

## THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MODIFIED DICTOGLOSS IN PROMOTING RECEPTIVE AND PRODUCTIVE KNOWLEDGE OF COLLOCATION

Mufidatur Rohmah

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

[fidaakira@gmail.com](mailto:fidaakira@gmail.com)

### Abstrak

Studi ini difokuskan pada mengeksplorasi bagaimana tugas dictogloss dalam merekonstruksi teks dapat meningkatkan pembelajaran kolokasi Bahasa Inggris, terutama frasa verbal. Penelitian sebelumnya telah menunjukkan bahwa peserta didik menghadapi tantangan dalam menggunakan kombinasi kata-kata tersebut, namun terdapat keterbatasan teknik pengajaran yang efektif. Peserta dalam penelitian ini adalah 84 siswa Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam kelas sebelas (berusia 16-17 tahun). Studi ini menggunakan desain eksperimental untuk membandingkan efektivitas dua versi modifikasi dari tugas dictogloss. Dalam penelitian ini, peserta secara acak dibagi menjadi tiga kelompok: kelompok eksperimental 1 (SEM), kelompok eksperimental 2 (STRUC), dan kelompok kontrol (tradisional). Siswa bekerja berpasangan dan merekonstruksi teks Bahasa Inggris yang berisi target item (frasa verbal). Sebelum setiap rekonstruksi, dilakukan aktivitas pengawal dengan tujuan membantu peserta didik dalam memahami kolokasi (frasa verbal). Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa siswa yang melakukan dictogloss yang dimodifikasi memperoleh skor rata-rata yang lebih tinggi dalam tes paska-pelajaran pengetahuan reseptif dan produktif kolokasi dibandingkan dengan siswa yang melakukan dictogloss tradisional. Selain itu, melibatkan siswa dalam aktivitas pra-tugas yang melibatkan elaborasi makna kolokasi lebih unggul daripada aktivitas pra-tugas yang berfokus pada bentuk, terutama dalam hal pengetahuan produktif. Hasil tersebut dianalisis secara menyeluruh dalam kaitannya dengan penelitian sebelumnya, menyoroti implikasinya dalam pengajaran Bahasa Inggris dan penelitian di masa depan.

**Kata Kunci:** dictogloss yang dimodifikasi, pengetahuan reseptif, pengetahuan produktif, kolokasi.

### Abstract

This study focused on exploring how the dictogloss task of text reconstruction could enhance the learning of English collocation, especially phrasal verbs. Earlier studies have shown that learners face challenges when it comes to utilizing these word combinations, yet there are limited effective instructional techniques available. The participants in this research were 84 Islamic senior high school students in the eleventh grade (aged 16-17). The study employed a true experimental design to compare the effectiveness of two modified versions of the dictogloss task. In this study, the participants were randomly allocated to three groups: experimental group 1 (SEM), experimental group 2 (STRUC), and a control group (traditional). The students worked in pairs and reconstructed English texts containing the target items (phrasal verbs). Before each reconstruction, a priming activity was conducted with the intention of assisting learners in perceiving collocation (phrasal verbs). The result demonstrated that students who performed modified dictogloss gained higher mean scores in post-tests of receptive and productive knowledge of collocation compared to students who performed traditional dictogloss. Furthermore, engaging students in a pre-task activity that involved elaborating on the meaning of collocations outperformed a form-focused pre-task activity, particularly in terms of productive knowledge. The results are extensively analyzed in connection with previous research, highlighting their implications for English language teaching (ELT) and future research.

**Keywords:** modified dictogloss, receptive knowledge, productive knowledge, collocation.

### INTRODUCTION

Collocation refers to commonly recurring combinations of two to three words in syntagmatic units, encompassing both lexical and grammatical elements (Henriksen, 2013). This definition aligns with research conducted in L2 classrooms as it involves frequently used collocations that contribute to the development of students' competence. Collocation plays a big role in language

learning. Rao (2018) asserts that collocations are essential to non-native speakers of English as it is important in vocabulary acquisition. Moreover, it has great benefits for EFL learners to use native-like expressions and further develop their language proficiency.

There are several types of collocations. They are verb + noun (commit suicide), adjective + noun (fast food),

preposition + noun (on guard) and adjective + preposition (amazed at). Phrasal verb (carry on) is also another type of collocations by its definition. (Snoder & Reynolds, 2019) mention, in their study, that phrasal verb can be implemented in the SEM (Semantic) dictogloss as it is frequent in all types of English texts. Thus, this present study has considered that phrasal verb will be the topic of this research along with dictogloss technique.

Phrasal verbs, an abundant category of English verbs combined with particles, play a vital role in the language, being widely prevalent across various forms of English, particularly in informal conversations. Proficiency in phrasal verbs is crucial for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, as it not only contributes to their fluency but also enables them to sound more natural in their language usage. However, learning to use phrasal verbs is considered a challenging task due to the confusing number of verb combinations and multiple meanings associated with them (Side, 1990). Thus, an innovative approach is needed to tackle these difficulties and encourage effective learning of phrasal verbs.

Dictogloss, a popular language teaching technique also known as grammar dictation, offers a potential solution. It integrates dictation and collaborative writing, where students collaboratively reconstruct an original text read aloud to them using their notes and comprehension of the passage (Nabei, 2018). Dictogloss is an innovative classroom task that was first popularized by Ruth Wajnryb, an Australian teacher trainer, compared to the traditional dictation. This task involves collaboration in reconstructing texts and serves as a means of instructing L2 grammar (Wajnryb, 1990). The standard dictogloss procedure consists of four stages: preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis and correction. (Zohrabi & Tahmasebi, 2020) argue that the dictogloss task is more effective for students' vocabulary acquisition compared to their development of grammar skills, making it a suitable method for teaching phrasal verbs in the classroom. Moreover, (Kopinska & Azkarai, 2020) support implementing dictogloss in pairs, as it can enhance students' motivation in learning English.

Numerous researchers have explored the effectiveness of the dictogloss method in English language instruction, covering various language skills and components, such as listening, writing, grammar, and vocabulary (Aminatun, Mulyah, & Haryanti, 2021; Hermansyah & Herlina, 2018; Pertiwi, Ngadiso, & Drahati, 2018; Zohrabi & Tahmasebi, 2020). Furthermore, there are studies that investigate modified dictogloss, an innovative variation of the traditional technique, in various aspects. For instance, (Chun & Aubrey, 2021) propose a modified form of dictogloss to enhance the utilization of genre-specific conventions and style among ESL learners,

focusing on genre-based writing instruction. Another study examines the use of a modified dictogloss to improve students' writing abilities by substituting teacher dictation with audio (Lutfi Ratni Dewi, Flora, 2013). Additionally, investigations have explored the correlation between meaning and form in the context of dictogloss tasks (Fernandez, 2019). It is evident that dictogloss holds significant potential for enhancing students' competence in various language aspects.

The standard dictogloss procedure effectively enhances the learning of individual words due to their repetition during the oral reading of the passage. However, there is no guarantee that collocations will be retained as cohesive units when students reproduce the text. Yet, maintaining the integrity of collocating words in the minds of EFL learners is crucial for establishing stable memory traces. To address this, (Snoder & Reynolds, 2019) assert that teacher intervention via a pre-task activity is essential before engaging in the dictogloss task, reinforcing the connection between words within collocations. This approach aligns with usage-based theories of language acquisition (Ellis, 2003). Furthermore, a study by (Lindstromberg, Eyckmans, & Connabeer, 2016) supports the notion that a modified dictogloss surpasses the standard version in helping students' retention of various Formulaic Sequences (FSs). Hence, this study investigates the implementation of dictogloss for collocation learning, utilizing two modified versions of the dictogloss L2 Input processing.

The initial model, (Barcroft, 2015) Lexical Input Processing (lex-IP) theory, employs structural elaboration known as STRUC dictogloss. This approach involves activities where students focus on the form of target items, such as counting the number of letters they consist of. It prioritizes the structural aspect over the semantic aspect in lexical learning. The second model, (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001) Involvement Load Hypothesis (ILH) theory, employs semantic elaboration referred to as SEM dictogloss. This approach entails activities where students engage with the meaning of target items, such as rating their enjoyableness. Based on this theory, the acquisition of L2 vocabulary relies on the task executed by students during word processing, with tasks that entail a higher involvement load (IL) exhibiting superior performance compared to tasks with a lower IL.

(Snoder & Reynolds, 2019) support the idea that involving learners in elaborating on the meaning of collocations during a pre-task activity leads to better outcomes compared to a form-focused pre-task activity. Hence, semantic elaboration, referred to as SEM dictogloss, is believed to hold significant potential for English language teaching (ELT) practitioners in enhancing students' competence, as opposed to structural

elaboration, known as STRUC dictogloss. However, this recent study focuses solely on verb-noun collocations, leaving a gap to be addressed. Therefore, the objective of the current study is to examine the effectiveness of two versions of modified dictogloss in teaching another type of collocations, specifically phrasal verbs, to EFL learners.

Understanding a word encompasses various aspects of vocabulary knowledge, as discussed by (Henriksen, 1999) and (Nation, 2001). The receptive-productive dimension offers a means to distinguish between various types of vocabulary knowledge. This dimension helps assess the level of mastery in understanding and producing vocabulary items (Henriksen, 1999; Read, 2004; Schmitt, 2014). However, there is a lack of universally accepted definitions for the terms "receptive" and "productive" vocabulary knowledge. Researchers hold different perspectives on the definition of vocabulary knowledge (Laufer, 1998). Despite these differences, most researchers agree that lexical knowledge is not a binary concept but exists on a continuum of varying degrees. The variations among researchers lie in how they characterize these degrees and subsequently in the types of tests used to measure them. Therefore, in this study, receptive (passive) vocabulary knowledge refers to understanding the most common and central meaning of a word, such as understanding "solution" in the context of "solution of a problem" rather than "chemical solution" (Laufer, 1998). On the other hand, Laufer distinguishes productive (active) vocabulary knowledge into two categories: controlled and free productive knowledge. Controlled productive knowledge pertains to the capacity to generate words in response to cues or prompts, whereas free productive knowledge denotes the ability to spontaneously produce words without specific prompts for a particular word. As the focus of this study is on learning collocations and emphasizes controlled productive knowledge through elicitation tests rather than free written production, productive vocabulary knowledge pertains to the capability of producing words in accordance with task prompts, such as completing the word "fragrant" in the sentence "the garden was full of fra flowers" (Laufer, 1998).

In light of this, the study aims to explore the implementation of modified dictogloss in the context of phrasal verb learning, contributing to a deeper understanding of receptive and productive knowledge of collocation acquisition among EFL learners. The investigation will offer valuable insights for language educators and learners, ultimately advancing language teaching and learning methodologies.

**Research questions**

This study will focus on the following two questions:

1. Is SEM dictogloss significantly more effective than STRUC dictogloss in promoting receptive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs) to EFL learners?
2. Is SEM dictogloss significantly more effective than STRUC dictogloss in promoting productive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs) to EFL learners?

**METHOD**

This study employs a quantitative research design to investigate the comparative effectiveness of two modified versions of dictogloss in L2 vocabulary learning for teaching and enhancing the acquisition of phrasal verbs, a specific category of collocations. Quantitative research is chosen because it allows for the examination of large populations or samples using numerical data collected through instruments or measuring instruments, which can be analyzed statistically or quantitatively (Ary et al., 2010).

The study adopts a true experimental design where participants are assigned randomly to three groups: Experimental Group 1 (E1) receiving the SEM dictogloss treatment, Experimental Group 2 (E2) receiving the STRUC dictogloss treatment, and the Control Group (C) undergoing traditional dictogloss without any specific treatment. The dependent variable is assessed through a pre-test before the intervention, and the three groups are later measured on the dependent variable using a post-test. The post-test scores of the three groups are then compared.

**Table 1**  
*Experimental Design*

Groups	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
E1	✓	SEM	✓
E2	✓	STRUC	✓
C	✓	Traditional Dictogloss	✓

The participants in this study are 84 Islamic senior high school students in the eleventh grade, aged 16-17. The population of the study comprises all the students in the eleventh grade. A random sampling technique is used to select three classes from the total of 10 classes of the 11th-grade students. These three classes are randomly assigned to two experimental groups (E1 and E2) and one control group (C), resulting in a total of 84 participants.

The data collected in this research consist of the students' scores on pre-tests and post-tests, which assess both their receptive and productive knowledge of collocations (phrasal verbs) following their participation in the two modified dictogloss activities (STRUC and SEM). The pre-test scores for productive knowledge address the second research question, while the pre-test scores for receptive knowledge answer the first research question. The post-test scores for both receptive and productive knowledge are also utilized. The sources of data include the students' performance on these assessments before and after engaging in the modified dictogloss tasks.

To assess learning, the researcher develops two sets of assessments: pre-tests and post-tests, designed to measure both productive and receptive knowledge of the target items. Receptive knowledge is assessed using the Vocabulary Levels Test (Nation, 2001), while productive knowledge is evaluated using the Productive Vocabulary Levels Test (Laufer & Nation, 1999). The Vocabulary Levels Test involves a matching task where participants select the right definition or synonym for three words out of a set of six options. The Productive Vocabulary Levels Test is a cued recall test, requiring participants to fill in the missing word in a sentence, with initial letters of the words provided as prompts. The study prioritizes the development of controlled productive knowledge in learning phrasal verbs, assessed through an elicitation test format.

Prior to the intervention, all participants undergo a comprehensive pre-test assessment. As learners are already familiar with the dictogloss procedure, they form pairs based on their selection, resulting in 42 pairs. During the intervention phase, each pair collaboratively reconstructs two texts that incorporate the target collocations. Specific priming activities are conducted before each reconstruction to guide learners in perceiving the collocations as complete phrases. After completing both versions of the modified dictogloss, immediate unannounced post-tests are administered. The productive knowledge test is administered first, followed by the receptive knowledge test to control for any potential "practice effect."

The collected data comprises the pre-test and post-test scores of receptive and productive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs) among the learners. Both the pre-tests and post-tests are assessed dichotomously, with scores of 1 for correct answers and 0 for incorrect answers. The productive knowledge test requires the application of scoring criteria based on correctness (1 point) or incorrectness/blank (0 points). Grammatical errors and minor spelling errors that do not alter the word are not considered incorrect.

To analyze the differences in outcomes between the three groups (SEM, STRUC, and Traditional dictogloss), a one-way between-groups ANOVA is performed on the mean score differences. The objective of this analysis is to identify significant differences in the outcomes of the pre-test and post-test concerning both receptive and productive knowledge. The statistical analysis is performed using a website of Social Science Statistics.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 2**

*Result of One-Way Between-Groups ANOVA of Receptive Knowledge Post-test from E1, E2 and C Group*

Result Details				
Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	
Between-treatments	21.7143	2	10.8571	F = 6.43933
Within-treatments	136.5714	81	1.6861	
Total	158.2857	83		

This study examined the effect of modified dictogloss on promoting receptive knowledge of collocation, specifically phrasal verbs, in three conditions: SEM, STRUC, and Traditional Dictogloss. The results of the analysis revealed a significant effect of the types of dictogloss on receptive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs) at a significance level of  $p < .05$  for all three conditions [ $F(2, 81) = 6.44, p = 0.003$ ]. The significant effect indicated that the different types of dictogloss had an impact on participants' receptive knowledge of collocation. However, to further explore and identify specific differences between the means of the different groups, a Post Hoc Tukey HSD (honestly significant difference) analysis was conducted. This analysis allows for a pairwise comparison of the groups to determine if there are significant differences between them.

**Table 3**

*Result of Post Hoc Tukey HSD of Receptive Knowledge Post-test from E1, E2 and C Group*

Pairwise Comparisons		HSD <sub>.05</sub> = 0.8286 HSD <sub>.01</sub> = 1.0403	Q <sub>.05</sub> = 3.3765 Q <sub>.01</sub> = 4.2392
<b>T1:T2</b>	M <sub>1</sub> = 8.43 M <sub>2</sub> = 8.57	0.14	Q = 0.58 (p = .91100)
<b>T1:T3</b>	M <sub>1</sub> = 8.43 M <sub>3</sub> = 7.43	1.00	Q = 4.08 (p = .01388)

<b>T<sub>2</sub>:T<sub>3</sub></b>	M <sub>2</sub> = 8.57 M <sub>3</sub> = 7.43	1.14	Q = 4.66 (p = .00416)
------------------------------------	--	------	--------------------------

The Tukey HSD test showed significant differences in mean scores among the SEM (M = 8.43), the STRUC (M = 8.57), and the Traditional (M = 7.43) conditions, suggesting all three approaches promoted students' receptive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs). Both SEM and STRUC dictogloss were effective in enhancing receptive knowledge, with no significant difference between them. The slightly higher mean score in the STRUC condition hints at a potential advantage for the structural dictogloss approach. These findings highlight the positive impact of modified dictogloss on collocation learning and call for further research to explore the benefits of each version in language learning contexts. Educators can confidently use either approach to enhance students' understanding of collocation.

**Table 4**  
*Result of One-Way Between-Groups ANOVA of Productive Knowledge Post-test from E1, E2 and C Group*

Result Details				
Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	
Between-treatments	115.5238	2	57.7619	F = 15.07873
Within-treatments	310.2857	81	3.8307	
Total	425.8095	83		

The study investigated the impact of modified dictogloss on enhancing productive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs). A between-groups ANOVA was conducted, dividing participants into three groups: SEM Dictogloss, STRUC Dictogloss, and Traditional Dictogloss. The analysis revealed a statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in the post-test scores of productive knowledge among the three groups. The F-value obtained was  $F(2, 81) = 15$ , with a corresponding p-value of 0.00001. This suggests that both modified dictogloss approaches positively influenced participants' productive knowledge of collocation compared to the traditional dictogloss approach. Further post hoc tests are needed to explore specific differences between the groups. Overall, the findings indicate that modified dictogloss can effectively enhance learners' productive knowledge of collocation, particularly phrasal verbs.

**Table 5**  
*Result of Post Hoc Tukey HSD of Productive Knowledge Post-test from E1, E2 and C Group*

Pairwise Comparisons		HSD <sub>.05</sub> = 1.2489 HSD <sub>.01</sub> = 1.5680	Q <sub>.05</sub> = 3.3765 Q <sub>.01</sub> = 4.2392
<b>T<sub>1</sub>:T<sub>2</sub></b>	M <sub>1</sub> = 10.64 M <sub>2</sub> = 8.64	2.00	Q = 5.41 (p = .00075)
<b>T<sub>1</sub>:T<sub>3</sub></b>	M <sub>1</sub> = 10.64 M <sub>3</sub> = 7.86	2.79	Q = 7.53 (p = .00000)
<b>T<sub>2</sub>:T<sub>3</sub></b>	M <sub>2</sub> = 8.64 M <sub>3</sub> = 7.86	0.79	Q = 2.12 (p = .29526)

The Tukey HSD test compared mean scores among three groups: SEM Dictogloss (M = 10.64), STRUC Dictogloss (M = 8.64), and Control (M = 7.86). The results showed that SEM Dictogloss significantly improved students' productive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs) compared to both STRUC Dictogloss and Control. However, STRUC Dictogloss did not significantly enhance productive knowledge compared to the Control group. These findings support the use of SEM Dictogloss as an effective technique for improving students' productive knowledge of collocation, particularly phrasal verbs.

One interesting finding of this study was that the effectiveness of providing structural elaboration of target items, as anticipated based on the Lexical Input Processing theory (Barcroft, 2015), was significantly lower than expected. On the other hand, the provision of semantic elaboration yielded more favorable outcomes, indicating that engaging students in the semantic aspects of collocations had a greater impact on their learning. These results provided empirical support for the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), which suggests that the level of cognitive involvement during the learning process significantly influences learning outcomes. However, it is important to note that these findings specifically applied to the students' productive knowledge of collocations, particularly phrasal verbs. The results indicated that neither the SEM nor STRUC dictogloss significantly enhanced students' receptive knowledge of collocations. Nevertheless, it was found that students who received the STRUC dictogloss treatment achieved higher scores compared to those who received the SEM dictogloss treatment.

The present study findings align with a previous study, affirming the practicality and theoretical benefits of the dictogloss as a classroom task for EFL learning. As indicated by the previous study, the SEM dictogloss exhibits significant potential for English Language Teaching (ELT) practitioners aiming to enhance learners' understanding of collocations. In particular, the SEM dictogloss offers a distinct advantage over the STRUC dictogloss, as it produces a medium effect size for productive knowledge of incongruent target collocations in the delayed post-test (Snoder & Reynolds, 2019). However, this study did not administer the delayed post-test. Thus, we call for more EFL classroom-based research that further expands the durable learning gains of modified dictogloss in collocation.

In summary, the results of this study demonstrated that both versions of the modified dictogloss approach were effective in improving students' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations when compared to the traditional dictogloss method. As a result, teachers can confidently incorporate this modified dictogloss technique when teaching phrasal verbs, preferably by providing a pre-task activity before engaging in the dictogloss exercise. To promote productive knowledge, inducing semantic elaboration was identified as an effective strategy for facilitating students' reproduction of target items. Conversely, inducing structural elaboration of target items proved to be beneficial in enhancing students' receptive knowledge of collocations. By implementing the modified dictogloss technique in the learning process of collocations, especially in the context of phrasal verbs, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners are likely to achieve advanced or even native-like proficiency in their language skills.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings of this study demonstrate that the use of modified dictogloss techniques is more effective in enhancing students' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations, specifically phrasal verbs, among EFL learners. The results show that both SEM dictogloss and STRUC dictogloss have a positive impact on students' receptive knowledge of collocation, but there is no significant difference between the two approaches. However, SEM dictogloss proves to be significantly more effective than STRUC dictogloss in promoting students' productive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs).

The experimental groups that received the SEM and STRUC dictogloss treatments exhibited higher mean scores in both receptive and productive knowledge post-tests compared to the control group, which only undertook traditional dictogloss without any specific

prompts for semantic or structural elaboration. These results indicate that the implementation of modified dictogloss, with pre-task activities focusing on meaning or form, enhances students' understanding and proficiency in using collocations, particularly phrasal verbs.

Overall, the study highlights the importance of employing various instructional approaches to address the different aspects of collocation learning among EFL learners. While both SEM and STRUC dictogloss techniques contribute positively to receptive knowledge, SEM dictogloss stands out as a more effective approach in promoting productive knowledge of collocation (phrasal verbs). These findings have significant implications for language educators seeking to enhance vocabulary acquisition and language proficiency in EFL contexts. By incorporating modified dictogloss activities into language teaching, educators can facilitate a more comprehensive and effective learning experience for students, particularly in mastering collocations like phrasal verbs.

## Suggestions

The researcher offers valuable suggestions applicable to English teachers, learners, and future researchers. Implementing modified dictogloss in the classroom can significantly improve students' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations, particularly phrasal verbs, compared to traditional dictogloss. The pre-task activity enhances motivation, collaboration, and critical thinking while inducing semantic elaboration aids in productive knowledge, and structural elaboration benefits receptive knowledge. Moreover, modified dictogloss is expected to attract students to learn collocations, fostering a better understanding of phrasal verbs and developing their creativity. English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners can benefit greatly, advancing their proficiency to more advanced levels.

This study only concentrates on a specific category of collocations referred to as phrasal verbs. Furthermore, this study does not administer delayed post-test so the durability of learning gains is not taken into account. For future research, exploring the effectiveness of modified dictogloss on different collocational patterns, conducting long-term assessments to evaluate retention, including diverse learner populations, enlarging sample sizes, and adopting a mixed-methods approach are recommended. Addressing these suggestions will expand knowledge on the effectiveness of modified dictogloss and its impact on collocation learning across various contexts and learner groups, ultimately enhancing language teaching practices and learning outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Aminatun, D., Mulyah, P., & Haryanti. (2021). THE EFFECT OF DICTOGLOSS ON STUDENTS' LISTENING ACHIEVEMENT. *Jurnal PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, 5, 262–269. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v5i2.8246>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, LC, & Rosensen, C. (2010). Introduction to Research in Education. Belmont: Cengage Learning.
- Barcroft, J. 2015. Lexical Input Processing and Vocabulary Learning. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chun, L. T., & Aubrey, S. (2021). Using a Modified Dictogloss to Improve English as a Second Language Learners' use of Genre-appropriate Conventions and Style. *RELC Journal*, (April). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211045783>
- Fernandez, F. O. (2019). *The discussion of meaning and form in a dictogloss task*.
- Henriksen, B. (1999). *THREE DIMENSIONS OF VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT*. (August 1996), 303–317.
- Henriksen, B. (2013). *Research on L2 learners' collocational competence and development – a progress report*. 29–56.
- Hermansyah, & Herlina. (2018). TEACHING ENGLISH GRAMMAR WITH DICTOGLOSS Hermansyah. *HOLISTIC JOURNAL*, 10(20), 1–67.
- Kopinska, M., & Azkarai, A. (2020). Exploring young EFL learners' motivation: Individual versus pair work on dictogloss tasks. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 607–630. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.10>
- Laufer, B. (1998). The development of passive and active vocabulary in a second language: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 255–271. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.2.255>
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.1>
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 33–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229901600103>
- Lindstromberg, S., Eyckmans, J., & Connabeer, R. (2016). A modified dictogloss for helping learners remember L2 academic English formulaic sequences for use in later writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 41, 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2015.08.002>
- Lutfi Ratni Dewi, Flora, A. N. (2013). MODIFIED DICTOGLOSS TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING SKILL AT SMA AL-KAUTSAR BANDAR LAMPUNG. *Paper Knowledge . Toward a Media History of Documents*, 05, 12–26.
- Nabei, T. (2018). Grammar Dictation (Dictogloss). *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0067>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 1–23. Retrieved from <http://eltj.oupjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/elt/56.1.91>
- Pertiwi, D., Ngadiso, & Drajadi, N. A. (2018). The effect of Dictogloss Technique on the students' writing skill. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 279–293. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.11484>
- Rao, V. C. S. (2018). The Importance of Collocations in Teaching of Vocabulary. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 2(7).
- Read, J. (2004). Plumbing the Depths: How Should the Construct of Vocabulary Knowledge Be Defined. In P. Bogaards, & B. Laufer (Eds.), *Vocabulary in a Second Language* (pp. 209-227). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/llt.10.15rea>
- Schmitt, N. (2014). *Size and Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge: What the Research Shows*. (December), 913–951. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12077>
- Side, R. (1990). Phrasal verbs: sorting them out. *ELT Journal*, 44(2), 144–152. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.2.144>
- Snoder, P., & Reynolds, B. L. (2019). How dictogloss can facilitate collocation learning in elt. *ELT Journal*, 73(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy024>
- Wajnryb, R. 1990. Grammar Dictation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zohrabi, M., & Tahmasebi, Z. (2020). A study of the effect of dictogloss as a medium of form-focused instruction on vocabulary versus grammar development of Iranian EFL learners. *Applied Research on English Language*, 9(2), 183–204. <https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2019.117960.1473>