Journal of Educational Sciences (*JEDUS*) Fall & Winter, 2022, 29(2), 211-234 DOI: 10.22055/edus.2022.38188.3261 Rcceived: 18 Aug 2021 Accepted: 11 Oct 2022

Orginal Article

Construction of a Rubric to Evaluate Fair Classroom Assessment at the University of Tehran: An Exploratory Mixed-Method Study

Ali Baniasadi^{*} Keyvan Salehi^{**} Ebrahim Khodaie^{***} Khosro Bagheri^{****} Balal Izanloo^{*****}

Introduction

Fairness is an important quality of classroom assessment as a continuous process that affects learners' beliefs, mentality, motivation, satisfaction, and performance. The main purpose of this study was to construct a rubric for evaluating fairness in classroom assessment.

Method

For this purpose, based on an exploratory sequential mixed methods design, two studies were conducted. In the first study, using purposive and nonproportional quota sampling, 29 students and 10 faculty members of the University of Tehran were selected, respectively. A group interview and a Focus group interview were also conducted and in the second study, 511 students from the University of Tehran were selected through three-stage cluster sampling. Qualitative data analysis led to the identification of a conceptual model including the four main themes of "procedural fairness", "interactional fairness", "nature of assessment" and "fairness in the paper-pencil test" as the basis for the development of criteria and making Rubric. In the second study, the psychometric properties of Rubric were investigated using content validity, item

^{*} Ph.D. Student, Faculty of Psychology and Education, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

^{**} Assistant Professor, Faculty of Psychology and Education, University of Tehran, Iran. *Corresponding Author:* keyvansalehi@ut.ac.ir

^{***} Associate Professor, Faculty of Psychology and Education, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. **** Professor, Faculty of Psychology and Education, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

^{*****} Associate Professor, Faculty of Psychology and Education, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran.

analysis, construct validity and reliability determination.

Results

The content validity of each criterion was higher than the standard value of 0.78 and the validity of the overall scale was 0.94. The results of exploratory factor analysis showed the extraction of three factors of procedural fairness, the nature of measurement and interactional fairness, which explained 57.08% of the total variance of variables. The results of factor analysis along with the study of discrimination and difficulty coefficients of items led to the elimination of three weak criteria and the final rubric was compiled with 17 criteria. The calculated Cronbach's alpha for procedural fairness, the nature of assessment and interactional fairness were 0.87, 0.84 and 0.79, respectively. Also, the retest coefficient for them was calculated at the desired level and 0.65, 0.63 and 0.54, respectively.

Discussion

According to the desirable psychometric properties of the rubric, this rubric can help to increase the literacy of professors, increase the quality of teaching and assessment and strengthen the civic and educational behaviors of students by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of professors in the field of fairness.

Keywords: Rubric, Exploratory Mixed Method, Classroom Assessment, Assessing Student Performance, Fair Assessment

Author Contributions: In the present study, the second author, as a supervisor, was responsible for supervising and strategizing the overall research process and compiling and finalizing the corrections of the article. In developing the research plan, the first author has been in charge of the process of gathering, analyzing and interpreting the findings and writing the text of the article, and in general, drawing conclusions from the findings and expanding and interpreting them jointly and with the discussion and exchange of opinions of all colleagues and with the accompaniment of the third, fourth and The fifth was done as consultant professors.

Conflict of interest: The authors acknowledge that there is no conflict of interest in this article.

Funding: The current research did not receive financial support from any institution and institution, and all expenses during the research implementation process were borne by the researchers.

Acknowledgments: The present research would not have been possible without the cooperation of the participants; we hereby acknowledge and thank all the participants.