

# **Effect of Models and Cooperative vs. Collective Learning on Students' Performance in English Writing in a Product-Oriented Class\***

Ahmad Mohamed Faleh AL-Magableh\*\*

## **Abstract**

This paper aimed at exploring the Effect of models and cooperative versus collective learning on students' performances in the learning of English writing in a product-oriented class. Students were freshmen enrolled at King Saud University. Data were collected from seventy nine students who were divided into treatment and control groups. The treatment group included forty-one students, whilst the control group was thirty eight. Scheffe was used as a statistical means for analyzing the data collected for the purposes of the study. A pre-test was performed and the sample of the study was randomly distributed. In light of the results of post test, findings of the study revealed that implementing models in the learning of English writing advantaged significantly students' performances. The study also revealed that the cooperative technique significantly contributed in developing students' achievements. The study recommended that English writing courses need to be revised to include models and exercises which necessitate using the cooperative technique in the writing classes to assure high quality of the outcomes of the learning process. On the other hand, collective and cooperative techniques should be included and fully covered in the pre and in-service EFL teacher training programs.

---

\*This research is fully sponsored by King Saud University

\*\* Corresponding author: Assistant Professor, College of Languages and Translation, Department of European Languages and Translation, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Email: [Amfimagabeh.2005@yahoo.com](mailto:Amfimagabeh.2005@yahoo.com); [Magableh@operamail.com](mailto:Magableh@operamail.com)

# **Effect of Models and Cooperative vs. Collective Learning on Students' Performance in English Writing in a Product-Oriented Class**

## **1. INTRODUCTION:**

Classroom techniques have a serious effect on the teaching/learning process. They play an important role in determining the outcomes expected from the teaching process. They also determine the extent to which students are involved in the learning process. Consequently, teaching strategies used in the teaching of English writing in a foreign context can be of fruitful results or of devastating effects on the students' performances in the learning of language in general and English writing in particular. Good pedagogy gives students consistent guidance and coherently builds on students' learning experiences. Hence, writing teachers need to be aware of the consequences of the pedagogical techniques they implement in the classroom. In Berlin's (1982) words (cited in Susser, 1994: 40-41), writing teachers must:

become more aware of the full significance of their pedagogical strategies. Not doing so can have disastrous consequences, ranging from momentarily confusing students to sending them a way with faulty and ever harmful information. The dismay students display about writing is, I am convinced, at least occasionally the result of teachers unconsciously offering contradictory advice about composing-guidance grounded in assumptions that simply do not square with each other.

Linguists and socio-linguists have developed different approaches to the investigation of language teaching. The central argument in this study is to show how literature to date views techniques used in product-oriented writing classes emerged from the theory of language teaching; to what extent do scholars see these techniques as advantaging or disadvantaging of students' performances in writing.

Pedagogy has also a tangible effect on students' involvement in the classroom and on their attitudes towards the learning of writing. Classroom atmosphere determines the extent to which students are interactively involved in the teaching/learning activities. Classroom



atmosphere (Zamil, 1987) which encourages risk-taking and trust between students and teachers can be easily established and developed. Teacher will not be the only authoritative person; rather authoritativeness can supposedly be shared between teacher and students. Consequently, writing will be viewed as meaning making, rather than error-pinpointing. In light of such encouraging atmosphere, students will, also, have positive attitudes towards writing and make real progress in writing performance.

### **Literature Review**

In this review of literature, the study elaborates on the product approach and cooperative versus collective learning of writing.

### **The Product Approach**

#### **Focus of the Product Approach:**

The way the product approach views writing process is discussed along three main points; focus of the product approach on the writing skills, linearity of the writing process and mechanism of the writing drills in the classroom.

The heydays of the audio-lingual method as a mode of teaching were 1960s. Product-oriented approach was preliminary Called "current traditional rhetoric", or "product-centered work" (Johnson, 1994) where the focus is on the correct usage, and correct grammar. What distinguishes this approach is that it focuses on form of writing as a finished product since the very beginning with the ultimate ignorance of the process in which the original writer produced the model manipulated (Pauline, 1988). It, for instance, (Johnson, 1994 & Raims, 1991) concentrates on teaching the topic sentence, the various methods of developing a paragraph, and rhetorical features of a text; unity, coherence and emphasis.

Consequently, it is not surprising to find the product approach as grammar focused more than content focused. It is mainly dominated (Yannakopoulou, 1994) with the leaching of grammar and sentence structure focusing on formal accuracy and correctness. The first priority of teaching is to avoid errors as much as possible to help students write an error-free text. The content is not problem for the writers according to this approach as students know in advance what they want to say. The problem' is rather the form represented in grammatical and rhetorical patterns into which the content will be molded.

This important pillar in the product approach; focusing on form as the final product (Neo, 1996), may explain the reason why the writing class traditionally starts with analysis of a model of writing, focusing on the patterns of organization used in different genres. Silva (1990) clarifies that according to the product approach, writing is revolving around arranging and adapting grammatical units (sentences and paragraphs) into prescribed models.

The product approach perceives writing as a multi-stage linear process. As a result of using models of writing in the classroom as examples to be imitated, "the model approach" has become another name for the product approach. The model approach can be defined as (Flower and Hayes, 1981) a linear series of stages which lead to a gradual evolution of the written product. These stages include prewriting, writing and re-writing. In the pre-writing, the writer makes some mental and physical preparations for the task before being really engaged in writing. In the writing stage the writer starts transferring his thoughts into words. In the re-writing, the writer reviews and starts revising the written discourse already produced. A model of writing for students to imitate was (Pauline, 1988) a crucial pillar in this approach. According to this model, teaching of writing has been traditionally perceived as a means to the teaching of language. Teacher was perceived as the main reference to students.

Classroom activities in the product approach encourage mechanical drilling more than creativeness and innovation. In the product approach writing is used (Pauline, 1988) to reinforce linguistic themes students were sensitized to the spoken form of language. Most of the writing exercises are (Raims, 1991) mechanical drills such as sentence drills, fill ins, substitution, transformation and completion. These exercises are centralized around the model based approach where students have to imitate paragraph or essay form, paragraph completion, identification of a topic sentence and the supporting sentences and scrambled paragraphs to reorder or scrambled sentences to reorder in a paragraph.

#### **Classroom Interaction in the Product Approach:**

In a product-oriented classroom atmosphere, teachers assume all the authority. They are the main source of knowledge and it is only their responsibility to judge students works in terms of grammatical accuracy, correctness, mechanical errors (Raims, 1991 & Susser, 1994) and



closeness to the writing model promoted to see the extent they are, or not, doing well (Neo. 1996). As Strang (1984:26) mentions:

In the so called "current-traditional" or product-oriented model... ..the teacher played an authoritarian role as the guardian of grammatical and rhetorical property and the judge of finished student papers. ... .The instructor felt most comfortable in the lecture hall and the professional office equipped with red pens and handbooks of error codes.

Writers' main role in the product approach is to receive information. They rarely get involved directly in creative activities in the classroom and they rarely either exchange information or experiences among one another in a collaborative manner. Furthermore, they do not have the chance to choose the topic. Rather, it is the teacher who does that to achieve specific purposes in the teaching of language such as exploring and practicing some grammatical, syntactical and rhetorical issues (Raims, 1991).

#### **Criticism of the Product Approach:**

Product approach has been criticized for three flaws; overemphasizing of accuracy, overemphasizing of accuracy, artificiality and misleading students.

#### **Focus on Accuracy:**

It generally focuses on form of writing and devalue the meaning of the text. Structuralists, for example, (Tomlinson, 1983) have criticized the traditional approaches for the abundance of errors they have to deal with. It is quite common in the teaching of second language writing that form has stolen the lime light by the time little attention is paid to meaning, function, and purpose (Raims, 1983). As mentioned before, the main focus of the product-based approach is on a predicted product. Therefore, it promotes a model as a guide for the students in their writing to produce a similar one drawing on the organisational framework of the model. It devalues the message intended from writing as it leads students to see writing as a form which molds the content (Pauline, 1988 and Hairston 1982). Sharing the same viewpoint, Freedman et.al (1983) states that traditional method of teaching writing highlighted issues such as correct usage, correct grammar, and correct spelling, topic sentence, and methods of developing paragraph and organization. So, this clarifies that the main concern of the traditional paradigm is the product and not the process



which leads students to be more interested in the accuracy of writing. In his words, Richard (cited in Hairston, 1982:78) states that:

The overt features are obvious enough: the emphasis is on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into description, narration, exposition and argument; the strong concern with usage and with style; the preoccupation with informal essay and research paper; and so on.

Writing is a means to express meaning. Unfortunately, product approach does not consider the content of writing as a priority although a mastery of grammar and syntax, is not sufficiently enough to produce a communicative piece of writing (Hamdan, 1988). Discourse parameters should be taken into consideration when teaching or designing writing courses. Kenneavy (1980) emphasizes that isolated teaching of grammatical skills has not a tangible effect in actual composition writing. Students may need more focus on parameters as such vocabulary development, sentence maturity and paragraph instruction. Instead of highlighting (Zamil, 1982) structure and correct form, more important issues such as purpose of writing, audience and process of composition itself need to be given more attention.

#### **Artificial Teaching:**

Artificiality of the traditional approaches is embodied in their focus on mechanical drills and assigning students imaginative topic which are not related to authentic situations. Functionalists, therefore, denounce the focus of such approaches, because of their ignorance of purpose, topic, and the intended reader. An approach should aim at increasing learners' exposure to authentic writing to help them solve their problems in writing outside the classroom. It should also aim at getting learners to write effectively. Hairston (1982:84) mention that writing cannot be separated from its context, that audience and purpose should affect every stage of the creative process. This may explain the reason why traditional approaches have failed to direct writing practices in the classroom to achieve social purposes; teaching grammatical skills without relating them to their function. The focus of the product approach may have little impact on students' performance in writing.

Therefore, students find themselves engaged in artificial, imaginative tasks and unfamiliar situations. They are, for instance, not immersed (Duke, 1988) in real life writing, which gives them a wrong impression



that there is a formula which fits all the situations. As a result, considering the importance of sense of real audience in making writers more specific and expressive in their writing (Wolcott, 1987), students' writing may lack clarity, conciseness and their performance will drastically be lower than teachers may expect. The traditional approaches, with their focus on product, are perceived as impractical, because they do not meet students' needs (Zamil, 1983 and Pauline, 1988) and lead to declining in their performance in writing (Wolcott, 1987). Moreover, linearity and sequence of writing in the product approach (Neo, 1996; Casanave, 1988 & Pauline, 1988) does not consider recursiveness of the writing process, which gives students more problems in their writing. In Pauline's (1988:7) words:

Linear model of writing is both inappropriate and unhelpful, since writing appears to be a highly recursive process. Writing is essentially a thinking process. Therefore, cognitive theories hold out some hope of providing a richer account of the writing process than a view which explains it in terms of habit reinforcement.

Not only do the traditional approaches give troubles to students as clarified above, but teachers may also find themselves in dilemma as they (Witte and Faigly cited in Hamdan, 1988) have not been provided with specific directions for the teaching of writing.

#### **Misleading Students:**

Product approach may be considered as misleading to students in the learning of English writing as it gives them an unrealistic impression about the writing process and it does not either allow students to write more creatively.

The traditional approaches may have negative effects on students learning how to write. Students can be misguided in terms of the way they should perceive writing and the quality of writing they produce. When the main focus of modes of the instruction is on product, it may have serious effects on students' impression of the writing process and on their interaction in the classroom. As a result, overemphasizing accuracy (Susser 1994:34) can generate a false impression about the composing process. As he states:

Product-oriented pedagogy pays lot of effort to inform .students if their writing was accurate. Therefore, most students believe that composing is primarily or essentially a matter of getting clearly in mind what they want to say and then finding the words which will read these meanings and make them available to others. .

Such a misleading awareness of the writing process may push students to establish a narrow notion (Zamil, 1987) about the nature and function of writing. They may perceive form of writing as more important than meaning and rules of language are highly emphasized by the time audience is given little attention. On the other hand, they may take for granted that teacher is their sole reference and the only responsible person to correct their written works.

Product approach does not encourage students to think creatively while writing. Students' awareness of the teachers' emphasis on syntactic and grammatical errors (Shaughnessy, 1977) may distract their attention to the extent that they will not use major strategies of writing. The model approach, for instance, does not encourage students to be inventive and creative in their writing, rather it urges them to abide themselves to a linear process of composing; prewriting, writing and rewriting (Pauline, 1988 and Hairston 1982). It does not either illustrate how the writing process is done or how the writer of the model provided has managed to arrive at that end and is criticized for being too long. Further, it does not tackle students' problems in writing, particularly at the content level.

#### **Advantages of the product Approach:**

However, although the product approach has some disadvantages on the teaching of writing and on students' performances in its learning, it has its own merits and is unwise to turn our backs completely towards it. Instead, it is recommended (Davies, 1993) to use the product approach at the early stages of learning how to write in English. The reason for such a recommendation is that students have, in the early stage of learning, enough information about the topics they write by the time they have meager linguistic repertoire to express their thought. The product approach promotes a solution for such a problem as it provides students with the chance to learn the linguistic forms which may help them to great extent in writing - the case which rationalizes implementing the product approach in this study.



Teacher's main role will be coordinating the learning process. As for little effort in comparison to the collective learning (Duke, 1990). As for students, they can help one another regardless of their level of achievement and motivation. Moreover, it seems that students enjoy doing their writing assignments according to this technique where they negotiate of how to write, develop their fluency and proficiency and support their communicative competence (Nation, 1994). Studies in this field have been classified into three categories; writing, other skills and courses and the teaching process in general.

### ***Studies Related Writing***

Anwer (2002) assures that conferencing, a form of cooperative learning, improves significantly students' performance in writing and their reflective and critical thinking. Magdadi and Alherish (2002) uncover that cooperative learning enables students to acquire theoretical and practical editing skills. Moursi (1995) finds out that cooperative learning enabled students to achieve significant results in favor the treatment group. Girls are found to outperform boys significantly. Hart (1991) asserts similar findings.

### ***Studies related to other skills and courses:***

AbuSeileek (2007) asserts that cooperative computer-mediated technique is an effective method for learning and teaching oral skills. He adds that students react positively to the cooperative computer-mediated approach. Sawalheh and Bani Khalid (2006) mention that technique of teaching (dependent/independent) has positively affected the development of students' critical thinking and the extent to which they have learnt concepts. Samarah and Alodaily (2006) report that cooperative learning has affected positively students' performance in chemistry. Mifleh and Kana'an (2005) reveal that cooperative learning is effective in developing students' reading comprehension. Ibraheem (2004) mentions that cooperative learning develops students' performances and their positive attitudes towards prosody. Abo Alheaja and Alsa'di (2003) find out that teaching model implemented is effective in developing students' level of critical reading whereas technique of teaching is ineffective in this regard.



Abidalhameed (2002) point out that cooperative learning enhances students' performance in skills in designing and producing some teaching materials. Najem and ALShatheli (2004) used this technique in the teaching of history texts. They found out that the treatment group (using the cooperative technique) significantly outperformed the experimental one which used the tradition approach. Kedrowicz & Watanabe (2006) confirms that teamwork was advantageous in the learning of oral skills.

### ***Studies Related to The Teaching Process in General:***

The majority of the studies affirm positive effect of the cooperative techniques on the learning process. Rashed and Bakeer (2001) finds out that carefully planned cooperative learning situations guarantee that EFL learners are actively involved forming their knowledge. They conclude that cooperative learning promote higher achievement than the collective learning.

Other studies have focused on the teaching process in general. ALSaraireh and Younis (1999) report that students have positive attitudes towards the practical techniques (groups work, role play and games) in comparison to the traditional way which mainly based on memorization, because they create cooperation and motivate students to be more alert and activated. Almani' (2005) point out that cooperative learning is of the preferences of the students. It promotes positive classroom climate and incentives which can raise students' curiosity. AL-Quran (2003) assures that learning style preference not only affects how learners learn, but also how teachers teach. He revealed that teacher-student congruence of learning style has a significant effect on students' ability in perceiving the difficulties involved in English language learning reflected in the divergent and convergent congruence.

As far as this review of literature is concerned, it is clear that effectiveness of using models in the teaching of English writing on students' performances is not cultivated. Joining models of writing to the techniques (Cooperative versus collective) in the learning process is missing in the literature to date, too. Consequently, the study comes to fill in these research gaps by investigating the extent to which the cooperative activities and models of writing can help students develop their performance in a product-oriented writing class. The study gains its significance as it is mainly concerned with freshmen who are going to get specialized in translation to which writing proficiency is a key pre-requisite.



### **The Present Study:**

This study aims at promoting a wider understanding of the product approach particularly when it is joint to some Collective and collaborative techniques and providing a base for reviewing and scrutinizing the techniques EFL teachers implement in the teaching of English writing in Year One at King Saud University. In particular, the study aims at estimating the extent to which two classroom techniques (cooperative and collective) are effective in a model-based, product-oriented writing class. Therefore, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Do learners who have access to model-oriented learning perform better than those who have not such access?
2. Do learners who have access to cooperative learning perform better than those who have collective learning?
3. Are there any significant differences in students' performances in writing in the groups of the study due to the implementation of models and techniques in the teaching of English writing?

### **Terms**

#### ***Cooperative learning:***

It is dividing students to small groups from four to six where they are expected to exchange ideas, teach one another, share experiences with slight guidance from the teacher. So, students learn and teach at the same time (Najem and AlShatheli, 2004).

#### ***Collective learning:***

Students are given a considerable degree of freedom in following up their own courses under the supervision of the teacher (AlSaraireh and Yunis, 1999).

#### ***Models:***

A group of patterns and samples of professional writing of different genres distributed to students in the classroom for discussion purposes. The patterns will be subject for analysis where the teacher points out styles of organization. Students, on the other hand, explore and practice some grammatical, syntactical and rhetorical issues (Raims, 1991). They are expected to imitate the style of writing and the way ideas are molded. Flower and Hayes (1981) explains that the model approach can be defined as a linear series of stages which lead to a gradual evolution of the written product; prewriting, writing and re-writing.

## **Methodology**

### **Research Problem:**

Problem of the study is presented in scarcity of cooperative activities included in the present writing course book taught at King Saud University in the Department of European Languages and translation. The book does not either include models of writing to be implemented in the classroom where they will be subject for analysis to identify the way ideas are organized and textual features at form and content levels of a well written script-a situation which can underlie their poor performances. Thus, the present study comes to bridge this gap by investigating the extent to which cooperative learning and models can help in developing students' performances in writing.

### **Significance of the Study:**

The present study can be of great importance for people concerned in the learning/teaching process in general and the teaching of English writing in particular as it presents a review of the teaching of English writing. It may promote guidance for EFL teachers as how to enhance the way they teach English writing. It also presents a cooperative model of teaching where more than one technique can be joined to elevate students' performance as much as possible, encourage them to develop the spirit of collaborative work and keep themselves away of unhealthy, destructive individual competitiveness. The study can draw decision-makers' and curricula designers' attention to the importance of including cooperative activities and analytical models in the present curricula at the school and university levels particularly for students getting specialized in translation for whom writing is a critical issue.

### **Sample of the Study:**

The sample of the study consisted of Saudi freshmen in the Bachelor program of translation in the Department of European Languages and Translation in the first semester in the Academic year 2008. All of the subjects were enrolled in Writing One. Two sections were considered for the purposes of this study.

### **Procedure and Design:**

The two groups included in the study were identical in terms of age and academic level; Year One. Sample of the study were subject for pre-test.



There were no significant differences between average scores of the treatment and control groups. The treatment group (41 students) was trained by providing them with models to analyze and imitate where they were expected to produce scripts of similar linguistic, organizational and rhetorical features at the form and content levels. The control group (38) was not provided with such models. They were given the chance to draw on their own experiences and impressions they have got in mind about "what is estimated to be good writing".

On the other hand, each group was divided randomly into two sub-groups where they worked cooperatively and collectively respectively. In the cooperative teaching, students worked in groups of four to six where they used to read one another's writings and exchange comments on the weaknesses as well as the strengths. In some cases, groups used to work collaboratively producing one piece of writing. Then, groups exchanged the writing products and discuss them in the same manner outlined. Students in the collective group were required to work separately. However, students in both groups were not aware that they were being experimented.

#### **Instrument:**

A scale for composition evaluation adapted by AL-Magableh (1992) was used to assess students' performances in writing. The scale focuses on clarity, coherence, cohesion, concluding statement, organization and reader-orientation.

#### **Data Collection and Analysis**

Following the first three weeks in the term, students started to write one assignment every week. Producing such texts was expected to take place in the classroom. Writing classes were used for training purposes and giving feedback.

Three raters were employed in the study for assessing students' writings by using the scale for composition evaluation. Students' scores in the post-test were assessed. Average of the interraters' assessments was calculated for each student.

Means and standard deviations of students' overall scores in writing were computed. Scheffe was used to analyze students' performances in the treatment and control groups. Students' overall scores were analyzed with respect to any differences attributable to using models and techniques

(cooperative vs. collective) in the teaching of English writing. The relationships between model (model/non-model) and techniques (cooperative/collective) groups were also calculated.

## Results

The first research question asked if learners who have access to model-oriented teaching perform better than those who have not such access. Table 1 lists the means and standard deviations of students' scores. A comparison of these means has been performed.

Table 1:  
Means and Standard Deviations of students' scores (model/no-model groups)

<i>Modelity</i>	<i>Techniques</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std Deviation</i>	<b>N</b>
Model	Cop	6.0556	3.01900	18
	Col	3.000	2.11058	23
	Total	4.3415	2.94627	41
No model	Cop	3.3500	1.61690	20
	Col	2.5556	1.74738	18
	Total	2.9737	1.74738	38

Table 1 shows that the overall means of the model-oriented group was extremely higher than that of the no model-oriented group. The total means of the model-oriented group was 4.3400 and the standard deviation was 2.94627. On the other hand, the total means of the no model group was 2.9737 and the standard deviation was 1.74738. To debrief, presenting models of writing for analysis in a writing classroom led to significantly higher performance in comparison to the no-model group.

The second research question asked if learners who have access to cooperative learning perform better than those who have collective learning. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of students' scores in this regard. A comparison of these means has been done.



Table 2:  
Means and Standard Deviations of students' scores  
(cooperative/collective groups)

<i>Modelity</i>	<i>Techniques</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std Deviation</i>	<b>N</b>
Model	Cop	6.0556	3.01900	18
	Col	3.000	2.11058	23
	Total	4.3415	2.94627	41
No model	Cop	3.3500	1.61690	20
	Col	2.5556	1.74738	18
	Total	2.9737	1.74738	38

Table 2 shows that the means of the cooperative group in the model-oriented class was 6.0556 and the standard deviation was 3.01900, whilst the means of the collective group was 3.000 and the standard deviation was 2.11058. This shows clearly that the cooperative learning was effective in elevating students' performances in writing.

On the other hand, the means of the cooperative group in no model-oriented class was 3.3500 and the standard deviation was 1.61690. The means of the collective group in the no model group 2.5556 and the standard deviation was 1.74738. This also indicates that cooperative learning led to push students' performances in writing higher than the collective technique in the no-model class. In summary, regardless of the fact that a model is implemented in the class, it can be generalized that cooperative learning led to enabling students to achieve much higher than the collective group.

The third research question was related to the existence of any significant correlation between the implementation of models and techniques to the teaching of English writing in terms of students' performance.

Table 3 shows multiple comparisons of mean differences between groups of the study sample.

**Table 3:**  
**Multiple Comparisons**

Dependent Variable: RESULT  
Scheffe

(I) TECHNIQU	(J) TECHNIQU	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
cop	col	3.0556(*)	.68941	.001	1.0838	5.0273
	Cop	2.7056(*)	.71174	.004	.6699	4.7412
	Col	3.5000(*)	.73023	.000	1.4115	5.5885
Col	Cop	-3.0556(*)	.68941	.001	-5.0273	-1.0838
	Cop	-.3500	.66979	.965	-2.2656	1.5656
	Col	.4444	.68941	.937	-1.5273	2.4162
Cop	cop	-2.7056(*)	.71174	.004	-4.7412	-.6699
	Col	.3500	.66979	.965	-1.5656	2.2656
	Col	.7944	.71174	.743	-1.2412	2.8301
Col	cop	-3.5000(*)	.73023	.000	-5.5885	-1.4115
	Col	-.4444	.68941	.937	-2.4162	1.5273
	Cop	-.7944	.71174	.743	-2.8301	1.2412

Based on observed means.

(\*) The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Findings in Table 3 show that there was significant effect of the group on students' performances in writing. Scheffe comparisons indicated that the students who worked cooperatively in the treatment group outperformed significantly the other three groups; the collective one in the treatment group, the cooperative and collective ones in the control group respectively at  $p < .05$  level.

Moreover, the table also shows that the students who worked collectively in the treatment group outperformed significantly at  $p < .05$  level those who worked cooperatively, or collectively in the control group.

On the other hand, the students who worked cooperatively in the control group outperformed significantly at  $p < .05$  the other students who worked collectively in the same group.



Table 4 shows significance of the findings of the study.

Table 4:

**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Dependent Variable: RESULT

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	137.150(a)	3	45.717	9.526	.000
Intercept	1094.069	1	1094.069	227.970	.000
MODALITY * TECHNIQU	.000	0	.	.	.
MODALITY	.000	0	.	.	.
TECHNIQU	100.254	2	50.127	10.445	.000
Error	359.939	75	4.799		
Total	1569.000	79			
Corrected Total	497.089	78			

a. R Squared = .276 (Adjusted R Squared = .247)

The data in table 4 show that there was a significant effect of the model and cooperative techniques on students' performances.

## Discussion

It is clear from the findings of the study that the students who had access to the model-supported process in the learning of English writing achieved much higher than those who did not have such access in both the treatment and control group. This indicates that students can get benefit of analyzing such model in the classroom and can develop their style and organization of writing in light of the experiences of the professional writers who have written such texts. These findings have been supported by other research done to identify the effect of using models in enhancing students' achievement in writing; Sawlhah (2006).

The finding also showed that students who worked cooperatively without being supported with models in the treatment group had higher significant performances than students who worked collectively in the control group. Implementing cooperative learning in the classroom seems to enrich the teaching process and enable students to master writing skills more appropriately than the collective technique. Sawarah (2006), Aboalheaja (2003), Anwer (2002) and AL Herish & Magdady (2000) support this finding. One interpretation of this finding is that in the cooperative learning students help one another in the group exchanging ideas, experiences and concepts, which enabled them to shoulder their responsibilities in the learning process more skillfully. Every student in

the group acquired the skills needed and developed them, which could lead by the end of the learning process to the development of the skills of the whole group (Najem and AlShatheli, 2004).

In surveying the literature, no study was found to contradict the findings of the present study. On the contrary, all of them were supportive although the settings and context of their implementation were variant; Jordan, Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco.

It is clear from the findings that there was correlation between students' performances in both treatment and control groups and using the cooperative technique. This means that cooperative learning has provided students with opportunities to develop their potentials in writing. They did not rely on their own experiences and linguistic knowledge; rather they shared experiences, suggestions and pieces of advice with their peers. They also had the chance to be not only aware of their own weaknesses and strengths in writing, but they also could discover other students' strengths to build on and weaknesses to avoid.

### **Conclusion**

Interpretation of the results of the present study needs to be done with great cautious. The small size of the sample can limit to great extent generalizing the findings of the study to a wider scope. The study was also confined to freshmen during a limited period of time. Had the study been extended the period to two academic terms and included different levels of students, not only the freshmen, the findings would have been more generalizable.

Consequently, there could be a need for further studies which can take these limitations into consideration and address other issues (such as using conferencing) related to implementing models and cooperative learning in the teaching of English writing.

To conclude, findings of the present study have promoted additional pieces of evidence towards a better understanding of the learning/teaching of English writing. The findings appear to be of great help for EFL teachers as how best they can develop students' potentials in this regard instead of relying heavily on the traditional method in their daily classroom teaching practices. Implementing models in a writing class makes familiarizing students with the skills needed for producing a well-written text possible. The models seem to have contributed in the



development style and organization of their writings, which can help compensate them for their possible lack of knowledge and competence.

The findings of the study showed also a significant effect of the cooperative technique in comparison to the collective one. Therefore, English teachers are recommended to implement this technique in the classroom although it needs more time and efforts in comparison to the collective one.

The study recommends that English writing Curricula are to be revised on a regular base AlSabhi (2002). Curricula designers need to include models of writing to be analyzed in the classroom where focus will be on the writing skills at both form and content levels (grammar, spelling, punctuation and capitalization, coherence, cohesion, unity, organization, reader-orientation, concluding statement and completeness).

On the other hand, the writing curricula need to include activities and exercises that necessitate implementing the cooperative techniques in the teaching of English writing. This needs to be perceived as an obligation for English teachers and not an option.

It seems essential that pre and in-service training courses expose EFL teachers and train them on employing the cooperative learning as one of the effective techniques in the teaching of English writing. Therefore, collective and cooperative learning are to be included and fully covered in the pre and in-service training programs.

## References

- Abedalhameed A. (2002). Effect of collective and cooperative learning on students' acquisition of knowledge and practice related to designing and producing teaching materials. *Journal of Research in Education and Psychology*, 15 (3) 1-27.
- Aboalheaja, K. & Alsa'di, I. (2003). Effect of teaching model and learning technique on the development of skills of critical thinking of fourth graders. *Journal Damascus University*, 19 (1) 129-182.
- Abuseileek, A. (2007). Cooperative vs. Individual Learning of Oral skills in a call environment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20 (5) 1-23.
- Alherish, A. & Migdadi, M. (2000). A comparative study of effect of collective and cooperative learning on students' acquisition of skills of script editing program and the extent to which they can retrieve them. *Educational Journal*, 15 (57).
- AlMani, A. (2005). Students' preferences of teaching techniques in the intermediate stage versus the common teaching styles in the schools of Riyadh in Saudi Arabia. 32, 201-215.
- Al-Quran, (2003). Teacher-Student Congruence of Learning Style as Related to Perceived Difficulty in English Language Learning. 19, 2A, 69-85.
- Alsabhi, A. (2002). Internal competency of curricula and external competency of the teaching system in the Saudi Universities. *Studies in Curriculum and Instruction*, 82, 113-134.
- Al-Saraireh, Y. & Yunis, A. (1999). University teaching methods between memorization and practice. *Abhath AlYarmouk*, 15, 1, 83-102.
- Anwer, I. (2002). The Effect of using writing conferences in teaching a composition course to fourth year English majors, Faculty of Alson on their writing performance, reflective and critical thinking. *Journal of Research in Education and Psychology*, 15 (3), 2002.
- Casanave C. (1988). The process approach to writing instruction: an examination of issues. *The CATESOL Journal*. 1 (1) 30-40.
- Davies, L. (1993). Designing a writing syllabus in English for academic purposes: process and product. *ELT Documents*: 129. Hong Kong: Modern English Publication and The British Council.
- Duke, C. (1988). I was a victim of the process approach. *The Technical Writing Teacher*, XV (1) 78-83.



- Duke, D. (1990). *Teaching an Introduction*. New York: Mc Graw – Hill Publishing Company.
- Flower, L. and Hayes, J. (1981). The pregnant pause: An inquiry into the nature of planning. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15, 229-244.
- Freedman, A. and Pringle, I (1989). Contexts for developing arguments. In R. Andrews (ed.) *Narrative and Argument*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Hairston, M. (1982). The wind of change: Thomas and Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 76-88
- Ibraheem, A. (2004). A study of effectiveness of cooperative learning in the teaching of prosody on students' performance and their attitudes toward it. *Studies in Curricula and Instruction*, 93 April, 15-31.
- Johnson, D. (1994). *The Effectiveness of Genre Based Approach to the Academic Literacy of Teacher Trainers and Trainees in Zimbabwe. A Doctoral Thesis*. University of Bristol. UK.
- Kedrowicz, A. & Watanabe, S. (2006). Infusing technical communication and teamwork within ECE curriculum. *Turkish Journal of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science*, 14(1), 41-53.
- Mifleh, G. & Kana'an, A. (2005). Effectiveness of cooperative learning on developing first secondary students' skills of reading comprehension. *Journal of Damascus University*, 21, 2, 269-302.
- Moursi, M. (1995). Efficiency of cooperative learning in secondary school students' acquisition of writing skills. *Studies in Curricula and Teaching Methods*. 1, 217-249.
- Najem, Y. & AlShatheli, A. (2004). Efficiency of using cooperative versus collective Techniques of teaching in the development of reading proficiency of historical texts. *Studies in Curriculum and Instruction*. 95, 129-175
- Nation, P. (1994). Group work and language learning. In Kral Thomas (Ed.), *Teacher Development Making the Right Moves*. Washington D.C.: English Language Programs Division, US Information Agency.
- Neo, R. (1996). *A Study of Teaching of Writing in Malaysia with Special Reference to Teachers' Written Feedback*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Bristol.
- Pauline C. (1988) *Academic Writing: Process and product*. ELT Documents:129. Modern English publication and British Council. Hongkong.

- Raims A. (1983). What unskilled writers do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (4) 535-552.
- Raims A. (1991). Out of woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25 (3) 407-430.
- Sawalhah, M. (2006). Effect of type of field and instruction model in the learning of critical thinking skills by the tenth graders. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10 January,
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: development, issues and directions in ESL. In Barba Kroll(ed.) *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the classroom*. CUP
- Smarah, N. & Odeali A. (2006). Effectiveness of using a cooperative learning-based model on students' performance in chemistry at Mutah University in Jordan. *Magallat Ittihad Aljamiat AL-Arabiah* (Journal of the Association of Arab Universities, 47 December,
- Strang, S. (1984). Product and process: The author-led workshop. *College Composition and Communication*. 35.(3) 327-337.
- Susser, B. (1994). Process approaches in ESL/EFL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Wolcot, W. (1987). Writing instruction and assessment. The need for interplay between the process and the product
- Yannakopoulou, H. (1994). The Effect of the Process Approach on the Quality of Students' Writing.
- Zamil, V. (1982). Writing : the process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly* 16 (2) 195-209.
- Zamil, V. (1983). Reply to Barnes. *TESOL Quarterly*. 17, 138-139
- Zamil, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*.21 (4) 697-715.



## أثر استخدام نماذج الكتابة وأساليب التدريس على أداء الطلبة في الكتابة في اللغة الإنجليزية

احمد محمد فالح المقابلة\*

### الملخص

هدف هذا البحث الى استكشاف أثر نماذج الكتابة وأساليب التدريس على أداء الطلبة في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية وفقا لطريقة التدريس التي تركز على النتاج الكتابي. كان جميع أفراد العينة من طلبة السنة الأولى المسجلين في كلية اللغات والترجمة في جامعة الملك سعود. تضمنت العينة تسعة وسبعون طالبا والذين تم تقسيمهم الى مجموعة ضابطة (٤١ طالبا) و مجموعة تجريبية (٣٨ طالبا). تم استخدام سكييف كأداة إحصائية لتحليل بيانات الدراسة. وقد خضعت العينة لإختبار قبلي للتحقق من أن العينة موزعة عشوائيا. أشارت نتائج الدراسة الى أن استخدام نماذج النصوص الكتابية في تعلم الكتابة في اللغة الإنجليزية قد ساهمت بشكل فاعل في تحسين أداء الطلبة. كما بينت الدراسة الى أن استخدام الأسلوب التعاوني كان له أثر كبير في تحسين أداء الطلبة. وقد بين التحليل الإحصائي أن نتائج الدراسي كانت دالة إحصائيا. أوصت الدراسة بضرورة تصميم مناهج اللغة الإنجليزية بحيث تحتوي على نماذج من النصوص التحليلية وتمارين كتابية تحتم على الطلبة استخدام الأسلوب التعاوني في تعلم الكتابة وذلك لضمان مخرجات تعليمية عالية الجودة. على الناحية الأخرى، توصي الدراسة بضرورة تدريب معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية في برامج قبل وأثناء الخدمة على إتقان استخدام أساليب التدريس التعاونية والفردية.

---

\*أستاذ مساعد، جامعة الملك سعود، كلية اللغات والترجمة، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية  
[Amfmagabeh.2005@yahoo.com](mailto:Amfmagabeh.2005@yahoo.com); [Magableh@operamail.com](mailto:Magableh@operamail.com)