MONITORING IN COLLABORATIVE LEARNING OF LARGE ORAL ENGLISH CLASS IN COLLEGES

Approved: Tom Lo Guidice   Date: April 29, 2012

MONITORING IN COLLABORATIVE LEARNING OF LARGE ORAL ENGLISH CLASS
IN COLLEGES

_____

A Seminar Paper

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

_____

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirement for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

English Education

_____

By

Huang Li (Wendy)

2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Abstract

MONITORING IN COLLABORATIVE LEARNING OF LARGE ORAL ENGLISH CLASS
IN COLLEGES

Huang Li

Under the Supervision of Tom Lo Guidice, Ph.D.

With the expansion of university enrollment in China, large (40+ students) classes become the commonplace, ESL teaching confronts new problems. How to ensure the effectiveness of classroom teaching in the large classes is considered by all the English teachers in China. Consequently, collaborative learning was adopted. In order to guarantee students' high participation and desired achievement in the collaborative learning, many researchers mentioned monitoring.

This paper is a report on a study, the monitoring in large oral English class. With the study of the surveys, the relationship between teacher's monitoring and students' participation in collaborative learning is explored. Possible effective monitoring strategies for Chinese-featured large oral English classes were expected to be found. This is helpful for the exploration of effective monitoring strategies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction

Introduction

The "teacher-centered teaching model" has occupied a dominant part in Chinese education for thousands of years. Students are accustomed to passive learning. In order to change this learning pattern to "student-centered learning model", Chinese authorities launched "college English reform project" in 1999. In the recent years, with the expansion of university enrollment, large class, which is over 50 students, even in oral English class, is normal in ESL teaching. ESL teachers find it is difficult to carry on teaching plan and improve students' English competence in the new situation (Wang, 2003). Therefore, since 2002 the collaborative learning has been seriously considered in order to make some improvements in Chinese ESL classroom teaching (Sun, 2010).

Oral English teaching is a significant part of ESL teaching (Wang, 2009). Since speaking is an output competence and needs practice (Ling, 2007), less students in an oral English class is more helpful for improvements of students' speaking competence (Wang, 2009). The problem is how to change large oral English classes into smaller classes or to utilize some smaller classroom techniques in a large class. Collaborative learning has been emphasized as one possible solution (Sun, 2010). However, the large oral English class creates several dilemmas including too many small groups or too many students in one large group. Obviously, it provides challenges for teachers' monitoring.

Professor/Teacher monitoring in collaborative learning includes a variety of professor/teacher actions to follow through on following student tasks within the groups. Typically the members of the group have responsibilities such as "task-master" (clarity of the professor/teacher instructions and helping members keep on task), "time management", "scribe",

"group spokesperson", "resource allocation", "encourager" and " group processor" (what went well, and how could things go even better with the next group activity). The professor/teacher also may remind students of individual accountability related to the task. This focus of literature for the proposed paper will discuss variety of views on collaborative learning, different methods of monitoring, student's participation in collaborative learning and the relationship between them.

Statement of the Problem

The problem stated as general and specific questions include the following: Does teacher's monitoring affects students' participation in collaborative learning? If so, to what extent teacher's monitoring affects students' participation? Does the students' participation vary under different monitoring?

Definition of Terms

Collaborative learning. Collaborative learning occurs when we stop relying on experts and teachers to transfer their knowledge to us and instead engage together in making sense and creating meaning for ourselves (Rhea, 2010).

Monitoring. Monitoring is a crucial activity for informing practice as well as research. It is usually carried out by the tutors and plays a pivotal role in both the management and evaluation of CSCL processes (Persico, Pozzi & Sarti, 2010).

Assessment and evaluation tasks. The base group provides a structure for assessing and evaluating student academic learning (Johnson & Johnson, n.d.).

Delimitations of Research

The research was conducted in and through the Karrmann Library at the University of

Wisconsin-Platteville, over ninety days. Primary searches were conducted via the Internet through EBSCO host, ERIC, Wilson, Google Scholar and Baidu. Key search terms included "collaborative learning", "monitoring", "large classes", "higher education", "grading" and "assessment".

Method of Approach

An action research project was carried out to collect data on how students perform and view their spoken language experiences in a large (40+ students) class. The action research proceeded in the fall of 2011.

The subject of this research was a group of first-year non-English majored college students. Survey study is used in this research. Students were asked to finish the questionnaires, which include questions related to reflections on teachers' monitoring of collaborative learning, classroom behavior and other related topics. All the collected data is analyzed and showed in chapter 4.

Chapter 2 Review of Related Literature

Many experts discussed and researched on collaborative learning. The majority of them deal with monitoring. Though they have some small differences in collaborative learning and monitoring, the scholars hold similar views in many aspects. Compared with the abundant discussions on monitoring of collaborative learning itself, survey studies are less. In fact, some researchers took survey studies in some courses, but little was done on large language classroom.

The Definition of Collaborative Learning

College spoken English teaching is facing dilemmas in China with the increasing student number of each class. More and more teachers introduced collaborative learning in their classes. In fact, how to ensure the effectiveness of collaboration in large classes is a problem. Monitoring is one choice but it also encounters many challenges. Some theoretical discussions, relevant cases and possible problems of collaborative learning and monitoring are discussed in this paper. However, there is little study deals with the monitoring in large ESL classes. Therefore, some further research is needed to explore the practical monitoring strategies in collaborative learning to ensure the quality of Chinese-featured ESL teaching.

"Collaborative learning occurs when we stop relying on experts and teachers to transfer their knowledge to us and instead engage together in making sense and creating meaning for ourselves" (Rhea, 2010, p. 41). Rhea (2010) pointed out the key of collaborative learning. Both teachers and learners should convert their concepts on learning—rather than rely on teachers, self explorations are the most significant in learning. Learners should give up their safe and familiar learning method. Meanwhile, teachers have the responsibility to encourage learners to participate in the new way (Rhea, 2010).

Researchers Smith and MacGregor (1992) gave their more specific and complete definition

on this issue. They believed the term of collaborative learning involves a lot of meanings. The multiple connotations of it look like an umbrella because a lot of educational approaches would be involved. The basic form of collaborative learning is group working. Smith and MacGregor emphasized the learners' active participation. There are at least two learners in one group, they work together to explore the solutions to problems or make some creations by themselves mainly based on course materials. The activities of collaborative learning could be diverse, any way that is helpful for their problem solution could be allowed. Teachers are no longer the central point in teaching and learning activities. They have to change their role from experts to designers or coaches. Compared with the traditional learning method, teachers' explanations or presentations occupy little proportion in collaborative learning (Smith & MacGregor, 1992).

Another researcher (Dillenbourg, 1999) studied collaborative learning from some slightly different angles. The researcher realized the variety of meanings for "collaborative" and "learning"; therefore Dillenbourg discussed them individually with details. The scholar insisted that the key of understanding collaborative learning is in the relations between criteria for defining the situation, interactions, processes and effects.

Further, Dillenbourg (1999) argued that "collaborative learning is neither a mechanism, nor a method" (p. 5). In fact, collaborative learning is not a single mechanism. Variety of methods and activities could be used in collaboration. However, these methods and activities are not the unique ones for collaborative learning. Many of them may be found in individual work. In addition, because collaborative learning could not be totally predicated, we can not define it as a method. The "collaborative situation is a kind of social contract" (Dillenbourg, 1999, p. 5). The particular interaction between learners or learners and teacher could be expected, but not be guaranteed because of many individual, subjective or unpredictable factors during the

collaboration process. No one could calculate the exact procedure and result of the activity. What we can do is to develop the ways that could increase the occurrence probability of interactions. Dillenbourg mentioned four ways. First, teachers should set up or design the conditions carefully before collaboration. Second, teachers should give each learner specific role and responsibility. Third, apart from face-to-face instructions, teachers could give some complementary instructions in the medium to ensure productive interactions. The last one, teacher should monitor the whole interactions. In his point of view, "collaboration" concerns four aspects of learning: situation, interactions, mechanisms and ways of measuring the effects of collaborative learning.

Chinese researchers have expressed their ideas on collaborative learning that used in China. For example, Yue Zheng (2009) holds the view that collaborative learning suits college ESL students especially in China. For one thing, Chinese college students have already possessed the required English competence before they entered the colleges. For another, Chinese students have extremely strong will to make success in colleges. Therefore, collaborative learning is suitable for Chinese students and Chinese students would benefits from the collaborative learning in ESL vice versa.

The Discussion of Monitoring and Classroom Management in Collaborative Learning

Many scholars contribute a lot to the use of collaborative learning. They have discussed collaborative learning from variety of aspects: types of collaborative learning, teacher's role, student's role, grouping, monitoring, governing, grading, collaborative learning strategies, designing of collaborative learning activities and so on.

In order to guarantee students obtain the knowledge and skills of the course, Pozzi, Manca, Persico and Sarti (2007) believed that monitoring plays a significant role in collaboration. On one hand, students could revise their learning way to a more efficient one according to the traces

of collaboration process. On the other hand, with the help of monitoring, teachers could identify the strengths and weakness of their teaching and adjust it promptly (Pozzi, Manca, Persico & Sarti, 2007).

Noted cooperative learning advocates—Johnson and Johnson (n.d.), clarified monitoring and intervening into several parts in terms of different periods. Before the class, teachers conduct the lesson in the effective way to ensure students can learn successfully in the class. During the class time, teachers monitor each group and intervene when needed to improve task work and teamwork. Johnson and Johnson detailed monitoring and intervening in this period. As for monitoring, "While students are working, you circulate to see whether they understand the assignment and the material, give immediate feedback and reinforcement, and praise good use of group skills. Collect observation data on each group and student" (Johnson & Johnson, n.d., p. 11). As for intervening, teachers "Provide taskwork assistance (clarify, reteach) if students do not understand the assignment. Provide teamwork assistance if students are having difficulties in working together productively" (Johnson & Johnson, n.d., p. 11). Before the end of the class, teachers bring closure to the lesson. In addition, apart from the classroom teaching, evaluate student learning and process group functioning are involved in teachers' responsibilities (Johnson & Johnson n.d.).

Elaborating on the concept, Schumm, Vaughn and Sobol (1997) studied students' understanding of the lesson and provide some practical suggestions to monitor it. They hold similar views as Johnson and Johnson's (n.d.) on monitoring. Schumm et al. believed that in order to make sure students take effective learning, teachers' monitoring should covers students entire learning process—before, during and after the lesson. Teacher's role in monitoring is to gather data of how and what students are learning. Besides, Schumm et al. presented a particular

idea on teacher's role in monitoring: teachers should try to establish comfortable and relaxed surroundings for students to ask questions; meanwhile, teachers take responsibilities to help students on how to ask questions. They listed a number of monitoring strategies: to ask students questions frequently and use effective questioning techniques; to check students progress when they conduct the assignment; to give students informal checks and risk reminders; to ask students give summaries to the main points and directions, complete lesson reaction sheets, write learning logs and write K (Know)-W (Want)-L (Learned) worksheet before the class; to use collaborative open-note tests and fake pop quiz. Unlike other researchers, Schumm et al. employed think-pair-share in peer-monitoring activities.

When noted educational theorist Brophy (2010) discussed the classroom management, the scholar shared the similar point of views on classroom environments with Schumm, Vaughn and Sobol (1997). Brophy insisted that it is much better for teachers to establish and maintain effective learning environments than emphasize their authority or disciplines. Classroom management is a process of establishing effective learning environments. Collaborative knowledge construction means not only students take turns on speaking and listening politely, but also deals with making contribution to the progress of the collaboration, supporting the ideas and so on. In order to conduct effective collaboration, teachers should articulate clear expectations, supply assistances when necessary and give pressure if needed (Brophy, 2010).

Another scholar, Bevilacqua (2000) also admitted the role of teacher in collaborative learning is facilitator rather than instructor. Bevilacqua pointed out that teachers should monitor the progress of the group carefully. There are several monitoring activities used in secondary English class: walking around the room, answering questions, giving suggestions, and interrupting the chatting. Other scholars have also contributed specific teaching strategies.

Vermette and Erickson (1996) clarified some cooperation learning strategies for new teachers. They argued that during the group work, teachers should give students clear expectations and suggestions if necessary, courage and urge students take the responsibility of their collaboration task. There are some specific ways on governing. First, teachers could ask students to write "one-minute" paper on the effectiveness of their group work at the end of the class. Second, teachers could walk around the classroom and ask the students randomly what they achieved in their group work. Third, teachers could stop by, observe and give some comments or suggestions on the group work while students are working (Vermette & Erickson, 1996).

Vermette and Erickson (1996) also put emphasis on grading. They believed that grading should be carefully considered and thought out, explained to the students clearly and rationally, carried the rules out consistently during the whole course time. They provided some different grading plans for various places. The bonus plan—if everyone in one group reaches a certain level, teacher will give each bonus. The bonus with team component—the test is divided into two parts: in the first part, students write their own answers in the circumstances of collaborative learning; in the second part, students can only finish the work individually. The group grade—all the group members share the same grade. The variated project that includes an overall group grade and individual responsibilities (Vermette & Erickson, 1996).

The Cases of Application of Monitoring Strategies in Collaborative Learning

Some researchers examined monitoring in their teaching process, especially in CSCL. Although nearly all the findings indicated that monitoring has positive effects in collaborative learning, some researchers found there are some problems need to be improved.

Zumbach, Reimann and Koch (2006) made two experiments on the monitoring of students'

collaboration in computer-mediated collaborative problem-solving. They studied the relationship between teachers' monitoring, feedback and students' collaborative interactions, problem solution and group climate. Zumbach et al. found: "Taken together, results suggest that our monitoring and feedback strategies, examples for the management-based scaffolding approaches, had positive effects on students' interaction behavior, problem-solving processes, and group climate" (Zumbach et al., 2006, p. 421).

Wang (2009) designed the CSCL learning environment in his study. Some monitoring strategies were used and found helpful after the researching, such as developing product versions, writing progress reports, making comments, grading students. Wang also suggested that "Monitoring the learning process would be more natural if a computer program like the wiki could be used to automatically track what has been changed on a piece of work along the time" (Wang, 2009, p. 1145).

Persico, Pozzi and Sarti (2010) set a model for monitoring and evaluating in CSCL processes. They made use of the model in monitoring the initial teacher training on educational technology. Six teachers in an online course used the model with a set of monitoring tools. In order to evaluate the quality of the learning process, monitor the students' performance and inform teacher actions, assess individuals' learning, Persico et al. set four dimensions: the participative dimension, the social dimension, the cognitive dimension and the teaching dimension. Quantitative and qualitative data has been collected and displayed in monitoring activities. The results were positive (Persico et al., 2010). The monitoring activities are effective in the collaborative learning.

Unlike the above scholars, Sam (1999) took a different way on assessment. Sam strongly recommended log writing because the only final evaluation can not tell students' latest learning

situations.

The Monitoring Strategies in Large Collaboration Classes

Researchers studied group work in large classes rarely. Beichner and Saul (2003), Copper and Robinson (2000) contributed a lot to this field.

Beichner and Saul (2003) made a research on the student-centered activities in large physics classes. They adopted formal cooperative groups and provided studio-style classroom environment to the students. First, at the beginning of the semester, teacher divided the class into several groups of 3 to 4 students each with the help of some information: students' pretest score, grade, GPA, etc. Each group contains the student of the top, middle and bottom level. Then they used round table, comfortable chairs and one laptop for each group, large white boards suspended around the classroom walls and portable group boards are provided. In the end, teacher offer each group some 10 to 15 minute tasks via the web which are available only in the class time. The research results indicated that the SCALE-UP (Student-Centered Activities for Large Enrollment Undergraduate Programs) Project students performed better in exams than the students come from the traditional classes.

Beichner and Saul (2003) employed several ways to ensure the effectiveness of the large physics class. In order to improve the participation of each student in the interaction activities, they took some special actions to the ones who are reluctant to immerse themselves in the group work. As for the better students who believe they would "slow down" by others and don't want to work with peers, "we offer five "teamsmanship points" to each member of any group whose exam average is 80% or better" (Beichner & Saul, 2003, p. 3). As for the lazy low-end student, "we provide a mechanism whereby they can be "fired" from their group for poor performance" (Beichner & Saul, 2003, p. 4).

In the procedure of the activities, teacher should walk around and glance at the white board so as to get to know the latest situation of the activities. "Progress is ensured by engaging students in semi-Socratic dialogs" (Beichner & Saul, 2003, p. 6). Teacher should inspire the students to explore the answer of the question instead of giving them the direct answer. In addition, teachers should be very carefully guide students to the desired goal if students walk on the incorrect way. Find something to praise is a very good choice (Beichner & Saul, 2003).

Beichner and Saul (2003) examined the placement of the laptop for the students. They argued that the laptops are preferred to desktop system or close the lids when students don't have to use laptops. It is helpful for teacher's monitoring and students' concentration.

Copper and Robinson (2000) believed that informal groups is quite suitable for the beginning of the semester in large classes because students are accustomed to the traditional lectures. It is helpful for students to change their study way in the class. Think-pair-share, think-pair-square and minute paper are all good strategies for informal group work (Copper & Robinson, 2000). Smith (2000) recommended jigsaw strategies, structured academic controversy, base groups, problem-based learning, and restructured lecture-recitation-laboratory and eliminated lectures, substitution of hands-on laboratory in formal group works of large classes. Cooper, MacGregor, Smith and Robinson (2000) studied many successful small-group works in large classes. They found teachers should put more emphasis on student skills and outcomes rather than the multiple-choice exams. Group and individual grades should be considered both. Furthermore, students perceived many small-group strategies. Therefore, it is unnecessary to use grade to motivate students in the activities (Cooper, MacGregor, Smith & Robinson, 2000).

Some Problems of Monitoring in Collaborative Learning

Although nearly all the researchers admitted monitoring is helpful in collaborative learning, Bevilacqua (2000) mentioned some drawbacks of collaborative learning:

One is the student who insists (for whatever reason) that he or she prefers to work alone. This situation calls for compromise on both parts. Another stumbling block will occur if a student fails to hold up his or her end in the group. You will need to intervene here, perhaps to regroup, or recalculate a group's score (Bevilacqua, 2000, p. 133).

Parks (2009) studied a "successful" group in lesson study project. One core learner and two other member learners are involved in this group. They experienced three stages of collaboration: joint work, mutual engagement and shared repertoire. The three learners cooperated energetically and effectively, everyone shared their responsibilities to contribute to the work of the group. Some interesting details have been found in their collaboration. The group turned in their written work and put all three names on top; two members change their roles into teachers by using the voice of teacher in order to participate in the group discussion better, although they are not teachers; teacher could not join the group discussion seamlessly; three group members could comfortably interrupt each other and then finish the sentence, however, they could not do this with teacher; teacher spent less time on the "successful" group discussion; all the members agreed with each other perfectly and shared some special terms only within the group. After examining these phenomena, Parks discovered some problems in collaboration. He argued that resistance is not the biggest obstacle in collaboration. The ineffectiveness of teacher's interactions was resulted from the strength of the learners' collaboration. Group members should be encouraged to make some explanations on their ideas and question their partners' beliefs instead of make simple agreement. Some more forceful interventions should be put in if necessary (Park, 2009).

Brindley, Walti and Blaschke (2009) took another look on the effectiveness of grading and intervening. They studied the relationship between grading and student participation level in collaborative learning in an online classroom; and what other factors would involved in creating an effective collaborative learning groups. The findings indicated that there was no evident increase or decrease in participation levels in grading and no grading circumstances when students took part in the group work; and students participated more in group works than in the larger main conferences. It is notable that a required course which has never been graded but the participation levels are consistently high. In other words, there was no "immediate benefit in assigning grades to the collaborative study group project" (Brindley et al., 2009, p, 7). Brindley et al. believed that rather than grading, some specific instructional strategies could stimulate student's participation, "which result in an enhanced sense of community, increased skill acquisition, and better learning outcomes" (Brindley et al., 2009, p, 1). The strategies include facilitate learner readiness for group work and provide scaffolding to build skills, establish a healthy balance between structure and learner autonomy, nurture the establishment of learner relationship and sense of community, monitor group activities actively and closely, make the group task relevant for the learner, choose tasks that are best performed by a group and provide sufficient time. Brindley et al. insisted teachers should monitor the whole procedure of the group work and give them continuous feedback:

During the collaborative process, the instructor needs to be available for feedback, general information and private counsel. In addition, the instructor needs to intervene as required to keep discussions on track, support and animate dynamic conversation, help students stay focused on the task, assist with relationship building, and provide reassurance. (Brindley et al., 2009, pp, 13)

Chapter 3 Plan of Study

Before undertaking this study, the Teaching Improvement Form provided by the University of Wisconsin-Platteville Institutional Review Board (IRB) was completed. The study was endorsed by the seminar paper professor, the Director of the School of Education and was approved by the IRB.

This survey study was developed in order to conduct a quantitative research study on the relationship between students' classroom behavior, reflection and teachers' monitoring of collaborative learning in the circumstances of large oral English class (40+ students). These students come from Hubei University of Economics, all freshmen, majored in Finance, Accounting, Project Management, Journalism and Engineering. The only one teacher taught these students with the same course and used the same monitoring methods. Students in this study completed the paper questionnaires in the classroom in 3 times—the beginning, the middle and the end of the semester.

The goal of the first survey was to gain the information of students' English learning in their high school, including learning conditions, individual learning habits, performances and behaviors in English classroom, some viewpoints toward English learning, etc. The second survey that was developed mainly based on the monitoring methods that experts used in their collaborative learning of large classes before. Some other monitoring methods were listed as the teacher who participates in the survey believes they are significant and possibly helpful but no experts mentioned before in collaborative learning of large classes. The focus of the second survey was to identify the most important and effective 5 monitoring methods in students' eyes after a period of practice. The goal of the last survey was to identify the relativity between teacher's monitoring and students' performance or classroom behavior in collaborative learning

15

of large class. The first part in this survey that was developed mainly based on Elisabeth Hayes's survey of classroom behavior in 1992.

Both multiple choice and Likert scale format were utilized in the first survey to collect the information of students' English classroom learning in their high school. The second and third surveys employed Likert scale format only. In the second one, students indicate their degree of influence with the statement that was rank ordered in the following way: completely influenced=1, influenced=2, not sure=3, uninfluenced=4, completely uninfluenced=5. Students rated the influence of teacher's monitoring on them in collaborative learning of large oral English class. In the third survey, students indicate their degree of frequency with the statement that was rank ordered in the following way: always=1, often=2, sometimes=3, usually not=4, never=5. Students rated the frequency of their classroom behavior and teacher's monitoring.

Chapter 4 Study Results

This chapter is a summary of the findings of this quantitative study. The findings include demonstration of students' English classroom learning in high school, the extent that teacher's monitoring influence students, the frequency that students and teacher behaved in the large collaborative class, and the relative between teacher's monitoring and students' behavior.

The First Survey

At the beginning of the semester, 244 students finished the first survey. The results demonstrate students' English learning in their high school and personal tendency in English learning.

Table 1-10 illustrate information of respondents' English classroom learning in their high school and their tendency in their future college English learning. There are three descriptive choices for each question.

Table 1

English Class Scale in Respondents' High School

Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Large class (over 50)	208	85.2	85.2	85.2
Medium class (between 30 and 50)	34	13.9	13.9	99.2
Small class (less 30)	2	.8	.8	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 2

The Source of Respondents Gain English Knowledge in Their High School

Source	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Teachers	5	2.0	2.0	2.0
Teachers and course books	155	63.5	63.5	65.6
Teachers, course Books and classmates	84	34.4	34.4	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 3

Respondents' Performance in Their High School English Class

Performance	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I concentrated on the lectures seriously and answered questions actively	36	14.8	14.8	14.8
I concentrated on the lectures seriously and answered questions occasionally	192	78.7	78.7	93.4
I can't concentrate on the lectures and never answered questions	16	6.6	6.6	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 4

Respondents' Reaction on Difficulties When Learning English

Reaction	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I always solve the problem individually	40	16.4	16.4	16.4
I always turned to teachers for help	70	28.7	28.7	45.1
I always discussed the problem with my classmates	134	54.9	54.9	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 5

Cause for Not Active in High School English Class

Cause	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
The class is too nervous *(i.e. makes me nervous)*	48	19.7	19.7	19.7
I am too shy to participate in the class activities	59	24.2	24.2	43.9
My English competence is too poor to participate in the class activities	137	56.1	56.1	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 6

Reaction on Teacher's Questions in Class

Reaction	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I always volunteered to give my statement	32	13.1	13.1	13.1
I hope teacher could push me to give my statement	114	46.7	46.7	59.8
I don't want to give my statement in any circumstances	98	40.2	40.2	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 7

The Main Obstacle on Learning Oral English

Main obstacle	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
There is little chance for me to practice my oral English because of too many students in one class	49	20.1	20.1	20.1
I am not sure my expressions are right or wrong	173	70.9	70.9	91.0
I am an introvert person so I don't want to talk to others	22	9.0	9.0	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 8

Respondents' Favorite English Class Climate

Favorite climate	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Relaxed	156	63.9	63.9	63.9
The mixture of relaxed and serious one	88	36.1	36.1	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 9

Respondents' Favorite Teaching Form in Class

Favorite teaching form	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
teacher's lectured-centered	7	2.9	2.9	2.9
students' activities-centered	50	20.5	20.5	23.4
the mixture of teacher's lectured and students' activities	187	76.6	76.6	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

Table 10

Respondents' View on College English Teachers' Most Important Responsibility

Responsibility	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Teachers transfer knowledge to students	7	2.9	2.9	2.9
Teachers inspire students and explain learning techniques	226	92.6	92.6	95.5
Teachers urge students to acquire English knowledge	11	4.5	4.5	100.0
Total	244	100.0	100.0	

There are 244 students completed the first survey. Plenty of information of their English learning in high school could be found. As expected, Table 1 illustrates that majority of the respondents at 85.2% learnt English in high school in large classes (over 50). Only 0.8% of them experienced English class no more than 30. According to Table 3 and Table 6, 78.7% of the respondents prefer concentrated on teacher's lecture and answered questions occasionally; 46.7% of the respondents hope teacher push them to give statement in the class, and 40.2% are reluctant to give statement in any circumstances. Obviously, respondents are quite serious but passive in their high school English class. Table 2 shows that 63.5% of the respondents admitted they gained English knowledge from teachers and course books. It is easily find that Chinese English learners are mainly experienced teacher-centered education. Table 5 and Table 7 demonstrate some reasons for their inactivity in classroom. 56.1% of the respondents believe their English competence is too poor to participate in the class activities and 24.2% think they themselves are too shy. As for the most difficult thing in learning oral English, 70.9% of the respondents believe they can not make sure if their expressions are right, 20.1% think too many students in one class and little chances for their practice are problems in oral English learning.

Actually, respondents prefer something different in their English learning in college. In table 9, only 2.9% of the respondents want to keep the teacher's lecture-centered English class in college oral English class. 20.5% prefer students' activities-centered class and 76.6% prefer the mixture of the two patterns. In the respondents' eyes, nearly all of them at 92.6% believe the most important responsibility for college English teachers is to inspire students and explain learning techniques. 2.9% think teachers should transfer knowledge to students only. According to Table 8, majority of the respondents at 63.9% believe relaxed class is helpful for their English learning. In fact, many respondents are ready for different English learning pattern. In Table 4,

83.6% of the respondents always discussed problems with their classmates or asked teacher for help. Only 16.4% solve the problem by themselves. Therefore, it could figure out that respondents' conception on English class and English learning has changed.

Table 11 illustrates to what extent the respondents' acted in their high school English classroom and their tendency in English learning.

Table 11

Respondents' Class Performance and Tendency in English Learning

Survey statement	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %
I was reluctant to speak English in my high school English class.	9.4	33.6	24.6	25.4	7.0
My previous English class is teacher's lecture-centered.	23.0	52.0	8.2	14.3	2.5
I occasionally had the chance of answering questions in my high school English class.	8.6	38.9	22.5	25.0	4.9
My high school English class is lively.	3.7	25.8	21.3	37.3	11.9
Classmates seldom communicated with each other in my high school English class.	12.7	49.2	11.1	21.7	5.3
My high school English teacher and classmates always cooperated, communicated and inspired each other.	3.7	22.1	20.1	43.9	10.2
I don't think my English teacher give me adequate suggestions according to my individual situation.	4.5	32.4	23.4	32.8	7.0
I always communicated with English teacher on my own in the high school English class.	1.6	6.1	17.6	59.8	14.8

Survey statement	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %
I like discussed questions with my classmates in English in the class.	8.2	42.6	20.9	22.5	5.7
I felt very nervous when I answered questions in English in the class.	14.8	50.8	16.4	15.2	2.9
I always volunteered to answer teacher's question in my high school English class.	1.2	8.2	25.4	56.6	8.6
The competitive climate is helpful for the improvement of my English competence. I like competition.	6.6	40.2	24.6	23.4	5.3
I am not interested in group work.	2.5	4.9	17.2	60.7	14.8
I hope I could have more chances to practice my oral English.	22.5	57.4	16.4	2.9	.8
I always stay away from my English teacher.	1.3	9.3	19.8	58.2	11.4
The score of final exam reflects my English competence. I think final exam is a good thing.	1.3	11.0	23.2	55.3	9.3
I like to cooperate with my classmates and finish the task together.	22.8	70.5	6.3	0	.4
I am always willing to share my knowledge with my classmates.	24.5	67.5	7.2	.8	0
I am influenced by the class climate greatly.	25.3	52.3	12.2	9.7	.4
I know my strong points and weak points in English learning. Also I know how to improve my weak points.	8.4	39.7	41.8	8.9	1.3

More information about respondents' English class in high school can be detected in Table

11. 75% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their previous English class is teacher's lecture-centered, 70.5% of them disagreed or strongly disagreed that their high school English class is lively, 61.9% of them agreed or strongly agreed that classmates seldom communicate with each other in class, 54.1% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed their high school English teacher and classmates always cooperated, communicated and inspired each other. 65.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt very nervous when they answered questions in English in class. Therefore, respondents' high school English class was traditional and students were passive.

In addition, respondents' more detailed class performance in high school English class could be found in Table 11. 47.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they occasionally had the chance of answering questions in high school English class and 22.5% are not sure about this question. 74.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they always communicated with English teacher on their own. 65.2% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they always volunteered to answer questions. It could find that respondents communicated little with peers and teacher as well.

In contrast to respondents' classroom performance and learning environment in their high school, respondents are looking forward for something different or changes. 79.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they hope they could have more chances to practice their oral English. What's more, respondents showed their interests in discussion and cooperation. 50.8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they like to discuss questions with peers in English in class, 92% of them agreed or strongly agreed that they are always willing to share their knowledge with classmates, 75.4% of them disagreed or strongly disagreed that they are not interested in group work, 93.2% of them agreed or strongly agreed

that they like to cooperate with classmates and finish the task together. But it is interesting that 43% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were reluctant to speak English in high school English class.

Respondents uncovered their views on some other aspects of English learning. As for the learning climate, 46.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed the competitive climate is helpful for the improvement of their English competence, 77.6% of them agreed or strongly agreed they were influenced by the class climate greatly. In the case of teacher, 69.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they always stayed away from their English teachers. 36.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they didn't think their English teacher give adequate suggestions according to their individual performance, while 39.8% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with that. Sharply contrast appeared in this point. As for the exam, 64.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the score of the final exam reflects their English competence. In addition, it is interesting that 41.8% of the respondents keep neutral in the statement that they know their strong points and weak points in English learning, and how to make improvement.

The Second Survey

In the middle of the semester, there are 248 students participated in the second survey. Since the teacher tried all the monitoring methods listed in the survey in the previous classes, the results demonstrate the influence of teacher's monitoring on students' collaborative learning in large oral English class.

Table 12 provides descriptive statistics to illustrate teacher's different monitoring methods influence on students. The five category response statements were coded with a Likert rank: completely influenced=1, influenced=2, not sure=3, uninfluenced=4, completely uninfluenced=5

to obtain the mean score in each category.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Monitoring Influence on Students' Collaborative Learning

Monitoring method	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teacher asks students write "one-minute" paper on the effectiveness of their group work at the end of the class.	248	1.00	5.00	2.9758	1.09813
Teacher asks students write learning logs after the class.	248	1.00	5.00	2.9758	1.11641
Teacher asks students submit their printed group work results.	248	1.00	5.00	2.9355	1.03182
Teacher often walks around the classroom when students work on the group activity.	248	1.00	5.00	2.9073	.93702
Teacher gives each group member specific role and responsibility.	248	1.00	5.00	2.8347	.94424
Teacher stands by and observes group activity.	248	1.00	13.00	2.7298	1.11104
Teacher requires students give summaries to the main points and directions of the group work.	248	1.00	5.00	2.7177	.88222
Teacher pays attention to the progress of each group work during the whole process of collaboration.	248	1.00	5.00	2.5968	.93445
The grade of group work is involved in the final assessment.	248	1.00	5.00	2.5806	.90520
Teacher intervenes in time if students meet with some difficulties on collaboration, such as a reluctant group member.	248	1.00	5.00	2.5806	.90071

Monitoring method	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teacher pays attention to each group member in the group work.	248	1.00	5.00	2.5242	.93049
Teacher interrupts or reminds students if they were working in the wrong way or start chatting.	248	1.00	5.00	2.4597	.96832
After the group work, teacher asks students represent their cooperate result in the class.	248	1.00	5.00	2.4113	.93525
Teacher helps students know and understand the standard of the assessment or evaluation for this course.	248	1.00	5.00	2.3790	.94883
After finishing the group work, teacher gives students assessment and feedback.	248	1.00	5.00	2.3750	.83962
In the process of group work, teacher inquires if students have difficulties or questions constantly.	248	1.00	5.00	2.3750	.86807
Teacher asks students questions frequently.	248	1.00	5.00	2.3629	.88929
Teacher uses scientific and consistent assessment and evaluation.	248	1.00	5.00	2.3508	.98260
Teacher takes part in students' group work frequently.	248	1.00	4.00	2.2742	.87557
Teacher employs interesting group work.	248	1.00	4.00	2.1976	.87548
Teacher assists students immediately if they have any difficulties in the group work.	248	1.00	5.00	2.1411	.86792
Students let the teacher get to know: what they have known, what they want to learn and what they have learned.	248	1.00	4.00	2.1371	.88014

Monitoring method	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teacher gives students some comments and suggestions in the process of group work constantly.	248	1.00	5.00	2.1210	.82563
Apart from the face-to-face instructions in class, teacher gives students some complementary instructions via the medium, such as the Internet.	248	1.00	4.00	2.1008	.84528
Teacher gives students some suggestions or instructions on collaboration skills.	248	1.00	4.00	2.0645	.82218
Teacher explains the requirement and goal of the group work to students clearly before the group activity.	248	1.00	4.00	2.0444	.83086
Teacher often praises students or their group when they make progress or do something well.	248	1.00	4.00	2.0242	.89500
Teacher knows (likes / understands) students.	248	1.00	5.00	1.9960	.92862
When students ask questions, teacher often gives them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers.	248	1.00	5.00	1.9919	.86774
Teacher clarifies students' questions before the group activity.	248	1.00	4.00	1.9919	.85836
Amicable teacher.	248	1.00	4.00	1.5363	.74114
Comfortable and relaxed surroundings.	248	1.00	5.00	1.5282	.74693

The resulting data show that average or mean for respondents' perception of the extent that monitoring methods influence on their group activity ranged from 1.5282 to 2.9758. The standard deviation ranged from 0.74114 to 1.11641. These results indicate that respondents

primarily believe they were greatly influenced, influenced or not sure about all the monitoring methods. In other words, they primarily believe they were influenced by all the monitoring methods more or less.

Strikingly, the results show that the mean for the last five monitoring methods in Table 12—teacher knows (likes / understands) students, when students ask questions, teacher often gives them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers, teacher clarifies students' questions before the group activity, amicable teacher and comfortable and relaxed surroundings, ranged from 1.5282 to 1.996. The standard deviation of these monitoring methods ranged from 0.74114 to 0.92862. These results indicate respondents believe they were greatly influenced or influenced most by the previous five monitoring methods mostly.

The mean of the first 11 monitoring methods in table 12, that is, teacher asks students write "one-minute" paper on the effectiveness of their group work at the end of the class, teacher asks students write learning logs after the class, teacher asks students submit their printed group work results, teacher often walks around the classroom when students work on the group activity, teacher gives each group member specific role and responsibility, teacher stands by and observes group activity, teacher requires students give summaries to the main points and directions of the group work, teacher pays attention to the progress of each group work during the whole process of collaboration, the grade of group work is involved in the final assessment, teacher intervenes in time if students meet with some difficulties on collaboration, such as a reluctant group member, teacher pays attention to each group member in the group work, ranged from 2.5242 to 2.9758. The standard deviation ranged from 0.88222 to 1.11641. The results indicate that respondents basically not sure about the influence of these monitoring methods on their group activity since many experts employed nearly all these methods widely in their classes.

The Third Survey

There are 252 students took part in the third survey at the end of the semester. Since the five most influential monitoring methods have been found in the second survey, the teacher applied these five monitoring methods mainly in the last part of the semester. The results demonstrate the respondents' classroom behavior, application of teacher's monitoring and the relative of the two.

Table 13 illustrates the respondents' gender who participate this survey.

Table 13

Gender of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	78	31.0	31.0	31.0
Female	174	69.0	69.0	100.0
Total	252	100.0	100.0	

Among the 252 respondents, there are 78 male students and 174 female students. Female comprised 69% of the respondents and males were 31% of the total number. Females outnumbered males distinctly.

Table 14 illustrates the start time of respondents' English learning. In China, primary school students aged from 6 to 12, junior high school students aged from 13-15, senior high school students aged from 16-18.

Table 14

Start Time of Respondents' English Learning

Start time	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Primary school	97	38.5	38.5	38.5
Junior high school	155	61.5	61.5	100.0
Total	252	100.0	100.0	

As noted in Table 14, all the respondents began to learn English before senior high school. 61.5% of the respondents began to learn English in junior high school and 38.5% of them began to lean English in primary school. Obviously, majority of the respondents began to learn English in junior high school.

Table 15 illustrates the descriptive statistics of respondents' classroom behavior. The five category response statements were coded with a Likert rank: Always=1, Often=2, Sometimes=3, Usually Not=4, Never=5 to obtain the mean score in each category.

This survey was developed mainly based on Elisabeth Hayes's survey of classroom behavior in 1992.

Factor 1, labeled Verbal Participation, consists of items that refer to involvement in class discussions, answering and asking questions, or other forms of verbal communication. The highest loading items on the second factor, Learning Orientation, reflect positive attitudes or feelings about learning. Other items seem to relate to how an individual handles the task of learning (i.e., organization, concern with details). Two characteristics that loaded on this factor, polite and well-spoken, have a less obvious relationship to other items, but also suggest generally positive traits related to learning in the classroom. The third factor, Dominating Others, included items that refer to efforts to assert authority over the teacher or other students. Support-Seeking, the fourth factor was comprised of items representing attempts to gain assistance from other students or the teacher, included items referring to a tendency to express personal concerns or emotions. Factor 6 was labeled Self-Assurance to reflect the characteristic underlying all items loading on this factor, these items were all attributes that suggest confidence in personal ability. The last factor, Sociability, included items relating to an individual's orientation toward

interpersonal relationship. (Hayes, 1992, pp. 384)

In this survey, the lowest loading items reflect positive attitudes or feelings.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics of Respondents' Classroom Behavior

Classroom behavior	Mean	Std. Deviation
Verbal participation	2.8039	.63485
Learning orientation	2.4450	.50621
Dominating others	3.7460	.45225
Support-Seeking	2.6667	.54968
Self-Disclosure	2.8770	.69305
Self-Assurance	3.3783	.63866
Sociability	2.4296	.51641

The data shows that the mean for respondents' some classroom behaviors—verbal participation, learning orientation, support-seeking, self-disclosure and sociability, ranged from 2.4296 to 2.8770. The standard deviation ranged from .50621 to .69305. These results indicate that respondents primarily believed that as for these five aspects they behaved often or sometimes.

The mean for dominating others and self-assurance ranged from 3.3783 to 3.7460. The standard deviation ranged from .45225 to .63866. The data indicate that respondents mainly believed that they sometimes or usually not behaved the previous two actions.

Table 16 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the teacher's monitoring methods that applied in the classroom of the last part of the semester. The five category response statements were coded with a Likert rank: Always=1, Often=2, Sometimes=3, Usually Not=4, Never=5 to obtain the mean score in each category.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Monitoring

Teacher's monitoring	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teacher clarified students' questions before the group activity.	1.6548	.67678
Teacher built comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class.	1.3929	.56494
When students asked questions, teacher often gave them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers.	1.6944	.70703
The teacher is amicable.	1.2778	.49922
Teacher knew students.	2.2540	.94415

The resulting data show that except the last one—teacher gets to know me, the average or mean for teacher's monitoring ranged from 1.2778 to 1.6944. The standard deviation ranged from .49922 to .70703. The results demonstrate that respondents primarily believed the teacher always or often used these monitoring methods in their classroom.

The mean for the teacher gets to know me is 2.2540 and the standard deviation is .94415. It indicates that respondents mainly believed that the teacher often or sometimes used this monitoring method in their classroom.

Table 17 illustrates the relativity of respondents' classroom behavior and teacher's monitoring. The five category response statements were coded with a Likert rank: Always=1, Often=2, Sometimes=3, Usually Not=4, Never=5 to obtain the mean score in each category.

Table 17

Relativity of Respondents' Classroom Behavior and Teacher's Monitoring

Respondents' classroom behavior	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5
Verbal participation					
Pearson Correlation	.097	.090	.094	.074	.310**
Sig(2-tailed)	.123	.153	.136	.243	.000
Learning orientation					
Pearson Correlation	.188**	.123	.165**	.110	.127*
Sig(2-tailed)	.003	.052	.009	.081	.044
Dominating others					
Pearson Correlation	-.104	-.076	-.149*	-.067	.009
Sig(2-tailed)	.101	.231	.018	.290	.887
Support-Seeking					
Pearson Correlation	.169**	.149*	.147*	.098	.191**
Sig(2-tailed)	.007	.018	.020	.122	.002
Self-Disclosure					
Pearson Correlation	.026	.106	.134*	.073	.191**
Sig(2-tailed)	.683	.093	.033	.247	.002
Self-Assurance					
Pearson Correlation	.002	-.060	-.061	-.027	.192**
Sig(2-tailed)	.971	.341	.338	.672	.002
Sociability					
Pearson Correlation	.258**	.218**	.184**	.161*	.233**
Sig(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003	.010	.000

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Note. $N = 252$. M1 = teacher clarified students' questions before the group activity; M2 = teacher

built comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class; M3 = when students asked questions, teacher

35

often gave them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers; M4 = the teacher is amicable; M5 = teacher knew students.

According to the data, at the 0.01 level(2-tailed), the correlations between M1 and learning orientation, support-seeking, sociability are significant, the Pearson Correlation are .188, .169 and .258 respectively. The correlation between M2 and sociability is important and the Pearson Correlation is .218. The correlations between M3 and learning orientation, sociability are remarkable. The Pearson Correlations are .165 and .184. The correlations between M5 and verbal participation, support-seeking, self-disclosure, self-assurance, sociability are significant. The Pearson Correlations are .310, .191, .191, .192 and .233 respectively.

At the 0.05 level (2-tailed), the correlation between M2 and support-seeking is significant. The Pearson Correlation is .149. The correlations between M3 and dominating others, support-seeking, self-disclosure are important, the Pearson Correlations are -.149, .147 and .134 respectively. The correlation between M4 and sociability is remarkable, the Pearson Correlation is .161. The correlation between M5 and learning orientation is significant, the Pearson Correlation is .127.

Chapter 5 Conclusions and Implications

Scholars studied a lot on the theories and applications of collaborative learning and monitoring in collaborative learning. Some of them developed the monitoring strategies in their classroom teaching. Nearly all the scholars confirmed the positive impact of monitoring on students' participation and classroom teaching.

This survey study has the similar results. The first survey reveals that respondents' English classroom learning in their high school was teacher-centered, passive and traditional. They are expecting some changes in the university English classroom—more participation, more practice, more communication, more practical, more flexible and gain more. Varieties of monitoring methods in classroom were used in the first part of the semester in the large oral English class. The second survey makes the conclusion that all the monitoring methods influenced respondents more or less. Respondents were influenced most by the following five monitoring methods—teacher knows (likes / understands) students, when students ask questions, teacher often gives them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers, teacher clarifies students' questions before the group activity, amicable teacher, comfortable and relaxed surroundings. After the second survey, the teacher mainly used the most remarkable five monitoring methods in the large oral English class.

In the third survey, the relationship between respondents' classroom behavior and teacher's monitoring methods could be traced. At the 0.01 level (2-tailed), teacher clarified students' questions before the group activity could facilitate respondents on learning orientation, support-seeking and sociability. Teacher built comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class could gear up respondents on sociability. When students asked questions, teacher often gave them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead direct answers could promote respondents on

learning orientation and sociability. Teacher knew students could facilitate respondents on verbal participation, support-seeking, self-disclosure, self-assurance and sociability.

At the 0.05 level (2-tailed), teacher built comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class could promote respondents on support-seeking. When students asked questions, teacher often gave them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers could facilitate respondents on support-seeking and self-disclosure. An amicable teacher could gear up respondents on sociability. Teacher knew students could facilitate respondents on learning orientation. One remarkable thing is that when students asked questions, the more the teacher gave them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead direct answers the fewer respondents dominate others.

Among the five most effective monitoring methods that we researched in the last survey, one monitoring method—teacher knew students, influenced greatly on all the aspects of students' classroom behavior except dominating others. The monitoring methods—teacher often gave them some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students asked questions, and teacher clarified students' questions before the group activity impact on five and three aspects of students' classroom behavior respectively. The monitoring method—the teacher is amicable influenced students on sociability only.

On the other hand, among the students' seven classroom behavior aspects, sociability is the easiest one that influenced by teacher's monitoring. Support-seeking is followed, it is influenced by all the monitoring methods apart from the teacher is amicable. On the contrary, dominating-others is only influenced by teacher gives students suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students ask questions.

What's more, the teacher who participated in this survey believes it is necessary to use proper monitoring in large oral English class. Generally speaking, majority of the respondents in

this survey performed actively in their large oral English class during the whole semester. If the teacher wants to increase students in verbal participation, he / she could try to get to know students more. If the teacher wants to enhance students on learning orientation, he / she could clarify the questions before the group activity, give students suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students ask questions, and get to know students frequently. If the teacher wants to boost students on support-seeking, he / she could clarify the questions before the group activity, get to know students, build comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class, and give students suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students ask questions often. If the teacher wants to increase students on self-disclosure, he/ she could get to know students, and give students suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students ask questions always. If the teacher wants to improve students on self-assurance, he / she could get to know students often. If the teacher wants to boost students on sociability, he / she could clarify questions before the group activity, build comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class, give students suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students ask questions, get to know students, and build an amicable teacher always. On the contrary, if the teacher gives students suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when students ask questions frequently, it could decrease students' on dominating others.

However, students' changes or fluctuations of classroom behavior or participation during the whole semester are not as obvious as expected. In fact, they were active during the whole semester. Sometimes, they were passive and quite, the teacher believes that related with students' own English level, the difficulty of the topics discussed in the class and if students are interested in them or similar emotions.

As many scholars discussed and expected, all the monitoring methods that were used in the

semester are effective more or less. However, in fact, many monitoring methods, which have been discussed, used or recommended frequently by many experts, didn't influence respondents as greatly as we expected. Among all the 28 monitoring methods they discussed, only 3 of them influenced or completely influenced respondents' classroom behavior—teacher builds comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class, teacher clarifies students' questions before the group activity, and teacher often gives students some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers when they ask questions. As for the last 25 monitoring methods, respondents perceived they were influenced but not very much.

It is interesting that there are 4 monitoring methods which were not mentioned a lot by experts but influenced respondents. The teacher, who participated in this survey study, believed these 4 monitoring methods are possibly influence students classroom behavior or participation greatly. Therefore, these monitoring methods were used in the survey. They are teacher asks students submit their printed group work results, the grade of group work is involved in the final assessment, teacher knows (likes / understands) students, amicable teacher. Among the 4 monitoring methods, the first two influenced students but not so much. The remarkable thing is that, the last two influenced students greatly. Therefore, it is greatly possible that other than the monitoring methods that experts have already discussed a lot, more effective monitoring methods would influence students' behavior or participation in large classroom teaching.

This survey study exposes a lot and inspires teachers. However, it is limited in the scope of research. There are only about 250 respondents participated in this survey. They are all studying in one college, study in 5 different majors, have the similar English competence—intermediate level, and instructed by one teacher. More students come from different colleges, majors, with different English competence and different teachers are expected to participate in this kind of

research. Moreover, the course of this survey took only 7 weeks. Longer course and long-term monitoring could more convincing.

Based on the previous research, more research are expected to reveal more: how to use specific monitoring methods to courage students in large collaborative learning classroom, the relationship between students' classroom behavior and the improvement of their English competence, effective post-class monitoring methods, and the negative correlation between teacher's monitoring and students' participation.

This survey studies what monitoring methods influenced students classroom participation, and to what degree these monitoring impact on students in the circumstances of collaborative learning. Influences are highly emphasized in this study. In fact, a lot of things are involved in these monitoring methods, for example, the application of every specific monitoring method. We have the suspect that when one monitoring method is used in different ways and different surroundings by different teachers would bring different effects. What is the most effect way to use these effective monitoring methods? What makes one monitoring method effective or ineffective? What should teachers avoid or do more when one specific monitoring method is applied? The answers are expected to explore in further research.

To help students improve their English competence is the final destination of every English classroom in China. In this survey, the relationship between teachers' monitoring and students' classroom behavior or participation in large collaborative learning classroom is examined. Is it possible that the student who participates in the classroom activity more is easier to improve his English competence? The relationship between students' classroom participation and their English competence or the improvement of their English competence is expected to reveal in the future.

Appendix

Appendix A

Approval letter from UWP-IRB

5/31/11

Li Huang
Sponsor: Tom Lo Guidice
School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

RE: IRB Protocol #2010-11-49

Project Title: Monitoring in Collaborative Learning of Large Oral English Class
                           in Colleges

Approval Date: 5/31/2011
Expiration Date: 5/30/2012

Your project has been approved by the University of Wisconsin-Platteville IRB via an
Expedited Review. This approval is subject to the following conditions, otherwise
approval may be suspended:

1. No participants may be involved in the study prior to the IRB approval date listed
    above or after the expiration date.
2. All unanticipated or serious adverse events must be reported to the IRB.
3. All modifications to procedures, participant selection, and instruments used
    (surveys, consent forms, etc) must be reported to the IRB chair prior to their use.
4. If the project will continue beyond the expiration date, then the researcher must
    file for a continuation with the IRB at least 14 days prior to the expiration date. If
    the IRB approval for this project expires before approval for continuation is
    given, then a new protocol must be filled out and submitted. Federal guidelines
    allow for no exceptions to this rule. Any data collected after the expiration date
    cannot be used in the study.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB chair at the address below. Include
your protocol # on all correspondence.

Sincerely,

Dr. Barb Barnet
Institutional Review Board Chair
Professor, Mathematics Department
Gardner 451
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
(608) 342-1942   barnetb@uwplatt.edu

Appendix B

Questionnaires (English Version)

Questionnaire No. 1

Dear Friends:

     We tend to get to know your English learning in your high school. All your answers will be used in English teaching research. Please choose your answer according to your own experience.

     Thank you very much.

Part I

Please choose the ONE letter that matches your high school English class.

1. How many students in your high school English class?

    A. large class (over 50)

    B. medium class (between 30 and 50)

    C. small class (less 30)

2. Where did you get your English knowledge?

    A. teachers

    B. teachers and course books

    C. teachers, course books and classmates

3. What is your performance in your high school English class?

    A. I concentrated on the lectures seriously and answered questions actively.

    B. I concentrated on the lectures seriously and answered questions occasionally.

    C. I can't concentrate on the lectures and never answered questions.

4. What did you usually do if you meet some difficulties when learning English?

    A. I always solve the problem individually.

B. I always turned to teachers for help.

C. I always discussed the problem with my classmates.

5. What makes you were not active in your high school English class?

A. The class is too nervous *(i.e. makes me nervous)*.

B. I am too shy to participate in the class activities.

C. My English competence is too poor to participate in the class activities.

6. What did you usually do if teacher asked students to give statement on the problem?

A. I always volunteered to give my statement

B. I hope teacher could push me to give my statement.

C. I don't want to give my statement in any circumstances.

7. What is the most difficult thing when you learning oral English?

A. There is little chance for me to practice my oral English because of too many students in one class.

B. I am not sure my expressions are right or wrong.

C. I am an introvert person so I don't want to talk to others.

8. What is your favorite English class climate?

A. Relaxed.

B. Serious.

C. The mixture of relaxed and serious one.

9. What is your favorite teaching form of your English class?

A. teacher's lectured-centered

B. students' activities-centered

C. the mixture of A and B

10. What is the most important responsibility for college English teachers?

A. Teachers transfer knowledge to students.

B. Teachers inspire students and explain learning techniques.

C. Teachers urge students to acquire English knowledge.

Part II

Please refer to the following scale as you indicate the extent to which you believe in your past English learning.

1. I was reluctant to speak English in my high school English class.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

2. My previous English class is teacher's lecture-centered.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

3. I occasionally had the chance of answering questions in my high school English class.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

4. My high school English class is lively.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

5. Classmates seldom communicated with each other in my high school English class.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

6. My high school English teacher and classmates always cooperated, communicated and inspired each other.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

7. I don't think my English teacher give me adequate suggestions according to my individual situation.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

8. I always communicated with English teacher on my own in the high school English class.
   1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

9. I like discussed questions with my classmates in English in the class.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

10. I felt very nervous when I answered questions in English in the class.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

11. I always volunteered to answer teacher's question in my high school English class.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

12. The competitive climate is helpful for the improvement of my English competence. I like competition.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

13. I am not interested in group work.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

14. I hope I could have more chances to practice my oral English.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

15. I always stay away from my English teacher.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

16. The score of final exam reflects my English competence. I think final exam is a good thing.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

17. I like to cooperate with my classmates and finish the task together.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

18. I am always willing to share my knowledge with my classmates.

  1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

19. I am influenced by the class climate greatly.

1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

20. I know my strong points and weak points in English learning. Also I know how to improve my weak points.

1. Strongly Agree   2. Agree   3. Neutral   4. Disagree   5. Strongly Disagree

Questionnaire No. 2

Dear Friends:

Thank you for your participation and cooperation in this course. We tend to know your views, feeling and experience of your group activities. Please refer to the following scale as you indicate the extent to which you believe the factors would influence you in the group work. Your answers will be only used in English teaching research.

Thank you very much!

1. The interesting group work.
   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced
   5. Completely Uninfluenced

2. To let the teacher get to know: what I have known, what I want to learn and what I have learned.
   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced
   5. Completely Uninfluenced

3. The teacher explains the requirement and goal of the group work to us clearly before the group activity.
   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced
   5. Completely Uninfluenced

4. The teacher requires us give summaries to the main points and directions of the group work.
   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

5. The teacher clarifies our questions before the group activity.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

6. Comfortable and relaxed surroundings.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

7. The teacher gives us some suggestions or instructions on collaboration skills.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

8. The teacher gives each group member specific role and responsibility.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

9. The teacher takes part in our group work frequently.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

10. The teacher stands by and observes our group activity.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

11. The teacher gives us some comments and suggestions in the process of our group work constantly.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

   5. Completely Uninfluenced

12. The teacher pays attention to the progress of our group work during the whole process of collaboration.

   1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

13. The teacher pays attention to each group member in the group work.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

14. The teacher often praises me or our group when we make progress or do something well.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

15. The teacher intervenes in time if we meet with some difficulties on collaboration, such as a reluctant group member.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

16. The teacher asks us questions frequently.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

17. In the process of group work, the teacher inquires if we have difficulties or questions constantly.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

18. The teacher assists us immediately if we have any difficulties in the group work.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

19. When we asked questions, the teacher often gives us some suggestions or instructive ideas instead of direct answers.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

20. The teacher interrupts or reminds us if we were working in the wrong way or start chatting.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

21. The teacher often walks around the classroom when we work on the group activity.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

22. After the group work, the teacher asks us to represent our result in the class.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

23. We hand in the printed result of our group work to teacher.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

24. After finishing the group work, the teacher gives us assessment and feedback.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

25. I write learning logs after the class.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

26. I write "one-minute" paper on the effectiveness of our group work at the end of the class.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

27. I know and understand the standard of the assessment or evaluation for this course.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

28. Scientific and consistent assessment and evaluation.

1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

5. Completely Uninfluenced

29. The grade of group work should be involved in the final assessment.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

30. Amicable teacher.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

31. The teacher knows (likes / understands) me.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

32. Apart from the face-to-face instructions in class, the teacher gives me some complementary instructions via the medium, such as the Internet.

    1. Completely Influenced   2. Influenced   3. Not sure   4. Uninfluenced

    5. Completely Uninfluenced

Questionnaire No. 3

Dear Friends:

*   Thank you for your participation and cooperation during this semester. We tend to know your experience and views of group works. Please refer to the following scale as you indicate the degree to which you believe you and your teacher behaved in the group work. Your answers will be only used in English teaching research.*

*   Thank you very much!*

Part I

Personal Information

Major _____   Gender _____   Age _____

When you begin to learn English:

□primary school   □junior high school   □senior high school

Part II

Please refer to the following scale as you indicate the extent to which you were when you participated in the group work.

1. I participate actively in discussions.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

2. I answer questions posed by teacher.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

3. I ask questions to teacher or my group partners.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

4. I initiate the discussion.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

5. I play a dominant role in the group work.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

6. I express my opinions.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

7. I give positive feedback to teacher.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

8. I am serious about coursework.
   1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

9. I am motivated to learn English.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

10. I am enthusiastic about English learning.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

11. I am well-organized in English learning.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

12. I concern about details.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

13. I concern about grades.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

14. I am well-spoken and polite.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

15. I criticize teacher.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

16. I interrupt teacher and express my ideas.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

17. I disagree with teacher.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

18. I impress my classmates.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

19. I interrupt my group partners and express my ideas.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

20. I give advice to my group partners.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

21. I am argumentative.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

22. I seek teacher's approval.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

23. I ask other group members for help when I have problems.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

24. I seek teacher's support when I have problems.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

25. I take notes.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

26. I seek clarification of assignments.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

27. I discuss my personal problems with my group partners.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

28. I am emotional.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

29. I am good at expressing my feelings.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

30. I share my personal experiences.
    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

31. I am confident.

1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

32. I am assertive.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

33. I am competitive.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

34. I am friendly.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

35. I develop friendship with other group member.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

36. I am sensitive to other's feelings.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

37. I interact with other group member.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

Part III

Please refer to the following scale that your English teacher did in your group work this semester.

1. The teacher clarifies your questions before the group activity.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

2. The teacher builds comfortable and relaxed atmosphere in class.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

3. When we asked questions, the teacher often gives us some suggestions or instructive ideas instead direct answers.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

4. The teacher is an amicable teacher.

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

5. The teacher gets to know me

    1. Always   2. Often   3. Sometimes   4. Usually Not   5. Never

Questionnaires (Chinese Version)

调查问卷 1

亲爱的同学：

你好！非常感谢您的热情参与。本问卷卷旨在了解您上大学前的英语学习状况，请根据您自己的真实情况来回答以下问题（每个问题只限选一个答案）。此问卷调查只作为教学研究使用，决不涉及同学们的隐私等问题。

您的每一个选择对于我们都是十分重要和宝贵的，衷心感谢您的支持！

Part I

1. 我以往英语课的班型

    A.大班（人数多于 50）   B.中班（人数在 30-50）   C.小班（人数少于 30）

2. 课堂上我英语知识的主要来源

    A.老师   B.老师及课本   C.老师、课本和同学

3. 在以往的英语课堂中，我的表现是

A.认真听讲，积极回答问题　　　　B.认真听讲，偶尔回答问题　　　　C.注意力不集中，从

不回答问题

4. 课堂上英语学习中遇到问题时，我经常

A.独立解决　　　　B.问老师　　　　C.与同学讨论解决

5. 我觉得阻止自己在课堂中积极主动的因素是

A.课堂中紧张焦虑的气氛　　　　B.自己害羞内向的性格　　　　C.自己的英语水平

6. 老师请同学陈述自己观点是，我通常

A.踊跃主动回答　　　　B.希望老师点名让自己回答　　　　C.无论会与不会，都不想回答

7. 我认为在口语学习上最大的困难是

A. 班级人数过多，没有足够机会练习　　　　B.不知道自己表达是否正确而不愿意说

C.性格内向而不愿意与人交流

8. 我认为以下课堂气氛利于自己学习

A.轻松融洽　　　　B.严肃紧张　　　　C.二者相结合

9. 我希望大学里英语课的上课形式应是

A.仍以老师讲为主　　　　B.以学生活动为主　　　　C.二者相结合

10. 我认为大学教学中老师最重要的职责是

A.传授知识　　　　B.激发学生的学习兴趣,指导学习技巧　　　　C.督促学生对语言知识的

学习和掌握

Part II

1. 在以往的英语课上，我不太愿意说英语。

　　1.完全同意　　　2.同意　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

2. 在以往的英语课上，均以老师的讲课为主。

　　1.完全同意　　　2.同意　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

3. 在以往的英语课上，我不能经常获得回答问题的机会。

　　1.完全同意　　　2.同意　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

4. 在以往的英语课上，我觉得课堂气氛活跃。

　　1.完全同意　　　2.同意　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

5. 在以往的英语课上，同学间很少交流。

　　1.完全同意　　　2.同意　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

6. 以往的英语老师和同学们之间总是相互配合，相互激发，交流很充分。

　　1.完全同意　　　2.同意　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

7. 我觉得老师针对我的个人情况，给于我的指点不够多。

1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

8. 我常常在课堂上主动用英语和老师交流。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

9. 我喜欢上课时能与同学用英语讨论问题。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

10.当着全班同学的面，在课堂上用英语回答问题，我觉得紧张。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

11.听课时，我总是尽可能多的举手回答老师提出的问题。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

12.竞争性的学习环境更有利于英语学习成绩的提高，我喜欢竞争。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

13.我对以小组为单位进行英语学习不感兴趣。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

14.课堂上，我希望有更多的锻炼机会。

　　1.完全同意　　　　2.同意　　　　3.不确定　　　4.不同意　　　5.完全不同意

15. 我总是对老师敬而远之。

    1.完全同意　　2.同意　　3.不确定　　4.不同意　　5.完全不同意

16. 我觉得现在通过期末考试来评定英语水平能力的方法很好。

    1.完全同意　　2.同意　　3.不确定　　4.不同意　　5.完全不同意

17. 我愿意与同学合作来完成某一项任务。

    1.完全同意　　2.同意　　3.不确定　　4.不同意　　5.完全不同意

18. 我总是很乐意把我所了解的知识告诉同学。

    1.完全同意　　2.同意　　3.不确定　　4.不同意　　5.完全不同意

19. 课堂气氛对我的英语学习兴趣影响很大。

    1.完全同意　　2.同意　　3.不确定　　4.不同意　　5.完全不同意

20. 在英语学习中，我知道我什么地方做得好，什么地方做得不好，我也知道下一步应该如

    何来改进。

    1.完全同意　　2.同意　　3.不确定　　4.不同意　　5.完全不同意

调查问卷 2

亲爱的同学：

　　你好！非常感谢您一段时间以来的课堂参与和配合。本问卷卷旨在了解同学们小组活

动的情况， 请根据您自己的真实情况来回答以下问题（每个问题只限选一个答案）。此问

卷调查只作为教学研究使用，绝不涉及同学们的隐私等问题。

您的每一个选择对于我们都是十分重要和宝贵的，衷心感谢您的支持！

下面这些在小组合作学习过程中的因素，对我在合作学习中积极参与情况的影响是

1. 有意思的小组活动任务。

　　1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

2. 让老师了解我：会什么，想学什么和学到了些什么。

　　1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

3. 在小组活动开始之前，老师清楚地对活动要求和目标做出解释。

　　1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

4. 老师要求我们重复小组活动的要求要点。

　　1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

5. 在小组活动开始之前，当我们对小组活动要求有疑问时，老师及时给我们进行解答。

　　1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

6. 轻松的课堂气氛。

　　1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

7. 老师给我们进行一些合作技巧方面的指导。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

8. 在小组合作中，老师给每位小组成员以明确的分工和职责要求。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

9. 在小组活动时，老师经常参与到我们的讨论中来。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

10. 老师在一旁观察我们的讨论情况。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

11. 在进行小组活动时，老师经常给我们一些意见和建议。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

12. 在进行小组合作活动时，老师至始至终关注我们的活动进展情况。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

13. 老师关注每一位同学在小组讨论中的表现情况。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

14. 对于我们取得进步或者做的好的地方，老师给我们以赞赏。

1.非常大的影响　　　2.比较大的影响　　　3.有影响　　　4.没什么太大影响　　　5.完全没有影响

15. 在小组活动过程中，遇到有不合作的同学，或者合作方面的困难，老师及时进行干预。

1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

16. 老师经常向我们提问。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

17. 在小组讨论过程中，老师经常向我们询问是否遇到困难或问题。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

18. 当我们在小组讨论中遇到困难时，老师在第一时间给我们以帮助。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

19. 当我们向老师询问讨论中遇到的问题时，老师给我们一些引导性的意见和建议，而不是

　　直接的答案。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

20. 如果我们的小组讨论偏离了正轨，或者开始聊天，老师马上给我们以提醒。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

21. 老师经常在教室里面巡视。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

22. 在我们的小组讨论结束后，在全班进行讨论成果的展示。

　　1.非常大的影响　　2.比较大的影响　　3.有影响　　4.没什么太大影响　　5.完全没有影响

23. 把我们的小组讨论结果，以书面的形式上交给老师。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

24. 在小组活动结束后，老师对我们的小组合作结果做出评价和反馈。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

25. 每次上完课后写学习日记。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

26. 在每次下课之前，写一段关于这次小组合作活动有效性的感想。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

27. 我了解关于这门课程清晰的评分标准。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

28. 科学一致的评分标准。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

29. 把小组合作学习的成绩，作为期末总评成绩中非常重要的一部分。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

30. 和蔼可亲的老师。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

31. 老师认识（喜欢 / 了解）我。

1.非常大的影响 2.比较大的影响 3.有影响 4.没什么太大影响 5.完全没有影响

32. 除了课堂上面对面的指导，老师还在课下通过网络等给我们一些补充性的指导。

    1.非常大的影响   2.比较大的影响   3.有影响   4.没什么太大影响   5.完全没有影响

调查问卷 3

亲爱的同学：

    你好！非常感谢您一个学期以来的课堂参与和配合。本问卷卷旨在了解同学们小组活动的情况，请根据您自己的真实情况来回答以下问题（每个问题只限选一个答案）。此问卷调查只作为教学研究使用，决不涉及同学们的隐私等问题。

    您的每一个选择对于我们都是十分重要和宝贵的，衷心感谢您的支持！

Part I
个人基本信息

自然班级：_____   **性别**：□男 □女   **年龄**：_____

英语学习开始时间：□小学   □初中   □高中

Part II

在本学期参与英语课堂的小组活动时，请选出自己的实际情况：

我的课堂参与情况	1. 完全同意	2. 同意	3. 不确定	4. 不同意	5. 完全不同意
1. 我经常非常积极地参加小组活动。	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.

2. 我经常回答老师提出的问题。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
3. 我经常向老师或小组其他同学提出问题。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
4. 我经常发起讨论。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
5. 我在小组活动中经常处于主导地位。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
6. 我经常表达自己的观点。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
7. 我经常给予老师积极的回馈。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
8. 我一直对英语学习严肃认真。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
9. 我总是积极地去学习英语。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
10. 我总是对英语学习充满热情。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
11. 我总是有条理地去学习。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
12. 我总是很关注细节。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
13. 我总是很关心分数。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
14. 我总是言语很得体。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
15. 我经常批评老师的观点。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
16. 我经常插话，打断老师。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
17. 我经常不同意老师的观点。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
18. 我经常给其他同学留下印象。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
19. 我经常插话，打断其他同学。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
20. 我经常给其他同学建议。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
21. 我总是好争论。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.

22. 我经常寻求老师的赞同。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
23. 当遇到问题时，我经常向小组其他同学寻求帮助。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
24. 当遇到问题时，我经常向老师寻求帮助。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
25. 我经常做笔记。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
26. 我把作业完全弄清楚。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
27. 我经常和其他同学讨论自己的问题。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
28. 我总是善于表达情感。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
29. 我经常表达个人的感情。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
30. 我经常和他人分享个人的经历。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
31. 我总是充满自信。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
32. 我总是过分自信。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
33. 我经常与他人竞争。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
34. 我总是对小组其他同学很友好。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
35. 我经常和小组其他同学交朋友。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
36. 我经常对小组其他同学的感觉很敏感。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.
37. 我经常和小组其他同学相互交流。	1	2.	3.	4.	5.

Part III

请选出你的英语老师在组织小组活动时的实际做法情况

33. 在小组活动开始之前，当我们对小组活动要求有疑问时，老师及时给我们进行解答。

1.总是这样做　　2.经常这样做　　3.有时候这样做　　4.偶尔这样做　　5. 从不这样做

34. 营造轻松的课堂气氛。

1.总是这样做　　2.经常这样做　　3.有时候这样做　　4.偶尔这样做　　5. 从不这样做

35. 当我们向老师询问讨论中遇到的问题时，老师给我们一些引导性的意见和建议，而不是

直接的答案。

1.总是这样做　　2.经常这样做　　3.有时候这样做　　4.偶尔这样做　　5. 从不这样做

36. 塑造和蔼可亲的教师形象。

1.总是这样做　　2.经常这样做　　3.有时候这样做　　4.偶尔这样做　　5. 从不这样做

37. 老师尝试认识（喜欢 / 了解）我。

1.总是这样做　　2.经常这样做　　3.有时候这样做　　4.偶尔这样做　　5. 从不这样做

References

Beichner, R. J., & Saul, J. M. (2003). *Introduction to the SCALE-UP (Student-Centered Activities for Large Enrollment Undergraduate Programs) Project*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International School of Physics, Varenna, Italy.

Bevilacqua, M. (2000, January/February). Collaborative learning in the secondary English class. *The Clearing House, 73*(3), 132-133.

Brindley, J. E., & Walti, C. (2009). Creating effective collaborative learning groups in an online environment. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *10*(3), 1-18.

Brophy, J. (2010). Classroom management as socializing students into clearly articulated roles. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 45*(1), 41-45.

Cooper, J. L., MacGregor, J., Smith, K. A., & Robinson, P. (2000). New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 81. Strategies for energizing large classes. In J. MacGregor, J. L. Cooper,

& K.A. Smith, P. Robinson (Eds.), *Implementing small-group instruction: Insights from successful practitioners* (pp. 63-76).   New York: Wiley.

Cooper, J. L., & Robinson, P. (2000). New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 81. Strategies for energizing large classes. In J. MacGregor, J. L. Cooper, & K.A. Smith, P. Robinson (Eds.), *Getting started: Informal small-group strategies in large classes* (pp. 17-24).   New York: Wiley.

Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *Collaborative learning: cognitive and computational approaches*. New York: Elsevier Science, Inc.

Elisabeth, H. (1992). Students' perceptions of women and men as learners in higher education. *Research in Higher Education, 33*(3), 377-393.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (n.d.). *Cooperative learning center*. Retrieved from http://www.staff.uni-mainz.de/kesslet/arbeit/kriss/cooperativeLearning/johnson.doc

Ling, C. H. (2007). Function of collaborative learning in large oral English class. *Journal of Hubei Radio & Televison University, 6,* 153-154.

Parks, A. N. (2009). Collaborating about What? An instructor's look at preservice lesson study, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, pp. 81-97.

Persico, D., Pozzi, F., & Sarti, L. (2010). Monitoring collaborative activities in computer supported collaborative learning. *Distance Education, 31*(1), 5-22.

Pozzi, F., Manca, S., Persico, D., & Sarti, L. (2007). A general framework for tracking and analyzing learning processes in computer-supported collaborative learning environments. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(2), 169-179.

Rhea, M. (2010). The power of collaborative learning. *Associations Now*, pp. 41-44.

Sam, V. (1999). *Assessment of advanced ESL students through daily action logs.* Retrieved from

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED435187.pdf

Schumm, J. S., Vaughn, S., & Sobol, M. C. (1997, January). Are they getting it? How to monitor

    student understanding in inclusive classrooms. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 32,*

    168-171.

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. T. (1992). Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher

    Education. In Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed), *"What is*

    collaborative learning?". Washington, DC.

Smith, K. A. (2000). New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 81. Strategies for

    energizing large classes. In J. MacGregor, J. L. Cooper, & K.A. Smith, P. Robinson (Eds.),

    Going deeper: Formal small-group learning in large classes (pp. 25-46).　New York:

    Wiley.

Sun, L. (2010). Modifying large English class with the use of MI-theory. *Journal of Technology*

    Information, 30, 611.

Vermette, P. J., & Erickson, D. B. (1996, June). Cooperative learning in the college classroom:

    three structures and seven activities. *College Student Journal, 30,* 203-213.

Wang, J. G. (2009). Discussions on oral English teaching of higher education. *Instruction of*

    Culture, 13, 134-135.

Wang, Q. (2009). Design and evaluation of a collaborative learning environment, *Computer &*

    Education, 53, 1138-1146.

Wang, X. H. (2003). Problems and solutions of large college English class. *Longdong University*

    (Social Science Edition), 2, 76-78.

Yue, Z. (2009). Collaborative learning and second language acquisition for Chinese college students. Retrived from http://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/34618

Zumbach, J., Reimann, P., & Koch, S. C., (2006). Monitoring students' collaboration in computer-mediated collaborative problem-solving: applied feedback approaches. *Educational Computing Research, 35*(4), 399-424.