

Evaluation of
MONITORING SHEET in Writing
of 2nd Year Majors
at
National Economics University
to Overcome **FREE-RIDING** in
COLLABORATIVE LEARNING

Le Thuy Linh, MTESOL

Overview

Research questions:

- * *How does the monitoring sheet encourage students in group writing?*
- * *Does the monitoring sheet motivate students?*
- * *What difficulties do they encounter in completing the sheet?*

Overview

Context

Macro-skill	Writing	
Task	Secondary research	Group work is compulsory, a library research handed in at week 5.
Number of students	25	5 groups in total, each with 5 members
Time of innovation	Summer semester	5 weeks
Lessons/week	3	Monitoring sheet: integrated into all 15 lessons.

Background

Writing skill:

- Have significant role in EFL and ESL (Ismail & Maasum, 2009; Mandal, 2009).
 - Help a learner develop language capabilities (Mandal, 2009; Ahmed Ismail, 2010).
 - Group work should be employed in writing lessons (Marlene, 2011), Kagan (2009).
- > Numerous idea collection, higher academic performance, lighter workload and intimate friendship (Gibson, Moore & Lueder, 1980; Swortzel, 1997; Burdett, 2003; Hendry, Hyde & Davy, 2005).
- > Group work: be integrated into writing skill.

Arising problem

Team members: hardly contribute to or take no responsibility
= *free-riding* (Kerr & Bruun, 1983)

-> Affects members' morale

destroys instructor's reputation

(Roberts & McInnerney, 2007; Burdett, 2003).

-> Solutions should create:

- Environment with individual tasks
- Participatory jobs
- Rewarding valuable efforts

(Roberts & McInnerney, 2007; Davies, 2009).

Innovation

A monitoring sheet

- As a compulsory completion
- With details of individual job,
qualities of group leader,
team procedure
member's participation

(Appendix 1).

Procedure

- * 1st lesson: the sheet was introduced. No further explanation.
- * Every lesson, each student brought it to the class, took notes.
- * Comments: were welcome at lesson 1, week 2.

Evaluation methods

- * **Documentary analysis:**

Each student: one paper

For every 3 sessions: one monitoring sheet completed.

-> Totally, file of 7 sheets/ head

- * **Semi-structured interview**

Individual interview: ten questions (Appendix 2): week 5 Each conversation: nearly half an hour.

The interviewer: took notes because of inconvenience for record.

Evaluation methods

- * **Observation field notes:**

Every session: teacher: took notes of: students' attitudes, behaviors facial expressions (Appendix 3)

- * **Diaries:**

Each attendant:

has one notebook for jobs after one week (three sessions)

gives feedbacks on filling sheet that week.

->A set of 25 diary notebooks analyzed (Appendix 4)

Ethical issues

Recording

The researcher had to take notes with no other choices because the search for agreement of being recorded failed.

Data analyses process

Documentary analysis

Each student: handed in 7 papers of sheets for 5 weeks

->175 papers (25 sets) was investigated

Each set: comments, feedbacks :summarized

-> A database with 25 core monitoring sheets was ready to be processed

Data analyses process

Semi-structured interview

25 files: notes of 25 sts' answers

noun phrases, adjectives, verb phrases, liking devices

-> Main ideas of 25 sets were calculated of percentage (out of 100%) for each statement.

Data analyses process

Observation field notes

A book: by teacher, 15 A4-sized papers

Key terms: noun phrases, verb phrases, adjectives, icons.

Data analyses process

* Diaries

- The last session

- > Analyzed in turn

- > It was possible to calculate percentage of agreement and disagreement with each statement based on these 25 papers.

Key findings and data triangulation

Most students get involved and be interactive

60% feel responsible, beneficial and excited

80% have problems in completing

-> The monitoring sheet:

- * Be well accepted
- * Contributed to involvement
- * Promoted excitement

Discussion

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

- * 90% respondents could fill well
- * only 50% could be able to describe in detail what they had done.
- * More than half agreed that the innovation helped to participate
- * 20% mark was valuable

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

- 
- * a new thing-> curiosity
 - * English majors are highly motivated -> eager and willing to work

BUT

There should be rules for punishment and awards
-> enhance the role of key persons and make other work harder

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



This was a new thing in a writing class

-> Sts are eager and willing to work

There should be rules for punishment and awards.

-> Enhance the role of key persons and make other work harder.

punish or fine free-riders of doing more jobs next time

- Success in participation section asking “who”
 - > Competitiveness
- Wish for a section of free comments on good and bad participation
- Amendment in the scale
 - > more convenient and time-saving

- 
- Some sections: be released
 - Evaluation of group leader: no relevance in the interview or diaries
 - > The role was not appreciated
 - More space with adjectives about participation qualities
 - > The respondents know how effective their contributions assessed.

Problem

The influence of the teaching style

- Normally, teacher dominant

- > at the beginning, hard to work in group
more complicated situation

- Teachers: resistant to change.

- > They did not approve

- > Demotivated learners in completing the sheets.

Conclusion

- * The innovation helped **most of the students** participate in collaborative learning tasks
- * The monitoring paper brought about **60% of students** raised awareness, interested in the innovation and more excited grouping
- * Nonetheless, **80% students** demonstrated that problems in completing the monitoring sheet.

- 
- * The innovation is can create chances for students to challenge themselves
 - * Especially, each participant recognizes equal contribution
 - * The innovation should also be changed at some points of contents and format

- 
- * It would be not easy to spread out this innovation
 - * Before officially accepted, there should be reflections
 - * Photographing should be employed and an observer gets involved

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.

References

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.

References

Ismail, S.B., & Mohamad Maasum, T.N., (2009). *The effects of cooperative learning in enhancing writing performance*. Retrieved from pkukmweb.ukm.my/sollso9/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.

References

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.*



Thank you