THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DICTOGLOSS TO TEACH WRITING SKILL VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' RISK-TAKING

Abdul Arif

English Education Department of STKIP PGRI Pontianak
Jl. Ampera No.88 Pontianak
arif_farrel25@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Tujuan Penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah: (1) dictogloss lebih efektif dari pada dicto-comp dalam pengajaran keterampilan menulis; (2) siswa yang memiliki keberanian tinggi dalam mengambil resiko memiliki keterampilan menulis lebih baik dari pada siswa yang memiliki keberanian rendah dalam mengambil resiko; dan (3) ada interaksi antara metode pengajaran dan keberanian siswa dalam mengambil resiko pada pengajaran keterampilan menulis. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian ekperimental terhadap mahasiswa semester dua Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris STKIP-PGRI Pontianak pada Tahun Akademik 2012/2013. Hasil analisa data menunjukkan bahwa: (1) dictogloss lebih efektif dari pada dicto-comp dalam pengajaran menulis; (2) siswa yang memiliki keberanian tinggi dalam mengambil resiko memiliki keterampilan menulis lebih baik daripada yang memiliki keberanian rendah dalam mengambil resiko; dan (3) ada interaksi antara metode pengajaran keterampilan writing dan keberanian mahasiswa dalam mengambil resiko. Berdasarkan temuan ini, dapat disimpulkan bahwa dictogloss adalah metode yang efektif dalam pembelajaran keterampilan menulis dan efektifitas metode tersebut dipengaruhi oleh tingkat kemampuan mahasiswa dalam mengambil resiko.

Kata Kunci : Dictogloss, Keterampilan Menulis, Keberanian mengambil resiko

Abstract

This research is aimed at finding out whether : (1) dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill; (2) the students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking; and (3) there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' risk-taking in teaching writing skill. This research is an experimental study carried out at the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013. The results of the data analysis showed that (1) dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill; (2) the students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' risk-taking to teach writing skill. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that dictogloss is an effective method to teach writing skill and the effectiveness of the method is influenced by the students' level of risk-taking.

Keywords: Dictogloss, Writing skill, Risk-taking

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one the important ways of expressing thoughts and communicating ides and views to others. According to Cox (2005) in Brindley (2005: 151), writing is widely used in a variety of fields and serves many purposes both for individual and for society as a whole, and it is not limited to the communication of information. It has cognitive functions in clarifying and supporting thought and the functions of record keeping and storing both information and literacy works.

Writing is one of the four language skills of English which may be well considered as the most difficult to master. Patel and Jain (2008: 125) state that writing is a skill which must be taught and practiced. Moreover, Richards and Renandya (2002: 303) state that there is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill for L2 learners to master. Cox (2005) in Brindley (2005: 152) states that writing is difficult because there is no simple transition from spoken to written language, from casual to formal language, from spontaneous to planned language, and from a known to unknown audience.

The statements above imply that teaching writing requires an understanding about what kinds of approach can effectively be practiced. English teachers need to discover a way to improve the students' writing skill. Patel and Jain (2008: 125) state that writing is the most efficiently acquired when practice in writing parallels practice in the other skills. Teaching writing through dictogloss, for example, is considered effective in teaching writing. Wajnryb (1990: 6), the advocate of this method, states that dictogloss is a task-based procedure designed to help students towards a better understanding of how grammar works on a text basis. Jacobs (2003: 1) and Manda (2003: 12) define dictogloss as a teaching method of English integrating skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing which involves four stages: preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis and correction. Furthermore, Wang (2011: 1) states that dictogloss is a text-based, task-based, and learner-centered teaching method, which aims to help students to learn, master, and use target language on the basis of learning texts, and at the same time to emphasize the importance of meaning and forms.

Another teaching method considered effective in teaching writing skill is dicto-comp. According to Nation and Newton (2009: 62), dicto-comp is variation of dictation that is an easily prepared activity that can become a part of the regular classroom routine. Ilson (1962) and Riley (1972) in Nation and Newton (2009: 68) state that dicto-comp is similar to dictogloss, but it doesn't involve group work. In the dicto-comp, the learners listen as the teacher reading a text to them.

Another important thing that needs to be considered in teaching writing as second or foreign language is the students' individual differences. One of them is risk-taking. It refers to a willingness to make a decision involving something new and different without putting the primary focus on success or failure (Bem, 1971 in Bang, 1999: 13). It involves four dimensions: a lack of hesitancy about using newly encountered element, a willingness to use linguistics elements perceived to be complex or difficult, a tolerance of possible incorrectness or inexactitude in using the language, and an inclination to rehearse a new element silently before attempting to use it aloud (Ely, 1986 in Maeda, 2010: 40). Zuniga (2010: 4) states that risk-taking plays a significant role since it increases proficiency in the target language, giving experience to students to participate actively in English classes.

Considering the background above, the writer formulates the problems of this study as follows: (1) is dictogloss more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in The Academic Year of 2012/2013?; (2) do the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013 with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking?; (3) is there any interaction between teaching methods and risk-taking in teaching writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013?.

Based on the problem statements above the objectives of the study is to find out whether: (1) dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013?; (2) the students

with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013?; and (3) there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' risk-taking in teaching writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013?

Writing

Writing has some definitions. According to Cox (2005) in Brindley (2005: 152), the term 'writing' is ambigous: in the first place, it can refer either the process of writing or the written product. Iskandarwassid and Sunendar (2008: 292) simply define writing as a prosses of recording language into graphic signs. Zamel in Ho (2006: 2) states that writing is a process through which students can explore their thought, construct meaning, and assess them at the same time. Olshtain in Celce-Murcia (2001: 207) defines writing as an act of communication which takes place between the writer and the reader via the text in an interactive process. Meanwhile, Brown (2000: 335) states that written language is the graphic presentation of spoken language resulted from thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require specialized skills. Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that writing is a prosses of recording language into a sequence of sentences resulted from thinking, drafting, and revising procedures which takes place between the writer and the reader through which they can explore their thought and construct meaning.

The nature of writing needs writing components that need to be master in order to be able to produce a succesfull writing. Huhges (1993: 91) mentions five aspects of writing; grammar, mechanics (punctuation, spelling, and capitalization), fluency, and organization. Brown (2000: 335) also states five aspect of writing; content, organization, discourse markers, clear meaning, grammar, and final product. From the theories above, it can be concluded that writing has five components that need to be mastered in order to be able to produce a succesfull writing. Those are organization, content, grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary.

Writing is one of the four language skills of English which may be well considered as the most difficult to master. Richards and Renandya (2002: 303) states that there is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill for L2 learners to master (Patel and Jain, 2008: 125). It means that helping students to be able to write succesful writing will be hard working for the teachers. In this study, the writer proposes dictogloss as a method of teaching writing considered as a balance between product and process oriented.

Dictogloss

Dictogloss is a relative recent method in language teaching which has four stages in the procedure: preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis and correction (Wajnryb, 1990: 5),. Wang (2011: 1) explains that dictogloss is a text-based, task-based, and learner-centered teaching method, which aims to help students to learn, master and use target language on the basis of learning texts, and at the same time to emphasize the importance of language's meaning and forms.

Dictogloss is considered as an effective teaching method because it is a kind of discovery learning that provides practice in interpersonal skills and communicative competency, and highlights individual linguistic strengths through a shared learning environment. It allows L2 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 learners to think critically and take risks in their language use, results in synchronous interaction which means that more students speak more often (Smith, 2012: 2). In addition, according to Smith (2012: 4), dictogloss situates teachers as co-learners, promotes learner autonomy, group autonomy, cooperation, collaboration, discussion among learners, and foster curricula integration (all four skills plus grammar, vocabulary, focus on meaning, and focus on message-all in the one task).

Dicto-comp is variation of dictation that is an easily prepared activity that can become a part of the regular classroom routine (Nation and Newton, 2009: 62). Ilson (1962) and Riley (1972) in Nation and Newton (2009: 68) state that dicto-comp is similar to dictogloss, but it does not involve group work. It has

similarity with dictogloss in the form of the procedure. The main different is that dicto-comp does not involve group work in the reconstruction and analysis and correction stage.

Risk-taking

Another important thing that needs to be considered in teaching writing as second or foreign language is the students' individual differences. One of them is risk-taking. According to Brown (2000: 149), risk-taking is an important characteristic of successful learning of a second language, which refers to the learner's ability to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out hunches about the language, and take the risk of being wrong. Risk-taking is an important characteristic of successful learning of a second language referring to student's willingness to make a decision involving something new and different without putting the primary focus on success or failure. According to Skehan (1989) in Shalabi (2003: 190) and Ely (1986) in Maeda (2010: 40) mentions that risk-taking involves four indicators; a lack of hesitancy about using newly encountered element, a willingness to use linguistics elements perceived to be complex or difficult, a tolerance of possible incorrectness or inexactitude in using the language, and an inclination to rehearse a new element silently before attempting to use it aloud.

Based on the theoretical description above, the hypotheses are formulated as follows: (1) dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013; (2) the students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking; and (3) there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' risk-taking in teaching writing skill.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted at the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak which is located on Jl. Prof. M. Yamin/ Jln Ilham no. 45 Pontianak, Kalimantan Barat. The research was conducted from August 2012 to

June 2013 beginning from writing the research proposal, conducting the research, and writing the research report.

Experimental study was employed in conducting this research. The purpose of experimental study is to determine cause-and-effect relationship. Through experimentations, cause and effect relationship can be identified. Because of this ability to identify caution, the experimental approach has come to represent the prototype of scientific method for solving problems (Christensen and Johnson, 2000: 23). The research design used in this research was factorial design 2x2. It allows a researcher to study the interaction of an independent variable with one or more variables (Tuckman, 1978: 135).

The population of the research was the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the academic year of 2012/2013. The sample of this research consists of two classes; class A as experimental group treated by using dictogloss and class B as the control group treated by using dicto-comp. Each class consists of 40 students divided into two group based on the students' level of risk-taking. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling. In this study, there are two techniques of collecting data; questionnaire used to know the level of students' risk-taking and writing test used to know the result of students writing skill after the treatment. The instruments used to collect the data are risk-taking questionnaire and writing test. The date are analyzed using descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis is used to know the mean, median, mode and standard deviation of the scores of the writing test. To know the normality and the homogeneity of the data, the writer uses normality and homogeneity test. The normality and homogeneity tests are done before testing the hypothesis. Inferential analysis used is multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA 2x2). It is used to test the hypothesis. H_o is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t. If Ho is rejected, the analysis is continued to know which group is better using Tukey test.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The result of data analysis showed that: (a) because F_o between columns (5.161) is higher than F_t(3.92) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, Ho is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. There is a significant difference between the students who are taught by using dictogloss and those who are taught by using dicto-comp in their writing skill. The mean score of the students who are taught by using dictogloss (75.05) is higher than the mean score of students who are taught by using dicto-comp (72.20). It can be concluded that dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill; (b) Because F_o between rows (10.681) is higher than F_t (3.92) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, H_o is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. The students with high level of risk-taking and those with low level of risk-taking are significantly different in their writing skill. The mean score of the students with high level of risk-taking (75.68) is higher than those with low level of risk-taking (71.58). It can be concluded that the students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking; (3) because F_o columns by rows (31.136) is higher than F_t (3.92) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, H_o is rejected and there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' risk-taking to teach writing skill. Thus, it can be concluded that the effect of teaching methods on writing skill depends on the level of students' risk-taking.

The analysis of tuckey test also showed that: (a) because q_o between A_1 and A_2 (3.21) is higher than q_t at the level of significance (α) = 0.05 (2.86), applying dictogloss is significantly different from dicto-comp to teach writing skill. The mean score of A_1 (75.05) is higher than the mean score of A_2 (72.20). It can be concluded that dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill; (b) because q_o between B_1 and B_2 (4.62) is higher than q_t at the level of significance (α) = 0.05 (2.86), the students with high level of risk-taking are significantly different from those with low level of risk-taking in their writing skill. The mean score of students with high level of risk-taking (75.68) is higher than the mean score of students with low level of risk-taking (71.58). It can be concluded that students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than

those with low level of risk-taking; (c) because q_o between A_1B_1 and A_2B_1 (7.85) is higher than q_t at the level of significance (α) = 0.05 (2.95), dictogloss differs significantly from dicto-comp to teach writing skill for students with high level of risk-taking. The mean score of A_1B_1 (80.60) is higher than the mean score of A_2B_1 (70.75). It can be concluded that dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for students with high level of risk-taking; (d) because q_o between A_1B_2 and A_2B_2 (3.31) is higher than q_t (2.95) at the level of significance (α) = 0.05, dictogloss differs significantly from dicto-comp to teach writing skill for students with low level of risk-taking. The mean score of A_2B_2 (73.65) is higher than the mean score of A_1B_2 (69.50). It can be concluded that dicto-comp is more effective than dictogloss to teach writing skill for students with low level of risk-taking; (d) based on the result of analysis on points c and d above, dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for students with high level of risk-taking and dicto-comp is more effective than dictogloss to teach writing skill for students with low level of risk-taking, therefore, it can be concluded that there is interaction between teaching methods and students' risk-taking to teach writing skill. It means that the effect of teaching methods on writing skill depends on the level of students' risk-taking.

Based on the findings of the study, a discussion is presented as follows:

Dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp

Teaching writing skill by using dictogloss makes students learn more actively and successfully in writing class. It involves individual and group work which allows learners to cooperate as a team by sharing their resources to carry out the task and to process and activate language in a collaborative writing task. As a kind of group work, dictogloss absorbs the elements of communicative teaching method. Through a small group of discussion and interactive solving problems, dictogloss focuses on both the meaning and the form of the language through comprehensible input. Thus, dictogloss is suitably used in teaching writing skill because the goal of teaching writing skill is to make the students able to communicate their ideas and construct meaning. Smith (2012: 2) states that dictogloss allows L2 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, and results in synchronous interaction which means that students practice the target language more often. In addition, Smith (2012: 4) also states that dictogloss situates teachers as co-learners, promotes learner autonomy, group autonomy, cooperation, collaboration, discussion among learners, and foster curricula integration (all four skills plus grammar, vocabulary, focus on meaning, and focus on message-all in the one task). Therefore, dictogloss makes students learn more actively and successfully in writing class.

On the other hand, dicto-comp activities do not involve group work. Here, the students reconstruct and check their version of the text individually. Dicto-comp activities rely on the teacher's clarification in writing difficulties rather than working in group. Thus, in dicto-comp activities the students have less interaction among the students. Ilson (1962) and Riley (1972) in Nation and Newton (2009: 68) state that dicto-comp is similar to dictogloss, but it does not involve group work. Kidd (1992: 55) explains that in dicto-comp students must have been already made aware, through previous instruction, of the form and meaning of the target structure and it is probably a good idea for the teacher to review the structure prior to the dictation and reconstruction stage and point out that it will be contained in the text. As a result, dictogloss activities are more beneficial than dicto-comp activities. In the other word, dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill.

The students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking

In learning language, high risk-taking students are considered as good or successful language learners. They can acquire language better than the learners who don't have the characteristics of high risk-taking. In language classroom, high risk-taking students interact and discuss actively. They are willing to take risk; willing to guess, to communicate and get the message across, to make mistakes, to appear foolish in order to learning, and to use what knowledge they

have in the target language in order to create novel utterances. They are able to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out the hunches about something new, and take the risk of being wrong. It means that the learners who have those characteristics can be assumed as risk-takers. Rubin (1975: 43-47) and Beebe (1983: 46) in Luft (2007: 2) identify four characteristics of high risk-taking students: (1) being willing to appear foolish in order to communicate and get the message across; (2) using the language when not required to do so; (3) being comfortable with uncertainty and willing to try out guesses; and (4) being willing to make mistake in order to learn and communicate. Brown (2000: 149) explains that high risk-taking students are able to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out hunches about the language, and take the risk of being wrong. Corder (1981), Faerch and Kasper (1980), Naiman, et al. and Todesco (1978), Reis (1985), Rubin (1975), Rubin and Thompson (1982), Stern (1975) in Bang (1999: 22) all state that the students who have those characteristics are considered as good or successful learners. Therefore, it is understandable that high risk-taking students can acquire language better than the learners who do not have those characteristics.

Low risk-taking students, on the contrary, are unwilling to take risk; unwilling to guess, to communicate and get the message across, to make mistakes, to appear foolish in order to learning, and to use what knowledge they have in the target language. They are not able to gamble, to try out the hunches about something new, and take the risk of being wrong. Skehan (1989) in Shalabi (2003:19) state that low risk-taking students have much hesitancy about using newly encountered linguistic element and many inclinations to rehearse a new element silently before attempting to use it aloud. They are unwilling to use linguistics elements perceived to be complex or difficult. Even, they don't have a tolerance of possible incorrectness or inexactitude in using the language. As a result, they don't participate actively in language classroom. Therefore, it can be concluded that high risk-taking students have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking.

There is an interaction between teaching methods and students' risk taking

The use of dictogloss in teaching writing skill involves the learners both as an individual and as a member of the group. In these activities, the learners work cooperatively as a team by sharing their resources to carry out the task and to process and activate language in a collaborative writing task. Thus, dictogloss activities result an interaction, collaboration, and empowerment. This completely changes the patterns of activity in a class that tend to be teacher-centered. Dictogloss situates teachers as co-learners, promotes learner autonomy, group autonomy, cooperation, collaboration, discussion among learners, and foster curricula integration. Wang (2011: 1) explains that dictogloss is a text-based, task-based, and learner-centered teaching method. Jacobs (2003: 1) and Manda (2003: 12) state that dictogloss allows the students to work together to create reconstructed version of a text read for them by the teacher, correct, and discuss their version of the text. In short, the stages of dictogloss activities require students to be actively involved during the instructional activities. Hence, dictogloss is suitable for high risk-taking students. In language classroom, high risk-taking students interact and discuss actively. They are willing to take risk; willing to guess, to communicate and get the message across, to make mistakes, to appear foolish in order to learning, and to use what knowledge they have in the target language in order to create novel utterances. Corder (1981), Faerch and Kasper (1980), Naiman, et al. and Todesco (1978), Reis (1985), Rubin (1975), Rubin and Thompson (1982), Stern (1975) in Bang (1999: 22) all point out that high risk-taking students are willing to communicate and get the message across, to make mistakes, to appear foolish in order to learning, and to use what knowledge they have in the target language in order to create novel utterances. They are also able to gamble a bit, to try out the hunches about something new, and take the risk of being wrong. Therefore, dictogloss is effective to teach writing skill to the students with high level of risk-taking.

Dicto-comp activities, on the other hand, do not require many interactions, discussions, collaborations, and empowerments as dictogloss does. Dicto-comp does not involve group work. In the stage of reproducing and correcting the text,

the students reconstruct and check their version of the text individually. It tends to be more teacher-centered since dicto-comp activities rely on the teacher's clarification in writing difficulties rather than working in group and the students have less interaction among the students. The students have been aware of the form, meaning, and the structure of the target language since the teacher has reviewed them before the dictation and reconstruction stage. Ilson (1962) and Riley (1972) in Nation and Newton (2009: 68) state that dicto-comp is similar to dictogloss, but it does not involve group work. Kidd (1992: 55) explains that in dicto-comp students must have been already made aware, through previous instruction, of the form and meaning of the target structure and it is probably a good idea for the teacher to review the structure prior to the dictation and reconstruction stage and point out that it will be contained in the text. Hence, dicto-comp is preferred by students with low level of risk-taking. Students with low level of risk-taking are not actively involved during the instructional activities. They would prefer working individually to working in group because they don't want to appear foolish when they make a mistake. In language class room, they would prefer keeping silent to taking the risk of being wrong, guessing and trying out the hunches about something new, communicating and getting the message across, making mistakes and being foolish in order to learning, gambling and using what knowledge they have in the target language in order to create novel utterances. Thus, they have less interaction and communication among the students. Rubin (1975: 43-47) and Beebe (1983: 46) in Luft (2007: 2) identify that low risk-taking students are unwilling to appear foolish in order to communicate and get the message across, unwilling to use the language when required to do so, being uncomfortable with uncertainty and unwilling to try out guesses, and unwilling to make mistake in order to learn and communicate. In addition, Ely (1986) in Maeda (2010: 40) state that low risk-taking students have much hesitancy about using newly encountered linguistic element and many inclinations to rehearse a new element silently before attempting to use it aloud. They would prefer using linguistics elements perceived to be easy to using linguistics elements perceived to be complex or difficult. Even, they don't have a tolerance of possible

incorrectness or inexactitude in using the language. Since dicto-comp and low risk-taking students have a suitable characteristic, dicto-comp is suitable to teach writing skill for low risk-taking students.

Therefore, there is an interaction between teaching methods and risk-taking toward students' writing skill. Dictogloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for students with high level of risk-taking. In the other words, dictogloss is suitable for high risk-taking. Meanwhile, dicto-comp is more effective than dictogloss to teach writing skill for low risk-taking students. In the other words, dicto-comp is suitable for low risk-taking students.

CONCLUSION

Based on the description of the data analysis, some findings of the research are: (1) digtoloss is more effective than dicto-comp to teach writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013; (2) the students with high level of risk-taking have better writing skill than those with low level of risk-taking for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013; (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and the students' risk-taking to teach writing skill for the second semester students of the English Education Department of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013.

Based on the above findings, it can be concluded that dictogloss is an effective method to teach writing skill for the second semester students of The English Education Department of of STKIP-PGRI Pontianak in the Academic Year of 2012/2013. The effectiveness of the method is influenced by the students' level of risk-taking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bang,Y. 1999. Factors Affecting Korean Students' Risk-taking Behavior in EFL Clasroom.Desertation:Ohiouniversity. Retrievedat:httpetd.ohiolink.eduview.

Brindley, S. 2005.*Teaching English*. London: Routledge

Brown, H. D. 2000a. *Principles and Practices of Language Learning and Teaching* (fourth edition). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Brown, H. D. 2000b. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (second edition). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Christensen, L.B. And Johnson 1977. *Experimental Methodology*. London: Allyn and Bacon

Ho, B. 2006. *The effectiveness of using the process apprach to teach writing in six hongkong primary classroom.* Retrieved in February, 2011 at WWW.cityu.edu.uk/en/research/spring2006ho.pdf

Iskandarwassid and Sunendar. 2008. *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa.* Bandung: Rosda

Jacobs, G 2003. Combining Dictogloss and Cooperative Learning to Promote Language Learning : *The reading Matrix* Vol 3. No. 1
Retrieved in Mei, 2012 at. http://www.georgejacobs.net/cooperative.htm

Luft, S. 2007. L*anguage Classroom Risk Taking Behavior in A Performed Culture-Based Program*: Thesis. School of The Ohio State University. Retrieved in August, 2012 From httpetd.ohiolink.eduview.cgiacc_num=osu1229701363

Manda, M.L. 2003. *DICTOGLOSS: AN APPROACH TO TEFL*: Journal Anlysis.Vol. 4. No. Retrieved in Mei, 2012 at http://pasca.unhas.ac.id/jurnal_pdf/vol_4_2_jan03/

Maeda, M. 2010. *Foreign Accent Modification: Association among word emphasis and risk-taking for adult Japanese English-Language Learners.* A Dissertation for doctor Philosophy of Whicita State University.

Murcia, C.M. and Elite O. 2000. *Discourse and context in language teaching.* Newyork: Printice Hall.

Nation I.S.P. and Newton J. 2009. *ESL/ EFL Listening and Speaking*: Paris: Routledge, Taylor

Richard C.J. and Renandya A. W. 2002. M*ethodology in Language Teaching; An Onthology of Current Practice*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patel, M.F. Dr and Jain. M. P. 2008. *English Language Teaching (method, tools & Techniques)*. Jaipur: Sunrise Publisher & Distributors

Shalabi, M. F. 2003. *Study of Theories of Personality and Learning Style*. Desertation paper of the University of Edinburgh. Moray House School of Education. Rerieved from http//www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/193

Smith, M. K. 2012. *Dictogloss: A multi-Skill Task for Accuracy in Writing Trough Cooperative Lerning. A Paper.* Meisei University. Japan. Retrieved in Jun 20, 2012 from:http//www.thtjapan.orgproceeings2011069-080_smith.pdf

Tuckman, B.W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research.* New York: Horcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Wajnryb, R. 1990. *Grammar Dictation*: New York: Oxford University Press.

Wang, FF. 2011. *An Empirical Study Of Dictogloss In English Writing Teaching Of Higher Vocational Colleges.* [Abstract] viewed on July 23, 2012 at http://www.globethesis.com/.

Zuniga, et al.. 2010. *Fostering Risk taking Trough Pair work.* Retrieved o Mei 17, 2012,from http://www.elitv. org/documentos/maestria/Memorias2011.