writing. Therefore, the students with low ability in writing can learn from their friends who have higher ability in writing so their writing can be improved.

Dictogloss involves four phases namely preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis and correction. These stages led to oral communicative activities among language learners. After reconstructing their own version of the dictated text, the students were asked to read them aloud, analyze the used words, phrases and the grammatical constructions, compared their written works with the original text as well as with their peers' works, work in small groups and discussed the results and shared opinions about them. These activities resulted interaction, collaboration, and empowerment among the students. This completely changed the patterns of activity in the class that was before a teacher-centered.

Vasiljevic (2010) states that by Dictogloss, students can learn and train to write good paragraph/s in different ways. Students are given much time to interact with their friends during learning. Dictogloss also gives opportunities for students to learn something new from their group because every person has different skill in writing. In this study, it was seen that from the other members of groups, the students could get feedback and correction to their mistakes in writing, so that they could identify their strengths and weaknesses in writing to produce better writing. Moreover, it decreased their anxiety in learning writing because they worked in a group.

This is also supported by previous research done by Farid et al. (2017). The research was to find out how Dictogloss storytelling enhances the students' writing ability. The analysis of student texts showed that the implementation of Dictogloss storytelling led to the improvement of students' writing performance, not only in terms of score, but also in terms of its schematic structure, content, and language. Students wrote narrative schematic structure in a better organization. The content was improved, in which students were able to write detail events in proper order. In terms of the use of language, error in grammar, vocabulary, and spelling, and punctuation, it did not occur as frequently as in the students' pre-test writing. Moreover, the findings of interview demonstrated that the students enjoyed learning activities using Dictogloss storytelling technique. This technique helped the students to enrich their vocabulary and complete the writing task given by the teacher. Furthermore, Dictogloss storytelling enabled the students to actively participate in the learning activities. This was supported by the classroom observation result; it revealed that students were actively giving responses to the characters of the story, they enthusiastically responded to the questions asked by the teacher and showed great participation in groups.

Another research result was from Lim and Jacobs (2001). They considered the collaboration aspect of dictogloss task and based on the journals and questionnaires collected from the students, they found that it has a positive effect on the learners in case of both recognition and effect. They concluded that a collaborative task like dictogloss can help learners be satisfied with working in groups, have better feelings and therefore learn better.

On the contrary, in Direct Instruction, the students were the objects of learning. They were passive students rather than active since they fully depended on the teacher's instruction and guidance, they listened to the teacher's instruction and did the things required by the teacher. The teacher played an important role in this

technique. He or she is the resource of information and knowledge. It is stated by Hinson et al. (2000) that Direct Instruction is teacher-centered model. This means that the teacher becomes the major information, and all the activities are under the teacher's control. The material is determined by the teacher, which means that the students have less opportunity to learn from others.

Some researcher (Gagné, 1985, as cited in Magliaro et al., 2005) posit that Direct Instruction should be not be used for higher level learning or performance, but in situations where motor skills or prerequisite intellectual skills are being instructed. This would be: mathematical producers, grammar rules, scientific equations, etc. As stated in the research conclusion by Ryder et al. (2006), Direct Instruction approaches can be tied to three principles: language is broken down into components taught in isolation, learning is teacher-directed, and students have little input. Thus, based on these positions, it made Dictogloss to be more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill.

4.2.2 Motivation

The findings of this research revealed that students having high motivation have better writing skill than those having low motivation. The mean score of students having high motivation is higher than that of having low motivation. Students who had high motivation tended to be more active in the teaching learning process because they had stronger desire to learn. They were curious and enthusiastic in joining teaching learning process. They were good at making full use of every chance to improve themselves. Their desire continued to influence their conscious decision to act and the effort that they put into learning. Learning was not a burden for them but a moment of enjoyment. They felt happy to learn, and the efficiency was greatly improved. This is supported by Gardner (2005) that high motivation display many characteristics. Motivated individuals express effort in attaining the goal, they show persistence, and they attend to the tasks necessary to achieve the goals. They have strong desire to attain their goal, and they enjoy the activities necessary to achieve their goal. They are aroused in seeking the goals, they have expectancies about their successes and failure, and when they are achieving some degree of success they demonstrate self-efficacy; they are self-confident about their achievement. Finally, they have reasons for their behavior.

Long et al. (2013) state that students who have high learning motivation take a correct and positive attitude towards their study and make great efforts to master English with clear goal and desire, and consequently gain better grade. Similar views, Martens and Kirschner (2004) posit that high-motivated students are more persistence, and more likely to achieve set goals, and have higher levels of self-regulation. The students are more curious and engage in more deep level learning, an effect that holds true for students of all age group.

This also supported by the previous research done by Waite and Davis (2007). They found that the students showed a higher level of motivation when they planned meetings and discussed problems within a supportive group of similarly motivated individuals. This finding shed light on instructional methods that provided a strategic approach to promote learning through collaborative interaction. Students may well perform better when they feel they belong and share interests with their teachers in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and abilities that engender academic success. That is,

intrinsically motivated students, when working together, may mutually help each other's learning beyond the level of that seen in extrinsically motivated individuals. The instructional methods teachers employ play an essential role in deciding the motivational orientation of their students. This is in line with research result from Wigfield and Wagner (2005), that showed that high-motivated students have higher achievement levels, lower levels of anxiety and higher perceptions of competence and engagement in learning than students who have low motivation.

On the contrary, students who had low motivation tended to be passive recipients of knowledge; they only received what the teacher said. They always depended on someone else, did not try hard, gave up easily in the face of challenge, and did not have the desire to improve their competencies. Students who had low motivation tended to be discouraged to participate or involve in learning activities. Furthermore, they got bored easily and they did not enjoy the activity in the classroom. They could not be motivated to perform well because of their low interest to solve the problem, or the desire to understand during the lesson. There is no energy and mental power from the students to reach the goal.

Li and Pan (2009) describe that students with low motivation have less power to sustain effort to learn and cannot achieve a lot; as a result, they become unsuccessful learners. Once they meet difficulties, most students with low motivation, choose to stop learning, fear to lose faces and are afraid of making mistakes. They tend to avoid and seek for other chances of challenging when they may feel competent. It seems that they unlikely achieve success no matter who the teacher is or what the curricula are.

Ryan and Deci (2000) state that students have low motivation when they believe that working on the task will result in desirable outcomes (e.g. reward, good grade, parents' and teacher approval, avoidance of punishment). Moreover, Legault et al. (2006) describe that unmotivated students lead to poor academic achievement, they are not interested in the challenges, they often fail because of low self-efficacy (effort, persistence, and goal setting). In line with this, Lai (2011) also states that low-motivated students tend to procrastination, to make excuses, to avoid challenges tasks, and not to try, in an attempt to avoid negative ability attributions for tasks they are not confident they can perform. Those characteristics present low motivated students when they get assignment from the teacher.

This condition is similar to the previous study conducted by Tuan (2011) that unmotivated learners show a lack of interest in the L2 or L2 community culture, hesitate to participate in any class activities, have no intimate affiliation with the teacher and/or peers. Consequently, they show ever-growing diffidence in the classroom environment. Eventually, these learners end up with appalling learning outcomes, which in turn aggravate remaining motivation. Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) identified five factors of demotivation in high school EFL learners: (a) course content and material, (b) teacher competence and teaching style, (c) inadequate school facilities, (d) lack of intrinsic motivation, and (e) test scores. Therefore, it can be concluded that students having high motivation have better writing skill than those having low motivation.

5.   CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result of this study, the researcher draws some research findings: (1) Dictogloss is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing; (2) students having high motivation have better writing skill than those having low motivation. Besides, it is recommended that first, in relation to the teacher's performance, it is suggested that every teacher should have a good understanding on the proper application of Dictogloss in teaching writing. Therefore, this technique can be implemented properly as the value and theory of Dictogloss. Moreover, teachers should prepare the material and activity to ensure the efficiency of the classroom activity during the teaching learning process. Teachers also need to manage the time effectively, so that both the teacher and students can enjoy the lesson

Next, the steps of teaching should be more emphasized on the listening part since it has pivotal part of this technique. Once the students are keen on listening to the teacher's story, they will start to grasp it better. Then, it is important to take into consideration the group size because students must have the equal opportunity to share their ideas during discussion. The pronunciations of the teacher also need to be considered. The more fluent the teacher, the more easier students to catch the sentences.

For future similar research, the use of video recording is a great idea for better improvement. As for further research, this research can be additional references, especially for conducting the same kind of research related to teaching writing. The researchers hope that other researchers will make improvement by trying to use this topic of research with different subjects of research to different psychological points of view besides motivation, which may have correlation to the students' writing skill.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principle*. London: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment principle and classroom practices*. White Plains: Pearson Education.

Collins, V. R. (2000). *Becoming a tour guide: The principles of guiding and site interpretation*. London and New York: Continuum.

Farid, A. A. P. A., Setyarini, S., & Moecharam, N. Y. (2017). The implementation of dictogloss storytelling in improving 8th grade students' writing skill. *Journal of English and Education, 5*(1), 85-91.

Gagné, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold Ltd.

Gardner, R. C. (2005). *Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. (Joint Plenary Talk)*. Ontario: Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics/Canadian Linguistics Association.

Hamidun, N., Hashim, S. H. M., & Othman, N. F. (2012). Enhancing students' motivation by providing feedback on writing: The case of international students from Thailand. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 2*(6), 591-594.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Malaysia: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (Fourth ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Hinson, S. L., Parsons, R. D., & Sardo-Brown, D. (2000). *Educational psychology: A practitioner-researcher model of teaching*. London: Wadsworth Pub Co.

Ismail, S. A. A. (2011). Exploring students' perceptions of ESL writing. *English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 73-83.

Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of writing research, 1*(1), 1-26.

Kooshafar, M., Youhanaee, M., & Amirian, Z. (2012). The effect of dictogloss technique on learners' writing improvement in terms of writing coherent texts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(4), 716-721.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching from method to postmethod*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lai, E. R. (2011). Motivation: A literature review. London: Pearson.

Legault, L., Green-Demers, I., & Pelletier, L. (2006). Why do high school students lack motivation in the classroom? Toward an understanding of academic amotivation and the role of social support. *Journal of Education Psychology, 98*(3), 567-582.

Li, P., & Pan, G. (2009). The relationship between motivation and achievement - A survey of the study motivation of English majors in Qingdao agricultural university. *English Language Teaching, 2*(1), 123-128.

Lim, W. L., & Jacobs, G. M. (2001). *An analysis of students' dyadic interaction on a dictogloss task*: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 456 649.

Long, C., Ming, Z., & Chen, L. (2013). The study of student motivation on English learning in junior middle school (A case study of No.5 middle school in Gejiu). *Canadian Center of Science and Education, 6*(9), 136-144.

Mackenzie, A. (2011). Dictogloss tasks to promote cooperative learning and vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of Business Administration, 81*, 135-143.

Magliaro, S. G., Lockee, B. B., & Burton, J. K. (2005). Direct instruction revisited: A key model for instructional technology. *Journal of Education Research Technology and Development, 53*(4), 41-56.

Mahadi, T. S. T., & Jafari, S. M. (2012). Motivation, its types, and its impacts in language learning. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(24), 230-235.

Martens, R., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). Predicting intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 20*(5), 621-630.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: The McGraw Hill.

Richards, J. C. (2002). *Methodology in the language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54–67.

Ryder, R. J., Burton, J. L., & Silberg, A. (2006). Longitudinal study of direct instruction effects from first through third grades. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 179-191.

Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technologies and Applied Linguistics, 37*(1), 57-69.

Smith, K. M. (2012). Dictogloss: A multi-skill task for accuracy in writing through cooperative learning. Retrieved 27th September 2017 from http://tht-japan.org/publications/2011/069-080_smith.pdf

Tuan, L. T. (2011). EFL learners motivation revisited. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(10), 1257-1272.

Vasiljevic, Z. (2010). Dictogloss as an interactive method of teaching listening comprehension to L2 learners. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 41-52.

Waite, S., & Davis, B. (2007). Developing undergraduate research skills in a faculty of education: Motivation through collaboration. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*(4), 403-419.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *(Grammar dictation) Resource books for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wigfield, A., & Wagner, A. L. (2005). Competence, motivation, and identity development during adolescence. In J. A. Elliot & S. C. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 222-239). New York, US: Guilford Press.

Williams, K. C., & Williams, C. C. (2011). Five key ingredients for improving students motivation. *Research in Higher Educational Journal, 12*(8), 101-123.

THE AUTHORS

Dian Pertiwi is a graduate student of the English Department at Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia. She was born in West Borneo on August 20, 1991. She received her Bachelor degree in English Education from Ahmad Dahlan University, Indonesia, in 2013. Her research interest is in English Language Teaching. She has joined an international conference in Semarang and published in the proceedings with her paper entitled "Exploring EFL learners' vocabulary learning strategy". She has also done a poster presentation with the title "Supporting students' writing skill by using Facebook" in the seminar of *Teachers Now and Future: Beyond the Boundaries* that was held in Sebelas Maret University.

Ngadiso is a lecturer at Sebelas Maret University. He completed his Bachelor degree in English Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia, in 1987. In 1999, he completed his Master degree in Language Education at IKIP Jakarta. Then, in 2004, he continued his Doctoral degree to State University of Jakarta with a major in Language Education. He has published two articles with the title "Model of teaching English using Curriculum 13 for the students of SMA Surakarta" and " Massively Multiplayer Online Role Playing Game (MMORPG): An alternative medium in English Language Teaching" in an international journal. He has also written two books with the title "English Book for RSBI Class" and "Science for RSBI Class".

Nur Arifah Drajati currently teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia. She finished her Doctoral degree in Language Education at State University of Jakarta in 2013. Her research interests include technology in language learning, literacy, and writing. In 2018, she has published two articles with the title "Preservice English teachers' perceptions of English as an international language in Indonesia and Korea" in the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* and "Investigating English language teachers in developing Tpack and multimodal literacy" in the *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. She had previously taught at the Lab School in Jakarta before she joined Sebelas Maret University as a lecturer.