Journal of Innovative and Creativity
Journal Homepage: https://joecy.org/index.php/joecy
e-mail: journaljoecy@gmail.com

Faculty of Education
University of Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai
ISSN 2775-771X (Online)
ISSN 2962-570X (Printed)
6 (2) 2026, Page: 27503-27510

Exploring the Use of Self-Designed Analytic Rubrics in Academic Speaking Assessment

Khairul Azmi[1], Nur Aisyah Zulkifli[2]

[1,2]Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: 22590814644@students.uin-suska.ac.id, nur'aisyah.zulkifli@uin-suska.ac.id

Published: Mei, 2026

ABSTRACT

In academic speaking assessment, evaluation criteria are conventionally designed by instructors with limited student involvement, making the assessment criteria undear to students. Consequently, this lack of engagement diminishes learners' sense of responsibility, elevates performance anxiety and cognitive load during complex oral presentations. Therefore, this study aims to explore the effectiveness and practicality of utilizing a self-designed analytic rubric to support these cognitive and affective barriers in public speaking tasks. This study employed a mixed-methods case study design with a dominant qualitative approach. The primary participant was a university-level EFL student delivering an extensive speaking monologue. Nine assessors, comprising one supervising lecturer and eight peer raters, concurrently evaluated the oral performance using a student-constructed rubric consist four domains: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. Quantitative score matrices were processed using descriptive statistics, while qualitative data were gathered via a Post-Presentation Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and analyzed through systematic thematic coding. The quantitative findings show that the speaker achieved a "Good" proficiency level with a cumulative mean score of 87.2, where fluency emerged as the primary asset (88.8) and grammar received the lowest score (86.0) due to intense real time cognitive multi-tasking. Qualitatively, the FGD interactions validated that co-constructing the criteria significantly optimized assessment transparency, clarified standard expectations, and lowered the speaker's affective filter. This study shows that using student-centered assessment tools does not only measure language skills; it also serves as a practical guide that helps the student feel more secure, autonomous, and reflective during public speaking tasks.

Keywords: *Self-designed rubric, Academic speaking, Learner-centered assessment, Case study, Focus Group Discussion*

© The Author(s). 2021 Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Atibution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

INTRODUCTION

Assessment and evaluation play a central role in language education, especially in shaping the way students understand learning objectives and monitor their own progress (Oya, 2024; Wenjie Zeng et al., 2018: Ghafar et al., 2025). In the context of speaking, assessments are not only used to measure learners' performance, but also to guide their preparation, use of strategies, and self-awareness (Alfianti, 2022). However, in many classroom practices, assessment criteria are often designed entirely by teachers with limited student involvement (Kizys et al., 2025). As a result, students often think of as a final assessment, rather than a meaningful part of the learning process. This can reduce their ability to prepare effectively and reflect on their own performance.

One of the tools used in speaking assessment is rubrics (Nguyet & Huong). which plays an important role in shaping educational assessments, providing clear criteria for teaching and learning (Panadero et al., 2025). The design and implementation of rubrics are critical to their educational success (Panadero & Jonsson 2020). A well-structured rubric can increase transparency, consistency,

and fairness in assessment (Riyawi & Zulhiddah, 2025). More importantly, rubrics can help students understand what is expected of them and how their performance will be evaluated (Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, 2019). Despite these benefits, previous practices tend to position students as passive recipients of rubrics, rather than as active contributors to their draftin(Ghafar et al., 2025)g (Nathan et al., 2017). This lack of engagement can limit students' deeper cognitive engagement with assessment criteria and reduce their sense of responsibility of the learning process.

Current perspectives in language assessment emphasize the importance of a learner centered approach including self-assessment, because it is an important learning practice that students use to monitor and improve learning (Yan & Carless, 2022). Involving students in developing their own assessment criteria has the potential to improve metacognitive awareness, as learners are required to think critically about what constitutes effective performance. By designing their own speaking rubrics, students can develop a clearer understanding of performance standards, which in turn can affect how they prepare for speaking tasks.

This process aligns with cognitive speech production and task performance models (Levelt, 1989; Skehan, 1998), which state that executing extensive oral monologues requires real-time management of conceptual planning, linguistic formulation, and self-monitoring. In high-stakes academic speaking, learners face constrained cognitive capacity, causing a competition for attentional resources between fluency, complexity, and grammatical accuracy (Skehan, 2014). Active co-design and internalization of assessment criteria serve as a cognitive scaffolding mechanism. This familiarity automates expectations, thereby reducing speech-processing strain and enhancing learners' sense of control (Rust et al., 2003). Conversely, externally imposed or ambiguous criteria increase cognitive load, leading to structural breakdowns and decreased confidence. Therefore, evaluating the practicality of self-designed rubrics alongside students' affective reactions is highly important to understanding how learner-centered tools buffer real-time cognitive demands.

Several recent studies have extensively investigated the implementation of rubrics in evaluating oral performance. For instance, Đorđević (2025) demonstrated that when utilized as both a preparation and assessment tool, rubrics yield valid, reliable, and replicable data for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) speaking skills. This reliability can be further optimized through detailed analytical rubrics and collaborative sessions among raters, as suggested by Limgomolvilas and Sukserm (2025). Furthermore, using rubrics allows instructors to pinpoint specific oral competencies, differentiating areas where students underperform (e.g., grammar and articulation) from those they excel in (e.g., non-verbal cues) (Khan et al., 2024).

However, conventional rubrics face several criticisms. Rouse (2024) noted that traditional public speaking assessments often place too much pressure on students and create unequal power dynamics between instructors and learners. Furthermore, Budiharso et al. (2024) revealed that many current rubrics focus only on basic comprehension and recall, rather than higher-level thinking skills. To overcome these challenges, this study uses a learner-centered approach by exploring self-designed rubrics. This approach is expected to enhance students' thinking process and lower their anxiety in academic speaking.

METHOD

Research Setting and Participants

This study employed a case study design supported by descriptive statistics. (Creswell 1997; Yin, 2018), combining a dominant qualitative approach with descriptive quantitative data to explore the implementation and practicality of a self-designed rubric in academic presentations. The study was conducted in a university-level English Foreign Language (EFL) learning environment during a formal academic presentation session. The primary subject of this case study was a single student presenter performing an extensive speaking task, categorized under the formal speaking taxonomy of Brown and Abeywickrama (2019). To gain various perspectives, the assessment involved one supervising lecturer and eight peers as raters. This approach was used to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the student's speaking performance and to see whether the student-designed rubric could be used consistently by different raters.

Data Sources and Data Collection Technique

Data were gathered from two distinct sources to enable data type triangulation: quantitative scores and qualitative spoken interactions. Quantitative data were derived from the numerical scores assigned by both the lecturer and the eight peer raters during the live academic presentation. These evaluations utilized the student-designed analytic speaking rubric, which assessed four core constructs: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. Each construct was quantified using a Likert-type rating scale ranging from Very Good to Very Poor. Concurrently, qualitative data were obtained from a semi-structured Post-Presentation Focus Group Discussion (FGD) conducted immediately after the presentation session. Moderated by the supervising lecturer, this FGD allowed the eight peer raters to actively interact, discuss, and provide collective oral feedback regarding the participant's linguistic strengths, communicative weaknesses, preparation depth, and the explicit practicality of the self-designed rubric. The entire FGD session was audio-recorded with the participants' consent for subsequent analysis.

The implementation of the data collection procedure follows four systematic stages. The first stage is the instrument design phase, where participants build an analytical rubric by synthesizing and adapting established oral descriptors from the leading language assessment literature (e.g., Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). Furthermore, at the performance stage, participants delivered academic presentations in front of the class forum. After that, at the simultaneous evaluation stage, lecturers and peer assessors simultaneously evaluate the performance directly using the rubric that has been developed. Finally, in the interactive FGD phase, as soon as the performance is over, the classroom environment transitions into a Post-Presentation Focus Group Discussion session to capture in-depth, interactive, and collaborative critiques of the presentation and clarity of the rubric instrument.

Data Analysis Procedure

The analytical framework comprised descriptive statistical analysis for quantitative metrics and thematic analysis for qualitative spoken data. The quantitative speaking scores were processed using descriptive statistics to determine the mean scores for each individual linguistic aspect, as well as the cumulative performance score. This numerical matrix provided an objective, baseline overview of how the participant's oral proficiency was rated across the self-designed criteria. For the qualitative data, the audio recordings of the Post-Presentation FGD were first meticulously transcribed verbatim. The resulting transcripts underwent a rigorous thematic analysis following the structural coding protocols of Saldaña (2014). This inductive analysis involved iterative reading of the transcripts, generation of initial codes from recurring verbal remarks, categorization of related codes, and the final crystallization of overarching themes. Consequently, four primary themes emerged and were categorized: preparation efficacy, linguistic performance, interactional competence, and rubric practicality.

Trustworthiness and Limitations

To ensure the trustworthiness, credibility, and dependability of the findings, source and method triangulation were operationalized by cross-examining the quantitative ratings against the qualitative insights generated during the Post-Presentation FGD. The multi-rater setup involving both the lecturer and peers allowed the researcher to map confluences and divergences in stakeholder perceptions, thereby minimizing individual rating bias. Furthermore, the verbatim transcription and systematic coding procedure ensured a transparent audit trail. Nevertheless, several methodological boundary conditions must be acknowledged. Because this study focused on an analytic rubric designed by a single participant within a specific institutional context, the findings lack statistical generalizability to broader EFL populations. Thus, future research should include larger sample sizes and involve multiple institutions to see if self-designed rubrics can be applied effectively in different classroom settings.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of this research began with the development of an analytic speaking rubric that was independently designed by researchers by adopting criteria from experts to assess the

performance of academic presentations. The use of the type of analytics rubric is chosen so that an in-depth assessment can be carried out on each performance component separately. The instrument covers four main aspects: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency, with a rating scale that ranges from Very Good to Very Poor. During the presentation session, the practicality of this rubric was tested in real classroom situations by involving eight peers and one lecturer as raters. The details of the assessment criteria used are presented in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Rubric of Scoring Speaking in Performance

Aspects	Scale				
	Very Good (Score 91-100)	**Good (Score 81-90)**	**Sufficient (Score 71-80)**	**Poor (Score 61-70)**	**Very Poor (Score 50-60)**
Pronunciation	Pronunciation is excellent, and L1 accent does not affect intelligibility	A few mispronunciations and L1 accents cause minimal listener distress	Few mispronunciations and L1 accents cause listener distress	Multiple mispronunciations and L1 accents cause severe listener distress	Frequent errors with pronunciation and L1 accents cause severe listener distress
Vocabulary	Perfect use of vocabulary	Rich and varied use of vocabulary	Vocabulary conveys mostly appropriate meaning; suitable for the level	Vocabulary does not convey meaning some of the time	Vocabulary does not convey meaning most of the time
Grammar	Grammar and spelling are most accurate	Grammar and spelling are accurate	Grammar and/ or spelling are mainly accurate	Grammar and/ or spelling contain errors	Grammar and/ or spelling contain frequent errors
Fluency	Speech smooth and fluent, little to no hesitations, no searching for words	Speech smooth and fluent, little to no hesitations, minor searching for words	Speech is relatively smooth, with some hesitation and unevenness caused by rephrasing and searching for words	Speaking is frequently hesitant, with some uncompleted sentences	Speak slowly, hesitantly, nervously, with continuity except for short, memorized phrases

After the above rubric instrument is determined, the assessment process is carried out during the researcher's academic presentation session. The integration of the self-designed analytic speaking rubric into the academic presentation session yielded critical metrics regarding both the presenter's oral proficiency and the instrument's classroom practicality. The operationalized rubric effectively compartmentalized the evaluation into four distinct linguistic domains: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency, utilizing a comprehensive descriptive scale. To measure cross-rater perspectives, evaluations were compiled simultaneously from one supervising lecturer and eight peer raters. The statistical distribution of the cumulative and aspect-specific scores is systematically 2 below:

Table 2. Speaking Performance Scores from Peer Reviewers and Lecturer

Aspects	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Fluency	Total Score
Peer Rater 1	80	80	78	85	323
Peer Rater 2	80	85	89	88	342
Peer Rater 3	90	92	85	89	356
Peer Rater 4	92	90	88	92	362
Peer Rater 5	95	93	95	95	378
Peer Rater 6	90	95	90	95	370
Peer Rater 7	94	92	93	94	372

Peer Rater 8	80	85	78	80	323
Lecturer	80	75	78	82	315
Average	86.7	87.4	86.0	88.8	87,22

Table 2 shows that the participant's overall speaking performance achieved a cumulative mean score of 87.2, placing it firmly within the "Good" proficiency category. Based on the assessment scores, fluency received the highest average score of 88.8, followed closely by vocabulary at 87.4 and pronunciation at 86.7. On the other hand, grammar received the lowest average score of 86.0. Despite this lower score, the student's grammar performance still fell within the 'Good' category.

The quantitative dataset also exposed a noticeable divergence in evaluative perceptions between student peers and the academic professional. The peer raters exhibited a more generous grading tendency, with individual cumulative scores spanning from 323 to 378. In contrast, the supervising lecturer demonstrated a significantly more conservative and stringent evaluative approach, assigning a total score of 315. Despite these absolute numerical variations, a high level of pattern consistency was maintained; both the lecturer and the peer cohort unanimously agreed on marking Fluency as the speaker's pinnacle performance area and grammar as the dimension requiring immediate pedagogical intervention. To further contextualize these numerical insights, a qualitative thematic analysis was performed on the transcribed data from the Post-Presentation Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The interactive dialogues and verbal arguments generated during the FGD sessions crystallized into three primary thematic categories:

1. Preparation Efficacy and Material Mastery

The discourse during the FGD highlighted a strong consensus among the raters regarding the presenter's structural readiness and cognitive command over the academic content. The participants noted that the active process of co-designing the criteria explicitly advanced the presenter's psychological state of readiness. One peer rater explicitly stated during the discussion: *"The presentation was highly organized, and your explanation was exceptionally clear. It was evident that you were well-prepared and possessed a responsibility understanding of the topic"* (FGD Transcript, 2026).

This qualitative dialogue indicates that when learners are actively engaged in constructing their own assessment parameters, they develop a predictive understanding of the performance expectations. Consequently, this preparatory alignment directly translates into heightened confidence and structured material delivery during the actual presentation. The FGD participants agreed that the transparency of the rubric allowed the presenter to map out the content logically, minimizing structural ambiguity before stepping into the classroom assembly.

2. Linguistic Constraints and Audience Interaction Dynamics

Despite the positive evaluations of material delivery, critical deliberations emerged during the FGD regarding technical grammatical precision and performance anxiety. Several peer raters pointed out that intense cognitive multi-tasking compromised structural accuracy. This concern was emphasized by a student participant who stated: *"While the ideas flowed smoothly, your spoken grammar and pronoun usage require further refinement to maintain professional academic standards"* (FGD Transcript, 2026).

Additionally, the supervising lecturer suggested that the presenter should maintain a more relaxed to reduce anxiety and engage better with the audience. The interactive arguments from this session underscore the ongoing struggle of EFL learners in managing cognitive load during long-form monologue tasks. While the presenter could maintain communicative fluency, the real-time demands of an academic presentation often cause a temporary drop in structural and grammatical precision. The feedback from both the lecturer and peers during the FGD highlighted that physical delivery and linguistic accuracy are deeply intertwined with the speaker's emotional state, suggesting that future rubric implementations should place a balanced emphasis on coping with performance anxiety.

3. Transparency and Usability of the Learner-Centered Rubric

The final part of the FGD discussed the practicality and usefulness of the self-designed rubric. The peer raters gave positive feedback, emphasizing that their involvement in discussing the criteria

made the assessment process much clearer. A comment from the group discussion highlighted this transparency: *"The descriptors inside the rubric were incredibly precise and clear, which significantly simplified the grading process and allowed us to assign objective marks without confusion"* (FGD Transcript, 2026).

This agreement indicates that involving students in rubric design improve collaborative learning of the assessment tool fundamentally changes the classroom dynamic. By involving peers in the design phase, the rubric changes from a teacher-imposed checklist into a shared roadmap. The FGD participants noted that having clear, pre-determined criteria helped them act as objective evaluators, which significantly reduced the subjective bias often found in peer grading.

Discussion

Practicality and Transparency of the Self-Designed Rubric

The findings of this investigation robustly validate that empowering student to design their own analytical rubrics substantially increases transparency within oral communicative assessments. The high quantitative marks observed in Fluency (88.8) and Vocabulary (87.4) directly correspond with the collaborative consensus from the Post-Presentation FGD affirming the clarity of the descriptors. By breaking down oral performance into isolated, explicit components, the analytic rubric proved to be highly practical, allowing non-expert peer raters to evaluate complex linguistic outputs seamlessly. This enhanced transparency aligns with the assertions of Riyawi and Zulhiddah (2025), who argued that a collaboratively constructed rubric serves as an explicit, improve collaborative learning. pedagogical roadmap for learners. Furthermore, as demonstrated by Đorđević (2025), utilizing a structured rubric as a dual-purpose tool for both front-end presentation preparation and back-end performance assessment yields valid, reliable, and highly replicable data within rigorous EAP speaking contexts.

Classification of Academic Presentations as Extensive Speaking Tasks

Analyzing these outcomes requires contextualization within established language taxonomies, specifically the frameworks articulated by Brown and Abeywickrama (2019). The academic presentation delivered in this study is accurately categorized as an Extensive Speaking (Monologue) task. In contrast to interactive oral tasks, extensive speaking involves prolonged monologues with no immediate feedback from the audience. Since this task requires formal planning and a high level of independence, the speaker must fully manage the presentation structure. Consequently, involving the student in drafting the rubric is highly important; matching the preparation criteria with the final evaluation guidelines helps the learner effectively handle complex academic speaking tasks.

Metacognitive Awareness and Cognitive Load Limits

From a cognitive perspective, designing the assessment criteria together encourages better self-regulation. However, the fact that grammar received the lowest score (86.0) highlights a common psychological phenomenon: the heavy cognitive load experienced by EFL learners. Students often struggle to balance grammatical accuracy with fluency during formal public speaking tasks. This difficulty is consistent with Khan et al. (2024), who observed that grammatical precision often drops when students are overwhelmed by the demands of speaking delivery. Nevertheless, as noted by Budiharso et al. (2024), knowing the explicit criteria beforehand helps reduce this cognitive strain, enabling the student to manage the presentation well and maintain an overall performance in the 'Good' category.

Affective Alignment and Learner Empowerment

Finally, the positive shifts in the presenter's affective domain constitute a critical breakthrough in this study. The qualitative interactions recorded during the FGD consistently illustrated that the presenter exuded confidence and strategic control during the presentation. This confidence comes from the student's increased responsibility in the assessment process. As brilliantly articulated by Rust et al. (2003), granting students a deep, active comprehension of their assessment criteria effectively dismantles traditional power imbalances, empowering them with a genuine sense of agency over their educational outcomes. Consequently, participating in the rubric design process lowered the speaker's affective filter and diminished speech anxiety, because the criteria for success were transparently understood beforehand. These results strongly reinforce the findings of Limgomolvilas and Suksem

(2025), which concluded that detailed analytical tools coupled with collaborative rater involvement engagement psychological safety and comfort in oral assessments. The transparency of this learner-centered framework provides an indestructible emotional and cognitive foundation, successfully transforming language assessment into an instrument of ultimate learner empowerment.

CONCLUSIONS

This case study indicates that developing and implementing a self-designed analytic rubric can change the speaking assessment process into a more collaborative experience. By involving the EFL student in determining the evaluation criteria for the extensive speaking task, this approach helps clarify the grading expectations. The quantitative and qualitative findings show that a clear understanding of the assessment criteria helps the student prepare more systematically and master the presentation material, while also boosting confidence during the delivery. Furthermore, this study offers practical insights into how students manage their speaking performance. Involving the student in the rubric design fosters better self-evaluation, which is essential for complex speaking tasks. Although extensive speaking still imposes a heavy cognitive load as shown by the grammatical difficulties during the presentation the clear criteria help the learner maintain a good overall performance. This collaborative assessment process also helps reduce presentation anxiety by making the evaluation more transparent and predictable.

REFERENCES

Alfianti, M. (2022). the Implementation of Self-Assessment in Efl Student'S Speaking Performance. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature (JELTL)*, *5*(2), 103–116. https://doi.org/10.47080/jeltl.v5i2.2043

Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019). Language Assessment Principles And Classroom Practies

Budiharso, T., Solikhah, I., Armadi, S., & Wandana, R. (2024). Using Bloom's Taxonomy in Rubrics for Assessing Writing and Speaking Skills. *Novitas-ROYAL*, *18*(2), 146–159. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13860992

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.http://www.revistacomunicacion.org/pdf/n3/resenas/research%5C_design%5C_qualitative%5C_quantitative%5C_and%5C_mixed%5C_methods%5C_approaches.pdf

Đorđević, J. (2025). Rubrics in the Assessment of Eap Speaking Skills Supported By Mobile Assisted Language Learning. *ESP Today*, *13*(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2025.13.1.5

Ghafar, Z. N., Hazaymeh, O. M.-A. A., Raheem, B. R., & Anjum, F. (2025). Evaluating English language skills: The role of formative and student-centered assessments in language learning. *Journal of Language and Pragmatics Studies*, *4*(2), 94–106. https://doi.org/10.58881/jlps.v4i2.122

Haqnawaz, H., Naeem, N. & Khan, S. (2024). Complexities of English: a Study of Grammar, Vocabulary, and Pronunciation. *Kashf Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *1*(11), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.71146/kjmr118

Kizys, D. N., Lotter, C., Perez, L., Gilreath, R., & Limberg, D. (2025). Integrating community assets, place-based learning, and career development through project-based learning in rural settings. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*(May). https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1577093

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. MIT Press.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1993). The architecture of normal spoken language use. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *10*(2), 121–135.

Limgomolvilas, S., & Sukserm, P. (2025). Examining Rater Reliability When Using an Analytical Rubric for Oral Presentation Assessments. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *18*(1), 110–134. https://doi.org/10.70730/JQGY9980

Maxwell, J. (2014). Designing a Qualitative Study. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research*

Methods, 214–253. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483348858.n7
Nguyet, D., T. & Huong, L., T. (2023). *Students,' Perceptions on Using Rubric s as a Peer and Self-Assesment Tool in EFL Speaking Courses* (pp. 119–136). International Journal of TESOL &Education. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.23337
Nathan, S. S., Berahim, M., & Ramle, R. (2017). Rubric for measuring psychomotor and affective learning domain. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *25*(May), 101–108.
Oya, A. (2024). Evaluation of Assessment Projects in English Language Education: A Bibliometric Review. *ASEAN Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, *3*(3), 255–266.
Panadero, E., Fernández Ortube, A., Krebs, R., & Roelle, J. (2025). Analysis of online rubric platforms: advancing toward erubrics. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *50*(1), 31–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2345657
Riyawi, M., R. & Zulhiddah. (2025). *CONTENT ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH ASSESSMENT RUBRICS USED IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS RELIABILITY , TRANSPARENCY , AND*. *14*(4), 4359–4367.
Rouse, M. N. (2024). Basic Communication Course Annual Basic Communication Course Annual Assessment "ResponsAbilities" in the Basic Course: Evaluating Assessment "ResponsAbilities" in the Basic Course: Evaluating Public Speaking Rubrics Public Speaking Rubrics. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, *36*, 5.
Rust, C., Price, M., Donovan, B. O., & Brookes, O. (2003). their Understanding of Assessment Criteria. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *28*(2), 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293032000045509
Saldaña, J. (2014). Coding and Analysis Strategies. In *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Number April). https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.001
Skehan, P. (2014). *Limited attentional capacity and the trade-offs between fluency, accuracy, and complexity in second language speaking*. Routledge.
Thanh Xuan Phan, H. Y. P. (2017). *using analytical.pdf* (pp. 34–39). IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME). https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0703043439
Yan, Z., & Carless, D. (2022). Self-assessment is about more than self: the enabling role of feedback literacy. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(7), 1116–1128. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2001431
Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
Zeng, W., Huang, F., Lu Yu, S. C. (2018). *Towards a learning-oriented assessment to improve.pdf* (pp. 211–250). Educ Asse Eval Acc. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-018-9281-9