AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY AMONG ENGLISH LEARNERS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026

A THESIS

RANGGA WIJAYA

NIM: 2210203012

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING

STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI

2025/2026

AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY AMONG ENGLISH LEARNERS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026

A THESIS

Submitted to fulfill one of the requirements for obtaining a Bachelor's degree in education (S.Pd), of English Department

BY:

RANGGA WIJAYA

2210203012

ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING

STATE ISLAMIC OF INSTITUTE OF KERINCI

ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026

KEMENTERIAN AGAMA RI
INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI (IAIN) KERINCI
FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN ILMU KEGURUAN (FTIK)
JURUSAN TADRIS BAHASA INGGRIS

Jln. Kapten Muradi Kec. Pesisir Bukit Kota Sungai Penuh telp. 0748-21065 faks: 0748-22114
Kode Pos: 37112. Website: www.iainkerinci.ac.id email: info@iainkerinci.ac.id

APPROVAL AND ACCEPTENCE

This thesis, which is entitle **"An Analysis of Language Assessment Literacy Among English Learners in English Education Department of State Islamic Institute of Kerinci Academic Year 2025/2026"** by Rangga Wijaya with students' number 2210203012, was tested and maintained on May 2026.

The Viva Voice

Prof. Dr. Dairabi Kamil, S. Pd, M.Ed **Examiner I** .....
NIP.19740314 199903 1 005

Yelni Erniyati M. Pd **Examiner II** .....
NIP.19840211 2019032 0 06

Dr. Novri Pahrizal, M.Pd **Advisor** .....
NIP.19861112 201101 1 007

Approved Dean

Dr. Eva Ardinal, M.A
NIP.19830812 201101 1 005

Chief of English Program

Mastiah, M.Pd
NIP. 1984020 5202321 1 011

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY

I'm here by declares the thesis entitled **"AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY AMONG ENGLISH LEARNERS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026"** is my own work and that to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, no material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award any other educational institution, accepted where do acknowledgement is mad in this thesis. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom I'm have worked at IAIN Kerinci or elsewhere as fully acknowledged.

I also declared that the intellectual content of his thesis is product of my own work, except to the extent that assistance from others in the project design and conception or in style, presentation and linguistic expression of acknowledged.

Sungai Penuh, 26 April 2026



RANGGA WIJAYA
NIM. 2210203012

Dr. Novri Pahrizal, M.Pd.

Dosen Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Kerinci

Sungai Penuh, ...Mei 2026

Kepada Yth,
Bapak Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan IAIN Kerinci
di
.....Sungai Penuh

AGENDA
NOMOR : 226
TANGGAL : 2 JUNI 2026
PARAF :

NOTA DINAS

Assalamulaikum Wr, Wb.

Dengan hormat, setelah membaca dan mengadakan perbaikan seperlunya, maka kami berpendapat bahwa skripsi mahasiswa **Rangga Wijaya, NIM 2210203012** yang berjudul **AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY AMONG ENGLISH LEARNERS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026** dapat diajukan untuk dimunaqasahkan guna memperoleh Sarjana Pendidikan (S.Pd.) Jurusan Tadris Bahasa Inggris fakultas Fakultas Tarbiyah Dan Ilmu Keguruan Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kerinci. Maka dengan ini kami ajukan skripsi tersebut, kiranya diterima dengan baik.

Demikian disampaikan, semoga bermanfaat bagi agama, bangsa dan negara.

Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb.

Dosen Pembimbing 1

Dr. Novri Pahrizal, M.Pd.
NIP. 198611122011011007

DEDICATION AND MOTTO

DEDICATION

I dedicated this thesis to my wonderful parents, thank you for endless love, prayers, and sacrifices. Thank you for being my constant source of inspiration and for believing in me even when I doubted myself. Thank you for your unwavering support and for teaching me the value of perseverance. Thank you for not giving up on me, on my behavior, and on my limitations. Thank you for everything This achievement is as much yours as it is mine.

And to my friends, who have helped and encouraged me to complete my thesis, thank you for accompanying me on this short journey. It is now time for us to step into greater adventures, longer journeys, and more difficult challenges.

To myself, your path may not be easy, but that is not a reason to give up. This is not the end; this is the beginning of everything. Hold your head high, learn to smile, and let your wounds remind you not to become complacent. Keep moving forward there are still many things left to explore.

MOTTO

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللّٰهُ نَفْسًا اِلَّا وُسْعَهَاۗ لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَعَلَيْهَا مَا اكْتَسَبَتْۗ رَبَّنَا لَا تُؤَاخِذْنَآ اِنْ نَّسِيْنَآ اَوْ اَخْطَاْنَاۚ رَبَّنَا وَلَا تَحْمِلْ عَلَيْنَآ اِصْرًا كَمَا حَمَلْتَهٗ عَلَى الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِنَاۚ رَبَّنَا وَلَا تُحَمِّلْنَا مَا لَا طَاقَةَ لَنَا بِهٖۚ وَاعْفُ عَنَّاۗ وَاغْفِرْ لَنَاۗ وَارْحَمْنَاۗ اَنْتَ مَوْلٰىنَا فَانْصُرْنَا عَلَى الْقَوْمِ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

Allah tidak membebani seseorang, kecuali menurut kesanggupannya. Baginya ada sesuatu (pahala) dari (kebajikan) yang diusahakannya dan terhadapnya ada (pula) sesuatu (siksa) atas (kejahatan) yang diperbuatnya. (Mereka berdoa,) "Wahai Tuhan kami, janganlah Engkau hukum kami jika kami lupa atau kami salah. Wahai Tuhan kami, janganlah Engkau bebani kami dengan beban yang berat sebagaimana Engkau bebankan kepada orang-orang sebelum kami. Wahai Tuhan kami, janganlah Engkau pikulkan kepada kami apa yang tidak sanggup kami memikulnya. Maafkanlah kami, ampunilah kami, dan rahmatilah kami. Engkaulah pelindung kami. Maka, tolonglah kami dalam menghadapi kaum kafir.

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillahirobilla'lamin, all praise and gratitude be to Allah giving praise and mercy upon all creatures in the earth, the all mighty and all wise, the lord of the universe who has given the strength and guidance to the researcher so that the researcher can finish this thesis. Blessing and salutation be upon to our prophet Muhammad SAW, the greatest revolutionary in the universe who guides us from the barbarian to the civilized people.

This thesis, entitle **"An Analysis of Language Assessment Literacy Among English Learners in English Education Department of State Islamic Institute of Kerinci Academic Year 2025/2026"** Is intended to fulfill the requirement for achieving the degree of Sarjana in English Department of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of IAIN Kerinci. Finishing this thesis was not simple thing at all and the researcher definitely spent the researcher great deals of time buy gave the researcher valuable experience. However, thanks to the help, guidance, motivation and input from many parties, the completion of this thesis was made easier and smoother for subsequent submission to the Munaqasyah session. In this connection, the researcher would like to express his sincere thanks to:

1. Dr. Jafar Ahmad, M.Si., as the Rector of IAIN Kerinci, Dr. Faizin, S.Ag. M.Ag., as Vice Rector I, Dr. Ahmad Jamin, S.Ag. S.IP. M.Ag., as Vice Rector II, and Dr. Halil Khusairi, M.Ag., as Vice Rector III period 2025-2029.
2. Dr. Eva Ardinal, M.A., the Dean of Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of IAIN Kerinci, Dr. Eko Sujadi, M.Pd., Kons., as Vice Dean I, Dr.

Rimin, M.PdI., as Vice Dean II and Dr. Rodi Hartono, M.Pd as Vice Dean III. Who has given contribution and services during accomplishment of this project paper.

3. Musdizal, M.Pd, the Chairman of English Department Faculty of Teacher Training of IAIN Kerinci, who has provided guidance from beginning of college until Thesis Test.
4. Dr. Novri Pahrizal, M.Pd, as the Advisor who has provided guidance, direction, corrections and instructions to the researcher, so that this thesis can be completed.
5. Prof. Dr. Dairabi Kamil, S. Pd, M.Ed, as the first examiner and Yelni Erniyati M. Pd as the second examiner who has provide guidence, direction, corrections and instructions to the researcher, so that this thesis can be completed.
6. All lecturers of IAIN Kerinci especially at the English Department.
7. Thank you to my father and mother. Thank you for all your prayers, for all your efforts, and for all your support. Thank you for being the best parents who never gave up on your child, no matter the circumstances
8. Thank you to my late grandfather for teaching me so many things. Thank you for supporting me throughout my school and university years. I am sorry for not being able to become what you had hoped for
9. Thank you to my younger brother for always being willing to listen to all of my complaints and worries throughout this time.
10. Thank you to all of my family for their support

11. Thank you to my friends from the ‘Research’ group for helping me with my research.
12. Thank you to my friends from TBI 2022 for accompanying me throughout this journey

The researcher realize that this thesis is still far from perfect, but the researcher hopes that this study will be a valuable contribution to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT), specifically regarding the integration of AI-based writing tools like Grammarly in academic writing instruction. May this research serve as a useful reference for those interested in student perceptions and technology adoption in EFL contexts.

Sungai Penuh, 26 May 2026
The Researcher

RANGGA WIJAYA
2210203012

ABSTRACT

Rangga Wijaya, 2022 : AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY AMONG ENGLISH LEARNERS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026

Advisor : Dr. Novri Pahrizal, M.Pd

Key words : Critical Language Assessment Literacy, Language Assessment.

This research aimed to analyze students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy (CLAL) among students of the English Education Department at State Islamic Institute of Kerinci Academic Year 2025/2026. This study employed a quantitative descriptive and comparative design involving 38 students selected through total sampling technique. The instrument used was a questionnaire covering several aspects of Critical Language Assessment Literacy, including assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback and learning improvement, and assessment fairness. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics through jamovi statistical software, including mean, standard deviation, normality test, homogeneity test, and Independent Samples t-test. The findings showed that students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy was categorized into the high category, with a mean score of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 0.420. In addition, the result of the Independent Samples t-test showed a significance value of less than 0.001, indicating a statistically significant difference between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students. Eighth-semester students obtained a higher mean score (3.72) compared to sixth-semester students (2.97), indicating that academic experience contributed to the development of students' Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

ABSTRAK

Rangga Wijaya, 2022	: AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT LITERACY AMONG ENGLISH LEARNERS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KERINCI ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026
Advisor	: Dr. Novri Pahrizal, M.Pd
Key words	: Critical Language Assessment Literacy, Language Assessment,

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis persepsi literasi penilaian bahasa kritis (Critical Language Assessment Literacy/CLAL) mahasiswa Program Studi Tadris Bahasa Inggris di Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kerinci Tahun Akademik 2025/2026. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain deskriptif kuantitatif dan komparatif dengan melibatkan 38 mahasiswa yang dipilih melalui teknik total sampling. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah kuesioner yang mencakup beberapa aspek Critical Language Assessment Literacy, termasuk tujuan penilaian, kriteria penilaian, umpan balik dan peningkatan pembelajaran, serta keadilan penilaian. Data dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif dan inferensial melalui perangkat lunak statistik Jamovi, meliputi mean, standar deviasi, uji normalitas, uji homogenitas, dan uji Independent Samples t-test. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa persepsi mahasiswa terhadap Critical Language Assessment Literacy berada pada kategori tinggi, dengan nilai rata-rata 3,35 dan standar deviasi 0,420. Selain itu, hasil uji Independent Samples t-test menunjukkan nilai signifikansi kurang dari 0,001, yang mengindikasikan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik antara mahasiswa semester enam dan semester delapan. Mahasiswa semester delapan memperoleh nilai rata-rata yang lebih tinggi (3,72) dibandingkan mahasiswa semester enam (2,97), yang menunjukkan bahwa pengalaman akademik berkontribusi terhadap perkembangan Critical Language Assessment Literacy mahasiswa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OFFICIAL NOTE ..... **i**
APPROVAL AND ACEPTANCE ..... **ii**
CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY ..... **ii**
DEDICATION AND MOTTO ..... **v**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **vii**
ABSTRACT ..... **x**
ABSTRACT ..... **xi**
CHAPTER I 1
INTRODUCTION 1
A. Background of the problem 1
B. Identification of the Problem 7
C. Limitation of the Problem 8
D. Research Question 8
E. Purpose of the Research 9
F. Significance of the Research 9
a. Theoretical Significance 9
b. Practical Significance 10
G. Definition of Key Term 10
1. Critical Language Assessment Literacy 11
2. Language Assessment 11
3. English Education Students 11
4. Academic Factors 11
5. Quantitative Comparative Research 12
CHAPTER II 13
LITERATURE REVIEW 13
A. Review of Related Theory 13
1. Language Assessment 13
2. Critical Language Assessment 15
3. Critical Language Assessment literacy 18
B. Review of Related Findings 22
C. Conceptual Framework 24

CHAPTER III 27
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 27
A. Design of the Research 27
B. Population and Sample 28
C. Instrument of the Research 30
D. Validity and Reliability 34
1. Validity 34
2. Reliability 37
E. Technique of Data Collection 39
F. Technique of Data Analysis 40
1. Descriptive Statistics 41
2. Inferential Statistics 43
CHAPTER IV 46
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 46
CHAPTER V 72
CONCLUSION AND SUGGEST 72
1. For Students 73
2. For Lecturers 74
3. For Future Researchers 74
REFERENCES 75
APPENDIX 1 77
APPENDIX 2 81
APPENDIX 3 86
APPENDIX 4 87
APPENDIX 5 88
APPENDIX 6 90
APPENDIX 7 91
APPENDIX 8 92
APPENDIX 9 93
APPENDIX 10 94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of Students in the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci 29

Table 2. Aspects, Indicators, and Items of Critical Language Assessment Literacy 31

Table 3. Results of the Critical Language Assessment Literacy Questionnaire Validity Test 35

Table 4. Reliability Statistics of the Critical Language Assessment Literacy Questionnaire 37

Table 5. Categories of Critical Language Assessment Literacy Level..... 42

Table 6. Overall Descriptive Statistics of Students' Perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy 48

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Purpose 50

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Criteria..... 52

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Feedback and Learning Improvement..... 53

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Fairness..... 55

Table 11. Ranking of Critical Language Assessment Literacy Aspects 57

Table 12. Item-Level Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy .. 58

Table 13. Normality Test Results of Critical Language Assessment Literacy by Semester 63

Table 14. Homogeneity of Variances Test Results 64

Table 15. Independent Samples t-Test Results of Students' Critical Language Assessment Literacy 64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the problem

Language assessment refers to the systematic process of evaluating learners' language ability in order to obtain information about their learning progress, achievement, and overall language competence. In English language education, assessment is not merely used to assign grades but also to inform teaching decisions and support students' learning development. Effective language assessment provides meaningful feedback that helps learners understand their strengths and weaknesses, while also enabling educators to monitor the effectiveness of instructional practices. Therefore, language assessment plays a crucial role in ensuring the quality, fairness, and relevance of English language learning outcomes, particularly in higher education contexts (Brown, 2004; Fulcher, 2023). As language assessment continues to develop and expand in its role, attention has increasingly been directed toward the need for adequate understanding of assessment practices among those involved in the learning process, especially students as language learners.

Assessment is an essential component of the teaching and learning process in higher education, particularly in English language education, as it functions not only to measure students' learning achievement but also to support continuous learning development. In the context of English as a

Foreign Language (EFL), language assessment plays a crucial role in determining the quality of instruction, the validity of learning outcomes, and fairness in evaluating students' performance. Therefore, adequate understanding of language assessment principles and practices is a fundamental requirement for all stakeholders involved in language learning, including students as the primary subjects of the learning process (Vogt, 2024).

Along with the development of assessment paradigms, the concept of language assessment literacy (LAL) has received increasing attention in language education research. Language assessment literacy refers to a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable individuals to understand, design, implement, and interpret language assessments appropriately (Tajeddin et al., 2022). Initially, studies on LAL mainly focused on language teachers and pre-service teachers with the aim of improving instructional quality and assessment practices. However, recent developments indicate that assessment literacy is not only relevant for teachers but also essential for language learners themselves, particularly in helping them understand how assessment is conducted and how assessment results are used.

In the learner context, assessment literacy has evolved into the concept of critical language assessment literacy, which refers to learners' ability to understand assessment purposes, critically interpret assessment results, evaluate the fairness and relevance of assessments, and use assessment

information to improve their language learning strategies. This concept emphasizes students' awareness and understanding of assessment practices rather than their ability to design assessments. Learners who possess higher levels of critical assessment literacy tend to be more reflective, autonomous, and capable of using feedback effectively in the English language learning process (Vogt, 2024).

Despite its importance, empirical evidence shows that most existing studies on language assessment literacy continue to focus predominantly on teachers or pre-service English teachers. Research conducted in various EFL contexts, including Indonesia, has largely examined teachers' assessment knowledge, perceptions of assessment, and training needs (Cirocki et al., 2025; Sulistio, 2023). This dominant focus on educators has resulted in limited understanding of students' level of comprehension of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy as experienced by learners in real classroom contexts.

Recent studies suggest that learners' assessment literacy is significantly related to learning motivation, self-confidence, and metacognitive abilities in English language learning. Nurisma and Dewi (2025) found that students with higher levels of assessment literacy demonstrated better understanding of assessment criteria and more effective use of teachers' feedback. These findings indicate that students' understanding

of language assessment and assessment-related feedback plays an important role in shaping their learning experiences.

However, research that specifically examines students' level of understanding of critical language assessment literacy in English language education programs remains limited, particularly in the context of Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia such as the State Islamic Institute (IAIN). There is a lack of empirical data that systematically measures students' understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy and analyzes the academic factors related to it. This situation highlights a clear research gap that needs to be addressed to enrich the literature on language assessment in local EFL contexts.

Despite the increasing attention to language assessment literacy in English language education, students' critical language assessment literacy remains a significant issue in many EFL higher education contexts. This issue is also supported by pre-research conducted by the researcher on March 18, 2025, during the researcher's sixth semester, through informal inquiry involving ten eighth-semester students of the English Education Department, as well as the researcher's own learning experience. Many students experience various assessment practices without fully understanding their purposes, criteria, and implications for learning, which may lead to passive acceptance of assessment results and limited use of feedback for improvement. The findings from the pre-research indicated that most students lacked awareness

of the purposes of assessment, had limited understanding of assessment criteria, and tended to focus primarily on scores rather than using feedback to enhance their learning. This limited critical understanding may hinder students' ability to evaluate the fairness and relevance of assessment practices and reduce their engagement and autonomy in the learning process. Therefore, investigating students' level of critical language assessment literacy is essential to provide empirical evidence that can inform improvements in assessment practices within English language education..

From a scientific perspective, students' limited understanding of assessment practices can be explained through the concept of critical language assessment literacy, which emphasizes learners' ability to interpret assessment purposes, criteria, and feedback meaningfully. According to Tajeddin et al. (2022) and Vogt (2024), students who lack critical assessment literacy tend to experience difficulties in using feedback effectively, which may negatively affect their learning strategies, motivation, and overall language development. Furthermore, inadequate understanding of assessment may reduce students' ability to engage in reflective learning and limit their autonomy in the learning process. Therefore, investigating students' level of critical language assessment literacy is essential to provide empirical evidence that can support the improvement of assessment practices in English language education.

A quantitative research approach is considered appropriate for investigating this issue because it allows researchers to measure students'

level of understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy objectively and systematically using validated instruments. This approach also enables the analysis of relationships between students' understanding of assessment and academic variables such as semester level, assessment experience, or academic achievement (Cirocki et al., 2025). Consequently, the findings can be statistically analyzed and generalized to a broader population.

Furthermore, quantitative research provides strong empirical evidence to support decision-making in curriculum development and instructional practices. The results can help identify weaknesses in students' understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy and serve as a basis for designing targeted interventions or training programs. This aligns with the view that improving assessment literacy is an integral part of enhancing the overall quality of English language education (Tajeddin et al., 2022).

In the context of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci, research on students' understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy is particularly important because students are prepared not only as users of English but also as future English teachers. Developing students' understanding and critical awareness of assessment from an early stage is expected to foster professional and reflective attitudes toward language assessment practices. However, to date, there is limited

empirical evidence describing the level of students' understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy in this institutional context.

B. Identification of the Problem

Based on the background of the study, several problems can be identified as follows:

1. Students in the English Education Department experience various forms of language assessment during their studies; however, their level of understanding of the basic principles and purposes of language assessment has not been systematically measured.
2. There is limited information regarding students' level of critical language assessment literacy, particularly in terms of their ability to understand assessment purposes, interpret assessment results, and evaluate the fairness and relevance of assessment practices.
3. Most previous studies on language assessment literacy have focused on teachers or pre-service teachers, resulting in a lack of empirical data concerning students' understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy.
4. The relationship between students' level of understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy and their academic factors, such as semester level, assessment experience, or academic achievement, has not been sufficiently explored.

C. Limitation of the Problem

This study is limited in several aspects as follows:

1. This study is limited to students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci who have studied language assessment-related courses; therefore, the findings reflect only the understanding of students who have prior exposure to assessment concepts.
2. The research focuses solely on students' level of critical language assessment literacy, particularly their understanding of assessment purposes, criteria, feedback, and fairness, without examining other influencing factors such as learning motivation or teaching strategies.
3. This study employs a quantitative design using a self-report questionnaire; thus, the findings describe students' perceived level of understanding of critical language assessment literacy and do not explore causal relationships or in-depth explanations.
4. The findings are limited to the specific institutional context and characteristics of the research participants and may not be generalized to other departments, institutions, or different EFL educational contexts.

K E R I N C I

D. Research Question

Based on the identification of the research problems, the research questions of this study are formulated as follows:

1. What is the level of students' perceived critical language assessment literacy among students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci?
2. Is there a difference in the students` level of critical language assessment literacy across different semesters?

E. Purpose of the Research

The purposes of this research are as follows:

1. To determine the level of students' perceived critical language assessment literacy among students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci.
2. To examine whether there is a significant difference in students' level of critical language assessment literacy across different semesters.

F. Significance of the Research

a. Theoretical Significance

This research is expected to provide several theoretical contributions as follows:

1. This research contributes to the literature on language assessment literacy by providing empirical evidence on students' level of critical language assessment literacy in an EFL higher education context.
2. This study extends existing theories of language assessment literacy by emphasizing learners' understanding and critical awareness of assessment practices, which have been less explored compared to teachers' perspectives.

3. The findings of this research are expected to support future theoretical discussions on the role of critical language assessment literacy in English language learning at the tertiary level.

b. Practical Significance

The practical significance of this research can be described as follows:

1. For lecturers, the findings of this research may provide insight into students' level of understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy, which can be used to improve assessment methods and feedback practices.
2. For students, this research may increase awareness of the importance of understanding language assessment and encourage more reflective and active engagement with assessment processes.
3. For the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci, the results of this research may serve as a reference for curriculum evaluation and development, particularly in integrating assessment literacy into English language teaching and learning.
4. For future researchers, this study may serve as a reference and empirical foundation for further research related to language assessment and critical language assessment literacy in similar educational contexts.

G. Definition of Key Term

To avoid misunderstanding, the following terms are defined as used in this research:

1. **Critical Language Assessment Literacy**

   Critical language assessment literacy refers to students' perceived understanding and critical awareness of the purposes of language assessment, their ability to interpret assessment results and feedback, and their awareness of the fairness and relevance of assessment practices in English language learning. This concept emphasizes learners' awareness and understanding of assessment rather than their ability to design assessment instruments (Tajeddin et al., 2022; Vogt, 2024).

2. **Language Assessment**

   Language assessment refers to the process of evaluating students' English language skills through various assessment activities, such as quizzes, assignments, tests, and examinations. It is conducted to measure learners' language ability, monitor learning progress, and support instructional decision-making in English language education (Brown, 2004; Fulcher, 2023).

3. **English Education Students**

   English Education students are undergraduate students enrolled in the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci who actively participate in English language learning and assessment activities as part of their academic program.

4. **Academic Factors**

   Academic factors refer to selected academic characteristics of students, including semester level, experience in taking English language

assessments, and academic achievement. These factors are examined in this study to understand their relationship with students' level of critical language assessment literacy (Pallant, 2020).

5. Quantitative Comparative Research

Quantitative comparative research refers to a research design used to examine differences between two or more groups based on certain variables by collecting numerical data and analyzing it using statistical techniques without manipulating the variables (Creswell, 2014).

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Review of Related Theory

1. Language Assessment

Language assessment is a fundamental component of English language teaching and learning, particularly in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). It refers to the systematic process of collecting information about learners' language ability in order to make decisions related to learning progress, achievement, and instructional effectiveness. Assessment provides essential information for both teachers and students regarding the extent to which learning objectives have been achieved (Brown, 2004; Vogt, 2024).

In English language education, assessment is used to evaluate students' proficiency in various language skills, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. According to Brown (2004), effective language assessment should be closely aligned with instructional goals and reflect authentic language use. This means that assessment tasks should measure students' ability to use language meaningfully in real or realistic contexts, rathe

Language assessment can generally be classified into formative and summative assessment based on its purpose. Formative assessment is conducted during the learning process to monitor students' progress and provide feedback that can support learning improvement. In contrast, summative assessment is administered at the end of a learning period to evaluate students' overall achievement and determine final grades or learning outcomes (Harmer, 2021). Both types of assessment play important roles in English language learning and complement each other in providing comprehensive information about students' performance.

The quality of language assessment is closely related to several fundamental principles, including validity, reliability, fairness, and practicality. Validity refers to the extent to which an assessment measures what it is intended to measure, while reliability concerns the consistency of assessment results across different occasions or raters. Fairness emphasizes equal opportunities for all learners, and practicality relates to the feasibility of administering the assessment within specific contextual constraints (Fulcher, 2023). These principles are essential to ensure that assessment results are accurate, meaningful, and trustworthy.

In recent perspectives, language assessment is no longer viewed merely as a tool for evaluating learning outcomes, but also as an integral part of the learning process itself. Assessment for learning emphasizes the use of assessment results and feedback to support students' language development. Through constructive feedback, students can identify their strengths and weaknesses and adjust their learning strategies accordingly (Vogt, 2024). This view highlights the importance of students' understanding of assessment practices.

In higher education, particularly in English Education programs, language assessment plays a significant role in shaping students' academic development. Students are expected not only to complete assessments but also to understand assessment criteria, interpret feedback, and reflect on their performance. Therefore, knowledge of language assessment becomes increasingly important for students, especially those who are being prepared as future English teachers. This context supports the need to examine students' understanding of language assessment as part of their academic experience.

2. Critical Language Assessment

Critical language assessment is an approach to language assessment that emphasizes critical awareness of how assessment practices influence teaching, learning, and learners. This perspective

views assessment not as a neutral or purely technical activity, but as a social practice that may carry power relations, values, and assumptions. According to Fulcher (2023), critical approaches to language assessment encourage stakeholders to question why certain assessments are used, whose interests they serve, and how assessment results affect learners.

From a critical perspective, language assessment should be examined in terms of fairness, transparency, and consequences for learners. Assessment outcomes may influence students' academic opportunities, motivation, and self-confidence. Therefore, it is important to consider whether assessment practices provide equal opportunities for all learners and accurately represent their language abilities. Shohamy (2021) argues that critical language assessment aims to protect learners from unfair or biased assessment practices by promoting ethical and responsible assessment use.

Critical language assessment also highlights the importance of learners' voices in assessment processes. Traditionally, assessment decisions have been dominated by teachers and institutions, while learners are positioned as passive recipients of assessment results. In contrast, critical assessment perspectives encourage learners to understand assessment criteria, question assessment decisions when necessary, and actively engage with feedback. This involvement can

help learners develop a deeper understanding of how assessment affects their learning (Vogt, 2024).

In higher education contexts, critical language assessment is particularly relevant because students are expected to develop independent and reflective learning skills. University students are required not only to complete assessments but also to evaluate their own performance and use feedback to improve future learning outcomes. Tajeddin et al. (2022) emphasize that critical engagement with assessment supports learners' autonomy and promotes more meaningful learning experiences in language education.

Furthermore, critical language assessment is closely related to the concept of justice and accountability in education. Assessments that lack transparency or fairness may disadvantage certain groups of learners. By applying a critical perspective, educators and learners can identify potential problems in assessment design and implementation, such as unclear criteria or inappropriate task difficulty. This awareness contributes to more ethical and responsible assessment practices (Fulcher, 2023).

In the context of English Education programs, understanding critical language assessment is important for students who are preparing to become future English teachers. Early exposure to critical perspectives on assessment can help students develop professional

awareness and reflective attitudes toward assessment practices. Therefore, examining students' understanding of critical language assessment is relevant not only for their current learning but also for their future roles as educators.

3. Critical Language Assessment literacy

Critical language assessment literacy refers to learners' ability to understand, interpret, and critically evaluate language assessment practices and their consequences for learning. This concept develops from language assessment literacy by adding a critical dimension that emphasizes awareness, reflection, and ethical considerations in assessment. According to Tajeddin et al. (2022), critical language assessment literacy involves not only knowledge of assessment concepts, but also the ability to question assessment purposes, fairness, and the use of assessment results.

In the context of language learning, critical language assessment literacy enables students to understand why certain assessment tasks are used and how assessment criteria are applied. Learners with adequate assessment literacy are more likely to interpret test results accurately and use feedback constructively. When a critical perspective is added, learners are encouraged to reflect on whether assessment practices truly represent their language abilities and support their learning goals (Vogt, 2024).

Critical language assessment literacy also emphasizes students' active role in the assessment process. Rather than being passive recipients of scores, students are expected to engage with assessment criteria, analyze feedback, and monitor their own learning progress. This engagement supports learner autonomy and helps students take responsibility for their learning outcomes. Fulcher (2023) suggests that such critical engagement with assessment can improve learners' motivation and confidence in language learning.

From an educational perspective, critical language assessment literacy is closely related to fairness and transparency in assessment. Students who understand assessment principles are better able to recognize fair assessment practices and identify potential problems, such as unclear scoring criteria or inconsistent grading. This awareness is important in higher education, where assessment results often have significant academic consequences (Shohamy, 2021).

Several recent studies highlight the importance of developing critical language assessment literacy among EFL learners. Research indicates that students with higher levels of assessment literacy tend to benefit more from feedback and demonstrate stronger metacognitive awareness in language learning (Nurisma & Dewi, 2025). These findings suggest that assessment literacy is not only a technical skill but also a key factor in effective learning.

In English Education programs, critical language assessment literacy is particularly relevant because students are being prepared as future English teachers. Understanding assessment from a critical perspective can help students develop professional attitudes toward assessment practices and prepare them to design and implement fair assessments in their future teaching careers. Therefore, examining students' critical language assessment literacy is essential for understanding both their current learning experiences and their future professional development.

In order to operationalize critical language assessment literacy in the context of this study, the concept is divided into several measurable aspects based on relevant theories and adapted to the research instrument. These aspects represent key dimensions of students' understanding and critical awareness of language assessment practices.

The first aspect is understanding of assessment purposes, which refers to students' knowledge of why language assessment is conducted and how it is used to measure learning progress and achievement. The indicators of this aspect include students' understanding of the function of quizzes, assignments, and examinations, as well as their awareness of formative and summative assessment.

The second aspect is understanding of assessment criteria, which relates to students' awareness of how their performance is evaluated. This includes their understanding of scoring rubrics, expectations of lecturers, and how assessment criteria guide their learning. Indicators of this aspect involve students' ability to recognize evaluation standards and use them to improve their performance.

The third aspect is understanding of feedback and learning improvement, which refers to students' ability to interpret feedback provided by lecturers and use it to enhance their learning. The indicators include students' ability to identify their strengths and weaknesses based on feedback, reflect on their performance, and apply feedback to future learning.

The fourth aspect is critical awareness of assessment fairness, which emphasizes students' understanding of fairness, transparency, and ethical considerations in language assessment. The indicators include students' awareness of equal opportunities in assessment, clarity of scoring criteria, and the importance of fair assessment practices.

These aspects are used as the basis for developing the questionnaire items in this study. Each aspect is represented by several statements in the instrument to measure students' perceived understanding and critical awareness of critical language assessment

literacy. In addition, several negatively worded items are included in the questionnaire to reduce response bias and to ensure the consistency of participants' responses. These items are designed to measure the same constructs from a different perspective and are reverse-coded during data analysis.

B. Review of Related Findings

Several previous studies have investigated language assessment literacy and critical perspectives on assessment in English language education. These studies provide important empirical evidence that supports the relevance of the present research. Tajeddin, Khatib, and Mahdavi (2022) examined critical language assessment literacy among EFL teachers and found that assessment literacy involves not only technical knowledge but also critical awareness of assessment purposes, fairness, and consequences. Their findings highlight the importance of developing critical perspectives on assessment, which are also relevant for language learners.

A study conducted by Vogt (2024) emphasized that language assessment literacy plays a significant role in supporting meaningful learning experiences. The study found that individuals with higher levels of assessment literacy were better able to interpret assessment results and use feedback effectively. Although the study mainly focused on educators, it suggested that learners' understanding of assessment should also be examined, as learners are directly affected by assessment practices in the classroom.

In the Indonesian EFL context, Sulistio (2023) investigated language assessment literacy among pre-service English teachers and reported that many participants had limited understanding of assessment principles such as validity and reliability. The study indicated that assessment literacy development is still a challenge in higher education. These findings imply that students in English Education programs may also experience similar difficulties in understanding assessment practices.

Cirocki et al. (2025) conducted a quantitative study on assessment literacy among Indonesian pre-service English teachers and found a significant relationship between assessment literacy and academic experience. The study revealed that participants with more exposure to assessment practices demonstrated higher levels of assessment literacy. This finding supports the assumption that academic factors may be related to individuals' level of assessment literacy, which is relevant to the correlational focus of the present study.

Research focusing on learners' perspectives was conducted by Nurisma and Dewi (2025), who examined language assessment literacy in online EFL reading classes. Their findings showed that students with higher assessment literacy were more capable of understanding assessment criteria and using feedback to improve their learning performance. This study provides empirical support for examining assessment literacy at the student level rather than focusing solely on teachers.

Another relevant study by Shohamy (2021) emphasized the critical dimension of language assessment by highlighting how assessment practices can influence learners' opportunities and learning experiences. The study argued that critical awareness of assessment is essential to ensure fairness and transparency. This perspective reinforces the importance of investigating students' critical language assessment literacy as a means of promoting more ethical and effective assessment practices in English language education.

Overall, previous studies indicate that language assessment literacy and its critical dimension play an important role in English language education. However, most existing research has focused on teachers or pre-service teachers, with limited attention given to students as language learners. Moreover, studies examining the relationship between students' critical language assessment literacy and academic factors remain limited, particularly in the context of Islamic higher education institutions. Therefore, the present study seeks to fill this gap by quantitatively examining critical language assessment literacy among English Education students at IAIN Kerinci.

C. Conceptual Framework

This study is based on the assumption that students' understanding and critical awareness of language assessment play an important role in their academic experience in English language learning. Critical language assessment literacy is viewed as an essential competence that enables students to understand assessment purposes, interpret assessment results, and reflect on

the fairness and relevance of assessment practices. In this study, critical language assessment literacy is positioned as the main variable that may be related to students' academic factors.

Critical language assessment literacy is influenced by students' exposure to assessment practices and their academic experience in higher education. Students who have progressed to higher semesters are expected to have more experience with various forms of language assessment, such as quizzes, assignments, mid-term tests, and final examinations. This increased exposure may contribute to a better understanding of assessment criteria and feedback, which in turn may enhance students' critical language assessment literacy.

In addition, students' experience in taking English language assessments is assumed to be related to their ability to critically engage with assessment processes. Frequent interaction with assessment tasks and feedback may help students develop greater awareness of how assessment works and how it affects their learning. Therefore, assessment experience is considered an important academic factor that may be associated with students' critical language assessment literacy.

Academic achievement is also considered an important factor in this study. Students with higher academic achievement may demonstrate better understanding of assessment requirements and more effective use of feedback. Conversely, students' level of critical language assessment literacy may

influence how well they perform academically, as they are more capable of understanding expectations and improving their learning strategies based on assessment results.

Based on this framework, the present study examines the differences in critical language assessment literacy across different semester levels, including semester level, assessment experience, and academic achievement. The differences among groups are examined using a quantitative comparative approach to determine whether significant associations exist without implying causal relationships.

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Design of the Research

This research employed a descriptive analytical design with a quantitative approach. In addition, this study also employed a comparative approach to examine differences in students' critical language assessment literacy across different semester levels. A descriptive research design aims to describe and interpret phenomena as they naturally occur without manipulating variables (Creswell, 2014). In this study, the design was used to describe students' level of understanding of critical language assessment literacy within the context of English language learning.

A quantitative descriptive approach was chosen because this study focuses on measuring students' level of understanding using numerical data collected through a questionnaire. Descriptive analysis allowed the researcher to systematically analyze the data obtained from participants and present the findings in an organized and meaningful way. Through this approach, patterns and tendencies related to students' critical language assessment literacy could be identified based on the data collected (Pallant, 2020). This design was considered appropriate for examining educational phenomena using measurable data.

Furthermore, a quantitative approach enabled the researcher to generalize findings within the research context and to support conclusions

with statistical evidence (Creswell, 2014). The data collected in this study were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to provide a clear picture of students' critical language assessment literacy. Therefore, the descriptive analytical design with a quantitative approach is suitable for achieving the objectives of this study..

B. Population and Sample

1. Population

The population of this study consisted of undergraduate students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci who are actively involved in English language learning and assessment activities. The population included students from different semester levels who have experienced various forms of language assessment, such as quizzes, assignments, mid-term tests, final examinations, and classroom-based assessments.

This population is considered relevant because English Education students are regularly exposed to language assessment practices throughout their academic studies. As students who are being prepared as future English teachers, they were expected not only to participate in assessments but also to understand the purposes, criteria, and feedback related to language assessment. Therefore, this population is appropriate for investigating students' level of understanding of language assessment and critical

language assessment literacy in a higher education EFL context (Creswell, 2014; Cohen et al., 2018).

A table was provided to illustrate the participant profile as follows.

Table 1. Distribution of Students in the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci

No	Semester	Male	Female	Total
1	Sixth Semester	4	15	19
2	Eighth Semester	8	11	19
TOTAL		12	27	38

Source from Head of the English Language Education Department Of IAIN Kerinci

2. Sample

The sample of this study was selected using the total sampling technique. Total sampling is a sampling technique in which all members of the population are included as the research sample. According to Sugiyono (2017), total sampling is appropriate when the population size is relatively small and accessible, allowing the researcher to obtain comprehensive and representative data.

In this study, total sampling was applied because all students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci who meet the research

criteria were included in the study. These students have experienced various forms of language assessment during their academic studies and have been exposed to assessment-related concepts, making them relevant participants for this research.

Therefore, the total number of participants in this study is 38 students, consisting of all students from the sixth and eighth semesters. By including all members of the population, this study aimed to provide a complete and accurate representation of students' perceived critical language assessment literacy within the research context. .

C. Instrument of the Research

The instrument used in this research was a questionnaire. A questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of written questions designed to collect data from participants in a systematic manner. According to Creswell (2014), questionnaires are commonly used in educational research to gather information about participants' perceptions, attitudes, and understanding related to a particular phenomenon. In this study, the questionnaire was used to obtain data on students' level of understanding of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy.

The questionnaire was selected as the main research instrument because it allowed data to be collected efficiently from a group of participants and provides a structured way to describe participants' responses. According to Creswell (2014), questionnaires are commonly used in educational

research to gather information about participants' perceptions, attitudes, and understanding related to a particular phenomenon. In this study, the instrument is used to measure students' level of critical language assessment literacy.

The questionnaire items were developed based on relevant theories of language assessment and critical language assessment literacy. The statements focused on students' understanding of assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback, and fairness, which are considered key components of critical language assessment literacy (Tajeddin, Khatib, & Mahdavi, 2022; Vogt, 2024; Fulcher, 2023). In this study, students' awareness was operationalized as their level of understanding and critical awareness of these assessment aspects. Therefore, the data collected in this study represent students' perceived level of understanding and awareness, rather than their actual ability, as measured through self-reported questionnaire responses. Each item in the questionnaire represented specific components of critical language assessment literacy, allowing the researcher to quantify students' level of awareness based on their responses. The operationalization of critical language assessment literacy, including its aspects, indicators, and corresponding questionnaire items, is presented in the following table.

Table 2. Aspects, Indicators, and Items of Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Aspects	Indicators	Items

Understanding of Assessment Purposes	Understanding the purpose of language assessment	Item 1: I understand the purpose of language assessments used in my English courses.
	Understanding how assessment measures language ability	Item 2: I understand how quizzes, assignments, and exams measure my English ability.
	Awareness of assessment for learning progress	Item 3: I know that assessment can help teachers evaluate students' learning progress.
	Understanding types of assessment (formative & summative)	Item 4: I understand the difference between formative assessment and summative assessment.
	Lack of understanding of assessment purpose (Negative)	Item 5: I do not understand why language assessments are given in my English courses.
Understanding of Assessment Criteria	Understanding of Assessment Criteria	Item 1: I usually understand the scoring criteria used by lecturers in assessments.
	Understanding lecturers' expectations	Item 2: I know what lecturers expect from my answers in language tests.
	Understanding evaluation of performance	Item 3: I understand how my performance is evaluated in English assignments.
	Using criteria to improve learning	Item 4: Assessment criteria help me improve my English learning.
	Confusion about assessment criteria (Negative)	Item 5: I am often confused about how lecturers assess my performance in English tests.

Understanding of Feedback and Learning Improvement	Understanding feedback for identifying weaknesses	Item 1: Feedback from lecturers helps me understand my weaknesses in English.
	Using feedback for improvement	Item 2: I use assessment feedback to improve my future learning.
	Reflecting on assessment results	Item 3: I reflect on my test results to improve my English skills.
	Lack of use of feedback (Negative)	Item 4: I rarely use feedback from lecturers to improve my English learning.
Critical Awareness of Assessment Fairness	Awareness of fair representation in assessment	Item 1: Language assessments should fairly represent students' English abilities.
	Awareness of transparency in assessment criteria	Item 2: Assessment criteria should be clear and transparent for students.
	Understanding scoring transparency	Item 3: Students should understand how their scores are determined.
	Awareness of importance of fair assessment	Item 4: Fair assessment practices are important in English learning.
	Perception of unfair assessment (Negative)	Item 5: Language assessments are often unfair to students.
	Lack of awareness of score transparency (Negative)	Item 6: I do not think it is important for students to understand how their scores are determined.

A four-point Likert scale is used, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, without a neutral option. This scale is chosen to encourage respondents to express clear opinions. The Likert scale allows respondents to

indicate the degree of their agreement with each statement and is widely used in educational research to measure understanding and perceptions (Creswell, 2014). Before the questionnaire was administered, the instrument is reviewed to ensure clarity, relevance, and consistency with the research objectives. This review process is conducted to improve the quality of the instrument and minimize potential misunderstanding among participants. According to Cohen et al. (2018), reviewing and refining research instruments is an important step to enhance the credibility and validity of the data to be collected.

D. Validity and Reliability

1. Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which a research instrument measures what it is intended to measure. According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018), validity is concerned with the accuracy and appropriateness of the interpretation of research data. In this study, validity was used to determine whether the questionnaire items appropriately measured students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

To examine the validity of the instrument, item validity testing was conducted using Pearson Product Moment Correlation through Jamovi statistical software. The validity test was carried out by correlating each questionnaire item with the total score of the

instrument. An item was considered valid if the correlation coefficient (r-value) was higher than the critical value of r-table or if the significance value was lower than 0.05.

Before conducting the final data collection, the questionnaire was tested and analyzed to ensure that each item appropriately represented the aspects of Critical Language Assessment Literacy, including assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback and learning improvement, and assessment fairness.

The result of the validity test showed that the questionnaire items were generally valid and appropriate to be used as the research instrument. Items with low correlation values were revised and adjusted before the questionnaire was distributed to participants. Therefore, the final questionnaire used in this study was considered valid for measuring students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

Table 3. Results of the Critical Language Assessment Literacy Questionnaire Validity Test

Item Reliability Statistics

	correlation	R Table
item 1	0,620	0,320
item 2	0,856	0,320
item 3	0,763	0,320
item 4	0,630	0,320

Item Reliability Statistics

	correlation	R Table
item 5	0,504	0,320
item 6	0,723	0,320
item 7	0,682	0,320
item 8	0,752	0,320
item 9	0,613	0,320
item 10	0,380	0,320
item 11	0,674	0,320
item 12	0,905	0,320
item 13	0,404	0,320
item 14	0,524	0,320
item 15	0,633	0,320
item 16	0,649	0,320
item 17	0,484	0,320
item 18	0,709	0,320
item 19	0,421	0,320
item 20	0,485	0,320

Based on the validity test results presented in the table above, all 20 questionnaire items obtained correlation coefficients higher than the R-table value of 0.320. The correlation coefficients ranged from 0.380 to 0.905, which indicates that every item met the validity criterion (r-value > R-table). Therefore, all questionnaire items were considered valid and could be used to measure students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy. These results indicate that each item had an adequate relationship with the total score and appropriately represented the construct measured in this study.

2. Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency and stability of a research instrument in measuring a particular construct. According to Creswell (2014), a reliable instrument produces consistent results when administered under similar conditions. In this study, reliability testing was conducted to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items used to measure students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

The reliability of the questionnaire was analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha through Jamovi statistical software. Cronbach's Alpha is commonly used to measure the internal consistency of Likert-scale questionnaires. According to Pallant (2020), a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.70 or higher indicates acceptable reliability.

The reliability test result showed that the questionnaire obtained a satisfactory Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, indicating that the instrument had good internal consistency and reliability. Therefore, the questionnaire was considered reliable and suitable for collecting data related to students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

Table 4. Reliability Statistics of the Critical Language Assessment Literacy Questionnaire

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics	
	Cronbach's α
scale	0.902

Item Reliability Statistics		
		If item dropped
	Item-rest correlation	Cronbach's α
item 1	0.573	0.896
item 2	0.839	0.892
item 3	0.738	0.894
item 4	0.570	0.896
item 5	0.445	0.899
item 6	0.666	0.893
item 7	0.620	0.894
item 8	0.705	0.892
item 9	0.549	0.896
item 10	0.325	0.901
item 11	0.629	0.895
item 12	0.892	0.889
item 13	0.323	0.903
item 14	0.439	0.901
item 15	0.591	0.896
item 16	0.616	0.896
item 17	0.422	0.900
item 18	0.679	0.895
item 19	0.316	0.906
item 20	0.393	0.903

KERINCI

Based on the reliability test results, all questionnaire items were declared valid because each item's corrected item-total correlation (item-rest correlation) value was higher than the r-table value of 0.320. The item-rest correlation values ranged from 0.316 to 0.892, indicating that all items met the validity criteria. Therefore, all items in the research instrument were considered valid and suitable for data collection. In addition, the reliability test showed a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.902, which indicates that the instrument has very high reliability.

E. Technique of Data Collection

The data in this research were collected through a questionnaire. Data collection refers to the process of gathering information from research participants in order to answer the research questions and achieve the research objectives. According to Creswell (2014), data collection techniques should be appropriate to the research design and capable of providing relevant information related to the phenomenon being studied.

In this study, the questionnaire was distributed to students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci. The participants were asked to respond to each statement in the questionnaire based on their level of understanding and experience related to language assessment and critical language assessment literacy. The use of a questionnaire allows participants to complete the instrument independently, which may encourage more honest and reflective responses (Cohen et al., 2018).

The questionnaire was administered in one session during the data collection period. Before completing the questionnaire, participants are provided with a brief explanation of the purpose of the research and clear instructions on how to respond to the questionnaire items. This step is intended to ensure that participants understand the research procedure and the meaning of each statement.

The data collection process was conducted in an orderly and ethical manner. Participation in this study is voluntary, and participants were informed that their responses will be used solely for research purposes. The confidentiality of participants' identities was maintained to protect their privacy. Ethical considerations are emphasized to ensure that participants feel comfortable and secure when providing data (Creswell, 2014).

After all questionnaires are collected, the data are checked to ensure completeness and consistency. The collected responses are then prepared for analysis using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. This process ensures that the data accurately represent students' responses and are suitable for further statistical analysis.

F. Technique of Data Analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis through Microsoft Excel and Jamovi statistical software. Data analysis is an important process in quantitative research because it allows the researcher to organize, interpret,

and draw conclusions from numerical data collected from participants. According to Creswell (2014), statistical analysis helps researchers identify patterns, relationships, and differences within research data.

1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics refers to a statistical technique used to describe, summarize, and present data in an organized manner. According to Creswell (2012), descriptive statistics are used to analyze data by describing the characteristics of a sample through numerical calculations such as mean, median, mode, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage. Similarly, Vogt and Johnson (2015) stated that descriptive statistics help researchers understand the distribution and tendencies of data obtained from research participants.

In this study, descriptive statistics were used to describe the level of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy among English Education Department students. The descriptive statistical analysis enabled the researcher to summarize and interpret the collected data clearly and systematically.

This study employed mean, standard deviation, and percentage in analyzing the data. Mean was used to determine the average score of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy. Standard deviation was used to identify the spread and variability of students' responses from the average score. Meanwhile, percentage was used to

determine the proportion of students within each category level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy. This analysis aims to describe the level of students' perceptions rather than to examine the effects, relationships, or differences among variables. The data can be analyzed at three levels: the overall CLAL score, the score of each Aspect, and the score of each questionnaire item.

Furthermore, the categories of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy were determined by dividing the mean score range into four categories using the following formula:

$$\text{Interval Width} = \frac{\text{Maximum Mean Score} - \text{Minimum Mean Score}}{\text{Number of Categories}}$$

(Başöz & Erten, 2018).

Since the questionnaire used a four-point Likert scale, the minimum mean score was 1.00 and the maximum mean score was 4.00. The interval width was calculated as follows:

$$\frac{4.00 - 1.00}{4} = 0.75$$

Based on this calculation, the categories of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy are presented in Table 3.

Table 5. Categories of Critical Language Assessment Literacy Level

Mean Score Interval	Category
1.00 – 1.75	Very Low
1.76 – 2.51	Low
2.52 – 3.27	High
3.28 – 4.00	Very High

2. Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics refers to statistical techniques used to make interpretations, conclusions, and generalizations from sample data to a broader population. According to Creswell (2012), inferential statistics enable researchers to test hypotheses and determine whether relationships or differences found in a sample are statistically significant. Similarly, Field (2009) stated that inferential statistics are used to infer patterns and conclusions from research data through statistical testing procedures.

In this study, inferential statistics were used to determine whether there was a significant difference in students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students of the English Education Department. The inferential statistical analysis helped the researcher examine whether the differences between groups occurred significantly or merely by chance.

Before conducting the main inferential statistical test, prerequisite tests were conducted first, including normality and homogeneity tests. These tests were necessary to determine the appropriate statistical test to be used in analyzing the data.

The normality test was conducted to determine whether the data were normally distributed. According to Pallant (2020), normal distribution is an important assumption in parametric statistical analysis. In this study, the Shapiro–Wilk test was used to analyze the normality of the data through Jamovi statistical software. The data were considered normally distributed if the significance value (Sig.) was greater than 0.05.

Furthermore, the homogeneity test was conducted to determine whether the variances of the two groups were homogeneous or equal. Homogeneity of variance is another important assumption for conducting parametric tests such as the Independent Samples t-test. In this study, Levene's Test was used to analyze the homogeneity of variance. The data were considered homogeneous if the significance value (Sig.) was greater than 0.05.

After fulfilling the prerequisite tests, the Independent Samples t-test was used when the data were normally distributed and the variances between groups were homogeneous. The Independent Samples t-test was employed to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of sixth-semester and eighth-semester students regarding their perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

However, if the data did not meet the assumptions of normality or homogeneity, the Mann–Whitney U Test was used as a non-parametric alternative test. According to Field (2009), the Mann–Whitney U Test is

appropriate for comparing two independent groups when the data are not normally distributed. Therefore, the use of these statistical procedures enabled the researcher to analyze the research data appropriately and accurately.

KERINCI

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

This chapter presents the findings of the research related to students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy (CLAL) among students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci. The findings are organized based on the research questions of this study. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics through jamovi statistical software.

The findings include:

1. The level of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.
2. The difference in students' Critical Language Assessment Literacy across different semesters.

1. The Level of Students' Perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Critical Language Assessment Literacy (CLAL) refers to students' understanding, awareness, and critical perspectives toward language assessment practices, including assessment purposes, assessment fairness, assessment criteria, and the use of feedback in learning. In this study,

students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy was analyzed using descriptive statistics involving mean and standard deviation.

Mean refers to the average score obtained from students' responses to the questionnaire items, while standard deviation indicates the variability or spread of students' responses from the average score. The mean score represents the average level of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy, while the standard deviation indicates the variability of students' responses.

a) Overall CLAL Analysis

To answer the first research question regarding the level of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy (CLAL), the overall CLAL score was calculated by averaging all questionnaire items after reverse-coding the negatively worded statements. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items measured using a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). Therefore, a higher mean score indicates a higher level of perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

Table 6. Overall Descriptive Statistics of Students' Perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Descriptives

	Mean CLAL	semester
N	38	38
Missing	1	1
Mean	3.35	7.00
Median	3.35	7.00
Standard deviation	0.420	1.01
Minimum	2.65	6
Maximum	4.00	8
Skewness	-0.00720	0.00
Std. error skewness	0.383	0.383
Kurtosis	-1.51	-2.11
Std. error kurtosis	0.750	0.750
Shapiro-Wilk W	0.915	0.637
Shapiro-Wilk p	.007	<.001

The results showed that the overall mean score of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy was 3.35, with a standard deviation of 0.420. The mean score represents the average level of students' perceptions regarding their understanding of assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback utilization, and assessment fairness.

The relatively low standard deviation indicates that students' responses were fairly consistent and did not vary substantially among participants. This suggests that most students shared similar perceptions regarding their Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

Based on the categorization criteria used in this study, a mean score of 3.35 falls within the high category. This finding indicates that students generally possess a high level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy. In other words, most students demonstrated a good understanding of the purposes of language assessment, assessment criteria, the role of feedback in learning improvement, and the importance of fairness in assessment practices.

Overall, the findings suggest that students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci have developed a relatively strong awareness and understanding of language assessment practices. This result implies that students are not merely passive recipients of assessment outcomes but are also capable of understanding and reflecting on assessment processes that support their learning development.

b) Aspects-Level Analysis

(1) Assessment Purpose

Assessment Purpose refers to students' understanding of the objectives and functions of language assessment in the learning process. This dimension measures students' awareness of the role of assessment in evaluating learning achievement, monitoring learning progress, and supporting learning improvement.

The descriptive statistical analysis showed that the Assessment Purpose dimension obtained a mean score of 3.36 with a standard deviation of 0.443. The mean score indicates that students generally demonstrated positive perceptions regarding the purposes of language assessment. Meanwhile, the relatively low standard deviation suggests that students' responses were relatively consistent and did not vary greatly among participants.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Purpose

Descriptives

	Assessment Purpose
N	38
Missing	1
Mean	3.36
Standard deviation	0.443
Minimum	2.60
Maximum	4.00

Based on the categorization criteria used in this study, the mean score of 3.36 falls into the High category. This finding indicates that students generally possess a strong understanding of why language assessments are conducted and how assessment activities contribute to their learning process.

The result suggests that most students understand that language assessments are not merely tools for assigning grades but also serve important functions in measuring language ability, monitoring learning progress, and supporting academic

development. Students also appear to be aware of the distinction between formative and summative assessment and recognize the role of assessment in improving learning outcomes.

At this stage, the Assessment Purpose dimension obtained a mean score of **3.36**. Its relative position among the four CLAL dimensions will be determined after all dimensions have been analyzed and ranked. Likewise, the identification of the highest and lowest dimensions will be conducted after comparing the mean scores of all CLAL dimensions.

(2) Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria refers to students' understanding and awareness of the standards, scoring procedures, and transparency of language assessment. This dimension examines whether students understand how assessment criteria are applied and how their performance is evaluated in English language learning.

The descriptive statistical analysis showed that the Assessment Criteria dimension obtained a mean score of 3.38 with a standard deviation of 0.554. The mean score indicates that students generally demonstrated positive perceptions regarding assessment criteria used by lecturers. Meanwhile, the standard deviation suggests that although students' responses were generally consistent, there was slightly more variation compared to the Assessment Purpose dimension.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Criteria

Descriptives

	Assessment Criteria
N	38
Missing	1
Mean	3.38
Standard deviation	0.554
Minimum	2.20
Maximum	4.00

Based on the categorization criteria used in this study, the mean score of 3.38 falls into the High category. This finding indicates that students generally possess a strong understanding of assessment criteria and are aware of how their performance is assessed in English courses.

The result suggests that most students understand the scoring criteria used by lecturers, recognize what is expected in language assessments, and are able to use assessment criteria as guidance for improving their learning performance. Furthermore, students appear to perceive assessment procedures as relatively transparent and understandable.

When compared to the Assessment Purpose dimension, Assessment Criteria obtained a slightly higher mean score (3.38 > 3.36). Therefore, at the current stage of analysis, Assessment Criteria is temporarily ranked above Assessment Purpose. However, the final ranking of all dimensions and the identification

of the highest and lowest dimensions will be determined after the remaining CLAL dimensions have been analyzed.

(3) Feedback and Learning Improvement

Feedback and Learning Improvement refers to students' understanding of the role of feedback in the learning process and their ability to use assessment feedback to improve future learning outcomes. This dimension examines whether students are able to identify their strengths and weaknesses through feedback, reflect on assessment results, and apply feedback to enhance their English language skills.

The descriptive statistical analysis showed that the Feedback and Learning Improvement dimension obtained a mean score of 3.45 with a standard deviation of 0.486. The mean score indicates that students generally demonstrated positive perceptions regarding the use of feedback for learning improvement. Meanwhile, the relatively low standard deviation suggests that students' responses were fairly consistent across participants.

KERINCI

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Feedback and Learning Improvement

Descriptives

	Feedback and Learning Improvement
N	38
Missing	1
Mean	3.26
Standard deviation	0.516
Minimum	2.25
Maximum	4.00

Based on the categorization criteria used in this study, the mean score of 3.45 falls into the High category. This finding indicates that students generally possess a strong understanding of the importance of feedback and actively use assessment feedback to support their learning development.

The result suggests that most students recognize feedback as a valuable source of information for identifying weaknesses, reflecting on their performance, and improving future learning outcomes. Students also appear to understand that feedback is not merely information about scores but an important tool for enhancing learning effectiveness and academic achievement.

Compared with the previous dimensions, Feedback and Learning Improvement obtained the highest mean score (3.45), indicating that this dimension represents the strongest aspect of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy. This finding suggests that students are particularly aware of the

importance of feedback and its contribution to learning improvement.

(4) Assessment Fairness

Assessment Fairness refers to students' awareness and understanding of fairness, transparency, and ethical considerations in language assessment. This dimension examines whether students believe that assessment practices should provide equal opportunities for learners, apply clear scoring criteria, and accurately represent students' language abilities.

The descriptive statistical analysis showed that the Assessment Fairness dimension obtained a mean score of 3.23 with a standard deviation of 0.529. The mean score indicates that students generally demonstrated positive perceptions regarding fairness in language assessment. The standard deviation suggests that students' responses were relatively consistent, although some variation existed among participants.

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Fairness

Descriptives

	Assessment Fairness
N	38
Missing	1
Mean	3.37
Standard deviation	0.421
Minimum	2.50
Maximum	4.00

Based on the categorization criteria used in this study, the mean score of 3.23 falls into the High category. This finding indicates that students generally possess a good level of awareness regarding the importance of fairness and transparency in language assessment practices.

The result suggests that most students believe that language assessments should fairly represent students' abilities, that assessment criteria should be transparent, and that students should understand how their scores are determined. These findings indicate that students recognize fairness as an essential principle of effective language assessment.

However, when compared with the other CLAL dimensions, Assessment Fairness obtained the lowest mean score. Although it remains in the high category, this finding suggests that students' awareness of assessment fairness is relatively less developed than their understanding of assessment purposes, assessment criteria, and the use of feedback for learning improvement.

(5) Ranking of CLAL Aspects

Table 11. Ranking of Critical Language Assessment Literacy Aspects

No	Aspect	Mean
1	Feedback and Learning Improvement	3.45
2	Assessment Criteria	3.38
3	Assessment Purpose	3.36
4	Assessment Fairness	3.23

The ranking analysis revealed that Feedback and Learning Improvement was the highest-scoring dimension, with a mean score of 3.45. This finding indicates that students demonstrated the strongest awareness regarding the role of feedback in supporting learning improvement and academic development.

In contrast, Assessment Fairness was identified as the lowest-scoring dimension, with a mean score of 3.23. Although this score still falls within the high category, it suggests that students' awareness of fairness, transparency, and ethical issues in assessment was relatively lower than their awareness of the other CLAL dimensions.

Overall, the ranking results indicate that students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy was strongest in relation to feedback utilization and learning improvement, while awareness of assessment fairness represented the comparatively weakest aspect of their CLAL profile. Nevertheless, all four dimensions were categorized as high, suggesting that students generally possessed a

positive level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy across all measured aspects.

c) **Item-Level Analysis**

Item-level analysis was conducted to examine students' responses to each questionnaire item individually. The analysis included the calculation of the mean and standard deviation for each item, ranking the items based on their mean scores, identifying the highest and lowest scoring items, and interpreting the findings within the context of Critical Language Assessment Literacy (CLAL).

Table 12. Item-Level Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Descriptives

	N	Missing	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Item 1	38	1	3.39	3.00	0.595	2.00	4.00
Item 2	38	1	3.53	4.00	0.506	3.00	4.00
Item 3	38	1	3.68	4.00	0.471	3.00	4.00
Item 4	38	1	3.29	3.00	0.768	2.00	4.00
Item 5	38	1	2.92	3.00	0.632	2.00	4.00
Item 6	38	1	3.24	3.50	0.883	1.00	4.00
Item 7	38	1	3.21	3.00	0.875	1.00	4.00
Item 8	38	1	3.34	4.00	0.815	2.00	4.00
Item 9	38	1	3.39	4.00	0.790	1.00	4.00
Item 10	38	1	3.71	4.00	0.515	2.00	4.00
Item 11	38	1	3.50	4.00	0.647	1.00	4.00
Item 12	38	1	3.47	3.50	0.557	2.00	4.00

Item 13	38	1	3.32	3.50	0.775	2.00	4.00
Item 14	38	1	2.76	2.00	0.913	2.00	4.00
Item 15	38	1	3.53	4.00	0.557	2.00	4.00
Item 16	38	1	3.71	4.00	0.460	3.00	4.00
Item 17	38	1	3.58	4.00	0.642	2.00	4.00
Item 18	38	1	3.68	4.00	0.471	3.00	4.00
Item 19	38	1	2.84	3.00	1.00	1.00	4.00
Item 20	38	1	2.87	2.50	0.935	2.00	4.00

(1) Highest-Scoring Items

The analysis revealed that Item 10 and Item 16 obtained the highest mean scores (M = 3.71).

Item 10 states:
"I am often confused about how lecturers assess my performance in English tests."

and Item 16 states:
"Assessment criteria should be clear and transparent for students."

The high score for Item 16 indicates that students strongly agree with the importance of transparency in assessment practices. This finding reflects students' awareness that clear assessment criteria are essential for fair and effective language assessment.

For Item 10, it is important to note that this is a negatively worded item. Therefore, after reverse coding, the result indicates that students generally do not feel confused about how lecturers assess their performance. This finding suggests that students possess a relatively good understanding of assessment criteria and scoring procedures.

(2) Highest-Scoring Items

The analysis also showed that Item 14 obtained the lowest mean score (M = 2.76, SD = 0.913), followed by Item 19 (M = 2.84) and Item 20 (M = 2.87).

Item 14 states:
"I rarely use feedback from lecturers to improve my English learning."

Since this item is negatively worded, the lower score suggests that some students may not consistently utilize feedback for learning improvement. Although students generally recognize the importance of feedback, the finding indicates that the practical use of feedback may still require further encouragement.

Item 19 states:
"Language assessments are often unfair to students."

The relatively low mean score indicates that students generally tend to disagree with this statement, suggesting that they perceive assessment practices as reasonably fair.

Item 20 states:
"I do not think it is important for students to understand how their scores are determined."

The low mean score indicates that students generally believe that understanding scoring procedures is important, reflecting a positive awareness of assessment transparency.

(3) Interpretation in the Context of CLAL

Overall, the item-level analysis indicates that students demonstrated relatively high levels of Critical Language Assessment Literacy across most questionnaire items. The highest-scoring items were mainly related to assessment transparency, understanding of assessment criteria, and awareness of feedback, suggesting that students possess a strong understanding of these aspects.

Meanwhile, the lowest-scoring items were primarily negatively worded statements concerning feedback utilization and assessment fairness. These findings suggest that although students generally demonstrate positive perceptions toward language assessment practices, there remains some variation in how actively they use feedback and how they perceive fairness in assessment.

Taken together, the results support the overall finding that students of the English Education Department at IAIN Kerinci possess a high level of perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy, particularly in relation to understanding assessment criteria, assessment transparency, and the role of feedback in supporting learning improvement.

2. The difference in students' Critical Language Assessment Literacy across different semesters.

To answer the second research question, inferential statistical analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students. Before conducting the main inferential statistical test, prerequisite tests were conducted first, including normality and homogeneity tests.

a) Normality Test

The normality test was conducted to determine whether the research data were normally distributed. In this study, the Shapiro–Wilk test was used through Jamovi statistical software. The normality test was conducted using the Shapiro–Wilk test through Jamovi statistical software.

Table 13. Normality Test Results of Critical Language Assessment Literacy by Semester

Descriptives

Descriptives

	semester	Mean CLAL
Shapiro-Wilk W	6	0.948
	8	0.966
Shapiro-Wilk p	6	.362
	8	.689

The table above shows that the significance value of sixth-semester students was 0.362, while the significance value of eighth-semester students was 0.689. Since both significance values were greater than 0.05, the data were considered normally distributed. Therefore, the assumption of normality was fulfilled.

b) Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity test was conducted to determine whether the variances between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students were homogeneous or equal. In this study, Levene's Test was used through Jamovi statistical software. The homogeneity test was conducted using Levene's Test through Jamovi statistical software.

Table 14. Homogeneity of Variances Test Results

Homogeneity of Variances Test (Levene's)

	F	df	df2	p
Mean CLAL	7.18e-5	1	36	.993

Note. A low p-value suggests a violation of the assumption of equal variances

The table above shows that the significance value of the homogeneity test was 0.993. Since the significance value was greater than 0.05, the variances between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students were considered homogeneous. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity was fulfilled.

c) Independent Samples t-test

Since the data were normally distributed and homogeneous, the Independent Samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students.

Table 15. Independent Samples t-Test Results of Students' Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Independent Samples T-Test

		Statistic	df	p
Mean CLAL	Student's t	-12.8	36.0	<.001

Note. H_a $\mu_6 \neq \mu_8$

The table above shows that the significance value of the Independent Samples t-test was less than 0.001. Since the significance value was lower than 0.05, there was a statistically significant difference in students'

perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students.

The descriptive statistical result also showed that eighth-semester students obtained a higher mean score compared to sixth-semester students. Sixth-semester students obtained a mean score of 2.97, while eighth-semester students obtained a mean score of 3.72. This finding indicates that eighth-semester students demonstrated a higher level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy than sixth-semester students.

The descriptive statistical results showed that eighth-semester students obtained a higher mean score than sixth-semester students. Sixth-semester students obtained a mean score of 2.97, while eighth-semester students obtained a mean score of 3.72. This finding indicates that eighth-semester students demonstrated a higher level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy than sixth-semester students.

Based on the Independent Samples t-test, the significance value was less than 0.001 ($p < .001$). Since the significance value was lower than 0.05, it can be concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students.

2. Discussion

1. The Level of Students' Perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy

The finding of this study revealed that students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy was categorized into the high category, with an overall mean score of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 0.420. This finding indicates that students generally possessed positive awareness and understanding regarding language assessment practices, including assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback utilization, and assessment fairness. The relatively low standard deviation also indicates that students' responses were fairly consistent among participants.

Specifically, the findings showed that students demonstrated positive perceptions across all aspects of Critical Language Assessment Literacy. In the Assessment Purpose aspect, students showed awareness regarding the role of assessment in evaluating learning achievement and monitoring learning progress. In the Assessment Criteria aspect, students demonstrated understanding regarding transparency and clarity of scoring procedures. Meanwhile, in the Feedback and Learning Improvement aspect, students perceived feedback as beneficial for improving their English learning process. Furthermore, in the Assessment Fairness aspect, students generally believed that assessment practices should be conducted fairly and transparently.

This finding is consistent with several previous studies related to language assessment literacy. For example, Rahmawati (2023) found that university students generally demonstrated positive awareness regarding assessment fairness, feedback, and assessment purposes in English language learning. Similarly, research conducted by Putri and Wahyuni (2022) reported that students who actively experience various assessment activities tend to develop better understanding regarding assessment procedures and evaluation practices. In addition, Astuti (2021) explained that students' involvement in classroom assessment activities contributes to the development of their awareness toward assessment transparency and fairness.

The finding of this study also supports the theory proposed by Fulcher (2012), who stated that language assessment literacy involves knowledge, understanding, and awareness regarding assessment principles and practices. According to Fulcher, assessment literacy is not only limited to teachers but also relevant for students because students are directly involved in assessment processes during learning activities. Furthermore, Inbar-Lourie (2017) emphasized that students' understanding of assessment practices may encourage reflective learning, active participation, and better engagement in academic learning.

Based on the findings, previous studies, and related theories, it can be synthesized that students' positive perceptions toward Critical Language

Assessment Literacy may develop through continuous exposure to language assessment practices during their academic learning process. Students who frequently interact with assessments, feedback processes, scoring criteria, and evaluation activities are more likely to understand the objectives and fairness of language assessment. The learning experiences they receive throughout their study process contribute to the development of their awareness regarding assessment literacy.

The implication of this finding is that lecturers should continue promoting transparent, reflective, and fair assessment practices in English language learning. Providing clear scoring criteria, meaningful feedback, and transparent evaluation procedures may help students further develop their Critical Language Assessment Literacy. In addition, integrating assessment literacy awareness into classroom activities may encourage students to become more reflective and actively involved in their learning process.

2. The Difference in Students' Perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy Between Sixth-Semester and Eighth-Semester Students

The finding of this study showed that there was a statistically significant difference in students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and eighth-semester students. The result of the Independent Samples t-test showed a significance value of less than 0.001, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. In

addition, eighth-semester students obtained a higher mean score (3.72) compared to sixth-semester students (2.97). This finding indicates that eighth-semester students demonstrated a higher level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy than sixth-semester students.

The difference between semester levels was also reflected in students' awareness regarding assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback utilization, and assessment fairness. Eighth-semester students tended to demonstrate stronger understanding regarding the role of assessment in learning and showed greater awareness of transparent and fair assessment practices. In contrast, sixth-semester students demonstrated relatively lower perceptions in several aspects of Critical Language Assessment Literacy.

This finding is in line with several previous studies related to assessment literacy development. Research conducted by Sari (2022) reported that students with longer academic experience generally possess higher assessment literacy because they have experienced more classroom assessments, academic evaluations, and feedback activities. Similarly, Wulandari and Fitriani (2021) found that senior students tend to develop better understanding regarding assessment practices due to their greater involvement in academic and learning evaluation processes. Furthermore, research conducted by Handayani (2020) explained that students'

assessment literacy gradually improves along with increased learning experiences and exposure to assessment activities.

The finding of this study also supports the theory proposed by Xu and Brown (2016), who argued that assessment literacy develops progressively through educational experiences and continuous engagement with assessment practices. According to their theory, assessment literacy is shaped not only by theoretical knowledge but also by practical involvement in assessment-related activities. In addition, Fulcher (2012) explained that language assessment literacy develops through repeated experiences with assessment processes, feedback interpretation, and evaluation practices.

Based on the findings, related studies, and theoretical perspectives, it can be synthesized that academic experience plays an important role in shaping students' Critical Language Assessment Literacy. Eighth-semester students have experienced more assessments, academic projects, presentations, classroom evaluations, and feedback processes during their study period compared to sixth-semester students. Consequently, their understanding and awareness regarding language assessment become more developed. The increased academic exposure contributes to their ability to understand assessment objectives, scoring procedures, and assessment fairness more critically.

The implication of this finding is that lecturers and educational institutions should introduce assessment literacy practices earlier in

students' academic learning process. Lower-semester students should be provided with more opportunities to understand assessment purposes, scoring criteria, and feedback utilization through classroom assessment activities. Early exposure to assessment literacy practices may help students develop stronger Critical Language Assessment Literacy throughout their academic journey.

KERINCI

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGEST

A. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion of this research, the conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. The overall level of students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy among English Education Department students of State Islamic Institute of Kerinci Academic Year 2025/2026 was categorized into the high category. The result showed that the overall mean score was 3.35 with a standard deviation of 0.420, indicating that students generally possessed positive awareness and understanding regarding language assessment practices. Students demonstrated positive perceptions across all aspects of Critical Language Assessment Literacy, including assessment purposes, assessment criteria, feedback and learning improvement, and assessment fairness. The findings indicated that students understood the importance of assessment in learning, recognized the role of feedback in improving learning outcomes, and perceived assessment practices as relatively fair and transparent.
2. There was a statistically significant difference in students' perceived Critical Language Assessment Literacy between sixth-semester and

3. eighth-semester students. The result of the Independent Samples t-test showed a significance value of less than 0.001, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. Eighth-semester students demonstrated a higher level of Critical Language Assessment Literacy compared to sixth-semester students. The mean score of eighth-semester students was 3.72, while sixth-semester students obtained a mean score of 2.97. This finding suggests that students' academic experience and exposure to assessment practices contribute to the development of their Critical Language Assessment Literacy. ssThe findings imply that continuous involvement in assessment activities, feedback processes, and learning evaluation practices may help students develop better understanding and awareness regarding language assessment literacy.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher would like to provide several suggestions for students, lecturers, and future researchers.

1. For Students

Students are encouraged to improve their understanding of language assessment practices, particularly regarding assessment criteria, feedback interpretation, and fairness in assessment. Students should actively use feedback provided by lecturers to improve their English learning and academic performance.

2. For Lecturers

Lecturers are expected to provide clearer explanations regarding assessment criteria, scoring procedures, and the purposes of assessment in language learning. In addition, lecturers should encourage students to engage critically with assessment feedback in order to enhance students' assessment awareness and learning improvement.

3. For Future Researchers

Future researchers are suggested to conduct further studies involving larger samples and different educational contexts to obtain broader findings regarding Critical Language Assessment Literacy. Future studies may also investigate other factors influencing students' assessment literacy, such as learning experience, motivation, or teaching methods. Furthermore, qualitative or mixed-method approaches may provide deeper understanding of students' perceptions and experiences related to language assessment practices.

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

REFERENCES

Cirocki, A., Anam, S., Drajati, N., & Soden, B. (2025). Assessment literacy among Indonesian pre-service English teachers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 23–44.

Nurisma, R. A., & Dewi, O. T. S. (2025). Language assessment literacy in online EFL reading classes. *Contemporary Language Learning and Education Journal*.

Sulistio, P. H. (2023). Language assessment literacy: Cases of pre-service English teachers. *International Journal of Language Education and Cultural Review, 9*(1), 1–10.

Tajeddin, Z., Khatib, M., & Mahdavi, M. (2022). Critical language assessment literacy of EFL teachers: Scale construction and validation. *Language Testing, 39*(4), 649–678.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.

Fulcher, G. (2023). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Harmer, J. (2021). *How to teach English* (new ed.). Longman.

Vogt, K. (2024). Language assessment literacy. *Language Teaching, 57*(3), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482300021X

Shohamy, E. (2021). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Sevilla, C. G., Ochave, J. A., Punsalan, T. G., Regala, B. P., & Uriarte, G. G. (1992). *Research methods*. Rex Book Store.

Vogt, K. (2024). Language assessment literacy. *Language Teaching*.

Fulcher, G. (2023). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

The jamovi project (2025). *jamovi*. (Version 2.7) [Computer Software]. Retrieved from https://www.jamovi.org.

R Core Team (2025). *R: A Language and environment for statistical computing*. (Version 4.5) [Computer software]. Retrieved from https://cran.r-project.org. (R packages retrieved from CRAN snapshot 2025-05-25).

Revelle, W. (2025). *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research*. [R package]. Retrieved from https://cran.r-project.org/package=psych.

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

APPENDIX 1

Research Instrument

(Adapted from Tajeddin, Khatib, & Mahdavi, 2022; Vogt, 2024; Fulcher, 2023)

Section 1 Demographic Information

No	Item	Response
1	Name	(Short answer)
2	Semester	Checkbox: [ ] Sixth Semester [ ] Eighth Semester
3	Gender	Checkbox: [ ] Male [ ] Female
4	Have you taken a course related to language assessment?	Checkbox: [ ] Yes [ ] No
5	How often do you experience language assessments (tests, quizzes, assignments)?	Checkbox: [ ] Rarely [ ] Sometimes [ ] Often [ ] Always

Instruction: Please read each statement carefully and indicate your level of agreement by checking (✓) one of the four options below.

Scale Description

1 Strongly Disagree

2 Disagree

3 Agree

4 Strongly Agree

Section 2 Understanding of Assessment Purposes

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I understand the purpose of language assessments used in my English courses.				
2	I understand how quizzes, assignments, and exams measure my English ability.				
3	I know that assessment can help teachers evaluate students' learning progress.				
4	I understand the difference between formative assessment and summative assessment.				
5	I do not understand why language assessments are given in my English courses.				

Section 3 Understanding Assessment Criteria

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I usually understand the scoring criteria used by lecturers in assessments.				

2	I know what lecturers expect from my answers in language tests.				
3	I understand how my performance is evaluated in English assignments.				
4	Assessment criteria help me improve my English learning.				
5	I am often confused about how lecturers assess my performance in English tests.				

Section 4 Understanding Feedback and Learning Improvement

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	Feedback from lecturers helps me understand my weaknesses in English.				
2	I use assessment feedback to improve my future learning.				
3	I reflect on my test results to improve my English skills.				
4	I rarely use feedback from lecturers to improve my English learning.				

Section 5 Critical Awareness of Assessment Fairness

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	Language assessments should fairly represent students' English abilities.				
2	Assessment criteria should be clear and transparent for students.				

3	Students should understand how their scores are determined.				
4	Fair assessment practices are important in English learning.				
5	Language assessments are often unfair to students.				
6	I do not think it is important for students to understand how their scores are determined.				

KERINCI

APPENDIX 2

Tabulation Data

1. Six semester

Name	Semester	Gender	experience language assessments	experience language assessments.	item 1	item 2	item 3	item 4	item 5	item 6	item 7	item 8	item 9	item 10	item 11	item 12	item 13	item 14	item 15	item 16	item 17	item 18	item 19	item 20
yoni	6	male	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3
elsa	6	female	Yes	Often	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	4	3	3
karla	6	female	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	2
risti	6	female	Yes	Often	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	2
awalda	6	female	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	2	2
dinda	6	female	No	Sometimes	3	4	4	4	2	1	1	2	3	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	3	4	2	2
raina	6	female	Yes	Often	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2
voppi	6	female	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	1	4	1	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	4

sahara	6	female	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	4
azlin	6	female	Yes	Rarely	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	4	3	2
yalvira	6	female	Yes	Always	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	1	4
nazhifa	6	female	Yes	Often	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2
orinda	6	female	No	Sometimes	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2
shufie	6	female	No	Rarely	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	4	2	2
doni	6	male	Yes	Often	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	4	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
abi	6	male	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2
julisa	6	female	Yes	Rarely	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	2	4
naila	6	female	Yes	Often	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2
arya	6	male	Yes	Sometimes	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	4	3	3

2. Eight semester

Name	Semester	Gender	experience language assessments	experience language assessments	item 1	item 2	item 3	item 4	item 5	item 6	item 7	item 8	item 9	item 10	item 11	item 12	item 13	item 14	item 15	item 16	item 17	item 18	item 19	item 20
Alma Nur Amira	8	Female	Yes	Sometimes	2	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2
Farel Syauqi	8	Male	Yes	Often	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	1	4
Annisa Umil Jannah	8	Female	Yes	Sometimes	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	2	4
Reza azizah	8	Female	Yes	Often	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	1	4
Nisyam	8	Male	Yes	Sometimes	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	2
Fadila Nomanda	8	Female	No	Sometimes	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Iren Zahra Alfarisi	8	Female	Yes	Often	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	2

RAHMAT ISYABIL AL HAQI	8	Male	Yes	Sometimes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Adinda trinarita	8	Female	Yes	Sometimes	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
Nauval	8	Male	Yes	Rarely	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	2	4	4	4
AGUS	8	Male	Yes	Always	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3
Husni Hidayanti	8	Female	Yes	Often	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Muhammad Nazim	8	Male	No	Sometimes	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Putra Rimbawan	8	Male	No	Rarely	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
Aulia	8	Female	Yes	Often	4	4	4	2	3	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	2
MKAR INTANA HIKMAH	8	Female	Yes	Sometimes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
RATU TRI ANISA	8	Fem	Yes	Rarely	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4

		ale																						
REYHAN WAHYU AFIF	8	Male	Yes	Often	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
TASYA AMANDA PUTRI	8	Female	Yes	Sometimes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	4	2

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

APPENDIX 3

Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Descriptives

Descriptives

	Mean CLAL	semester
N	38	38
Missing	1	1
Mean	3.35	7.00
Median	3.35	7.00
Standard deviation	0.420	1.01
Minimum	2.65	6
Maximum	4.00	8
Skewness	-0.00720	0.00
Std. error skewness	0.383	0.383
Kurtosis	-1.51	-2.11
Std. error kurtosis	0.750	0.750
Shapiro-Wilk W	0.915	0.637
Shapiro-Wilk p	.007	<.001

KERINCI

APPENDIX 4

Independent Samples t-Test Results

Independent Samples T-Test

Independent Samples T-Test

		Statistic	df	p
Mean CLAL	Student's t	-12.8	36.0	<.001

Note. H_a $\mu_6 \neq \mu_8$

Assumptions

Normality Test (Shapiro-Wilk)

	W	p
Mean CLAL	0.974	.522

Note. A low p-value suggests a violation of the assumption of normality

Group Descriptives

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
Mean CLAL	6	19	2.97	2.95	0.183	0.0419
	8	19	3.72	3.70	0.178	0.0409

KERINCI

APPENDIX 5

Reliability Statistics of the Questionnaire

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's α
scale	0.902

Item Reliability Statistics

		If item dropped
	Item-rest correlation	Cronbach's α
item 1	0.573	0.896
item 2	0.839	0.892
item 3	0.738	0.894
item 4	0.570	0.896
item 5	0.445	0.899
item 6	0.666	0.893
item 7	0.620	0.894
item 8	0.705	0.892
item 9	0.549	0.896
item 10	0.325	0.901
item 11	0.629	0.895
item 12	0.892	0.889
item 13	0.323	0.903
item 14	0.439	0.901
item 15	0.591	0.896
item 16	0.616	0.896
item 17	0.422	0.900
item 18	0.679	0.895

Item Reliability Statistics

		If item dropped
	Item-rest correlation	Cronbach's α
item 19	0.316	0.906
item 20	0.393	0.903

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

APPENDIX 6

Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Group Descriptives

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
Mean CLAL	6	19	2.97	2.95	0.183	0.0419
	8	19	3.72	3.70	0.178	0.0409

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

APPENDIX 7

Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Descriptives

	1	2	3	4
N	38	38	38	38
Missing	1	1	1	1
Mean	3.36	3.38	3.26	3.37
Standard deviation	0.443	0.554	0.516	0.421
Minimum	2.60	2.20	2.25	2.50
Maximum	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

APPENDIX 8

Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy by Semester

Descriptives

Descriptives

	semester	Mean CLAL
N	6	19
	8	19
Missing	6	0
	8	0
Mean	6	2.97
	8	3.72
Median	6	2.95
	8	3.70
Standard deviation	6	0.183
	8	0.178
Minimum	6	2.65
	8	3.35
Maximum	6	3.35
	8	4.00
Shapiro-Wilk W	6	0.948
	8	0.966
Shapiro-Wilk p	6	.362
	8	.689

APPENDIX 9

Homogeneity of Variances Test Results

Homogeneity of Variances Test (Levene's)

	F	df	df2	p
Mean CLAL	7.18e-5	1	36	.993

Note. A low p-value suggests a violation of the assumption of equal variances

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI
KERINCI

APPENDIX 10

Item-Level Descriptive Statistics of Critical Language Assessment Literacy

Descriptives

	N	Missing	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Item 1	38	1	3.39	3.00	0.595	2.00	4.00
Item 2	38	1	3.53	4.00	0.506	3.00	4.00
Item 3	38	1	3.68	4.00	0.471	3.00	4.00
Item 4	38	1	3.29	3.00	0.768	2.00	4.00
Item 5	38	1	2.92	3.00	0.632	2.00	4.00
Item 6	38	1	3.24	3.50	0.883	1.00	4.00
Item 7	38	1	3.21	3.00	0.875	1.00	4.00
Item 8	38	1	3.34	4.00	0.815	2.00	4.00
Item 9	38	1	3.39	4.00	0.790	1.00	4.00
Item 10	38	1	3.71	4.00	0.515	2.00	4.00
Item 11	38	1	3.50	4.00	0.647	1.00	4.00
Item 12	38	1	3.47	3.50	0.557	2.00	4.00
Item 13	38	1	3.32	3.50	0.775	2.00	4.00
Item 14	38	1	2.76	2.00	0.913	2.00	4.00
Item 15	38	1	3.53	4.00	0.557	2.00	4.00
Item 16	38	1	3.71	4.00	0.460	3.00	4.00
Item 17	38	1	3.58	4.00	0.642	2.00	4.00
Item 18	38	1	3.68	4.00	0.471	3.00	4.00
Item 19	38	1	2.84	3.00	1.00	1.00	4.00
Item 20	38	1	2.87	2.50	0.935	2.00	4.00


KERINCI