

<https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/index.php/jeep>

P-ISSN: 2460-4046 E-ISSN: 2830-0327

Journal of English Education Program (JEEP), Vol. 13 No. 2, July 2026

Teachers' Pedagogical Techniques in Delivering Speaking Assessment: Secondary Level of Education

Putri Rahmawati Oktapiani

English Education Program, FKIP, Universitas Galuh, Ciamis, Indonesia
rahmawatiputri309@gmail.com

Luthfiyatun Thoyyibah

English Education Program, FKIP, Universitas Galuh, Ciamis, Indonesia
luthfiyatun.thoyyibah@unigal.ac.id

Didih Faridah

English Education Program, FKIP, Universitas Galuh, Ciamis, Indonesia
didihfaridah@gmail.com

APA Citation: Oktapiani, P. R., Thoyyibah, L., Faridah, D. (2025). Teachers' pedagogical techniques in delivering speaking assessment: Secondary level of education. *Journal of English Education program (JEEP)*, 13(2). 332-341.

DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/\(jeep\).v13i2.20705](http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/(jeep).v13i2.20705)

Received: 5-8-2025

Accepted: 18-7-2026

Published: 19-7-2026

Abstract: Speaking assessment plays a critical role in English language teaching, especially in developing students' oral communication skills in junior high schools. Teachers often rely on limited or repetitive speaking assessment methods, which may not fully support the development of students' speaking skills. Therefore, this study aimed to explore the types of speaking assessment techniques used in the classroom and the considerations behind the teacher's choices. A qualitative case study approach was employed, involving one English teacher as the participant. Data were collected through classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The findings revealed that oral presentation was commonly used, especially in the teaching of procedural texts. Other techniques mentioned included interviews, role plays, group discussions, and picture descriptions. The assessment process was supported by clear instructions, the use of rubrics, a one-on-one delivery format, and sufficient time allocation for both preparation and performance. The teacher's decisions in choosing assessment techniques were influenced by practicality, validity, student anxiety, and attention to key speaking components such as pronunciation and intonation. The study concludes that speaking assessments can be more effective when adapted to the classroom context and student needs through flexible and student-centred approaches.

Keywords: *oral presentation; speaking assessment; teacher technique.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Speaking has gained increased prominence in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum, particularly as a key objective in fostering students' communicative competence. In the Indonesian educational context, speaking has become a central skill to be taught and assessed, especially at the junior high school level. This emphasis is aligned with the recent shift towards the Merdeka Curriculum, introduced in 2022, which promotes student-centred learning and encourages authentic, context-based speaking assessments (Rafiq et al., 2023). The curriculum

reform reflects a growing recognition of the need for meaningful oral communication skills that support learners' participation in real-life social and academic interactions.

In addition to teaching speaking, assessing students' speaking proficiency plays a crucial role. As Ardiyansah (2019) notes, teaching speaking becomes more purposeful when grounded in assessment, enabling teachers to set learning targets, tailor instructional materials, and apply diverse evaluation forms to support students' communicative growth. Furthermore, Córdoba González, (2003) argues that speaking assessments must align with students' needs and reflect real-world language use to ensure relevance and impact. This perspective highlights the integral role of speaking assessment not only in measuring learning outcomes but also in guiding the learning process.

Despite the curricular emphasis on speaking, challenges remain in the practical implementation of speaking assessments. One common issue is the overreliance on a narrow set of speaking assessment techniques, resulting in limited variation and reducing students' chances to demonstrate different aspects of their oral proficiency. Baroroh & Sukiman (2023) observed that students' speaking performance often varies significantly across different regions and cultural backgrounds, creating further complexity in ensuring fair and accurate assessments. In regions such as Ciamis, for instance, the local linguistic environment may affect students' English proficiency, underscoring the need for culturally responsive assessment practices (Bachman & Oxford, 2010). Besides, Jamil, (2023) also points out that the lack of variation in speaking assessments, such as overreliance on controlled or written-based tasks, reduces students' engagement and limits their communicative development. Similarly, Swastika et al., (2020) found that textbooks recommended by the Ministry of Education disproportionately emphasize imitative and intensive speaking tasks, while more communicative forms, such as interactive and extensive speaking, are less frequently addressed. Rozak et al., (2024) revealed that classrooms remain limited due to logistical constraints and teachers' unfamiliarity with newer assessment tools.

While these studies have documented the types of speaking assessments used and highlighted issues in implementation, there remains a lack of in-depth understanding of how teachers make practical decisions in selecting and applying assessment techniques in actual classroom contexts. Previous literature has focused on categorizing assessment types or analysing materials, rather than examining the rationale behind teachers' choices and the contextual challenges they face. Thus, a gap exists in connecting theoretical assessment frameworks with classroom realities, particularly in underrepresented settings such as rural public schools with limited resources and staff. This study aims to address that gap by exploring the techniques used by an English teacher in conducting speaking assessments at a junior high school in Ciamis. Specifically, it investigates the types of speaking assessments employed and the teacher's considerations in selecting them. By focusing on a single case through qualitative methods, this research contributes nuanced insights into how pedagogical, contextual, and affective factors shape speaking assessment practices. The findings are expected to inform more adaptive and learner-centred assessment approaches in similar educational settings.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with a case study design to explore how an English teacher implemented speaking assessment techniques in a junior high school in Ciamis, Indonesia. The case study method was chosen because it allows for an in-depth and contextualized exploration of a specific phenomenon in this case, the speaking assessment practices of a single teacher in a natural classroom setting. This approach enabled the researcher to focus on the real-world complexities and pedagogical decisions made by the teacher in conducting speaking assessments.

The participant of the study was one English teacher who was responsible for teaching all grade levels (7th to 9th) at the selected junior high school. The teacher was selected through purposive sampling, with criteria including having several years of teaching experience and being directly involved in planning and conducting speaking assessments. The teacher's unique position as the sole English instructor in the school provided a comprehensive view of speaking assessment across different student levels and learning stages.

To collect the data, the researcher used two main instruments: classroom observation and a semi-structured interview. The observation process was conducted over three separate sessions during English lessons, focusing on how the teacher implemented speaking assessments in class. These observations aimed to document the techniques used, how tasks were presented, how feedback was delivered, and how the assessment environment was arranged. The observation guide was designed based on theoretical frameworks from Brown (2004) and Luoma (2004), ensuring that essential elements such as task clarity, rubric use, and interaction were systematically examined.

Following the classroom observations, a semi-structured interview was conducted with the teacher to gain deeper insight into the rationale behind the assessment techniques used. The interview consisted of ten guiding questions, covering topics such as the teacher's considerations in choosing techniques, challenges faced, perceptions of student readiness, and the role of pronunciation and intonation in assessment. Data were analysed using Miles and Huberman's (1994) interactive model, which includes three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The researcher first transcribed the interview and field notes, then coded the data thematically to identify patterns and categories relevant to the research questions. To strengthen the validity of the findings, triangulation was employed by comparing data from both observation and interview. Additionally, member checking was used to confirm the accuracy of interpretations, as the teacher was asked to review and validate the findings derived from her input.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This part explained the results of the research after the data from classroom observation and semi-structured interviews were obtained. In this case, the researcher acted as a non-participant observer, conducting a semi-structured interview. The results will be discussed in the following parts:

Types of Speaking Assessment Used by the Teacher

The first focus of this study is to explore the types of speaking assessment techniques implemented by the English teacher in the classroom. The findings, obtained through classroom observations, revealed that the teacher applied several speaking assessment methods, with oral presentation being the most frequently utilized during the instruction of procedure texts. In addition to this, other formats such as interviews, role-plays, group discussions, and picture descriptions were also acknowledged as part of the teacher's speaking assessment repertoire.

Based on the data, it was observed that the teacher applied oral presentation as a speaking assessment technique during a lesson on procedural text. Students were asked to describe a process or sequence of actions orally in front of the class. This activity allowed the teacher to evaluate speaking proficiency in a structured and authentic context. To implement the assessment, the teacher gave clear and detailed instructions. Students were informed about the presentation structure, starting with greetings, introducing the topic, listing materials, and delivering step-by-step procedures using appropriate transitional phrases such as "first," "next," and "finally." The teacher also outlined the assessment criteria, which included fluency, pronunciation, and

organization. This clarity helped students understand expectations and reduced confusion prior to performance.

Besides, the assessment was conducted one-on-one to reduce distractions and anxiety. Students waited outside and entered the classroom individually to present. This arrangement provided a quiet, focused environment for each student, enabling the teacher to observe each performance closely. It also promoted fairness and validity by ensuring equal attention to each student's speaking task. This controlled setup created a quiet, low-stress environment, allowing each student to present at their own pace. It enabled the teacher to observe individual performance with greater depth, paying closer attention to aspects such as fluency, pronunciation, coherence, and non-verbal communication like eye contact and posture. Without the distraction of a full classroom, the teacher could take notes, provide immediate feedback, and apply the assessment rubric more precisely.

Another aspect observed was that the teacher used a rubric to assess four main criteria: visual display, content organization, eye contact, and voice projection. Students were evaluated based on how creatively they selected and used materials, how logically they organized their ideas, and their ability to maintain eye contact and speak clearly. The rubric promoted objectivity and allowed the teacher to provide specific feedback. The visual display criterion encouraged students to use relevant and engaging materials that supported their procedural text presentations. For instance, students who brought real objects or used creative props such as cooking tools or handcrafted items were perceived to have put more effort into preparation. This aspect not only enhanced the authenticity of the presentation but also assessed students' initiative and ability to integrate visual aids meaningfully.

Content organization focused on the clarity and logical flow of ideas. Students were expected to follow a coherent sequence starting with an opening greeting, listing materials, and explaining each step in order using appropriate transition markers (e.g., "first," "then," "next," "finally"). This criterion ensured that students developed structured speech, which is an essential skill in both academic and real-life communication contexts. Students who presented their steps in a disorganized or repetitive way scored lower, which underlined the importance of planning and coherence. The eye contact component evaluated students' engagement with the teacher as the audience. Maintaining eye contact indicated confidence and awareness of communication norms, whereas frequent downward glances or reading from notes suggested nervousness or lack of preparation. This criterion served to foster students' public speaking abilities and encouraged more authentic interaction, rather than mere memorization or script reading. Voice projection, including clarity, volume, intonation, and fluency, was also carefully assessed. Students were expected to speak loudly and clearly enough to be understood, with natural pacing and minimal hesitation. Mumbled speech, inconsistent volume, or monotone delivery negatively impacted scores. This aspect is particularly relevant in assessing pronunciation, intonation, and overall comprehensibility, which are central to oral proficiency.

The use of a detailed rubric contributed to objectivity and consistency in the assessment process. It helped eliminate subjectivity by providing concrete descriptors for each performance level, which ensured that every student was judged according to the same standards. Furthermore, the rubric served as a formative tool, guiding both the teacher in delivering feedback and the students in understanding how to improve specific areas. After the presentation, the teacher could reference the rubric to give precise comments, such as encouraging a student to make better eye contact or organize ideas more clearly.

Ample preparation time was provided before the assessment. Students were informed of the task one week in advance, which allowed them to plan, rehearse, and familiarize themselves with the rubric. During the waiting period outside the classroom, students reviewed their notes and rehearsed their steps. As a result, they entered the room prepared and delivered their presentations with confidence. Throughout the preparation period, students were encouraged to become familiar with the assessment rubric, which outlined specific criteria such as fluency, organization, eye

contact, and voice projection. By knowing in advance what would be evaluated, students could strategically focus their preparation on areas that needed improvement.

On the day of the assessment, students were permitted to wait outside the classroom and use that time for last-minute rehearsal. Many students took advantage of this opportunity by reviewing vocabulary, mentally rehearsing transitions (e.g., “first,” “then,” “finally”), and ensuring they remembered the steps of their procedural task. This extra space and time allowed them to calm their nerves and focus their energy before entering the classroom, contributing to smoother and more confident performances. Importantly, the time allocated for both preparation and assessment execution proved to be adequate and well-managed. With only 15 students in the class, the teacher was able to conduct the one-on-one presentations over two standard class periods. Each student was given 3 to 5 minutes to present their procedure text, with enough flexibility for those who needed slightly more time. This scheduling approach demonstrated that, in smaller classroom contexts, individual speaking assessments can be realistically and effectively integrated into regular instructional time without sacrificing lesson continuity.

By offering advance notice, sufficient rehearsal time, and individualized space for task performance, the teacher successfully created a low-pressure environment that supported student success. The clear planning and structured timing contributed not only to the fairness and effectiveness of the assessment but also to the overall development of students’ speaking confidence and preparedness.

The teacher fostered a supportive atmosphere by encouraging students to ask questions before presenting. Several students clarified vocabulary or pronunciation with the teacher, which boosted their confidence and reduced performance anxiety. During the assessment, the teacher also offered subtle support when needed, such as prompts or follow-up questions to help students continue their speech. Feedback was provided both during and after the presentation. While students were presenting, the teacher occasionally intervened to guide them with questions like “What’s the next step?” to keep their narration on track. After the assessment, individual feedback was given to highlight strengths and areas for improvement, including pronunciation and content clarity. The feedback was constructive and aimed at motivating students and helping them develop their speaking abilities. Overall, the teacher’s approach combined structure, support, and thoughtful planning, allowing the speaking assessment to be conducted fairly, meaningfully, and efficiently.

The first finding highlights the teacher’s use of oral presentations as an assessment method, particularly during a lesson on procedural texts. This aligns with Brown’s (2004) concept of extensive speaking, where students produce longer, structured speech. The teacher provided clear instructions and a rubric beforehand, helping students understand expectations and prepare accordingly. This aligns with principles of instructional clarity (Hughes, 2002) and supports validity and fairness in assessment. A notable strategy was the use of one-on-one assessment, where students entered the classroom individually to present. This reduced anxiety and created a more learner-centred, low-stress environment, reflecting Krashen, (1982) emphasis on minimizing affective filters to improve performance. The teacher also ensured sufficient preparation time, informing students about the task one week in advance. This allowed them to rehearse and enter the assessment calmly, which aligns with Bachman and Palmer’s (1996) concept of performance conditions. Overall, the teacher’s techniques demonstrated a strong understanding of both pedagogical principles and student needs, resulting in a valid and supportive assessment environment.

Although studies reported similar speaking assessment formats, their findings highlight general trends across schools, whereas the present study examines the teacher’s reasoning, alleges, and real-time decision-making in greater detail.(Rozak et al., 2024). The findings revealed a notable similarity with the present study, particularly in teachers’ recognition and application of effective assessment strategies. In their research, most teachers incorporated speaking-related activities into their lesson plans and teaching modules, demonstrating an effort to align

instructional practices with assessment objectives. This is reflected in the current study, where the teacher integrated oral presentation tasks into a lesson on procedure texts, positioning them as both a learning activity and an assessment tool. Moreover, Rozak et al., (2024) identified common assessment formats used by teachers, including conversational tasks, question-and-answer sessions, and role-plays. These techniques were also acknowledged by the teacher in this study during the interview, indicating her familiarity with diverse speaking assessment methods. However, oral presentations were the most consistently implemented in practice. Both studies further emphasized the value of providing clear instructions and constructive feedback. In the current context, the teacher demonstrated this by clearly outlining the speaking task, explaining the assessment criteria beforehand, and offering individualized feedback both during and after student performances.

The Teacher's Considerations on a Certain Technique

The second focus of this study is to examine the teacher’s considerations in selecting and applying specific speaking assessment techniques. Based on the data gathered from semi-structured interviews, several key factors influenced the teacher’s decisions, including practicality, time management, student readiness, and the importance of assessing targeted speaking components such as pronunciation and intonation. These considerations reflect a learner-centred approach that aims to strike a balance between assessment effectiveness and classroom realities.

The goal of this research was to identify the important characteristics that determine how teachers choose specific assessment techniques. Thematic analysis, as described by Braun, et al. (2019), was utilized to analyse the interview data. The technique included coding and identifying key patterns in the teacher's comments.

Table 1.
Teachers’ Use of Diverse Speaking Assessment Techniques

Code	Interview results
T	Interviews, role-plays, oral presentations, group discussions, and describing a picture

As shown in Table 1, the teacher integrates a variety of speaking assessment techniques to support a more comprehensive and flexible evaluation of students' oral performance. The choice to implement diverse methods allows the teacher to address multiple communicative skills, from structured delivery to spontaneous interaction. By avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach, the teacher demonstrates awareness that students possess different strengths and learning preferences, which can be better identified through varied tasks.

Table 2. Practicality and Validity as Primary Considerations

Code	Interview results
PV	The selection of speaking skills assessment techniques depends on practicality, validity, and reliability, with performance-based methods being preferred due to their direct application in real-world contexts.

In Table 2, it is evident that practicality and validity are major factors in the teacher’s selection of speaking assessment techniques. While performance-based tasks such as role-plays and presentations are preferred due to their authentic nature and strong alignment with real-world communication, their implementation must also be feasible in a classroom setting. Therefore, the

decision-making process balances the pedagogical strength of a technique with the realities of the school environment to ensure assessments are both meaningful and manageable.

Table 3. Key Factors Influencing the Teacher’s Choice of Speaking Assessment Technique

Code	Interview results
VS	It must reflect the speaking skill being targeted and match the learning objectives, and the students’ abilities and confidence. Some students need more support than other

Table 3 illustrates the key factors that the teacher considers when determining which speaking assessment techniques to apply. Practicality and feasibility are prioritized to ensure assessments can be administered effectively within classroom constraints such as time and class size. Simultaneously, the teacher values validity, ensuring that each technique accurately reflects the speaking skills being targeted and aligns with instructional goals. The teacher also emphasizes the importance of addressing student proficiency and emotional needs, noting that tasks must be matched to learners’ comfort and readiness to speak. Lastly, the consistent use of assessment rubrics is highlighted as a way to uphold fairness and give students clear expectations, supporting both performance and learning.

Table 4. Strategies to Ensure Fairness and Objectivity in Speaking Assessment

Code	Interview results
CR	Defining clear assessment criteria, using standardized tools, providing feedback, ensuring consistency in administration and scoring, and considering the diverse needs of learners, and accommodating their background

Table 4 shows that the teacher uses strategic measures to ensure fairness and objectivity in speaking assessment, including clear criteria, consistent administration, and inclusivity. These measures maintain transparency, minimize bias, and consider students' diverse backgrounds, language levels, and needs, ensuring that results are based on actual performance and not external factors.

Table 5. Challenges in Student Participation

Code	Interview results
CF	Students are hesitant to speak, avoiding questions or exhibiting signs of anxiety. These difficulties can stem from various factors, including language proficiency, fear of making mistakes, lack of confidence, and even the assessment format itself.

Table 5 presents the challenges faced by the teacher in managing student participation during speaking assessments, along with the strategies used to address them. Hesitancy, avoidance, and anxiety were identified as common issues, often rooted in low language proficiency, fear of mistakes, or the nature of the assessment task itself. To overcome these challenges, the teacher implements supportive strategies, such as building a safe and inclusive environment and setting clear expectations. These efforts aim to reduce performance anxiety and increase student confidence. Additionally, the teacher emphasizes the importance of understanding individual learner needs, including shyness or neurodiversity, and offers differentiated support accordingly. These personalized approaches contribute to more equitable and effective speaking assessments.

Table 6. Focus of Speaking Assessment

Code	Interview results
FA	Pronunciation and intonation. Assessing students in this area involves gauging their ability to articulate sounds accurately and to convey the rhythm and pitch of the language.

Table 6 demonstrates that the teacher places the greatest emphasis on pronunciation and intonation when assessing students' speaking tasks. These aspects are considered fundamental for achieving clear and effective communication, as they directly impact a speaker's intelligibility. By focusing on students' ability to articulate sounds correctly and deliver the natural rhythm and pitch of English, the teacher aims to evaluate both technical accuracy and communicative competence. This reflects the belief that successful spoken interaction relies not only on vocabulary and grammar, but also on how a message is delivered and perceived by the listener.

The interview findings revealed several essential factors that shaped the teacher's selection of speaking assessment techniques. One of the most prominent considerations was practicality, which encompassed time management, classroom dynamics, and student numbers. The teacher acknowledged that while interactive tasks like role plays and oral presentations are pedagogically valuable, they require more time and preparation to implement effectively. This aligns with Brown (2004) on the definition of practicality in language assessment, which emphasizes the importance of designing tasks that can be feasibly administered within available resources. Another significant factor was validity, referring to the degree to which the assessment technique accurately evaluates the intended speaking skills. The teacher favoured performance-based assessments, such as interviews and oral presentations, because they offer direct insights into students' communicative abilities within authentic or near-authentic contexts. This perspective is supported by Hughes (2003), who argues that oral performance tasks provide a more valid measure of speaking competence than indirect formats. The teacher also took into account the learners' individual needs and proficiency levels. She recognized that certain students, especially those with limited confidence or higher anxiety, may struggle with more demanding formats like debates or group discussions. In such cases, she made adjustments to the tasks or provided scaffolding to ensure that all students could participate meaningfully. Lastly, fairness and reliability emerged as crucial guiding principles in the assessment process. To maintain consistency and equity, the teacher used rubrics and predefined criteria, allowing for standardized evaluation across performances. This approach not only ensured that the same standards judged all students but also helped create a transparent and supportive assessment environment.

This is in line with Zahari et al., (2023) highlighted that speaking assessment practices which prioritize ongoing practice and timely feedback were highly valued by instructors, as they contribute significantly to students' skill development. This aligns with the findings of the present study, in which the teacher also placed strong emphasis on the importance of allowing students adequate preparation time, providing consistent feedback, and fostering a supportive, student-centred assessment environment. Such an approach was intended to enhance students' confidence and performance during speaking tasks.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the types of speaking assessments utilized by the teacher, the researcher concludes that the teacher employs a strategic and context-sensitive approach when implementing speaking assessments in the classroom. Various methods were identified, including interviews, role-plays, group discussions, and picture descriptions; however, classroom observations revealed that oral presentations were predominantly used, particularly in the procedure text lesson. This technique was deemed the most appropriate, considering the classroom dynamics and the specific needs of the students, as it enabled them to express their speaking abilities individually and in

more depth. The teacher also fostered a positive classroom environment, allocated sufficient time for preparation and delivery, and employed well-defined and transparent scoring rubrics. These practices reflect that the assessments were not only formal in nature but were also intentionally structured to boost student confidence and progressively develop their speaking skills.

Moreover, interview findings reveal that the teacher's selection of speaking assessment techniques is grounded in principles such as practicality, validity, student preparedness, and the availability of time and materials. Emotional factors like anxiety and confidence were also considered to ensure that the chosen assessment methods supported optimal student performance. The teacher's focus on elements like pronunciation and intonation highlights an awareness that effective speaking involves more than just grammatical accuracy; the way the message is delivered is equally crucial. It can therefore be concluded that the teacher employs a blend of technical and pedagogical considerations in implementing speaking assessments. Nonetheless, the study's single-participant design limits generalizability, suggesting the need for further research involving a wider range of teachers and school contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors sincerely thank all individuals and institutions who supported this research. Special thanks to the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Galuh University. Appreciation also goes to the English teacher and students who participated in this study. I extend my gratitude to those who assisted with proofreading and formatting, and the authors also appreciate their family and friends for their unwavering support and motivation. This research would not have been possible without them.

REFERENCES

- Ardiyansah, T. Y. (2019). Analysis of speaking assessment in ESP speaking class. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 2614–5871. <https://doi.org/10.30587/jetlal.v3i1.787>
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., & Terry, G. (2019). Thematic analysis 48. *Handbook of research methods in health social sciences*, 843–860.
- Hughes, A. (2002). *Testing for Language Teachers* (Cambridge Language Teaching Library) (2002).
- Bachman, L., & Oxford, A. P. (2010). *Language Assessment in Practice* (Vol. 10, Issue 2). Book Review 41 Press.
- Baroroh, U., & Sukiman, S. (2023). Analisis Standar Penilaian pada Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah di Indonesia. *Nusantara: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 3(3), 711–732. <https://doi.org/10.14421/njpi.2023.v3i3-18>
- Brown, S. (n.d.). *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* (Vol. 1).
- Córdoba González, G. (2003). Assessment in English Language Classrooms: Constructing and Empowering Meaningful Learning. In *REVISTA PENSAMIENTO ACTUAL* (Vol. 4, Issue 5).

- Jamil, H. (2023). Teachers Practices on Speaking Assessment of Malay Language in Classroom Assessment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(12). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i12/20353>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*.
- Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge university press.
- Miles, M. B. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. *Thousand Oaks*.
- Rafiq, R., Aswad, M., Asfihana, R., & Singh, A. K. J. (2023). Implementation of “Merdeka Belajar”: Evolving Learner Autonomy and Speaking Skill Through Cultural Discovery Learning Model. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching*, 8(1), 54. <https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v8i1.1237>
- Rozak, M., Na'im Rohman, A., & Mistar, J. (2024). *An Exploring Teachers' Strategy in Assessing Students' Speaking Performance Based on The Independent Curriculum Corresponding Email Article's History An Exploring Teachers' Strategy in Assessing Students' Speaking Performance Based on The Independent Curriculum*. 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.763>
- Swastika, P. A., Miranti, R. R., & Nur, M. R. O. (2020). The Analysis of Speaking Assessment Types in Textbook “When English Rings a Bell Grade VII.” *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, 3(2), 167–173. <https://doi.org/10.30605/jsgp.3.2.2020.262>
- Zahari, N. S., Supie, H. S. Md., Khairuddin, Z., & Khairuddin, Z. (2023). Assessment Practices for Oral Presentations: Insights from ESL Instructors. *International Journal of Education*, 15(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v15i1.20684>