Volume: 2 Issues: 6 [December, 2017] pp.1-33]
International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling
eISSN: 0128-164X
Journal website: www.ijepc.com

WAYS TO ACTIVATE THE TEACHING OF ARABIC LINGUISTICS AND ITS EFFECTS IN NON-ARABIC SPEAKERS IN MALAYSIAN UNIVERSITIES: AN ANALYTICAL DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Asma Abdul Rahman

Accepted date: 30 May 2017**; Published date:** 17 December 2017

To cite this document: Abdul Rahman, A. (2017). Ways to Activate the Teaching of Arabic Linguistics and Its Effects in Non-Arabic Speakers in Malaysian Universities: An Analytical Descriptive Study. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counselling*, 2(6), 1-33.

Abstract

The outcome of education (students) in various countries of the Islamic world and the Arab find that a large proportion of them are not at the desired level in terms of possessing the skills and abilities of language and linguistic sciences in various branches, despite the efforts made by teachers, supervisors and state institutions, but did not achieve the desired results, To heal the rift, there must be a cure for the different teaching methods and factors affecting ways of activating the methods of education. The aim of the research is to address the quality of teaching provided to students, And make the teaching effective to make the change required. The student is not in the process of learning the student is a recipient of information only, but a participant and seek information in various ways possible. The preparation of language curriculum is a pattern of teaching depends on self-activity and positive participation of the learner through which may Research, using a set of activities and scientific processes such as observation and clarification of hypotheses, measurement and reading data and conclusion, which help in obtaining the information required by himself and under the guidance of the guide and guidance, and we seek to find ways to activate the teaching of Arabic linguistics Different teaching style and its effects in non - Arabic speakers.

Keywords: *Ways of Activating, Teaching Arabic Linguistics, Its Effects, Non-Arabic Speakers.*

Introduction

A variety of problems have emerged in Malaysian community as a result of the rapid developments and the flow of humanitarian and scientific knowledge. Thus, that people unable to adapt to the huge number of methods and means of modern education technology. The impact of foreign media and audio-visual and print and unsecured computer network bring about strange behavior, not only in Malaysian social aspects, but also Arabic language education procedures. The reform of this problem calls for more attention to be paid on theories education teaching methods, so as to the quality and quantity the rules, principles, methods and curricula of teaching and evaluation. This may include putting emphasis moral, cultural and heritage education based on the Qur'aan and Sunnah as well as conduction different scientific educational on the above respective fields. In an optimistic vision of current researchers for the high-quality teaching and learning process learners should be prepared to cope with globalization and interact successfully with the rapid changes and global trends on the evolution of educational patterns of thinking. The revision of teaching and learning process in question calls for higher perception levels in Moral-behavioral science. That is an effective way to change the structure of the learning process in the community and its effects on cultural-educational characteristics.

Objectives of Research :

1 - To explore the methods of teaching Arabic language to non-Arab speaker in the Malaysian national universities and their implications.
2 - To describe the relationships between the methods of teaching Arabic Language for non-Arabs in the Malaysian national universities and other related educational characteristic.
3- To describe the relationships between the methods of teaching Arabic Language for non-Arabs in the Malaysian national universities and other soft skills .
4- To identifying the challenges facing educators in achieving goal of Arabic language in the Malaysian national universities.
5-To develop scientific research hypotheses on future Arabic research implications based on results of this study.

Significance of Research

This research highlights the collective reform for the future generation behavior though research on modern scientific education approaches communication, globalization, scientific and technological discoveries, production development, social changes and emergence of new standards that tend to replace the traditional values, principles and standards. Such situations have emerged in to needs to develop methods of education and curricula that may provide favorable control over such massive social malfunction. Thus, the significance of this research manifests them in:

- Assessing teaching methods so as to produce generations with acceptable behavior through acquisition of the great values; in such that, researchers consider the effectiveness of educational process for the community enhancement.

- Preservation of Islamic education through linguistic identity, Arabic Language and motivating young people who drawn from the culture back to civilization and renaissance.
- Developing and promotion of new concepts of teaching methods to Arabic language teachers to include religion and fundamental values through curriculum development.
- Development of social skills that serve basic social needs of the learner and gain social skills learning motivation.
- Amendment of behavior for better education and making a adjustment between the learner and environment through education curriculum to provide learners with knowledge of education as well as ethical thinking.
- Immunization against what the individual received from the media that enable the to preserve Islamic identity.
- To assist the Arabic language teacher to use different teaching methods in raising the level of education, through an optimal use of good for learners and society.

Statement of Problem:

The teaching of Arabic to non-Arab speakers in the Malaysian universities is ineffective in religion, language, values, heritage and history. The effects of this problem are linked to the neglect of the advantages of traditional methods of teaching Arabic to non-Arabic speakers, as well as the modern methods of teaching, when designing and developing Arabic language curricula. Various Arab lessons, which may lead to the elimination of the identity of Arabic language curricula from its main elements. This problem has various cultural disadvantages in Malaysian society. As they become fickle, and fade away bonds of love and social cohesion, and the dispersion of incentives for scientific, cultural and social renaissance.

Most of the signs of this problem have reached the highest level in the Malaysian universities community, which requires experts to make scientific observations about them, describing the imbalance in the teaching of Arabic to non-Arab speakers in the Malaysian national universities, and the extent to which they relate to different educational variables. And then classification, processing and analysis of the analysis is sufficient and accurate to derive its significance on the one hand, and on the other to clarify the entrances to the scientific research on it later.

Research Questions

1 – What are the methods of teaching Arabic language to non-Arab speaker used in the Malaysian national universities?
2- What education characteristics related to the teaching of Arabic Language for non Arabs in the Malaysian national universities and other related educational characteristic?
3- What other natural soft skills related to the teaching of Arabic Language for non Arabs in the Malaysian national universities.
4- What challenges facing educators in achieving goal of Arabic language in the Malaysian national universities ?
5- What scientific research hypotheses necessary for future Arabic research based on implications and results of this study?

Research Methods and Procedures

Research Methodology: An Analytical Descriptive Approach.

The researcher will describe a specific problem and quantify it by collecting, cataloging, analyzing and subjecting detailed data and information to the subsequent micro-study. In this descriptive approach, researchers will carry out a set of research procedures that complement the description of this phenomenon based on the collection of facts and data. And then classification, processing and analysis of the analysis are sufficient and accurate to derive its significance on the one hand, and on the other to clarify the entrances to the scientific research on it later.

The Researcher will describe the problem through collection of quantitative data and information about it. In this descriptive approach, researchers will conduct a series of integrate investigations to describe the phenomenon based on the f facts and data in question. Then, they will develop scientific research hypotheses necessary for future Arabic research based on results of this study.

First: analytical descriptive aspect of this research
The descriptive approach of this research is illustrated by the following:
- Provides data on the reality of teaching Arabic to non-Arab speakers in Malaysian national universities and explains them.
- Analyzes and organizes data quantitatively or quantitatively, and extracts conclusions that help to understand and develop Arabic language teaching for non-Arab speakers in Malaysian national universities.
- The use of descriptive comparisons is permitted to determine the relationship between teaching Arabic to non-Arab speakers in Malaysian national universities and other related phenomena.
- The descriptive approach can be used to study other natural human phenomena besides teaching Arabic to non-Arab speakers in Malaysian national universities.

Second: The survey aspect of this research
- The surveying side will question all members of the research community or a large sample of them, in order to describe the problem studied in terms of nature and degree of existence. This will be done through the collection of information and data on Arabic language teaching and its impact on teachers and non-Arabic speaking students in the Malaysian national universities, in order to identify the phenomenon of teaching Arabic to non-Arab speakers in the Malaysian national universities, identify the current situation and identify strengths and weaknesses. In order to determine the validity of the methods of teaching Arabic to non-Arab speakers in Malaysian national universities or the extent to which partial or fundamental changes are needed. This will be followed by an analysis of our experiences and comparison with previous studies, with a view to making use of them when deciding on similar matters.

Literature Review

The review of literature focuses on teaching methods in general as well as in the classroom of Malaysian national universities. It also reviews literature on academic achievements in Arabic language. Soft skills are also discussed in this chapter as a factor that is related to achievement in Arabic language in the classroom Malaysian national universities. The review of literature will proceed with critical discussions of the previous findings cited in the scope of this study. Along with the discussions in question the researchers provide alternative suggestions for appropriate actions to be taken when investigating the methods of teaching Arabic language and their effects on non-Arab speakers in Malaysian national universities.

Theoretical Foundations of Cooperative Learning

Educational theorists indicate that cooperative learning was formally initiated by Mason and colleagues in London in the 1960's (Lunsford, 1989). Dewey (1897) applied the cooperative learning ideas in his revision of traditional theories of education. In the pedagogic creed by Dewey (1897) it was stated that learners are social individuals. The education that learners receive is activated through their interaction with other people. Learners' education is conditioned by different social contexts and cultural awareness (Kent, 1999). According to Dewey (1897) education fails because it does not consider the school as a part of community life. That is when education does not recognize the centrality of interaction and social activity in the learning process, yet the social activities provide the core of education to which all subjects correlate (Dewey, 1897).

The critique of traditional education by Dewey (1938) focused on two observations. The first observation indicated that, traditional education is a one-way process, whereby learning occurs from teachers to students. The teachers' role is to transmit information to learners. Since the knowledge that learners receive is beyond their experience, they cannot participate in its discovery. Hence education is imposed upon them. The second observation was that, in traditional education students enter into a single relationship with teachers and no formal interaction among the students is encouraged. Dewey (1938) sought to overturn this traditional way of teaching. He attempted to replace the social aspects of traditional education with social interaction. According to Dewey (1938), the school and classroom are seen as a group or community held together in order to carry out common activities.

Although traditional education assumes that the domain of power and responsibility for learning in classrooms belongs to teachers and not the learners, it is believed that students' minds are not empty when they enter the classrooms. Students come with life histories, previous knowledge and experiences. Therefore, it is the teachers' responsibility to mobilize what students already know and use them for developments of new concepts. Dewey (1938) shifted the classroom focus away from teachers to the students, but Dewey did not shift classroom authority from teachers.

Dewey (1938) also indicated that, traditional learning separates between students' social and intellectual lives. The saying that socializing is for after-school is inappropriate for learning behavior. Hence, cooperative learning attempts to direct energy of social interaction towards broader learning perspectives. The cooperative learning recognizes peer group influence as a powerful tool for learning. Dewey (1897, 1938 and 1952) wanted the school to reorganize a spirit of free communication of ideas, whereby sharing knowledge is not considered a threat to an individual's learning, but rather the basis of education.

Supporting Dewey's cooperative and social based theory of education is the philosophy of social constructionism, which is referred to as the "new pragmatism" or "dialogism". Social constructionism professes that all knowledge is socially constructed. Some of the theorists reaffirm the social constructionist view that all knowledge is socially obtained, including learning how to write (Plea, 1971). LeFevre (1987) removed writing from the domain of the isolated individual activities and placed its growth in a social context. Bruffee (1984) encouraged English teachers to use cooperative learning, such as using dialogue activities in their classes.

The traditional learning emphasizes that students should be grouped in separate classes according to their ability. It assumes that the most homogeneous group is the most teachable. However, research indicates that homogeneous learning groups result in problems to lower ability students. For instance, lower ability students are related to inferior teaching and low-level performance. Thus, it is not preferable to group students according to their ability or their homogeneity (Good and Marshall, 1984).

Cooperative learning, on the other hand, considers social and cultural differences as essential to classroom learning. Therefore, cooperative learning demands that teachers should make productive use of learners' differences. The cooperative learning forces learners and teachers to confront the key issues necessary for freedom and survival. They can learn to live, work and learn together irrespective of their differences. Cooperative learning creates an atmosphere, for critical thinking to flourish. Through the strategies of cooperative learning such as dialogue and communication, students gain more understanding of their own experiences, their world and the world of others.

Deutsch (1949) classified the distinction between cooperative and competitive learning situations. In cooperative learning situation, the success of one group member enhances the chances for the success of the rest of the group. Whereas in the competition and independent situations the success of some students decreases the chances for the success of others. In the cooperative learning situations, students go about balancing their task orientation. When students play different roles depending upon their experiences, they do not fear to give and take evidences, answer or ask questions. In the cooperative learning environment, students view themselves as teachers teaching one another. This makes the learning effect stronger than it might be if they view themselves as students getting instructions from the teacher.

Methods of Cooperative Learning

Various methods of cooperative learning have been applied in classroom learning. Among the common forms of cooperative learning strategies is the Student Teams-Achievement Divisions. This form of cooperative learning is referred to as "STAD" (Slavin, 1978). There is a method of cooperative learning called Teams-Games-Tournament which is referred to as "TGT" (DeVries & Edwards, 1974). Another common form of cooperative learning strategy is Team Accelerated Instruction which is also known as the Team Assisted Individualization. This form of cooperative learning is sometimes referred to as "TAI" (Slavin, Leavey & Madden, 1982).

Another common method of cooperative learning is the Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition. This form of cooperative learning is referred to as "CIRC" (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987). There is another method of cooperative learning strategy called Jigsaw (Aronson, Blaney, Sikes, Stephan & Snapp, 1978). There is also a common form of cooperative learning known as Group Investigation which is sometimes referred to as "GI" (Sharan & Sharan, 1976 and 1992). Another method of cooperative learning is called Learning Together or "LT" (Slavin, Farnish, Livingston, Sauer and Colton, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1975 and 1999). Another cooperative learning method is called Academic Controversy or Constructive Controversy or "AC" or "CC" (Johnson D.W. & Johnson R., 1979). There is also a cooperative learning method called Cooperative Structures or "CS" (Kagan, 1985). There are many other cooperative learning methods that are not mentioned here. The diversity of cooperative learning methods is determined by the differences in the learning environments. For instance, Calder'n, Hertz-Lazarowitz, Ivory, Slavin (1996); Calderón, Tinajero, & Hertz-Lazarowitz (1992) added to the CIRC structure several adaptations in order to make CIRC appropriate to bilingual settings.
In the STAD or Student Teams-Achievement Divisions, the learning teams are diverse in achievement level, gender, and ethnicity. The teacher presents a lesson, and the students work within their teams to make sure each team member has learned it. Each student takes the same test without help from their team-mates. A student's test score is compared to his past score. Then, points are given to each team based on the sum of individual test scores. Whereas in the TGT or Teams-Games-Tournaments the tests are replaced by weekly tournaments against other teams in the class. Low achievers play against other low achievers, and high achievers against high achievers. Team-mates help each other to prepare, but cannot help each other in the tournament. The TGT was the first cooperative learning method developed in Johns Hopkins University. Some teachers combine the STAD and TGT methods.

In the TAI or Team-Assisted Individualization, cooperative learning is combined with individual instruction. TAI is specifically designed to teach mathematics to students in grade three through grade six. Students enter an individualized sequence according to a placement test and proceed at their own pace. In general, members of a team work on different units. They check each other's work using answer sheets and help one another to solve procedural problems. Final tests are taken without help from other students.

The strategy of CIRC or Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition was adapted in this study. The CIRC is a comprehensive program for teaching reading and writing in the upper elementary and middle grades. Teachers use novels or basal readers. They may or may not use reading groups. In case reading groups are used, they are constituted in such a way that two or more reading levels are identified. From each level one or more pairs of students are selected. Students work in pairs within their group on tasks such as reading to one another, making predictions about story resolutions and summarizing stories. Other activities include writing responses to stories, practicing spelling, decoding, enriching vocabulary and mastering the main idea of topics. Then, students take a quiz at the end of the program, or when all team-mates are ready (Slavin, 1994). The CIRC for reading and the CIRC for writing are usually used together, but can be used as separate reading and writing programs (Slavin, 1994).
In the Jigsaw cooperative learning method, students are assigned to six-member teams to work on academic materials that are broken down into sections. For example, Arabic language can be divided into sub-skills such as focusing on the main idea, providing details, and organization of written contents. Writing sections can focus on the use of vocabularies, grammar and morphology. Further sections may focus on the use of punctuations, spelling and handwriting (Margie, 1987).

Each team member is responsible for one of these divisions or some team members can volunteer to work on other categories of language-arts that are included in their paper (Sanacore and Joseph, 1996; Kress, 1999). The members of different groups who have been given the responsibility for the similar division meet in the expert groups to discuss their writing tasks. Then, they return to their team-mates and teach them about their writing tasks. This method is called the Jigsaw one (I).

There is also a Jigsaw two (II). Slavin (1985) indicated that, instead of assigning students to different sections, all students share common experiences along with the writing divisions. Individual students receive parts on which they become experts. Then, students with similar topics meet in the expert groups. Eventually, they return to their team-mates and teach them about what they have learned. Students then take individual quizzes which result in group scores based on the scoring system of the STAD.

The method of cooperative learning called Group Investigation, is a general classroom plan in which students work in small groups using either the technique of Cooperative Inquiry and Group Discussion or Cooperative Planning and Project. In this method, students form different groups. Each group chooses a topic from the unit being introduced to the entire class. The topics chosen are broken down into small activities carried out by individual group members. The group members then prepare their reports. Each group thus presents and displays its findings to the entire class (Sharan and Sharan's, 1976; Slavin, 1995).

For instance, if the students are studying in Selangor, one group may investigate the religions of the Selangor population. Another group may investigate the geographical features of Selangor. Other groups may choose to investigate the foods, education and political system of Selangor. Teachers and students cooperatively plan the goals and expected outcomes from the groups. Then, all groups work together on a general project

that is subsequently presented to the class as a whole. The method of Group Investigation stresses having students in each group share their individual tasks and experiences with the rest of the group members. Also, the method of Group Investigation stresses having groups broaden the knowledge of the whole class through their presentations (Sharan and Sharan's, 1976).

In the Academic Controversy model (Johnson & Johnson, 1979), it is indicated that teachers assign students to two or four pairs. Then, the students are instructed to read a given assignment. Each pair then takes on the pair with the opposite of the task, after which they develop a plan for supporting their ideas. The opposing pair listens actively and takes notes. This step is then followed with a general discussion, whereby all the pairs try to reach a consensus. The cooperative learning pairs are also encouraged to synthesize information from both sides. Then they write a general report expressing their conclusions.

Students who participate in the Academic Controversy model find it easy to transfer the learned concepts into new situations. They also use more complex and higher order reasoning strategies in recalling and transferring information learned. They also gain more knowledge about issues discussed. Furthermore, the students who participate in the Academic Controversy model are more able to combine and synthesize the information of two controversial ideas.

Kagan (1985) indicated that, cooperative learning model consists of team building, management techniques and rewards. The cooperative learning model of Kagan (1985) also indicated that it is based on a complex system of points. Kagan (1985) indicated the following five types of cooperative structure:

1) peer tutoring, where team-mates teach each other to carry out given tasks; 2) Jigsaws, in which each member of a group is given a piece of information and must share that information with the others in the group to complete a task; 3) cooperative projects, where the members of a group work together to complete a group project; 4) cooperative, individualized projects, where students work alone on a particular assignment or project, but evaluations of their individual progress contribute to a group grade and 5) cooperative interaction, where each student is graded individually although completion of the task requires a cooperative effort.

Slavin (1994) however argued that, the application of cooperative learning strategies should fulfill the following conditions: (a) positive interdependence, (b) individual accountability, (c) group processing for writing activities and (d) face-to-face interaction. It is perceivable that cooperative learning strategies can have positive effects on students' achievements when properly implemented. However, this perception does not guarantee that all applications of cooperative learning strategies are effective at all times. While many different cooperative learning methods are being advocated for and frequently used, researches have little information about which specific cooperative learning method is most effective in a particular situation (David, Johnson D.W., Johnson R.T. and Stanne, 2000).

Common Benefits of Cooperative Learning

According to Slavin (1989) cooperative learning strategies enhance students' academic and social skills. Among the academic benefits of cooperative learning is that, cooperative learning improves students' comprehension of academic contents. Students engaged in cooperative learning have more chances to identify and increase their academic achievement. The cooperative learning also focuses on the success of all students. Slavin (1995) indicated that cooperative learning strategies ease teachers' activities in terms of classroom management and instructions.

As far as social skills are concerned, Gresham and Elliott (1990) asserted tha cooperative learning students have more chances to learn positive social skills, whereby it creates situations for students to exercise the interactive behaviors such as: helping others, sharing materials, and complying with rules and directions. Besides that, cooperative learning trains students to apply initiating behaviors such as: asking others for information, introducing oneself to others and responding properly to inappropriate actions of others. Cooperative learning also enhances the courage to stand for one's rights and for the rights of other people (Gresham and Elliott, 1990).

Among the social-psychological benefits of cooperative learning is that, students who apply cooperative learning also learn to support one another through learning processes. Furthermore, cooperative learning improves interpersonal relations and strengthens conflict resolution skills. Cooperative learning also improves self-esteem, trust in peers and positive attitudes towards schoolwork (Slavin, 1989). Student who use cooperative learning have more chances to exercise decision making. Furthermore, cooperative learning strengthens diverse learning styles.

Gresham and Elliott (1990) added that cooperative learning also enhances students' ability to communicate with others and it trains students with a sense of valuing properties of oneself. Cooperative learning also trains students with a sense of respecting other people's properties and their ideas. The cooperative learning plants in the minds of students the behaviors that show concern towards people's feelings. It also trains students to respect their differences. Students also learn to demonstrate emotional control in conflicting situations such as applying the proper response to disappointments and challenging situations.

Generally, cooperative learning is assumed to reinforce the acceptable social skills such as cooperation, empathy, assertion, responsibility and self-control (Gresham and Elliott, 1990). Such assumed benefits of cooperative learning encouraged the researcher to use the cooperative learning strategies in this research. Cooperative learning strategies are assumed to not only influence learning processes, but they can also influence learners' achievements and social skills.

Pitfalls of Cooperative Learning

While the above section discussed the strong points of cooperative learning, there are weaknesses that should be avoided when using cooperative learning. Cooperative learning methods, if not properly administered, can allow for the free rider effect, whereby some group members do all or most of the work while others do not contribute anything. This problem is most likely to occur when a group is assigned to a single task. For instance, when students are asked to hand in a single report, complete a single work sheet or work on one project. Such single task assignments can also create a situation in which slow learners are ignored by other group members. This problem is sometimes referred to as diffusion of responsibility (Slavin, 1983).

There is also a problem of students' complaints. Cooperative learning instructors should direct some attention to the phenomenon of learners' resistance and open hostility that is expected to happen when using cooperative learning. In such situation students who learn fast may complain about being held back by their slower team-mates. Yet slow learning students may complain about being ignored in group sessions. Instructors with sufficient patience generally find ways to deal with these problems through group structuring procedures and proper implementation of cooperative learning principles. Nevertheless, other instructors may become discouraged by learners' complaints and revert to the traditional teacher-centered method which is less productive compared to cooperative learning.

However, some problems of cooperative learning could be controlled. For instance, Slavin (1986) indicated that the problem of diffusion of responsibility can be controlled by two principles: 1) The first principle is to make each group member responsible for a unique part of the task as in the Jigsaw group investigation. However, there is a danger of task specialization. Some group members may learn a great deal about the portion that they work on but not about the rest of the task content. 2) The second principle of controlling the diffusion of responsibility in cooperative learning is to have the students individually accountable for their learning. For instance, in cooperative learning methods, groups are rewarded based on the sum of members' individual quiz scores or other individual performance. In this way, group members make sure that everyone learns the content assigned to a group because no student can sit idle (Slavin, 1986).

Effects of Cooperative Learning Strategies on Academic Achievement

Methods and students' achievements in the non-cooperative learning methods are discussed.

Among the reviewed cooperative learning studies is the one by Hertz-Lazarowitz *et al.* (1980). Hertz-Lazarowitz *et al.* (1980) investigated Arabic language and culture by using cooperative learning method of Jigsaw 1 and control classes, *n* 67, Total ES.00. Another cooperative learning study is by Hertz-Lazarowitz *et al. (*1981). He also, investigated

Arabic language and culture using the cooperative learning method of Marched Jigsaw 1 and control classes, *n* 68, Total ES.+.22.

Sherman (1986) compared the effects of cooperative learning and individual learning in the psychology classroom. He compared three sections of cooperative learning (*n*s = 30, 26, and 31) with a single section of cooperative learning (*n* = 40). An ANOVA was used to compare pre-and post-tests dealing with academic achievement. An examination of the Four-Groups at the pre-test showed the groups not to be statistically different. A second comparison at the end of the course showed that all sections made significant gains in achievement, but that the differences among groups were not significant.

Burron, James, and Ambrosio (1993) used the Learning Together technique to examine the effects of cooperative learning on two physical science laboratory sections. The scope was pre-service teachers in elementary and middle school levels. The differences between the experimental group and the control group were measured in the areas of academic achievement, social skills, and attitudes. From the results of test scores, the authors concluded that no significant differences were observed in achievement. Unfortunately, the small sample sizes of n = 43 in the control group and *n* = 24 in the experimental group might almost preclude the significance of his findings.

Tlusty, McIntyre, and Eierman (1993) used a 2 x 2 design to compare the effects of traditional and cooperative learning environments on student achievement in laboratory chemistry. Tlusty *et al.* (1993) intended to determine if there were any associated gender-based effects with the two strategies. A small group (*n* = 46) of students was used, presumably equally distributed between two different groups. The first group used cooperative learning strategies throughout a 16-week semester, whereas the second group was introduced to cooperative learning practices only after the 8th week of the semester. They found no significant differences among sections in terms of academic achievements.

Overlock (1994) attempted to determine the effect of cooperative learning on the academic success rate of physics students enrolled in a technical college. The study attempted to measure the effectiveness of cooperative learning by comparing the means of final exam scores of students enrolled in two sections of an introductory physics course. Overlock (1994) used the experimental method of post-test only. In this study a group of 18 students took the physics course that followed traditional expository methods of instruction that consisted of lecture, in-class discussion, and small group laboratory sessions. A second group of 12 students worked through the course using cooperative learning methods.

The methodology of cooperative learning used in Overlock (1994) included short lectures, and collaborative homework and lab assignments. The means of final exam scores were compared using a t-test for independent means. A slight negative effect was found for those enrolled in the section employing cooperative learning methods as compared to those in the traditional section. It was argued that the groups were random samples on the basis that students randomly chose two indistinguishable sections of the same course, offered at approximately the same time of a day. The study concluded that the cooperative learning method was at least as effective as the traditional method, but there was no attempt to

determine the pre-treatment equivalence of the experimental and control groups. Therefore, these findings should be treated with caution.

Pisani (1994) examined the effect of cooperative learning on academic achievements among biology majors at the University of Illinois. The study compared achievements of students enrolled in the undergraduate honors biology workshop in which cooperative learning was used with that of non-honors students enrolled in a traditional learning environment. The major finding of the study was that the cooperative learning environment positively influences student involvement (p. 2). Increased involvement was a natural effect of cooperative learning generally, that had no lasting effect according to the author. Pisani (1994) concluded that the effect of cooperative learning on academic achievements had no significant positive effect when measured by student grades.

In a Ph.D research titled "Collaboration and Composition: Effects of Group Structure on Writing and Classroom Dynamics" conducted at Louisiana State University, Hecht (1994) set out to measure the efficiency of using collaborative writing groups in a college level composition class, and to determine if students should remain in the same collaborative writing groups for an entire semester or for the duration of the writing project. The method of gathering and analyzing data used in this study, integrated two paradigms of social scientific research. One of these paradigms was to use a process-product quantitative design. The process-product quantitative design focused on measures of student writing performance and writing improvement, while at the same time taking care of learners' attitudes, retention and absence rates. Another paradigm described the social and interaction process involved in cooperative learning groups.

Participants of Hecht's (1994) research were approximately 150 college freshmen at a medium-sized public Open Admissions Southern University. The subjects were enrolled in six sections of a second semester freshman composition course. The experiment was conducted by two instructors and the author himself for an entire semester. Two sections wrote the majority of their assignments in permanent groups. While other two sections wrote in groups that changed with each writing task. About every two to four weeks the other two sections wrote every work independently. The collaborating writing groups were heterogeneous in composition each consisting of four to five students.

The results of Hecht's (1994) research showed that the collaborating writing groups were efficacious. All students significantly improved their writing. Retention rates for group classes were significantly higher than individual classes. Students enjoyed writing more in group classes. Permanent groups showed more dialogic collaboration. Although there were benefits to all groups, students in permanent groups achieved a more process-oriented education. There were significant differences in essay writing scores among individuals, changing and permanent groups on the pre-test and the post-test at (F 1.94), $p<.001$. The improvement in writing skills occurred in all the three courses, but a higher degree of improvement was observed among cooperative learning groups especially the permanent groups.

Kirk (1997) reported no significant effect size in the study on the effectiveness of cooperative learning. The study particularly focused on academic achievement, self-esteem and academic self-image. Kirk (1997) also referred to students' social skills and student attitudes in primary mathematics and English spelling classes in Ireland. Among the objectives of the study was also to examine the effectiveness of cooperative learning on the development of academic achievement, social skills and friendship patterns.

The experimental study by Kirk (1997) was conducted over a period of two years. In the first year, the research involved a six-week action research experiment in the researcher's classroom. The pre-test / post-test control group design was used. Participants were divided on the basis of ability into two groups of sixteen students. For the first three weeks of the experiment one group worked cooperatively at mathematics each day for fifty minutes, while the remainder of the class were taught in the traditional didactic manner working independently. The classroom arrangement was reversed during English spelling classes over the remaining three weeks of the experiment.

In the second year, there was one stage of action research. A replication of this experiment was undertaken over a three-week period. That was done for the sake of investigating if similar results would be obtained with a different group at the same class level and in the same subject area. The pre-test / post-test control group design was again used with a new group of 28. Sixth class students were divided in a similar manner, but only on the basis of mathematical ability using the results of the Sigma-T standardized mathematics attainment test. The division of sixth class created two main groups, the control group (15 students) and five cooperative learning teams of three members. The Two-tail significance score of 0.77 showed that there was no significant difference between the cooperative learning and control groups in the second year.

Follow-up interviews were also conducted in the second year with the 32 participants of the first-year experiment. The target then was to observe the long-term impact of the intervention on the students of the first year. Moreover, follow-up interviews were intended for obtaining students' attitudes and views with regard to cooperative learning. The English spelling experiment was not repeated in the second year because the control group in the spelling experiment had completed three weeks working cooperatively in mathematics. Sensitization would result in interference in the results obtained during the spelling experiment, particularly in the area of self-esteem.

English spelling in the first year were tested using a Fifty Word Parallel Spelling Achievement Test, while social skills were observed by using a Socio-Metric Device. Kirk (1997) used the Socio-Metric Device to investigate the friendship patterns. The Socio-Metric Device was also helpful for Kirk (1997) in observing the relationship choices within each cooperative learning group. Among the tools used was an Academic Self-Image Scale which consisted of nine items, and a Self-Esteem Inventory which contained 25 statements. Kirk (1997) also used a 20 Question Mathematics Achievement Test on Area and Perimeter and a 28 Item Questionnaire for the cooperative learning group, and a 10 Item Questionnaire for the control group. He also used a Variety of Group Processing Checklists, a Weekly Group Performance Chart and a Structured Observation Form.

Finally, Kirk (1997) used a 22 Item Follow-Up Interview Questionnaire. Unfortunately, the validity and reliability of the tools used were not provided.

Kirk (1997) calculated the mean scores of the standardized mathematics and spelling tests for each cooperative learning group to ensure a reasonable balance of performance between the groups. The pre-test results of the two groups were also compared and as the Two-tail significance score of 0.768 was >0.05 there was no significant difference between the results of the two groups.

The results were presented with respect to inter-group relations, social skills development and self-esteem. Also, the presentation by Kirk's results focused on academic self-image and academic achievements in mathematics, spelling and participants' attitudes towards cooperative learning. The results also provided particular reference to high, middle and low achievers.

Kirk (1997) indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in achievement levels in mathematics between the cooperative learning and the control groups in terms of pre-test and post-test scores, neither in the first year nor the second year. In the first year the post-test results when examined they showed a Two-tail significance of 0.198. As this score was greater than 0.05 the difference between the cooperative learning and control groups was not regarded as significant. On the t-test for equality of means for the second year, the Two-tailed significance level score was 0.252, which showed that there was no significant difference between the cooperative learning and control group scores.

The overall mean for the cooperative learning groups of the second year in spelling showed an increase of 11.8%, whereas for the control group for spelling which had just completed three weeks of cooperative learning in mathematics, it dropped by 1%. Overall, similar to the first year, friendship patterns within the cooperative learning groups of the second year showed no major development following three weeks of cooperative learning. There were greater changes in the working relationship patterns than in the friendship choices within the cooperative learning groups, which were clearer in the first year than in the second year. It was also apparent that the level of social adjustment among the second-year participants was higher at the start of the experiment in comparison to the participants of the first year.

A considerable improvement was noted in the participants' awareness of social skills. This awareness resulted in a greater frequency in the use of social skills. The social skills in question included listening to others, appropriate reactions to other's comments and appropriate body language. Furthermore, the social skills investigated by Kirk (1997) revealed that cooperative learning led students to more responsible behavior and more positive attitudes displayed towards work and towards others. The social skill of encouraging seemed to have benefited most from cooperative learning as indicated by students in the follow-up interviews. Other social skills which benefited from cooperative learning were eye contact, listening, helping and explaining.

In the study by Kirk (1997) the majority of students, particularly the middle and low achievers, appeared to have viewed the higher order social skills of checking and explaining as relatively easy social skills to use, despite the fact that they did not score as highly in these social skills in either year. Generally, Kirk (1997) observed that cooperative learning was a preferred method of learning for the majority of students. Furthermore, Kirk (1997) observed that there were many positive longer-term effects of cooperative learning as evidenced in the interviews conducted in the second year.

David *et al.* (2000) conducted a meta-analysis research in which he investigated the general effects of cooperative learning methods. However, the sample studies by David *et al. (*2000) included studies that were conducted in non-educational settings, with partial sets of studies that might not validly represent the whole literature. That notwithstanding the study was quite extensive, dealing with 164 studies and investigating eight cooperative learning methods. Since some studies used in the meta-analysis by David *et al.* (2000) were listed more than once, it ended up that the study reported 194 separate comparisons of cooperative learning and control methods.

The cooperative learning methods investigated by David *et al. (*2000) were Learning Together (LT), Academic Controversy (AC), Student-Team-Achievement-Divisions (STAD) Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT), Group Investigation (GI), Jigsaw, Teams-Assisted-Individualization (TAI) and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC). The impact of cooperative learning was compared with competitive learning. In order to examine the empirical support validating the effectiveness of the different methods of cooperative learning in maximizing achievement, the study specifically investigated four issues. These were (i) How much research had been conducted to validate the effectiveness of specific cooperative learning procedures? (ii) How many different cooperative learning methods had been evaluated? (iii) How effective were the different cooperative learning methods in maximizing achievement? and (iv) What were the characteristics of the more effective cooperative learning methods?

The study focused on two independent variables and one dependent variable. The first independent variable was the method of cooperative learning as defined by the author(s) of each sample study. If the author stated that the method used was STAD or Jigsaw it was noted as such. The second independent variable was the classification of cooperative learning methods on a continuum of direct to conceptual. More direct cooperative learning methods consisted of well-defined procedures that teachers were supposed to follow in an exact, lock-step way. While more conceptual cooperative learning methods consisted of conceptual frameworks that teachers use as a template to overlay lessons and activities structured to fit their specific circumstances. The dependent variable was student achievement. Achievement was defined as an outcome measure for some type of performance. This included scores on standardized and teacher-made tests as well as quality of performances such as compositions and presentations.

The sample studies by David *et al.* (2000) yielded 194 independent effect sizes representing academic achievement. The effect size "*d*" was the difference between treatment divided by the pooled standard deviation of the two groups. All effect sizes were adjusted to control

for small sample bias. Within studies where there were multiple achievement measures, the average effect size was found by averaging the multiple measures to derive one effect size for each treatment contrast. The mean weighted effect size was found by multiplying each independent effect size by the inverse of its variance and then the sum of these products was divided by the sum of the inverses. The resulting weighted mean effect size was referred to as "*d+.*" Confidence intervals 95% were calculated to determine the statistical significance of each weighted mean effect size.

The results of the research by David *et al. (*2000) showed that, all the eight cooperative learning methods had a positive impact on student achievement. When the impact of cooperative lessons was compared with individualistic learning, the method of Learning Logether resulted in the greatest effect, followed by AC, GI, TGT, TAI, STAD, Jigsaw, and CIRC respectively. However, without reviewing specific research on the different cooperative learning methods, it was difficult to accept these results.

Nevertheless, the results of this meta-analysis indicated that the more conceptual the method of cooperative learning, the greater its impact on student achievement tends to be. This was an important addition to the literature on implementation and institutionalization of innovations.

Onwuegbuzie (2001) investigated the relationship between peer orientation and achievement using cooperative learning. The study focused on the relationship between peer orientation and achievement when cooperative learning techniques were utilized. The sample size by Onwuegbuzie (2001) comprised of 159 students enrolled in 7 sections of a graduate-level research methodology course spread over 2 semesters. The students, who were administered a learning-style instrument, were enrolled in sections in which cooperative learning groups were formed to undertake the major course requirements. Participation was voluntary, but students were required to give their permission by signing an informed consent document. They received extra course credit for their participation.

The study was based on the phenomenon reported by researchers that learning styles play an important role in research methodology classes (Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 1997a). In particular Onwuegbuzie (2001) observed that graduate students who preferred to learn in cooperative learning groups tended to obtain lower achievement levels of performance in research methodology courses. In these courses all assignments were undertaken and graded individually. Yet other students who had more individualistic orientations tended to obtain higher achievement levels of performance in the courses of research methodology (Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 1997b). It was also found that peer orientation explains as much as 27.4% of the variance in achievement among graduate students. Upon that background Onwuegbuzie (2001) wanted to determine whether the relationship between peer orientation and achievement existes in research methodology courses in which cooperative learning groups are formed to undertake major course requirements.

In this study Onwuegbuzie (2001) used Productivity Environmental Preference Survey (PEPS) administered on the first day of class. The PEPS, designed by Dunn, Dunn, and Price (1991), is an instrument that surveys individuals' preferences in each of the 20

different modalities. The PEPS was developed through factor analysis using orthogonal (varimax) rotations. It was believed to be a comprehensive approach to the identification of how adults prefer to function, learn, concentrate, and perform during educational processes and work activities in the following areas: (a) environment (i.e., sound, temperature, light, and design); (b) emotionality (e.g., motivation, responsibility, persistence, and the need for either structure or flexibility); (c) sociological preferences (i.e., peer orientation, authority orientation); and (d) physical needs (e.g., perceptual preference(s), time of day, intake, and mobility).

Specifically, the PEPS measures preferences pertaining to the following 20 modalities: noise, light, temperature, design, motivation, persistence, responsibility, structure, peer orientation, authority orientation, multiple perceptual preferences, auditory, visual, tactile, kinesthetic, intake, evening or morning, late morning, afternoon and mobility. Each sub-scale represented a learning modality. Performance on each of the 20 sub-scales was expressed in standard score units, ranging from 20 to 80, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. According to the author of the PEPS instrument individuals having a standard score of 40 or less, or 60 or more in a sub-scale find that particular modality important when they study or work. While individuals who scored between 40 and 60 typically differed from others with respect to how much that variable was important to them. Scores on the PEPS were analyzed as continuous variables instead of being partitioned, because categorization of a continuous variable leads to a loss of some important information. Consequently, the variable loses a sensitive analysis (Kerlinger, 1986; Pedhazur, 1982).

Onwuegbuzie (2001) correlated the scores from the peer orientation sub-scales with the final examination. That assessment, which was administered individually in all classes, measured the related conceptual knowledge, including students' knowledge of research concepts, methodologies, and applications.

It was found that a small but statistically significant relationship existed between peer orientation and achievement. Students who were more oriented towards cooperative learning attained lower levels of achievement than those who did not have an orientation towards cooperative learning. There was a significant relationship between peer orientation and achievement at ($r = .16$, $p < .05$). Specifically, students with a peer orientation attained lower levels of achievement than those who did not have an orientation towards cooperative learning. Squaring the correlation coefficient revealed that peer orientation explained 2.6% of the variance. Although that relationship was statistically lower ($p < .05$) than the corresponding relationship reported by Onwuegbuzie and Daley (1997b), the fact that the relationship was not trivial warranted for further research.

Onwuegbuzie (2001) used the Type I error rate so that peer orientation was related statistically significantly at ($p<.05$) along with the following learning modalities: motivation ($r = -.27$), responsibility ($r = .36$), authority orientation ($r = .39$), multiple perception orientation ($r = -.62$), and mobility ($r = -.32$).

Specifically, students who were more peer-oriented tended to report lower levels of motivation. They also tended to be less responsible and they were found to have less positive attitudes towards the presence of authority figures in the classroom. Furthermore, the students who were more peer-oriented tended to be less inclined to have multiple perception preferences. They also tended to require mobility in learning environments. Using a criterion of Cohen's (1988), the correlations fund by Onwuegbuzie (2001) represented moderate to large effects.

Thus, it was likely according to Onwuegbuzie (2001) that peer-oriented students who were under-achieved in research methodology courses did so not only because they were unsuited to traditional, individual methods of instruction but also because they were instructed to use learning styles that did not maximize their learning in the classes. The findings by Onwuegbuzie (2001) also suggested that peer-oriented learners possessed potentially debilitative learning styles that appeared to include (a) low motivation, (b) less responsibility, (c) less positive attitudes towards the presence of authority figures, (d) less inclination to learn with multiple resources and (e) they needed mobility in learning environments. The relatively low motivation levels reported by peer-oriented learners seemed to have been a major drawback for instructors of research methodology because motivation had been consistently found to be related to achievement (Bailey, Onwuegbuzie, & Daley, 2000).

The findings by Onwuegbuzie (2001) also seemed to support the observation by Onwuegbuzie and DaRos (1999) that a notable proportion of peer-oriented students, particularly the weaker ones, appeared to like cooperative learning for reasons that were not compatible with the instructional objectives by Onwuegbuzie (2001). Onwuegbuzie and DaRos (1999) indicated that some peer-oriented students assumed the role of free-riders in their cooperative groups. Apparently, those individuals liked cooperative learning because they realized that they did not need to put forth as much effort to obtain a passing grade in research methodology courses. Onwuegbuzie and DaRos (1999) further suggested that those free-riders rely on their more able group members to maximize their groups' project grades.

Effects of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) on Achievement of Reading and Writing skill

Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, (1987), used Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition, or CIRC in grades 2-8. The study involved a series of activities derived from research on reading comprehension and writing strategies. Students worked in four-member heterogeneous learning teams. After the teacher introduced a story from a basal text or trade book, students worked in their teams on a prescribed series of activities relating to the story. These included partner reading, where students took turns reading to each other in pairs. Also, students worked together to identify characters, settings, problems, and problem solutions in narratives and summarization activities.

Students wrote complete sentences to show the meaning of new vocabulary words, and wrote compositions that were related to their reading. The study by Stevens *et al.* (1987)

included a curriculum for teaching main idea, figurative language, and other comprehension skills, and that include a home reading and book report component. The writing and language-arts component of CIRC applied a cooperative writing process approach in which students worked together to plan, draft, revise, edit, and publish compositions in a variety of genres. Students mastered language mechanics skills in their teams, and these were then added to editing checklists to ensure their application in students' own writing. Teams earned recognition based on the performance of their members on quizzes, compositions, book reports, and other activities (Madden, Slavin, Farnish, Livingston, Calderón, & Stevens, 1996).

Calderón, *et al.* (1992; 1996) added to the CIRC structure several adaptations in order to make CIRC appropriate to bilingual settings. It was built around Spanish reading materials in the younger grades and then used transitional reading materials as students began the transition from Spanish to English. The age of transition depended on materials that accompanied Spanish novels developed through the sixth grade. The CIRC program was evaluated in three studies in elementary schools by Stevens *et al.* (1987) and Stevens & Slavin (1995). Another study in two middle schools was conducted by Stevens & Durkin (1992). In each case, the CIRC students made significantly greater gains than control students in standardized tests of reading achievement.

A four-year study of CIRC was conducted in 24 grades 2-4 bilingual classes in El Paso, Texas (Calderón, 1994; Hertz-Lazarowitz, Ivory, & Calderón, 1996). Experimental and control classes were matched. Students transitioned from mostly-Spanish instruction in second grade to mostly-English instruction in the fourth grade. At the end of second grade, CIRC students scored significantly better than control students in the Spanish Texas Assessment of Academic Skills in both reading (ES=+.43) and writing (ES=+.47). At third grade, students were tested on the English Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas and again CIRC students outperformed controls in reading (ES=+.59) and language (ES=+.29). Finally, fourth graders in CIRC scored higher than controls in Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas reading (ES=+.19).

Academic Achievement in Writing Skills

This part reviewed studies on academic achievements in writing skills. Then it discussed the concept of language-arts as an important part of language research. Despite the fact that Arabic language were diagnostically reported to be the most critical skills of Arabic as a second language, the researcher found very few studies administered to specifically observe variables influencing achievements in Arabic language in the second language classroom. Nevertheless, the available information about writing in general was useful for this study. Also, important for the procedures of this present study were the findings of other researches dealing with writing skills in languages other than Arabic.

In a report by the USA Education Research and Improvement April (1993) entitled "What's Wrong with Writing and What Can We Do Right Now?", the relationship between writing achievements and students' attitudes to writing assignment and awarding of writing scores were elaborated. With reference to Arabic language Su'aidi Safei (1997) investigated the

computer assisted Arabic writing showing how instructional technology might influence the acquisition of Arabic writing skills.

Further information about the usage of instructional technology in the second language classroom of Arabic language might be obtained from Kirembwe (1997) who investigated the teaching of Arabic language to adult non-native speakers of Arabic language. He also provided samples of lesson plans with an application of visual aids for elementary level. Such studies provided the researcher with some information about the academic achievements in writing skills in general and academic achievements in Arabic language in particular. The detailed analyses of such studies were provided in the later discussions of this chapter. Some of the selected studies for analyses in this review of literature were introduced according to their leading titles where necessary.

What's Wrong with Writing and What Can We Do Right Now?

Harris, Riley, Elliot and Conaty (1993) conducted a research titled "What's Wrong with Writing and What Can We Do Right Now?". The report by Harris *et al.* (1993) was based on correlation and descriptive observations. Some parts of the report by Harris *et al.* (1993) were based on meta-analysis methods. Harris *et al.* (1993) provided information about the relationship between the frequency of writing assignments done by students and their performance on the writing measures of the national assessment of educational progress in the United States. Harris *et al.* (1993) also provided information about the relationship of the efficiency of teachers' responses and marking techniques with the students' written work and their performance on different writing skills.

The findings by Harris *et al.* (1993) indicated that, the frequency of writing tasks provided to the treated clusters and differences in awarding scores made by different data collectors can influence post-test findings. Therefore, there should be a similar frequency of writing tasks made moderate in time for all groups, and data collectors should be the same for all treatment groups. Otherwise, they can lead to the maturation, sensitization and datacollectors threats that can interfere with the post-tested data.

According to the research by Harris *et al.* (1993) the assignments given to develop writing skills and effect sizes observable in the developments of writing skills were always small, showing that the development in writing skills as related to the frequency of writing assignments was small. Harris also indicated that there was a linear relationship between frequency of writing assignments and improvement of writing skills. For instance, Harris's examination of the data obtained from the National Assessment of USA. Educational Progress (1991) revealed that students did not write much and that was probably, the causes of their low achievement levels in writing skills.

According to the National Assessment of USA. Educational Progress (1991), it was found that, in order to learn to write well, students need frequent practice in writing a variety of materials. This reflects the USA April report of Educational Progress (1993) which indicated the slow positive and linear relationship between writing growth and numbers of

writing assignment provided per week. The more the writing assignments provided in a week the better the students' achievements in writing skills.

Computer Assisted Arabic Writing

In a Ph.D experimental dissertation titled "Computer Assisted Arabic Writing" at the University of Leeds UK, Su'aidi Safei (1997) specifically investigated the problem of Malaysian learners of Arabic at the intermediate level (group L2) of the diploma pre-university level who needed to improve their Arabic writing skills. There was a severe shortage of instructional material for Arabic as a foreign language. Hence, it was difficult for students to improve on mechanics of Arabic language and characteristics of Arabic writing style.

The aim of Su'aidi Safei (1997) was to enhance the writing proficiency in Arabic as a foreign language and to pay attention to the writing process itself. The approach emphasized that writing involves continual reflection and revision in drafting and requires use of grammatical, semantic and rhetorical knowledge. Su'aidi Safei (1997) in conjunction with Uk'tub'li Foundation at the University of Leeds hypothesized that computer application could improve students' achievement levels in Arabic clauses, sentences and styles. Su'aidi Safei (1997) commented that it was easy for students to use and modify the learning aids in question so that they could suit the students' particular requirements.

To test the capabilities of the selected writing aids a small validation was undertaken involving six pairs of final year British undergraduate students (Level 3, Year 4) in the Department of Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Leeds. The objective was to gauge the validity of selected writing facilities with students like Malaysian learners, at the intermediate level of Arabic as a second language. Diagnostic assessments of the students' writings during the experiment were recorded based on orthographical, morphological, syntactical, semantic and rhetorical errors, and described in individual record sheets.

These results showed that students made extensive application of the computer facilities and references which were used as aids for improving their performance. This included instances like changing patterns of using these facilities in the drafting and in the presentations during training courses of Arabic writing. Eventually the recorded interviews indicated that five of the six pairs of students were satisfied with their writing improvement at the end of the activity. Therefore, his experimental findings supported the positive alternative hypothesis (Ha) that computer-assisted Arabic writing improves students' achievements in Arabic clauses, sentences and styles.

Teaching Arabic language to Adult Non-Arab Speakers

In an unpublished MA. thesis by Kirembwe (1997) entitled "Teaching Arabic language to Adults Non-Arab Speakers, Samples of Lesson Plans with an Application of Visual Aids for Elementary Level", Kirembwe (1997) aimed at investigating the acquisition of pre-university Arabic language for adult non-Arab speakers at the International Islamic

University Malaysia by the use of visual aids. The research problem by Kirembwe (1997) was based on the fact that, the ways of writing Arabic language-are different from other languages. Therefore, the students of the International Islamic University Malaysia were finding difficulties in transferring their oral expressions into the correct written forms. Although they might express themselves orally, they could hardly do so in writing without committing grammatical and other errors.

Kirembwe (1997) assumed that elementary writing instruction could depend on different statements about visible items and practices. He suggested the use of visual aids in order to improve students' performance in the program of acquiring the Arabic language for elementary levels. Therefore, Kirembwe (1997) hypothesized that: (i) the application of the techniques that present the elementary Arabic writing materials to adult non-Arab students by integrated visual aids and elementary writing skills might reduce Arabic writing mistakes, (ii) the selection of writing content from students' contemporary life situations could improve students' learning activities in the elementary classes of Arabic writing skills.

Kirembwe (1997) used the method of exploiting the merits of the visual aids in the classroom of elementary writing skills for Arabic as second language, so that the selected visual aids could influence the acquisition of the elementary Arabic language in question. At the end of the research he concluded that if the schemes of work, lesson plans, classroom and home exercises were derived from and based upon the daily experiences encountered by students they could positively influence the acquisition of elementary Arabic language for adult non-Arab speakers. Hence, Kirembwe (1997) supported the theory that learners should be the target of all instructional procedures. When the visual aids are applied in the acquisition of elementary Arabic language for adult non-Arab speakers, the learners should be encouraged to be creative and self-taught when acquiring the selected Arabic writing skills.

REFERENCES

Abu Haamid Bn. Muhammad Bn. Muhammad Assuyuuty Al-Ghozaaly (490 HJ.) Kitaabu Al-Mustasfaa Min Ilmi Al-Usuul, First Edition 1937AD /1356 HJ. Library of Mustafa Muhammad, Egypt.

Adrian Gully, Joseph Norment Bell - Michael G. Carter, Agostino Cilardo, Pierre Larcher, Stefan Leder, Julie Scott Meisami, Petr Zemánek (1997). Discourse of Arabic Advertising Preliminary Investigations Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies Volume One. http://www.uib.no/jais/jais.htm. Retrieved on 15th 5 -2001.

Ahmad Al-Hamlaawi. (1965) Shadha Al-Arafi Fi -Fanni Al-Ssarfi, Sixth Edition, Sharikatu Mustafa Al- Baabi, Egypt.

Anthony, J. Onwuegbuzie (2001). Relationship Between Peer Orientation and Achievement in Cooperative Learning-Based Research Methodology Courses; The Journal of Educational Research, Bloomington Jan/Feb 2001; Vol. 94, Iss. 3; Pg. 164, 7 Pgs.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Sikes, J., Stephan, C., & Snapp, M. (1978). The Jigsaw Classroom. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Aronson, E., & Patnoe, S. (1997). The Jigsaw Classroom (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

A.S Hornby, Jonathan Crowther, Kthryn Kavanagh and Michael Ashby, (1996). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Fifth Edition, Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford New York USA.

Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (2000). Using Learning Style to Predict Foreign Language Achievement at The College Level. System, 28, 115-133.

Beaven, M.H. (1977). Individualized Goal Setting, Self-Evaluation and Peer Evaluation. In C.R. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds), Evaluating Writing; Describing, Measuring, Judging, (pp. 135-156). Urbana, IL: National Council Teachers of English.

Bello, T. (1997). Writing Topics for Adult ESL Students. ERIC Digest.ED409746 Jun (1997), Improving ESL Learners' Writing Skills, Paper presented at the 31st Annual Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Convention, Orlando, FL. Washington.

Benson, N. (1979). The Effect of Peer Feedback During the Writing Process, on Writing Performance, Revision Behavior and Attitude toward Writing. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Colorado.

Borkowski, J., Carr, M., Rellinger, E., & Pressley, M. (1990). Self-Regulated Cognition: Interdependence of Metacognition, Attributions and Self-Esteem. In B. F. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.), Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction (p.53-92). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bos, C. S., & Vaughn, S. (1994). Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behavior Problem (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bouton, K. & Tutty, G. (1975). The Effect of Peer Evaluated Compositions on Writing Improvement. The English Journal, (26-67).

Brophy, J. (1987). Synthesis of Research on Strategies for Motivating Students to Learn. Educational Leadership. 45 (2), 40-48.

Bruffee K. (1983). Writing and Reading as A Collaborative or Social Act. In the Writer's Mind, (PP.159-169). Urbana, IL; National Council of Teachers of English.

Bruffee K. A. (1984). Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind. Collage English Journal 46, 635-652.

Bryan, T. (1994). The Social Competence of Students with Learning Disabilities Over Time: A Response to Vaughn and Hogan. Journal of Leaming Disabilities, 27, 304-308

Burron, B., James, M. L., & Ambrosio, A. L. (1993). The Effects of Cooperative Learning in a Physical Science Course for Elementary/Middle Level Pre-service Teachers, Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30(7), 697-707.

Calderón, M. (1994). Cooperative Learning for Bbilingual Settings. In R. Rodriguez, N.J. Ramos, & J.A. Ruiz-Escalante (Eds.), Compendium of Readings in Bilingual Education (pp. 95-110). San Antonio: Texas Association for Bilingual Education.

Calderón, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Ivory, G., & Slavin, R.E. (1996, April) Effects of Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition on Students Transitioning from Spanish to English Reading. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Calderón, M., Tinajero, J., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1992). Adapting CIRC to meet the needs of bilingual students. Journal of Educational Issues of Linguistic Minority Students, 10, 79-106.

Campbell, D.T. and Stanly (1966). Experimental and Quasi Experimental Designs for Research. P.34, Skokie IL-Rand Mc Nally.

Chan, R. M. (1980-81). The Effect of Student Need for Affiliation on Performance and Satisfaction in Group Learning. Interchange, 11, 39-46.

Cohen, E. (1994). Restructuring the Classroom: Conditions for Productive Small Groups. Review of Educational Research, 64, 1-35.

Cohen Jacob (1977). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Revised Edition, Department of Psychology, New York University, New York.

Cohen Jacob, (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, Jacob, (1990). Things I have Learned (so far). American Psychologist, 45, 1304-1312.(U.S.A).

Cohen Jacob (1992). A Power Primer, Quantitative Methods in Psychology, in *Psychological Bulletin* 1992, Vol. 112, No.1. 155-159. American Psychological Association, Inc. 0033-2909/92/53.00

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., Partland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., and York, R. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: Officer of Education, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

David D.W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson, and Mary Beth Stanne, (May, 2000). Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis. University of Minnesota, 60 Peik Hall, 59 Pillsbury Drive, S.E. Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Deborah A. Prentice and Dele T. Miller (1992). When Small Effects are Impressive, in Psychological Bulletin 1992, Vol. 112, No.1. 155-159. American Psychological Association, Inc. 0033-2909/92/53.00.

Deutsch M. (1949), An experimental Study of the Effects of Cooperation and Competition upon Group Process. Human Relations 2, 199-231.

DeVries, D., & Edwards, K. (1974). Student Teams and Learning Games: Their Effects on Cross-race and Cross-sex interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 741-749.

Dewey J. (1897). My Pedagogic Creed. The School Journal 54, 77-80.

Dewey J. (1938). Experience and Education. New York; the Macmillan Company.

Dewey J. (1952). Introduction to the Use of Resources in Education. by E.R. Clapp. New York; Harper.

DiPardo, A and Freedman, S. W. (1988). Pear Response Group in the Writing Classroom; Theoretic Foundations and New Direction. Review of Educational Research, 58, 2 119-149.

Dippong, J. (1992). "Two Large Questions: Teacher Challenges and Appropriate Student Tasks in Assessing and Evaluating Student Learning." Cooperative Learning. 13(1), pp. 6-8.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K., & Price, G. (1991). Productivity Environmental Preference Survey. Lawrence, KS: Price Systems, Inc.

Dunkin M.J. & Biddle B.J. (1974). The Study of Teaching. Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ferida Abdul Kudhus, (2000, May 17th Wednesday). Probe on Schools; Cabinet Wants Independent Study on Gangsterism. The Sun, Malaysian Daily News, No.2090, PP 2644/ 12/ 2000, Page 1.

Foyle, H. C. (Ed.). (1995). Interactive Learning in the Higher Education Classroom: Cooperative, Collaborative, and Active Learning Strategies. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Frank M. Gresham and Stephen N. Elliott, (1990). Social Skills Rating System Manual Publisher American Guidance Service Inc.

Frary, R.B. (1996). Brief Guide to Questionnaire Development. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation (30 pages), Washington.

Freire plea (1971). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. (M. Bergman Ramos Trans). New York; Harder and Harder.

Frymier, J. (1985). Motivation to Learn. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Gay, L. R. (1987). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gebhardt, R. (1980). Team work and Feedback: Broadening the Bass of Collaborative Writing. College Composition and Communication, 31, 69-74.

Gibbs, G. (1992). Improving the Quality of Student Learning. Bristol: Technical & Educational Services Ltd.

Good, T. L. and Marshall S. (1984). Do Students Learn More in Heterogeneous or Homogeneous? In P. L. Peterson, L. C. Wilkinson, and M. Hallinan (Eds.), The Social Context of Instruction, (PP. 15-38). New York; Academic Press.

Gravetter, F. J. & Wallnau, L.B. (1992). Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.

Gresham, F., & Elliott, S. (1989). Social Skills Deficits as a Primary Learning Disability. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22, 120-124.

Grunlund, N.E. (1993). How to Make Achievement Tests and Assessments. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gunther Kress (1999). Genre and the Changing Contexts for English Language Arts. Language Arts, Urbana; Jul 1999; Vol. 76, Iss. 6; pg. 461, 9 pgs.

Hall, R. H., Rocklin, T. R., Dansereau, D. E, Skaggs, L. P., O' Donnell, A. M., Lamiotte, J. G., & Young, M.D. (1988). The Role of Individual Differences in The Cooperative Learning of Technical Material. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 172-178.

Harkins S.G. & Szymanski, K. (1989). Social Loafing and Group Evaluation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 934-941.

Harste, J., & Short, C. with Burke, C. (1988). Creating Classrooms for Authors: The Reading-Writing Connection. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hasselgren, Biorn, and Beach, Dennis. Phenomenography: A Good for Nothing Brother of Phenomenology? Department of Education and Educational Research, Gotenborg University, Sweden. http://www.tgsa.edu/online/cybrary/phenom.html. Cited on 22nd April 2002.

Hazel, J. S., Schumaker, J. B., Sherman, J. A., & SheldonWildgen J. (1981). Asset: A Social Skills Program for Adolescents. Champaign, ll: Research Press.

Heath, J. Edwards, E. Posavac, F. Bryant, Y. Suzrez-Balcazar, E. Henderson-King, & J. Myers (eds.), Theory and Research on Small Groups (pp. 9-36). New York: Plenum. Social Psychological Applications to Social Issues, Volume 4.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Sharan, S. and Steinberg,R. (1980). Classroom Learning Style and Cooperative Behavior of Elementary School Children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 27,99-106.

Hertz-Lazarowitz R., Sapir, C. and Sharan, S. (1981), Academic and Social Effects of Two Cooperative Learning Methods in Desegregated Classroom. Manuscript. Haifa University, Haifa Israel.

Hillebrand, R. (1994). Control and Cohesion: Collaborative Learning and Writing. English Journal, 83 (1), 71-4.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1994). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Hinkle, D. E., Oliver, J. D., & Hinkle, C. A. (1985). How Large Should the Sample Be? Part II, The One-Sample Case. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 45, 271-280. (USA).

Hillocks, G. (1984). What Works in Teaching Composition: A Meta-analysis of Experimental Treatment Studies. American Journal of Education, 93, 133-170.

Hyman, Ronald T. (1980). Improving Discussion Leadership. New York: Columbia Univ., Teachers College Press.

Hyslop, Nancy B. (1990), Reading and Communication Skills, Bloomington, (U.S. Department of Education, ERIC Clearinghouse under contract no. RI88062001.

Jack R. Franenkel and Norman E Wallen, (1996), How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education, Third Edition, McGraw-Hill, Inc.U.S.A.

Jacullo-Noto, J. (1992, April). Action Research and School Restructuring: The Lessons Learned. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (U.S.A).

James, D. (1981). Peer Teaching in the Writing Classroom. English Journal. 70,48-50.

Johnson D., Maruyama G., Johnson R., Nelson D., & Skon L., (1981). Effects of Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Goal structures on Achievement: A Meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin 89, 47-62.

Johnson, D. R., Johnson, R. T. and E. J. Holubec. (1986) Circles of Learning: Cooperation in the Classroom. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (Eds.). (1978). Social Interdependence within Instruction. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12(1).

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1979). Conflict in the Classroom: Controversy and Learning. Review of Educational Research, 49, 51-70.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and Interpersonal Attraction Among Heterogeneous and Homogeneous Individuals: A Theoretical Formation and a Meta-analysis of the Research. Review of Educational Research, 53, 5-54.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1998). Cooperation in the Classroom, (7th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1992). Advanced Cooperative Learning. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1974). Instructional Goal Structure: Cooperative, Competition, or Individualistic. Review of Educational Research, 44, 213-240.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1975). Learning Together and Alone: Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Learning. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. First edition, 1975.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1994a). Professional Development in Cooperative Learning: Short-term Popularity Vs. Long-term Effectiveness. Cooperative Learning, 14(2), 52-54.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1994b). Successful Professional Development Sessions: Laying the groundwork first. Cooperative Learning, 14(4), 53-54.

John W. Best and James V. Kahn (1998). *Research in Education*. 8th Edition Allyn and Bacon, USA.

Kagan, S. (1985). Cooperative Learning Resources for Teachers. Riverside, CA: University of California at Riverside.

Kavale, K. (1996). Social Skill Deficits and Learning Disabilities. A Meta-Analysis Research,Victoria University of Willington, Nuzealand.

Keeler, C. M., & Anson, R. (1995). An Assessment of Cooperative Learning Used for Basic Computer Skills Introduction in the College Classroom. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 12(4), 379-393.

Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, (1990), Huraian Sukatan Pelajaran,Pendidikan Moral, Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menegah Tingkatan Dua. Pusat Perkembangan Kurikurum, Malaysia.

Kent (1999). Using Cooperative Learning Groups to Develop Health-Related Cultural Awareness; Eva I Doyle; The Journal of School Health, Feb 1999; Vol. 69, Iss. 2; pg. 73, 4 pgs.

Kerlinger, E N. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Khalid Mubireek, (March 2000), Arabic Calligraphy, http://www.islamicart.com/main/ calligraphy/ index.htm USA. Retrieved on 20th 3 -2001.

King, L., & Stovall, D. (1992). Classroom Publishing: A Practical Guide to Enhancing Student Literacy. Hillsboro, OR: Blue Heron Publishing.

Klein, J. D., & Pridemore, D. R. (1994). Effects of Orienting Activities and Practice on Achievement, Continuing Motivation, and Student Behaviors in A Cooperative Learning Environment. Educational Technology, Research and Development, 42(4), 41-54.

Krest Margie (1987). "Time on My Hands: Handling the Paper Load." English Journal, 76(8) December 1987. 37-42. EJ 367 295, National Standards: Oral and Written Communications. Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, 1984. ED 297 351, Washington.

Lavoie, R. D. (1994). Learning Disabilities and Social Skills with Richard Lavoie: Last one Picked...First one Picked on [Video and Teacher's Guide]. (Available from PBS Video).

LeFevre, K. B. (1987). Invention as a Social Act. Carbondale; Southern Illinois University Press.

Lembaga Peperiksaan Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, Kerajaan Malaysia and Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Malaysia. (1997). Bahasa Arab Komunikasi, Kertas 1 6362/1 © 1997, Kerajaan Malaysia.

Lowman, Joseph. (1984). Mastering the Techniques of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Louis Harris, Richard W. Riley, Emerson J. Elliot and Joseph C. Conaty, (1993). What is Wrong with Writing and What Can We Do Right Now? Article, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Experimental Report, U.S. Department of Education, 555, New Jersey Avenue NW, Room 610e, Washington, DC, 20208-5648.

Lunsford *A.* (1989). Definitions and Implications of Collaborative Writing. Paper Presented at the 8th annual Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition. PA.

Malaysian National Institute of Translation; (Institut Terjemahan Negara Malaysia Berhad) (ITNM) (2000). Social Skills Rating Questionnaire; (Skala Pengkadaran Kemahiran Sosial Bagi Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Malaysia) Wisma No.2 Jalan 2/27E Section 10 Wansa Maju 53300 Kuala Lumpur.

Marija J. Norusis (1997). SPSS 7.5 Guide to Data Analysis, Upper Saddel River, New Jersey.07458

Marton, F. (1988). Describing and Improving Learning. In R.R. Schmeck (ed.), Learning Strategies and Learning Styles. New York: Plenum.

Marton, F., & Saljo, R. (1976). On Qualitative Differences in Learning - I: Outcome and Process. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 4-11.

Marwan Ibrahim Al' Kaysi (1992). Morals and Manners in Islam, A Guide to Islamic Aadaab. Qazi Publishers and Distributors New Delhi-110013.

Mc Allister Carole Hecht (1994). Collaboration and Composition: Effect of Group Structure on Writing and Classroom Dynamics, Ph.D. Research, a Bell and Howell Company America.

McDaniel, T. (1984). A primer on Motivation: Principles Old and New. Phi Delta Kappa, 66 (1), 46--49 (especially the checklist entitled 'How Good a Motivator Are You?" p. 4-9.

Mesch, D., Lew, M., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1986). Isolated Teenagers, Cooperative Learning, and the Training of Social Skills. Journal of Psychology, 120, 323-334.

Merrill, Hyslop, Nancy B. (1983-1988). A Study to Test the Effects of Daily Writing upon Students' Skills in Explanatory Discourse at the Eleventh Grade Level. Unpublished dissertation.

Michael Russell, Walt Haney (1997). Testing Writing on Computers: An Experiment Comparing Student Performance on Tests Conducted via Computer and via Paper-and-Pencil Education Policy Analysis Archives, A peer-reviewed scholarly electronic journal Volume 5 Number 3 January 15, 1997, Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287-2411, ISSN 1068-2341"http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa"

Miller D.W., Kramer and Stephen Humphreys R., (2001). Middle East-Studies Programs Are Accused of Scholarly Orthodoxy. The Chronicle of Higher Education Section: Research & Publishing, http://chronicle.com/free/v48/i09/09a02601.htm. Page: A26, Retrieved on 21st October, 2001.

Mohd Rosli Bin Mohd Ghazali, (1998). Analisis Keputusan Bahasa Arab PMR 1998 - Kebangsaan dan Selangor. Lembaga Peperiksaan Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, Kerajaan Malaysia.

Mullis, Ina V.S. (1990, 1992). The NAEP Guide: A Description of the Content and Methods of the 1990 and 1992 Assessments. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, National Assessment of Educational Progress, USA.

Muniir Albaalbakki (1976), Almawrid, A Modern English-Arabic Dictionary, Tenth Edition, Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin, Beirut, Lebanon.

Nunan, David (May 1990). Second Language Classroom Research, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321550 Eric Product (071); Eric Digests (selected) (073), Washington.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & DaRos, D. A. (1999 in press). The Role of Cooperative Learning in Research Methodology Courses: A Mixed-Methods Analysis. Research in the Schools.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (1997a). The Role of Multiple Intelligences in Statistics Aanxiety. Reflection and Research, 3(2).

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bi Daley, C. E. (1997b). Learning Style and Achievement in a Course on Research Methods. Psychological Reports, 80, 496-498.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & DaRos, D. A. (1999, April). Should I Cooperate with my Classmates? The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Attitudes and Achievement in Graduate-level Research Methodology Courses. Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Othman Mohamed (2001). Penulisan Tesis Dalam Bidang Sains Sosial Terapan. Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia. Cetakan Pertama.

Overlock, T. H. (1994). Comparison of Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning Methods and Traditional Methods in Physics Classes at Northern Maine Technical College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 394).

Patti Puckett (1997). Parents Helping Children Become Lifelong Readers Language Arts: It's A Complex Combination of Reading, Writing, Grammar and Listening Skills. The Atlanta Journal the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.; Nov 20, 1997; pg. J.13.

Pearson E.S., and Hartly H.O. (1959). Biometrika Tables for Statisticians. Vol. 1 & 2, New York Cambridge. In John W. Best and James V. Kahn (1998). Research in Education p.461, Library of Congress USA.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple Regression in Behavior Research. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pisani, A. M. (1994). Involvement through Cooperative Learning: An Attempt to Increase Persistence in the Biological Sciences. Association for the Study of Higher Education, Tucson, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 375 723)

Polya, G. (1945). How to Solve It. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pusat Perkembangan Kurikurum, Malaysian Ministry of Education (1990). Hurian Sukatan Pelajaran Pendikan Moral Tingkatan (1) Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Malaysia.

Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum and Malaysian Ministry of Education (1990/ 91). The Curriculum of Communicational Arabic language for Secondary Schools, Malaysia.

Rais Yatim (2001, Sunday, July 29), Education Review Needed. New Sunday Times, Page 7. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Rashid Abdul- Hamid Kirembwe (1997), Teaching Arabic Writing Skills To Adults Non-Arab Speakers, Samples of Lesson Plans With An Application of Visual Aids For Elementary Level. Unpublished Master's Thesis. U.I.A. K.L. Malaysia. "http:// www.iiu. edu. my/ rescentre/ researcher/ jan98. html#newlook"

Robert E. Slavin and Anna Marie Farnish, Margaret A. Livingston, Dorothy C. Sauer and Barbara S. Colton (1994). Using Student Team Learning Fourth Edition. The Johns Hopkins University USA.

Robert L. Linn (2000) Assessments and Accountability Featured Article Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, University of Colorado, Boulder. H ttp://www.aera.net/pubs/er/arts/29-02/linnbio.htm Cited on 10th February 2007.

Rosini B. Abu and Jim Flowers (2002) The Effects of Cooperative Learning Methods on Achievement, Retention, and Attitudes of Home Economics Students in North Carolina. Journal of Vocational and Technical Education Volume 13, Number 2, H Ttp:// Scholar.Lib.Vt.Edu/Ejournals/Jvte/V13n2/Abstract.Html, Cited on 4th February 2002.

Sanacore Joseph (1996). Supporting Language Arts Innovations that Endure; Journal of Adolescent& Adult Literacy, Newark Sep 1996; Vol. 40, Iss. 1; pg. 58, 5 pgs.

Sandra Stotsky (1997 July, "State English Standards: An Appraisal of English Language-Arts, Reading Standards in 28 States," *Fordham Report*, Vol. No. 1, Thomas B. Fordham Foundation http://www2.southwind.net/~educate/stotsky1.html Retrieved on 25th 2 -2007.

Schuster and Nancy J. (1997). Integrated Language Arts in A College Communications Course; Journal of Adolescent &; Adult Literacy, Newark; Mar 1997; Vol. 40, Iss. 6; pg. 483, 3 pgs.

Scott Peck M. (1978). The Road Less Travelled, A New Psychology of Love, Traditional Values and Spiritual Growth, Cox and Wyman Limited UK.

Seifert, T. & Wheeler, P. (1994). Enhancing Motivation: A Classroom Application of Self-Instruction Strategy Training. Research in Education 51, 1-10.

Sharan, S., & Sharan, Y. (1976). Small Group Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Sharan, S. (1980). Cooperative Learning in Teams: Recent Methods and Effects on Achievement, Attitudes and Ethnic Relations. Review of Educational Research, 50, 241-272.

Sharan, S., & Sharan, Y. (1992). Group Investigation: Expanding Cooperative Learning. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Simpson, M. (1986). What am I Supposed to Do while they're Writing? Language Arts, 63 (7) 680-684.

Slavin, R. (1977). Classroom Reward Structure: An Analytical and Practical Review. Review of Educational Research, 47, 633-650.

Slavin, R. (1978). Student Teams and Achievement Divisions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12, 39-49.

Slavin, R. (1986). Using Student Team Learning (3rd Edition). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Slavin, R., Leavey, M., & Madden, N. (1986). Team Accelerated Instruction: Mathematics. Watertown, MA: Charlesbridge.

Slavin, R. (1991). Group Rewards Make Group-Work Work. Educational Leadership, 5, 89-91.

Slavin, R.E., Eds, (1985). Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learn. New York, Plenum Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1989). Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Slavin, R. E. (1992). Cooperative Learning. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research, (6th ed.) New York: Macmillan.

Slavin, R. E. (1994). Cooperative Learning. In T. Husen, & T. H. Postlethwaite (Eds.), The International Encyclopedia of Education, (2nd ed.) New York: Pergamon Press.

Slavin, R.E. (1995). Cooperative Learning, Second Edition. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Stevens, R.J., & Slavin, R.E. (1995). Effects of a Cooperative Approach in Reading and Writing on Academically Handicapped and Nonhandicapped students. The Elementary School Journal, 95(3), 241-262.

Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Farnish, A.M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two field experiments. Reading Research Quarterly, 22, 433-454.

Stiggins, R.J. (1994). Student-Centered Classroom Assessment. New York: Merrill

Su' aidi Safei (1997). Computer Assisted Arabic Writing Computer Based Learning Unit: Ph.D. Dissertation Abstract University of Leeds UK.

Tlusty, R., McIntyre, S., & Eierman, R. (1993). Cooperative Learning in a College Chemistry Course. Atlanta, GA: American Education Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 874)

Tompkins, G., and Hoskisson, K. (1991). Language Arts, Content and Teaching Strategies. 2nd ed. NY: Merrill. (figure 7-13 (p. 261) Entitled "The Writing Process in Action.)

Tran, H. (1997). March)."Becoming a Writer." Paper Presented at the 31st Annual Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Convention, Orlando, FL.

Treasa M. Kirk (1997). The Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning: with Particular Reference to Academic Achievement, Self-Esteem, Academic Self-image, Social Interaction and Student Attitudes in Primary Mathematics and English Spelling Classes in Ireland. A Dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for a Ph. D. degree in Education, University of Dublin, Trinity College, School of Education, Division of In-Service Education.

Umaru Sulay'man Muhammad and Mahmud Is'mail Swiini, (1991). Al'Im'laa'u Al'wadhiiffi Lil'mus'tawa Al'mutawas'stah Min'ghayri An'naatiqiina Bil'Arabiyyah,. First Edition, University of Al'malik Saudi, Saudi Arabia.

Urbana (1992). Spelling and the Language Arts. Language Arts, Urbana Oct 1992; Vol. 69, Iss. 6; pg. 464, 3 pgs.

Urbana (1993). Integration and Thematic Teaching: Integration to Improve T; Language Arts; Urbana Apr 1993; Vol. 70, Iss. 4; pg. 252, 12 pgs

Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press and Wiley. (originally published in Russian in 1934)

Vygotsky, L, Michael Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner, & Ellen Souberman. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, H., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). Antisocial Behavior in School: Strategies and Best Practices. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R (1984). The Teaching of Tearning Strategies. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Wells J.C. (1999). Postgraduate Prospectus, Phonetics and Linguistics Department of Phonetics and Linguistics, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom, http:/ / www. phon.ucl.ac.uk/educ/pg1999.html#s5.

Widaman, K. E, & Kagan, S. (1987). Cooperativeness And Achievement: Interaction of Student Cooperativeness with Cooperative versus Competitive Classroom Organization. Journal of School Psychology, 25, 355-365.

Williams, J., & Alden, S. (1983). Motivation in the Composition Class. Research in the Teaching of English, 17 (2), 101-112.

Wilson, V. A. (1998). A Study of Anxiety in Graduate Students in an Introductory Educational Research Course. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 427 075).

World Language Resources Inc. (2001). Chinese Language. 2130 Sawtelle Blvd. Suite 304A Los Angeles, CA 90025 USA ©1998-2001, http://www.worldlanguage.com/ Languages/ Chinese.htm?CalledFrom=5002 .Retrieved on 10th August2001

Zemelman, S., and Daniels, H. (1988). A Community of Writers: Teaching Writing in the Junior and Senior High School. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. (figure 17.1, p. 223).