

Secondary School Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Cooperative Group Work Assessment Challenges in Ethiopia.

Abate Demissie * & Getu Lema Shewangezaw**

Arbaminch University, Ethiopia

Abstract

Cooperative Learning (CL) has been encouraged in Ethiopia's secondary schools as an important strategy to facilitate effective student learning. However, the effectiveness of CL hinges, among other factors, on appropriate assessment of students' group work. Challenges faced by teachers and students in implementing assessment of group work have remained an obstacle to the effective use of CL. The aim of this study was therefore to examine what Ethiopian secondary school teachers and students, respectively, consider to be problems and obstacles in the way of efficiently implementing student the cooperative group work assessment. Accordingly, 213 teachers and 212 students were randomly selected for a questionnaire survey. In addition, two teachers and five students were also interviewed and a focus group discussion (FGD) was carried out in each of the five schools selected for data gathering. The data acquired through the questionnaire was analyzed through one-sample t-test while the data obtained through interviews and FGD were analyzed through qualitative verbal descriptions. The findings indicate the main challenges from the point of view of the teachers to be their inadequate training on the assessment of group work process and individual contributions; uncertainty on what should be assessed, and heavy workloads. From the

* Abate Demissie Gedamu, Department of English language and Literature. (abachad22@gmail.com)

**Getu Lema Shewangezaw, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies. (shewangezawgetu@gmail.com)

Acknowledgements: We would like to acknowledge Arba Minch University for funding this study. We also thank the head of Research Coordination Office at the College of Social Sciences and Humanities (CSSH) for facilitating our research by his timely responses to any query we made. We are also grateful to teachers and students who participated and helped with data collection for this research. Finally, we would like to extend our gratitude to Dr. Tesfaye H. Mariam for his constructive comments time and again.

students' perspective, the main challenges were inadequate teacher support and follow up and equal reward for unequal contribution by members to group work..

Keywords: assessment, group work assessment, assessment challenge, group work assessment challenge

Introduction

Cooperative learning (CL) is a student-centered educational practice in which students work with each other in small groups to make the best use of their individual and joint learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Sharan, 1994). CL engages students actively in constructing their own meaning (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Liang, 2002). The literature associates several benefits with CL, including better student performance and improved communication, higher self-esteem, acquisition of problem-solving skills, and of socialization (Johnson & Johnson, 2002; Slavin, 1996). In addition, it offers the students non-threatening, more comfortable and supportive learning environment whereby they can engage in open and friendly discussions with each other (Gupta, 2004).

Ethiopia's education system has implemented the CL at different levels, though this remains at infancy stage (Abiy, 2015; Feyisa & Simeret, 2018). Even the pre-reform government (before 2018) in Ethiopia mandated and encouraged teachers to employ group works at all levels of education. Students were required to perform classroom study tasks in fixed 'one-to five' permanent groups that they stay in during a semester. These are mixed ability and gender representative student groups where a high achiever among them is designated as the leader of the group until another member's better semester examination result elevates him/her as the new leader (Abiy, 2015).

Cooperative learning emerged from within Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory (SCT) which considers learning to be a social process that occurs through reciprocal interactions among learners for the achievement of shared goals (Johnson & Johnson, 2008; Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, in this context, learning is socially constructed through interactions (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Accordingly, "individual learners first learn through individual to individual social interaction and then knowledge is individually internalized" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.84). This implies that individual meaning and performance are acquired through social interaction of the group as knowledge is constructed from cooperative efforts to learn, understand, and solve problems. The theory does not deny that individual learning also occurs whereby knowledge is acquired and skills are internalized.

Many studies have affirmed that CL enhances students' academic and social growth as they interact with others in their group to complete shared goals (Johnson & Johnson, 2002; Slavin, 1996). Baloché and Brody (2017) concluded that CL "has positive effect on students' achievement, motivation for learning, inter-group relations, critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and a host of other well-researched outcomes" (p.1). Gupta (2004) stressed how it provides students with an encouraging, comforting and helpful learning environment as compared to individual or competitive group work.

However, the effective implementation of CL has faced many challenges. These include teachers' lack of the concepts of CL (McManus & Gettinger, 1996), large class size and shortage of class time (Peek, Winking & Peek, 1995), high noise level, and teachers' difficulties with implementing cooperative group work assessment (Gillies & Boyle, 2010; Le, Janssen & Wubbels, 2018; Ross & Rolheiser, 2003; Topping, Buchs, Duran & Van Keer, 2017), mismatch between teachers' beliefs and orientations of CL (Brody, 1998), cultural constraints (Sharan, 2010), lack of training on the assessment of collaborative learning, and absence of assessment criteria (Le, Janssen & Wubbels, 2018; Ross & Rolheiser, 2003). Ross and Rolheiser (2003) found teachers' difficulties with assessing cooperative group work to be the most critical of these challenges.

Relatively few studies have been carried out on assessment of cooperative group work challenges for Ethiopian schools. For example, Muhammed (2012) and Zeleke & Tsega, (2015) have carried out studies on cooperative learning practices in Ethiopia, Hanna (2015) on teachers' and students' attitudes towards cooperative learning, Berhanu (2013) on teachers' knowledge, attitude, and practice of cooperative learning, and Wondwosen (2008) on oral group lessons in promoting cooperative learning. However, studies on the assessment of group work in general and group work assessment challenges are scarce.

Le, Janssen and Wubbels (2018) argue that teachers could not directly and accurately assess the collaborative process since they are unable to observe how students collaborate. They note the literature's suggestion of using self- and peer-assessments to assess collaborative process but argue that both teachers and students distrust their legitimacy as assessment techniques although they use them. Thus, students reported that when they applied self- and peer-assessments, they assessed their friends leniently and granted high marks to all group members regardless of the differences in the individual contribution to the group work (Le, Janssen & Wubbels, 2018).

On the side of the students, issues of concern that are obstacles to the assessment of cooperative group work include their lack of adequate training on social interactions for collaboration, and peer and self-assessments (Galton, Hargreaves & Pell, 2009; Kutnick et al., 2005) and lack of credible instruments to assess collaborative skills (Koutrouba, Kariotaki & Christopoulos, 2012). Capping these challenges was student resentment of the lack of fairness in group work assessment when non-contributing peers are not equitably assessed according to their levels of contribution (Davis, 2009; Ross & Rolheiser, 2003).

Some studies have also investigated teachers' psychological disposition to and thought about group work assessment. Casal (2016) observed that many teachers already developed underlying beliefs that assessing social skills and group and individual performances were difficult. Many teachers are said to harbor uncertainty and ambiguity on the content and methods of assessing collaborative learning (Frykedal & Chiriak, 2011; Gillies & Boyle, 2010; Ross & Rolheiser, 2003). It is therefore difficult to expect serious attempts of cooperative group work assessment from such teachers.

Research Goal

It is apparent that teachers' assessment practices significantly affect student learning. Nonetheless, the involvement of students in their own learning is highly valuable as it determines the quality of their learning. Resolving the dual issue of student involvement in their own learning and teachers' views of challenges of cooperative group work assessment would serve to enhance appropriate assessment practices that will promote student motivation and learning. Consequently, this study sought to explore cooperative group work assessment challenges through the lenses of teachers and students at selected secondary schools in the Southern Nation Nationalities Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS) of Ethiopia. The study has two specific objectives: (i) to investigate cooperative group work assessment challenges from teachers' perspective; (ii) to examine cooperative group work assessment challenges as viewed by the students.

Research Methodology

Research Design

To address the objective of the study, a cross-sectional descriptive survey research design was adopted as it was appropriate to use it to canvas opinions on the issue. Hence, to collect the relevant

data, questionnaires were administered to teachers and students, interviews were conducted with teachers, and FGD were held with the students.

Participants of the Study

Selected teachers and students from five secondary schools in SNNPRS participated in the study. These schools were Arbaminch Secondary School, Karat Secondary School, Sawula Secondary School, Merab-Abaya Secondary School and Konso Secondary School. They were selected purposively due to their relative proximity to Arbaminch, the researchers' workplace.

Among 450 teachers in the five secondary schools, 254 teachers were selected for this study through systematic simple random sampling technique for questionnaire survey. The teachers were sampled from all academic subjects taught in the schools as per the curricula of the Federal State of Ethiopia. Two hundred and thirteen (213) of the selected teachers properly filled and returned their questionnaires. Two teachers from each school were selected for in-depth interview. For the students, two hundred and seventy (270) were selected for questionnaire survey through systematic random technique. Of this number, 212 properly filled and returned their questionnaires. To carry out focus group discussions (FGD), five students at each school were selected on the basis of their willingness to participate in the study.

Data Collection Instruments

The questionnaires, interview and, FGD were developed based on the few prior empirical works and related review literatures on cooperative learning (Frykedal & Chiriac, 2011; Gillies & Boyle, 2010; Le, Janssen & Wubbels, 2018; Paul & Ralph, 2005; Valente, 2018; Webb, 1994). Each of the tools is described and presented below.

Questionnaire

The purpose of teacher questionnaire was to elicit quantitative data concerning challenges the participants' (teachers and students) believed they faced in the assessment of cooperative group work. The self-rating questionnaire for teachers consisted of (n=12) items while that of the students had (n=6) items. Both were prepared on 5-point Likert scale which were labeled as strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The questionnaire for teachers had internal consistency reliability of ($\alpha = .76$). The student questionnaire maintained ($\alpha = .81$) value of internal consistency reliability. This implies that the tools could consistently measure what they are supposed to measure.

Interview

In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interview questions were used to intensively probe challenges teachers felt in the assessment of cooperative group work. To this effect, face-to-face individual interview was conducted with each interviewee. The interview was transcribed verbatim for data accuracy.

Focus Group Discussion with Students

Focus group discussions were held with selected students to generate data on the challenges the students' perceived in their assessment of cooperative group work. FGD helped to get more in-depth qualitative data that could not be captured through a closed-ended questionnaire. To guard against FGD participants getting anxious with been audio-recorded, field notes were used to capture their responses. The discussants were assured of the confidentiality of their opinions after which the discussions were conducted. The field notes from the FGD were thereafter transcribed.

Methods of Data Analysis

The data collected through questionnaires were encoded into SPSS version 21 for analysis. Mean values at both item and scale levels were units of analysis. On the other hand, data collected through interviews and focus group discussions were coded and categorized thematically for analysis. The quantitative data obtained through questionnaires on cooperative group work assessment challenges was analyzed with one sample *t*-test. One sample *t*-test was used to determine whether there was statistically significant difference between the observed mean and expected mean (3.00) at both items and scale levels. The assumptions of the *t*-test were tested to avoid possible flaws that might have originated from violation of the assumptions before applying it. In addition, five percent ($\alpha = 0.05$) level of significance was used throughout the study. Finally, the coded and categorized data secured through interviews and focus group discussions were analyzed qualitatively through verbal descriptions.

Results

Before running one-sample *t*-test, the data obtained through questionnaire from teachers and students were checked for normality of the distribution. The results indicated the skewness and kurtosis values of the data were below 2.00 at an item and a scale level. This shows that one-sample *t*-test could be applied. To this effect, *t*-test results of teachers' and students' perspectives on cooperative group work assessment challenges were provided below.

Teachers' Questionnaire Data Analysis on Assessment Challenges

Table 1. One Sample T-test results on Group Work Assessment Challenges (Teachers' View)

Test value = 3

No	items	Mean	df	t	p
1	Assessment of cooperative group work was time consuming	4.01	212	14.43	.000
2	There is lack of clear assessment criteria to assess group work	3.48	212	6.04	.000
3	There were too many students in my classes	4.03	212	12.14	.000
4	I have insufficient training on the assessment of cooperative group work	3.02	212	0.24	.806
5	Cooperative group work assessment increased teacher workload	3.46	212	4.51	.000
6	I was unfamiliar with cooperative group work assessment techniques	2.47	212	-6.27	.000
7	I had too many classes (sections) to assess group work	3.84	212	9.47	.000
8	I am uncertain on what should be assessed in group work	3.01	212	0.15	.875
9	Difficulty of assessing and weighting of group work process	3.42	212	9.58	.000
10	Unreliability of peer or self-assessments	3.44	212	5.43	.000
11	The management of non-contributing students in the group	3.57	212	7.02	.000
12	Inability of assessing individual contribution to the group work	3.09	212	1.08	.279
	Scale	3.40	212	9.19	.000

As shown in table 1, one sample t-test was performed to find out whether the observed means of the items on the group work assessment challenges were significantly different from the expected mean (3.0). The results indicated statistically significant positive mean differences for most items from the expected mean (3.0) at ($p < 0.01$). On the other hand, significant but negative mean difference from the expected mean was found for 'unfamiliarity with group work assessment techniques' item at ($p < 0.01$). In addition, the results confirmed statistically non significant mean differences at ($p > 0.05$) for items on 'insufficiency of training on the assessment of group work', 'too many classes of students (sections) to teach', and 'inability of assessing individual contribution to the group work'.

From the above presentation, it can be deduced that time consuming nature of group work assessment, lack of clear assessment criteria, class size, the number of class sections teachers cover, work load, assessment of group process, a lack of trust in peer and self- assessment, and problem with management of free riders were the challenges teachers faced in their effort to assess cooperative group works. Conversely, unfamiliarity with cooperative group work assessment techniques is not found to be a challenge to teachers. However, the finding revealed that teachers remained ambivalent on the items ‘insufficiency of training on the assessment of group work’, ‘uncertainty of what should be assessed in group work’, and ‘inability of assessing individual contribution to the group work’.

Students' Questionnaire Data Analysis on Assessment Challenges

Table 2. One Sample T-test Results on Assessment Challenges (Students' View)

Test value=3

Items	Mean	df	t	p
1 Insufficient support and follow-up from the teacher	3.30	211	2.96	.003
2 Unequal contribution of individual to the group work	3.36	211	3.67	.000
3 The effect of non-contributing members (free riders) in the group	3.10	211	1.00	.315
4 Lack of proper peer evaluation of non-contributing in the group	2.99	211	-.102	.919
5 Long time friendships among members of cooperative learning group	3.22	211	2.39	.017
6 Insufficient training and experiences on peer assessment	3.13	211	1.25	.209
Scale	3.18	211	2.54	.012

As shown in table 2, one sample t-test was run to find out whether the observed means of the items on group work assessment challenges were significantly different from the expected mean (3.00). The results show statistically significant positive mean differences for ‘insufficient support and follow up’, ‘unequal contribution of individual to the group work’, and ‘long time friendship’, at $p < 0.01$ of the items of the scale. Conversely, the results revealed statistically nonsignificant mean differences at ($p > 0.05$) for items ‘the effect of non-contributing members (free riders)’, ‘lack of proper peer evaluation of non-contributing members (free riders)’, and ‘insufficient training and experiences on peer assessment’.

These show that insufficient support for and follow up by teachers, unequal contribution of individual to the group work, and long-time friendship among group members were found to be

major challenges to assessment of cooperative group works. However, students seem to be undecided on the effect of non-contributing members (free riders), lack of proper peer evaluation of non-contributing members, and insufficiency of training and experiences on peer assessment.

Analysis of Teachers' Interview Data on Group Work Assessment Challenges

Teachers were interviewed on the challenges they faced in their attempt to assess cooperative group work and particularly with regards to the challenges they experienced in the assessment of individual contribution to the group work and group process. One interviewed teacher noted:

As teachers, we have not put the principles of cooperative learning into effect as it should have been. We use to let the group leaders present the group work and be accountable for the entire group work. Yet, we offer equal marks to all group members regardless of the assessment of individual contribution to the group work, and the group process they have passed through to complete the task. This situation has been a prevalent problem not resolved yet (Teacher 1).

Describing the assessment challenges they faced, another teacher noted:

The assessment of cooperative group work is a daunting task. Teachers assess the group product and offer the same marks regardless of the differences in the group. The group leader in most occasions is high achiever. The task of the group lies on the shoulder of this individual and the teacher assess the final outcome without paying attention to the process. As the result, everybody in the group will get the same mark. This situation has been a break down in the implementation of cooperative group work (Teacher 6).

As for the basic attributes behind their shortfall in assessing cooperative group works, the teachers enumerated some inadequacies and proffered elaborations that include their workloads, class size, and number of sections they teach, their training on the assessment of group work, time constraints and other related limitations. One of the interviewed teachers reported,

. . . we handle 20 and plus [class] periods a week with class size of 70 or more in most cases. We cover 4 to 5 sections... and this means we get in touch with 280 to 350 students every day. As a consequence, it will be very challenging to assess group work process and individual contribution to the group work. We offer equal marks to the group product with little or no consideration of group process and individual contribution to the group work (Teacher 2).

Other interviewed teachers also emphasized large class size and workload as major challenges in their assessment endeavor of group process and of individual contributions to the group work. The teachers reported that they could not assess group process and individual contributions either through presentation or any other formal or informal means. Consequently, they offer equal marks for all students based on the final work. It is interesting to note that class size problem (40-50 students) mentioned above was not found to be a challenge at one of the schools, Merab Abaya Secondary School.

In addition to class size and workload, teachers reported time constraint as one crucial challenge in the assessment of group work. On this issue, the interviewed teachers argued that the contents of the curriculum to be covered in an academic year are too vast. Due to this, in most cases, they said they were always in a race against time, short of time to assess each and every group work group process and individual contribution.

The other challenge teachers reported include inadequacy of their expertise on the assessment of cooperative group work, and inadequacy of their students' knowledge and experiences of peer and self-assessment, although there are variations among senior and junior students. Teachers, therefore, found it difficult to involve students as they should in assessing group process and individual contribution to the group work. The teachers reported that they had not taken any staff development or continuous professional development courses on assessment of cooperative group work. They reported inadequate assessment skills to inhibit group work assessment practices.

Focus Group Discussion Analysis

The focus group discussions with students on group work assessment corroborated teachers' feelings about challenges they faced in the assessment endeavors. There was a consensus among them that unwillingness of all group members to participate and contribute proportionally if not equally remains a prevailing problem in group work. They all deplored the fact that the unwilling/reluctant students are beneficiaries of marks equal to what the other contributing and hardworking members earned for their efforts. A discussant underlined the situation as follow:

The majority of the group members are reluctant to participate and contribute their best to the group work. The group leaders will do the entire works. Group leaders shoulder the group burden and responsibility. The majority of students are reluctant; yet, they favor

group work and its assessment as they are beneficiaries of equal group marks with little or no contribution.

Concerning the effects of long-time friendship among group members on assessment and the lack of teacher support and follow up of group work, a FGD participant who has been a group leader for long time reported,

I have been group leader for long time. The group leaders used to report the levels of the group members involvement and the amount of individual contribution to the group work. The reports we give are not genuine in most cases. We used to report as if everybody did his/her best to the group work due to long time friendship among members of the group and the influence of free riders on us. In addition, there is no sufficient support and follow up of the group work from the sides of the teachers. The teachers, on most occasions, offer the same equal marks on the basis of our wrong reports.

Discussing the effect of non-contributing group members on the group work, the discussants emphasized that group leaders tended to shoulder the responsibility of the groups, ending up doing the entire work with little or no contributions to the group work from the rest of the members. Yet, teachers give equal marks to all members without distinction. The discussants unanimously affirmed that the consequence of this unfairness and of the over burdening of group leaders was that the group leaders and the bright students are discouraged. They consequently are declining to do their best in group work assignments.

Although students are only rarely involved in the assessment of group work, the FGD discussants reported that when they participated, it was not on the strength of a prior orientation or experiences of group work assessment. They averred that they had no peer and self-assessment skills for assessing their peers and for awarding marks for individual contributions to the group works.

Discussion and Conclusions

The data acquired from teachers through questionnaire and interview confirmed a number of challenges that have been ascribed to the assessment of cooperative group work in the literature and are therefore consistent with conclusions, for example, in works by Le, Janssen & Wubbels (2018) and Ross & Rolheiser (2003). These include time constraints and workloads challenges. While the results from the questionnaire indicated that Ethiopian teachers are familiar with group work

assessment techniques, the teachers nonetheless reported that they found it difficult in practice to assess and weigh group processes. The questionnaire result also show that teachers are unclear and ambivalent about a number of other group assessment items, including, 'sufficiency of training to assess group work', 'certainty of what should be assessed', and 'ability of assessing individual contribution' items of the group work. What was very clear from the interview results was that teachers have difficulty in assessing group process and individual contribution to the group work. The results show that they had inadequate skills for the assessment of cooperative group work. Consequently, the assessment done by the teachers was on group work product for which they give the same grade to all the students regardless of the differences in individual contribution to the tasks.

This implies that the participant teachers did not have adequate skills for the assessment of group work process and evaluation of individual student contribution to the group work, methods of group work assessment, nor were they even certain on what should be assessed. All these findings agree with and confirm previous works and observations on CL assessments by Le, Janssen & Wubbels (2018), Ross & Rolheiser (2003), and on many teachers been uncertain and ambiguous on the content and methods of group work assessment (Frykedal & Chiriack, 2011; Gillies & Boyle, 2010; Ross & Rolheiser, 2003).

The other important challenge the interviews identified in the assessment of cooperative group work was the distrust teachers had of students' peer and self- assessment. Consequent to this, teachers rarely involve students in the assessment and only in a limited way. While the literature suggests that peer and self-assessments provide good opportunities for assessment of group work process and of individual contribution to the group work, this study shows that students require to be educated on the processes involved in the assessment of group work and should be provided with clear assessment rubrics. This will help to obviate or reduce teachers' doubt of student peer and self- assessment and decrease their tendency to thereby assess only the group product and offer equal marks to all group members irrespective of individual contribution (Le, Janssen & Wubbels, 2018).

The problem of how to manage for free riders remains a very difficult one. Results from both questionnaires and interviews identify the free riders' effect as a top challenge for the optimal function of the CL group and the assessments of its work. From students' perspective, the support

and follow up by teachers were insufficient, a factor said to adversely affect their peer assessment of cooperative group work.

On the surface, the data obtained from students through questionnaire and FGD contradicted each other on some assessment challenges in the assessment endeavor of cooperative group work. Thus, the results from questionnaire implied a neutral level of concern by the students on the effect of a lack of proper peer evaluation of non-contributing (free rider) students, on insufficiency of training, and on lack of experience on peer assessment. This would seem to be caused by students not wanting to expose the wrong they did by assessing each other high marks regardless of non-equal contributions to group work. However, results from FGD revealed that most group members tended to leave the bulk of group work to group leaders because they realized that they would earn the same mark even without them contributing to the work. The consequence of this unfair workload and assessment marks distribution was that group leaders and the brilliant students began to reduce the quality of their contribution. It is therefore evident that the effect of the lack of proper management of non-contributing members to student group work constituted a major problem to the group. The results are consonant with early works which showed that among the obstacles to the assessment of cooperative group work were students' resentment of the lack of fairness in assessment due the lack of management of non-contributing peers (Davis, 2009; Ross & Rolheiser, 2003) and the absent or inadequate training on peer and self-assessments (Galton, Hargreaves & Pell, 2009; Kutnick et al., 2005).

Recommendations

In view of the challenges in the assessment of cooperative group work, the SNNPRS and district education bureaus should organize on-the-job training on the assessment of cooperative group work for teachers to overcome or minimize its challenges. Similarly, teachers should educate students on and involve them in the assessment of their own learning via self- and peer assessments. In addition, teacher education institutions should revamp the group work assessment component in their curricula to appropriately equip teachers with the requisite skills while they are being prepared for going out into the field.

References

Abiy, Y. (2015). Students' Perception and Practice of Writing through Peer-led Learning (PLL) at

- Baloche, L. & Brody, C. M. (2017). Cooperative learning: Exploring challenges, crafting innovations. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 43(3), 274-283.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2017.1319513>
- Berhanu, Y. (2013). *Teachers' knowledge, attitude and practice of cooperative learning; the case of Alamata town administration second cycle primary schools*. Unpublished M.A thesis: AAU.
- Brody, C. (1998). The significance of teacher beliefs for professional development and cooperative learning. In C. Brody & N. Davidson (Eds.), *Professional development for cooperative learning: Issues and approaches* (pp.25-48). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Casal, S. (2016). Cooperative Assessment for Learning in CLIL Contexts. *Estudios Sobre Education*, 31, 139-157. DOI: 10.15581/004.31.139-157
- Davies, M. (2009). Group work as a form of assessment: common problems and recommended solutions. *Higher Education*, 58, 563–584 DOI 10.1007/s10734-009-9216-y
- Feyisa, M. & Simeret, K. (2018). The Roles of a Peer-Led Collaborative Learning Approach in Ethiopian Secondary Schools. *Bahir Dar Journal of Education*, 18(2), 98-116.
- Frykedal, K. F., & Chiriach, E. H. (2011). Assessment of students' learning when working in groups. *Educational Research*, 53, 331–345.
- Galton, M., Hargreaves, L., & Pell, T. (2009). Group work and whole-class teaching with 11- to 14-year-olds compared. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39, 119–140.
- Gillies, R., & Boyle, M. (2010). Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 933–940.
- Gupta, L. (2004). Enhancing student performance through cooperative learning in physical sciences. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29, 63-73.
- Hana, Y. (2015). *Teachers' and students' attitudes towards cooperative learning in selected primary schools in bole sub city, Addis Ababa*. Unpublished M.A thesis: AAU.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2002). Learning together and alone: overview and meta-analysis. *Asia*

- Pacific Journal of Education*, 22, 95-105.
- Koutrouba, K., Kariotaki, M., & Christopoulos, I. (2012). Secondary education students' preferences regarding their participation in group work: The case of Greece. *Improving Schools*, 15, 245–259
- Koutselini, M. (2009). Teacher misconceptions and understanding of cooperative learning: An intervention study. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 43(2), 34-44.
- Kutnick, P., Sebba, J., Blatchford, P., Galton, M., Thorp, J., MacIntyre, H., & Berdondini, L. (2005). *The effects of pupil grouping: Literature review (Research Report 688)*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Le, H., Janssen, J., & Wubbels, T. (2018). Collaborative learning practices: teacher and student perceived obstacles to effective student collaboration, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(1), 103-122, DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2016.1259389
- Liang, T. (2002). *Implementing Cooperative Learning in EFL Teaching: Process and Effects* (Doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan Normal University). [Online] Available: <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/>
- McManus, S. M., & Gettinger, M. (1996). Teacher and student evaluations of cooperative learning and observed interactive behaviors. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(1), 13-22.
- Muhammed, K. (2012). Cooperative Learning Practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 3(11). www.ijsr.net
- Peek, L. E., Winking, C., & Peek, G. S. (1995). Cooperative learning activities: Managerial accounting. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 10(1), 111-126.
- Paul, E. K., & Ralph, R. B. (2005). *Problems Associated with Evaluating Student Performance in Groups*. *College Teaching*, 53(2): 57-61. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27559221>

- Ross, J., & Rolheiser, C. (2003). Student assessment practice in co-operative learning. In R., M. Gillies & A., F. Ashman (Eds.), *Co-operative learning. The social and intellectual outcomes of learning in groups*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Sharan, Y. (2010). Cooperative learning for academic and social gains: Valued pedagogy, problematic practice. *European Journal of Education*, 45, 300-310.
- Slavin, R. (1996). Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 43–69.
- Stefani, L. (1998). Assessment in partnership with learners. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(4), 339-350.
- Topping, K. J., Buchs, C., Duran, D. & Van Keer, H. (2017). *Effective peer learning: From principles to practical implementation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Valente, L. (2018). CO-LAB Guidelines for Assessing Collaborative Learning in the Classroom. Brussels: European School net. Available at <http://colab.eun.org/>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Webb, N. M. (1994). Group collaboration in assessment: competing objectives processes and outcomes. *Technical Report 386*. CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles.
- Wondwosan, T. (2008). *Assessment of the Oral Group Lesson in 'English for Ethiopia. Grade Seven. In: Promoting CL*. Unpublished M.A thesis: AAU.
- Zelege, T. & Tsega, M. (2015). A Study on the Practices of Cooperative Language Learning Method: Enango High School Grade 9 in Focus. *STAR Journal*, 4(2): 278-287 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/star.v4i2.39>