

## **Saudi Students' Reactions to Peer Response Groups in EFL Composition Classrooms**

**Fahad Mohammed Al-Qurashi**

*Assistant Professor, Department of Social Sciences,  
Faculty of Education, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia*

(Received 05/09/1428H.; accepted for publication 01/03/1429H.)

**Abstract.** The aim of the present research was to investigate how Saudi college students would respond to peer response techniques introduced in composition classrooms. The study was conducted over two consecutive semesters, namely Fall 2005 and Spring 2006. Throughout the two semesters, the students were grouped in small groups of three, required to look at each other's work and comment on one another's writing. At the end of the second semester, 24 students responded to a four-point survey. The results of the survey showed that most students thought their English writing skills improved as a result of studying writing as a process. In addition, most students had positive attitudes toward both giving and receiving comments and advice from peer writers. Moreover, most students mentioned they changed their texts because of opinions and suggestions from peers. Such positive attitudes reflect the need to update composition teaching methods and foster group work strategies in composition classrooms in Saudi Arabia.

### **1. Background**

Group learning has gained increasing importance due to a theoretical shift in focus from cognitive factors to social factors related to the learning process. Learning is now seen more as a social process acquired through concrete social interaction and active involvement in collective activities with others that guide and shape the learners' acquisition of skills (Olivera and Straus, 2004). This theoretical shift paved the way to a parallel pedagogical shift in instructional methods in different fields in which group learning techniques have become the norm for many classroom activities. Group work and joint activities were found practical techniques to exert positive influence on learners, facilitate discussion and interaction, and make it possible for the students to accept others' opinions and understand their perspectives (Bonk and Cunningham, 1998).

Peer response strategies used in composition classrooms are group learning situations that have enriched the teaching of writing in different ways. The term peer response "refers to students' reading and responding to each other's written work to provide their peers with comments on how they can improve the draft versions of their papers" (Nelson,

1997: p. 77). The utilization of peer response groups in teaching second language writing is supported by four theoretical stances: process writing theory, collaborative learning theory, Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, and interaction and second language acquisition (SLA). Studies founded on these theoretical stances have provided "substantial evidence that peer response activities in fact help second language learners develop not only their L2 writing abilities but also their overall L2 language abilities through the negotiation of meaning that typically takes place during peer response" (Liu and Hansen, 2002: p. 2).

The process-oriented approach to writing emerged as a response to the traditional product-oriented approach that considered writing a linear process, valued form over meaning, and focused on a composition made up of a series of parts—words, sentences, paragraphs—where the whole discourse with meaning and ideas is widely ignored (Li Wai Shing, 1992). The process approach promotes the recursive nature of writing in which the act of composing is broken down into many stages. The focus is on how students' performance develops in each stage. Students begin with generating and organizing ideas, writing multiple drafts, receiving

comments from teachers and other students, and revising before turning in the assignment (Lo, 1996). Peer response is a key component in the teaching of writing as a process as it allows students to work on their compositions several times rather than submitting a single draft that they think is sufficient. Putting students to work together in composition classrooms allowed the expansion of the concept of audience through which students considered not only their teacher's opinion, but also their peers' opinions. (Levine *et al.*, 2002).

Another theoretical stance that supports utilizing peer response groups is the collaborative learning theory. Knowledge, according to the collaborative learning theory, is socially constructed in the sense that the more the students engage in collaborative activities, the more they build knowledge, care about their fellow students, and wish to facilitate their acquisition of skills (Romney, 2000). Accordingly, learning is seen more as a social process acquired through concrete social interaction and active involvement in collective activities with others (Althaser and Matuga, 1998). Within this framework, students have the opportunity to be mutually supportive, share responsibility for thinking by jointly managing argument construction, model and learn different thinking strategies, and benefit from the shared expertise of the group (Brown and Palinscar, 1989). Peer response activities are one kind of collaborative learning work that has the potential to lead to greater opportunities for students to negotiate meaning as they work with group-mates over the different stages of the writing process. When engaged in peer response activities, students have the opportunity to help each other in a way that was not possible if individualistic learning techniques are followed (Connor and Asenavage, 1994).

A third theoretical framework that promotes the use of peer response groups in L2 writing classes is derived from the notion of the "zone of proximal development" (ZPD) as the site where learning takes place. ZPD is formally defined as: "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978: p. 86). The notion of ZPD explains learning in terms of how to move from what the learners know or can do individually to what they can know or do with help. Learning, accordingly, occurs when learners are challenged through exposure to new experiences beyond their knowledge (Murphy, 1997). The strategy through which teachers and more capable

peers can help others master new skills is called *scaffolding*. The role of group work during peer responding activities is to help learners gradually absorb the new experiences in the sense that guidance provided by more skilled peers becomes a key factor to make new experiences meaningful. If this does not take place, the learners will be perpetually operating within their comfort zone and will not move from what is known to what is new learning (Gibbons, 2002).

Research in the field of second language acquisition provides additional support for using group work in L2 classrooms. In particular, the various pedagogical options implemented in foreign language teaching need to be based, in part, on psycholinguistic considerations (Doughty and Long, 2003). The comprehension approach to second language acquisition assumes that learning can only occur when meaning is involved. Accordingly, the need to negotiate meaning in any language-learning situation is a basic requirement to establish comprehension (Trimino, 1993). Learner-to-learner interactions facilitated by peer response groups can increase the pace of L2 acquisition (Mackey, 1999) and encourage the authentic use of the target language and meaningful communication (Bygate, 2000). Besides, group work motivates learners to use the language and skills they have acquired to produce comprehensible output, which is necessary in order for second language acquisition to take place (Swain, 1995). The interactive method followed in peer response groups helps L2 learners to become aware of their language knowledge gaps in situations where they can understand a language and yet can only produce limited utterances in it. The result is that L2 learners are pushed to experiment with language forms and structures in order to produce comprehensible output (Ariza and Hancock, 2003).

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Procedures

The study was conducted over a full academic year to examine the Saudi composition students' reactions to peer response groups. The researcher taught two courses, namely Writing I and Writing II, over two consecutive semesters, Fall 2005 and Spring 2006. Group work was the educational strategy followed during the whole experiment. Throughout the two semesters, students were grouped in small groups of three, required to look at each other's work and comment on one another's writing. During the two semesters, the researchers worked with the students over the different stages of the writing

process, explained what they should do in each stage, and gave them orientation on how they can respond to their group mates' writing.

## 2.2. Subjects

The population of the study consisted of 24 male Saudi college students. They were freshman students whose major is English. They were students of two composition levels, namely Writing I and Writing II, that are part of the English language BA program at Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia. All students took Writing I in Fall 2005. Twenty-four students passed that course and studied Writing II in the Spring 2006.

## 2.3. Instrument

The qualitative data used for this study were collected via a survey that the 24 students responded to at the end of the second semester after they finished studying Writing II. The survey was developed by the researcher. It consisted of only four questions that were written in English first and then translated into Arabic. The accuracy of translation was checked by a translation specialist who teaches at the researcher's home department of English. Students had a choice to answer in English or Arabic. (Survey questions and students' answers are listed in the Appendix).

## 2.4. Instructional context

The classes for both levels met twice a week. Once for a 100-minute lesson and once for a 50-minute lesson per week. The books used were Interactions I and Interactions II, which are four-skill comprehensive ESL/EFL series. The focus of this series is on introducing the basic steps in the composing process through implementing a peer response methodology. Each chapter of the two books introduces a new topic that students should work on for 2-3 weeks. Class activities in both classes, Writing I and Writing II, focused on dividing students into small groups of three students each. Students were assigned to new peer response groups in each class in order to offer the opportunity for students to collaborate with different peers each time.

Members in each peer response group worked together in different stages of the composing process and critiqued each other's assignments. For example, the title of the second chapter in Interactions I is Experiencing Nature where students are requested to write a description of a painting. In Part 1 of the chapter, there are 10 questions introduced to help students generate ideas. Students were asked to form small groups of three in a random way, answer the 10

questions, and compare their answers. Then, the researcher asked the groups' leaders to take turns and represent the answers of their group mates. Similarly, this mechanism of group work was the norm for all other composing stages in each chapter. The chapters of Interactions I were as follows:

Chapter 1: School Life around the World  
 Chapter 2: Experiencing Nature  
 Chapter 3: Living to Eat or Eating to Live?  
 Chapter 4: In the Community  
 Chapter 5: Home  
 Chapter 6: Cultures of the World  
 Chapter 7: Health  
 Chapter 8: Entertainment and the Media  
 Chapter 9: Social Life  
 Chapter 10: Customs, Celebrations, and Holidays  
 Chapter 11: Science and Technology  
 Chapter 12: The Global Consumer

The chapters of Interactions II were as follows:

Chapter 1: Education and Student Life  
 Chapter 2: City Life  
 Chapter 3: Business and Money  
 Chapter 4: Jobs and Professions  
 Chapter 5: Lifestyles around the World  
 Chapter 6: Global Connections  
 Chapter 7: Language and Communication  
 Chapter 8: Tastes and Preferences  
 Chapter 9: New Frontiers  
 Chapter 10: Medicine, Myths, and Magic  
 Chapter 11: The Media  
 Chapter 12: With Liberty and Justice for All

## 3. Results

This section presents the results of the survey in light of the students' responses to the four questions:

1) Did learning about and doing the writing process (drafting, reviewing and revising) improve your English writing skills?

Most students had similar reactions toward learning the writing process. They thought their English writing skills improved as a result of studying writing as a process. Studying writing as a process changed the way students approach writing. One of the students mentioned: "Most people, especially students, write directly without going over these writing steps, but I assume this has changed now". One of the students was very specific in stating certain benefits of studying writing as a process. In particular, he mentioned that studying writing as a

process was useful in learning about "cohesion and style and how to put conjunctions... etc." Another student considered revision the most important part in the writing process. He wrote: "revision was beneficial in making corrections to my writing and my peers' writing".

The new teaching method was motivating. A student commented: "studying the different steps of writing was useful and helped me to improve my skills. I will try to improve those skills even further". The interactive method used throughout the semester made it available to students to improve their English speaking skills as well. A student mentioned, "studying writing as a process was useful and made me learn how to write and speak [English] better". There were also some points of criticism raised in the students' responses. For example, a student mentioned that there should have been more practice than the theoretical part in order to get more benefit. Another student acknowledged the benefit of learning the writing process, but also asked for more exercises to apply the instructions presented in the book.

2) What was your attitude toward giving comments and advice to peer writers?

Most students had positive attitudes toward giving comments and advice to peer writers. A student wrote that "It's always good to hear different opinions and mostly it's a very helpful way to know and accept your mistakes due to the fact they were pointed by a classmate". Another student commented: "This is a very extraordinary way. I hope other teachers apply it because of its positive results".

However, some students felt that the process of giving comments and advice to peer writers had some problems. A student mentioned that giving comments and advice to peer writers [as an idea] "was good, but some of them didn't care". Another student felt reluctant to give comments to any group mate. He commented: "The idea was OK, but I gave suggestions only to my friends". A third student had doubts about the impact of giving comments to peer writers in the sense that this process "was ineffective", but he didn't give reasons.

3) What was your attitude toward receiving comments and advice from peers?

Most students had the same positive reactions toward receiving comments and advice from classmates. A student mentioned that he "accepted it because they contain some important notes about my writing's mistakes". Another one stated, "I feel happy

to receive those comments so I don't make mistakes again". A third one mentioned "I believe accepting [comments about my] mistakes is the only way to avoid making them in the future, so I'm OK with it". A fourth student mentioned that he believes that receiving comments from peer writers can improve his writing ability. He stated, "I like the idea wholeheartedly and try to use these comments to improve my writing skills".

However, there were students who had less positive attitudes toward receiving comments and advice from peer writers. A student expressed that he was selective in accepting comments. He stated, "I took what was useful for me". Another student seemed reluctant to accept such comments in the sense that this process "was embarrassing because some students [who give comments] don't know how to write".

4) Did you change your texts because of opinions and suggestions from peers? Why or why not?

Most students mentioned that they changed their texts because of opinions and suggestions from peers. They felt good about changing their texts because their peers' comments improve their writing, provide them with more ideas, and give them a chance to benefit from others' suggestions that reflect multiple viewpoints. A student mentioned: "Yes, I did. Some of them are better than I am and know more about good writing". Another student stated, "Yes, I did. Because they got my attention on some mistakes and they have explained to me why and how to correct my mistakes and improve my writing's skills in the future". A third student stated, "Yes of course, because sometimes I was confused and my classmates explain some points for me. In my point of view it is useful way".

Some students changed much of what they wrote based on their peers' comments. A student stated, "Yes, actually I did. That was when they convinced me that some ideas, sentences, or even words needed to be changed. I once changed a whole paragraph". In reverse, only one student expressed that he did not change texts because of opinions and suggestions from peer writers. He wrote: "No, because I have the problem that most students have: shyness".

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Studying writing as a process

It should be mentioned that this was the first time ever writing is introduced to students as a multiple-step process. Even though it was a new experience for

language proficiency or their composing skills were not developed enough. This comment could have been, with less probability, an indication that he could not read his group mates' handwriting and could not understand what their observations were all about.

#### 4.4. Changing texts because of peer suggestions

According to students' input to the survey, most of them changed their texts because of opinions and suggestions from peers. This stance makes a perfect sense for the majority of students who had positive attitudes toward both giving comments and receiving comments from peer writers. It seems that students made use of class discussion to provide each other with more ideas and insights that have been utilized in changing and improving their compositions. Such outcome corroborates the argument introduced by Bitchener (2004) that the actual behavior of composing is socially-based. Peer response groups foster the development of writing abilities through emphasizing the communal aspects of the learners' intellectual life as well as promoting interactive reciprocal negotiation of meaning.

Even though 23 out of 24 students mentioned they changed their texts because of ideas and insights from peers, there was one student who expressed unwillingness to change his texts based on his peers' comments. It seems that this attitude is not unusual because he expressed negative attitudes toward both giving comments to and receiving comments from peer writers. What could have led this student to adopt such unenthusiastic attitude? One possible reason behind the reluctance to make use of peer comments could have been related to face-saving matters. Participants in face-to-face communication, under normal circumstances, do their best to save their face and not threaten others' face. Receiving comments and giving comments on peers' writing could have been considered a face-threatening act by this student who may have never engaged in group work before taking this class. Consequently, it may have been that this student utilized reluctance to give or receive peer comments as a face-saving technique (McPherson and Kearney, 1992)

#### 5. Conclusion

The present research surveyed Saudi college students about their reactions towards peer response techniques applied in two writing courses. The study involved 24 students who were taught two writing

classes by the researcher in their first year at an English as a foreign language BA program. Qualitative data obtained from the post-course survey that the students filled showed that they expressed positive reactions to the new teaching style introduced for the first time to Saudi college students. They liked the different steps of studying composition within a process-oriented approach. Working on the same topic for 2-3 weeks gave them the opportunity to gather more ideas, plan their essays more precisely, and improve their writing. The students mentioned also that they liked working with their classmates in small groups which indicates that collaborative learning techniques are not as hard to introduce as thought beforehand. Most students had positive attitudes toward both giving and receiving comments and advice from their peer and used those comments to improve their texts. Finally, the positive experience that the students had during this experiment helped to overcome the difficulties that face initiating modern teaching methods.

Current teaching methods in composition classrooms in Saudi Arabia should be updated to meet the trend of adopting the process approach in teaching composition. In this approach the focus is not on the final written product, but on understanding the different steps how students walk through in order to tackle a composing task. In addition, composition teaching methods should adopt group work strategies in writing classrooms in order to get the benefit of group work as a significant instructional technique. The experiment proved that the application of this technique brought about multiple advantages and made writing smoother and easier to students.

#### 6. References

- Ariza, E.N. and Hancock, S. "Second Language Acquisition Theories as a Framework for Creating Distance Learning Courses." *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, Vol. 4, (2003). Available at: <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/142/222>
- Bitchener, J. "The Relationship between the Negotiation of Meaning and Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study." *Language Awareness*, Vol. 13, (2004), 81-95.
- Bonk, C.J. and Cunningham, D.J. "Searching for Learner-centered, Constructivist, and Sociocultural Components of Collaborative Educational Learning Tools." In: C.J. Bonk and K.S. King (Eds.), *Electronic Collaborators: Learning-centered Technologies for Literacy, Apprenticeship, and Discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, (1998), pp. 25-50.
- Brown, G. "External Factors Forcing Change on Education: How Can They Work for Us?" (1994), retrieved June 8, 2005 from:

- <http://www.inform.umd.edu/UMS+State/UMD-Projects/MCTP/Essays/ExternalForces.txt>
- Bygate, M.** "Introduction." *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 4, (2000), 185-192.
- Carson, J.G. and Nelson, G.L.** "Writing Groups: Cross-cultural Issues." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 3, (1994), 17-30.
- Connor, U.M. and Asenavage, K.** "Peer Response Groups in ESL Writing Classes: How Much Impact on Revision?" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 3, (1994), 257-276.
- Crismore, A.** "Helping ESL and EFL University Students Read Critically: A 2000's Challenge." ED450592, (2000).
- Doughty, C.J. and Long, M.H.** "Optimal Psycholinguistic Environments for Distance Foreign Language Learning." *Language, Learning & Technology*, Vol. 7, (2003), 50-80. Available at: <http://l1t.msu.edu/vol7num3/pdf/doughty.pdf>
- Gibbons, P.** *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, (2002).
- Hofstede, G.** *Culture's Consequences*. London: Sage, (1984).
- Levine, A.; Oded, B.; Connor, U. and Asons, I.** "Variation in EFL-ESL Peer Response." *TESL-EJ*, Vol. 6, (2002). Retrieved June 8, 2005 from: <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej23/a1.html>
- Liu, J. and Hansen, J.G.** *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, (2002).
- Li Wai Shing, J.** "A Process Approach to Feedback in Writing." *Perspectives*, Vol. 4, (1992). Available at: <http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/10/1000038.pdf>
- Lo, R.** "A Possible Approach to Improve Teaching of Writing." *TESL Reporter*, Vol. 29, (1996), 10-20.
- Mackey, A.** "Input, Interaction, and Second Language Development: An Empirical Study of Question Formation in ESL." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 21, (1999), 557-587.
- Massi, M.P.** "Interactive Writing in the EFL Class: A Repertoire of Tasks." *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. 7, (June 2001), available at: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Massi-WritingTasks.html>
- McPherson, M.B. and Kearney, P.** "Classroom Embarrassment: Types, Goals, and Face Saving Strategies." ED354566, (1992).
- Murphy, E.** *Characteristics of Constructivist Learning & Teaching*. (1997). Retrieved June 8, 2005 from: <http://www.cdli.ca/~elmurphy/emurphy/cle3.html>
- Nelson, G.L.** "How Cultural Differences Affect Written and Oral Communication: The Case of Peer Response Groups." *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, Vol. 70, (1997), 77-78.
- Olivera, F and Straus, S.G.** "Group-to-individual Transfer of Learning: Cognitive and Social Factors." *Small Group Research*, Vol. 35, (2004), 440-465.
- Porto, M.** "Implementing Cooperative Writing Response Groups and Self-evaluation in South America: Struggle and Survival." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 45, (2002), 684-91.
- Romney, C.** "An Introduction to Collaborative Learning." *Teaching and Learning News*, Vol. 1, (2000). Retrieved July 2, 2005, from: <http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/academic/citl/news19.html>
- Swain, M.** "Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning." In. G. Cook and G. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principles and Practices in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honor of H.G. Widdowson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (1995), pp. 125-144.
- Trimino, A.** "Negotiation of Meaning in Second Language Acquisition." ED364113, (1993).

## Appendix

## Students' Answers to the Four-question Survey

عدد	1. Did learning about and doing the writing process (drafting, reviewing, and revising) improve your English writing skills?	2. What was your attitude toward GIVING comments and advice to peer writers?	3. What was your attitude toward RECEIVING comments and advice from peer writers?	4. Did you change your texts because of opinions and suggestions from peers?
١	نعم. لأنها حسنت التطوير الكتابي لدي.	جيد. لأنني لا أحرصهم.	جيد. لأنها في مصلحتي الخاصة وتطوير الكتابة لي.	نعم. لأنهم يساعدوني في وجود أخطائي ومعرفتها.
٢	نعم. استفدت كثيراً في كتابة التعابير الطويلة وتعديلها.	موقف رائع حيث استفدت من الآراء في أخطائهم وتصحيحها.	موقف إيجابي حيث استفدت من معظمهم تطبيقاً على كتابتي ومعرفة طريقة كتابة غيري والأخذ ببعض أساليب زملائي الطلاب في الكتابة.	نعم. فمنهم أفضل مستوى وأدرى بطريقة الكتابة المتنوعة. لقد كانت طريقة المجموعات وطريقة شرح وسرد المعلومات رائعة جداً. حيث يعود ذلك في تطوير وتحسين الكتابة لدي معظم الطلاب.
٣	نعم.	كنت أتكلم على الذي أعرفه.	كنت آخذ منها ما يفيد وأحياناً ما يقولون شيء.	نعم. لأنها كانت مهمة.
٤	نعم. وخاصة تجميع المعلومات وأيضاً التحسن في المهارات.	جيدة. لا بأس بها.	استفدت كثيراً من بعض اقتراحات زملائي.	نعم. وذلك لوجود بعض الأخطاء السابقة.
٥	نعم. استفدت لأنها الطريقة تعبر بما عما يدور في ذهنك.	جيد. يزيد من فهمي في حالة فهمي للموضوع وهناك اقتراحات زميلي فلا بأس.	أقبل الاقتراحات لأنها جيدة وقد تغير من أسلوب كتابتي.	نعم. لأنها اقتراحات تهتم في موضوع ما كتبت.
٦	Yes it did and in many ways like cohesion and style and how to put conjunctions... etc.	It was only to help them and to give them advices according to my knowledge about the subject.	I accepted it because they contain some important notes about my writing's mistakes.	Yes, I did. Because they got my attention on some mistakes and they have explained to me why and how to correct my mistakes and improve my writing's skills in the future.
٧	Yes, I did.	It was good, but some of them didn't care.	I agreed with them in many times.	Yes of course, because sometimes I was confused and my classmates explain some points for me. In my point of view it is useful way.
٨	نعم. استفدت في تحسين كتابتي.	متوسط. لا أقدم اقتراحات إلا لزملاء والتي يجمعني معهم صداقة.	جيد.	نعم. لأجل البلوغ الأحسن.

٩	بشكل نسبي وكان من الممكن بشكل أكبر. أن يكون هناك جانب عملي أكثر مما هو نظري حتى تعم الفائدة المرجوة ولا أخفيك أن هناك عدد لا بأس به من الطلاب يريد اكتساب المعرفة والخبرة لا مجرد النجاح فقط.	إيجابي في أغلب الأحيان	أكون سعيداً لذلك لكي لا أقع في الخطأ مرة أخرى .	نعم. لأنني أعتقد أن مجال اللغة مجال واسع ونحن كما تعلمون أننا مبتدئون وشيء طبيعي أننا نخطئ.
١٠	نعم. والله	كان موقف حازم وصادق.	كنت أغلبها أتقبلها.	نعم.
١١	نعم.	كانت جيدة لكنها تحتاج إلى بعض التعديلات والمراجعة.	كان محرجاً جداً لأن بعض الطلاب وللأسف لا يعرف الكتابة ولا حتى تصاريف الأفعال.	نعم. لأنها كانت تفتقر إلى القواعد الأساسية لكتابة اللغة الإنجليزية وأيضاً الأخطاء الإملائية وهذا مهم جداً لكتابة اللغة بشكل جيد.
١٢	نعم. جيدة بس ينقصها بعض التمارين المفيدة.	كانت جيدة لكنها تحتاج إلى بعض التعديلات والمراجعة.	في البداية كانت غير مقبولة وأصبحت جيدة واستفدت منها.	نعم. لأنها المحاضرة الوحيدة التي يكون فيها العمل الجماعي وتقبل الآراء.
١٣	نعم. ولكن ليس على الوجه المطلوب لأن التقصير واقع من ناحية الطلاب.	غير مجدي بصراحة ولو يكون الواجب في المحاضرة يكون أفضل.	لم يكن هناك أي مناقشة إلا اليسير بصراحة.	لا لأني بصراحة واقع في مشكلة أكثر الطلاب وهو الخجل.
١٤	في الحقيقة من خلال خبرتي البسيطة في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة أم القرى مررت بتجارب عدة ولكن هذه التجربة نمت لدي الكثير من الكلمات والجمل فلك الود والثناء.	في الحقيقة لا أستطيع تلك المشاعر التي جمعتها الإخوة في قاعة الدرس والعمل الجماعي الذي أفادنا كثيراً.	كل إنسان يخطئ فيستفيد ممن حوله وأنا أعجبت بهذا الأسلوب الرائع.	نعم. أجريت الكثير واستفدت الكثير وأتمنى أن
١٥	١٥	Yes, it did. Most people, especially students, write directly without going over these steps, but I assume this has changed now.	I believe accepting and admitting mistakes is the only way to avoid making them in the future, so I'm OK with it.	Yes, actually I did. That was when they convinced me that some ideas, sentences, or even words needed to be changed. I once changed a whole paragraph.
١٦	استفدت كثيراً.	يجب التعليق وتقديم الاقتراحات للزملاء لكي يتم فهم بعض المناهج على الأقل.	كان موقف أحموي يعني الكلمة.	نعم. لأن البعض منهم أحسن مني مهارة في الكتابة.
١٧	جيد نوعاً ما ولم يكن جيداً بالحد المطلوب أكيد.	استفدت كثيراً لكي لا أقع في أخطائهم.	لم يكن جيداً.	نعم. لأنني لا أقع في أخطائهم.

١٨	لقد استفدت منها بالطبع وبالذات في هذه النقاط لأنها كانت تساعدني في كل يوم أدرس فيه بتنمية مهاراتي التي كانت تنقصني وسوف أحاول تطويرها إن شاء الله.	هذه كانت جداً رائعة وأتمنى تطبيقها في جميع المواد لما كان لها من أثر إيجابي.	كنت كل ما اكتشفت أخطاء نعم. بالتأكيد لأنني اكتسبت الخبر منهم والتعاون في أثناء الحصة. الحصة. جدية.
١٩	نعم. استفدت دراسة الكتابة وخاصة في إجراء التعديلات والمراجعة الكتابية وكتابات زملائي.	كنت أفيد واستفيد منهم طبعاً.	كان أيضاً عادي لأن أحلى وسيلة للتعلم وتصحيح الأخطاء نعم.
٢٠	Yes I did. Because we learning all things.	مفيد جداً ورائع لتعلم قواعد الكتابة ومهاراتها وتحسين مهاراتهم في الكتابة.	نعم أجريت الآن بعض الأحيان توجد لدي أخطاء في القواعد والإملاء فأحاول أن استفيد من أخطائي من خلال تنظيم الكلمات واستخدام الكلمات المناسبة في الكتابة.
٢١	نعم. استفدت دراسة ذلك.	كان موقف رائع لأنني كنت استفدت من تقديم مقترحاتي عليهم.	كان موقف رائع لأنني كنت استفيد من تعليقاتهم وتوجيهاتهم. كبيرة في تحسين كتابتي.
٢٢	كنت استفيد منها وأتعلم التحدث والكتابة أيضاً بشكل كبير.	نعم. استفدت أكثر من أي مادة أخرى وتحسنت مهاراتي بشكل كبير وسريع والله الحمد.	أكيد أجريت تعديلات كثيرة لأجل تطوير مهاراتي في الكتابة وتحسينها بشكل أفضل.
٢٣	نعم بالطبع.	ذلك على ما أراه غير صحيح. إيجابياً.	بعض الشيء. وذلك لاكتشاف بعض الأخطاء وكان لا بد لي من تعديلها.
٢٤	نعم. وأظنها أهم المواد في التخصص حيث تجمع بين أهمية الكتابة الصحيحة بالقواعد والتعرف الكثير من الكتابات.	أظنه كان ضعيفاً بحكم مستواي ولكن هذه النقطة بالذات كانت فعالة وجيدة	نعم. تكون لدي أخطاء كثيرة خصوصاً في القواعد وترتيب الجمل.

## مواقف الطلبة السعوديين تجاه إفادات زملاء خلال دراسة التعبير باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

فهد بن محمد القرشي

أستاذ مساعد، قسم اللغات الأوروبية والترجمة،  
مركز اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة أم القرى، مكة المكرمة  
alqarni@hotmail.com

(قدم للنشر في ١٤٢٨/٩/٥ هـ، وقبل للنشر في ١٤٢٩/٣/١ هـ)

**ملخص البحث.** هدف هذا البحث هو استقصاء مرئيات الطلبة السعوديين تجاه فعاليات التعليم التعاوني. استعرضت هذه الدراسة آراء ٢٤ طالباً درسوا مستويي كتابة خلال عامهم الأول بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة أم القرى. تم جمع البيانات النوعية من مسح وُزِعَ على الطلاب بعد انتهائهم من دراسة ذينك المستويين. أشار الطلاب إلى استحسانهم لطرائق التعليم التعاوني التي اتبعها الباحث واستحسانهم كذلك لدراسة مهارة الكتابة عن طريق التدريس متعدد الخطوات.

مواقف معظم الطلاب كانت إيجابية حول تقديم التعليقات لزملائهم وتقبل الملاحظات من زملائهم بالإضافة على استفادتهم من تلك التعليقات في سبيل تحسين مستوى كتابتهم