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ABSTRACT

Student self-evaluations constitute a learning opportunity for students within basic communication courses. As such, scholars have analyzed how goal setting is part of self-evaluation (Schunk; LeFebvre), how student estimations of their own ability affect their performance (LeFebvre et al.), and how students engage in self-evaluations (MacGregor). However, no research on the basic communication course has specifically analyzed the relationship between self-evaluations and metacognition. To better understand this relationship, this study was designed to describe metacognition’s role within self-evaluations by examining the topics through which students exhibited metacognition within their answers. As a result of this qualitative research, metacognition in basic communication course self-evaluations has been shown to share features with the metacognitive markers in eportfolios in composition as described by Bokser et al. (2016). This study can contribute to the basic communication field’s knowledge about how the genre of self-evaluation relates to metacognition by identifying how self-evaluations could contribute to student transfer of skills through giving students the chance to practice metacognitive skills.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

With an enrollment of approximately 1.3 million students each year (Beebe 3), the basic communication course functions to help students gain proficiency in the various skills of public communication. To accomplish this, instructors of this course choose from and use a variety of assignments, speeches, and teaching methods. A subset of these assignments and methods asks students to self-assess and self-evaluate their speech performances as a way to increase student learning. One type of self-assessing assignment used within the basic communication course is the self-evaluation, and while not every instructor in the basic communication course uses this assignment, Morreale, Worley, and Hugenberg, in a survey on the basic course, note that 93.7% of four-year and 81.8% of two-year respondents surveyed mentioned critical thinking as an area of emphasis within their basic communication course (421). Additionally, Dance discusses how, by having students engage in critical thinking, the basic course enables “the development and refinement of conceptual structures, conceptual processes” (qtd. in Morreale, Worley, and Hugenberg 407). Considering the prevalence of this emphasis on developing the conceptual thought processes of students within the basic communication course, instructors of the basic communication course could benefit from a fuller understanding of how to cultivate mindful and meaningful thought processes within their students.

As shown within the research on the basic communication course, self-evaluations serve as an assignment through which students can self-assess and critically consider their own work. Scholars note several ways through which self-evaluations can improve student learning. For example, Miles shows that students focus on delivery over content when they critique their performance. Additionally, Schunk describes how setting goals and evaluating one’s progress
towards those goals was important to student learning. On the other hand, Bourhis and Allen show that having students give feedback to themselves based on videotape recordings has become a common feature in basic communication courses (256) and Quigley and Nyquist identify how using videotapes could be an effective way to help students gain skills as long as they are accompanied by structured assessment. Furthermore, LeFebvre et al. investigates the ways students can estimate their individual speech grades during self-assessment in self-evaluation assignments. What much of this literature on self-evaluations shows is that, when students are able to watch videos of their performance alongside of a quality self-evaluation document, those students gain the opportunity to critically consider themselves and their performance. Therefore, how an instructor decides to focus the self-evaluation has value for how a student will learn.

However, during this discussion of self-evaluations, no scholar has yet considered how students metacognitively engage when they self-assess their speech performances within their self-evaluations in the basic communication course. Metacognition is a term from psychology that refers to “the act of thinking about one’s own thought process” (Silver 1). As MacGregor explains, self-evaluations require a student to consciously consider what they have learned in comparison to what they know and have learned about themselves (9). While not specified as such in MacGregor’s explanation, thinking about one’s self and about one’s own thought processes is metacognition. It is this metacognitive aspect of self-evaluations that requires further study.

Inquiry into this unexamined perspective on self-evaluations within the basic communication course has the potential to improve basic communication course instructors’ understanding of self-evaluations as a genre, which can provide those instructors a chance to
improve the learning of their students. To find answers to help fill this metacognitive gap in the literature on self-evaluations in the basic communication course, we can learn from another assignment that cultivates critical thought through self-assessment since self-assessment is, of course, not only an element of basic communication course pedagogy. Roberts defines self-assessment as the “process of having the learners critically reflect upon, record the progress of, and perhaps suggest grades for, their own learning” (Roberts 3). In this way, self-assessment is a way for students to be engaged in considering the quality of their own work (13). To better understand how self-evaluations could improve the metacognitive thought processes of students, then, we can examine another assignment that focuses on self-assessment: a reflection.

Instructors of foundational composition courses often have students complete reflections to help them develop self-assessing, metacognitive, and written communication skills. Reflections are assignments that ask students to think and write about their learning, either as a stand-alone assignment or as a part of an eportfolio. Kathleen Blake Yancey describes the purpose of reflections as helping people to “make sense” of what is being reflected upon (187). Additionally, Yancey notes that reflections give writers a space to invent their “composing self” through recursive thought (200). So, while self-evaluations place a greater emphasis on watching videos and on assessing one’s performance, reflections more directly emphasize one’s growth and composing one’s self—one’s approach to learning. This emphasis on metacognition helps make reflections and reflections in eportfolios an excellent analog to metacognition within self-evaluations.
The other aspect of reflections and self-evaluations that makes them suitably comparable is the idea that both assignments are focused on helping students gain transferable skills through the use of metacognition. So while reflections have mainly been used in and researched in the context of composition courses (Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak; Yancey) and self-evaluations have mainly been used and researched in communication courses (LeFebvre et al.; Hirschfeld; Hinton and Kramer), the two assignments can be productively compared because they share the same end goal of transfer. Self-evaluations and reflections share this end goal because of how their metacognitive essences foster transfer. To understand this connection, however, one must first understand what transfer is. Nowacek described transfer as recontextualization, meaning that transfer is the successful use of a skill or understanding in a different context than that in which the skill was originally learned. As Nowacek specifically notes, “transfer is not only mere application; it is also an act of reconstruction” (25). What this means is that transfer, as a process, requires not just the practice of a skill, but the mental ability to match that skill to a new situation and thereby create a suitable approach to that situation. In regards to reflections, Yancey, Robertson, and Taczack mention that “as we have seen in portfolios...when students write concurrently in multiple contexts, there may be exceptional opportunities for transfer” (209). In regards to self-evaluations, MacGregor discusses how “the self-evaluation process can provide curricular coherence that links classes, transforming what was a serial and often discontinuous experience into a new cognitive map” (55). As we can understand from both of these explanations, both reflections and self-evaluations give students the opportunity to develop their mental abilities, which helps these students have a better chance of transferring their skills to future endeavors.
To consider the uninvestigated relationship between self-evaluations and metacognition, this study will focus on three main topics: self-evaluations, reflections, and metacognition. An examination of the intersection of these ideas will help scholars learn what student metacognition looks like within self-evaluations. This information could help the instructors of the basic communication course to better understand metacognition within self-evaluations and thereby better comprehend how to potentially craft their assignments, especially self-evaluations, to focus more on metacognition. Additionally, by better understanding how to help students practice metacognition in self-evaluations, instructors could improve the chance for their students to transfer what they learn about themselves and public speaking to new courses and experiences.

In order to explain the relationship between self-evaluations and metacognition, Chapter 2 poses my research question by delving further into the relationship between self-evaluations, reflections, and metacognition. Chapter 3 describes the grounded descriptive coding methods I used to pursue the answers to my research question. Chapter 4 describes the seven markers of metacognition that resulted from the descriptive coding. Chapter 5 discusses the implications and limitations of the answers to my study’s research question and concludes my current inquiry into metacognition within self-evaluations in the basic communication course.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This review explains the connections between metacognition, reflection, and self-evaluation as depicted in Fig. 1. I accomplish this by joining together literature from cognitive psychology, composition, and the basic communication course. To build a case for examining the relationship between metacognition and self-evaluations, I begin by defining metacognition as it is discussed in cognitive psychology, because knowing how metacognition is defined within the literature of its birth is crucial to understanding what metacognition means for how people think in reflections and self-evaluations. I then use literature from composition to provide an operational definition of reflection that is congruent with current literature on the topic. This definition allows me to connect the literature on reflections and reflective eportfolios to my review of metacognition literature by

Fig. 1. A depiction of the relationship between the literature on reflection, self-evaluation, and metacognition
showing how metacognition has been discussed within the literature on reflections within composition (as illustrated by the 1 in Fig. 1). Specifically, this portion of my literature review focuses on the Bokser et al. study on metacognition within eportfolios to highlight its relevance to this study. A comparison of these strands of literature to the literature on self-evaluations silhouettes the absence of literature on metacognition within self-evaluations. As with the review of reflection literature, my review of self-evaluations also focuses on creating an operational definition of self-evaluations to be consistent with the literature. By tracing the need for more research within this area of self-evaluation literature, I ask my study’s research question. By posing this research question concerning metacognition within self-evaluations, this study will provide additional connection between the speech communication and composition fields.

**Metacognition**

This part of the literature review outlines metacognition as part of cognitive psychology and education. Additionally, this section discusses how metacognition fits into assignments such as reflections and self-evaluations.

Achieving metacognition can be influential, for it can help a person gain understanding over the structures of his or her mind, and, in as much as thinking contributes to the creation of someone’s identity, gain awareness of how one thinks can alter one’s very self. This is especially important for college students, who are themselves going through a kind of metamorphosis as they are trying to learn their discipline in order to become people who can achieve their goals. Therefore, understanding the literature on metacognition is important for understanding how to best construct assignments that can help students develop how they think about their thoughts.

In the literature on metacognition within cognitive psychology, many voices have contributed to what is known as metacognition. For example, Metcalfe and Shimamura discuss
how metacognition was initially developed as a concept to analyze changes in self-reflection during early development, but that metacognition has become a term that encompasses someone’s “knowledge about how we perceive, remember, think, and act” (xi). The focus on the self-aware aspects of this definition are echoed in Hacker, Dunlosky, and Graesser, who discuss how people may learn metacognitive habits so well that they become automatic. Hacker, Dunlosky, and Graesser refer to those who have learned metacognition as “agents of their own change” (10). In this way, assignments that focus on developing metacognition can help prepare students to be successful in the classroom and beyond by giving them opportunities to develop that metacognition.

Like Hacker, Dunlosky, and Graesser, scholars Chambres, Izaute, and Marescaux support the idea that metacognition is an active process that, once fully learned, becomes automatic (107-108). Kolencik and Hillwig share this conception of metacognition as an active to passive process when they discuss how greater skill in metacognition helps students become more independent as learners (8). By knowing that metacognition is an active process that can lead to well-learned actions and processes, an instructor of the basic communication course can recognize that knowing how to think metacognitively can help students believe in their ability to learn because it helps make them aware of their power and their agency as a learner.

Some of the literature on metacognition also points out that skill in metacognition has value even beyond the classroom. Yzerbyt, Lories, and Dardenne point out how being successfully able to socially interact with others is partly dependent on one’s ability to think metacognitively. Additionally, Zull emphasizes that “awareness of the importance of emotion, and reminding ourselves of it, is a key metacognitive strategy for enhancing memory formation”
So not only is metacognition important for being able to understand how one thinks and feels, but it is also important for interacting with others.

In comparison to the strands of research on metacognition within cognitive science, which began in the 1960s, the focus on metacognition in education is a more recent strand of research, beginning in the early 1990s (Hacker, Dunlosky, and Graesser 19). This includes works from researchers such as Kolencik and Hillwig, who write about how knowledge about oneself as a learner, knowledge about academic tasks, and knowledge about strategies to use in order to accomplish those academic tasks” (7-8) are all aspects of metacognition. In comparison to the definition provided by Kolencik and Hillwig, Silver defines metacognition as “the act of thinking about one’s own thought process” (1). Silver’s definition mirrors elements from the description of metacognition by Young and Fry, who define metacognition to be “the activity of monitoring and controlling one’s cognition....[as well as] what we know about our cognitive processes and how we use these processes in order to learn and remember” (1). They also note that metacognition can be understood as metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive regulation (1). Metacognitive knowledge is what a person knows about his or her processes and mental states, whereas metacognitive regulation is all of the activities that a person engages in in order to learn and remember ideas. These actions include “planning, monitoring and evaluating” (2). In relation to metacognition, Young and Fry describe how evaluating the outcome in comparison to one’s learning goals can help a person determine the effectiveness of said learning goals (2). In these ways, we can see how metacognition can include various types of thoughts.

Keeping these descriptions in mind, we can, as Silver noted, conceptualize metacognition as thinking about one’s thinking, but we should also remember that metacognition can help students grow into more active learners, can help them monitor and evaluate their actions and
emotions, and can help students become more aware of how they think and act.

Reflection

Thinking back to Fig. 1 at the beginning of this literature review, we can note that there exists an overlapping portion between metacognition and reflection (see the 1 in Fig. 1); this portion of the literature has been explored by several members of the composition field. However, before I discuss these recent forays into metacognition and reflection, I must define what reflections are. The following discussion defines reflections and then reviews research that focuses on metacognition within reflections and eportfolios, emphasizing the contribution of Bokser et al. to this line of literature and to this study. Since reflections share with self-evaluations a common goal in helping students achieve transfer, much can be learned about metacognition in self-evaluations by understanding how the composition field has examined metacognition in reflections and reflective eportfolios. Between considering metacognition, reflection, and eportfolios, this section helps to build the basis for this study’s research question.

Yancey, an expert on reflections within composition pedagogy, describes reflection by identifying three types—reflection-in-action, constructive reflection, and reflection-in-presentation (202). She defines reflection-in-action as the reflection that occurs during a writing event (200), constructive reflection as the reflection that happens between writing events wherein a multi-voiced self is created (200), and reflection-in-presentation as ruminations on a writing event and the many relationships of the writer and the piece within a particular setting to a particular event (200). The reflections and reflections in eportfolios that are part of many composition courses fall under reflection-in-presentation since those are assignments meant to have students explore the relationships between themselves and the many variables within their writing and writing in general.
Four years after Yancey defined reflection in these three ways, Carol Rodgers claimed that “over the past 15 years, reflection has suffered from a loss of meaning. In becoming everything to everybody, it has lost its ability to be seen” (843). To reinstate that meaning, Rodgers provided a more historical explanation of reflection—primarily through the vision of John Dewey.

The first element of Rodger’s definition of reflections looks at reflections as opportunities for meaning creation, or learning. Specifically, Rodgers explains:

Reflection is a meaning-making process that moves a learner from one experience into the next with deeper understanding of its relationships with and connections to other experiences and ideas. It is the thread that makes continuity of learning possible, and ensures the progress of the individual and, ultimately, society. It is a means to essentially moral ends. (845)

This definition clearly explains how reflection both relies upon and develops the ability to transfer meaning and thus help an individual grow in their understanding of the connectedness of ideas. By creating meaning through reflections, students can improve their ability to learn through transfer, which, as has been explored previously in this review, is enabled by the metacognitive thoughts inherent in reflection.

The second part of Rodgers’ definition of reflection focuses on the idea that “Reflection is a systematic, rigorous, disciplined way of thinking, with its roots in scientific inquiry“ (845). The third element of Rodgers’ definition of reflection focuses on the idea that “Reflection needs to happen in community, in interaction with others” (845). The fourth part of Rodgers’ definition of reflection focuses on the idea that “Reflection requires attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of oneself and of others.” (845). For Rodgers, and thus for Dewey, this
includes whole-heartedness, directness, open-mindedness, and responsibility, which together form a state of readiness for reflection.

By combining the results of Rodgers’ research with the previous research done by Yancey, I define reflection as an activity or habit of mind that requires a person to elaborate in whole-hearted, specific detail in order to metacognitively consider one’s learning.

Reflection is thus considered to be an activity that can encourage students to develop their consciousness through metacognitive thought. Patricia Perry, in her book on composition, argues that the curriculum of writing courses should focus on helping students to develop a conscious awareness of a duality within their minds (181). One of the most profound implications of her argument is that she calls for a curriculum that, at its core, advocated a kind of metacognitive experience. For example, Yancey contends that composition scholars should talk about reflection “by bringing identity formation into the center of class, by assuming agency on the part of students, by seeing learning and texts as negotiated” (199). Yancey also affirms that the process of finding and forming one’s identity is the purpose of the composition classroom (202). Metacognition can help students build their selves, so the idea that identity-formation is a purpose of a writing classroom means that metacognition plays an incredibly important, even a vital, role in reflections.

Studies in composition have recently focused in on examining the metacognition of students who have completed eportfolios, which are assignments based on reflecting on one’s learning across a semester as well as the interconnections among assignments and the assignment’s relation to course and learning outcomes. Researchers such as Landis, Scott, and Kahn; Meyer et al.; and Bokser et al. have made great strides in examining metacognition’s role within eportfolios in foundational composition courses.
One of the most relevant incarnations of reflection in a composition course today is in the eportfolio assignment. Meyer et al. defines what an eportfolio is by describing it as “a digital container capable of storing visual and auditory content including text, images, video and sound” (84). Meyer et al. also illustrate the pedagogical value of this assignment by describing how the assignment allows students the opportunity to be creative while they discuss the process that went into their work (85). Jensen recognizes the value of well-integrated eportfolios, noting within her article several levels of quality reflection that students can achieve within the assignments (55-58). As explored by Jensen, reflection is an important element in eportfolios. Researchers Landis, Scott, and Kahn explain, “Reflection has long been viewed as a cornerstone of most eportfolio practice in higher education, whether for supporting learners in making connections among learning experiences or for enabling authentic assessment of learning within programs” (107). In this sentence, Landis, Scott, and Kahn describe the connections that eportfolios allow students to create amongst their learning experiences. Considering that Landis, Scott, and Kahn’s study was informed by the principles of reflection established by Rodgers, and considering that reflections and self-evaluations have a same end goal in transfer, this means that what composition scholars have learned about metacognition’s role within eportfolios can inform the study of metacognition within self-evaluations.

Bokser et al.’s 2016 study is the most recent research on metacognition within student eportfolios. In this study, Bokser et al. discover, through an examination of 30 student eportfolios, four markers of metacognition within the students’ eportfolios: “Awareness of Learning Over Time,” “Awareness of Processes & Strategies,” “Awareness of Strengths & Weaknesses,” and “Awareness of Affect & Values” (15). In finding these markers, Bokser et al. discovered a way to potentially analyze other assignments for metacognitive units. In the
following paragraphs, I discuss Bokser et al.’s study as well as each of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers to illustrate the value of their insights.

The main purpose of Bokser et al.’s study was to discover any evidence of metacognition in the eportfolios. They define metacognition as “an individual’s awareness of and thoughts about his/her own thinking and learning processes; it is also an ability to monitor, track, evaluate, and change those thinking and learning processes” (34). To find evidence of student metacognition in eportfolios, Bokser et al. used descriptive coding to analyze student eportfolios and, through that process, develop a final list of four codes. Bokser et al. called the final versions of the four codes metacognitive markers. Bokser et al’s qualitative study is important because, through metacognitive markers, they found a way to “identify evidence of metacognitive ability within the work of three very different student populations enrolled in courses at our institution with varying intentions, content, and disciplines” (33). The following paragraph will explain each of Bokser et al’s four metacognitive markers.

The first of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers is awareness of transfer of learning over time. For Bokser et al., this marker indicated instances when students would apply a past experience to a present or future one (36). The second of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers is awareness of processes and strategies for learning. For Bokser et al., this marker represented the activates, actions, or procedures the students used to learn or what motivated them to learn (36). The third of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers is awareness of strengths and weaknesses in learning. For Bokser et al., this marker included when students discuss what abilities they have to complete a task or what deficiencies they may have (36). The fourth and final of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers is awareness of affect & values. Bokser et al. explicitly say that this marker includes “emotional response to a learning experience” as well as any preferential value
the student applies to that experience (37). Together, these codes provided a way for Bokser et al. to examine student metacognition across sections and courses.

These markers of metacognition from Bokser et al. are a valuable conceptual frame for studying the basic communication course because they represent a detailed level of understanding that, if the literature on the basic communication course had, could be used to improve the teaching of students within the basic communication course. Additionally, Bokser et al. makes the hypothesis that their results are a consequence of the language of the eportfolio assignment, meaning that the occurrence of metacognition could differ based on what an assignment asked for. Most importantly, however, the most influential implication of Bokser et al.’s study is the idea that “metacognition can be recognized and described across different contexts, and in ePortfolios with varied purposes” (40). Finding markers of metacognition within a particular assignment could help teachers of various disciplines by improving instructors’ understanding of assignments and their understanding of what metacognition looks like within particular disciplines and beyond. Additionally, the more markers of metacognition are found and studied, the understanding of what metacognition is overall should grow and improve.

Self-Evaluation

To consider the uninvestigated relationship between self-evaluations and metacognition (depicted as 2 within Fig. 1), I will synthesize various scholars’ definitions of self-evaluations to create an operational definition of the assignment, explain the origins and development of scholarship on self-evaluations, and discuss how the topic of metacognition within the current literature on self-evaluations deserves more scholarly attention. I will end this literature review by posing my study’s research question.
Self-evaluations have had various interpretations over the years. For instance, Kusnic and Finley define self-evaluations as “the student’s reflection on and evaluation of his or her learning, in writing” (8). By doing this, Kusnic and Finley touch on the idea that reflection allows students to think about what they have learned (Roberts 4). Kusnic and Finley also discusses how student self-evaluation can provide a unique platform for self-definition and for claiming one’s own sense of self within the wider community of a course. In contrast to Kusnic and Finley’s definition, Dale H. Schunk’s description of how “self-evaluation refers to comparing one’s progress with one’s goal to determine whether progress is acceptable and reacting to that assessment” (86) is more focused on the idea of progressing towards a goal rather than reflecting on and evaluating one’s learning. The inclusion of goals in the definition of self-evaluations as an assignment is shared by LeFebvre. In his study of goal settings and self-generated feedback from two speeches in a basic communication course, LeFebvre demonstrates the connected nature of goals and self-generated feedback; the connection is achieved through students’ self-observations of their own speeches via video recordings.

Overall, by synthesizing the views on self-evaluation in the basic communication course as described by Kusnic and Finley, Schunk, and LeFebvre, a self-evaluation can be understood to be an assignment that has a student evaluate and assess his or her learning by comparing his or her progress with his or her goal and the performance criteria defined within the rubric of assessment after observing his or her own speech via a video recording. By keeping this definition in mind, we can better understand the growth and development of this assignment.

Self-evaluations have their scholastic roots in video replay, the history of which stretches back several decades. In 1970, James C. McCroskey and William B. Lashbrook inquired into whether students could better meet the goals of the course after watching a video of their
performance (200) and they found that students did better when they watched their video and received feedback from the instructor of the course (205). Over the course of the next few decades, several other researchers (Hirschfeld; Miles; and Hinton and Kramer) also established the value that video recordings can bring to student evaluations, critiques, and analyses of their own speeches.

As research moved forward, however, more focus was directed to student interaction with and response to self-evaluation situations. For example, another communication scholar, Renee Edwards, wrote in 1990 about how feedback affected students of differing sensitivities in different ways. Specifically, Edward noted, students with high sensitivity created their self-evaluation based on more sources and thus were less likely to incorporate instructor feedback, whereas students with lower sensitivity relied more on teacher feedback for their self-evaluation (110). In this sense, who a student is and where they are in their learning development could make a difference in how they approach, respond, and grow from a speaking situation.

The development of the self has been a growing theme in self-evaluation literature. As LeFebvre notes, “self-observation serves an important self-regulatory function by providing information to people about what they do and how they are doing it, which is then used for goal-setting and evaluative progress” (290). Importantly, LeFebvre et al. also note that self-evaluations help students “assess their own behavior and serve as their own source of feedback” (2). As LeFebvre et al. affirm, the words the students write during their self-evaluations create “an avenue for examining how students perceive themselves and determine where their focus resides during the self-evaluative process” (2). This statement is important, for its reference to students’ perceptions of their selves is indicative of one of the major skills that self-evaluations help students to learn and develop—metacognition.
Elements of metacognition have been discussed in self-evaluation literature—for instance, as Kusnic and Finley point out, “student self-evaluation requires not only reflection but also self-reflection...to think not only about what they have learned but also about what they have learned in relation to themselves” (9). LeFebvre et al. describe how students can, in addition to accurately estimating their abilities, also over- or underestimate their own abilities (4), and in doing so make insights about what students think about and how that differs amongst ability level. This is rather similar to considering how students are thinking about their own thinking, and therefore could potentially benefit from the consideration of metacognition. The fact that scholars such as Kusnic and Finely and LeFebvre et al. are discussing these inward–looking, self-developing, self-critical aspects of self-evaluation is indicative of the potential utility of a deeper examination of metacognition within the self-evaluation assignment.

While scholars have explored how students can estimate their abilities and how the self-evaluation assignment can provide an opportunity for students to be self-reflective, none of the current studies on self-evaluation in the basic communication course have yet identified markers of metacognition within student self-evaluations. In light of the need for a greater understanding of metacognition within self-evaluations, this study emulates Bokser et al.’s focus on finding metacognitive markers within eportfolios by seeking to find metacognitive markers within self-evaluations. To do so, this study asks the following question:

*RQ₁:* What are the metacognitive markers that students in the basic communication course display when completing self-evaluations?

This chapter reviewed several strands of literature and posed one key question fueled by the gap in the research on self-evaluations and self-assessments concerning the presence of
metacognition within self-evaluations. Chapter 3 will explain the descriptive coding methods by which the author has contributed to this research space.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

In order to answer the research question posed by this study, the author completed a grounded analysis of thirty self-evaluations using descriptive coding (Saldaña). Metacognition served as the sensitizing concept, directing the author’s focus within her coding of the self-evaluations (Bulmer). The coding resulted in seven categories, also referred to as markers of metacognition.

Sample

The samples for this study were drawn from the data of an IRB-approved study. That study included submissions of self-evaluations of instructional speeches and persuasive speeches from 536 participants. These participants completed these self-evaluations as part of a basic communication course at a large Midwestern, four-year, state university. The current research study focused on thirty of these 536 willing participants. Thirty self-evaluations from thirty students were chosen because the Bokser et al. study examined 30 different eportfolios; the thirty participants were selected in order to help create a comparable study.

The thirty self-evaluations were picked to represent the different student variables found within the basic communication course. These variables included the section of the course, the sex of the student, and the year in school of the student. Other demographic information, such as age or ethnicity, were not collected and thus were not included in the choosing process. The overall grade in the course was also originally used as a variable, but was in the end ignored because that number actually referred to a student response to another assignment. The selection process also initially ignored the content of the students’ responses, since choosing based on that content could have unintentionally skewed the results of the study to focus on particular markers of metacognition. To avoid potential bias, the author also excluded any students taught by the
author. The students in this sample were split between 15 males and 15 females. Specific females and specific males were chosen from the sections to evenly represent the year in school of the student as well as the overall grade earned in the course. This sample included 6 freshman, 8 sophomores, 8 juniors, and 8 seniors. These students represented 15 sections of the course and 21 different majors. This variety of students was chosen to help ensure that the sample represented the expressions of the students within the basic communication course.

These samples were drawn from one assignment—the self-evaluation of the students’ instructional speech. This speech was the first that the students completed and evaluated within the course. By sampling student self-evaluations of their first large speech in the class, the author meant to examine students’ initial efforts at metacognitively considering their performance.

The self-evaluation assignment being studied was created by LeFebvre and is available in Appendix A. The self-evaluation assignment asked five questions:

1. What was the best thing(s) you saw yourself do during the speech?
2. What did you see that you would like to change or do differently?
3. How do you plan to adapt your goals to be more effective as a speaker for the next speech?
4. How many times did you watch the video of your speech?
5. What letter grade do you think you earned on your speech?

The responses to the first three questions from 30 students were coded for markers of metacognition through the use of descriptive coding. The responses to the last two questions were not metacognitive, in that they were giving themselves a grade or confirming the presence of an action rather than ruminating on any kind of mental thought process. Due to the lack of a focus on a mental thought process, the final two questions were not included in this study.
Analysis

In order to code the data and thereby create categories, the author read through the 30 samples, taking notes of the metacognitive markers discussed by the students. The unit of analysis for the coding was primarily sentences, with some longer sentences being split into smaller pieces in order to be coded more accurately for metacognitive markers. The author then used these observations to create the preliminary set of 8 coded categories: Set a Goal, Expression of Positive Emotion, Expression of Negative Emotion, Preparation Process, Past Experiences, Perspective Change, Personal Habits, and Other Mental Processes. She tested these categories by teaching a graduate student the rules for each category and then having that student code a test of examples of coded material to check for inter-rater reliability. The author then calculated for Cohen’s Kappa, which resulted in an inter-rater reliability score of .717. The author used the agreements and disagreements from the first round of inter-rater reliability testing to refine and reorganize the categories of the data.

The author tested a refined second set of categories in the same manner as the first with a different graduate student. This second set of 7 codes included the following—A Goal, An Expression of Emotional Contentment, An Expression of Emotional Discontent, A Part of the Preparation Process, Personal Knowledge, A Change in Perspective, and Other Mental Processes. The Personal Knowledge category was created from the previous Past Experiences and Personal Habits categories to represent the moments whenever a student considered their past personal attributes and experiences. Once these codes were developed, the author updated her codebook with the new categories (see Appendix B). To test the reliability of this coding scheme, the author taught a new coder the rules for each coded category and then had that graduate student code a test of 21 examples of coded material. After this process, the author
calculated for Cohen’s Kappa, which resulted in an inter-rater reliability score of .717. Since this result was equal to the previous test, the author deemed her scheme consistent and proceeded with the study. The author then used the seven markers to state, discuss, and analyze the results of the study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The author's descriptive coding of the thirty student self-evaluations from a basic communication course resulted in a set of seven categories, which are also referred to as the metacognitive markers of the self-evaluations. See Appendix B for a full description of these markers and see Fig. 2 for an account of the number of students (out of the thirty in the sample) that expressed metacognition that matched a particular marker. The following paragraphs discuss and exemplify each of the metacognitive markers that resulted from the descriptive coding of the data set.

![Chart]

Fig. 2. Number of students who expressed these metacognitive markers

The first marker, *A Goal*, represents the moments when students set goals for their future performance. The following is an example of a student setting a goal—“Next time around I will make sure that the information I plan to deliver fits my organizational pattern” (12). Among all
thirty samples, twenty two of the students displayed this kind of metacognition, making this marker the most prevalent of the seven.

The second marker, *A Part of the Preparation Process*, represents the students’ thoughts on their already completed preparations for their most recent speech. The following are two examples of students discussing their preparation process—“I practiced my intro the most because it is the most important in getting connected with my audience” and “I think that a lot of the faults in my speech were due to lack of practice and time put into the organization.” Both of these examples show how these students were thinking about their practice methods, yet another instance of metacognition within these self-evaluations. This marker was the second least frequent, only occurring in the responses of eleven students.

The third marker, *An Expression of Emotional Contentment*, represents the students’ comments that expressed emotions (such as happiness, pride, or confidence), which indicated the students’ contentment with their performance. The following are two examples of students expressing emotional contentment—“I am very proud of this instructional speech” and “I already feel a little more comfortable in front of a group.” Both of these instances show students describing their emotional state, which constitutes this marker of metacognition.

The fourth marker, *An Expression of Emotional Discontent*, represents the students’ comments that expressed emotions (such as anger, nervousness, confusion, or disappointment) that described their discontent with their performance. The following are two examples of students expressing emotional discontent—“I’m really mad at myself for going over on time!” and “I did pass my notes back and forth between my hands though, so I can tell I was still somewhat nervous.” Just like with the examples of the emotional contentment marker, these students are expressing emotion as a metacognitive marker. The only difference is that these
students display emotional dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction and contentment. In comparison to the *An Expression of Emotional Contentment* marker, student use of this discontent marker was slightly less numerous, with thirteen students discussing their discontent rather than fourteen students discussing their contentment.

The fifth metacognitive marker, *Personal Knowledge*, is a marker that represents when students reference a personal experience, memory, or ongoing habit to discuss their performance. The following is an example of this marker—“during my delivery of my instructional speech my delivery was not as bad as it would have been in high school.” This particular student chose to connect his or her recent learning experience—their instructional speech—with a past experience—being in high school. This act of connecting to personal experience or memory is metacognition. Fifteen, or half, of the sample included this form of metacognition.

The sixth marker, *A Change in Perspective*, represents the moments when a student described a change in how he or she perceived his or her performance. This marker focuses on the shifts and changes explicitly described in a student’s learning. The following is an example of this marker—“after watching myself deliver the instructional speech, I have come to the conclusion that there are many things I would like to change about my public speaking” (11-12). As with other examples of this marker, this student described a change in his or her thinking that came from the experience of re-watching and evaluating their speech. Twelve students in the sample exhibited this marker of metacognition.

The seventh marker, *Other Mental Processes*, represents the students’ various kinds of metacognitive thoughts, including forgetting, reminding, and understanding. The following is an example of a student discussing one of these processes—“I also had a firm understanding of my topic and it is something I have done many times.” While this marker was the least occurring of
all of the markers, with only seven students of the possible thirty using this marker of metacognition, this example illustrates that some students consider the exact method they use to mentally process information.

The analysis of these markers in Chapter 5 will explain how these results contribute to answering the research question posed by this research study.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

By analyzing student metacognition within this set of thirty student self-evaluations, we can better understand how students think metacognitively about the act of public speaking within the basic communication course. The following discussion focuses on answering the research question this study poses by stating and analyzing the markers of metacognition found within this study of self-evaluations. To illustrate how these markers deepen our understanding of metacognition within the basic communication course and the foundational composition course, I will then compare how the self-evaluation markers are similar to and different from the markers within reflective eportfolios described by Bokser et al. This comparison leads my description of the implications of the similarities and differences between these sets of markers for guiding pedagogy toward a greater emphasis on teaching metacognition for transfer within the basic communication course.

Based on the results of this research study, students in the basic communication course exhibit seven different markers of metacognition: setting goals, expressing emotional contentment, expressing emotional discontent, describing their preparation process, discussing personal knowledge, describing a change in their perspectives, and acknowledging the mental processes they used to evaluate their performances on the speech (See Table 1). In comparison to the Bokser et al. study, these seven metacognitive markers were slightly different than the Awareness of Processes and Strategies; the Awareness of Strengths and Weaknesses marker; and the Awareness of Affect and Values marker of eportfolios. Specifically, the seven markers of metacognition from self-evaluations differ from the markers from eportfolios in that they did not include an emphasis on values, placed a greater emphasis on goal-setting, and used emotional
responses to evaluate strengths and weaknesses. These differences will be expounded upon in the paragraphs below.

Additionally, in comparison to the markers of metacognition of eportfolios, the markers of metacognition of self-evaluations showed similarities to each of the four metacognitive markers identified in eportfolios by Bokser et al. (see Table 1). In short, both sets of markers share a time-based focus on learning, a goal-oriented metacognition, and an emotion-based considerations of their work. In the following paragraphs, these similarities will be explored at greater length.

Understanding these differences and similarities between the metacognition in self-evaluations and eportfolios can help instructors of the basic communication course to understand how best to facilitate students’ learning of metacognitive skills that could assist them in transferring their knowledge to new situations.

Table 1: Metacognitive markers from the current study on self-evaluations and the Bokser et al. study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognitive Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Evaluation Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Part of the Preparation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Contentment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Discontent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Change in Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Bokser et al. Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Learning Over Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Process and Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Strengths and Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Affect and Values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One significant similarity between the metacognition of self-evaluations and reflections in eportfolios is the fact that self-evaluations share with eportfolios a time-based focus on learning. One of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers is Awareness of Learning Over Time, which describes statements wherein “students connect or transfer a prior learning experience to a present or future one” (11). In this research study, several markers of metacognition for self-evaluations correspond quite closely with this marker of metacognition. For instance, the Personal Knowledge marker includes students who connected their experience watching and evaluating their own performance in the recent past to specific memories from their personal past. Specifically, half of the students in this sample included references to personal memories and habits of action as part of their self-evaluations. One student mentioned that “I have a horrible habit of getting into a pattern when I speak” while another student described how “My hands used to tremble during public speaking class a few years ago.” Both of these excerpts exemplify how some students used their prior experiences to gage their levels of performance and learning. The contrast of selves and of one’s own performance across time inherent in the Personal Knowledge markers is a clear example of how students in self-evaluations also have a concept and an awareness of their learning across time.

The A Goal and the A Change in Perspective metacognitive markers are also both evocative of Bokser et al.’s learning over time metacognitive marker. In one way, changing perspectives had the student writing about his or her experience with the instructional speech in a way that they showed what they learned from their experience. This marker is reminiscent of Bokser et al.’s learning over time marker because it requires students to become aware of the specific connections between their past and their present. By connecting potential areas of
improvement to areas of less preparation, these students identified gaps and errors in their processes and thus were able to set goals for their future performances.

In a similar fashion, when students set goals within the assignment, the student makes a connection between the learning experience of the speech and their future speech. Instances of this goal-oriented metacognitive marker occurred quite frequently mostly because it was explicitly requested in the third prompt of the assignment. As can be read in Appendix A, this prompt asked students to describe their plans for improvement and to use the course rubric and to focus on improving their content and delivery. This detailed prompt explains the existence of the majority of students’ focus on content, delivery, and preparation within their goals (see Fig. 2). The prevalence of this metacognitive type shows that direct request for a type of metacognitive marker has the chance to improve the likelihood that students think metacognitively. Through this focus on setting goals, many students’ thinking matched one of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers—that of awareness of learning over time.

Evidence of another of Bokser et al.’s metacognitive markers—the Awareness of Processes and Strategies—can also be found in this sample of self-evaluations. Bokser et al. define this marker to encompass instances when students “address how the learning came about” (Bokser et al. 11). This kind of metacognition is primarily noticeable in self-evaluations within the A Part of the Preparation Process marker. In the instances of this marker, students discuss the work they put into preparing for the speech that they were evaluating. In doing so, each student provides a rationale for his or her actions, describing the strategy that lead to his or her success in that learning situation.

One of the other metacognitive markers described by Bokser et al.—the Awareness of Strengths and Weaknesses—had a more complex appearance in these self-evaluations. In
answering the first two questions posed by this assignment, students identified the best things they did during the speech as well as areas for improvement. In this way, they discussed what they did well and what they could improve upon.

The emotional discontent and contentment of the student self-evaluations also applies to the fourth metacognitive marker—the Awareness of Affect and Value. Bokser et al. identify this awareness as occurring when “students include their emotional response to a learning experience. They may also relate some aspect of their learning to their values” (12). Being able to write words like “I was confident about what I was going to say” is a good indication of metacognition because it indicates a student’s awareness of affect. However, unlike the eportfolios Bokser et al. examined, the self-evaluations had no noticeable reference to values—notably as to why this learning experience was or was not important for them.

However, in students’ more thoughtful discussions of their strengths and weaknesses, many students did include emotional responses to their performances. It was in these responses that their metacognitive awareness of their strengths and weaknesses became visible through emotion. Some students expressed their emotional contentment with their performances and some students expressed their emotional discontent with their performances. Through statements of content and/or discontent, twenty of the thirty students in this sample became more consciously aware of what and how they thought about their processes. These connections between emotion and awareness of the quality of a performance allowed for students to connect with their experience in order to identify areas of needed improvement or areas of achievement. In other words, emotion allowed students to metacognitively engage with their learning through self-evaluations.
The previously described similarities and differences between the metacognitive markers of eportfolios and of self-evaluations further bolster the idea that both assignments share a similar purpose: to have the student grow as a communicator by giving him or her a chance to metacognitively examine and learn from their previous experiences. While self-evaluations do not appear to include exactly the same metacognitive markers as eportfolio reflections, they do provide students with some opportunities to think in a metacognitive way. In the end, it seems that the metacognition students express within self-evaluations helps those students to critically consider their selves and to thereby gain a better understanding of their learning.

Implications

This research study has interesting implications for the future of the basic communication course pedagogy. As previously demonstrated, students are expressing markers of metacognition as part of their self-evaluations. The occurrence of these metacognitive markers is made possible by the fact that a student watching a video of their own performance can compare different performances, focus on certain skills, observe themselves, and receive feedback alongside performance (Quigley and Nyquist 325-330). However, as Quigley and Nyquist also point out, “unstructured video replay does not appear to result in students’ modification of their behavior” (332). Therefore, while a student watching a video of his or her performance can help students become more aware of their actions, an additional guiding or structuring mechanism—a prompt—is required to elicit student growth through changes in their future behavior. Therefore, if instructors of the basic communication course want to increase the frequency of student metacognition, they need to consider what questions they are asking their students to complete. For instance, the third question of the self-evaluation assignment in this study (see Appendix A) focuses on asking students to consider their future goals. This prompt correlates with A Goal
being the most prevalent marker of metacognition within this sample.

One way that instructors of the basic communication course could alter their assignments’ prompts to more explicitly ask for metacognition is to ask for students to discuss more of the markers presented in this study. These markers include setting a goal, expressing emotional contentment or discontentment, planning for a task, discussing personal knowledge, experiencing a change in perspective, or thinking about their kinds of mental processes.

Instructors of basic communication courses could also add a prompt or two to their evaluation documents to focus more on eliciting metacognitive thoughts from their students. For example, to augment a student’s viewing of one of his or her speech videos, a self-evaluation assignment could ask—“How did you think or feel while watching the recording of your speech?”

Instructors of the basic communication course could examine the typical responses of their students within their self-evaluations and compare them to the metacognitive markers identified by this study to know how they might need to change their prompts to focus on helping students develop different metacognitive thoughts.

When considering these potential alterations to the pedagogy of and research on basic communication courses, one should remember that metacognition, as a learnable skill, exists as a bridge to help students achieve successful transfer of knowledge from one situation to another. Through being able to make connections and critically consider previously gained knowledge, lived experiences, or even prior practices in the light of a new situation, metacognition can help students to learn from their past and present to succeed in the future. This is an important skill for students to develop both within the basic communication course and the foundational composition courses, because both seek to teach elements of rhetorical practice. Of course, while public speaking, composition, and rhetoric are often not taught within the same courses in
universities, both public speaking courses and composition courses teach valuable communication skills that, through metacognition, can transfer to courses and situations beyond a particular semester.

As we have learned through this analysis of student metacognition within self-evaluations in the basic communication course, metacognition in self-evaluations is both similar to and different from the metacognition in eportfolios described by Bokser et al. (2016). Additionally, we have learned that the type of metacognitive markers displayed by students correlates with what prompts their self-evaluation assignments ask. Through this idea of the connection between the prompts asked and the answer given, this analysis has also identified how self-evaluations could contribute to student transfer of skills through giving students the chance to practice metacognitive skills within their responses. In answering the research question of this study, basic communication course instructors have new knowledge that could help them better craft their self-evaluation documents to focus more on metacognition. If basic communication course instructors and directors want their students to be more metacognitive learners, speakers, and eventually citizens, then even further consideration of how their assignments are or are not prompting markers of metacognitive thought is important.

**Future Research**

Basic communication course instructors and directors could continue this line of research and build off of this understanding of the differences and similarities between the metacognitions displayed by students within self-evaluations and reflective eportfolios. For example, one could inquire into whether the differences and similarities produced by the metacognitive markers from this study improve composition’s or the basic communication course’s understanding of metacognition.
Additionally, instructors of the basic communication course could further inquire into the pedagogical significance of these similarities and differences in metacognitive markers by creating a separate assignment to help students understand and practice the difference between evaluating the quality of their speech performances and metacognitively evaluating themselves as speakers and learners. This potential assignment could be evocative of the eportfolio utilized by many foundational composition courses, there could be an assignment at the end of the course that asks students to look back across their speeches and provide a detailed analysis of their mental growth. This assignment could be a portfolio evaluation of the progress captured on the videos from the first speech to the last speech. Additionally, this assignment could ask students to choose particular videos to review or experiences to reconsider with prompts, such as “How did your preparation processes contribute to your development throughout the semester?”, to structure their analysis. This assignment could also provide a framework through which a student could reevaluate his or her experiences in the classroom and thereby practice metacognition in relation to their experiences in the basic communication course. This kind of consideration could allow students to have an active understanding of their knowledge, making it much easier to transfer what they learned to new situations.

Limitations

While this study has been able to contribute a perspective to scholars’ understanding of metacognition’s role within self-evaluations, there are several influences that have limited the effectiveness and applicability of the data to other situations. All of the samples were from one university. Therefore, the results may not apply to other types of colleges or other age groups. Also, the sample was originally partly chosen based on the score they would have given themselves in the class from a different assignment, so while that was an aspect of the students’
experience, it did not immediately effect how they responded to their self-evaluation since it was from a different assignment. The sample was also limited to a small portion of several basic speech communication course sections. Additionally, the inter-rater reliability achieved by this study was marginal. Each of these elements limited the study. The sample was also limited in that it was only included students’ first self-evaluation.

**Conclusions**

By analyzing the metacognition of student self-evaluations in basic communication courses, this study has sought to enhance basic course instructors’ understanding of the genre of self-evaluations. In answering the research question of this study, we have learned that the metacognition within self-evaluations is noteworthy for its role of emotions as indicators of strength and weakness as well as the prevalence of goal setting as a form of metacognition. Having students learn and achieve metacognition within their self-evaluations, and perhaps also through new reflective assignments, has the potential to help students gain long-lasting communication skills that they could transfer to new courses and new situations. Scholars’ and instructors’ continued awareness of the kinds of metacognition that occur in self-evaluations, and increased awareness of the importance of metacognition to the success of self-evaluation assignments in achieving transfer should help to guide future pedagogical decisions regarding these assignments.
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APPENDIX A

SELF-EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Self-evaluation Form:
Speech Communication 212

Name __________________________________________
Section _________________________________________
Speech __________________________________________

Directions: There is a difference between how you feel compared to how you sound and look during a speech. When viewing your video pay attention to how you look and sound rather than how you feel and watch the video as if watching a stranger.

When answering each question be specific and detailed, using examples from what you see and hear on the video recording. Compose at least one well-developed paragraph (consisting of a minimum of five to seven sentences) when responding to each section or subsection of the self-evaluation. A well-developed paragraph is clear, cohesive, and contains a topic sentence that is elaborated on in subsequent sentences. Upon completion of your self-evaluation form please submit the form by the date and time specified in the syllabus.

Section 1: Focus your evaluation on the positive aspects of your speech. Each subsection below requires a well-developed paragraph (consisting of minimum of five to seven sentences); therefore, each subsection should contain a well-developed paragraph worth five points – totaling 20 points for the entire section.

What was the best thing(s) you saw yourself do during the speech?

| Introduction: |
| Delivery: |
| Structure: |
| Conclusion: |

Section 2: Focus your evaluation on what you would like to change about your speech. This section requires a well-developed paragraph (consisting of minimum of five to seven sentences) – totaling 10 points for the entire section.

What did you see that you would like to change or do differently?

Analyze your speech considering all aspects of the rubric. What would you like to change about this speech?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you see that you would like to change or do differently?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section 3: Focus your evaluation on how you plan to make adjustments to be more effective as a speaker. This section requires a well-developed paragraph (consisting of minimum of five to seven sentences) – totaling 10 points for the entire section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you plan to adapt your goals to be more effective as a speaker for the next speech?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you plan to adjust your approach or strategies for speechmaking to improve the effectiveness and quality of your speech, considering both content and delivery. Use the rubric to assist in formulating your goals for the next speech, and reflect on what you could do differently in the preparation process for the next speech. Be specific when you describe your intentions for improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Indicate the number of times you watched your speech in its entirety by **bolding** and **underlining** that number. This section is worth a total of 5 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times did you watch the video of your speech?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5: Indicate the letter grade you think best represents the score you earned on your speech by **bolding** and **underlining** that letter. This section is worth a total of 5 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What letter grade do you think you earned on your speech?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A  A-  B+  B  B-  C+  C  C-  D+  D  D-  F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### EXPLANATIONS AND EXAMPLES OF THE MARKERS OF METACOGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker of Metacognition</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Typical Words and Phrases</th>
<th>Example One</th>
<th>Example Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Goal</td>
<td>This marker represents the moments when students set goals for their future performance. This only applies to goals set after the students see the video recording of their most recent speech. Therefore, this marker does not apply to any goals set before the most recent speech. Instead, this marker encapsulates what the student indicates that he or she wants to accomplish or achieve in his or her preparations for the next speech.</td>
<td>goal; I plan to; I will; I need to; I wish to; I am going to; next time; I would like to</td>
<td>Next time around I will make sure that the information I plan to deliver fits my organizational pattern.</td>
<td>I wish to be more equipped and practiced up on the delivery of the speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Contentment</td>
<td>This marker represents the students’ comments that expressed emotions such as happiness, pride, or confidence. These kinds of emotions indicated that the student was content with an aspect of his or her performance. Emotional contentment, in this regard, is an element of the evaluation process for these students and therefore occurs after they view the video of their most current speech. Emotional contentment also includes any description of a lack of emotional discontent.</td>
<td>happy; proud; confident; relaxed; relief; love; smart; comfortable, did not panic, not nervous</td>
<td>I spent a good amount of time on my final statement and was proud of how well it tied back to my attention getter.</td>
<td>Obviously I would love to be more fluent in my speech and less nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Discontent</td>
<td>This marker represents the students’ comments that expressed emotions such as anger, nervousness, confusion, or disappointment. These kinds of emotions reflected that the student was not content with their performance. Emotional discontent, in this regard, is an element of the evaluation process for these students and therefore occurs after they view the video of their most current speech. This means that any emotions felt prior to the speech are not included in this marker. Emotional discontent also includes any description of a lack of emotional contentment.</td>
<td>confused; bummed; nervous; angry; mad; doubt; not excited</td>
<td>I think with this being our first major speech I let myself get more nervous than I ought to be.</td>
<td>I couldn’t hear myself at times and was confused with what I said at moments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Part of the Preparation Process

This marker represents the students’ thoughts on their already completed preparations for their most recent speech. It includes any description and consideration of the actions or thoughts a student went through to help himself or herself prepare to give his or her speech. This does not refer to any of the methods the student may plan to use to improve for a future communicative event.

If I was to do it over again, I would practice a lot more

I didn’t practice much

integrating slides into my speech, so I accidentally went to the next slide multiple times

prepare; practice; lack of practice

Personal Knowledge

This marker represents when students referenced a personal experience, memory, or ongoing habit to discuss their performance. The examples of this marker include a mix of past tense and present tense lines. What connects all of the examples is the introspective focus on the self, whether it is a past experience or a continuing occurrence.

always had; usually; regularly; from my experience

I have a raspy voice anyway, so it’s something I’m always trying to work with.

My hands used to tremble during public speaking class a few years ago

A Change in Perspective

This marker represents a change that students describe concerning how they go from thinking one way to thinking in a different way. The most notable aspect of this marker is its intersection between past events and current (during the self-evaluation) revelations. Therefore, examples of this marker occur after a student has watched the video of his or her speech and is then able to make the comparison between their current and past selves.

now; but; after; I didn’t realize

Finally, while it felt natural and meaningful at the time, my hand gestures looked rather awkward in retrospect.

My ending sounded less awkward to me than it did when I was practicing and when I gave it

Other Mental Processes

This marker represents the students’ various kinds of metacognitive thoughts, including forgetting, reminding, and understanding. In examples of this marker, students talk about how they mentally contend with the task of giving the previous speech in various ways. This marker only discusses the variety of mental processes students indicate having utilized for the previous speech.

assumed; remembered; forgot; understand

I assumed they knew nothing about this topic

I easily remembered what I was going to say
Fig. 1. A depiction of the relationship between the literature on reflection, self-evaluation, and metacognition.
Metacognitive Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognitive Markers</th>
<th>Self-Evaluation Study</th>
<th>The Bokser et al. Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Goal</td>
<td>A Goal</td>
<td>Awareness of Learning Over Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Part of the Preparation Process</td>
<td>A Part of the Preparation Process</td>
<td>Awareness of Process and Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Contentment</td>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Contentment</td>
<td>Awareness of Strengths &amp; Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Discontent</td>
<td>An Expression of Emotional Discontent</td>
<td>Awareness of Affect and Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Knowledge</td>
<td>Personal Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Change in Perspective</td>
<td>A Change in Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Processes</td>
<td>Other Mental Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>