InjET

International Journal of Education and Training
http://www.injet.upm.edu.my

The Effect of Dictogloss on Jordanian EFL Teachers' Instructional Practices and Students' Writing Performance[1]

Ruba Fahmi Bataineh[1*] & Riyadh Ali Bani Younis[2]

[1] Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan
[2] Ministry of Education, Jordan

ABSTRACT

This study examines the potential effect of a proposed DG-based training on Jordanian EFL teachers' writing instruction and their students' overall writing performance, using a mixed quantitative and qualitative quasi-experimental design. The findings reveal a significant effect for Dictogloss on both teachers' writing instruction and students' writing performance.

Keywords: Dictogloss, EFL, instructional practices, Jordan, writing performance

INTRODUCTION

Research (e.g., Brown, 2001; Byrne, 2011; Cunning, 1998; Flower & Hays, 1981; Langan, 1987; Nunan, 1999; Omaggio, 2001; Parker, 1993; Rivers, 1975) suggests that writing is not a matter of putting things down on paper. There seems to be a consensus among scholars that writing is a complex process (e.g., Flower & Hays, 1981; Nunan, 1999) of exploring one's thought, discovering ideas, and generating meaning which requires continuous intellectual effort over time. In other words, writing is seen more as a distinctly slow and laborious process than just transcription of speech (Cunning, 1998; Harp & Brewer, 1991; Langan, 1987; Omaggio, 2001; Parker, 1993).

In writing, learners not only engage in higher level skills (e.g., planning, organizing) but also in lower level skills (e.g., spelling, punctuation, word choice). Richards and Renandy (2002) claim that writing is the most difficult skill to master for second/foreign language learners, as the difficulty of mastering writing stems not only from generating and organizing ideas but also from translating these ideas into readable text.

To facilitate teaching and learning writing, scholars (e.g., Brown, 2001; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Raimes, 1998) have put forth a number of principles for designing writing instruction. These principles include, among several others, incorporating the various practices of good writers (e.g., focusing on a main idea, audience awareness, planning ahead, soliciting and utilizing feedback, revising and reviewing), balancing process and product, connecting reading and writing, allowing for authentic writing, and framing the techniques in terms of pre-writing, drafting, and revising stages.

Dictogloss (henceforth, DG) is a fairly recent instructional technique, first introduced by Wajnryb and Malay (1990), which combines traditional dictation with the integration of form and meaning. DG is defined as "an integrated skills technique for language learning in which students work together to create a reconstructed version of a text read to them by their teacher" (Jacobs & Small, 2003, P.1). Similarly, Nunan (2010) and Vasiljevic (2010) define DG as a classroom dictation activity where learners listen to a passage, note down key

[1] This manuscript is extracted from the second author's doctoral dissertation per the regulations in force at Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

* Corresponding author: rubab@yu.edu.jo
eISSN: 2462-2079

words and then work together to create a reconstructed version of the text, which allows them to both practice the four language skills and use grammar and vocabulary in completing the task.

Albeit similar in some aspects, dictogloss is distinct from traditional dictation, which is simply defined as an activity in which students write down what is spoken or read to them by the teacher. Dictation, whose utility as an instructional and/or testing technique is highly debatable (Afsharrad & Sadeghi Benis, 2014), has lost much of its popularity, brought about by the Grammar Translation Method, with the advent of the Audiolingual Method to once again regain its popularity as an effective instructional and/or testing technique of overall language proficiency (Faghani, Derakhshan & Zangoei, 2015). Historically, dictation has alternated between three views: as an ineffective measure since the text is entirely dictated to the students (e.g., Lado, 1961) with virtually no creativity (Bennett, 1968) or precision (Harris, 1969), as an effective measure for testing whole language proficiency rather than isolated language components (Oller, 1971), and as an instructional but not a testing measure (Rivers, 1968).

Dictogloss has the advantage of integrating communicative notions with the traditional concerns of grammar instruction (Al-Sibai, 2008; Pica, 1997), as a form-focused technique (Jacobs and Small, 2003; Shak, 2006) in which students aim not to reproduce the text word-for-word but rather to approximate its meaning and style as closely as possible. DG also provides the added advantage of the so-called 'meta-talk' or 'language related episodes', which are defined as occasions in which students discuss or question their language use as they engage in a reconstruction task in L2 (Qin, 2008; Rashtchi & Khosroabadi, 2009).

Dictogloss is implemented in three to five major steps (e.g., Jacobs & Small, 2003; Wajnryb & Malay, 1990; Wilson, 2003). Wajnryb and Malay identify four stages whereas Wilson and Jacob identify three and five stages, respectively. However, as the difference in the number of stages hardly alters the content, this research adopts four stages, as outlined below:

Preparation. The teacher engages the students in topic-related warm-up or preliminary oral or written exercise to activate their prior knowledge and vocabulary on the topic and optimize their receptivity to the text. At the conclusion of the stage, students are put into groups and made aware of what is expected of them during the activity (Stewart, Silva & González, 2014; Wajnryb & Malay, 1990).
Dictation. The teacher reads the text once at normal speed, without pauses, for the students to just listen and once more for them to take notes. After a short break (e.g., three to five minutes), a third reading may be done to enable students to confirm the information and revise their notes, especially as they gain familiarity with the procedure.
Reconstruction. Using the notes they have taken during the *dictation* stage, students work, in groups of three or four under the teacher's direct supervision, to reconstruct the text. Note that the purpose here is to get the gist of the original text rather than to fully replicate it.
Analysis and Correction. Students work, in groups, to analyze and correct their reconstructed texts and to compare texts among groups to identify the problems they may have in comprehending the text. The teacher circulates among the groups to check peer feedback and provide assistance where needed prior to engaging the students in a comparison of their versions to the original text (often using the board).

The significance of DG essentially derives from its objectives. Wajnryb and Malay (1990) claim that interaction is the key to DG, as it requires students to create their own versions of the original text, simultaneously attending to grammatical accuracy, cohesion, and logical sequence and gaining awareness of their points of strength and weakness as they work collaboratively amongst themselves.

Based on the assumption that a learner's awareness of language form facilitates his/her language learning, Kowal and Swain (1994) hail DG as an effective language learning technique because it provides a context for negotiation. During both the *reconstruction* and the *correction and analysis* stages, students are given the opportunity to discuss, compare notes, and edit drafts for correct punctuation, spelling, and main ideas in addition to comparing text versions among the various groups.

Statement of the Problem

There seems to be a consensus among scholars (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2000; Harris & Sass, 2007; Stronge, Ward, Tucker & Hindman, 2007) that teacher quality and experience play a significant role in student learning and achievement. As experienced EFL practitioners, the researchers claim that Jordanian EFL teachers generally lack for effective techniques not only for teaching writing but also for teaching all four language skills. Furthermore, since most Jordanian learners are rather weak in the four language skills (Bataineh, 2005; Bataineh & Zghoul, 2006; Al-Rabadi & Bataineh, 2015),), especially in writing (Bani Younis, 1997; Bataineh & Obeiah,

2016; Obeiah & Bataineh, 2016; Smadi, 1997), this research constitutes an attempt to alleviate this problem through DG-based training for both teachers and students.

Purpose and Questions of the Study

This study aims at examining the potential effect of a proposed DG-based training not only on Jordanian EFL teachers' writing instruction but also on their students' overall writing performance. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What is the potential effect of the DG-based training on teachers' instructional practices in writing?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the teachers' mean scores on the pre- and post-test, which can be attributed to the DG-based training?
3. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the students' mean scores on the pre- and post-test, which can be attributed to the DG-based training?

Significance and Limitations of the Study

Even though ample local and international research has been conducted on teacher training, to the best of these researchers' knowledge, DG-based training to improve teacher and student writing performance has not been attempted. Thus, this study may contribute to the literature on teacher professional development by providing new insights on using DG to improve teaching and learning writing alike.

However, the generalizability of the findings may be limited by the fact that only 16 teachers from the North-Eastern Directorate of Education and their 120 students participated in the study and, thus, the generalizability of the conclusions drawn may be limited to teachers and students in similar contexts.

Previous Research

An extensive review of the literature has revealed a dearth of local and international empirical research on the utility of DG in developing EFL writing performance. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, this is the first attempt, in- and outside Jordan, to examine the potential effect of DG-based training on teachers' instructional practices and on their students' overall writing performance.

Nabei (1996) examined the effect of DG on four Polish and Chinese ESL learners' interaction within DG to determine its potential to facilitate language learning. Learner interactions were analyzed for instances of critical language-related (meaning-based, grammatical, and orthographic) episodes indicative of attention to language skills. Nabei reported that about 49 percent of the episodes were grammar-related and 35 percent meaning-based. The patterns of critical language-related episodes also indicated that DG facilitated discussion of both form and meaning.

Zheng (2006) investigated the effect of short passage dictation practice on 60 first-year college Chinese EFL learners' writing ability. The students in the experimental group were given 10 to 20 minutes dictation practice in every class session. At the end of the semester, a post-test was conducted and the results showed that short-passage dictation greatly improved students' writing performance.

Qin (2008) compared the effect of processing instruction and DG task on 110 Chinese EFL seventh-grade students' learning of the passive voice. The findings revealed that the DG group outperformed the processing group in production whereas the processing group outperformed the DG group in comprehension on the immediate post-test. However, both groups performed similarly on both comprehension and production on the delayed post-test.

Similarly, Patten, Inclezen, Salazar, and Farley (2009) compared the effects of DG, processing instruction and traditional teaching on 108 Spanish students' learning of object pronouns and word order. Assessment was done through an interpretation task, a sentence-level production task and a paragraph reconstruction task, all given as pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test. Students in the processing instruction group were found to outperform those in the DG group and those in the traditional learning group (who made gains only on the interpretation and sentence-level production tasks).

Using a grammaticality judgment test, an error correction test, and a meta-linguistic knowledge test, Han (2011) examined the relationship between 14 upper intermediate multi-national ESL learners' noticing of target forms in a DG task, their learning outcomes, and the factors that limit noticing and subsequent learning. Her findings revealed a positive relationship between the extent of noticing and subsequent learning and the learners' readiness for learning the target form.

Uludag and Vanpatten (2012) investigated the comparative effects of processing instruction and DG on 60 Turkish EFL university students' learning of the English passive, by means of a pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test. The findings revealed that the processing instruction group outperformed the DG group in developing correct interpretation of the passive voice structure. However, both processing instruction and DG were found to have the same effect in terms of developing sentence-level production and simple text reconstruction.

Kooshafar, Youhanaee and Amirian (2012) examined the effect of DG on 19 Iranian EFL students' writing. The findings revealed that DG is effective for improving students' long-term writing ability compared to traditional instruction which was reported to have a positive short-term effect.

Abbasian and Mohammadi (2013) studied the effect of DG on 70 Iranian EFL students' general writing ability. They reported that DG positively affects students' overall writing performance as well as the sub-components of organization and mechanics of writing. However, no effect was reported for content, usage or vocabulary.

Prince (2013) examined the effect of three variations of a DG-based task on 107 French EFL university students' listening, remembering, and writing. The findings revealed progress in students' writing on all the measures adopted as well as progress in their retention of the spoken input.

Purwaningsih and Kurniasih (2014) examined the implementation of DG in teaching writing to Nigerian eighth-grade students, their responses toward DG, and their writing task results. Using an observation checklist, field notes, a questionnaire, and students' task results, they reported appropriate DG implementation, positive students' responses, and improvement in their overall writing performance.

Khoii and Pourhassan (2015) compared the effect of three types of dictation (traditional dictation, dicto-comp, and DG) practice on 55 Iranian EFL elementary-stage students' immediate and delayed performance on the present tense of BE and indefinite articles. They reported that the traditional dictation group surpassed the other two groups on the immediate test of both present BE and indefinite articles, whereas the DG and dicto-comp groups outperformed the traditional dictation group on the delayed post-test.

Sampling, Instrumentation and Data Analysis

The participants of the study are 16 Jordanian EFL teachers and 120 tenth-grade students purposefully selected from the public schools of the North-Eastern Badia Directorate of Education in the second semester of the academic year 2014/2015. The experimental group (n=100) was taught through dictogloss, while the control group (n=20) was taught conventionally per the guidelines of the Teacher's Book.

The study uses a mixed quantitative and qualitative design. The quasi-experimental design was used for the student sample, randomly divided into one experimental and one control groups. A one-group design was used for the teacher sample, as qualitative data were collected through the classroom observation and teachers' reflection on the training.

Based on their collective experience and a thorough review of the literature, the researchers designed the instruments of the study, namely a pre- and post-test for teachers, a pre- and post-test for students, and a classroom observation checklist. The validity of the instruments was established by a jury of EFL professors, supervisors, and teachers whose notes on the instruments were taken into account in the final version of each instrument. The reliability of the instruments was established by administering them to a sample of students and teachers who were excluded from the sample of the study. The reliability coefficient for the two administrations of the tests amounted to 0.85 and 0.87 for the students and teachers, respectively.

The teachers' pre- and post-test, in its final form, consisted of six questions on the theory underlying DG. The students' pre- and post-test required them to write a description of their village. The observation checklist consisted of three main domains: preparation and planning (5 items), DG procedures (12 items), and assessment (3 items).

After establishing the validity and reliability of the instruments, the researchers met with the teachers to explain the purpose of the study and assure them of the confidentiality of their responses. The second researcher then trained them on both the theoretical and practical aspects of DG over period of four days, administered the pre-test to the student sample, administered the teachers' post-test and set to observe them as they implemented DG in their respective classrooms. The student post-test was administered immediately after the conclusion of the classroom observation.

Instructing the Experimental and Control Groups

The students of the experimental group were instructed through a number of steps: (1) the topic was introduced, and the students and teacher engaged in a discussion of the text (using key vocabulary); (2) key vocabulary was taught using, among others, visual organizers, examples, synonyms and antonyms; (3) the text was read aloud by the teacher at normal speed, with brief pauses between sentences; (4) at the end of the first reading, students were asked to work in groups to write words/phrases they could recall on an A3 sheet of paper (provided by the teacher); (5) the students and teacher discussed discrepancies among the recalled words/phrases; (6) the text was read again for the students to grasp its meaning; (7) in groups, students wrote sentences using their notes, compared their sentences with those of the other groups, negotiated correct answers, and edited their sentences; (8) the text was read for the third and final time, as students worked in groups to reconstruct the original text, using their notes and any information they could recall; (9) group work was checked and individual students were each asked to write his/her version of the text; (10) in groups, students worked on their reconstructed texts to ensure correct content, grammar, and punctuation, pooling their information and negotiating the best options; (11) the reconstructed texts were checked and finalized; (12) the teacher wrote a reconstructed text on the board and provided instant feedback.

By contrast, the control group was instructed per the guidelines of the Teacher's Book of *Action Pack 10*: (1) the teacher introduced the topic and the new vocabulary (in isolation); (2) students were taught how to state the purpose of their essays, to generate ideas, to organize, and to edit their essays. Note that, unlike those in the experimental group, these students received direct instruction; they did not get to listen to the text (but were rather asked to write the text using the new vocabulary and the ideas discussed in the introduction to the lesson), nor were they engaged in any group work or given immediate feedback on their performance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are presented and discussed according to the three questions of the research. To answer the first question, which addresses the potential effect of the DG-based training on teachers' practices in writing instruction, means and standard deviations were calculated for the results obtained through the classroom observation checklist, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Teachers' Instructional Practices after the DG-based Training

Practice No.	Dimension	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Degree
4	Preparation and Planning	The teacher determines the length of the text per the students' proficiency level.	4.44	0.73	1	High
1		The teacher formulates specific and measurable outcomes.	4.33	0.71	2	High
2		The teacher determines appropriate instructional strategies.	4.33	0.5	3	High
5		The teacher allocates appropriate time for each outcome.	4.33	0.5	4	High
3		The teacher determines appropriate assessment strategies and tools.	4.22	0.67	5	High
Total			4.33	0.47		High
11	Teaching Procedures	The teacher encourages students to express themselves orally and in writing.	4.89	0.33	1	High
15		The students discuss the text, in groups, before writing their final drafts.	4.89	0.33	2	High
6		The teacher engages the class in discussion on the topic of the upcoming text.	4.78	0.44	3	High
12		The teacher assigns students to small groups to reconstruct the text in full sentences (without his/her interference.	4.78	0.44	4	High
16		The teacher conducts an error analysis session.	4.67	0.50	5	High
8		The teacher reads the text aloud at normal speed without pauses as students listen, but do not write.	4.44	0.73	6	High
17		Once their final drafts are ready, the students are given the opportunity to check for ideas, stylistics and mechanics.	4.44	0.53	7	High
7		The teacher provides the students with opportunities to discuss the type of the text.	4.33	0.50	8	High
10		The teacher presents the material in a logical sequence.	4.22	0.67	9	High
14		The students, with the help of the teacher, identify similarities and differences in form between their reconstructed text and the original one.	4.22	0.83	10	High
9		The teacher reads the text again at normal speed with pauses, allowing students to take notes (words/phrases).	4.11	0.93	11	High
13		The students, with the help of the teacher, identify similarities and differences in terms of meaning between their reconstructed text and the original one.	3.89	0.60	12	High
Total			4.47	0.18		High
19	Assessment	The teacher encourages self-assessment.	4.44	0.53	1	High
18		The teacher uses appropriate assessment tools and strategies.	4.00	0.71	2	High
20		The teacher uses the results of assessment to improve students' performance.	3.78	0.83	3	High
Total			4.07	0.62		High
Overall			4.38	0.25		High

Table 1 shows that the level of the teachers' classroom practices on the observation checklist as a whole was high with a mean score of 4.38 and a standard deviation of 0.25. Table 1 also reveals that the level of the teachers' instructional practices on the observation checklist was high on each of the three dimensions: *teaching* which got the highest mean of 4.47, *preparation and planning* which scored the second highest mean of 4.33,

and *assessment* which scored the lowest mean of 4.07, with a standard deviation 0.18, 0.47 and 0.62, respectively.

Moreover, Table 1 reveals that Item 11, the teacher encourages students to express themselves orally and in writing, topped the mean scores with 4.89 and a standard deviation of 0.33 whereas Item 20, the teacher uses the results of assessment to improve students' performance, scored the lowest mean of 3.87, with a standard deviation of 0.83.

These findings may be attributed to a number of factors, amongst which is *the careful design and execution of the training*. Based on the second researcher's close contact and frequent supervisory classroom visits, the training was designed according to the teachers' actual needs. This claim is further supported by the findings presented later in Table 2, which show that the participants unanimously rated the content of the training as either *excellent* or *good*.

The reflective nature of the training may have been another catalyst for the teachers' practices, as the trainees were allowed opportunities to reflect on their micro-teaching during the practical phase of the training, to self-critique, and to receive both peer feedback and suggestions for improvement. Due attention was given to both points of strength and weakness for remediation and enforcement, which may have reflected positively on teachers' practices.

The trainer's friendly relationship with the trainees not only during but also prior to the training may have contributed to these positive findings. As the trainer serves as the Ministry-assigned supervisor of the participating teachers, their familiarity with his personality and style may have encouraged them to participate more actively and diligently in the training sessions which, in turn, may have affected their performance both on the test and in their classroom of DG.

The expert knowledge and confidence the teachers may have gained from the training may have also contributed to their superb classroom practices. Table 2 presents the frequencies and percentages of the teachers' reflection on the *content of the training, the method of training, the time of training, their interaction, their motivation,* and *their benefit*.

TABLE 2
Frequencies and Percentages of the Teachers' Reflection on the Training

Item	**Fair**		**Good**		**Excellent**	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Content of the training	0	0	2	12.5	14	87.5
Method of training	0	0	1	6.25	15	93.75
Time of training	2	12.5	7	43.75	7	43.75
Trainees' interaction	0	0	3	18.75	13	81.25
Trainees' motivation	0	0	2	12.5	14	87.5
Trainees' benefits	0	0	2	12.5	14	87.5

n=16

Table 2 shows that all or the vast majority of the respondents who have undergone the training (viz., all except for the *time of training* which was rated *fair* by 12.5 percent) rated the training as *good* or *excellent* on all six dimensions. The *method of training* was rated as *good* by 6.25 percent of the teachers compared to 93.75 percent who rated it as *excellent*. Similarly, compare 12.5 percent of the respondents who rated the *content of the training, trainee's motivation* and *trainee's benefit* as *good* to 87.5 percent of them who rated it as *excellent*. A little over 81 of the participants viewed interaction as excellent compared to just under 19 percent who viewed it as *good*.

To answer the second research question, which sought statistically significant differences which can be attributed to the DG-based training at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the teachers' mean scores on the pre- and post-test, means, standard deviations, and t-test statistics of the teachers' performance on the pre- and post-test were calculated, as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Means, Standard Deviations, and t-test Statistics of the Teachers' Performance on the Pre- and Post-test

Measure	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	df	Sig.
Pre	16	5.75	9.90	-30.890*	15	0.000
Post	16	71.88	9.45			

Table 3 reveals a statistically significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the teachers' mean scores on the pre- and post-test, which can be attributed to the training. The effect size of the DG-based training on the teachers' performance was calculated using the Cohen's d formula. The effect size was estimated at 72.2, indicating a large effect for the training.

Table 3 also shows that the mean score of the teachers' performance has risen from 5.75 on the pre-test to 71.88 on the post-test. This substantial improvement in teacher performance may be readily attributed to a host of factors, most prominent amongst which is the theoretical knowledge about DG gained by the trainees. Furthermore, the novelty of DG itself may have heightened the teachers' attention to and involvement in the training, which may have reflected positively on their performance.

The third research question seeks potentially statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean pre- and post-test scores of the students in the control and experimental groups, which can be attributed to DG. To answer this question, means and standard deviations were calculated, as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Means and Standard Deviations of the Students' Performance on the Pre- and Post-test

Group	**n**	**Pre-**		**Post-**	
		Mean	**Standard Deviation**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Control	20	2.90	1.83	2.85	1.69
Experimental	100	1.65	1.86	3.13	2.26
Total	120	1.86	1.91	3.08	2.17

Table 4 shows an observed difference between the mean scores of the students of the experimental group on the pre- and post-tests. Compare 1.65 to 3.13, with standard deviations of 1.86 and 2.26, respectively, which signals gains in achievement on the post-test. Table 4 further reveals an observed difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental groups on the post-test (viz., 2.85 vs. 3.13).

To determine the potential significance of these differences between the means, after eliminating the differences in the students' performance on the pre-test, One Way ANCOVA was used, as shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5
ANCOVA of the Mean Scores of the Students' Performance on the Post-test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	f	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pre	416.004	1	416.004	338.343	0.000	0.743
Group	37.362	1	37.362	30.387*	0.000	0.206
Error	143.856	117	1.230			
Total	597.222	119				

Table 5 reveals a statistically significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the students' performance on the post-test due to DG. In order to determine in whose favor this significance is, Bonferroni test was used on the adjusted means, as shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Bonferroni Test of the Adjusted Means of the Students' Test Scores

Group	Mean	Standard Error	Mean Difference
Control	1.80	0.254	1.54*
Experimental	3.34	0.111	

Table 6 reveals that the statistically significant difference is in favor of the experimental group whose participants were taught by DG, with a mean score of 3.34 compared to a mean score of 1.80 for the control group. To determine the effect size of the effectiveness of DG on the test, Eta Square was calculated. An Eta Square of 0.206 signals that 20.06 percent of the variance in the students' performance is due to the use of DG.

The findings presented in Tables 3, 5 and 6 suggest marked improvement in the experimental group's writing performance. This improvement may be attributed to the systematic implementation of DG in the classroom.

The dimension of *teaching procedures* consisted of 12 items which represent the procedures of DG. The mean scores of those items ranged between 3.89 and 4.89, which indicates that the teachers implemented the procedures of DG with high frequency (e.g., students were given the opportunity to discuss the topic and type of the upcoming text, the text was read to them at normal speed, the material was presented in a logical sequence, students were given the opportunity to express themselves orally and in writing as well as discuss their texts individually and in groups before attempting to write their final drafts). As a result, their students' writing performance was positively affected.

Another factor that may have contributed to the superior performance of the experimental group relates to the students themselves. They reportedly enjoyed the activities and engaged actively and attentively throughout the treatment, which was further corroborated by the outcome of class observations.

The current findings are consistent with earlier research findings (e.g., Abbassian & Mohammadi, 2013; Kooshafar *et al*, 2012). In both studies, DG was found to have a positive effect on students' writing abilities.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The dynamics of the research and its findings suggest that teachers should be encouraged to liberate themselves from the bondage of traditional methods to venture into supplementing their practice with innovative techniques like DG. Not only were the participants impressed with the effectiveness of the training, but it reflected positively on both their own and their students' performance.

Dictogloss offers several potential advantages, as it integrates individual and group activities to allow students the opportunity to learn from one another. It further incorporates follow-up activities which engage teacher and students in a discussion of the similarities and differences between the original and reconstructed versions of the text and the language involved in expressing these. Not only does this promote the use of authentic exchanges but also motivates students to be more engaged in the language teaching/learning process, which potentially fosters their expression and argumentative abilities.

As the findings revealed a significant effect for Dictogloss on both teachers' writing instruction and students' writing performance, these researchers recommend that Jordanian teachers be trained to incorporate DG into their instructional practices in the EFL classroom. However, further research may be needed on larger samples, incorporating variables such as gender and proficiency, on both writing and other language skills before definitive conclusions can be drawn.

REFERENCES

Abbasian, G. & Mohammadi M. (2013). The Effectiveness of Dictogloss in Developing General Writing Skill of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *Journal of Language and Teaching Research*, *4*(6), 1371-1380.

Afsharrad, M. & Sadeghi Benis, A.R. (2014). The Effect of Transcribing on Beginning Learners' Dictation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(10), 2203-2208. Retrieved 6 November 2015 from http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/view/13493.DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.10. 2203-2208.

Al-Rabadi, R. & Bataineh, R.F. (2015). Learning Strategies in Literature-Based Instruction: A Qualitative Study of Jordanian University Students. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education (University of Bahrain), 3*(1), 101-110. Retrieved 28 April 2016 from http://journals.uob.edu.bh/teacher/ Pages/Content.

Al-Sibai, D.M.M. (2008). Using Dictogloss Tasks: Attention to Form in a Collaborative Classroom Activity with Female Students at King Saud University. Unpublished Master's Thesis, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Bani Younis, R. (1997). *Assessing Students' Receptivity to their Instructors' Responses on their Foreign Language Writing at both Public and Private Universities in Jordan*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

Bataineh, R.F. & Obeiah, S.F. (May 2016, Forthcoming). The Effect of Scaffolding and Portfolio Assessment on Jordanian EFL Learners' Writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*

Bataineh, R.F. & Zghoul, L.H. (2006). Jordanian TEFL Graduate Students' Use of Critical Thinking Skills (as Measured by the Cornell Critical Thinking Test, Level Z). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(1), 33-50.

Bataineh, R.F. (2005). The Representation of the Local Environment in Jordanian Tenth Grade English Textbooks. *Association of Arab Universities Journal for Education and Psychology, 3*(2), 11-43.

Bennett, W.A. (1968). *Aspects of Language and Language Teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H.D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byrne, D. (2011). Teaching Writing Skills. Retrieved 26 July 2015 from http://www.scribd.com/doc/49860749/Byrne-Teaching-Writing-Skills.

Cunning, T. (1998). Assessing and Correcting Reading and Writing Difficulties. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archive,* 8(1). Retrieved 5 September 2015 from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs /article/view/392/515.

Faghani, B., Derakhshan A. & Zangoei, A. (2015). A Review on the Effect of Using Dictogloss Tasks and Fake Scoring on Children's Dictation Ability. *English Linguistics Research*, 4(3), 58-71.

Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice.* Mahwah (New Jersey): Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flower, L. & Hayes, J.R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication,* 32(4), 365-387.

Han, Y. (2011). Noticing in a Dictogloss Task: Learning Outcomes and Constraining Factors. *English Teaching*, 66(2), 23-45.

Harp, B. & Brewer, J. (1991). *Reading and Writing: Teaching the Connections*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Harris, D. & Sass, T. (2007). *Teacher Training, Teacher Quality and Student Achievement*. National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research. Working Paper 3. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved 6 December 2015 from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ ED509656.pdf.

Harris, D.P. (1969). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jacobs, G. & Small, J. (2003). Combining Dictogloss and Cooperative Learning to Promote Language Learning. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(1), 1-15.

Khoii, R. & Pourhassan, E. (2015). Effects of Different Types of Dictation Practice on Immediate and Delayed Performance Tests of Present Tense "To Be" Verbs and Indefinite Articles. Retrieved 8 September 2015 from www.academia.edu/4195113.

Kooshafar, M., Youhanaee, M. & Amirian, Z. (2012). The Effectiveness of Dictogloss Technique on Learners' Writing Improvement in terms of Writing Coherent Texts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(4), 716-721.

Kowal, M. & Swain, M. (1994). Using Collaborative Language Production Tasks to Promote Students' Language Awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73-93.

Lado, R. (1961). *Language Testing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Langan, J. (1987). *College Writing Skills*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nabei, T. (1996). Dictogloss: Is it an Effective Learning Task? *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics,* 12(1), 31-37.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. (2010). *Teaching English to Young Learners*. Anaheim: Anaheim University Press.

Obeiah, S.F. & Bataineh, R.F. (2015). Does Scaffolding-Based Instruction Improve Writing Performance? The Case of Jordanian EFL Learners. *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*, *39(*2), 106-123. Retrieved 28 April 2016 from http://www.lsmll. umcs.lublin.pl/issues/39-2-2016/7bataineh.pdf.

Oller, J. W. (1971). Dictations as a Device for Testing Foreign Language Proficiency. *ELT Journal,* 25(3), 254-259.

Omaggio, A. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Parker, S. (1993). *The Craft of Writing*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Patten, B., Inclezen, D., Salazar, H. & Farely A. (2009). Processing Instruction and Dictogloss: A Study on Object Pronouns and Word Order in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(3), 557-575.
Pica, T. (1997). Second Language Teaching and Research Relationships: A North American View. *Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 48-7.
Prince, P. (2013). Listening, Remembering, Writing. Exploring the Dictogloss Task. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(4), 486-500.
Purwaningsih, L. & Kurniasih, E. (2014). The Implementation of Dictogloss to Teach Writing Recount Text to Eighth-grade Students of SMP Nigeri 4 Jombang. *Retain*, 2(1). Retrieved 5 September 2015 from http://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/ index.php/retain/article/view/6833.
Qin, J. (2008). The Effect of Processing Instruction and Dictogloss Tasks on Acquisition of the English Passive Voice. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(1), 61-82. Retrieved 6 November 2015 from http://ltr.sagepub.com/content/ 12/1/61.short.
Raimes, A. (1998). Teaching Writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18,142-67.
Rashtchi, M. & Khosroabadi, P. (2009). The Comparative Effect of Explicit Focus on Form and Dictogloss Task on Learning English Tenses. *Journal of Language Studies*, 1(1), 101-114.
Richards, J. & Renandy, W. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rivers, W. (1975). *A practical Guide to the Teaching of French*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Shak, J. (2006). Children Using Dictogloss to Focus on Form. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 47-62.
Smadi, O. (1997). The Effect of a Corrective Feedback on Reducing Nonnative-Speaking Students' Composition Errors. *Educational Sciences and Islamic Studies*, 9(1), 1-15.
Stewart, B.L., Silva, L.H.R. & González J.A.T. (2014). Integrating Language Skills through a Dictogloss Procedure. *English Teaching Forum*, 2, 12-35. Retrieved 5 May 2015 from http://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ ae/resource_files/etf_52_2_12-19_and_35.pdf.
Stronge, J., Ward, T., Tucker, P., & Hindman, J. (2007). What is the Relationship between Teacher Quality and Student Achievement? An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Personnel Education*, 20(3), 165-184.
Uludag, O. & Vanpatten, B. (2012). The Comparative Effects of Processing Instruction and Dictogloss on the Acquisition of English Passive by Speakers of Turkish. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 50(3), 189-212.
Vasiljevic, Z. (2010). Dictogloss as an Interactive Method of Teaching Listening Comprehension to L2 Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 41-52. Retrieved 6 November 2015 from http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ elt/article/view/5212/4329.
Wajnryb, R. & Malay, A. (1990). *Grammar Dictation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilson, M. (2003). Discovering Listening – Improving Perceptual Processing. *ELT Journal*, 57(4), 335-343. Retrieved 6 December 2015 from http://203.72. 145.166/elt/files/57-4-2.pdf.
Zheng, D.M (2006). Effects of Dictation Practice on EFL Learners' Writing Ability. *Journal of Hunan First Normal College*, 3(29). Retrieved 6 May 2015 from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-DYHN200603029.htm.