



What do the students say? Integrating student input into participation assessment

Nafal Ossandón Hostens, University of Texas at Austin 

Ellen Jones Schoedler, University of Texas at Austin 

Abstract

The assessment of participation in the classroom has been at the center of debate among pedagogy scholars and instructors for decades, and the discussion gained new traction after the push towards remote learning during the COVID pandemic. Despite the surge of movements advocating to step away from traditional grading systems, this type of assessment is often deemed necessary in settings such as university-level language classes. Moreover, instructors do not always have influence on programmatic decisions, including whether or not to assess participation. This practice report presents two attempts to account for students' needs and perspectives when assessing participation in the foreign language classroom by actively involving them in the participation assessment process. One approach consisted of the systematic self-assessment and open dialogue of the weekly participation grade, which was then factored into the instructor's weekly assessment grade. The second approach used student input to create the rubric, which all students then agreed to, and allowed for discussion with the instructor. These two approaches were well-received by students, and regular mid-semester student surveys suggested that the novel approaches promoted a sense of fairness in the classroom and stimulated both willingness to participate (WTP) and to communicate (WTC).

Keywords: Participation Assessment, Student Involvement, Rubric Development, Self-Assessment

APA Citation: Hostens, N. O., & Schoedler, E. J. (2026). What do the students say? Integrating student input into participation assessment. *Second Language Research & Practice*, 6(1), 92–105.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10125/69897>

Introduction

Whether or not to assess participation in the classroom has been at the center of debate among pedagogy scholars and instructors for decades (Rocca, 2010). This discussion became especially relevant during the abrupt transition to online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic and was followed by open discussions regarding what we could learn from this collective experience (e.g., Coderch, 2023). In this context, it became evident that the definition of participation in the foreign language (FL) classroom required reassessment, as the shift to online instruction and the use of conference tools complicated the intuitive assessments typically applied in face-to-face settings. Assessment is one of the procedures students tend to feel the largest dissatisfaction with (Knight & Ferrell, 2022), likely rooted in a misalignment between learner and instructor's expectations. The past years have seen the rise of movements such as ungrading, which advocate for stepping away from traditional grading systems, favoring, for example, self-evaluation based on student reflection (Gorichanaz, 2022) and approaches such as contract grading (Katopodis & Davidson, 2020). However, instructors working in large language programs often do not have the authority to make programmatic decisions, such as whether participation is part of the final grade. The challenge, therefore, resides in finding a balance between what is possible within the institutional requirements and

what is desired from a pedagogical point of view.

The goal of this report is to share two approaches to integrating students' perspectives when assessing their participation and preparation, as implemented by two instructors in a German language program during multiple semesters and with different groups of students. These attempts consisted of (1) a co-created assessment rubric and (2) recurring self-evaluation by the students, both of which aimed to align expectations regarding what is meant to actively participate in class.

The following sections provide a brief overview of research on student input in participation assessment, a description of the approaches implemented, and the perception of these approaches by the students. We finish by providing some general suggestions for implementation in the classroom and for further research.

Participation Assessment in the FL Classroom

Language pedagogy scholars have long argued the importance of the synergistic, reciprocal relationship between *what is taught*, on the one hand, and *how it is assessed*, on the other. Assessment is thus viewed as an educational tool, aligned to the “how” and “what” is taught (McKeachie, 1994). This is especially reflected in backward design approaches, where “appropriate teaching activities and content are derived from the results of learning” (Richards, 2013, p. 20). Assessment can then take multiple forms. In the case of the FL classroom, formative assessments such as in-class activities and tasks are designed to maximize engagement with the target language (TL) in a communicative setting. It is the learner's participation during in-class activities and tasks that then shapes a major part of their acquisition process, hence the need for a systematic assessment of this engagement. The instructor's assessment of a learner's participation in class and the subsequent grade assigned might, however, affect students' own initiative to actively participate in class. Students' perception of such assessment is, however, understudied.

The transitions to and away from online instruction in 2020-2021 highlighted students' individual differences and needs, leading to an increased need to scrutinize how student participation is both defined and assessed. When discussing how remote learning impacted assessment strategies in the language classroom, Coderch (2023) stated that “language professionals should aim for a richer notion of assessment: an opportunity for teachers and students to cooperate and work together towards the shared goal of supporting learning” (p. 281). While Coderch (2023) focused on various assessment strategies and areas, not just participation assessment, she emphasized that the need for alternative assessment strategies identified during remote learning remains in a face-to-face classroom context. She argued that the pandemic exposed socioeconomic inequalities, among other individual needs, that affect learning. The return to face-to-face instruction brought a cultural shift among learners, who are now more aware of the environmental factors affecting their learning process and practical needs, and who are more likely to advocate for themselves.

The Importance of TL output

While communicative language teaching (CLT) enjoys continued popularity in many language teaching contexts, its emphasis on meaningful language use has, in some instances, led to a conflation of communication with language production. Indeed, participation in the form of (meaningful) interaction through oral production has been found to be strongly beneficial for language acquisition (Delaney, 2012; Gass, 2003; Henshaw & Hawkins, 2022; Long, 1996; Mackey, 2013), and language output is traditionally used as evidence for L2 acquisition (Bernales, 2016a; Kumaravadivelu, 2005). However, an emphasis on oral proficiency has multiple shortcomings: it does not necessarily improve student participation (Toro et al., 2019); it does not always reflect student participation (Bernales, 2016b; Henshaw & Hawkins, 2022); and it does not always align with individual learners' needs (Crosthwaite et al., 2015). Crosthwaite et al. (2015) investigated the assessment of in-class participation in an EFL classroom with Korean learners of English, focusing on learning style orientations of students and the perceived fairness of assessment criteria. They found that students had a broad range of learning styles orientations, and that there seemed to be a positive relationship between language proficiency and project learning (PO) and group (GAO) learning

style orientations. However, this seemed not to be the case for learners with more individualistic learning styles (IAO), who work best alone (Croswaithe et al, 2015, p. 14). Their results also showed that the common practice of holistic grading may unintentionally penalize more individualistic learners who are not as likely to actively participate in class activities/discussions in a traditional sense but still come prepared to class and take notes. The authors suggested that “what might actually happen is that those students who were already well-suited to classroom participation (i.e. PO and GAO learners) take an even more active role than they would have otherwise done due to the level of competition enforced upon them, making it more difficult for others to be noticed” (Crosthwaite et al., 2015, p. 15). Drawing on these findings, we argue that while the benefits of participation in the form of oral output have been widely established, this should not necessarily be the main focus of participation assessment to shift the focus of assessment from oral TL output and prevent more outspoken students from dominating classroom discussions.

Bernales (2016b) also recognized that participation can be more than just L2 production. In a mixed-methods study, she looked at students’ predictions and expectations regarding their own participation in an L2 German class and how this related to their willingness to communicate (WTC). Expanding from MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model, who define WTC as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a[n] L2” (p. 547), Bernales suggested that this definition of WTC differs from a willingness to participate (WTP) because “WTC does not necessarily require actual communication as long as students have the desire to speak and are ready to act upon their desire” (Bernales, 2014, p. 10). WTC could, therefore, “reside in students who actually raise their hands to volunteer an answer, regardless of whether they end up saying something out loud” (Bernales, 2016b, p. 3). Bernales (2016b) viewed this desire as participation, not communication. She proceeds to call for further research into understanding students’ notions and experiences regarding participation in the FL classroom, with a focus on WTP, especially considering how it is instructors who create classroom norms about what is understood under good participation. When instructors assess participation solely based on oral production, they are likely to miss other features that would be more reflective of WTP.

Student Involvement in Assessment

Coderch (2023) pointed out that “giving students the possibility to make decisions about their own assessment increases their autonomy and enhances their personal investment in tasks” (p. 272-273). However, the literature on learner involvement in assessment practices has mainly focused on the learner’s self-assessment of TL proficiency, and few studies have looked at self-assessment of participation and involvement in class and how this self-assessment may influence the student’s performance. Bernales (2016a) had students self-evaluate their language (speech) production and thought forming in the L2. As the students reported an improvement in their TL skills, Bernales found that they also reported speaking up less in class but beginning to *think* more in the L2. Learners, therefore, reported different resources to show their engagement in a lesson aside from TL output, some of which included silent participation and metalinguistic reasoning in their first language (L1). Such engagement methods, especially if silent or in the L1, may go unnoticed by the instructor.

Self-assessment is indeed one of the most common ways of involving students in their own evaluation. In a pilot study, White (2009) found that self-assessment of participation was positively received by his students but raised concern for the reliability of the measure. He provided his students with a score sheet that targeted the desired attitudes and behaviors, and covered aspects such as punctuality and preparation, being attentive and completing tasks, communicating strictly in the L2, and overall effort and attitude. Students had to indicate the frequency with which this applied to them. In a different vein, Rubio Gómez (2018) found, using a mixed-methods study, that self-assessment was as valid and reliable as instructor grading. Using an instructor-provided rubric, her students self-evaluated their efforts in class, their active participation and efforts to speak in the TL daily. She emphasized how this form of assessment positively reinforced students’ awareness of their own learning process and, therefore, involved them in establishing goals and assessing their own progress (p. 173). Self-assessment is, thus, more than just self-grading, but is instead a powerful tool to stimulate self-regulated learning.

Dancer and Kamvounias (2005) investigated whether student involvement in rubric creation and the self-assessment process increased the evaluation instrument's fairness and reliability outside of a language course. They claimed that, by involving students in the development of the criteria to assess participation in class, it was much clearer to students what was expected of them, and that administering a self-assessment led the students to take their participation more seriously. However, the students involved in this study were not systematically surveyed for their reception of the instrument, so these conclusions remain anecdotal. It is also worth noting that the researchers report utilizing the criteria created by that specific group of students in subsequent courses and not necessarily repeating the rubric co-creation process.

Two Approaches to Measuring Participation

Context

In this section, we detail two approaches to assessing participation designed to increase engagement by involving students. First, we describe the instructional context and the existing means of assessment used in this context. We then describe each of the alternative approaches in turn.

The courses in which these assessment approaches were used belong to a German language program at a large southwestern university in the United States. Historically, most of the lower division course sections (first- to third-semester German) are taught by graduate student instructors. Some instructors have expressed interest in alternative approaches such as ungrading. However, despite support at the departmental level, the extent to which radical changes can be implemented is limited due to a need for section and level consistency and meeting specific institutional requirements. Course sections taught by graduate instructors are also generally not uniform in size and range anywhere from seven to 16 students, which in turn may influence the amount students are able to participate in course discussions; smaller course enrollments mean that students have more opportunities to speak in class, whereas courses with a larger number of students risk not always giving individual students an opportunity to volunteer or conversations potentially being dominated by only a few. Most students enrolled in these courses have also entered university after completing high school in the US, and many students are required to take a FL course.

Default Assessment Method

The default participation assessment method used in most of the lower division courses in this program is relatively subjective, and section consistency is already in jeopardy. In these sections, participation is assessed by the instructor, and students receive a weekly total grade ranging between 0-10 out of a possible 10 points. These weekly grades are then a part of the total participation calculated for the final grade. No common rubric is used, and the decision to provide explicit feedback is left to the instructor's discretion. However, every syllabus from each of these course sections contains the following statement about grading student participation and preparation:

To earn full participation points, you must be present, punctual, prepared, speak in German, and participate in the main classroom session and breakout groups. You must work cooperatively with your classmates, engage with the instructor, maintain an open mind towards the target culture, and be mindful and respectful of your instructors' and classmates' opinions and abilities. A score of 85% represents average participation, meaning that you have met your instructor's basic expectations but have not exceeded expectations. Unexcused absences result in a score of 0 and will prevent you from earning full credit for participation. Please consult with your instructor so that you are aware of their expectations and what constitutes average, above-average, and below-average participation.

Attendance at each class session is included in the participation grades for students enrolled in these courses. This attendance policy was determined by the language program director in consultation with instructors. Participation itself is calculated as 10% (first- and second-semester German) or 15% (third-semester German) of the final grade. The percentage increase at the third semester is due to the higher expectation

of student-student interaction that accompanies higher proficiency.

As previously mentioned, in-class participation is, in practice, often graded according to the amount of L2 produced. It is therefore important to mention that use of the L1, primarily English, in the classroom is not explicitly forbidden by the language program. Although instructors are expected to conduct as much of the classroom conversation in the L2 as possible, they are also given the freedom to use English when/where necessary.

We will now discuss the two alternative assessment approaches that have incorporated student input into the assessment strategies. The first approach, used by one graduate student instructor, focused on incorporating student input in the construction of an evaluation rubric used to assess weekly participation and preparation. The second approach, used by a second graduate instructor, included weekly self-evaluations from students incorporated into the grade their instructor gave them. Both approaches were used by the graduate instructors for multiple semesters as described below.

Approach 1: Co-Construction of an Evaluation Rubric

Description

The first approach was the co-construction of an evaluation rubric. This evaluation rubric was used to assign students points based on a variety of criteria relating to student participation during class and preparation for each lesson. They then received a weekly evaluation as per the syllabus.

The criteria for achieving full points were determined through discussion with students during class in the first week of each semester. Students in these course sections were asked to discuss the following prompt with a small group:

Every week this semester you'll be given a **grade out of 10 for Participation & Preparation**. Together as a class we're going to decide what you should do to earn the full 10 points. The first four points are already decided: **4 points – Present & Punctual (1 per day, -0.5 for lateness)**.ⁱ Your job is to decide what a student in our class must do each week to earn the other **6 points for 10/10**. Discuss with your neighbors what else is important to succeed in German class!

After students had discussed this in groups, the instructor collected students' ideas on the board at the front of the room. The instructor then grouped aspects into three or four different broader categories and had students give their input on how many points they thought each category should be given. Once the class and the instructor had agreed on how each criterion would be evaluated, the students were asked to sign their initials on the board next to the list before leaving class as a form of agreement. The instructor used the list to create a more formal rubric in the online learning management system, Canvas. They also uploaded a photo of the signatures and list created in class so that students could refer to it if there were questions about the grades they received.

This method of co-creating a rubric was used with one second-semester course section and one third-semester course section, with no overlapping students. While there were slight differences between what students thought should be included in participation assessment, similarities between the two groups emerged. Both groups identified three general categories which were later incorporated into the individual rubrics for both sections:

- **TL use:** speaking German during classroom activities (and in general as the language of the classroom).
- **Active classroom participation:** working with their group members/partners during in-class activities and tasks; asking questions; paying attention; taking notes; and volunteering/answering questions.
- **Pre-class Preparation:** completing online homework/assignments before class; and having other materials ready for each class session (i.e. bringing their textbook and/or laptop to class).ⁱⁱ

Table 1. *Co-Constructed Rubric for Second-Semester German Course Section.*

Criteria						Points
Present & Punctual Present and on-time for class. Excused Absences or Sick Days will not affect this. (Half points possible - i.e. for tardiness)	4 pts - Full Marks Present and punctual for all class sessions.	3 pts - 3/4 Present and punctual for 3 sessions	2 pts - 2/4 Present and punctual for 2 sessions	1 pts - 1/4 Present and punctual for one class session.	0 pts - No Marks Not present at any class sessions	4 pts
Target Language Usage Uses the target language (German) to the best of their ability. Utilizes the Survival Expressions for communication breakdowns instead of switching right to English	2 pts - Full Marks Fully attempted to use German during activities/with classmates and used strategies like Survival Expressions when needed.	1 pts -Some Attempt Some attempt was made to communicate in German, and Survival Expressions were used, but switched to English more frequently.		0 pts - No Attempt No attempt was made to communicate in German, or very little. Switched to English often.		2pts
Participating in Class Actively made an effort in class and worked well with other students in group/partner activities. (Half points possible)	2 pts - Full Marks All criteria met.	1 pts - Minimal Attempt Made an effort part of the week and/or mostly worked well with other students.		0 pts - No Marks Did not make an effort at all this week and did not work well (or attempt to) with classmates.		2 pts
Prepared for Class Prepared for class by completing daily VHL homework and other preparation activities/materials. (Half points possible).	2 pts - Full Marks Fully met the expectations.	1 pts - Some Attempt Forgot to complete VHL homework before class once or twice this week and/or was not prepared for class.		0 pts - No Marks Not prepared for class at all and/or did not complete any VHL homework.		2 pts
Total Points: 10						

Table 2. *Co-Constructed Rubric for Third-Semester German Course Section*

Criteria					Points
<p>Present & Punctual</p> <p>Present and on-time for class. Excused Absences or Sick Days will not affect this. (Half points possible - i.e. for tardiness)</p>	<p>3 pts</p> <p>Full Marks</p> <p>Present and punctual for all class sessions.</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>2/3</p> <p>Present and punctual for 2 sessions</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>1/3</p> <p>Present and punctual for one class session.</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>No Marks</p> <p>Not present at any class sessions</p>	<p>3 pts</p>
<p>Target Language Usage</p> <p>Uses the target language (German) to the best of their ability. Utilizes the Survival Expressions for communication breakdowns instead of switching right to English</p>	<p>2 pts - Full Marks</p> <p>Fully attempted to use German during activities/with classmates and used strategies like Survival Expressions when needed.</p>	<p>1 pts - Some Attempt</p> <p>Some attempt was made to communicate in German, and Survival Expressions were used, but switched to English more frequently.</p>		<p>0 pts -No Attempt</p> <p>No attempt was made to communicate in German, or very little. Switched to English often.</p>	<p>2pts</p>
<p>Participating in Class</p> <p>Actively participating in group/partner activities and volunteering at least 3 times/week. (Half points possible)</p>	<p>3 pts - Full Marks</p> <p>Volunteered at least 3 times this week and worked well with partner/group for activities.</p>	<p>2 pts - Some Attempt</p> <p>Volunteered 2 times this week and worked well with partner/group, but occasionally got off track.</p>	<p>1 pts - Minimal Attempt</p> <p>Volunteered 1 time this week and mostly did not work well (or attempt to) with partner/group.</p>	<p>0 pts - No Marks</p> <p>Did not volunteer at all this week and did not work well (or attempt to) with partner/group.</p>	<p>3 pts</p>
<p>Prepared for Class</p> <p>Prepared for class by completing daily VHL homework and other preparation activities/materials. (Half points possible).</p>	<p>2 pts - Full Marks</p> <p>Fully met the expectations.</p>	<p>1 pts - Some Attempt</p> <p>Forgot to complete VHL homework before class once or twice this week or was not prepared for class.</p>		<p>0 pts - No Marks</p> <p>Not prepared for class at all and/or did not complete any VHL homework.</p>	<p>2 pts</p>
<p>Total Points: 10</p>					

Most of the students in these two sections had been in at least one university-level language course prior to enrolling in this course, so both groups had similar expectations for their own participation as well as

instructor expectations. However, the two course sections did have slightly different rubrics based on the lists the students came up with. Interestingly, the largest difference between the two groups emerged in what they thought should be considered active participation in class. The group of second-semester students (n=16), who had all been enrolled in first-semester German the previous semester and were less confident in their language skills, considered active participation to be: making a concerted effort during activities and working well with group members. These observations are consistent with the results found in Crosthwaite, Bailey, & Meeker (2015) and Bernales (2016), where students had different ideas about active classroom engagement than instructors did. There was also a student in the second-semester section who suggested that part of being a good student was “learning from your mistakes”, which was part of the instructor’s own expectations as to which aspects of classroom engagement students would deem important. The third-semester students (n=13), who had at this point taken at least one German course.ⁱⁱⁱ They could be considered advanced beginners and saw active participation in class to be volunteering and asking questions, suggesting that they already felt more confident expressing themselves in the L2.

Student Perception

Overall, responses to mid-semester surveys indicated that students were positive toward being included in the creation of a grading rubric and liked receiving some form of explicit feedback. For example, the instructor for the third-semester section, whose rubric and agreement included volunteering in class at least once per class day, had students who showed they were more likely to adjust their active participation in class after receiving feedback the week prior.

Compared to prior experience following the default assessment method, more students approached the instructor to discuss their participation grade. These conversations addressed instructor expectations versus student expectations. Students were also asked to complete an informal mid-semester survey that addressed participation, among other topics. Not all students in these courses completed it, however, so their answers did not yield systematic data. Anecdotally, students giving feedback on the co-constructed rubric generally seemed to feel that their grades were an accurate representation of their class involvement. They felt that their input was most incorporated at the beginning of the semester, which is consistent with the assessment strategy described above. Second-semester students in particular felt that they spoke more of the TL than they were given credit for; to align more with the student experience, the instructor adjusted grading practices for that course later in the semester.

Approach 2: Self-Evaluation of Participation

Description

The second approach was student self-evaluation of their participation and preparation. Students were not asked to assess their linguistic performance, but rather the extent to which they thought they had met the instructor’s expectations. The use of self-evaluation was rooted in the desire to encourage a self-compassionate, learner-centered language learning journey. Moreover, by inviting students to think about their own performance in class in terms of engagement and initiative taking, the instructor aimed to encourage self-regulated learning and metacognitive thinking. The rubric used was adapted from one created by colleagues in French & Italian at the same institution to assess class participation during online classes. Unlike the previous approach, the rubric was given by the instructor; while students did get to provide their input in the form of self-evaluation every week, they had no input in which aspects were included in the rubric.

When discussing the syllabus, the instructor explained the default participation assessment for the language courses in the program (see above). They then emphasized how individual the language learning process can be, and how they were aware that active participation could mean different things to different people. Moreover, they acknowledged that what might be considered good participation one day could be expressed differently on another day, and that this was a very subjective experience. The instructor explained that these were the reasons why students would be expected to, at the end of each week, evaluate how they

thought their participation had been. This self-assessment would not necessarily be their recorded participation and preparation grade but would be considered before assigning the weekly grade. Completing the self-assessment was not mandatory, but students were told that completion served as an indicator of engagement with the course, and thus WTP. The reasoning behind this decision was to encourage informed self-determination in students' participation assessment.

Participation and Preparation Self-Assessment

Please rate your participation for this week according to how you feel you engaged with our class. Enter the corresponding number to each question. Your self-assessment will be taken into consideration for your grade this week. The actual grade is still determined by your instructor, but this allows us to also include your perspective in this assessment. Be honest, but also not too hard on yourself! We all have different perceptions of things, and what feels good one day may feel different on another day. **Please** reach out to your instructor if there was anything going on this week that you think may have affected your participation and should therefore be taken into consideration.

1 1 point ✖

I arrived on time (= before class started), stayed for the entire class period and was well-prepared (= I did my homework before class and brought any additional requested preparation)

four out of four sessions = 4
 three out of four sessions = 3
 two out of four sessions = 2
 one out of four sessions = 2
 never = 0
 (Excused absences do not count)

2 1 point ✖

I tried to actively participate, stayed on task, and tried to include my classmates by letting them contribute to the conversation too.

all the time = 2
 almost all the time = 1.5
 most of the time = 1
 sometimes = 0.5
 rarely = 0

3 1 point ✖

I tried to use German as much as possible, also when working in pairs/groups and when asking questions to my instructor (e.g. using survival expressions and trying to work around words I don't know yet). I took initiative to look up words I didn't know when I wasn't able to work around them.

all the time = 2
 almost all the time = 1.5
 most of the time = 1
 sometimes = 0.5
 rarely = 0

4 1 point ✖

I volunteered at least once per session and took initiative during group work

four out of four sessions = 2
 three out of four sessions = 1.5
 two out of four sessions = 1
 one out of four sessions = 0.5
 never = 0
 (Excused absences do not count)

Figure 1. Student participation and preparation self-assessment as seen on the LMS.

Each week, students completed the self-assessment by filling in a rubric administered as an ungraded quiz^{iv} (see [Figure 1](#)) through Canvas, the institution's learning management system (LMS). The LMS provided space for open comments in case students considered it necessary to provide additional information, although no student made use of this option. The rubric used by the instructor (see [Table 3](#)), in turn, was a slightly reworded version of the student rubric, but covered the same aspects and had the same point

distribution (half-points were possible).

These rubrics were used with two different sections of second-semester German students (n=12 in fall semester and n=8 in spring semester), most of whom had completed the first-semester course in the program and were acquainted with the default assessment method. However, they came from different sections and thus had been assessed by different instructors during their first semester.

Throughout the semester, the instructor kept track of the students' self-assessments to account for students who may have either systematically underrated themselves or consistently self-assessed with full marks. Whenever the instructor encountered discrepancies between the self-assessment and the score that they thought most appropriate, they would usually account for the self-assessment on the final score by averaging and rounding up the instructor and student score, unless it was a student who systematically underrated themselves. For example, if a student reported improvement in one category (e.g. moving their self-assessed score from 1 to 1.5), the instructor would often follow the student's score, even if they had initially assessed the student's performance to be lower.

Table 3. *Participation and Preparation Evaluation Rubric as used by the Instructor with the Self-Assessing Groups.*

Criteria	Ratings			
Punctuality and Preparation Arrived by the start of class time and stayed for the entire class. Came properly prepared to actively participate in class	4 Points Every day	3 Points Three out of four times	2 Points Once or twice	0 Points Never
Active Participation Stayed on task, took initiative during group work and engaged with class and tasks.	2 Points Every day	1 Point Almost every day		0 Points
German usage The proportion of German used in class is as expected for a learner at this level. The student uses German to communicate with the instructor and classmates as much as possible.	2 Points Every day	1 Point Almost every day		0 Points
Volunteering Student volunteered and/or took initiative at least once each class.	2 Points Every day	1 Point Almost every day		0 Points

Similarly to Rubio Gómez (2018)'s findings, the students' self-assessments tended to overall agree with the instructor's assessment. Participation grades would generally increase 0.5 to 1 point from what the instructor had originally assessed, usually due to the sections targeting the amount of German spoken.

Student Perception

Most students seemed receptive to self-assessment and seemed to appreciate "having a say" in what their grade would be. In this sense, there were some discrepancies between the two sections where this approach was used: The fall semester students were very consistent in submitting their self-assessment and very

honest and critical of themselves, without necessarily underrating their own performance. In the spring, students were less enthusiastic, and some consistently forgot to turn in their self-assessment. During the program's mid-semester survey, one of the students in the spring semester course commented that the self-assessment was a nuisance because it was "another thing to do", and because of the subjective nature of the assessment (in the student's words, "it's difficult to give a fair unbiased evaluation"). However, most students seemed to be glad to be prompted to reflect on their own class engagement, and the instructor noticed a difference in student engagement by those who took the self-assessment seriously. This was reflected in changes in behavior such as trying to volunteer more in class and taking more initiative during group work. The latter was especially the case with those students who were less likely to speak in front of the whole group. This seemed to suggest that self-assessment served as a regular reminder that taking the initiative in group work was also a recognized form of volunteering, and it was possible to integrate students that would otherwise be penalized by a more traditional understanding of participation in the classroom.

The Influence of Student-Input Integration on Student Engagement and Self-Regulated Learning

While both approaches had the goal of changing student engagement with class participation, they appeared to have different impacts on learners. Students who took their self-assessment seriously appeared to show changes in behavior such as interacting with the whole group or taking initiative during pair work. They seemed to develop an awareness of their own responsibility and the active role they had in bringing changes to their participation grade, which was less the case in those students who did not regularly submit self-assessments of their participation.

Most of the students who participated in co-constructing their evaluation rubric did not show a large change in their behavior. However, several students expressed that they felt more comfortable discussing weekly grades that did not meet their own expectations because they had provided input for the rubric. After these students met with the instructor to discuss the grade, they also showed the most obvious changes in classroom behavior, whether that was volunteering more during class activities or actively trying to speak more in the L2. The third-semester students also showed more initiative in the classroom, which could also be attributed to more overall confidence in language production.

Conclusion & Further Potential

While the alternative participation assessment strategies described above involved students in different ways, comparable takeaways can be inferred from both. Students in a FL classroom acknowledge the importance of active participation and preparation in the learning process, and the aspects they identify as relevant and worth evaluation seem to largely overlap with instructor expectations. This could be due to internalized expectations from previous language-learning experiences (i.e. previous university or high school language classes).

Many university-level students are highly grade-motivated, and some view required language courses as simply one of many steps in earning their degree. With this paper, we have argued that integrating student input into the assessment process can be a productive way to stimulate both WTC and WTP. In doing so, we believe that these approaches encourage self-regulated learning and potentially increase intrinsic motivation to engage with the FL classroom. The benefits of involving students in their participation assessment are twofold: it can clarify how they can indicate that they are putting in effort during classroom activities, therefore reflecting both their WTC and WTP; and it can show they are learning. In the case of self-assessment, even if both instructor and student are assigning a similar grade (which could be argued makes one or the other assessment unnecessary), acknowledging both perspectives in the assessment process opens communication between the two parties and makes it more transparent. This is especially important because, in our experience, many students perceive participation grading as a subjective and even potentially biased assessment. Involving them in their assessment could increase the perceived fairness of

the assessment instrument while also clarifying and aligning expectations. This, in turn, could give them a better idea of areas where they can improve by encouraging them to consider their own class performance. Doing so may contribute to helping students become more active learners by fostering self-regulated learning, incentivizing WTC and WTP, thus directly influencing students' language acquisition process.

We acknowledge the potential logistical difficulties which can arise when incorporating one or both assessment strategies, and programmatic support was a crucial factor that enabled our approaches. Common guidelines across sections are necessary to ensure consistency between instructors regarding expectations, but so is the flexibility to tailor to each section's needs. One method could be integrating the two presented approaches, asking for student input in the rubric that they would then use to self-assess their own participation.

From the observations and impressions discussed in this paper, we believe that students are more likely to feel responsible for their participation grades when they have been included in the assessment process. This potentially leads to an increased perception of fairness, which we see as worth investigating further in a more systematic manner. One such investigation, which has already been carried out by the authors, is a systematic survey comparing students who partook in an alternative approach and those who did not. It was, however, not within this paper's limits to discuss those results in detail.

References

- Bernales, C. A. (2014). *Exploring "willingness to participate" in the FL classroom: A quantitative and qualitative study* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin - Madison]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/1553840252/abstract/4368D0E48567484DPQ/1>
- Bernales, C. A. (2016a). Conflicting pathways to participation in the FL classroom: L2 speech production vs. L2 thought processes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(2), 367–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12200>
- Bernales, C. A. (2016b). Towards a comprehensive concept of Willingness to Communicate: Learners' predicted and self-reported participation in the foreign language classroom. *System*, 56, 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.11.002>
- Coderch, M. (2023). The future of assessment in language education: What have we learnt from the pandemic? In W. Fiorucci (Ed.), *Language education during the Pandemic* (pp. 267–285). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35855-5_9
- Crosthwaite, P. R., Bailey, D. R., & Meeker, A. (2015). Assessing in-class participation for EFL: Considerations of effectiveness and fairness for different learning styles. *Language Testing in Asia*, 5(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-015-0017-1>
- Dancer, D., & Kamvounias, P. (2005). Student involvement in assessment: A project designed to assess class participation fairly and reliably. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 445–454.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099235>
- Delaney, T. (2012). Quality and quantity of oral participation and English proficiency gains. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(4), 467–482. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812455586>
- Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and Interaction. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of second language acquisition* (1st ed., pp. 224–255). Wiley.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch9>
- Gorichanaz, T. (2022). "It made me feel like it was okay to be wrong": Student experiences with ungrading. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14697874221093640.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874221093640>

- Henshaw, F. G., & Hawkins, M. D. (2022). *Common ground: Second language acquisition theory goes to the classroom*. United States: Hackett Publishing Company, Incorporated.
- Katopodis, C., & Davidson, C. (2020). Contract grading and peer review. In S. D. Blum (Ed.), *Ungrading. Why rating students undermines learning (and what to do instead)* (pp. 105-122). West Virginia University Press.
- Knight, S., & Ferrell, G. (2022, March 2). Principles of good assessment and feedback. *Jisc*.
<https://beta.jisc.ac.uk/guides/principles-of-good-assessment-and-feedback>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). *Understanding language teaching : From method to postmethod*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of second language acquisition*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012589042-7/50015-3>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>
- Mackey, A. (2013). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- McKeachie, W. J. & Chism, N. V. N. (1994). *Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co.
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293>
- Rubio Gómez, L. (2018). *Con voz propia: Creación de una rúbrica autoevaluativa para valorar la participación diaria en las clases elementales de español como lengua extranjera* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama]. <http://ir.ua.edu/handle/123456789/5269>
- Rocca, K. A. (2010). Student participation in the college classroom: An extended multidisciplinary literature review. *Communication Education*, 59(2), 185–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903505936>
- Toro, V., Camacho-Minuche, G., Pinza-Tapia, E., & Paredes, F. (2019). The use of the communicative language teaching approach to improve students' oral skills. *English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 110-118. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n1p110>
- 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.
https://www.academia.edu/977672/Assessing_the_Assessment_An_Evaluation_of_a_Self_assessment_of_Class_Participation_Procedure?sm=b

About the Authors

Nafal Ossandón Hostens holds a PhD in Germanic Studies from the University of Texas at Austin, where she is an affiliated researcher at the Second Language Acquisition & Bilingualism Lab. Her research revolves around SLA, especially psycholinguistics, input processing and the role of metalinguistic awareness, and additional language pedagogy and assessment.

E-mail: nafal@utexas.edu

Ellen Jones Schoedler is currently a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Department of Germanic Studies at the University of Texas at Austin after completing her PhD there in May 2025. Her research interests include German dialectology, linguistic anthropology, language revitalization, language and gender, sociolinguistics, and foreign language teaching pedagogy.

E-mail: ej.schoedler@gmail.com

- ⁱ The two course sections where this method was used differed slightly in that one course met three times a week and the other met four times a week. The rubrics were adjusted to reflect this.
- ⁱⁱ The language courses in this German program follow the flipped classroom approach, so students are generally expected to come to class having completed online practice and tutorials that would be covered in greater detail in class meetings. While their scores on those assignments are a part of the overall online homework grade, students felt being prepared for each class session itself should be part of their rubric.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Some students enroll in an accelerated first-year course that encompasses the materials covered by the regular-paced first-year courses.
- ^{iv} The LMS quiz did state that each answer was worth 1 point, but this was assessed for completion only. These “quizzes” did not count towards the final grade, and students were made aware of this.