Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science (RIELS) Journal
Vol. 5, No. 2, June 2024 | Page 791-803 |
https://www.randwickresearch.com/index.php/rielsj

The Effectiveness of the Dictogloss Technique in Teaching Narrative Text Writing (An Experimental Study in Class IX of SMP Parulian 3 Medan)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v5i2.1010

| Rohana Engelis Estomihi Sinaga[1] | Rahmawati[2,*] | Mayasari[3] |

[1,2,3]Universitas Prima Indonesia, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Universitas Harapan Medan

*rahmawati@unprimdn.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to elucidate the empirical findings of the effectiveness of dictogloss approaches in teaching grade IX students at SMP Parulian 3 Medan how to create narratives. This study uses a quantitative approach. Pretest and posttest design is the experimental methodology used in this study. 36 students in grade IX at SMP Parulian 3 Medan participated in the study's population during the 2023–2024 academic year. The researcher chose two groups as the research sample by using purposive sampling. Class IX A, an experimental class, and class IX B, a control class that will learn to produce narrative texts using dictogloss procedures, make up the chosen research sample class. There were 36 pupils between the two classes. Before therapy, the researcher administered a pretest to both classes, and following treatment, a posttest. Students are instructed to produce narrative texts for both the pretest and posttest using the writing instrument used in this study. The efficacy of the dictogloss technique on students' narrative text writing was then ascertained by utilizing the t test formula to examine the data collected from the pretest and posttest. The t-observation value was 4.27 in the results. The tt (ttable) value with 34 degrees of freedom at a significance degree of 5% is 2.03. This shows that t is greater than tt, or alternative hypotheses (H_o) are rejected, and the alternative The hypothesis (H_a) is agreed upon. Thus, it can be said that the scores of students' narrative writing before and after using the dictogloss technique differ significantly. Stated differently, the dictogloss technique is effective for learning to write narrative texts.

KEYWORDS

dictogloss technique; writing; narrative text

INTRODUCTION

The usefulness of the dictogloss technique for teaching narrative text composition is the subject of this study. It is crucial that educators and learners alike comprehend the fundamentals of written English syntax and the distinctions between speaking and writing. In the classroom, as a teacher, inspire pupils and motivate them to practice more in order to reap the rewards. Because they believe writing takes a lot of time, students in the educational system typically detest or steer clear of writing assignments (Pierangelo and Giuliani, 2006). Pupils frequently struggle with writing because they lack the appropriate language. Students find vocabulary frustrating, which is why vocabulary is crucial for words or sentences when conversing with one another. Because pupils' vocabulary will grow in proportion to how easy it is for them to acquire a language. Thus, teachers need to support their pupils' learning by giving them writing guidelines and vocabulary preparation. Writing may also be described as the process of putting thoughts into words

on paper. Kurniawan and Fitrawati (2014: 160). Put another way, writing needs to be cohesive and coherent, with its ideas making sense and making logical connections. According to Graham et al. (2002), writing is a process of communication in which the writer expresses his ideas and thoughts to the reader in written form. This implies that learning to write involves a greater number of processes. To ensure that the reader grasps the meaning of the author's intended message in this instance, the writer must construct a coherent sequence of phrases and assertions. Thus, writing can be used with strategies like dictogloss.

One dictation method that can be used to teach cooperative writing is called dicttogloss. In the dictation exercise known as "dictogloss," students listen to readings, highlight important terms, and then work on them in the classroom (Vasiljevic, 2010). This method goes beyond simple transcription (Anderson and Khaty, 2003). Pupils emphasize relationships among themselves as well as meaning over words. Additionally, the Dictogloss approach is applied to enhance student accomplishment in writing and is taught in the classroom to enable pupils to write (Putra, 2014). Students can benefit from using dictogloss approaches to compose narrative texts when they are learning to write (Evi, 2015).

Narrative text is a form of story text that aims to provide entertainment to its readers. This narrative text tells an experience or imaginary representation in a different way. Narrative texts are stories that show the cultural environment of society in the past and are related to problematic events that led to a crisis or turning point, which ultimately found a resolution (Watkins, 2005). Next, narrative text refers to written material that takes the shape of a story or fairy tale. These can be of many different genres, such as science fiction, romance, horror, mystery, and fairy tales. In addition to being entertaining, narrative texts also impart moral lessons through the course of the narrative (Djatmika and Wulandari 2013: 3). Thus, studies were done to find out how well the Dictogloss Technique worked for teaching people how to compose narrative texts.

RESEARCH METHODS

In the section, the researchers aim to discuss the study design, the participants demographic data, the instrument, and the data collection process.

Research Design

This research uses quantitative experimental research as the research design (Sugiyono, 2018). In this design, there is a pretest before treatment and a posttest after treatment. Then the researcher chose two groups as research samples, namely Class IX A as the experimental class and Class IX B as the control class in learning to write narrative texts using the dictogloss technique. The results after treatment in the control class can be known more accurately. Experimental and control research are the focus of this research. Research carried out under strictly controlled conditions in an effort to determine the effect of a variable on other variables is called quantitative experimental research. To determine the effectiveness of the digtogloss technique in writing narrative texts in class IX of SMP Parulian 3 Medan, research was used in two sample classes: experimental and control. Research instruments are tools used by scientists to collect information, organize their work, and achieve appropriate results so that data can be processed more accurately, completely, and systematically, making it easier to process data and measure student learning outcomes before treatment (pretest) and after treatment (posttest). The posttest results provide information on whether there has been an increase in students' understanding of learning to write after receiving this research treatment. Apart from the

writing results test, instruments in the form of student activity observation sheets and student response questionnaires were also used as additional instruments to determine the effectiveness of the digtoglos technique in learning to write narrative texts for class IX students.

Data Collection

The researcher used student activity data, student activity observation sheets, to obtain data on student responses to the learning process, used the dictogloss technique to obtain data on students' English learning outcomes, used the technique of administering learning outcomes tests, and viewed notes taken in the research. These documents include lesson plans, observation sheets, dictogloss technique sheets for test results, and student learning test results, which can provide information on data and test results. In addition, documents are used to provide a visual representation of student activities. Documents in the form of photos taken during the learning process.

Techniques for Analyzing Data

Researchers employed the t test to examine the data. As a statistical test, the t test is used to determine if the null hypothesis, which holds that no discernible change has occurred between two randomly selected samples from the same population, is true or false. “The t test is also a comparative analysis technique that is carried out to test whether the t test shows differences in two or more variables being studied.” The t test is the measure most commonly used in research when comparing scores for two groups. When comparing the scores of two groups in a study, this is the most often employed metric. The goal is to determine whether or not every experimental class and control class that takes the same test receives the same score. The exam provided the data for analysis. The pretest and posttest scores of the pupils in the experimental class and the control class were examined by the researcher. Therefore, this research carries out a large and interconnected sample. The following is the formula that will be used:

$$t_o = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SE_{M_1 - M_2}}$$

M_1 = values are averaged in the experimental class.

M_2 = values are averaged in the control class.

SE = Standard error

X = The experimental class's total squared deviation score results

Y = The control class's total squared deviation score results

Calculation stages:

1. Determine the mean of a variable 1/X and 2/Y =
   $M_1 = \frac{\sum fX}{N}$ $M_2 = \frac{\sum fY}{N}$
2. Determine the standard deviation (SD) in the mean variables 1 and 2:
   $SD_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N}}$ $SD_2 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum y^2}{N}}$
3. Determine the standard error for the mean of variables 1 and 2:
   $SE_{M_1} = \frac{SD_1}{\sqrt{N_1 - 1}}$ $SE_{M_2} = \frac{SD_2}{\sqrt{N_2 - 1}}$

   or

$$SE_{M_1 - M_2} = \sqrt{SE_{M_1}{}^2 + SE_{M_2}{}^2}$$

4. Calculate the standard error and mean difference between samples 1 and 2:

$$SE_{m1-m2} = \sqrt{SE_{m1}{}^2 + SE_{m2}{}^2}$$

5. Determine t_0 :

$$t_0 = \frac{M1-M2}{SEm1-m2}$$

6. Use the following formula to find the degree of freedom:

$$Df = n_1 + n_2 - 2$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To measure the level of students' English learning abilities, this research collected a lot of data in the form of a pretest before treatment. Observation data on student activities, data on student reactions to the learning process that occurs, then data on student learning outcomes after receiving treatment (posttest). The results of the analysis of each data are as follows:

Description of Data

In this research, researchers conducted direct research in the field by taking test scores from students. This research also only has 2 classes with a total of 36 students; 1 class has 18 students, and 1 class has 18 students. After that, one class is designated as an experimental class and the other as a control class. This study is being conducted in SMP Parulian 3 Medan, grade IX. This study aims to explore the effectiveness of the dictogloss technique in writing instruction. The pretest and posttest are the tests that were used in this evaluation. Before the course of treatment, pretests are administered, and posttests are administered following the course of treatment. Before receiving treatment, the pretest results are used to gauge the student's comprehension of writing instruction. Meanwhile, the posttest results provide information on whether there has been an increase in students' understanding of learning to write after receiving this research treatment. The data from the experimental class and the control class's pretest and posttest are shown below.

A. Experimental class

The table below displays the experimental class pretest results:

Table 1. Data arrangement 3.A: Pretest scores of experimental class students

No.	Students' names	CRITERIA					The overall student score
		Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanism	
1.	AR	25	16	15	18	4	78
2.	AS	21	17	17	17	3	75
3.	AH	14	9	9	9	3	44
4.	DP	16	13	13	17	3	62
5.	ES	17	13	14	16	4	64

6.	GE	21	13	10	10	3	57
7.	GH	22	17	16	18	4	77
8.	HP	25	15	15	18	4	77
9.	LP	17	9	10	10	3	49
10.	LB	13	8	7	6	3	37
11.	MM	18	14	14	12	3	61
12.	MR	13	7	7	6	3	36
13.	NA	18	15	16	13	3	65
14.	OS	16	12	11	17	3	59
15.	OC	14	13	10	10	3	50
16.	OS	13	10	11	10	3	47
17.	TP	17	9	11	12	3	52
18.	VB	23	14	14	18	4	73
N=18		**Total Score**					**1063**
		Average					**59,05**

The pretest results for the experimental class are displayed in Table 1. According to the data, 36 is the lowest score, and 78 is the best. Next, a student with the highest score and a student with the lowest score are produced. The experimental class's pretest average was 59.05. Afterward, the experimental class's posttest results improved. The following table provides an explanation of the posttest data:

Table 2. Data arrangement in 3.B: Posttest scores of experimental class students

No.	**Student's names**	**CRITERIA**					**The overall student score**
		Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanism	
1.	AR	25	16	15	18	4	78
2.	AS	24	17	17	17	4	79
3.	AH	15	10	11	11	3	50
4.	DP	17	13	14	17	3	64
5.	ES	25	15	16	19	4	79
6.	GE	23	16	14	18	4	75
7.	GH	23	17	16	18	4	78
8.	HP	25	16	15	18	4	78
9.	LP	18	13	13	17	3	64
10.	LB	14	9	8	7	3	41
11.	MM	21	15	15	13	3	67
12.	MR	15	9	9	10	3	46
13.	NA	24	15	16	18	4	77
14.	OS	23	16	15	18	4	76
15.	OC	20	16	16	17	4	73
16.	OS	18	15	15	15	3	66
17.	TP	18	14	14	14	3	63
18.	VB	24	15	15	19	4	77
N=18		**Total Score**					**1231**
		Average					**68,38**

The posttest findings for the students in the experimental class who wrote narrative texts are displayed in Table. 2. According to these statistics, 41 is the lowest score, and 79 is the

best. There are two types of students: one who gets the highest score and another who gets the lowest. The experimental class's average posttest score was 68.38. The researcher created the following table after defining the experimental class's improvement in pretest and posttest scores:

Table 3. Table data arrangement 3.C: information regarding the experimental class's pretest and posttest results

No.	Student's name	Scores on narrative writing	
		Pretest (X_1)	Posttest (Y_2)
1.	AR	78	78
2.	AS	75	79
3.	AH	44	50
4.	DP	62	64
5.	ES	64	79
6.	GE	57	75
7.	GH	77	78
8.	HP	77	78
9.	LP	49	64
10.	LB	37	41
11.	MM	61	97
12.	MR	36	46
13.	NA	65	77
14.	OS	59	76
15.	OC	50	73
16.	OS	47	66
17.	TP	52	63
18.	VB	73	77
N=18	**Total score**	**1063 ∑**	**1231**
	Average	**59,05 X**	**68,38**

The narrative texts produced by students who received writing instruction in the experimental class (IX A) both before and after the therapy are displayed in the following table. The results of the pretest and posttest provide the information shown in the following table. 36 is the lowest possible score, while 79 is the highest. When it comes to teaching writing, the maximum score is considered good, while a lower number indicates deterioration. The formula below is what researchers use to determine the average score:

$M1 = \frac{\sum X2}{N} = \frac{1231}{18} = 68{,}38$

The posttest average in the experimental class was 68.38. This shows an improvement from the pretest.

$M2 = \frac{\sum X1}{N} = \frac{1063}{18} = 59{,}05$

The pretest average in the experimental class was 59.05, indicating that students' writing teaching was still lacking.

$M = M_1 - M_2 = 68.38 - 59.05 = 9{,}33$

The score above shows an increase in students teaching writing, amounting to 9,33 points.

Note: M = mean
X1 = score value for students 1 (pretest)
X2 = score value for students 2 (posttest)
N = number of students
M1 = average posttest score
M2 = average pretest score

Determine the following mean from the summation: It seems that the mean scores on the pretest and posttest (in the experimental group) increased by 9.33.

B. Control class

According to a researcher, the following table explains the pretest results for the control class:

Table 4. Data Arrangement 3.D: Pretest scores of control class students

No.	Student's names	CRITERIA					The overall student score
		Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechaniesm	
1.	AH	14	12	12	11	3	52
2.	AJ	15	11	13	12	3	54
3.	C	17	13	14	16	3	63
4.	DDS	13	9	8	7	3	40
5.	GJ	13	7	7	7	3	37
6.	GN	17	11	14	14	3	62
7.	IE	13	7	7	8	3	38
8.	JT	20	13	13	16	3	65
9.	KK	15	13	12	15	3	58
10.	LP	14	11	10	11	3	49
11.	M	13	10	9	10	3	45
12.	NS	16	12	11	11	3	53
13.	NT	20	14	14	11	3	62
14.	N	13	7	8	7	3	38
15.	S	16	13	12	11	3	55
16.	SS	14	11	11	10	3	49
17.	SF	13	7	7	6	3	36
18.	SW	13	8	9	8	3	41
N=18		**Total Score**					**897**
		Average					**49,83**

The pretest results for the control class's students are displayed in Table 4. The data shows that the highest number, 65, is followed by the lowest value, 36. Next, a student with the greatest score and a student with the lowest score are identified. 49.83 was the average pretest score. In the meantime, higher scores were obtained from the control class posttest results. The following data table explains this:

Table 5. Data Arrangement 3.E: Posttest scores of control class students

No.	Student's names	CRITERIA					The overall student score
		Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanism	
1.	AH	17	14	14	11	4	60
2.	AJ	22	14	14	18	4	72
3.	C	18	14	14	16	3	65
4.	DS	17	10	14	11	3	55
5.	GJ	13	7	7	11	3	41

6.	GN	17	10	14	11	3	55
7.	IE	13	7	7	8	3	38
8.	JT	17	13	13	15	3	61
9.	KK	16	10	10	11	3	50
10.	LP	18	10	10	12	3	53
11.	M	17	11	10	11	3	52
12.	NS	20	13	13	15	4	65
13.	NT	18	13	12	12	3	58
14.	N	13	7	7	7	3	37
15.	S	15	10	10	10	3	48
16.	SS	17	11	12	11	3	54
17.	SF	13	7	7	7	3	37
18.	SW	16	9	9	10	3	47
N=18		**Total Score**					**948**
		Average					**52,66**

The control class's posttest results are displayed in Table 5. According to the data, 37 is the lowest possible score, and 72 is the greatest. Two pupils had the lowest scores, and one kid received the highest. The control class's pretest average was 52.66. The following data table provides an explanation of how students' pretest and posttest scores developed:

Table 6. Data Arrangement 3.F: Information about the control class's pretest and posttest values

No.	**Student's name**	**Scores on narrative writing**	
		Pretest (X_1)	Posttest (Y_2)
1.	AH	52	60
2.	AJ	54	72
3.	C	63	65
4.	DS	40	55
5.	GJ	37	41
6.	GN	62	55
7.	IE	38	38
8.	JT	65	61
9.	KK	58	50
10.	LP	49	53
11.	M	45	52
12.	NS	53	65
13.	NT	62	58
14.	N	38	37
15.	S	55	48
16.	SS	49	54
17.	SF	36	37
18.	SW	41	47
N=18	**Total Score**	**897**	**948**
	Average	**49,83**	**52.66**

The table above displays the narrative text of the students who received writing instruction in the control class (IX B) both before and after the intervention. This is demonstrated by the pretest and posttest results. The highest possible score is 72, and the range of scores is 36 to 72. A student who receives the greatest score is regarded as exceptional, whereas a student who has a lesser score is thought to be terrible.

To find the average score, researchers follow the formula:

$$M1 = \frac{\sum Y2}{N} = \frac{948}{18} = 52{,}66$$

Details about the average posttest scores for the control class 52.66. The data value shows that there is an increase from the pretest.

$$M2 = \frac{\sum Y1}{N} = \frac{897}{18} = 49{,}83$$

The control class pretest average was 49.83, meaning that students' writing teaching was lacking.

$$M = M_1 - M_2 = 52{,}66 - 49{,}83 = 2{,}83$$

The score above shows an increase in students teaching writing in the number of points.

Note: M = Mean N = Number of students
X1 = score value for students 1 (pretest) M1 = average posttest score
X2 = score value for students 2 (posttest) M2 = average pretest score

Table 7. Data Arrangement 3.G: Results from the pretest and posttest for the experimental class

Test	Experimental Class	Control Class
Pretest	1063	897
Posttest	1231	948

Data Analysis

The pretest and posttest results were obtained, and the t-test formula was developed at the 5% significance level. The next actions are as follows:

Table 8. Data Arrangement 3.F: Distribution Frequency Score

No.	X_1 Class IX A Experimental Posttest	Y_2 Class IX B Posttest Control	X (X_2- M1 X_2)	Y (Y_2- M1 Y_2)	X_2 (X_2 . X_2)	Y_2 (Y_2 . Y_2)
1.	78	60	9.62	7.34	92.54	53.87
2.	79	72	10.62	19.34	112.78	374.03
3.	50	65	-18.38	12.34	337.82	152.27
4.	64	55	-4.38	2.34	19.18	5.47
5.	79	41	10.62	-11.66	112.78	135.95
6.	75	55	6.62	2.34	43.82	5.47
7.	78	38	9.62	-14.66	92.54	214.91
8.	78	61	9.62	8.34	92.54	69.55
9.	64	50	-4.38	-2.66	19.18	7.07
10.	41	53	-27.38	0.34	749.66	0.11
11.	67	52	-1.38	-0.66	1.90	0.43
12.	46	65	-22.38	12.34	500.86	152.27
13.	77	58	8.62	5.34	74.30	28.51
14.	76	37	7.62	-15.66	58.06	245.23
15.	73	48	4.62	-4.66	21.34	21.71
16.	66	54	-2.38	1.34	5.66	1.79
17.	63	37	-5.38	-15.66	28.94	245.23
18.	77	47	8.62	-5.66	74.30	32.03
X=18	**$\sum X_2$= 1231**	**$\sum Y_2$= 948**	**$\sum X_2$= 1.72244**	**$\sum Y_2$= 1.42688**	**$\sum X_2$= 2438.2**	**$\sum Y_2$= 1745.9**
Average	**68.38**	**52.66**	**9.56911**	**7.92711**	**135.45**	**96.99**

Note: X2 : Posttest scores in the Experimental Class
Y2 : Posttest scores in the Control Class
X : Experimental Class Aberrations *T* = M1 – M2

1. Calculate the mean of variables X (1) and Y (2) with the following formula:

$M_1 = \frac{\sum X2}{N} = \frac{1231}{18} = 68.38$

$M_2 = \frac{\sum Y2}{N} = \frac{948}{18} = 52.66$

2. Calculate variables 1 and 2 with the following formula:

$SD_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X2}{N1}} = \sqrt{\frac{2438.2}{18}} = \sqrt{135.45} = 11.63$

$SD_2 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum Y2}{N2}} = \sqrt{\frac{1745.9}{18}} = \sqrt{96.99} = 9.84$

3. Calculate the mean standard error for variables 1 and 2:

$SE_{M_1} = \frac{SD_1}{\sqrt{N_1 - 1}} = \frac{11.63}{\sqrt{18-1}} = \frac{11.63}{\sqrt{17}} = \frac{11.63}{4.12} = 2.82$

$SE_{M_2} = \frac{SD_2}{\sqrt{N_2 - 1}} = \frac{9.84}{\sqrt{18-1}} = \frac{9.84}{\sqrt{17}} = \frac{9.84}{4.12} = 2.38$

4. Calculate the standard error and difference in the means of samples 1 and 2:

$$SE_{m1-m2} = \sqrt{SE_{m1}{}^2 + SE_{m2}{}^2}$$
$$= \sqrt{2.82^2 + 2.38^2}$$
$$= \sqrt{7.95 + 5.66}$$
$$= \sqrt{13.61}$$
$$= 3.68$$

5. Calculate t0:

$t_0 = \frac{M1-M2}{SEm1-m2} = \frac{68.38 - 52.66}{3.68} = \frac{15.72}{3.68} = 4.271$

6. Calculate the degrees of freedom using the formula:

$Df = n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 18 + 18 - 2 = 36 - 2 = 34$

According to this data, class IX A students' average pretest score on the experimental test was 59,05, whereas class IX B students' pretest score on the control class was 49,83. The experimental class received a score of 78 in IX A, whereas the control class received a score of 68 in IX B. The experimental class received the lowest pretest score, of 36 in both classes. These classes had different highest scores. and 36 for the class under control. Therefore, the experimental class's average posttest score is 68,38, higher than the control class's score of 52,66. The experimental class had the highest posttest score (79), while the control class had the highest score (72). The experimental class had the lowest posttest score (41), while the control class had the lowest score (37).

The value of t_o is 4.271 and the degree of freedom is 34 with 5% degrees based on the statistical computations above, indicating that the author utilizes This is possible given the significance, as seen in df = 34 at 5% significance. When comparing the t_table findings with the significance level of 5% and t_table = 4.271 > 2.032, the t_table value was 2.032. The T-observation was found to be 4.271 based on statistical computations, and the t_tabel DF 34 was 2.032 at a 5% significant level. Prior to this, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected because t-observation (t_o) was greater than t_tabel.

Table 9. Data Arrangement 3.G: Posttest Scores in Class A (Experiment) and Class B (Control)

No.	Posttest Score in Class A (Experimental)	Posttest Score in Class B (Experimental)
1.	78	60
2.	79	72
3.	50	65
4.	64	55
5.	79	41
6.	75	55
7.	78	38
8.	78	61
9.	64	50
10.	41	53
11.	67	52
12.	46	65
13.	77	58
14.	76	37
15.	73	48
16.	66	57
17.	63	37
18.	77	47
	1231	948
	68,38	**52,66**

The results of comparing the posttest scores in the experimental and control classes are shown in the following table, where the experimental class's highest score was 79, while the control class's highest score was 72.

Discussion

After conducting the investigation, the author presents how this study should be interpreted before summarizing the hypothesis. The study was conducted in order to provide answers to the following queries:

1. What is the student's ability to write narrative text before being given treatment and after being given treatment when using the dictogloss technique that is taught in writing? With this data, researchers asked students to write narrative texts using the dictogloss technique, which was used to assess their knowledge before being given treatment. And the average score that students get is 59.05. Then, after being given treatment, it was also given using the dictogloss technique, and students got very good improvement results. It can be seen from the results that they got an average student score of 68.38, which is a picture of students' writing teaching, which consists of writing that is consistent in vocabulary and then errors in language use, but the structure and mechanisms are understandable. These results conclude that the use of the dictogloss technique is very effective for improving students' skills by learning to write using narrative text in class IX of SMP Parulian 3 Medan.
2. How is the dictogloss technique applied in teaching writing narrative texts? To understand the dictogloss technique, which is applied when learning to write narrative text, the researcher wants to use the dictogloss technique, which can help students rewrite narrative text by reading narrative text twice as needed. By using the dictogloss technique with students, it can make it easier for them to use narrative text so that this technique can be used in learning skills such as listening and writing.

3. How to make the dictogloss technique effective, which will be studied in learning to write narrative texts in class IX of Smp Parulian 3 Medan? The following is how the alternative hypothesis () and null hypothesis () are formulated:
   (alternative hypothesis): There is a significant difference between students who were taught to write before treatment and after treatment in the use of the dictogloss technique. (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference in teaching students to write before treatment and after treatment using the dictogloss technique.

   The following is the hypothesis assumption: the alternative hypothesis is accepted, and the null hypothesis is rejected if it reaches ≥ ttable. The authors conclude that the employment of the dictogloss approach has an effect on students who are taught to write after assessing the results of the calculations rejected and accepted based on the data obtained from the experimental class and the control class.

   From these data, there is an increase in learning to teach writing due to the use of the dictogloss technique. In solving the problem in the statement, The author uses the dictogloss technique to teach storywriting skills where students succeed in deciphering the text based on its context. Students can more easily create narrative texts. Apart from that, the dictogloss technique is also very influential in writing narrative texts. Because narrative text without using the dictogloss technique results in students experiencing difficulties, the researcher helps students with this technique. So the dictogloss technique is suitable for learning to write using narrative text.

CONCLUSION

From research conducted at SMP Parulian 3 Medan regarding the "effectiveness of Dictogloss Teaching Techniques in Writing Narrative Texts,'' researchers can conclude several facts as follows: A pretest score of 59.05 and a posttest score of 68.38 were attained by the experimental class. The control class's pretest score was 49.83, while its posttest score was 52.66. The value of 4.271 in these results is greater than the 2.032 ttable value. There is a 5% significance. This indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected and the results of the alternative hypothesis are accepted. This indicates that it is extremely important to use the dictogloss technique in learning to write narrative texts in class IX of SMP Parulian 3 Medan.

From the data research, the researcher wants to provide several suggestions for the process of instruction and learning for both teachers and students. A. Teacher 1. Teachers in teaching and learning suggest choosing a variety of media or strategies in the process of instructing and learning. 2. Teachers need to be adept at using diverse media, tactics, and learning styles, especially when learning to write. 3. English teachers must use this strategy when teaching English, especially when learning to write narrative texts. B. Students 1. Students will be more enthusiastic and motivated if learning media are used. 2. Students must memorize vocabulary so that it is useful in assisting pupils with their writing, especially when using narrative text.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M., & Kathy, A. (2003). English text kinds 3. South: Mcmillan.

Djatmika & Wulandari. (2013). Writing narrative text. Bandung: Pakar Raya.

Evi, S. (2015). The effectiveness of Dictogloss technique in Teaching Narrative Writing. Thesis Department of English Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Keguruan State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah.

Graham, S., Tavsanli, O.F., & Kaldirim, A. (2002). Improving Writing Skills of Students in Turkey: A Meta-analysis of Writing Interventions. *Educational Psychology Review, 34*(2), 889-934.

Kurniawan, V., & Fitrawati (2014). Teaching writing hortatory exposition text by using stop and dare strategy to senior school students. *JELT, 3*(1), 159-167.

Pierangelo, R. & Giuliani, G. (2006). Assessment in special education: a practical approach (2nd edition). Boston: Allyan and Bacon.

Putra, K. N. (2014). The application of the dictogloss technique to improve students' Achievement in writing. A Thesis. Medan: English Department, Language And Art, States University of Medan. Analytical exposition.

Sugiyono. (2018). Methods of quantitative research, Bandung: Alphabeta

Vasiljevic, Z. (2010). Dictogloss as an Interactive Method of Teaching Listening Comprehension. Accessed on December 12th, 2015.

Watkins, M., & Knapp, P. (2005). Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing. Sydney: University of South Wales Press.