Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies

AJIS. Vol. 4 No. 1 (2026) Page 649-658

e-ISSN: 2988-7399 p-ISSN: 2988-7399

https://doi.org/10.61650/ajis.v4i1.1366

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Teachers' Needs for Digital Literacy Assessment in Elementary Indonesian Language Learning: A School Survey

Selviana Mariska[1*], Muslih Qomarudin[1], Ismail Fahmi[1], Sujari Rahmanto[1], Suwanto[1]

[1]*Institut Agama Islam Al-Hikmah Lampung, Indonesia*

Correspondence: selvianamariska266@gmail.com

Article History: 20 February 2026 • Revised: 25 March 2025 • Accepted: 15 April 2026 • Published: 30 April 2026date pending

ABSTRACT

This descriptive survey examines teachers' needs for digital literacy assessment in Indonesian language lessons at UPT SDN 1 Pisang Baru. All 22 teachers completed a questionnaire; five were selected for supporting interviews, and school documents provided contextual information. Seventeen teachers (77.3%) associated digital literacy with device use, whereas eight (36.4%) reported understanding media ethics, six (27.3%) cybersecurity, and five (22.7%) social-cultural aspects. Eighteen (81.8%) reported difficulty designing digital literacy assessments, and 19 (86.4%) reported limited familiarity with varied assessment techniques. All 22 requested contextual material and practical instruments. Insufficient knowledge (20), lack of training (19), limited time (18), and facilities (17) were common reported barriers. The findings describe one school and support the development and testing of age-appropriate tasks, rubrics, offline alternatives, and sustained teacher support. They do not establish the validity or effectiveness of a proposed assessment model.

Keywords: Needs Analysis; Digital Literacy; Assessment; Elementary Teachers; Indonesian Language

ABSTRAK

Survei deskriptif ini mengkaji kebutuhan guru terhadap asesmen literasi digital pada pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di UPT SDN 1 Pisang Baru. Seluruh 22 guru mengisi angket; lima guru dipilih untuk wawancara pendukung dan dokumen sekolah digunakan sebagai informasi kontekstual. Sebanyak 17 guru (77,3%) mengaitkan literasi digital dengan penggunaan perangkat, sementara 8 guru (36,4%) melaporkan pemahaman etika media, 6 guru (27,3%) keamanan siber, dan 5 guru (22,7%) aspek sosial budaya digital. Delapan belas guru (81,8%) menyatakan kesulitan merancang asesmen dan 19 guru (86,4%) kurang memahami teknik asesmen yang beragam. Seluruh responden membutuhkan materi kontekstual dan instrumen praktis. Kendala yang sering dilaporkan adalah kurangnya pengetahuan (20), pelatihan (19), waktu (18), dan fasilitas (17). Temuan satu sekolah ini menjadi dasar pengembangan dan uji instrumen sesuai usia, rubrik, alternatif luring, serta pendampingan guru; validitas dan efektivitas model belum diuji.

Kata kunci: Analisis Kebutuhan; Literasi Digital; Asesmen; Guru Sekolah Dasar; Bahasa Indonesia

How to Cite: Mariska, S., Qomarudin, M., Fahmi, I., Rahmanto, S., & Suwanto. (2026). Teachers' Needs for Digital Literacy Assessment in Elementary Indonesian Language Learning: A School Survey. *Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies*, *4*(1), 649–658. Retrieved from https://journal.assyfa.com/index.php/ajis/article/view/1366

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital literacy has become part of the ordinary reading and writing environment of elementary pupils. A child may encounter a message that combines written text, images, audio, and links before learning how to judge its accuracy or its consequences for others. Indonesian language lessons can help pupils interpret such materials, explain their reasoning, and communicate responsibly. Assessment must therefore examine meaning making and judgment as well as the operation of a device (Falloon, 2020; Hobbs, 2017).

Digital competence is broader than technical fluency. It includes selecting credible information, recognizing persuasive or misleading messages, protecting personal information, respecting others in digital communication, and producing appropriate responses. These dimensions have different observable indicators. A pupil who can open a web page, for example, has not necessarily learned to compare claims or decide whether sharing a photograph is appropriate. Instruments that treat all of these capacities as one undifferentiated skill risk concealing important learning needs.

Assessment in Indonesian language learning provides a natural context for examining digital texts because the subject already addresses reading comprehension, writing, speaking, and interpretation. A task may ask pupils to compare two short online explanations, identify evidence for a statement, or draft an ethical response to a message. The response can be collected on paper, using a shared device, or through a digital platform, depending on school resources. A useful assessment model must specify which skill is being observed and what evidence counts as satisfactory performance (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Teacher preparation shapes whether these possibilities can be used. Teachers may be familiar with presentations or online quizzes while having little experience assessing source credibility, privacy awareness, or multimodal composition. Designing such tasks also requires a practical rubric and

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

time to interpret student work. International teacher competence frameworks treat pedagogy, resources, assessment, and learner empowerment as connected areas, yet a framework does not by itself give a classroom teacher ready-to-use local examples (Redecker, 2017; Howard et al., 2021).

The present study examines these concerns at UPT SDN 1 Pisang Baru. The source manuscript reports a survey of all 22 teachers and supporting interviews with five teachers. Its initial observations suggested that many staff members had not used digital assessment and wanted clearer guidance. Because the population is one school, the findings are especially useful for defining a local development brief rather than estimating a national rate of teacher readiness.

The proposed development brief needs to distinguish four kinds of need. Material needs concern age-appropriate topics, texts, and examples. Instrument needs concern task formats and rubrics. Procedural needs concern how assessment fits a lesson and how scores lead to feedback. Support needs concern devices, connectivity, time, mentoring, and school arrangements. A teacher could endorse several of these at once; treating them as mutually exclusive would misrepresent the questionnaire.

This article addresses three questions: how teachers report their understanding of digital literacy, which assessment features they request, and which barriers they encounter in implementation. The descriptive survey cannot determine whether a teacher who reports limited confidence performs poorly in a classroom assessment, or whether a particular training program would solve the problem. A subsequent development study would need to test tasks with teachers and pupils.

The contribution here is an evidence-informed specification of what a locally usable model would have to provide: contextual Indonesian language tasks, clear criteria for critical and ethical digital participation, formats that work with uneven connectivity, and practice in interpreting student responses. The proposed “digital assessment literacy” focus describes a direction for design and testing. It is not presented as a newly validated construct or as an effective intervention already demonstrated by the current data.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This research used a descriptive survey supported by interviews and document review. It was conducted at UPT SDN 1 Pisang Baru during the even semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. All 22 teachers at the school took part, so the figures describe the participating school population rather than a sample selected to represent other schools. The manuscript reports 6 male and 16 female teachers, 20 with undergraduate degrees and 2 with master's degrees, and teaching experience ranging from 1 to 25 years.

The questionnaire comprised 35 statements with four response options from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Its content was divided among understanding of digital literacy (8 items), experience with digital assessment (6), needs for a model (12), and implementation barriers (9). The source describes reverse scoring for negatively worded statements and classifies an overall percentage score as low below 50%, moderate from 50% to 70%, and high above 70%. The exact items and item-level data are not included in the supplied manuscript.

Two reviewers, described as a learning-evaluation lecturer and an experienced senior teacher, assessed the instrument's content. The source reports CVR values of at least .75 and a pilot Cronbach's alpha of .87 from 10 teachers outside the school study group. These figures are retained as reported, but the reviewers' item ratings, number of items retained, item statistics, and pilot response data are unavailable for independent checking. An alpha for the whole instrument does not establish reliability separately for every domain.

Five teachers were purposively interviewed to include lower and upper grade levels and variation in teaching and technology experience. Interviews reportedly lasted 30–45 minutes, were recorded, and were transcribed for analysis. Lesson plans, existing assessment materials, and information about school technology supplied further context. The interview group was intended to explain patterns in the questionnaire; five illustrative accounts cannot represent all teacher viewpoints independently of the survey.

Questionnaire responses were summarized as counts and percentages with a denominator of 22. Understanding dimensions, requested features, and barriers could each receive multiple endorsements, so their percentages are interpreted separately. The overall low, moderate, and high categories are mutually exclusive. Interview material was coded into themes and compared with survey and document findings using data reduction, display, and verification (Miles et al., 2014). The source also reports member checking and peer discussion, but does not provide audit materials.

The analysis is restricted to descriptive comparisons. No statistical significance tests, causal models, direct tests of teachers' digital competence, student scores, or implementation trial are presented. Percentages were recalculated from the reported counts where necessary; specifically, six of 22 equals 27.3% after rounding to one decimal place, while one source table says 27.2%. These limitations guide how the findings are reported and how the proposed assessment priorities should be interpreted.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

3. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The first pattern concerns the breadth of teachers' digital literacy understanding. Seventeen of 22 teachers (77.3%) associated digital literacy with using digital devices. In comparison, 8 (36.4%) were recorded as understanding digital media ethics, 6 (27.3%) cybersecurity, and 5 (22.7%) social-cultural digital dimensions. These counts do not form a ranking of measured skill: respondents could be included in more than one dimension, and the classification relied on questionnaire responses.

The contrast between technical and critical dimensions is meaningful for assessment design. A task focused only on clicking, uploading, or operating an application could align with teachers' most familiar interpretation but leave ethical sharing and information evaluation unobserved. The source includes an interview account in which a teacher described being comfortable with presentations while uncertain about how to assess a child's response to online misinformation. That account helps explain the descriptive pattern without independently verifying the teacher's classroom practice.

Difficulty with designing assessments was widespread. Eighteen teachers (81.8%) reported that they did not understand how to design a digital literacy assessment, and 19 (86.4%) reported limited understanding of varied techniques. Based on the source's overall scoring bands, 16 teachers (72.7%) were classified low, 4 (18.2%) moderate, and 2 (9.1%) high. The three categories total 22, but the distribution should be checked against the full instrument and scoring sheets before treating the cutoffs as an independently validated standard.

Teachers' responses identify specific desired content. All 22 (100%) requested material contextualized to pupils' lives. Twenty-one (95.5%) requested integration with multimodal texts and grade-appropriate material, while 20 (90.9%) endorsed higher-order tasks. These are independently rated features, so a teacher may have requested all three. The response pattern supports designing realistic texts and age-appropriate judgments, but does not show which proposed task would be easiest for pupils to understand.

All 22 (100%) also requested practical instruments that are easy to use. Twenty-one (95.5%) endorsed engaging formats and simple procedures, 20 (90.9%) wanted low technical demands and integration with instruction, and 19 (86.4%) requested automatic feedback or flexibility, according to the relevant items. The figures point to a need for adaptable task examples, concise rubrics, and clear teacher directions. They do not establish that automation is necessary or suitable for every assessed competency.

Obstacles were reported alongside these preferences. Seventeen teachers (77.3%) linked limited facilities to non-use of digital assessment; 19 (86.4%) had not received relevant training or mentoring; 20 (90.9%) reported insufficient knowledge; and 18 (81.8%) cited lack of time to design tasks. Each percentage has the same denominator of 22, but the categories overlap. The source does not provide cross-tabulations showing which teachers faced several obstacles at once or which barrier preceded another.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

Interviews and school documents add context rather than a new quantitative estimate. Teachers asked for examples of assessment questions and scoring rubrics, and one experienced teacher described relying on familiar written tests because the criteria for evaluating a digital product were unclear. The available account is consistent with the frequency of requests for practical instruments. Full transcripts, coding decisions, and examples of current pupil work were not supplied, so the depth and variation of these perspectives cannot be independently assessed.

Taken together, the results specify a design problem. Teachers requested assessment materials that fit Indonesian language lessons and can be used without extensive new technical skills, while reporting limited training, preparation time, and equipment. This is evidence of a perceived local need; it is not evidence that the proposed model already improves assessment quality. A subsequent pilot should inspect what tasks teachers actually administer, how they score them, and what feedback pupils receive.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

4. DISCUSSION

The greater familiarity with device use than with ethics, security, and social-cultural dimensions suggests that a model built solely around technology operation would have limited coverage. A broader teacher competence framework links technical, pedagogical, and ethical knowledge, but the relevant constructs must be translated into observable classroom responses (Falloon, 2020). At the elementary level, an assessment of source evaluation might ask a pupil to explain why one short message is more credible than another. An ethical communication task might ask the pupil what to do before posting a classmate's photograph. Such tasks require explicit criteria rather than an assumption that time spent online indicates literacy.

The high frequency of reported difficulty in designing assessments identifies a distinct professional learning need. Familiarity with online quizzes does not automatically equip teachers to assess reasoning about information, respectful interaction, or the meaning of combined image and text. The scoring bands in the manuscript summarize questionnaire responses, but they do not supply performance evidence. A useful next step would ask teachers to score several anonymous examples of pupil work, explain differences in judgment, and revise a rubric. This would reveal whether the reported design uncertainty appears in actual assessment decisions.

Teachers unanimously requested contextual materials, and most asked for multimodal and grade-appropriate tasks. Indonesian language lessons can provide short public notices, screenshots, captions, videos, and familiar local situations while retaining clear objectives for reading and composition. Designers should specify what the text asks pupils to understand and which digital literacy judgment is being assessed. A text should also be checked for accessibility, cultural relevance, and age suitability. The preference percentages support a development priority in this school; they do not prove that every proposed multimodal task will improve learning.

The equally strong request for easy-to-use instruments and simple procedures makes scoring support important. An instrument package could include the pupil prompt, a brief teacher guide, a four-level rubric, examples of responses, and suggestions for feedback. Assessment research emphasizes that evidence should inform teaching and pupil improvement rather than merely produce a score (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Before adoption, teachers should check whether different scorers interpret the rubric similarly and whether it distinguishes meaningful differences in pupil responses.

Infrastructure constraints call for more than an online-only solution. A lesson can examine a printed screenshot or previously downloaded media and still assess whether pupils identify a source, question a claim, or consider privacy. A shared device can be used for a group demonstration while individual reasoning is collected on paper. These alternatives do not make connectivity irrelevant, but they reduce the likelihood that unequal device access will be mistaken for unequal digital judgment. The present study records teachers' reported constraints; a design trial should document devices and connectivity directly.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

Insufficient training, time, and knowledge were all common responses. The survey does not establish how these barriers interact or which should be addressed first. Sustained professional learning can combine a short introduction with repeated task design, classroom use, review of pupil work, and peer feedback, rather than rely on one presentation (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). School leaders would also need to allocate preparation time and a means of sharing vetted materials. The value of such support remains to be tested in this setting.

The proposed phrase “digital assessment literacy” can help organize the competencies teachers need to select evidence, design a suitable task, judge responses, and give feedback. It should be treated as a design hypothesis rather than a sixth pillar established by this 22-person survey. Instrument development would require content review, cognitive interviews with teachers and pupils, a pilot with real work samples, reliability checks for scoring, and revision where criteria are unclear. These steps would show whether the proposed assessment dimension is distinct and usable.

The limitations narrow the claims. The survey covers one school, relies substantially on self-report, and includes five supporting interviews without full transcripts in the materials supplied. The reported alpha and content-validity indicators cannot be recalculated from available data, and there is no observation of teachers administering the proposed tasks. Student perspectives were also not examined. Future research should include schools with different resource levels, compare teachers’ reported needs with observed practice, and test whether instruments support consistent scoring and useful feedback before claiming broader effectiveness.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

At UPT SDN 1 Pisang Baru, teacher responses show stronger reported familiarity with device use than with the ethical, security, and social-cultural dimensions of digital literacy. Most respondents reported difficulty designing digital literacy assessment, while all 22 requested contextual material and practical instruments. The frequent reports of limited knowledge, training, time, and equipment provide a clear local brief for further development.

The immediate product to develop is a small set of Indonesian language tasks that assess information evaluation, safe participation, ethical communication, and multimodal meaning making. It should include concise rubrics, annotated examples of pupil work, offline options, and guidance for using results as feedback. Teacher workshops should test these materials during ordinary lessons and document how easily the tasks can be adapted.

This descriptive study does not validate a new model or demonstrate improved pupil outcomes. The next research stage should examine content validity, teachers' understanding of directions, agreement in scoring, implementation demands, and pupils' responses in several schools. Only after those checks could claims about an effective assessment model be supported.

REFERENCES

Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 10–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5*(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008003

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140

Falloon, G. (2020). From digital literacy to digital competence: The teacher digital competency (TDC) framework. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 68*, 2449–2472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09767-4

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915–945. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915

Gilster, P. (1997). *Digital literacy*. Wiley.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hobbs, R. (2017). *Create to learn: Introduction to digital literacy*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Howard, S. K., Tondeur, J., Ma, J., & Yang, J. (2021). What to teach? Strategies for developing digital competency in preservice teacher training. *Computers & Education, 165*, Article 104149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104149

Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 945–980. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090

Popham, W. J. (2017). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Redecker, C. (2017). *European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., Sang, G., Voogt, J., Fisser, P., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2012). Preparing pre-service teachers to integrate technology in education: A synthesis of qualitative evidence. *Computers & Education, 59*(1), 134–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.10.009

van Laar, E., van Deursen, A. J. A. M., van Dijk, J. A. G. M., & de Haan, J. (2020). Determinants of 21st-century skills and 21st-century digital skills for workers: A systematic literature review. *SAGE Open, 10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900176

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment*. Jossey-Bass.

Wiliam, D. (2011). *Embedded formative assessment*. Solution Tree Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

© 2026 Mariska & Qomarudin. Published by CV. BimbinganBelajarAssyfa, Indonesia