

Running Dictation as an Active Learning Strategy to Enhance Descriptive Writing in EFL Classrooms

Yunice Mamoribo¹, Rizqi Claudia Wardani^{2*}

^{1,2}Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong

*Corresponding author, E-mail: rizqiclaudiawardani@unimudasorong.ac.id

Abstract

This study investigates the effectiveness of the Running Dictation technique in improving students' writing skills, particularly in composing descriptive texts, among eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 8 Doom. The objective of this research is to determine whether this active, collaborative strategy significantly enhances students' writing performance and learning interest. Employing a pre-experimental design with a one-group pre-test and post-test model, ten students participated in a series of instructional sessions utilizing Running Dictation as the core method. Data were collected through descriptive writing tests and a student interest questionnaire. Quantitative analysis using a paired sample t-test revealed a statistically significant improvement in writing scores, increasing from a pre-test mean of 60.00 to a post-test mean of 72.02 ($p = 0.011$). Additionally, 80% of students reported high to very high interest in the learning process, indicating strong engagement and motivation. These findings suggest that Running Dictation is an effective and enjoyable strategy for enhancing writing competence in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. The study offers practical implications for language teachers seeking interactive, low-cost methods to improve student writing outcomes.

Keywords: Running Dictation; Writing Skills; Descriptive Text; EFL

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) license.



Introduction

Writing is a foundational skill in language learning, yet it remains one of the most complex and demanding competencies for students to master, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. It requires a synthesis of multiple linguistic elements—vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, coherence, and organization—while simultaneously demanding creativity, clarity, and an awareness of audience and purpose (Hyland, 2019; Nation, 2020). Compared to other language skills like listening or speaking, writing often poses greater cognitive and emotional challenges, as students must produce extended discourse without immediate feedback. In many EFL classrooms, especially in Asia and Africa, students report high levels of writing anxiety, low motivation, and a lack of confidence in their ability to compose texts effectively (Teng, 2022; Hashemian & Heidari, 2018).

In Indonesia, these difficulties are even more pronounced in junior high schools located in rural or under-resourced areas. Writing instruction is frequently limited by conventional teaching practices, insufficient access to materials, and lack of exposure to varied models of English use (Setiawan & Hermagustiana, 2021; Nugroho & Mutiaraningrum, 2020). This situation often leads to poor learning outcomes and disengaged learners. Rahmawati and Puspitasari (2021) argue that in such environments, teacher-centered approaches dominate, reducing opportunities for student interaction, exploration, and autonomy. Consequently, students often struggle with organizing their thoughts, applying grammar accurately, and maintaining coherence in their writing (Putri et al., 2022). These challenges are

exacerbated in eastern Indonesia, where educational inequality persists due to limited infrastructure, teacher availability, and technology (Wulandari, 2023; UNESCO, 2021).

Preliminary observations at SMP Negeri 8 Doom, located in Sorong, West Papua, revealed that eighth-grade students exhibited significant difficulties in constructing descriptive texts. During classroom visits and informal interviews, students described writing as boring, confusing, and overly difficult. They struggled to develop ideas, form structured paragraphs, and apply descriptive vocabulary. Teachers similarly expressed concerns over students' passivity and lack of enthusiasm during writing activities. These findings reflect not only a gap in writing competence but also in student engagement, motivation, and instructional innovation. The persistence of teacher-led, worksheet-heavy instruction was identified as a contributing factor, revealing a clear need for more active and collaborative approaches to EFL writing pedagogy.

To address this issue, movement-based and cooperative learning strategies have received growing attention as effective means to engage students and improve language outcomes. One such strategy is Running Dictation, an active learning technique that combines physical movement, peer collaboration, memory, and integrated language use. In this activity, students work in pairs or small groups: one student (the runner) reads and memorizes short texts posted around the classroom, then returns to dictate the content to their partner (the writer), who transcribes it. This process engages students in reading, listening, speaking, and writing in a dynamic and interactive format. Moghaddam and Salimi (2018) highlight that Running Dictation facilitates both cognitive and kinesthetic involvement, which enhances memory retention and language accuracy. Additionally, the cooperative nature of the task fosters peer support, reduces anxiety, and creates a sense of shared responsibility for learning (Fitriana et al., 2022).

Several empirical studies have affirmed the effectiveness of Running Dictation in improving EFL learning outcomes. For example, Nurhayati (2020) found significant gains in vocabulary and sentence-level grammar among Indonesian junior high school students using this method. Likewise, Haryanto and Andriani (2021) reported improved organization, fluency, and accuracy in students' descriptive and narrative writing after engaging in Running Dictation activities. Internationally, similar benefits have been observed. In Iran, Hashemian and Heidari (2018) concluded that kinesthetic strategies like Running Dictation helped reduce cognitive load in writing tasks. In Taiwan, Teng (2022) found that integrated skills instruction using movement-based tasks improved learners' self-efficacy and text coherence. Furthermore, Liao and Wang (2016) note that such techniques promote learner autonomy, especially in low-tech environments.

Despite these promising outcomes, there remains a significant research gap regarding the use of Running Dictation in rural or resource-constrained EFL contexts, particularly in eastern Indonesia. Most existing studies are conducted in urban areas with better access to resources, trained teachers, and infrastructure (Khairunnisa & Lestari, 2023; Rasyid & Amelia, 2022). There is insufficient evidence on how the technique performs in marginalized settings where traditional pedagogy still dominates, and students have limited exposure to interactive methods. Furthermore, while several studies have focused on vocabulary acquisition and sentence construction, fewer have directly assessed its impact on full-text writing performance—particularly in genre-specific tasks like descriptive writing, which is a mandated genre in Indonesia's national curriculum for junior high school students (Kemdikbud, 2021).

Given this context, the current study aims to fill these gaps by exploring the use of Running Dictation as an instructional strategy to improve both descriptive writing performance and student engagement at SMP Negeri 8 Doom in Sorong, West Papua. The school's remote setting, limited technological access, and observed instructional challenges make it a compelling site for evaluating low-cost, high-impact teaching strategies. The novelty of this research lies in its dual focus on (1)

improving students' ability to produce coherent, accurate descriptive texts, and (2) examining students' affective responses—such as motivation, enjoyment, and interest—toward this interactive method.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine whether the Running Dictation technique significantly enhances the descriptive writing skills and learning interest of eighth-grade students in a rural EFL context. By addressing both cognitive and affective domains, this study contributes to the growing body of literature advocating for equitable, student-centered writing instruction in under-resourced areas.

Literature Review

A. *Writing in the EFL Context*

Writing is a complex and multidimensional skill that involves idea generation, grammar mastery, coherence, and audience awareness. In EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms, writing becomes even more challenging due to learners' limited exposure to the language outside the classroom and anxiety about making mistakes (Alavi & Taghizadeh, 2020). According to Pratama and Aziz (2023), many junior high school students in Indonesia struggle with expressing their thoughts in writing, particularly in structured genres such as descriptive texts. Descriptive writing, commonly taught in Indonesian secondary schools, requires students to vividly portray people, places, or objects through detailed language, proper sentence structure, and spatial organization. Yet, many students face difficulties with vocabulary selection, grammar accuracy, and idea development (Putri et al., 2022). These issues are often compounded using traditional instructional methods that fail to actively engage students in the writing process.

B. *The Need for Active Learning Strategies*

To address these challenges, researchers and educators have advocated for active learning strategies that foster collaboration, movement, and interaction in language classrooms. Active learning encourages students to participate cognitively, emotionally, and physically in the learning process, which can lead to deeper understanding and increased motivation (Rahmawati & Puspitasari, 2021). Strategies that promote kinesthetic learning—especially those that involve group work, discussion, and movement—have shown promising results in enhancing students' language proficiency (Wulandari, 2023). In the context of writing, engaging students in interactive tasks such as group brainstorming, peer editing, and movement-based dictation has been found to improve both linguistic accuracy and writing fluency (Fitriana et al., 2022). These approaches break away from the passive reception of information and help learners internalize grammar and vocabulary through meaningful use.

C. *Running Dictation: Definition and Pedagogical Basis*

Running Dictation is an active, collaborative learning technique in which students work in pairs or small groups to reconstruct texts through physical movement and memory. One student (the “runner”) reads and memorizes parts of a text displayed around the classroom, then returns to dictate them to a partner (the “writer”) who records the sentences. This method integrates reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills in one task (Moghaddam & Salimi, 2018). The pedagogical principles behind Running Dictation are rooted in communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based language teaching (TBLT), both of which emphasize meaningful interaction and language use for specific purposes (Nurhayati, 2020). As a kinesthetic and cooperative strategy, Running Dictation aligns with Vygotsky's social constructivist theory, where learning is mediated through social interaction and scaffolding.

D. *Empirical Studies on Running Dictation in EFL Classrooms*

Several recent studies have examined the effects of Running Dictation on language learning outcomes. Nurhayati (2020) implemented Running Dictation in an EFL classroom and found that it significantly improved students' descriptive writing performance, particularly in terms of vocabulary usage and sentence structure. Similarly, Fitriana et al. (2022) observed that students experienced lower

levels of writing anxiety and increased confidence when writing through this method, as it transformed a typically solitary task into a fun, team-based activity. In a study by Haryanto and Andriani (2021), the technique led to better organization and grammatical accuracy in students' written texts compared to traditional instruction. Moreover, learners showed higher engagement levels, which the researchers linked to the physical and competitive aspects of the activity. These findings confirm the value of Running Dictation not only as a language reinforcement activity but also as a method for enhancing writing instruction itself. Moghaddam and Salimi (2018) extended these findings by demonstrating that Running Dictation supports both short-term retention and long-term acquisition of sentence patterns. Their study with Iranian EFL learners revealed that students who regularly engaged in Running Dictation performed better in sentence-level grammar tasks and paragraph construction. However, most of these studies were conducted in urban or relatively well-resourced schools, with limited research available from rural or remote contexts. The present study seeks to fill this gap by exploring how Running Dictation works in a low-resource EFL environment like Sorong, West Papua.

E. Running Dictation and Student Engagement

Student engagement is a critical factor in successful language learning. Active learning techniques such as Running Dictation have been shown to significantly boost students' motivation and willingness to participate in classroom activities (Putri et al., 2022). Haryanto and Andriani (2021) note that students in their study displayed greater enthusiasm and collaboration during Running Dictation tasks compared to traditional dictation or writing assignments. Moreover, Wulandari (2023) emphasizes the importance of implementing movement-based strategies in schools with limited technological access. In such settings, low-cost, high-engagement techniques like Running Dictation become especially valuable. These methods do not rely on digital devices and are adaptable to different group sizes and classroom layouts, making them ideal for use in rural or under-resourced areas.

Despite the growing interest in Running Dictation as a language teaching tool, there is still a lack of research focusing on its application in teaching descriptive writing and its effectiveness in rural or low-resource settings in Indonesia. Previous studies have primarily focused on vocabulary or grammar outcomes, with less emphasis on full-text writing performance. Additionally, few studies have examined students' affective responses—such as interest and engagement—when using this method in writing instruction. This study addresses these gaps by (1) applying Running Dictation to the writing of descriptive texts, (2) evaluating its impact on students' writing achievement, and (3) exploring students' interest in the learning process. By doing so, the research contributes both pedagogically and empirically to the development of interactive, accessible teaching strategies in EFL contexts.

Methodology

This study employed a pre-experimental design using a one-group pre-test and post-test model to examine the effectiveness of the Running Dictation technique in improving the writing skills of eighth-grade students. This design was selected for its practicality in classroom-based research, allowing for a direct measurement of changes in student performance before and after the intervention. However, it must be acknowledged that pre-experimental designs lack a control group, which limits the ability to attribute improvements solely to the treatment and raises potential threats to internal validity, such as maturation or testing effects (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). Despite these limitations, the design remains appropriate for small-scale exploratory studies in natural classroom settings, particularly in rural or resource-limited contexts where random assignment is not feasible.

The research was conducted at SMP Negeri 8 Doom, located in Sorong Islands, West Papua, during the 2022–2023 academic year. The population consisted of all eighth-grade students at the school, totaling 15 learners. A purposive sampling technique was used to select a single class of 10 students as the sample. Selection criteria included class availability, the teacher's consent, and the

students' consistent attendance to ensure continuity throughout the treatment. The study involved two variables: the independent variable was the use of the Running Dictation technique, and the dependent variable was the students' writing ability, particularly in composing descriptive texts.

The instructional treatment was implemented across multiple sessions and required students to work in pairs or small groups. In each session, printed descriptive texts were posted at various points around the classroom. One student (the "runner") read and memorized text segments, then returned to dictate the content to a peer (the "writer"), who wrote it down. This process encouraged the simultaneous use of multiple language skills reading, memorization, oral dictation, listening, and writing and aimed to foster both cognitive engagement and peer collaboration.

Data collection instruments included a writing test and a student interest questionnaire. The writing test was administered twice: once before the intervention (pre-test) and once after (post-test). Students were asked to write a descriptive paragraph based on a standardized prompt. Their responses were assessed using an analytic scoring rubric adapted from the Jacobs et al. (1981) writing scale, which evaluated five key criteria: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. To ensure reliability, the rubric was reviewed by two language education experts, and inter-rater reliability was calculated using Cohen's Kappa, which showed a high agreement score of 0.87.

To measure students' affective responses to the learning process, a Likert-scale questionnaire was administered after the post-test. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items measuring levels of interest, engagement, and perception toward Running Dictation. Each item offered five response options ranging from "Very Often" to "Never." The questionnaire was adapted from previously validated engagement scales used in EFL settings (Teng, 2022) and was reviewed for content validity by two educational psychologists. Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess internal consistency, yielding a reliability coefficient of 0.89, indicating strong reliability.

The collected data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to present mean scores, frequency distributions, and standard deviations. The main inferential test was the Paired Sample t-Test, conducted using SPSS Version 25, to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between pre-test and post-test writing scores. Prior to hypothesis testing, the Shapiro-Wilk Test was applied to confirm data normality, and Levene's Test was used to assess the homogeneity of variances. The significance threshold was set at $p < 0.05$.

This methodological approach was designed to assess both the cognitive outcomes (i.e., improvement in descriptive writing performance) and affective outcomes (i.e., interest and engagement) associated with the implementation of Running Dictation. While the absence of a control group limits causal generalization, the study provides valuable preliminary insights into how interactive, low-cost techniques can enhance EFL writing instruction in under-resourced educational contexts.

Result

This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of the Running Dictation technique in improving students' writing skills, particularly in composing descriptive texts. The data were obtained from a pre-test and post-test administered to ten eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 8 Doom. In addition, a Likert-scale questionnaire was distributed to measure students' interest and engagement after the intervention. The results are presented in both tabular and narrative form. To further examine the distribution of student scores by classification, Table 1 presents the frequencies and percentages of students across performance levels.

Table 1: Score Classification of Writing Tests

Classification	Score Range	Pre-Test (f)	Pre-Test (%)	Post-Test (f)	Post-Test (%)
Very Good	86–100	0	0%	1	10%
Good	71–85	2	20%	6	60%
Enough	56–70	6	60%	3	30%
Less	41–55	2	20%	0	0%
Very Poor	≤40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

Table 1 presents a detailed breakdown of student performance based on score classifications before and after the implementation of the Running Dictation technique. The data show that prior to the intervention, the majority of students (60%) were categorized as having “Enough” writing ability, with scores ranging from 56 to 70. Additionally, 20% of students were classified as “Less,” indicating scores between 41 and 55. Only two students (20%) were able to reach the “Good” category (71–85), and none achieved the “Very Good” category (86–100). This distribution indicates a concentration of students in the lower and mid-range performance levels before treatment, with no students demonstrating high writing proficiency.

However, after the application of Running Dictation in writing instruction, a significant shift in score distribution occurred. The percentage of students classified as “Good” increased sharply from 20% to 60%, while one student (10%) entered the “Very Good” category—something not observed in the pre-test. At the same time, the number of students in the “Enough” category dropped from 60% to 30%, and no students remained in the “Less” or “Very Poor” categories, effectively eliminating the lowest performance bands. This movement suggests a substantial upward trend in writing proficiency. The emergence of the “Very Good” category, alongside the drop in “Less” and “Very Poor,” indicates that the intervention was effective not only in improving the class average but also in lifting the overall quality and consistency of student writing performance. These gains demonstrate that Running Dictation helped shift students from basic or struggling levels into more competent and higher-performing categories.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the improvement in classification levels aligns with the goals of differentiated instruction and student-centered learning. Students with varying initial abilities were all able to benefit from the collaborative and engaging nature of Running Dictation, which may have promoted not only better understanding of descriptive writing structures but also enhanced confidence and classroom participation. Overall, this table clearly illustrates the impact of the intervention beyond mean score increases, showing how the technique raised the general performance level of the group while narrowing the achievement gap between lower- and higher-performing students.

To test whether the improvement was statistically significant, a Paired Sample t-Test was conducted. The result is presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Paired Sample t-Test Results

Variable	Mean (Pre-Test)	Mean (Post-Test)	t-count	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Writing Scores	60.00.00	72.02.00	7.746	9	0.011

The result of the t-test shows a p-value of 0.011 ($p < 0.05$), which indicates a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test means. The t-count value (7.746) is well above the critical t-table value (2.306) for $df = 9$, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. These findings

affirm that the use of Running Dictation significantly improved students' writing performance. Additionally, assumptions for parametric testing were met. The Shapiro–Wilk test confirmed normal distribution ($p > 0.05$), and Levene's Test indicated homogeneity of variance ($p = 0.682$), validating the reliability of the t-test results.

Students' responses to a post-intervention questionnaire revealed strong interest and engagement with the Running Dictation technique. Table 4 summarizes the classification of questionnaire scores.

Table 2. *Students' Responses to Interest Questionnaire*

Category	Score Range	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Very High Interest	86–100	5	50%
High Interest	71–85	3	30%
Moderate Interest	56–70	2	20%
Low Interest	≤55	0	0%
Total		10	100%

The table above provides valuable insights into students' affective responses to the use of the Running Dictation technique in the writing classroom. The questionnaire measured levels of interest, engagement, and motivation during and after the treatment sessions, with scores interpreted through categorical ranges. The results indicate that 50% of students (5 out of 10) reported a "Very High Interest" in the learning activities, with scores between 86 and 100. This group represents students who consistently felt enthusiastic, actively participated in group work, and found the physical activity aspect (running, dictating, listening) enjoyable and engaging. Their responses suggest that Running Dictation was not only cognitively stimulating but also emotionally and socially fulfilling. For instance, written comments included, "I like learning while moving because I don't feel bored," and "The game makes it easier to remember words." These reflections imply that the combination of physical activity and social interaction increased both their concentration and enjoyment.

An additional 30% of students fell into the "High Interest" category (scores of 71–85). These learners also responded positively to the method, indicating that they enjoyed the lessons more than traditional approaches. Although their enthusiasm was slightly lower than those in the "Very High" group, they still showed strong agreement with items related to collaboration, increased confidence, and improved understanding during the activity. Many reported feeling more motivated to write and appreciated being part of a team, which helped reduce writing anxiety. Only 20% of students (2 participants) reported "Moderate Interest" (scores between 56–70). These students may have been less comfortable with group dynamics or found the physical movement aspect slightly distracting. However, it is important to note that no students selected responses consistent with the "Low Interest" category (≤ 55), which indicates that none of the participants felt disengaged, confused, or uninterested during the implementation of Running Dictation. This distribution—where 80% of students reported high to very high interest and 100% fell above the low-interest threshold—strongly supports the conclusion that the strategy was not only effective academically but also successful in fostering an engaging, student-centered learning environment. The absence of negative affective responses reflects how Running Dictation caters to multiple learning styles (auditory, kinesthetic, social) and aligns with the Merdeka Curriculum's emphasis on active learning and meaningful classroom experiences.

The combination of improved writing scores and positive student attitudes indicates that Running Dictation is both an effective and engaging instructional strategy. Students who were

previously passive during writing tasks became more active and collaborative, which is consistent with the literature emphasizing kinesthetic and peer-supported learning. The significant statistical gains, coupled with favorable interest levels, highlight the suitability of this technique in EFL writing instruction, especially in remote or resource-constrained settings such as SMP Negeri 8 Doom.

Discussion

The results of this study demonstrate that the Running Dictation technique significantly improved students' writing skills, particularly in descriptive text composition. The increase in the mean score from 60.00 in the pre-test to 72.02 in the post-test, supported by a statistically significant p-value of 0.011, indicates a strong effect of the intervention. Moreover, the shift in score classifications—where 60% of students achieved the “Good” category and 10% reached “Very Good”—shows that the improvement was not limited to a few individuals but extended across the class, reducing the number of students in the lower-performing categories entirely. These findings reinforce prior studies suggesting that interactive, movement-based strategies such as Running Dictation can positively influence writing performance in EFL contexts (Nurhayati, 2020; Haryanto & Andriani, 2021). In this study, students not only improved in technical aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics but also in higher-level skills like organization and coherence an indication that the multisensory and collaborative nature of the task supports deeper language processing.

A core strength of the Running Dictation strategy lies in its integration of multiple language skills within a single activity. Students were simultaneously engaged in reading, memorizing, dictating, listening, and writing, which aligns with the principles of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). This framework emphasizes the use of authentic, meaning-focused tasks to promote language acquisition (Ellis, 2020). Additionally, the activity's cooperative structure supports Vygotsky's social constructivist theory, which suggests that learners develop cognitive skills more effectively through peer interaction and scaffolding. The findings also align with active learning models, which emphasize engagement through movement, problem-solving, and communication—features that were evident in students' reflections and performance.

Beyond cognitive outcomes, the study revealed notable affective benefits. Questionnaire results showed that 80% of students expressed high to very high interest in the learning process, with none indicating low interest. Qualitative responses such as “I enjoy learning while moving” and “Group work helps me understand better” suggest that the activity was perceived not only as effective but also enjoyable and motivating. These results echo findings by Fitriana et al. (2022), who observed reduced writing anxiety and greater self-confidence among students engaged in Running Dictation. Affective engagement is particularly crucial in low-resource settings, where students often face multiple barriers to participation, such as low confidence, fear of mistakes, and passive instructional models.

From a practical teaching perspective, the implications of this study are significant especially for EFL teachers working in remote or under-resourced schools. Running Dictation requires minimal materials (only printed texts and space for movement), making it a cost-effective and adaptable technique. Teachers in similar contexts can implement this strategy without relying on technology or expensive teaching aids. Furthermore, the flexible structure of the activity allows for differentiated instruction: students with stronger verbal memory can take on the “runner” role, while those more comfortable writing can act as the “writer.” This adaptability caters to diverse learning styles kinesthetic, auditory, visual—and supports the Merdeka Curriculum's emphasis on inclusivity, student-centered learning, and contextual relevance. Teachers are also encouraged to use this technique not only for writing instruction but for integrated-skills lessons, especially in classrooms with mixed proficiency levels.

To ensure effectiveness, teachers should provide clear modeling of the activity before

implementation, set manageable text lengths based on student levels, and use scaffolded supports such as vocabulary lists or graphic organizers when needed. Feedback and reflection sessions after each activity can further reinforce learning and correct errors collaboratively. However, this study is not without limitations. The small sample size (10 students) and the short intervention duration (limited sessions) restrict the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the study focused exclusively on descriptive text, leaving open the question of whether Running Dictation would yield similar results for other writing genres, such as narrative, recount, or expository texts. The lack of a control group also makes it difficult to isolate the effect of the intervention from other potential influencing factors such as teacher style or student maturation.

Future studies can build upon this research in several ways. First, incorporating a control group or using a quasi-experimental design would enhance the internal validity of the findings. Second, increasing the sample size and extending the duration of the intervention across multiple classes and schools would provide more robust data and improve generalizability. Third, adding a qualitative dimension such as student interviews, classroom observations, or reflective journals would enrich the understanding of how learners experience and respond to the activity in real time. Moreover, future research could explore the impact of Running Dictation across different genres of writing and varying levels of student proficiency, including primary, senior high school, or adult learners. Despite these limitations, the present study offers strong evidence for the pedagogical value of Running Dictation in EFL classrooms. It demonstrates that a well-structured, student-centered, and low-cost technique can enhance both writing performance and learner engagement, particularly in rural or underserved regions. For teachers aiming to revitalize their writing instruction and promote meaningful participation, Running Dictation presents a practical, inclusive, and enjoyable alternative to conventional writing strategies.

Conclusion

This study investigated the effectiveness of the Running Dictation technique in improving students' writing skills, particularly in composing descriptive texts. The findings clearly demonstrate that Running Dictation had a significant positive impact on both the cognitive and affective aspects of student learning. Quantitative results from the pre-test and post-test revealed a notable improvement in students' writing performance, with the average score increasing from 60.00 to 72.02. Furthermore, the statistical analysis confirmed that this improvement was significant, with a p-value of 0.011. In addition to academic gains, the interest questionnaire results showed that students responded enthusiastically to the method. A large majority (80%) reported high to very high interest in participating in Running Dictation activities, indicating that the technique also contributed to greater classroom engagement and motivation. The collaborative and kinesthetic nature of the strategy appeared to reduce writing anxiety and promote active participation among students who previously struggled with written expression.

Taken together, these results suggest that Running Dictation is an effective and practical instructional strategy for enhancing writing skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting. It encourages the integration of multiple language skills—reading, speaking, listening, and writing—while also fostering teamwork and enjoyment in the learning process. This is especially important for schools in remote or under-resourced areas, such as SMP Negeri 8 Doom, where creative, low-cost teaching methods are essential. The study contributes to the growing body of literature advocating for active learning in language education and aligns with the Merdeka Curriculum's emphasis on student-centered and meaningful learning experiences. Teachers are encouraged to adopt Running Dictation not only as a writing tool but also as a strategy to build student confidence, interaction, and motivation. Future research should expand this investigation to larger populations and diverse writing genres to determine the broader applicability of the technique. Qualitative data, such as classroom observations

or interviews, could also enrich the understanding of how students experience and benefit from Running Dictation in different learning contexts.

References

- Alavi, S. M., & Taghizadeh, M. (2020). The role of writing in second language learning: Challenges and pedagogical strategies. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(2), 45–56.
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Ellis, R. (2020). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fitriana, S., Hasanah, R., & Ramadhani, T. (2022). Reducing students' writing anxiety through running dictation activity. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Indonesia*, 10(1), 22–31.
- Hashemian, M., & Heidari, Z. (2018). The effect of kinesthetic learning activities on EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 10(2), 65–85.
- Haryanto, D., & Andriani, N. (2021). Improving students' descriptive writing skills using running dictation technique. *ELT in Focus*, 4(2), 50–60.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Newbury House.
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2021). *Modul ajar Bahasa Inggris SMP: Teks deskriptif*. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.
- Khairunnisa, N., & Lestari, R. (2023). Enhancing students' engagement in EFL writing through interactive classroom strategies. *Jurnal Edukasi Bahasa dan Sastra*, 11(1), 64–76.
- Liao, Y. C., & Wang, Y. S. (2016). The effects of running dictation on young EFL learners' performance. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 5, 18–30.
- Moghaddam, M., & Salimi, A. (2018). The effects of running dictation on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy and complexity. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(5), 20–27.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2020). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.
- Nurhayati, D. A. W. (2020). Using running dictation to enhance students' writing performance in descriptive text. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature*, 5(2), 34–45.
- Nugroho, A., & Mutiaraningrum, I. (2020). Learner autonomy and writing skills: A classroom action study in rural Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 15(1), 1–14.
- Pratama, A., & Aziz, R. A. (2023). Teaching descriptive texts through interactive techniques in EFL classrooms. *Journal of English Language Teaching Innovations*, 3(1), 12–20.
- Putri, L. R., Ningsih, S., & Jannah, R. M. (2022). Students' perceptions on writing difficulties in descriptive texts. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Humaniora*, 11(1), 78–85.
- Rahmawati, D., & Puspitasari, D. (2021). Active learning strategies in EFL classrooms: Enhancing student motivation and performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 8(3), 101–112.
- Rasyid, M. A., & Amelia, R. (2022). Developing students' writing fluency through task-based activities in low-resource classrooms. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 21(2), 115–129.
- Setiawan, B., & Hermagustiana, I. (2021). Student-centered learning and its impact on writing performance in rural Indonesian schools. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(2), 274–291.
- Teng, M. F. (2022). EFL students' self-efficacy, writing performance, and engagement in integrated-skill instruction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 42(1), 51–67.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Education progress in remote areas: A global perspective*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wardani, R. C., Nursalim, N., & Samsur, F. R. (2019). Students Ability in Constructing Paragraph of Recount Text. *INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 6(1), 32–40. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.unimudatorong.ac.id/index.php/interactionjournal/article/view/2583>
- Wulandari, S. (2023). Implementing kinesthetic learning in rural EFL settings: A study of junior high schools in eastern Indonesia. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Bahasa*, 9(2), 88–97.