A peer reviewed, open-access electronic journal: ISSN 1531-7714

Assessing the Impact of Self-Evaluation Rubrics on Participation: Creating Equity and Empathy in the Classroom

Andrew Shepherd Nelson, *Yachay Tech University*
Sophia Louise Cadoux, *Yachay Tech University*
Josephine S. Javens, *Yachay Tech University*

Abstract: Grading classroom participation is a common practice in educational institutions, yet it is problematic. This is especially true in English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, which often involve multiple cultures. In marking class participation, language teachers rely on judgements which can be subjective, culturally biased, or unfair to students from non-Western backgrounds. Despite the prevalence of class participation assessment and grading, this practice remains underinvestigated. This study explores how a structured self-evaluation rubric can support equitable grading and promote culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) and assessment (CRA). Over eight weeks, 39 undergraduate EFL students at a public university in Ecuador used a self-evaluation rubric to assess their class participation. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire and follow-up interviews and statistically analyzed. The analysis of the data indicated that students supported the use of self-evaluation rubrics (RQ1) and described them as clear, fair, and beneficial. Further, self-evaluation rubrics provided opportunities for students to identify factors influencing their classroom engagement (RQ2), and students reported that their participation improved because of regular self-evaluation (RQ3). By incorporating CRP and CRA principles into ESL and EFL classrooms, language educators can create environments that support diverse learners' growth, agency, and belongingness.

Keywords: Classroom participations, Inclusive and culturally responsive assessment, Culturally responsive teaching, Digital self-evaluation rubrics, Student voice and self-assessment, Action research in EFL, English as a foreign language

Introduction

Class participation is paramount in language classrooms as it demonstrates student interaction with the material. 'Participation', according to The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 2012), can be interpretive, presentational, or interpersonal, which correspond to receptive skills,

productive skills, and spoken or written interactions with others, respectively. It is hotly debated by second language acquisition (SLA) theorists which of these forms of participation lead to greater learning, but even theorists that emphasize input over output recognize the importance of meaningful interactions for second language acquisition. Communication, the exchange and negotiation of meaning, helps us create implicit systems that are the base of second language acquisition. If tasks are designed so that output is communicative and meaningful (not just another form of grammar and/or vocabulary practice), and spur real engagement (vs. forced participation), then speaking activities are valuable. According to VanPatten (2015), communication involves the learners' engagement in tasks where language use serves a purposeful, meaning-oriented function rather than form-focused production. If students only speak to earn a participation grade, such participation becomes compliance rather than genuine communication.

The importance of all types of participation in the English language classroom cannot and should not be diminished as they are all necessary for students to become proficient users of the language, yet interpersonal engagement gains importance in classes that apply the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach (as many do to varying degrees). CLT, born from a rejection of rote grammar and vocabulary learning, underscores the need for student-centered language classrooms aimed at improving learners' cultural and communicative competence. Under this widely used framework, class objectives are aimed at fostering student ability to interact in authentic target language contexts rather than, for example, measuring their accuracy when conjugating verbs. Although CLT has drawbacks if not supported by explicit grammar and vocabulary teaching, "the consensus remains that CLT fosters higher levels of engagement and interaction in the classroom" (Salam & Luksfinanto, 2024, p.66). Added benefits of CLT include growth in student communication abilities, autonomy, critical thinking skills, and problem-solving skills (Qasserras, 2023), leading to both its popularity and, given its student-centered and communicative nature, an emphasis on interpersonal participation.

Communicating in the target language via interpersonal exchanges is an opportunity which many students may not otherwise have outside of the language classroom; for many, it is the main environment in which they can interact with others in the target language (L2) by taking part in activities that mirror real-world communication (Ding, 2021, p.1). Consequently, students who participate in peer and class discussions show greater language development and confidence (Nguyen, 2020). These details underscore the importance of communicative class participation for foreign language students.

Class participation has been shown to benefit learning. For example, students who participate in class show improved academic performance (Márquez et al. 2023; Akpur, 2021; Kinley & Pradhan, 2022; Turner & Patrick, 2004; Deslauriers et al., 2019). In essence, 'participation' shows 'engagement' with the learning process and the classroom environment (Márquez et al. 2023). While class participation is often graded, the performance and evaluation of class participation is often mediated by culture, which can create certain problems. This is especially relevant in EFL and ESL courses, which are often spaces of multicultural interaction. In these classrooms, students' diverse cultural backgrounds shape how they participate (Losey, 1995), and the teacher's cultural background shapes how he/she perceives students' participation. When a teacher does not share the same cultural background as the learners, the teacher's cultural biases can lead to inaccurate and unfair evaluations of class participation (especially for historically underrepresented students). The cultural background of students has been shown to induce bias in teachers when it comes to grading (Burgess & Greaves, 2013). Ingrained Western cultural expectations, such as being vocal in class, asking and answering questions, making comments, and participating in discussions (Vandrick, 2000) might be unclear or counterintuitive to students from other cultures; Western teachers may consider these students to be lazy or unprepared, and they may be less "visible" to these teachers (Rassuli & Manzer, 2005). These students, whose participation behavior does not match the teacher's expectations, may in fact be following different cultural norms regulating interactions with authority figures; this can lead to unfair penalization of these students' behavior (Ahmed et al., 2022; Zhao & Xu, 2022). For example, many Afghan students feel that

their upbringing prevents them from speaking confidently in front of authority figures such as elders (Atifnigar et al., 2023). In Singapore, where Confucianism emphasizes the value of humility and respect for authority figures, students may see speaking in class as challenging authority (Goh et al., 2025). Understanding student interactions in language classes through a cultural lens is, therefore, necessary to correctly interpret behavior and support students' participation in class.

Beyond cultural variables, the evaluation of class participation is further complicated by factors such as a teachers' lack of knowledge about how to improve their students' participation, the subjectivity and complexity of interpreting student behavior, the influence of students' personalities on the way they participate, record-keeping challenges, and teachers' difficulty justifying participation scores for a given individual if challenged (Jacobs & Chase, 1992, as cited in Bean & Peterson, 1998).

Though class participation has great value and grading it is often mandatory, it is problematic. Therefore, a solution is needed to address the factors, both cultural and practical, that complicate the evaluation of class participation. The solution should mitigate potential cultural biases and solve other difficulties, while promoting fairness and inclusion in the classroom, especially for historically underrepresented students. The purpose of this paper is to suggest such a solution. It aims to demonstrate how applying culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) through culturally responsive assessment (CRA) in the form of a student self-evaluation rubric can lead to more inclusive and equitable assessment practices for class participation, addressing many of the limitations, both cultural and practical, inherent in traditional approaches to grading class participation.

Before turning to the literature review, however, it is necessary to clarify how key concepts are defined and used throughout this paper. The following section ensures that prior research and pedagogical approaches are interpreted with these definitions in mind.

Key Terms and Caveats

To ensure clarity and avoid ambiguity, this section defines how key terms are used throughout the paper. These definitions establish the conceptual boundaries of the study and provide a shared vocabulary for interpreting subsequent discussions.

Educational assessment is a procedure for making inferences about student learning (Black & William, 2018). How learners engage in tasks and perform on assessment instruments generates data for teachers about the extent to which learning goals have been achieved and can guide pedagogical decisions. Within educational practice, assessment is commonly classified as formative or summative.

Summative assessment is used to evaluate student learning at the *end* of learning (Hopfenbeck et al., 2023), for example, an exam or project that students complete at the end of a course or program. The purpose of summative assessment is to certify achievement. Contrasted with formative assessment, summative assessment tends to be high stakes, formally graded, and product oriented, such as a capstone project or thesis.

Grading refers to the summative process of "evaluating individual pieces of students' work...to determine their overall grades for a longer period" (Normann et al., 2023, p.1), usually expressed numerically in points or percentages.

Self-evaluation is used to describe students' reflective appraisal of their own learning or behavior. The literature also refers to this process as *self-assessment* (Andrade, 2019; Wiliam, 1998), but for clarity, this article will use the term **self-evaluation.** Some researchers (Black & William, 1998) state that the process itself falls into formative assessment; however, the self-evaluation implemented in this study functioned within a summative assessment context, as it contributed to students' course grades.

Participation is operationalized as students' in-class engagement through listening and speaking during interpersonal exchanges with their peers. This is the most visible and commonly graded form of engagement in the EFL and ESL classroom.

These definitions establish a conceptual foundation for this study. However, it is important to acknowledge the broader debates, critiques, and limitations surrounding some of these terms, particularly the role of grading and assessment on student motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes. The following section clarifies the scope of this study in relation to those debates.

Caveats

Various voices have questioned the value of grading. Some scholars have found that number or letter grades fail to measure learning adequately (Sadler 2014; Schinske & Tanner 2014). Others point out the negative effects of using grades to motivate learners, as grades can enhance anxiety and cause students to avoid challenging classes (Chamberlin et al., 2023). Additionally, grading can undermine intrinsic motivation by steering students away from genuine learning because grades often encourage competition, stress, and superficial learning rather than promoting deeper, more meaningful engagement with the material (Kjærgaard et al., 2024). Some researchers suggest gradeless learning or grade-free learning policies (McMorran et al., 2017). On the other hand, grades can be useful because they signal which activities are worth students' time and effort (Konstantinou, 2022; Mammadova, 2023). This study does not attempt to promote a positive or negative view on grading; rather it seeks ways of making participation grading more culturally responsive within an English-learning context in which grading is already mandatory. As grading is common in conventional educational institutions (Schneider & Hutt, 2014), the findings of this study are better applied in such contexts.

Literature Review

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP) is a framework that calls for teachers to affirm students' cultural identities and challenge inequitable social structures (Ladson-Billings, 1995a). It involves "using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively" (Gay, 2002, p. 106) or "as a vehicle for learning" (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p.161). In ESL and EFL contexts, CRP can provide guidance to align class participation expectations with students' cultural norms and prior experiences (Senyshyn & Martinelli, 2021).

Culturally Responsive Assessment and Student Self-Evaluation

Extending CRP principles into evaluation, Culturally Responsive Assessment (CRA) emphasizes the alignment of grading, feedback, and participation criteria with learners' cultural backgrounds and ways of demonstrating knowledge (Hood, 1998; Gay, 2018, Guri-Rosenblit, 2019). CRA is critical because the communication styles and interaction norms of multicultural students may diverge from Western-centric expectations, which can lead to biased judgments of students' abilities (Ojochegbe, 2024; Steele et al., 2024).

CRA strategies include co-constructing assessment criteria with students, engaging in open dialogue about evaluation practices (Montenegro & Jankowski, 2017; Nieminen, 2022), and designing tasks that reflect students' identities, beliefs, and values (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Walker et al., 2023). Such approaches encourage autonomy and align with students' identity, beliefs, and values (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Walker et al., 2023). By grounding assessments in students' cultural realities, CRA can transform evaluation from a gatekeeping mechanism into a vehicle for equality and empowerment.

Student self-evaluation (SSE) can be implemented as a successful CRA practice. SSE is a student-centered practice (Tavakoli, 2010) in which "students reflect on and evaluate the quality of their work and their learning, judge the degree to which they [have met] explicitly stated goals or criteria, identify strengths and weaknesses in their work, and revise accordingly" (Andrade & Du, 2007, p.160). SSE or student self-assessment (SSA), as it is often referred to in the literature, is an area of research that continues to grow (Brown & Harris, 2013; Brown et al., 2015; Panadero et al., 2016; Andrade, 2019). Self-evaluation aligns well with CRA as it involves students directly in assessment, thus dismantling potential unequal, culturally-based power structures in the classroom; furthermore, SSE provides clear learning benefits, as the repeated use of self-evaluation may enhance students' ability to assess their own work as they improve self-regulated learning skills (Panadero et al., 2016). Furthermore, SSE, especially when repeated over time, aligns well with Walker et al.'s (2023) principle that CRA should be understood as a dynamic and flexible process that provides students with multiple opportunities to revise, reflect, and demonstrate growth over time. In this way SSE can support equity-oriented assessment practices that enhance engagement and a sense of belonging for students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Research on SSE has traditionally focused on its validity and reliability, particularly by examining how closely students' self-evaluation scores correspond to teacher-assigned grades. Studies in higher education have also shown that university students understand the purpose and function of self-evaluation (Ratminingsih et al., 2018), and other research has shown that self-evaluation can foster self-regulated skills (Wang, 2017), leading students to take responsibility for their learning (Ndoye, 2017). SSE may thus have significant pedagogical value.

Student Self-evaluation and Rubrics

Rubrics can play an essential role in SSE as a CRA (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007). Traditionally, rubrics are used to help teachers grade students' work more efficiently and to justify scores (Andrade, 2000). Rubrics are especially valuable for grading writing and speaking skills, which are more difficult to measure and quantify than listening and reading skills and discrete grammar and vocabulary knowledge (Lane & Tierney, 2008; Sadler, 2009). Likewise, when well-designed, rubrics help reduce subjectivity in participation grading (Chhetri, 2020), helping students to feel that grades are assigned fairly, in addition to helping students identify strengths and weaknesses and providing them with actionable feedback. Moreover, rubrics can help convey expectations explicitly to students through clearly defined criteria, which is essential when cultural differences between teachers and students can make expectations hard to guess.

In the same way that rubrics facilitate grading for teachers, rubrics help students evaluate themselves by making the process of SSE clearer and more objective by providing the necessary scaffolding through clearly stated criteria. Without rubrics, students may not know what factors constitute successful or unsuccessful performance. Thus, self-evaluation rubrics can be used within the CRA framework due to their potential for clarity, equity, flexibility, increased engagement, and scaffolding.

Research Gap and Research Questions

This study seeks to propose SSE rubrics as a culturally responsive solution to the problems of class participation evaluation. The study is designed as action research (AR) and is grounded in theory on CRP and CRA. The research gap that this study intends to fill is the lack of action research related to SSE as a CRA practice. Although there are many articles on SSE as a theoretical practice that aligns with CRP, there are very few action research studies on this topic. White (2009) conducted a study regarding the use of a self-evaluation procedure on class participation in an EFL class at a university in Tokyo. The author found that the self-evaluation procedure had a positive impact on the students' class participation. In a Canadian context, Anyichie et al. (2023) explored how CRP and self-regulated learning can enhance elementary student engagement. Anyichie et al. (2023) mention the need to study SSE in other cultural contexts and with older

students, who may have a better understanding of their culture. The researchers also call for the analysis of particular groups of students, and not only student perceptions in general. Our study addresses these suggestions.

In addition to a general gap in AR related to CRP and self-evaluation, there are also local gaps specific to the EFL classroom. Although some published studies on self-evaluation have been conducted in Latin America (Mercado López & Escudero-Nahón, 2025; Swaffield & Thomas, 2018), only one study focuses on self-evaluation in the EFL classroom (Herrera et al., 2022). This Colombian study found that self-evaluation helped undergraduate students improve metacognition, and even though there is an implicit understanding in this study that the way self-evaluation is conducted and perceived is affected by culture, there is no explicit discussion regarding the SSE assessment method in the context of CRP or its effectiveness with historically marginalized students.

An abundance of research has been conducted on Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) and CRP, and they are generally accepted for use with diverse learners (Young & Young, 2023; Pedroso et al., 2023), yet the application of CRT and CRP in the ESL and EFL classroom is under-researched, despite the diversity that these classrooms usually represent. A Saudi Arabian study in an EFL context found that CRP that targets both instruction and evaluation can benefit students' academic performance (Pilotti & Al Mubarak, 2021). Another study in a South African EFL classroom found that using CRP improved student outcomes (Monyai, 2024). And yet, there appears to be no studies dealing with CRP or CRT in a Latin American context, and none that analyze self-evaluation as a culturally responsive form of evaluation. Thus, there is a clear gap in the research: a lack of examination of the potential overlap between SSE and CRP/T in the EFL classroom.

This study examines Ecuadorian EFL students' perceptions of using a self-evaluation rubric to assess their class participation, based on data from a survey and structured interviews. The three research questions (RQs) are as follows:

RQ1: What are students' opinions on the use of self-evaluation rubrics?

RQ2: Can self-evaluation rubrics support culturally responsive assessment of class participation in diverse EFL classrooms?

RQ3: Do students think that their participation improved due to their use of the self-evaluation rubric?

Methodology

Research Design

The researchers aimed to explore how self-evaluation rubrics can promote fairer and more inclusive grading practices for class participation in the EFL classroom. The researchers applied the student self-evaluation rubric in the classroom and then sought to understand students' perceptions on its use. To gain a deeper understanding of the students' experiences and perspectives of the self-evaluation rubric, a mixed methods design was utilized that integrated both quantitative and qualitative data.

Research Context

The context of this study was uniquely positioned by geographic and academic factors. The university is located in a rural Andean setting, and the only undergraduate majors offered are in STEM fields. The university follows a partial English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) model, so that one-half to three-fifths of their coursework, corresponding to the final two or three years of study, is conducted in English. This policy was put into place to prepare students for expanded academic and professional opportunities. The course in which the participants of this study were enrolled, "Level IV," is designed to prepare students to

achieve a B1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), and it is one in a sequence of courses that are meant to prepare students to begin doing the coursework in their major field of study in English. Most of these students are native Spanish speakers, though some students are also native speakers of Kichwa, the local indigenous language.

Research Sample

Participants included 39 public university students enrolled in two sections of a required 16-week, B1.2 (lower intermediate) EFL course (Level IV) at a public university in Ecuador. There were 19 students in one section and 20 in the other. Twenty students were male and 19 were female. Both sections were taught by one of this study's authors (the teacher-researcher). Each course met four days a week for two hours each day, equaling a total of eight weekly contact class hours. Through information that was provided by the university administration about the participants' race and ethnicity, it was determined that the majority of students were Mestizo, three students were Kichwa, one was Montubio, and one was Afro-Ecuadorian.

Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants were not compensated for their participation. Informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Students' privacy was maintained by assigning each participant a number in the data collection file. Participant data was stored and protected in a private folder only accessible by the researchers. Students were assured of anonymity and the right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Materials

Self-Evaluation Rubric. A self-evaluation rubric was designed by the teacher-researcher rather than adapted from an existing instrument. The six criteria can be found in Table 1A of the Appendices section. The criteria were related to core aspects of classroom participation identified in prior literature such as engagement, collaboration, and communication.

Each criterion was rated using a 5-point scale from "Never (1)" to "Always (5)." To ensure the rubric's appropriateness, it was piloted in a paper-based version during the first half of the 16-week semester. Feedback was gathered from students and two faculty colleagues. Revisions were made to clarify items, and additional questions were added to spur reflection and give students space to inform the teacher of personal issues.

Student Perception Survey. An anonymous Microsoft Forms survey was used to collect information from students about their perceptions of the rubric and the practice of self-evaluating their participation. The survey was developed based on existing literature of classroom participation (Petress, 2006; Rassuli & Manzer, 2005; Czekanski & Wolf, 2013) and CRA practices (Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Asrobi et al., 2023; Bean & Peterson, 1998). The survey asked students to provide their opinions on the self-evaluation rubric in terms of fairness, equity, and academic growth. Out of the 38 responses, none were excluded. The survey consisted of two sections. The first section included 12 Likert-scale statements with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." These items focused on students' attitudes towards classroom participation and the use of the self-evaluation rubric. The second section of the survey included four open-ended questions. To ensure understanding, the survey was written both English and Spanish with parallel translations of each question. Before administering the questionnaire to students, the Spanish translation of the questionnaire was checked by two native-Spanish-speaking, bilingual faculty coworkers to ensure clarity and equivalence.

Procedure

The procedure for the application of the SSE rubrics was carried out in three principal stages: a preliminary stage, a main stage, and a survey and interview stage.

Preliminary Stage. The purpose of this first stage was to familiarize students with both the rubric and with the process of self-evaluation. It also served to pilot and refine the rubric. On the fifth day of class, the teacher graded each student's class participation using a paper-based rubric. The grades were then shared with each student. The following day, the teacher asked students to grade their own class participation using the same rubric. Upon reviewing the students completed self-evaluation rubrics, the teacher noted that the students' self-evaluation grades were lower than expected, and much lower than the teacher's evaluation of their participation graded on the previous day. The teacher surmised that the students' poor understanding of the rubric was the cause of these lower self-evaluation grades. On the following day, the teacher asked students to grade themselves with the same rubric, but this time to include a brief explanation of the score. From observation of the students' self-assigned scores and justifications, the teacher concluded that students indeed understood the rubric, but that the discrepancy between the teacher's score and the students' scores was due to the fact that students were more aware of their own participation behavior than the teacher. Following these observations, the teacher had the students self-evaluate with the rubrics on an irregular schedule and continued fine-tuning the rubric in response until the midterm evaluation (the eighth week of the 16-week course). Students completed the paper-based rubric 10 times during the preliminary stage.

Main Stage. Following the midterm exam, the main stage began. In this stage, students regularly rated their class participation using the self-evaluation rubric that had been refined in the preliminary stage and converted into a digital format in Microsoft Forms (see Appendix). The rubric asked students to rate themselves on a scale of "Never" (1) to "Always" (5) for each criterion.

In addition, the rubric included two closed, sentence-completion prompts designed to promote self-awareness by encouraging students to recognize both their strengths and areas for improvement, "I am very good at:" and "I need to improve (*mejorar*):", with the purpose of encouraging them to explain their reasoning. This approach promoted deeper self-reflection, as many students explained that they wished to continue improving even in areas where they already felt confident. Finally, the rubric included one open-ended question: "Personal considerations, in English or Spanish (for example, a death in your family, a mental health crisis, a health issue, etc.):". This question was added so that the teacher would be aware of issues that students were having and would be able to address these issues with the students if deemed necessary.

At the end of class on the day that students were introduced to this digital rubric, the teacher highlighted the criteria that were adjusted or changed from the preliminary-stage rubric. Then, the teacher gave students 15 minutes to complete the digital rubric. Students were encouraged to ask questions. For the rest of the semester, students were given approximately two to five minutes to complete the rubrics at the end of the class period, two to three times a week. Although the self-evaluation rubric contributed to the course grade, its primary function was to promote reflection and self-regulating learning through assessment. The rubric was not applied on days that students had tests or other evaluations in class. Students evaluated themselves 14 times with the digital rubric during the final 8 weeks of the semester. Added to the 10 instances of self-evaluation from the preliminary stage, students evaluated their participation a total of 24 times.

Every day that the rubric was applied, the teacher reviewed the grades that students gave themselves. Initially, the teacher entered the exact grade that students had given themselves in the rubric into the LMS gradebook in Moodle without alterations, including a comment that either indicated that teacher's agreement or disagreement with that grade and a reason. Two weeks later, after the initial adaptation period, the teacher began to change any scores that were too high or too low, providing justification in the comment feature of the gradebook. These changes were made so that students had a better understanding of the expectations that the rubric reflected, and so that students would not grade themselves too generously or too critically.

If the teacher saw that a student completed the optional question, "Personal considerations, in English or Spanish (for example, a death in your family, a mental health crisis, a health issue, etc)," and depending

on the gravity of what was written, the teacher would either write a comment in the gradebook and adjust the student's grade or talk to the student in person. 5.2% of all completed digital self-evaluation rubrics included information in this section, with answers ranging from disclosing an ADHD diagnosis, panic disorder, or health issue, to expressing discomfort participating in class.

Survey and Interview Stage.

Survey. At the end of the semester, the student perception survey was given to participants after the speaking portion of their final exam. The teacher told the students explicitly that the survey would be anonymous and encouraged them to answer honestly. There were no questions about age, ethnicity, or any other identifying information.

The survey was completed in an average of seven minutes and 30 seconds. The response rate was 97% (38 out of 39 participants). The survey was written in English and Spanish, and students were allowed to answer the questions in either language. The teacher was present in the classroom while students answered the survey but stood at a distance from them in order to maintain their privacy. The survey included 12 closed questions and 4 open-ended questions (including extra comments).

Interview. To determine the viability of self-evaluation of participation as a CRA method, oral student interviews were conducted with five out of five of the ethnically underrepresented students who participated in the study. The interviews were done 9 months after the course had finished and after tabulating survey results. The interviews gathered deeper insights into underrepresented students' perceptions about class participation, the rubric, and the process of self-evaluation. The five historically marginalized students represented the following racial-ethnic groups: Kichwa (an indigenous group—3 students), Montubio (an ethnicity from the rural coastal regions—1 student), and Afro-Ecuadorian (1 student). They were contacted after their course had ended, and they all agreed to be interviewed about their experience with the rubric. The students were asked five questions and provided with time to make final remarks. The interviews were conducted in Spanish, recorded, and transcribed.

Values Coding. Values coding was applied to four of the five interview questions to determine whether the participants' responses revealed a positive or negative attitude toward the rubric. Question 3 was not coded due to a lack of relevance. Inductive thematic coding was used to determine overarching themes by looking at all the answers to questions specifically regarding the rubric (Questions 1, 2 and 5); this approach was applied to the interview data to capture themes arising directly from the data rather than limiting them to predetermined categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006). If an answer contained multiple themes, it was coded multiple times.

Findings and Discussion

Quantitative Analysis

Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) is a commonly used measure of internal consistency, and it assesses the degree to which items on a scale are interrelated and collectively measure a single construct (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). High internal consistency, approaching 1.0, supports the validity of the instrument. Cronbach's alpha was calculated from the data set of the survey and found to be 0.97. This finding indicates excellent internal consistency, suggesting that the Likert-scale questions measured a unified construct: students' perceptions of the self-evaluation rubric.

Descriptive Statistics for the 12 Likert-Scale Survey Items. Next, each of the 12 Likert-scale survey questions was analyzed to identify patterns in student responses. Descriptive statistics (sum, median, mode,

and interquartile range (IQR) for each item) were calculated. Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). These results are presented in Table 1:

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the 12 Likert-Scale Survey Items

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	IQR
Q1: In my opinion, filling out the daily class participation rubrics helped me improve my class participation.	4.55	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q2: In my opinion, the rubric was easy to understand.	4.37	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q3: In my opinion, I assessed my class participation honestly when filling out the daily rubric.	4.26	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q4: In my opinion, assessing my class participation through the daily rubric was a valuable activity.	4.26	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q5: In my opinion, filling out the daily class participation rubric gave me input on my class participation grade that my teacher took into account.	4.39	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q6: In my opinion, I reflected adequately in order to choose an accurate answer on questions #5 and #6 of the rubric ('I am very good at:' and 'I need to improve (mejorar):').	4.29	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q7: In my opinion, identifying the things I was good at in question #5 of the rubric ('I am very good at:') inspired me to improve those areas.	4.32	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q8: In my opinion, identifying the things I was good at in question #5 of the rubric ('I am very good at:') inspired me to maintain those areas.	4.18	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q9: In my opinion, identifying areas to improve in question #6 of the rubric ('I need to improve (mejorar):') helped me improve in those areas.	4.21	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q10: In my opinion, identifying areas to improve in question #6 of the rubric ('I need to improve (mejorar):') helped me maintain in those areas.	4.18	5.00	5.00	1.00
Q11: In my opinion, Question #7 of the rubric ('Personal considerations') was an important question to include for assessing class participation.	3.95	4.00	5.00	1.75
Q12: In my opinion, other English teachers should use daily class participation rubrics with their students.	4.29	5.00	5.00	1.00

Summary (All Items Combined): 456 total responses → 40 (8.77%) Strongly Disagree, 5 (1.10%) Disagree, 19 (4.17%) Neutral, 119 (26.10%) Agree, 273 (59.87%) Strongly Agree

Interpretation of Responses to Survey Items. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the 12 Likert-scale items that measured students' perceptions of the self-evaluation rubric. Four different measures were used to summarize students' responses: the mean (average score), the median (the middle score when all responses are ordered), the mode (the most frequently selected response), and the interquartile range (IQR)

(the range within which the middle 50% of responses fall, indicating how much agreement or variability there was among respondents). The IQR was chosen over standard deviation because it is a more robust measure of variability and is less affected by skewed data and outliers.

Across all 12 items, the mean scores ranged from 3.95 to 4.55 on a five-point scale. This finding indicates generally positive perceptions of the self-evaluation rubric. 85.97% of responses were either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'. This finding suggests that students viewed the rubric as useful, fair, and beneficial to their participation and learning. Only 9.87% expressed disagreement, and 4.17% were neutral.

The median was 5.00 (Strongly Agree) for 11 of the 12 items. This finding demonstrates that the typical student response was highly positive. Similarly, the mode was also 5.00 for all items; this finding indicates that 'Strongly Agree' was the most common choice.

The highest mean score (4.55) appeared in Q1 ("Filling out the daily class participation rubrics helped me improve my class participation"). This finding shows that most students believed that the self-evaluation rubric had a direct positive impact on their classroom engagement. Items Q5, Q6, Q7, Q9, and Q12 also had a mean above 4.20 each. These high mean scores demonstrate that there was strong agreement regarding the rubric's clarity, reflective value, and overall usefulness.

The IQR was 1.00 for most items. This means that the middle 50% of the students' responses clustered between the categories of 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. This finding indicates a high level of consensus and suggests that perceptions of the rubric were not only positive but also consistent across the group of students. One exception was for Q11, which had a mean of 3.95 and an IQR of 1.75. This wider IQR indicates that students had more varied opinions on this item compared to other items. While the median (4.00) and the mode (5.00) still indicate that most students agreed, some students were less certain about the importance of Q11. This finding suggests an area that could be refined or clarified in future versions of the rubric.

The descriptive statistics demonstrate that the students' responses were overwhelmingly positive and consistent. High means and modes, combined with IQR values, indicate strong agreement regarding the self-evaluation rubric's effectiveness in supporting classroom participation, reflection, and self-evaluation. The item with greater variability (Q11) points to opportunities for further investigation into how specific aspects of the rubric are perceived by different learners.

Qualitative Findings

Open-Ended Survey Responses. In addition to the Likert-scale items described above, the survey included four open-ended questions designed for students to provide more nuanced reflections about their experience with the rubric as well as to provide suggestions. The open-ended survey questions are included in Table 2:

Table 2. Descriptive Summary of the Four Open-Ended Survey Questions

Question #	Survey Question
1	Please indicate what items should be added or removed from the daily class participation rubrics.
2	Do you think it is beneficial or not beneficial for teachers to grade class participation in a language class? Why?
3	Briefly describe your experience using the daily participation rubric.
4	Other comments:

Question 1. For the first open-ended question about the necessity of modifying the rubric, 60.5% of students believed no changes were needed, while 29.5% suggested additions or deletions. Students who suggested modifications debated the value of the personal considerations item, "Personal considerations, in English or Spanish (for example, a death in your family, a mental health crisis, a health issue, etc.)", with a few advocating for more similar items directed at student emotions during the class and others advocating for the removal of the "personal considerations" item in favor of questions about students' satisfaction with their understanding of academic content of the lesson.

Question 2. In the second question, 97.3% believed including class participation as a graded component of the course was beneficial, citing increased student motivation and teacher engagement in students' lives and academic performance. One student disagreed, however, because he/she felt that the rubric did not improve his/her language abilities.

Question 3. The third question asked about students' experiences using the rubric: 86.8% responded positively, stating it was easy to use and encouraged self-awareness and growth. A few students gave mixed or neutral responses, noting initial difficulty or room for improvement, but none responded negatively.

Question 4. Question 4 was an optional space for comments. Just over half of the participants responded, most offering brief praise or support for continued use of the rubric. No negative feedback was recorded.

Interview Findings. The questions used in the student interviews are represented in Table 3.

Table 3. Interview Questions

Question #	Interview Questions (translated from Spanish)
1	Do you think the rubric accurately reflected your participation in class? Is there anything that could be added to better reflect your participation?
2	Do you think the rubric benefited some students more than others?
3	In your culture, what forms of communication exist apart from spoken words? Do you think these forms of expression carry more or less weight than spoken language?
4	Do you think Afro-Ecuadorian, Montubio, and/or Indigenous students participate differently than Mestizo students?
5	Anything else to add?

The values coding for each individual question revealed that five out of five of the historically underrepresented students agreed that the rubric accurately reflected their participation. Three out of five of the students thought that nothing should be added to the rubric while two thought that the rubric should be more content and pedagogy-focused: one student mentioned that a section of the rubric should be dedicated to grading spontaneous speech, while another student advocated for a question about whether or not the student liked the content and/or methodology of the class. Four out of five of the students thought that the rubric did not benefit some students more than others; one student mentioned that it benefited motivated students more than unmotivated students. All students believed that the way in which a pupil participates does not depend on his/her ethnicity but rather his/her individual personality traits. This contrasts with scholars who have stated that culture affects the way that students participate (Atifnigar et al., 2023, Goh et al., 2025) and warrants further investigation.

Thematic Results. Thematic coding of all the responses to the interview questions pertaining to the rubric revealed six themes. These themes can be found in Table 4.

- Walker et al.'s (2023) Principles for CRA Design. The themes that emerged from the interviews with historically marginalized students can be correlated to four CRA design principles (Walker et al., 2023): the High Expectations Principle, the Engagement Principle, the Flexibility Principle, and the Asset-Based Principle.

Table 4. 4 Themes from the Thematic Analysis

Number of Mentions	Theme
9	the rubric spurred reflection
8	the rubric increased motivation to participate in class
6	the rubric was achievable for all students
4	the rubric was clear
3	the rubric was fair
2	the increase in participation due to the rubric helped increase English language skills

- The High Expectations Principle, which determines that CRA should convey teachers' high expectations for their students, relates to five of the themes found in Table 6. According to Walker et al. (2023), it is especially important to hold historically underrepresented students to high expectations because students from diverse backgrounds come to the classroom with the weight of negative stereotypes or biases about their culture, often relating to their lack of potential for high academic outcomes (p. 8). By creating an academically rigorous environment, students understand that their teacher believes that they can perform at a high level, thus negating "the influence of negative biases that often hinder student performance" (p. 4). This relates to the theme, "the rubric was achievable for all students", because although teacher expectations for student participation were not lowered due to the rubric, the interviewed participants felt that all students had "the potential to perform at high levels" (p. 4).
- According to the High Expectations Principle, assessments must focus on personal growth and reflection, not on intelligence as an inherent and unchanging characteristic. Practice, growth, and self-reflection are key parts of a rigorous class as they involve productive struggle, which in turn leads to increased learning (p. 11). As such, the themes "the rubric spurred reflection", "the rubric increased motivation to participate in class", and "the increase in participation due to the rubric helped increase English language skills" directly relate to this principle. In addition, the theme "the rubric was clear" supports this principle, as clarity ensures that students understand expectations, which fosters confidence in their ability to succeed.
- The Engagement Principle, which determines that assessments should "foster academic engagement and belonging in academic environments" (p. 4) relates to three themes. Creating an assessment that was clear and fair enhances engagement in the class by making the process more accessible and meaningful. This concept is reflected in the themes "the rubric was clear" and "the rubric was fair." Additionally, engagement often manifests as active classroom participation (p. 7), so it is significant that student felt "the rubric increased motivation to participate in class." One student mentioned that he/she started grading himself 25 out of 30 points on the participation rubric because he/she was not speaking enough English in class. This motivated the student to look for speaking opportunities outside of class, and after some

practice, he /she was able to participate orally in English more than before and consequently graded himself/herself 28 out of 30.

- The Flexibility Principle and the Asset-Based Principle are intrinsically aligned and relate to three themes. The first principle dictates that "assessments should be designed to maximize flexibility to account for individual differences in culture, interests, and identities of all learners ...[because] accommodating the test takers' diverse backgrounds...allow[s them] to use their particular talents to maximum advantage" (p. 4). These particular talents relate directly to the Asset-Based Principle, which says that assessments should be designed to measure what a student knows and can do rather than focusing on the ways they are not fluent in dominant culture. By engaging students with their strengths, they become empowered in their identities instead of seeing themselves as lacking. The asset-based principle then combats the lack of value attributed to skills, abilities, and knowledge that come from active involvement in the marginalized culture (p. 14). These two principles relate to the themes "the rubric increased motivation to participate in class" and "the rubric was achievable," because students were given many chances (flexibility) to demonstrate their abilities (asset-based) and were provided growth-oriented feedback. The theme "the rubric was fair" relates to the Flexibility Principle as students were able to write an explanation as to why their participation suffered on a particular day, and it relates to the Asset-Based Principle as they felt that all students had the ability to show their strengths.
- Although Walker et al.'s Shared Power Principle does not directly correlate to the themes, it relates to how the rubric was created and therefore may have informed all of these themes. The Shared Power Principle determines that "giving a voice to all stakeholders will help ensure that the assessments are culturally inclusive and will help prevent test misuses" (p. 4). This means that all stakeholders, such as teachers and students, should have a say at all points of the assessment process, from what activities lead up to the assessment, what the assessment will be and how it will be executed, to how the teacher will guide students in the learning process after the assessment. The teacher incorporated students' feedback in the creation of the final version of the rubric, wrote comments to students about their participation, and left a line open for students to contact the teacher; thus, parts of the Shared Power Principle were applied, which in turn could have informed student perception of the rubric.
- Comparison of the themes drawn from the student interviews with Walker et al.'s principles of CRA design show that the use of the self-evaluation rubric can be considered a CRA method.

*Non-thematic Results***.** There were several additional isolated responses that are worth mentioning even though they were not repeated across responses or participants. These were included in the analysis because these ideas could be more generalizable if the pool of participants were larger and could therefore be important for future study.

For the question, "Do you believe that Afro-Ecuadorian, Montubio and Indigenous students participate in a different way from Mestizo students?" one student said that he/she comes from an area with a very poor school system, which reflects the idea that ethically underrepresented students in Ecuador often receive lower quality schooling (UNESCO, 2020; López et al., 2022). This student felt that his/her lower level of English, and therefore his/her participation in the English course, was influenced by the quality of schooling the student received and not necessarily his/her cultural identity *per se*. This highlights a larger issue of educational disparity in Ecuador, something that could impact a student's ability to interact in a foreign language classroom.

In the section for optional final remarks, one student expressed gratitude, saying that engaging in self-evaluation helped him/her to regain self-confidence after having failed the same English course the semester before. According to this student, the teacher-researcher, with the help of the rubric, created an environment

of trust wherein personal situations were taken into consideration. With the guidance that the rubric provided, the student was able to continue to improve his/her confidence and abilities in the following level of English, demonstrating a potential long-term benefit of the rubric. In the same section, another student said that his/her speaking ability improved because succeeding in the participation rubric was relatively easy as the criteria were clear and achievable, and this achievability made everyone put in effort and improve.

Our findings largely coincide with results from Anyichie et al. (2023) who found that CRT methods can increase student engagement. Additionally, our findings coincide with White's study (2009) on self-evaluation in the Japanese undergraduate English classroom as his students largely viewed their self-evaluation rubric as fair and mostly agreed that it should be used in future English courses, while our findings differ in that more students perceived that their participation scoring was honest (90%) than in White's study (72%). This may be due to cultural factors or how the rubric was applied in class. White applied the rubric three times in the class, while the present study applied the rubric 24 times, with significant room for feedback from the students before, during, and after the process. The present study also involved teacher comments on the student's participation via the learning management system Moodle when the teacher perceived student grades were too high or too low, thus there was some accountability for accurate self-evaluation.

Results in Response to the Research Questions

RQ1*: *What are Students' Opinions on the Use of Self-evaluation Rubrics? The students' opinions of the self-evaluation rubric were overwhelmingly positive. Across all 12 Likert-scale items, the mean scores ranged from 3.95 to 4.55 (on a 5-point scale), with 85.97% of responses being 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'. The median was 'Strongly Agree' for 11 out of the 12 items. Additionally, 'Strongly Agree' was also the mode for all items. This finding indicates that the most typical and most frequent response was that the students favored the self-evaluation rubric. Qualitative data also supports this pattern. In the open-ended questions, 86.8% of students described their experience with the self-evaluation rubric as positive. Students emphasized its ease of use, its role in promoting reflection and self-awareness, and its fairness. Most students recommended that such rubrics should be used by other teachers (the mean of Q12 was 4.29). This finding suggests that students viewed the rubric as a valuable tool.

RQ2*: *Can Self-evaluation Rubrics Support CRA of Class Participation in Diverse EFL Classrooms? Findings from both qualitative and quantitative data suggest that self-evaluation rubrics can support CRA in diverse EFL classrooms. Students from different backgrounds (Kichwa, Montubio, Afro-Ecuadorian) expressed that the rubric allowed them to participate in ways that aligned with their cultural communication norms. Students suggested that the clarity of the rubric allowed them to understand how participation would be assessed. This clarity reduced ambiguity and potential teacher bias. Participants responded that the rubric allowed them to evaluate their own contributions in culturally meaningful ways, and several students advocated for expanding items (like Q11) for better understanding of socio-emotional or cultural factors that influence participation. The use of self-evaluation rubrics can support CRA of class participation in EFL classrooms when their criteria are clear, achievable, and fair. Evidence suggests that self-evaluation rubrics can be a tool for inclusive, culturally sensitive assessment, especially when they are thoughtfully designed to value diverse forms of participation.

RQ3*: *Do Students Think that their Participation Improved Due to their Use of the Daily Self-Evaluation Rubric? Students reported that using the rubric enhanced their participation in class. The highest scoring survey item (Q1 mean = 4.55) indicates that most students felt that filling out the rubric helped them improve their participation. Other items reinforced that perception as students agreed that the rubric prompted honest self-evaluation (mean = 4.26), meaningful feedback on their performance (mean =4.39), and helped them to identify strengths and areas for improvement (Q7 mean = 4.32; Q9 mean = 4.21). Qualitative data supports these findings. Nearly all the students (97.3%) stated that grading

participation (through the rubric) was beneficial because it increased motivation, goal setting, and engagement. One theme mentioned in the interviews was the value of the opportunities for reflection that completing the rubric provided to students. Students reported that they became more intentional about participating. Another student explained that he/she was able to identity a weakness and remedy it by practicing English outside of class. Thus, students linked the use of these rubrics with a greater awareness of their performance in class, which created behavioral changes. The self-evaluation rubric likely leads to a cycle of self-monitoring and improvement.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations that must be addressed. First, the small-scale nature of the design limits the generalizability of the findings. The study was conducted in Ecuador at a university with a STEM student population, and the findings presented may not be repeated in other populations due to institutional and other factors. Second, while the qualitative interviews strengthened the data, only five students participated. This was due to the small number of historically underrepresented students in the classes where this research was conducted. Given the positive skew of the descriptive statistics, future versions of the survey could employ a more differentiated Likert scale (e.g., 7 points) to encourage greater response variation. Additionally, the dual role of the teacher-researcher may have influenced how the interviewees responded, perhaps causing social desirability bias: students may have felt pressure to respond positively because the interviewer was their former teacher. Although the students had already passed the course, this may have made the students feel like they could not openly discuss disadvantages of the rubric due to discomfort or fear. Third, the interview and coding process may have introduced bias into the qualitative data, as the teacher-researcher was the one who conducted the interviews, transcribed, coded, and analyzed the students' interview responses, and translated some important student comments. Involving others in these processes may have better ensured that bias was not introduced. Finally, the oral interviews were conducted nine months after the conclusion of the course in which the self-evaluation rubrics were applied; thus, students may have forgotten some relevant details.

Implications of the Findings

This study determined that a self-evaluation rubric for participation can serve as a CRA practice because it meets many of Walker et al.'s (2023) principles of CRA design and because students from diverse backgrounds (Kichwa, Montubio, Afro-Ecuadorian) reported that the rubric was clear, fair, and inclusive. It was also found that self-evaluation rubrics can promote student reflection, as students can analyze their behaviors in class, find ways to improve them, and take responsibility for their grades. Third, it was found that as students became aware of how their participation would be assessed, their engagement increased. This engagement led to more social interactions and collaborative efforts. Socializing more in class is favored in social constructivist theory, in which student participation can be viewed as dynamic, socially mediated and student-centered.

Teachers who include graded class participation in their syllabi will benefit from using a structured self-evaluation rubric because it is a CRA that reduces subjectivity, gives students an opportunity to voice their opinions in the evaluation process, and provides a process through which students can hold themselves accountable. In these rubrics, students also have space to write down personal challenges that may have affected their participation, which encourages open communication practices and encourages empathy.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although many articles about CRA theory and SSE have been published, there are limited action research studies that employ these concepts as their theoretical bases. Action research studies related to CRP in Latin American ESL/EFL contexts, self-evaluation as a CRA, and participation evaluation in the language classroom need to be further examined. Longitudinal studies on the correlation between self-evaluation of

participation and academic outcomes should also be examined. Additionally, studies could be conducted on students with different levels of language proficiency to determine whether student perceptions are generalizable in regards to the SSE rubric, independent of L2 language ability. Due to the large research gap that these topics have, more action research into the use of self-evaluation as a CRA needs to be done at larger scale, in different countries, and at different educational levels and institutions.

Conclusion

The evaluation of classroom participation is a common practice in both the EFL and ESL classrooms; however, this evaluation is not always implemented in ways that are reflective, equitable, or culturally responsive. Previous studies have shown the effects that SSE can have on promoting student participation (White, 2009; Herrera et al., 2022; Monyai, 2024), yet the bridge between self-evaluation and cultural responsiveness remains underexplored, especially in linguistically and ethnically diverse populations.

The findings of this study contribute to the conversation by providing evidence that self-evaluation rubrics can function as CRA tools. The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data indicates that students supported the use of self-evaluation rubrics (RQ1), and described them as clear, fair, and beneficial. The rubric provided opportunities for students to express cultural influences on their classroom engagement (RQ2). Finally, students reported that their participation improved because of regular self-evaluation (RQ3). Combined, these findings suggest that self-evaluation rubrics can transform traditional classroom participation evaluation into a more reflective, inclusive, and powerful practice. By incorporating culturally responsive principles into the ESL and EFL classrooms, language educators can create environments that support learners' growth, agency, and belongingness.

Declarations

Funding. This research received no external funding.

Informed Consent Statement. All participants were informed about the research purpose, application, and study design, as well as the voluntary nature of their participation and the confidentiality of their responses. Informed consent was obtained from all participants for the use of their data.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank their university for its support of language teaching research and anonymous reviewers for their useful feedback.

Conflicts of Interest. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Received: 6/17/2025. **Accepted:** 12/19/2025. **Published:** 1/7/2026.

Citation: Nelson, A. S., Cadoux, S. L., Javens, J. S. (2026). Assessing the impact of self-evaluation rubrics on participation: Creating equity and empathy in the classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation*, 30(2)(4). Available online: https://doi.org/10.7275/pare.3255

Corresponding Author: Andrew S. Nelson, Yachay Tech University.
Email: anelson@yachaytech.edu.ec

References

Ahmed, A. A. A., Sayed, B. T., Wekke, I. S., Widodo, M., Rostikawati, D., Ali, M. H., Abdul Hussein, H. A., & Azizian, M. (2022). An empirical study on the effects of using Kahoot as a game-based learning tool on EFL learners' vocabulary recall and retention. *Education Research International*, *2022*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9739147

Akpur, U. (2021). Does class participation predict academic achievement? A mixed-method study. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *4*(2), 148–160. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i2.3551

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012*. ACTFL. https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012.pdf

Andrade, H. G. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, *57*(5), 13–19. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285750862_Using_rubrics_to_promote_thinking_and_learning

Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *32*(2), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600801928

Andrade, H. L. (2019). A critical review of research on student self-assessment. *Frontiers in Education*, *4*, Article 87, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00087

Anyichie, A. C., Butler, D. L., Perry, N. E., & Nashon, S. M. (2023). Examining classroom contexts in support of culturally diverse learners' engagement: An integration of self-regulated learning and culturally responsive pedagogical practices. *Frontline Learning Research, 11*(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v11i1.1115

Asrobi, M., Nazri, M. A., Hakim, Z. W. A., & Jaelani, S. R. (2023). Students' involvement analysis towards teachers' teaching reflection and its impact on classroom. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, *10*(1), 253-266. https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v10i1.3255

Atifnigar, H., Israr, S. W., Khanjar, I., & Hameed, S. A. B. A. (2023). Impacts of culture on classroom participation among undergraduate EFL learners in Afghanistan. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, *1*(2), 291–300. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2023.1(2).25

Bean, J. C., & Peterson, D. (1998). Grading classroom participation. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *1998*(74), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.7403

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 25*(6), 551–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brown, G., & Harris, L. (2013). Student self-assessment. In J. H. McMillan (Ed.), *Student self-assessment* (pp. 367-393). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218649.n21

Brown, G. T. L., Andrade, H. L., & Chen, F. (2015). Accuracy in student self-assessment: Directions and cautions for research. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *22*(4), 444–457. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2014.996523

Burgess, S., & Greaves, E. (2013). Test scores, subjective assessment, and stereotyping of ethnic minorities. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *31*(3), 535-576. https://doi.org/10.1920/re.ifs.2024.0468

Burns, D., Brown, M., O'Hara, J., & McNamara, G. (2019). Progressing culturally responsive assessment for higher education institutions. In *Diversity and triumphs of navigating the terrain of academe* (Vol. 23, pp. 63–85). Emerald Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-364420190000023006

Chamberlin, K., Yasué, M., & Chiang, I. C. A. (2023). The impact of grades on student motivation. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 24*(2), 109–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874211058471

Chhetri, K. (2020). The benefits of using rubrics to assess student work. *Rig Tshoel-Research Journal of the Royal Thimphu College*, *3*(1). https://journal.rtc.bt/index.php/rigtshoel/article/download/69/88

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Czekanski, K. E., & Wolf, Z. R. (2013). Encouraging and evaluating class participation. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.10.1.7

Deslauriers, L., McCarty, L. S., Miller, K., Callaghan, K., & Kestin, G. (2019). Measuring actual learning versus feeling of learning in response to being actively engaged in the classroom. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(39), 19251–19257. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821936116

Dikli, S. (2003). Assessment at a distance: Traditional vs. alternative assessments. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *2*(3), 13–19.

Ding, Y. (2021). Exploring effective teacher–student interpersonal interaction strategies in EFL listening and speaking classes. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, Article 765496. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.765496

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 106–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053002003

Goh, Q. S., Majeed, T. A., Yau, W. P., & Ho, H. K. (2025). Students' and instructors' perception on graded class participation: A multidisciplinary perspective within a comprehensive research university. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1), 2492691. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2492691

Griffiths, R. 2004. Knowledge production and the research–teaching nexus: The case of the built environment disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education 29*(6): 709–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507042000287212

Herrera, L., Cuesta Melo, C. H., and Lucero Zambrano, M. A. (2022). The influence of self-assessment on the English language learning process. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *24*(1), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.17673

Hood, S. (1998). Culturally responsive performance-based assessment: Conceptual and psychometric considerations. *Journal of Negro Education, 67*(3), 187–196. https://doi.org/10.2307/2668195

Hopfenbeck, T. N., Zhang, Z., Sun, S. Z., Robertson, P., & McGrane, J. A. (2023). Challenges and opportunities for classroom-based formative assessment and AI: A perspective article. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, Article 1270700. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1270700

Jacobs, L. C., & Chase, C. I. (1992). *Developing and using tests effectively: A guide for faculty*. Jossey-Bass.

Jonsson, A., & and G. Svingby. 2007. The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, *2*(2), 130–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2007.05.002

Kjærgaard, A., Buhl-Wiggers, J., & Mikkelsen, E. N. (2024). Does gradeless learning affect students' academic performance? A study of effects over time. *Studies in Higher Education, 49*(2), 336–351. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2152122

Kinley, D., & Pradhan, S. (2022). Exploring the relationship between class participation and student performance in science. *Bhutan Journal of Research and Development*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.17102/bjrd.rub.11.1.029

Konstantinou, P. (2022). The relevance in the value of grading in the educational process. In M. A. Danaher & P. A. Danaher (Eds.), *Teacher education in the 21st century* (pp. 1–15). IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.101268

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163320

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, *34*(3), 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675

Lane, S., & Tierney, S. T. (2008). Performance assessment. In T. L. Good (Ed.), *21st century education: A reference handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 461–470). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412964012.n50

López. Zurita, H.S., Vega. Rivera, P.M., & Zurita Alava, S.P. (2022). Ethnicity and gender inequality gaps in Ecuadorian education. *Medwave, 22*(S1), eCI132. https://doi.org/10.5867/Medwave.2022.S1.CI132

Losey, K. M. (1995). Mexican American students and classroom interaction: An overview and critique. *Review of Educational Research*, *65*(3), 283–318. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003283

Mammadova, N. (2023). Grading and feedback. In N. Mammadova (Ed.), *Academic writing and information literacy instruction in digital environments* (pp. 115–130). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8418-7.ch007

Márquez, J., Lazcano, L., Bada, C., & Arroyo-Barrigüete, J. L. (2023). Class participation and feedback as enablers of student academic performance. *Sage Open*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231177298

McMorran, C., Ragupathi, K., & Luo, S. (2017). Assessment and learning without grades? Motivations and concerns with implementing gradeless learning in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(3), 361–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1114584

Mercado López, E. P., & Escudero-Nahón, A. (2025). Self-assessment, hetero-assessment, and co-assessment as learning evaluation strategies within the flipped classroom. *Pensamiento Americano, 18*(36). https://doi.org/10.21803/penamer.18.36.806

Montenegro, E., & Jankowski, N. (2017). *Equity and assessment: Moving towards culturally responsive assessment* (Occasional paper No. 29). University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED574461.pdf

Monyai, R. B. (2024). Culturally responsive pedagogy in EFL classrooms: Navigating diversity for enhanced English language learning. *Addressing Issues of Learner Diversity in English Language Education*, *14*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2623-7.ch016

Mustapha, S. M., Abd Rahman, N. S. N., & Yunus, M. M. (2010). Perceptions towards classroom participation: A case study of Malaysian undergraduate students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *7*, 113–121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.017

Ndoye, A. (2017). Peer/self-assessment and student learning. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *29*(2), 255–269. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1146193.pdf

Nguyen, H. T. (2020). Classroom participation in EFL speaking classes: Students' perceptions. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies, 8*(4), 1–8. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346189749

Nieminen, J. H. (2022). Assessment for inclusion: Rethinking inclusive assessment in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(4), 841–859. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.2021395

Normann, D. A., Sandvik, L. V., & Fjørtoft, H. (2023). Reduced grading in assessment: A scoping review. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 135*, 104336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104336

Ojochegbe, A. T. (2024). Rethinking standardized testing in English language proficiency: Moving toward culturally responsive assessment models. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *5*(12). https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v5i12.6584

Palm, T. (2008). Performance assessment and authentic assessment: A conceptual analysis of the literature. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 13*(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.7275/9rbx-4x07

Panadero, E., Brown, G. T., & Strijbos, J. W. (2016). The future of student self-assessment: A review of known unknowns and potential directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(4), 803–830. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9350-2

Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Strijbos, J. (2016). Scaffolding self-regulated learning through self-assessment and peer assessment: Guidelines for classroom implementation. In D. Laveault & L. Allal (Eds.), *Assessment for learning: Meeting the challenge of implementation* (pp. 311–326). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39211-0_18

Panadero, E., & M. Romero. (2014). To rubric or not to rubric? The effects of self-assessment on self-regulation, performance and self-efficacy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *21*(2): 133–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2013.877872

Pedroso, J. E. P., Sasana, R., & Valencia, K. (2023). Social studies practice teacher's views on culturally responsive teaching. *EIKI Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, *1*(3). https://doi.org/10.59652/jetm.v1i3.34

Petress, K. (2006). An operational definition of class participation. *College Student Journal*, *40*(4), 821–823.

Pilotti, M. A., & Al Mubarak, H. (2021). Systematic versus informal application of culturally relevant pedagogy: Are performance outcomes different? A study of college students. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, *4*(2), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2021.1

Qasserras, L. (2023). Systematic Review of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Language Education: A Balanced Perspective. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, *4*(6), 17-23. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2023.4.6.763

Rassuli, A., & Manzer, J. P. (2005). "Teach us to learn": Multivariate analysis of perception of success in team learning. *Journal of Education for Business*, *81*(1), 21–27. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.81.1.21-28

Ratminingsih, N. M., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., & Vigayanti, L. P. D. (2018). Self-assessment: The effect on students' independence and writing competence. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(3), 277–290. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11320a

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Sadler, D. R. (2009). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for assessment and grading. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34*(2), 159–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801956059

Sadler, D. R. (2014). The futility of attempting to codify academic achievement standards. *Higher Education, 67*(3), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9649-1.

Salam, Y, M., & Luksfinanto, Y. (2024). A Comprehensive Review of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Modern Classrooms. *Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies*, 3(1), 58-70. https://doi.org/10.70177/lingeduca.v3i1.1338

Schinske, J. N., & Tanner, K. D. (2014). Teaching more by grading less (or differently). *CBE—Life Sciences Education, 13*(2), 159–166. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.cbe-14-03-0054

Schneider, J., & Hutt, E. (2014). Making the grade: A history of the A–F marking scheme. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46*(2), 201–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2013.790480

Senyshyn, R., & Martinelli, A. (2021). Learning to support and sustain cultural (and linguistic) diversity: Perspectives of preservice teachers. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, *15*(1), 20–37. https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-02-2020-0015

Steele, C., Gower, G., & Bogachenko, T. (2024). Creating and enacting culturally responsive assessment for First Nations students in higher education settings. *Australian Journal of Education*, *68*(2), 84–102. https://doi.org/10.1177/00049441241258

Swaffield, S., & Thomas, S. (Eds.). (2018). *Educational assessment in Latin America*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351257169

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, *2*, 53–55. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Tavakoli, M. (2010). Investigating the relationship between self-assessment and teacher-assessment in academic contexts: A Case of Iranian university students. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *12*(1), 234–260.

Tejeiro, R. A., Gomez-Vallecillo, J. L., Romero, A. F., Pelegrina, M., Wallace, A., & Emberley, E. (2012). Summative self-assessment in higher education: Implications of its counting towards the final mark. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, *10*(2), 789–812. http://dx.doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v10i27.1528

Turner, J. C., & Patrick, H. (2004). Motivational influences on student participation in classroom learning activities. *Teachers College Record*, *106*(9), 1759–1785. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2004.00404.x

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidelines for the governance of digital platforms*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374764

Vandrick, S. (2000, March 14–18). *Language, culture, class, gender, and class participation* [Paper presentation]. TESOL Annual International Convention, Vancouver, BC, Canada. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED473086

VanPatten, B. (2015). While we're on the topic: BVP on language, acquisition, and classroom practice. Cengage Learning.

Walker, M. E., Olivera-Aguilar, M., Lehman, B., Laitusis, C., Guzman-Orth, D., & Gholson, M. (2023). Culturally responsive assessment: Provisional principles. *ETS Research Report Series, 2023*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12374

Wang, W. (2017). Using rubrics in student self-assessment: Student perceptions in the English as a foreign language writing context. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(8), 1280–1292. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1261993

Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. Jossey-Bass.

White, E. (2009). Assessing the assessment: An evaluation of a self-assessment of class participation procedure. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *11*(3), 75-109.

Winzer, M.A., & Mazurek, K. (1998). *Special education in multicultural contexts*. Prentice Hall.

Yang, D., Olesova, L., & Richardson, J. C. (2010). Impact of cultural differences on students' participation, communication, and learning in an online environment. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *43*(2), 165-182. https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.43.2.b

Young, J., & Young, J. (2023). Before we let go!: Operationalizing culturally informed education. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *25*(2), 96-111. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2023.2212719

Zhao, T., & Xu, Y. (2022). Participation or eschewal? Final-year secondary school students' attitudes towards participation in higher education in Cameroon. *South African Journal of Education*, *42*(4), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v42n4a2126

Appendix A

Table 1A. The Self-Evaluation Rubric Criteria

Criteria #	Self-Evaluation Phrases
1	I participate in whole class activities
2	I only speak in English
3	I participate fully in pair and group activities
4	I pay attention (I am not distracted by my phone or work from another subject)
5	I am on time
6	I speak in whole sentences (not words or phrases)

Self-Evaluation of Participation Rubric

This form was completed by the students as part of the self-evaluation process. The original form was created using Microsoft Forms.

My Participation Today

1. Your Name:* _____
2. Date:* _____
1. My Participation (Rating 1–5): 1 (Never); 2 (rarely); 3 (sometimes); 4(often); 5(always).*

	1 (Never)	2 (Rarely)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Often)	5 (Always)
I participate in whole class activities					
I only speak in English					
I participate fully in pair and group activities					
I pay attention (I am not distracted by my phone or work from another subject)					
I am on time					
I speak in whole sentences (not words or phrases)					

3. Add up your score from above. The score is out of 30 points: * _____
4. I am very good at: * (choose all that apply)
    - participating in whole class activities
    - only speaking English
    - participating in pair and group discussions
    - speaking in complete sentences
5. I need to improve (*mejorar):* * (choose all that apply)
    - my whole class participation
    - how often I speak in English
    - my pair and group participation
    - the quality of my participation (speaking in complete sentences)
6. Personal considerations, in English or Spanish (for example, a death in your family, a mental health crisis, a health issue, etc.): (short answer question)