

Evaluation of Using Monitoring Sheet in Writing Classes of Second Year English Majors at National Economics University to Overcome Free-riding in Collaborative Learning

Le Thuy Linh, MTESOL

1. Introduction

An overview

This study looks into weaknesses and strengths of an innovation in the context of writing class, which is related to the application of a monitoring sheet to manage unequal participation in collaborative learning activities. In the following pages, research methods and data analyses are going to be presented in details with the aim of demonstrating the answers to three research questions:

- *How does the monitoring sheet encourage students' participation in group writing task?*
- *Does the monitoring sheet motivate students to join writing task?*
- *What difficulties do students encounter during completing the monitoring sheet?*

In addition to the clarification of each qualitative research method, the description of data triangulation as well as the interpretation of data sets, there is also a section illustrating concerning issues which arise from the innovation, working out aspects in which the innovation worked and did not work effectively. Especially, the study also proposes reflections on future work so that the employment of the innovation (monitoring sheet) might be improved in the upcoming times.

Context

Institution	National Economics University Faculty of foreign languages English department Division of Business English	
Class description features	Details	Notes
Year level	2 nd year English major Intermediate level	
Macro-skill	Writing	
Task	Secondary research	Group work is compulsory

		to conduct a library research handed in at week 5.
Number of students	25	There would be 5 groups in total, each has 5 members
Time of innovation	Summer semester	5 weeks
Lessons/week	3	In total, there are 15 lessons. Innovation (monitoring sheet) would be integrated into all lessons.
Some features of students	They are more familiar with teacher-center method and traditional teaching style, in which, teacher delivers theory at first, then, learners practice writing individually, hand in their papers and receive written feedbacks from the instructor. They are highly demanding and motivated.	

A summary of the innovation and a description of how it is introduced

Background and arising problem

It should be emphasized that writing skill plays a significant role in EFL (English as a foreign language) and ESL (English as a second language) class-based settings. This is the key to language acquisition (Ismail & Maasum, 2009; Mandal, 2009). As a matter of fact, writing could help a learner develop language capabilities to the fullest because this is the area providing a crucial incorporation of various language-relevant elements including vocabulary, spelling and grammar as well as idioms (Mandal, 2009; Ahmed Ismail, 2010). Without the assistance of writing, it seems to be impossible to check a student's knowledge of sentence structure and grammar even if this person is fluent at giving oral output (Mandal, 2009). Various references have discussed teaching approaches to help learners achieve the mastery over writing skill. Noticeably, according to Kagan (2009), group work should be employed in writing lessons as a teaching procedure, which brings about chances for different members to cooperate with a mutual goal (Marlene, 2011). This method would grant in numerous idea collection, higher

academic performance, lighter workload and even intimate friendship (Gibson, Moore & Lueder, 1980; Swortzel, 1997; Burdett, 2003; Hendry, Hyde & Davy, 2005). Thus, group work, or in other words, collaborative learning should be integrated into teaching and learning writing skill.

It cannot be denied that the utilization of team work has resulted in a number of benefits which are of sharing ideas (Jones, 2007; Brooks & Ammons, 2003), building up relationship (Dolmans, Wolfhagen, Vleuten & Wijen, 2001) as well as enhancing academic score and group work skill (Burdett, 2003). However, there is an apparent fact that there are team members who hardly contribute to or even take no responsibility for their tasks. This is referred to with the term *free-riding*, which is likely considered as the most popular disadvantage of collaborative learning (Kerr & Bruun, 1983). The free-riders would put influence on members' morale and destroy instructor's reputation (Roberts & McInnerney, 2007; Burdett, 2003). Hence, solutions to free-riding problem should create a studying environment clearly figuring out individual tasks, carefully assigning participatory jobs and encouragingly rewarding valuable efforts (Roberts & McInnerney, 2007; Davies, 2009).

Innovation and references

A monitoring sheet was put into effect with the expectation of preventing free-riding symptom. This is a material applied as a compulsory completion for obtaining attendance and participation mark. This paper provides details of individual job, qualities of group leader, information of team procedure and assessment of member participation (Appendix 1).

In fact, the proposal of operating a monitoring sheet is based on recommendations given by enormous researchers when dealing with team members who do not actively participate in group works. This tool would ensure equal jobs allocated to contributors (Watkins & Daly, 2003), fair treatment to all students (Roberts & MacInnery, 2007) as well as control and recognize individual involvement (Harkins & Jackson, 1985). However, these experts did not suggest either specific form or any model monitoring paper to drive the followers. Obviously, the idea seems to work effectively, then, its design and details are inferred to be based on various situations and teachers or researchers. It should be notified that *monitoring sheet* is the term created by the

researcher of this study, which might not be considered as either a commonly used method or tool. Then, it is probably hard to find out links showing the description of this innovation in different circumstances, even the quest for similar terms such as participation or controlling seems to come into view with irrelevant academic contents. Furthermore, the searching results for using measures to overcome free-riding appear with limited academic articles but for some linked with peer-to-peer system and group diaries. For instance, in their study, Michael and John (2005), from school of information management and systems, university of California, Berkeley, established a peer-to-peer (P2P) system, in which users should share resources so that they have access to acquire other materials and avoid revenge. Andrade (2004), studying grid computing, introduced a CPU-sharing grid (OurGrid) with “a very lightweight autonomous reputation scheme”, demonstrating that reputation system of OurGrid would successfully control free-riding, enhancing the collaboration of each peer to the benefit of the peer-to-peer community. Additionally, Dommeyer (2012) reported on the utilization of both individual and group diaries to prevent loafers in group projects.

Procedure of the innovation implementation

At the first lesson, the monitoring sheet was introduced to the students. No further explanation relevant to the research of the innovation was delivered.

Every lesson, each student brought to the class his/her sheet of monitoring group work and took notes in the sheet. It should be reminded that each different group work session would have a different paper.

There were amendment and adjustment to the sheet to ensure that it worked effectively. Thus, the comments and feedbacks were welcome at lesson 1, week 2.

2. Evaluation methods

Description and explanation of research methods

Documentary analysis:

At the first writing session, each student was provided with one paper of monitoring material. All class participants were asked to make copies of this sheet and bring to every 15 lessons. For every 3 sessions per week, there should be only one monitoring sheet to be completed. Totally, there should be a file of 7 sheets per head.

Semi-structured interview

Individual interview with ten key questions (Appendix 2) was conducted at week 5. Each conversation lasted nearly half an hour. The interviewer (researcher) had to take notes of the students' answers to the inquiries because they shared that it would be inconvenient for them to talk with a device of recording.

Observation field notes:

During every writing session, teacher was prepared to take notes of observation of students' attitudes and behaviors towards group work activities, especially, comments of their facial expressions, which sometimes were expressed by drawings on the notes to tell exactly how team members were feeling when they participated and how they were encouraged in contributing to both mutual and individual tasks. (Appendix 3)

Diaries:

(Appendix 4) All class attendants were required to use one notebook, decorate it in an attractive way and write down what they were assigned to do after one week with three sessions, how they finished the tasks, how they felt about their own completion and participation. They were also advised to give feedbacks on problems filling in the monitoring sheet for that week. A set of 25 diary notebooks were collected and analyzed at the end of the term.

Ethical issues

The most ethically concerning issue in this case is recording interviewee's ideas. Actually, in Vietnam, if the teacher decides to record, it is his/her decision to bring to the room a device and freely turns it on without asking for permission from the counterpart. However, that is immoral, and if students feel uncomfortable, they would not dare to tell the truth and they might make up stories, which seriously influences the quality of the study. Then, still, for the interview research method, the researcher had to struggle with taking notes with no other choices because the search for agreement of being recorded failed.

3. Research data and data analyses

Data analyses process

- **Documentary analysis**

Each student had to hand in 7 papers of monitoring sheets for 5 weeks (3 for the first week and 4 for the 4 rest ones). Then, a collection of 175 papers (25 sets) was put into

investigation. For each set of these sheets, the general comments and feedbacks for every criterion were summarized based on the most outstanding statements. Rankings were calculated based on the arithmetic average. Then, a database with 25 core monitoring sheets was established, which was ready to be processed so that main issues were given with specific figures (percentage) out of 100%.

- **Semi-structured interview**

A database of 25 files being filled with notes of 25 students' answers to the 10 basic questions and follow-up ones was available to be explored. For each file, key words of noun phrases (stating individual tasks), adjectives (describing emotions and feelings), verb phrases (illustrating actions) and liking devices (showing reasons and comparisons) were carefully highlighted with different color pens for different groups of questions. After that, main ideas covering all issues emerging through 25 sets of responses were given with a calculation of percentage (out of 100%) for each statement.

- **Observation field notes**

The processing of this kind of data was similar to the above one of answers to questions in the interview session. There was a book (like a diary) written by the teacher (who was also the observer in this case) with 15 A4-sized papers describing attendance, changes in participation and contribution as well as improvement in attitudes and behaviors. These 15 sheets were the notes of observation of 15 writing lessons. After carefully reviewed all of these papers, the researcher also underlined key terms of noun phrases (demonstrating individual job allocation in groups), verb phrases (describing learners' actions, movements and feedbacks), adjectives (telling group members' thoughts and feelings) and even icons of smiling and crying and so on. Then, it was a collection of key points referring to the significant aspects of all 15 papers that the researcher could complete, with each statement an estimation of percentage (out of 100%) was added.

- **Diaries**

Each student brought to the last writing class his/her own diaries with clear information filled in each required section. Having collected all of these documents, the researcher had a data set in written form with the number of 25 books and 15 pages for each. Then,

it was essential to analyze each diary in turn so that key findings (of 15 lessons) for every requirement were summarized. After that, the workload was just dealing with 25 sheets covering the most crucial ideas of 25 students. By this time, it was possible to calculate the percentage of agreement and disagreement with each statement based on the findings of these 25 papers.

Note: each data set of the same student was coded with the same number.

Key findings and data triangulation

The monitoring sheet made most of the students get involved and be interactive in the group tasks

The documentary analysis threw light on the pleasing information that 90% of the research subjects could clearly point out their individually assigned jobs. In fact, majority of the group members successfully wrote down their numerous tasks of searching references, preparing handouts, contacting participants, proposing outline, presenting main ideas, controlling negotiation process, etc. Moreover, when it came to the aspect of group procedure, 60% learners rated the implementation of group protocol at “very good” column. The same number agreed on the “good” enforcement of group rules like no private talk, no Vietnamese in class, etc. Especially, it should be noticed that about 70% group participants ranked “very good” for the element linked with equal part encouragement. In terms of individual participation, 50% pointed out that the frequency of team members’ speaking more than once was good. Also 50% appreciated “excellent” rate for asking questions, which all were relevant to the academic issue, not something else off topic. Additionally, 73% learners filled in the box of “good” for interactions among members of the team. It seemed that the monitoring sheet was a remarkable invention, which really assisted students in understanding their specific roles with various jobs, and at the same time, developed their disciplines in obeying the rules. It was also great that thanks to the monitoring sheet, participants were more aware of equality, even frequency of speaking times for everyone reached “good” level, pushing up interactive activities inside collaborative learning.

However, the data examined through semi-structured interview, at first, was not really as positive and promising as the above numbers. Although 90% students could give

evidences proving that they knew what they were asked to complete, only 50% interviewees were capable of describing what they did in details.

Interview notes Code 12:

That was the session in which we had to create the outline for our research paper. Of course, I still remember that I was asked to be in charge of seeking for supporting ideas for the first argument... Another time was when we, I mean the group, had to report what we could find useful after searching materials in the library, the leader told me that I would be the representative of the team to announce out results in front of the whole class. It seems to me that I could remember quite well my tasks.

Interview notes Code 15:

Answer: Oh, uhm, I'm so sorry, I actually did not pay much attention to what the leader said.

Follow-up question: Then, how could you know what you have to do?

Answer: I asked other people and some were really willing to help me.

Follow-up question: Well, what did they do to HELP you?

Answer: They reported to me what the leader had said, there was also a girl, who even asked if I needed her help to complete my job and I agreed.

Follow-up question: Woa, really! But do you think that it also meant others participated in the mutual work, but you did not? What did you think about your decision?

Answer: It did not matter, I suppose, provided that we could produce something of the whole group, I think it is good that hard-working and excellent students help the others.

About more than 60% people shared that the monitoring sheet actually helped them take part in the tasks, which matched with the number stating “very good” equal participation. However, reasons for this fact were rather various.

Interview notes Code 3

I really think the sheet worked well, we all joined the group tasks. Because if we did not do my job, we could not fill in the paper, and it would influence the participation score.

Interview notes Code 10

I participated because I felt the paper functioned like a reminder. It, honestly speaking, made me better by raising my awareness that participation, participation all the time.

Interview notes Code 12

I did participate simply because I was afraid of the teacher. All the time, I saw you hold papers and pens in your hand, go around the classroom and write down something. I thought that if my name was written in the bad corner, then, my mark would be deducted.

Interview notes Code 15

Well, I did not do much of my tasks. It did not mean that I did nothing. Because everyone had their own jobs, so I had to complete mine, otherwise, my friends would shout at me. Even the girl asking to help me, was really busy doing her jobs, so she just instructed me...

Discussing the benefits of the monitoring sheet, approximately 50% interviewees commented that they felt it was a tool forcing people to do, to join, to argue. Because when each person specialized in one aspect, then, that member was the master of the field-the only participant who could control ideas related to that point. In addition, the sheet made learners to interact (60%). Each person was assigned with a particular job and had to report the results to the whole class, then, that one should take responsibility for asking questions if not understanding what to do, telling other people to support if not managing the jobs in time. Then, it might be obvious that even the participation was due to non-academic reasons and the contribution sometimes was not precisely equal, the involvement in group activities should be ranked “good” because everyone had to join and do their jobs.

Another source of data to triangulate was based on observation notes.

Lesson 1: Today is the first writing class of the term. I grouped people randomly and asked them to agree on the area for their research paper. Going around the class, I found out that among 5 members of a group, only half of them spoke English and actively discussed, the rest people were just listening all the time and easily accepted the most persuading ideas...

Lesson 5: Today, I am working with groups on the introduction, how to narrow down the topic step by step to lead the readers to the theses statement. I have just asked members to join their groups and suggest their way of introducing. They looked excited to share their ideas. Some people were nodding their heads, or even smiling at others' comments. I realized that most of group members (about 3 or 4 out of 5) were discussed

enthusiastically. Their mouths kept moving until the others interrupted. The class was really noisy. I love this atmosphere.

Lesson 10: Last lesson, all students had chance to go the library to search for necessary books. This session, each group should deliver a short presentation reporting what they found and difficulties dealing with the supporting ideas with limited relevant materials. At first, each team was given 15 minutes to discuss. I am going around the class and taking notes as usual. I see that everyone is now showing their notes, some are pointing at some lines in their papers, some are listening carefully, some are busy writing down valuable points (I guess these are the secretaries of the groups). Even those who do not always talk are now busy taking part in arguing (with serious facial expressions) so that their ideas are taken into consideration.

It is apparent from the above evidences that at first, students' participation was not as much as expected. However, it might be because they were then more familiar with the companion of the sheet, then, they really got better at contribution. In most of the lessons, about 60-70% people were talking with each other (on topic).

The monitoring sheet made about 60% of students feel responsible, beneficial and excited with collaborative learning

The main source of database was from the interview. 50% people stating that because of the allocation of jobs clarified in the monitoring sheet, they had to do their works but chose no more option. When working alone, they might delay the essential preparation to produce an academic composition (the first semester of paragraph and essay writing) and rush to finish in two or three hours before due time, whereas cooperating with others, they had to activate their minds in order to finish the tasks on time. Therefore, concerning home tasks, members had to spend hours each day searching online sources, even hours meeting on online chat-room to discuss. The reason was that the mutual research paper would be marked as one score for every member so all participants had to care about each other. Then, it is clear that specific job allocation forced each person to work for the mutual objective. Answering the question "What do you think about the monitoring sheet?", majority of participants shared the same idea that it reminded them of what they have to do in each session, how many times they had to speak, how many questions they should ask and how much discussion they should have with other people. Because all the

names of members doing the above things would be listed in the sheet and they really expected to be praised.

Interview notes Code 4:

At first, I was forced to do, I felt ok, if the teacher wanted, I would do. I did not have any clear idea about the advantages of this paper. Later on, after each week, some of my classmates said they were appreciated by others because they brought about interesting ideas. I felt I also wanted that. Then, I tried. What made me surprised was that the more I talked, the more I felt I learned. People corrected my mistakes of logical ideas, and sometimes the teacher was passing me and corrected my errors of pronunciation. It was great! (raising her voice)

Interview notes Code 25:

I think it is useful. At least, we have something to know what we need to do and who is assigned to do what. It is very clear in group work, without it we would blame for each other if any wrong happens. Especially, the section of overall ratings really made us try our best when we compared our results with other groups. That is the team spirit we gain when working with each other.

Interviewees said they at first did not like the sheet, it was complicated to work with one compulsory paper and had to fill in it. However, 70% stated that, later on, the sheet became a vital part for all group sessions, even out of classroom, which made them work in the way of specialization.

Observation was the second method to reflect students' motivation. It was excellent that reviewing the notes, researcher found out repetition of adjectives like *excited, eager, prepared to talk, serious, full of responsibilities, improved participatory*, etc.

About 55% of students wrote in their diaries emotions like these:

Code 3:

I think today I did a good job, I introduced 3 interesting ideas to the group, I think they were all important. People agreed with me, they said yes, there was one commented that he liked my idea. I am happy and I feel needed by others

Code 22:

Adjectives about me today: full of ideas but afraid to talk, excited to share but shy to be commented on

What I want to improve: *be more active and ready to talk. I see other people discuss noisily, I like that environment and I want to join*

In conclusion, based on positive adjectives, it might be certain that most of the students actually felt like working with the monitoring owing to its good effects.

80% students demonstrated that they have problems in completing the monitoring sheet

Findings of all different research methods made it clear that there are concerning issues with the monitoring paper.

Problems	Interview	Diaries	Documentary analysis
There should be a section for statements of comments on other members' participation and overall ratings	70% Code 11: <i>I have no chance to express my feedbacks but for putting a tick into columns of ratings.</i> Code 23 <i>It is essential to spend some lines on free feedbacks to clarify reasons or things like that...</i>	75% Code 7: <i>If there were a section for comments on good points, I would say some beautiful words about him, he participated positively</i> Code 18: <i>Why did not the designer give some space for comments with icons 😊, 😊 like on face book, clearer, I think</i>	75% Code 4: <i>I do not think ticks on the rating columns are enough</i> Code 17 <i>I usually see that in other papers similar to this, there is a section for comments or suggestions, why not here?</i>
The rating scale should be revised	80% Code 2: <i>I find it hard to understand what it means by "excellent, very good"</i> Code 15 <i>I think it is too complicated with a variety of level. I think</i>	70% Code 16 <i>I am confused to rate our group participation today. I do not think it is great enough to be excellent, but it is unfair to say just good. I cannot tell</i>	80% Code 21 <i>I get confused with the ranking system</i> Code 23 <i>The tool for ranking should be changed</i>

	<i>it looks unfriendly</i>	<i>difference from excellent and very good Code 22 I think little and some are the same. I do not know. This week, Lan is the person talking private stories but not very much, where should I put a tick for her?</i>	
--	----------------------------	---	--

To summarize, the innovation (monitoring sheet) seems to be well accepted and welcome. It actually contributed to students' involvement, promoted excitement about the group works. However, there are still problems need fixing.

4. Discussion

RQ 1: How does the monitoring sheet encourage students' participation in group writing task?

90% respondents could fill well in the space of individual tasks but then, only 50% could be able to describe in detail what they had done. The reason for this fact was that normally, most students just did all questionnaires, teaching evaluation and related sheets as quickly as possible. Then, it was impossible for them to think carefully about what they were asked to tell. Furthermore, it should be emphasized here that Vietnamese people are those who always tell lies to hide their weaknesses. They want to express themselves with the perfect images without knowing that deep questions for great details would be the mirror to reflect exactly their responsibility for the mutual jobs.

More than half of the class agreed that the innovation helped them to participate. Nonetheless, the reasons for their participation were not always linked with the power of the monitoring sheet. Through the interview, it was obvious that some took part in the contribution because they were forced by the teacher, they simply did what the teacher told them to do. Another cause laid on the academic performance, if they did complete

the sheets, their participation score (20%) would be affected. The other 40% was of mid-term test, when they had to hand in finalized outline with clearly illustrated thesis statement and supporting ideas. The rest was of total mark for the final research paper. At this institution, it is the traditional story that writing score for secondary research is normally low, because of high requirements of academic content and writing style. Then, 20% of participation mark was valuable. Last but not least, contribution due to being afraid of other people's blames. Vietnamese people, in general, want to be praised, not to be badly commented in a direct basis. Then, in order to avoid that, one of the advisable ways was to work. All of these above mentioned reasons show that students themselves did not know the importance of the monitoring sheet, which was put into effect to help them work, not to force them to struggle with it.

The innovation should be highly appreciated in the way that its function is considered as a tool to make students work, whether they are aware of its real value or not. After finishing the whole-term-task, then, learners should recognize the intangible usefulness of this innovation when they know how to work logically and professionally in a team. However, it is essential to insert a column of leader's signature to confirm what other members listed was correct. Then, all weekly sheets had better be collected at the end of the week so that no changes were made. It is also important that the group leader might be diversified. At that time, everyone would have the same opportunities to express themselves, they would be more willing to participate.

RQ 2: Does the monitoring sheet motivate students to join the task?

For this section, the innovation worked quite well. The first root is because this was a new thing in a writing class in this institution, which made a big number of students curious about. Another derivation is that these English majors are highly motivated learners (as stated at first). They seem to be eager and willing to work with something different, but still, they have not dared to speak out may be because they are born really shy or they are dominated by other members who are good at either speaking or writing skills.

On the other hand, there should be rules for punishment and awards. At mid-term, the researcher should have collected information in the sheet, summarized names of participants who had actively contributed to the group task and praised them in front of

the whole class. This could enhance the role of key persons and make other work harder. Those who had not taken part in the activities of the whole team during the past weeks should also be named and punished of doing more jobs next time or being fined, etc.

RQ 3. What difficulties do students encounter during completing the monitoring sheet?

As mentioned in the previous section, the most concerning issues highly voted for were related to the wish for a section of free comments on good and bad participation of other members and the amendment in the scale so that it would be much more convenient and time-saving in completion.

The innovation successfully presented an outstanding detail leading to the value of the monitoring sheet, which is the participation section asking “who”. Particularly, that table explored who spoke more than once, who disclosed personal information and experience, who asked questions and who interacted well with others. This resulted in competition among group members, which is necessary to push up the studying spirit in the class. Especially, the evaluation of overall ratings among groups made them try their best so that their team would achieve the highest scores. These characteristics are crucial when working with Vietnamese people, who really wanted to be felt the best and who always feel excited joining competitiveness.

In the monitoring sheet, there are sections that should be released, particularly, those dealing with the emerging issues from group process, the extent to which the leader solved these issues. One more problem was the evaluation of the group leader. There was a part asking opinions about the leader but no relevant questions in the interview or required section in the diaries referred to this matter. Then, the role of this person was not appreciated whereas it should have been applauded. The monitoring sheet should have included more space with specific adjectives mentioning the qualities of participation. Consequently, the respondents would know how effective their contributions were assessed.

A problem that should be discussed here is the influence of the teaching style in the university. Normally, in writing class, teacher dominates both theory and practice, by which, it means that students learn in silence. They listen to the instructions, and produce compositions (paragraph or essays) individually and receive feedbacks from the teacher. Then, at the beginning, they would find it hard to work it group, and think that it is

strange to collaboratively write a common work. As a result, the introduction of the monitoring sheet might make the situation become more complicated. At the same time, teachers in the department seem to be resistant to change. They share that they do care about how group members work, just pay attention to the final product and mark it with the same score for everybody. Moreover, since it was required in the curriculum a group secondary research, traditional teaching methodology has been in use with no concerning effects. Therefore, they did not approve the innovation and when students accidentally mentioned it in other classes, they receive negative respond from the other teachers. This actually demotivated learners in completing the sheets.

Finally, the idea of introducing a monitoring sheet into collaborative learning activities was great but the problem that should be fixed at first is the content of the sheet so that it could be more focused on the essential information. Additionally, some minor changes of extra sections for comments, awards and punishment should be taken into consideration.

5. Reflections on future work

The application of this innovation in the future should go together with these the following points:

First of all, the monitoring sheet should be redesigned. There should be an addition of the group leader's signature to ensure that what the members have written is correct. Some irrelevant sections (denoting problems in group process) should be eliminated. The criterion evaluating level of participation should be clarified in much more details with specified adjectives or adverbs. An essential space for free comments on other people's works should also be paid attention to. The rating scale should be too general and confusing with terms like *little*, *not much*, *NA* or *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, etc and should not be divided into more than 5 columns. The Likert scale is supposed to be used instead. All of these changes would create a monitoring sheet that looks friendly, comprehensive and more focused on the key findings.

The second problem is accompanied with research method. Photographing should be utilized. Snap shots of pictures during every single class would be extremely interesting. Photographs are those which could tell exactly emotions and feelings of students over different lessons. It is suggested that at first, the teacher should ask the whole class to see whether they agree to be taken images of. If they disagree, then, this method cannot be

applied. However, if the answer is yes, a photographer should be invited so that teacher is not distracted but still keeps on instructing the whole class. For the semi-structured interview, it would be perfect if recorder or videotape could be accepted to be used, which could save the exact feeling and emotions of the interviewees through intonation, voices and images. However, this issue needs to be solved ethically. In case students still feel inconvenient working with a digital device, then, it is suggested to invite a colleague to take careful notes because the interviewer, playing the role of note taker at the same time was extremely distracted.

A request for the appearance of an observer in class is also significant. This would help teacher just concentrate on teaching and instructing the whole class to do their jobs. This would also make qualities of observation field notes more detailed and precise. Furthermore, students do not have to pretend that they are participating because of the teacher. Then, the data would be much more objective.

Conclusion

The very first comment that should be mentioned in this final section of the assignment is that the idea of the innovation was quite successful, with estimated level of about 50-60 %. It is wonderful to see that the innovation helped *most of the students* participate in collaborative learning tasks, by which, it means that learners really involved in different activities with other members with noisy discussions and arguments enhancing their interaction in an English class oriented by the communicative language teaching methodology. Moreover, the monitoring paper also brought about the number of **60% of students** who were raised awareness of mutual work responsibility, interested in the benefits of the innovation and more excited grouping with classmates in both in-and-out class activities. Nonetheless, it is disappointing to recognize that **80% students** demonstrated that they have problems in completing the monitoring sheet. This fact would certainly make the research think more carefully about the design and the content of the monitoring sheet for the next time of employing the innovation.

The application of the innovation is really good in the way of creating chances for students to challenge themselves with a new idea and a new teaching style, compete with each other to improve learning quality in class. Especially, thanks to this innovation, each participant is expected to recognize the equal contribution of different people to the

common task, which, later on, would help them a lot in the working environment where they have to do team work- a big obstacle for those who have never had chance to try before graduating from the university. Besides these benefits, the innovation should also be changed at some points of contents and format so that it could achieve the best response.

It would be not easy to spread out this innovation as a common rule in this institution, but, expectation should really be kept due to the increasingly utilization of communicative language teaching, where group talks play a vital position. However, before officially accepted, there should be some reflections of the innovation that really need to be considered. In addition to the redesign of the monitoring sheet, the research methods would provide more accurate results if photographing is employed and an observer gets involved. These factors would help to produce a database which is hoped to be more diversified as well as objective.

This work fills in the last segment of the series starting from looking at and choosing methods, thinking of innovation and writing about research methods and lastly ending with implementing the innovation integrated with the use of those above methods to evaluate the innovation. It had been anticipated that the innovation might be successful. Luckily, it did not fail but just needs some more changes in order to be perfect and comprehensive. Therefore, it can now be concluded that the idea of implementing a monitoring sheet in second-year writing class for English majors at National Economics university in Vietnam might help to prevent free-riding problem.

Word count: 7.377 (including evidences of data)

References

- Andrade, N. (2004) Discouraging free riding in a peer-to-peer CPU-sharing grid. *Conference on High Performance Distributed Computing*. Retrieved from http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/login.jsp?tp=&arnumber=1323511&url=http%3A%2F%2Fieeexplore.ieee.org%2Fxppls%2Fabs_all.jsp%3Farnumber%3D1323511
- Brooks, C., & Ammons, J.L. (2003). Free-riding in group projects and the effects of timing, frequency and specific of criteria in peer assessments. *Journal of Education for Business*, 75(5), 268-272.
- Burdett, J. (2003, p.178). Making groups work: university students' perceptions. *International Education Journal*, 4(3).
- Curt, J.D. (2007). Using the diary method to deal with social loafers on the group project: Its effects on peer evaluations, group behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 29 (2). doi: 10.1177/0273475307302019
- Davies, W. M. (2009). Groupwork as a form of assessment: common problems and recommended solutions. *High Education*, 58: 563-584 doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9216-y.
- Dolmans, D., Wolfhagen, I., van der Vleuten, C. & Wijen, W. (2001). Solving problems with group work in problem-based learning: Hold on to the philosophy. *Medical Education*, 35 (9), 884-889. Doi:10.1046/j.1365-2923.2001.00915.x.
- Gibson, T.L., Moore, J. & Lueder, E. J. (1980). *Teamwork in cooperative extension programs*. Division of program and staff development, University of Wisconsin-Extension, Wisconsin.
- Hendry, G.D., Hyde, S.J., & Davy, P. (2005). Independent student study groups. *Medical Education*, 39. 672-679.

- Ingham, A.G., Levinger, G., Graves, J., & Peckham, V. (1974). The Ringelmann effect: Studies of group size and group performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10 (4), 371-384, doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(74)90033-X.
- Ismail, S.B., & Mohamad Maasum, T.N., (2009). *The effects of cooperative learning in enhancing writing performance*. Retrieved from pkukmweb.ukm.my/solls09/Proceeding/.../Shafini.pdf.
- Jones, L. (2007). *The student-centered classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kanbur, R. (2003). *Q-Squared: Qualitative and quantitative methods of poverty appraisal*. (p.1) Permanent Black: Delhi.
- Kerr, N.L., & Bruun, S.E., (1983). Dispensability of member effort and group motivation losses: free rider effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 78-94.
- Lantance, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light in the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality of Social Psychology*, 37 (6), 822-832. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.6.822
- Mandal, R. (2009, March). Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skill. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1.
- Mandal, R.R. (2009). Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skill. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1 (2). Retrieved from www.mjal.org/Journal/Coop.pdf.
- Michael, F., & John, C. (2005) Overcoming free-riding behavior in peer-to-peer systems. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 5 (4), 41-50

- Roberts, T.S., & McInnerney, J.M. (2007). Seven problems of online group learning (and their solutions). *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(4), 257-268
- Swortzel, K. (1997). The effects of cooperative learning methods on achievement, retention, and attitudes of home economics students in North Carolina. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 13 (2). Retrieved from swortzel@ais.msstate.edu.
- Watkins, R., & Daly, V. (2003). Issues raised by an approach to group work for large numbers. *Paper presented at the BEST conference*, April 9-11, 2003, Brighton, UK.