International Journal of English Language and Pedagogy (IJELP)
Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 60 - 68
EISSN: 3025-4310,, DOI: https://doi.org/10.33830/ijelp.v1i1.5162

Research Test on Formative Assessment Product

Agustina Syafriani[1]
[1] Master of English Education, Universitas Terbuka

Article Info

Article history:

Received: March 5th, 2023
Revised: April 18th, 2023
Accepted: May 16th, 2023

Keywords: (3 – 5 keywords)

Formative
English textbook
Reading

ABSTRACT

The development of a formative assessment instrument is supposed to be based on the components of *Asesmen Kompetensi Minimum* (AKM / Minimum Competency Assessment). The components consist of content, cognitive processes and context and the instrument including the content of informational texts and socio-cultural and scientific contexts. However, in the cognitive process component, the textbook used in Grade X SMA Negeri 1 Pangkalan Susu North Sumatera provides information only. It does not include interpretation and integration, evaluation, and reflection. Furthermore, in line with the rules of the AKM, it is necessary to analyse the competency components measured according to the learning level for class X. 1. This research using a Feasibility study investigated the formative assessment of historical recount text based on AKM in reading skills for class X. This product based on the item validation process can be used as a formative assessment. The product formative assessment of historical recount text based on AKM in reading skills becomes a reference for teachers to prepare formative assessments or other assessments based on AKM. This is to familiarize and prepare students for the National Assessment specific to AKM. This conclusion comes from a result of testing data from material experts, Indonesian language teacher assessments and student responses.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Corresponding Author:

Corresponding Name
Email: fitri0anto@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The PISA results in 2018 show that students' learning skills in primary and secondary education in Indonesia are inadequate (OECD, 2019). Approximately 70% of students had literacy skills below the minimum level in 2018. Similar to mathematics and science skills, 71% of students are below the minimum level of mathematics and 60% of students are below the minimum level of science skills. Indonesia's PISA score has stagnated in the last 10-15 years. This situation makes Indonesia one of the countries with the lowest PISA rating of results.

According to Handayu's (2020) study on junior high school AKM simulation questions, the proportion of diversity based on PISA's three domains of mathematical literacy—process, content, and context—is not yet correct. Interpret, formulate, and employ were 60%, 27%, and 13% of the AKM simulation questions method. PISA questions state that the interpreting process is 25% the same as the formulating process and 50% the same as the engaging process. Uncertainty and data

accounted for 47% of content domain AKM simulation queries, space and shape 27%, and quantity, change, and relationship 13% each. The PISA exams have 25% for each of the four topics, unlike this. In the context domain, AKM simulation queries about personal issues were 66%, societal 27%, scientific 7%, and occupational none. In contrast, PISA queries have 25% of each of the four elements. The researcher inferred from the above analysis that the AKM simulation questions did not match PISA standard questions. Thus, the simulation assessment would not help students to understand their weaknesses and the teacher to give feedback based on the needed competencies prescribed by PISA.

There was also a similar problem in a textbook used in Grade X SMA Negeri 1 Pangkalan Susu North Sumatera. Thus, the researchers believe in developing a formative assessment product that is in line with AKM which in the end would help students get the minimum competency prescribed by PISA. However, in the limitations of time and funding, the assessment instrument that the researcher will develop in this study is specifically on reading skills on recount text.

Scriven's (1967) distinction between formative and summative assessment, the evaluation of student learning proposed by Bloom et.al. (1971), and Sadler's (1989) assessment theory all contributed to the idea of formative assessment. Summative assessments were used at the end of a unit or programme to evaluate students' learning and make plans (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Shepard, 2009; Cizek, 2010; Lam, 2013; Dixson & Worell, 2016). Summative assessment has been criticised for its focus on pupil performance. Boud (2000: 155) stated that "summative evaluation acts as a device to inhibit many features of a learning society" by providing tasks controlled by teachers, assessors, and organisations to students and novice employees. It hinders the learner's independent learning and control over their growth, he claimed. Formative and summative evaluations work together to create a continuous process (Taras, 2007).

Assessment should be an ongoing process that collects and interprets student progress data to inform learning choices. Formative evaluation makes learning a cycle of knowledge and processing. Shephard (2000) and Risyal et al (2022) noted that successful teachers can ask the right questions at the right time, anticipate conceptual pitfalls, and have a ready repertoire of instructional tasks that will help students take the next steps that require deep subject matter knowledge. Black and William (1998) reviewed 578 publications on formative assessment in the learning process. They found that teachers rarely reflected on assessment topics and results. For formative assessment to be effective, teachers must fully embrace it and share data. Weurlander, et.al., (2012) found that students studied better when given formative evaluation feedback throughout a course. Students can't hit a goal if they don't know what it is. Assessment should help students learn (Filsecker & Kerress, 2012). Students can use assessment data to take learning actions when their needs are at the centre of an assessment programme (Black & William, 1998).

Black and William (1998) suggested using assessment data to tailor instruction to student's needs. Assessment should be future, not retrospective. Teachers should plan the right questions and anticipate various student needs when creating a lesson. Shephard (2000) believed that teachers should have a variety of instructional methods to suit student needs. Assessing students' skills helps plan individualised teaching.

Student talents and skill deficits should be assessed. Formative assessments change teaching strategies, curricula, or both to suit student needs. This empowers students to make choices and achieve their learning goals. "Self-regulated learning is an active constructive process whereby learners set goals for their learning and watch, regulate, and control their cognition, motivation, and behaviour," (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 204). Students must know where they are and how to develop to self-regulate.

Bloom's (1984) feedback-correction-processing model—a key component of mastery learning—used formative assessment data to identify student-by-student who mastered which skills after a segment of teaching. Recycled students received skill-specific training. Formative assessment has been shown to improve pupil learning and performance (Rahmawati, 2023; Sela et al., 2022; Widarni, 2023). Using feedback, questioning, and peer-to-peer assessment, formative assessment improves pupil learning, according to multiple sources (Black & William, 1998; Shephard, 2000; Hattie, 2003; William & Leahy, 2015). Timely feedback should help students develop (Hattie, 2003). Specific, timely feedback allows pupils to correct and learn. Students rarely review assessment results unless they can be better (Black & William, 1998).

2. METHOD

This study uses Research and Development (R&D) methods that can enable to create and test products (Sugiyono, 2014). This action does not only stop until the product is available but also needs to do the test of efficacy, methods or strategies, and models. There is also to test effective, efficient, productive, and meaningful products, models, and procedures. This study seeks to create a learning tool: the formative assessment of historical recount text based on AKM in reading skills for class X SMA Negeri 1 Pangkalan Susu North Sumatera. As a product with a formative assessment feature, feedbacks for students are the focus. This assessment tool should be able to give:

- help students discover their strengths and weaknesses and work on them
- help the teachers identify students' issues and address them comfortably

Students of 10th Grade SMA Negeri 1 Pangkalan Susu North Sumatera are the research group. This study also does a validity test on the product with an outside expert from University Negeri Medan.

The answer criteria obtained from the observation sheet, questionnaire and validation sheet were made in the form of a Likert scale that has been given a score. The criteria were as follows in Table 1.

Table 1

Likert Scale Criteria

No	Criteria	Score
1	Perfect	4
2	Good	3
3	Fair	2
4	Poor	1

The selection of the participants was done using pusposive sampling. The researcher chooses the participants that most likely to provide rich information (Bachtiar, 2022; Sunubi & Bachtiar, 2022).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Expert Validation

3.1.1. Content Validation

The content validation process was carried out 3 times with an expert validator. The first meeting was conducted via a Zoom meeting between one of the researchers, the supervisor, and the validator. At this first meeting, the supervisor and validator gave suggestions as follows:

a) The lesson plan is omitted because the final product focuses on formative assessment.
b) Include questions in the form of a mind map or story map for different ways to present questions.

After revising, the second meeting, was a discussion via WhatsApp between one of the researchers and the validator. In this discussion, the validator provides the following suggestions:

a) Add variations in the form of questions;
b) Adjust the formative assessment analysis process.

The third meeting was held at the UNIMED postgraduate office between the first researcher, supervisor and validator after the completion of the revision suggested by the expert. At this meeting, the validators provide three validation sheets that have been filled with values for the formative assessment product. The following is the result of content validation in Table 2:

Table 2

Content Feasibility Aspects		Score	Criteria
Material			
1	Questions according to KD	4	Perfect
2	Questions in accordance with indicators	4	Perfect
3	Questions in accordance with the preparation of the grid	4	Perfect
4	Choice of homogeneous and logical answers	4	Perfect
5	There is only one answer key	4	Perfect
Construction			
6	There are clear instructions on how to work on the problem	4	Perfect
7	The subject matter is formulated briefly, clearly and firmly	4	Perfect
8	The subject matter of the question and the answer key are the only questions that are needed	4	Perfect
9	Use the question word or command that demands a description answer	4	Perfect
10	The subject matter does not give an answer key hint	3	Good
11	The subject matter is free and the question is double negative	4	Perfect
12	The choice of answers is homogeneous in terms of material questions	4	Perfect
13	The choice of logical answers is viewed in terms of material questions	4	Perfect
14	The answer choice length is relatively the same	4	Perfect
15	The choice of answer does not use the statement "all the answers above are wrong/correct"	3	Good
16	Choice of answers in alphabetical form	4	Perfect
17	The question item does not depend on the answer to the previous question	3	Good
Language			
18	The question formulation is easy to understand	4	Perfect
19	Does not contain multiple interpretations	4	Perfect
20	Do not use local language	4	Perfect
AKM Component Accuracy			
21	Content → Information text	4	Perfect
22	Cognitive process	4	Perfect
23	Context → Socio-cultural	4	Perfect
Total		**89**	
Validation Result		**96.74**	**Excellent**

Validity of content, specifically the suitability of the information presented or included in the assessment tool created. The material experts gave the instrument for assessing the description text a positive response regarding the component of content suitability because it almost always produced perfect results across the board except for two indicators (Dafrizal et al., 2022; Paiman et al., 2022). As a result, it is claimed that the assessment tool created in the part of content suitability has met the requirements of learning.

The results of the format validator are presented in the following Table 3:

Table 3

Format Feasibility Aspects		Score	Criteria
Instrument Size			
1	Size compatibility with ISO 216 Standars (A4, A5, and B5)	4	Perfect
Cover Design			
2	The appearance of the layout elements is harmonious and consistent	4	Perfect
3	Shows good center of view	4	Perfect
4	Harmonious color combination	3	Good
5	The composition and size of the layout (title, author, illustration, logo, etc.) is proportional and balanced	3	Good
6	The title letter size is more dominant and proportional than the author's name size	4	Perfect
7	Title color contrasts with background color	3	Good
8	Don't use too many font combinations	4	Perfect
9	Describing the instrument content	4	Perfect
10	Shape, color, size, proportion of objects according to reality	4	Perfect
Content Design			
11	Consistent layout element placement based on pattern	4	Perfect
12	The separation between paragraphs is clear	4	Perfect
13	Print area and margins are proportional	3	Good
14	Proportional adjoining page margins	4	Perfect
15	The space between the text and the illustration is appropriate	3	Good
16	Placement of each reading material title, page numbers are appropriate	4	Perfect
17	Correct illustration placement	3	Good
18	The placement of titles, subtitles, illustrations and image captions does not interfere with understanding	4	Perfect
19	Don't use too many fonts	4	Perfect
20	The use of letter variations (bold, italic, all capital, small capital) is not excessive	4	Perfect
21	Normal text collation width	4	Perfect
22	Spacing between lines of normal text layout	4	Perfect
23	Normal letter spacing	4	Perfect
24	The hierarchy between titles is clear, consistent and proportional	3	Good
25	Able to express the meaning of the object	3	Good
26	Accurate and proportional shape according to reality	4	Perfect
27	Creative and dynamic	3	Good
Presentation Design			
28	Items in each learning activity	3	Good
29	Answer Key	4	Perfect
30	Preface	4	Perfect
31	Table of content	4	Perfect
32	Closing	4	Perfect
33	References	4	Perfect
Total		122	
Validation Result		92.42	Excellent

The data above shows a value of 92.42% for the validation results on the "Excellent" criteria, based on these results the formative assessment product has received format validation from experts. Thus, the formative assessment product developed on the format feasibility aspect is declared to have fulfilled the format eligibility components including a) Instrument Size, b) Cover Design, c) Content Design, and d) Presentation Design.

The language validation process is the feasibility of using the language used to express ideas in the assessment instrument developed (Abdul Kohar et al., 2022). Data validation results by experts on linguistic feasibility can be seen in Table 4 below:

Table 4

Language Feasibility Aspects		Score	Criteria
Straightforward			
1	Accuracy of sentences	4	Perfect
2	Effectiveness of sentences	3	Good
3	Stiffness of terms	3	Good
Communicative			
4	Message readability	4	Perfect
5	Accuracy of language use	4	Perfect
Cohesion			
6	Grammar aspects	3	Good
7	Lexical aspects	3	Good
Coherence			
8	Harmonious	4	Perfect
9	Prosecuting	3	Good
10	Logical	3	Good
Dialog and Interactive			
11	The ability to motivate messages and information	4	Perfect
12	The ability to encourage critical thinking	3	Good
Conformity with Development Level Students			
13	Conformity of students' intellectual development	3	Good
14	Conformity with the level of emotional development of students	3	Good
Use of Terms, Symbols and Icons			
15	Consistency in the use of terms	3	Good
16	Consistency of using symbols and icons	3	Good
Total		**53**	
Validation Result		**82.81**	**Good**

The data in Table 4 shows a value of 82.81% for the validation results on the "Good" criteria, based on these results the formative assessment product has received language validation from experts. Thus, the formative assessment product developed on the language feasibility aspect is declared to have fulfilled the language eligibility components.

Following are some recommendations for language validators the practice problems should be intended to trigger pupils' critical reasoning and emotional skills and be diverse to boost their enthusiasm for working on the questions provided either as a collective or separately. The content validator's recommendations led to the creation of different versions of the questions. According to the procedure outlined by the content validator, this has been modified by the researcher.

Respond by Students

The extensive trials were conducted in class X MIA.4 totaling 35 students. In this trial, the distinguishing power of the assessment product was analyzed. The test results are presented in the following Table 5:

Extensive Group Trial

Students Number	Question Points																				Total Score	Value	Criteria
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20			
1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	13	65.00	Not Achieved
2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	11	55.00	Not Achieved
3	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	16	80.00	Achieved
4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	9	45.00	Not Achieved
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	20.00	Not Achieved
6	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	11	55.00	Not Achieved
7	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17	85.00	Achieved
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	16	80.00	Achieved
9	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	12	60.00	Not Achieved
10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	25.00	Not Achieved
11	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	50.00	Not Achieved
12	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.00	Not Achieved
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	90.00	Achieved
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	17	85.00	Achieved
15	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	11	55.00	Not Achieved
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	20.00	Not Achieved
17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	19	95.00	Achieved
18	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	15	75.00	Achieved
19	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.00	Not Achieved
20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	18	90.00	Achieved
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	10.00	Not Achieved
22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	18	90.00	Achieved
23	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	12	60.00	Not Achieved
24	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	11	55.00	Not Achieved
25	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	14	70.00	Achieved
26	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	12	60.00	Not Achieved
27	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	16	80.00	Achieved
28	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17	85.00	Achieved
29	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	10	50.00	Not Achieved
30	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	12	60.00	Not Achieved
31	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.00	Not Achieved
32	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	18	90.00	Achieved
33	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	30.00	Not Achieved
34	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	12	60.00	Not Achieved
35	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	55.00	Not Achieved
Total	**15**	**12**	**28**	**15**	**17**	**14**	**22**	**31**	**24**	**20**	**23**	**22**	**18**	**16**	**31**	**23**	**15**	**16**	**27**	**17**	**406**	58.00	**Not Achieved**

High school teachers who use formative assessment and personalised instruction will improve pupil learning. This will often require high school teachers to move from summative assessment for grades to formative assessment for adjusting teaching based on assessment feedback. High school teachers should value instructional methodology for individualising students' learning as much as course subjects. Formative assessment should be the norm in all high school classes. The building's administrative team promotes formative evaluation and acts accordingly. A school's teacher evaluation system should include formative assessment essential parts that can distinguish the individual needs of students. Based on this need of what formative assessment is then we can say that the product already meets the criteria as formative assessment. The product has already shown a high ability to make feedback to most students on the weakness of their studies. This condition will be very important in the need for teachers and students to understand what they need to do for making them able to know "Where am I going? How do I get there? Where next? In this case, we can conclude that the effectiveness of this product has good effectiveness to identify student-by-student who mastered which skills after a segment of teaching.

In addition, the researcher needs to add a need for teachers to use formative assessment accurately for maximizing the use of this product. Formative assessment strategies for the operational category "Where am I going?" helped students comprehend the teacher's learning targets. The teachers need to use used two strategies, which involved posting learning goals and doing so in a student-friendly manner, more often. The main action which is very important about helping students develop checklists or rubrics.

The "Where Am I Now?" strategies were designed to help students comprehend their current learning state compared to learning objectives. Teachers describe student achievement. Formative assessment should be done frequently so instructors can gather real-time student learning data and let teacher-students help each other learn.

To help students move from their current condition to the intended learning objectives, strategies were created for the final operational step, "How can I close the gap?". It is commonly used an action that was required in this area was teachers' instruction that was tailored to the student's learning gaps. Teachers also used a different tactic, one that includes changing the lesson's flow and pace in response to data collected about the students' learning. The expectation is for pupils to revise their work in light of feedback, track their learning over time, and consider what they have learned as closing the gap should be a joint endeavour between teachers and pupils. The teacher's most important activities are intended to facilitate the student's participation in this last stage.

4. CONCLUSION

Formative assessment that was used in this article was a part of the theory used to develop this product. To achieve the greatest benefit from the use of formative assessment, further development of formative assessment products that also cover speaking, writing and listening competencies is required. Such advancements also call for research that presents instances illustrative of formative assessment practice, how the elements of such an approach to formative assessment may function in a real setting, and how they may have an impact on student achievement. The primary contribution of the current study is promoting products of formative assessment that are easy to use and have a great benefit on learning English as a Second Language. The study identified the instructional classroom practice needs of teachers, and this product serves as an example of how these changes may afford new learning opportunities. It has been demonstrated in other studies that students' achievement increased when teachers used formative assessment for learning. To develop their use of formative assessment, most teachers would therefore benefit greatly from substantial support, and when such support is offered, it may lead to improved classroom practises that raise student achievement.

REFERENCES

Abdul Kohar, D., Saehu, A., & Sri Ardiasih, L. (2022). Strengthening reading comprehension and interest through SQ3R strategy using Whatsapp during pandemic. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, *8*(2), 165–176. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v8i2.6440

Andersson, C., & Palm, T. (2017). The impact of formative assessment on student achievement: A study of the effects of changes to classroom practice after a comprehensive professional development programme. *Learning and instruction*, *49*, 92-102. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: principles, policy & practice*, *5*(1), 7-74.

Bachtiar, B. (2022). Indonesian High School Students' Readiness and Attitude toward Online Learning: A Mixed Method Study. *EDUKATIF: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *4*(3), 3289–3300. https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v4i3.2678\

Dafrizal, Roza, W., & Juhana. (2022). The Influence of Parents' Educational Background and Giving Motivation to the Second Years Students' English Achievement at Junior High School 1 Sungai Aur. *BIRCI Journal*, *2*(2), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.3580

Paiman, P., Yundayani, A., & Suciati, S. (2022). The Use of Smartphone in Improving the Students' Speaking Skill. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(1), 1009–1018. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i1.597

Rahmawati, L. (2023). Developing English research article writing guide textbook for non-English department students using the ADDIE model. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, *9*(1), 53. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v9i1.7577

Risyal, M., Samanhudi, U., & Mokoagouw, M. E. (2022). Need Analysis of English Vocabulary Among Maritime Students (A Case Study of Politeknik Pelayaran Sorong). *SOSCIED Journal* , *5*(1), 25–27.

Sela, O., Azhar, F., & Samanhudi, U. (2022). ELT-Lectura: Studies and Perspectives in English Language Asynchronous Learning Model (Its Implementation Via Google Classroom). *ELT-Lectura*, *9*(2).

Sunubi, A. H., & Bachtiar, B. (2022). Blended Learning Method in Enhancing Students' Critical Thinking Skills: Challenges and Opportunities. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(4), 6817–6824. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i4.2163

Taras, M. (2007). Assessment for learning: Understanding theory to improve practice. *Journal of Further and higher education*, *31*(4), 363-371.

Weurlander, M., Söderberg, M., Scheja, M., Hult, H., & Wernerson, A. (2012). Exploring formative assessment as a tool for learning: students' experiences of different methods of formative assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *37*(6), 747-760.

Widarni, W. (2023). Analyzing Students' Self-Reflection on Project-Based Learning and Caption Text. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET*, *4*(2), 45–58.