

USING DICTATION STRATEGY IN TEACHING LISTENING COMPREHENSION ACHIEVEMENTS

**Tri Nurhidayanti ¹, Masagus Sulaiman ², Dwi Rara
Saraswati ³**

*¹ English Department, Faculty of Teachers Training
and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah
Palembang, Indonesia*

Email: trinurhidayanti31@gmail.com

*² English Department, Faculty of Teachers Training
and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah
Palembang, Indonesia*

Email: mrshu.ok@gmail.com

*³ English Department, Faculty of Teachers Training
and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah
Palembang, Indonesia*

Email: rara_filan89@ymail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effectiveness of the dictation strategy in improving students' listening comprehension achievements. The researchers applied a True Experimental research design in this study. There were 64 students in grade eight of SMP Dharma Bhakti Palembang who were involved as samples taken by purposive sampling technique. The researchers used pretest and posttest as research instruments to collect the data. To analyze the data, the researchers used a t-test, in line with the paired sample t-test

and independent sample t-test. The results showed that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. The null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected, because t -obtained (3.430) was higher than t -table (2.045) and p output (0.01) < (0,05 which means that the dictation strategy was effective in teaching listening comprehension achievements to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Dharma Bhakti Palembang.

Keywords: *Dictation Strategy; Listening Comprehension; Achievements*

Introduction

As one of the important language skills, listening is needed to be learned by heart by academic students. Brown (2004, p.284) agrees that listening especially for academic and professional context is a highly refined skill that requires a student's attention to series of strategies for extracting meaning from texts. This means that students have to pay attention and understand the text given. They have to understand the contents of the text. They have to listen to general and specific information of the text that related to finding topic and main ideas as well as detailed information of the text.

Additionally, Vasiljevic (2010, p.41) claims that more than 45% of communication time is spent listening, which clearly shows how important this skill. Unfortunately, many students find listening to be the most difficult language skill to understand and master. It supported by Kurita (2012, p.1) who states that students often consider listening to be the most difficult language skill to learn since they may be were not taught how to learn to listen effectively. Additionally, Arono (2014, p.64) assumes that listening makes sense of what one heard in which has something to do with a primary skill, because it is such a basic skill which is learnt unconsciously and naturally before other language skills. On the other side, Devito (2013, p.505) says that listening is an action that does not just happen without awareness but must be done intentionally. This involves understanding a speaker's accent or pronunciation.

Like other experts, Rost (2002, p.5) as cited in Desianu (2011, p.27) presumes that listening is

regarded as a multi-layered process involving receiving what that speaker actually says-hearing correctly, constructing and representing meaning-decoding, creating meaning through involvement and imagination. It means that when students study listening skill, they are required to comprehend the message or text they just listen and this activity was often known as listening comprehension.

According to Wei (2013, p.2), listening comprehension is a complex process in which listeners play an active role in discriminating between sounds, understanding vocabulary and grammatical structures, interpreting intonation and stress, and as well as interpreting the utterance. It provides students with the aural component of the target language to help them better hear the intricate sounds, enunciations, content and develop their abilities to communicate with others in a target language, (Jones, 2003, p.41).

Besides, Brown (2002, p.249) argues that “listening comprehension is the psychomotor process of receiving sound waves through the ear and transmitting nerve impulses to the brain”. It means that listening comprehension is like an interactive process of what received and comprehended. In teaching listening comprehension, the teacher ought to be vivid in stating teaching goal when start teaching listening comprehension. It is in keeping with the ideas of Thirumalai,(2002, p.3) who deciphers the goal of teaching listening comprehension that must be explicit and meaningful to the students and the teacher should give clear direction to the students as to what they listen to. In other words, the teacher must facilitate students with very good ways and procedure when teaching listening comprehension skill and get all students involved during the classroom activities because it is not either top-down or bottom-up learning process, but an interactive, interpretive learning process

where students use their prior knowledge and linguistic knowledge in understanding messages. It is as suggested by Larry (2002, p.2) who states that the degree to which listeners use when learning listening will depend on their knowledge of the language and familiarity with the topic as well as the purpose for listening itself.

On the other hand, Thirumalai (2002, p.6) delineates that there were several kinds of listening comprehension exercises that can be used as a good strategy in teaching listening skill, and one of them is dictation. Dictation is an ancient technique, the habit of dictating the teacher was basically an old habit that is not in accordance with today (Hamada, 2016, p.22). This activity lets students listen to a paragraph and write the missing words related to the text read by the teacher, and students need to take notes. Moreover, Desianu (2011, p.7) also adds that dictation ensures attentive listening, trains students to distinguish sounds, enables them to learn how to

transfer oral sound to written symbols, helps to develop aural comprehension and assists in self-evaluation.

Like other experts, Lightfoot (2005, p.1) delineates that dictation refers to a person's reading aloud of some texts in order the listeners can write down what has been said. While, Nation and Newton (2009, p.62) state that dictation is an activity that easily organized to become a part of the regular classroom routine. On the other side, Davis, Paul, and Rinvoluturi, (2003, p.122) elaborate that dictation can be a very useful test to ascertain students' progress in spelling, punctuation and pronunciation. Furthermore, Montalvan (2006) mentions some advantages of using dictation strategy in teaching listening, such as helping to develop three other language skills. (speaking, reading and writing).

Moreover, Scoot (2016, p.14) proposes 3 steps of applying dictation strategy in teaching listening, namely:

1. The first step is done by giving an apperception first, before starting dictation to attract students' attention.
2. The second step is done by writing dictation material. In this case, the teacher will do some activities, such as:
 - a) Writing the subject matter on the blackboard with interesting writing.
 - b) Reading the dictation subject matter that has been written slowly and smoothly.
 - c) After reading the dictation, the teacher asks students to read the dictation correctly and fluently then lets them write it down in a notebook.
 - d) Reading the dictation again till he or she is sure that there are no students make mistakes.
3. The third or the last step is done by evaluating activities, as follows:

- a) Collecting all students' dictation notes, to then check whether the dictation results are correct or not.
- b) Asking questions about the dictation that has just been made, and then telling one of the students to write it on the blackboard.
- c) Correcting the dictation as a whole.
- d) Conducting an assessment by giving posttest.

In conclusion, the researchers think that English teachers need to implement the steps of this strategy when teaching listening skill to students by considering students' abilities and the material given. Based on the explanation stated, the researchers decided to conduct research under the title "*Using Dictation Strategy in Teaching Listening Comprehension*".

Method

The researchers used quantitative method in term of true experimental research design to collect

the data. According to Syahri, Sulaiman, Susanti (2017, p.47) true experimental design is a research design in line with variables are controlled, the control group and the experimental group which is known as non-equivalent groups pretest-posttest design, There were 64 students from class VIII, B used as control class or group and class VIII.C used as experimental class or group. To be detailed, Table 1 was presented.

Table 1. Sample of the Study

No	Class	Number of Students
1	VIII. C	32
2	VIII, B	32
Total		64

There were 50 items for dictation test that the researchers gave to students. In this research, The researchers did such an achievement test based on the consideration that it will measure the students' mastery in listening. The students were hoped to perceive the contents of the passage and recognize all the words and phrases being read so they were able

to put these aural codes into written symbols. In this case, the researchers read words or phrases for three times and asked the students to write down on answer sheets. In analyzing the data, the researchers used t-test in terms of paired t-test and independent t-test through SPSS 25.0 Version.

Findings

The findings of the study were (1) the result of students' score in pretest and posttest of experimental group (2) the result of students' score in pretest and posttest of control group (3) the differences between pretest and posttest of control group (4) the comparison posttest of Experimental group and Control group by using independent sample T-test. In this study, the researchers calculated the inferential statistic data which were obtained from pretest and posttest scores.

**The Result of Students Pretest Score in
Experimental Group**

The number of students who took this test was 32 persons. The score of pretest obtained by students was presented in distribution score in Table 2.

Table 2 The Frequency of Pretest in Experimental Group

pretest_experimental

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 60	7	21.9	21.9	21.9
62	2	6.3	6.3	28.1
65	10	31.3	31.3	59.4
67	1	3.1	3.1	62.5
70	5	15.6	15.6	78.1
72	1	3.1	3.1	81.3
77	1	3.1	3.1	84.4
80	3	9.4	9.4	93.8

83	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 shows that the highest score that the students of experimental group obtained in pretest was 83 which was gotten by two student only (6.3 %) and the lowest score was 60 which was gotten by seven students (21.9 %). There were three students (9.4%) who got 80, one student (3.1%) who got 77, one student (3.1%) who got 72, five students (15.6%) who got 70, one student (3.1%) who got 67, ten students (31.3%) who got 65, two students (6.3%) who got 62.

The Result of Students Posttest Score in Experimental Group

The number of students who took this test was 32 persons. The score of Posttest obtained by students was presented in distribution score in Table 3

Table 3 The Frequency of Posttest in Experimental Group

posttest_experimental

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 70	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
72	1	3.1	3.1	12.5
77	1	3.1	3.1	15.6
80	2	6.3	6.3	21.9
82	1	3.1	3.1	25.0
85	1	3.1	3.1	28.1
87	5	15.6	15.6	43.8
90	4	12.5	12.5	56.3
92	2	6.3	6.3	62.5
95	5	15.6	15.6	78.1
97	7	21.9	21.9	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 shows the highest score that the students of experimental group obtained in posttest was 97 which was gotten by seven students only (21.9

%) and the lowest score was 70 which was gotten by three students (9.4 %). Five students (15.6%) who got 95, two students (6.3%) who got 92, four students (12.5%) who got 90, five students (15.6%) who got 87, one student (3.1%) who got 85, one student (3.1%) who got 82, two students (6.3%) who got 80. one student (3.1%) who got 77, one student (3.1%) who got 72.

The Result of Students Pretest Score in Control Group

The number of students who took this test was 32 persons. The score of pretest obtained by students was presented in distribution score in Table 4

Table 4. The Frequency of Pretest in Control Group

pretest_control_group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	45	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	52	2	6.3	6.3	9.4
	60	13	40.6	40.6	50.0
	62	3	9.4	9.4	59.4
	65	6	18.8	18.8	78.1
	70	3	9.4	9.4	87.5
	80	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	82	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	87	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	90	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 shows the highest score that the students of control group obtained in pretest was 90 which was gotten by one student only (3.1%) and the lowest score was 45 which was gotten by one student too (3.1%). There were one student (3.1%) who got 87, one student (3.1%) who got 82, one student (3.1%)

who got 80, three students (9.4%) who got 70, six students (18.8%) who got 65, three students (9.4%) who got 62, thirteen students (40.6%) who got 60. and two students (6.3%) who got 52.

The Result of Students Posttest Score in Control Group

The number of students who took this test was 32 persons. The score of Posttest obtained by students was presented in distribution score in Table 5.

Table 5. The Frequency of Posttest in Control Group

posttest_control_group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 45	4	12.5	12.5	12.5

47	1	3.1	3.1	15.6
50	1	3.1	3.1	18.8
52	1	3.1	3.1	21.9
72	2	6.3	6.3	28.1
75	2	6.3	6.3	34.4
77	2	6.3	6.3	40.6
80	1	3.1	3.1	43.8
82	3	9.4	9.4	53.1
85	2	6.3	6.3	59.4
87	4	12.5	12.5	71.9
90	4	12.5	12.5	84.4
92	3	9.4	9.4	93.8
95	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 shows the highest score that the students of control group obtained in posttest was 95 which was gotten by two students only (6.3 %) and the

lowest score was 45 which was gotten by four students (12.5 %). Three students (9.4%) who got 92, four students (12.5%) who got 90, four students (12.5%) who got 87, two students (6.3%) who got 85, three students (9.4%) who got 82, one student (3.1%) who got 80, two students (6.3%) who got 77. two students (6.3%) who got 75. two students (6.3%) who got 72 , one student (3.1%) who got 52, one student (3.1%) who got 50, one student (3.1%) who got 47.

The Differences between Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Group

To compare and figure out the significant difference between pretest and posttest scores in experimental group, the researchers used Paired Sample t-test. The result of paired sample t-test can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Paired Samples t-test of Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Group

Paired Samples t-test

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest_experimental	67.69	32	7.200	1.273
	posttest_experimental	88.09	32	8.774	1.551

	Paired Differences		T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	Mean	Std. Deviation			Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
			Lower	Upper				
Pair 1 pretest_experimental posttest_experimental	-20.406	10.289	1.819	-24.116	16.697	11.219	31	.000

Table 6 shows pretest score of the experimental group of the mean score was (67.69), the

standard deviation was 7.200 and standard error mean of pretests was 1.273. While posttest score in experimental group of the mean score was 88.09, the standard deviation was 8.774 and standard error mean of posttest was 1.551. The result of paired t-test showed the mean obtained was 20.406 the significance level $p < 0.5$. for 2 tailed and degree of freedom (df) was 31, and t-obtained was higher than t-test, so that H_0 (Null hypothesis) was rejected and H_a (alternative hypothesis) was accepted, because the differences between the experimental group score and control there was significance.

The differences Between Pretest and Posttest Score in Control Group

To compare and figure out the significant difference between pretest and posttest scores in control group, the researchers used Paired Sample t-test. The result of paired sample t-test can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Paired Samples t-test of Pretest and Posttest in
Control Group

Paired Samples t-test

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 pretest_control	64.19	32	9.447	1.670
posttest_control	76.47	32	17.048	3.014

Paired Differences				T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
			Lower	Upper		

Pair 1 pret est_ con trol pos ttes t_co ntro l	-12.281	18.567	3.282	18.97 5	5.587	- 3.742	31	.001
---	---------	--------	-------	------------	-------	------------	----	------

Table 7 shows pretest score of the control group of the mean score was (64.19), the standard deviation was 9.447 and standard error mean of pretests was 1.670. While posttest score in control group of the mean score was 76.47, the standard deviation was 17.048 and standard error mean of posttest was 3.014. The result of paired t-test shows the mean obtained was 12.281 the significance level $p < 0.5$. for 2 tailed and degree of freedom (df) was 31 , there for t-obtained was higher than t-table , so that H_0 (Null hypothesis) was rejected and H_a (alternative hypothesis) was accepted, because the differences between the experimental group score and control there was significance.

The comparison of Posttest Experimental Group and Control Group by Using Independent Sample T-test

To find out whether or not the dictation strategy was effective, the researchers used the comparison of posttests scores between experimental group and control group and analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test. Table 8 illustrates the results of the comparison.

Table 8. Independent Sample T-test

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper

Equal variances assumed	11.215	.001	3.430	62	.001	11.625	3.389	4.850	18.400
Equal variances not assumed			3.430	46.347	.001	11.625	3.389	4.804	18.446

Table 8 shows t-obtained (3.430) was higher than t-table (2.045) and $p (0.01) < (0,05)$ which means that dictation strategy was effective in teaching listening comprehension achievements to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Dharma Bhakti Palembang.

Discussion

Based on the finding stated, the students who were taught dictation strategy in teaching listening got better achievements than those were not taught speaking by using dictation strategy in listening. The average of the pretest score in the experimental group (32 students) was 67.69. The highest score was 83, while the lowest score was 60. For the posttest scores

the mean was 88.09. The highest score was 97 while the lowest score was 70. The result shows that the t -obtained was 3.430 which was 0,05 of level significance with the degree of freedom (df) was 31 with So f could be concluded that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected, because t -obtained (3.430) exceeded and highest that t -table (2.042) and p (0.01) was less or lower than α (0,05). It means that there was a significant difference between the students score in the pretest and posttest. It can be concluded that there was significant difference in students' listening comprehension achievement test scores between the pretest and posttest of experimental ($p = 0.001 < 0.05$) which means that the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It can be stated that using dictation strategy in teaching listening comprehension was effective that to the Eighth Grade Students at SMP Dharma Bhakti Palembang.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion formerly stated, the scores of the students listening comprehension achievements by using Dictation Strategy in the posttest was higher than pretest. The result of independent sample t-test also showed that t-obtained was higher than as its critical value of t-table. It can be concluded that it was effective to teach listening comprehension achievements using dictation strategy to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Dharma Bhakti Palembang

References

- Arono. (2014). Improving students' listening skill through interactive multimedia in Indonesia. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 5(1), 63-69.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principle and classroom practices*. NewYork, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University Press.

Davis., Paul., & Rinvolutri, M. (2003). *Dictation-new methods new possibilities*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Desianu. (2011). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Devito, J. A. (2013). *The interpersonal communication book* (13th ed). New Jersey, NJ: Pearson.

Hamada, E. (2016). *Writing skills: Practical techniques in language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Jones. (2003). Supporting listening comprehension and vocabulary acquisition with multimedia annotations: The students' voice. *CALICO Journal* 21(1), 41-65.

Kurita. (2012). *Issues in second language listening comprehension and the pedagogical*. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Issues-in-Second-Language-Listening-Comprehension-Kurita>.

Larry. (2002). *Listening: Theory and practice in modern foreign language competence*. Retrieved from <https://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/gpg/67>.

Lightfoot, (2005). *Using dictation*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/using-dictation>.

Montalvan, R. (2006). *Dictation updated: guidelines for teacher-training workshops*. Retrieved from <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/dictatn.htm>.

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/ EFL listening and speaking*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Scoot A. (2016). *Dikte sebagai alat pembelajaran bahasa*. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.Org/Tecniques/AlkireDictation.html>.

Syahri, I., Sulaiman, M., & Susanti, R. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian pendidikan bahasa*. Palembang: Roemah Sufie.

Thirumalai, M. S. (2002). *An introduction to TESOL: Teaching English to speakers of others languages*. Retrieved from <http://www.languageinindia.com/april2002/tesolbook.html>

Vasiljevic. (2010). *Dictogloss as an interactive method of teaching listening comprehension to L2 learners*. Retrieved from

Darussalam English Journal

Volume 3, Number 1, June 2023

eISSN: 2807-3223

DOI: 10.30739/dej.v3i1.2010

<https://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/5212>

Wei, L. (2013). *Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Not a universal medicine*. Retrieved from <http://idiom.nystesol.org/articles/vol40-04.html>