ISSN 2810-0182 (Online)
ACITYA WISESA: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
https://journal.jfpublisher.com/index.php/jmr
Vol. 5, Issue 3 (2026)
doi.org/10.56943/jmr.v5i3.1056

Development of a Democratic Attitude Assessment Instrument for Islamic Religious Education

Maslamah[1]*, Khuriyah[2]
[1]maslamah.dr@staff.uinsaid.ac.id, [2]khuriyah@staff.uinsaid.ac.id
[1]Master's Program in Arabic Language Education, UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta, [2]Master's Program in Islamic Religious Education, UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta

*Corresponding Author: Maslamah
E-mail: maslamah.dr@staff.uinsaid.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The assessment of students' democratic attitudes is an important component of Islamic Religious Education (IRE), as it supports the evaluation of affective learning outcomes alongside cognitive achievement. However, valid and reliable instruments for assessing democratic attitudes in IRE are still limited. This study aimed to develop and validate a democratic attitude assessment instrument for Grade XII senior high school students. The study employed a Research and Development (R&D) approach conducted from February to April 2026. An initial 15-item Likert-scale instrument was developed and evaluated through expert judgment. Following expert validation, 13 items were retained for empirical testing involving 34 students. Item validity was analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation, while instrument reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha with SPSS version 16.0. The empirical results indicated that two items did not meet the predetermined validity criterion ($r \leq r < 0.339$), whereas the remaining items demonstrated acceptable validity. The instrument achieved a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.729, indicating satisfactory internal consistency. The retained items measured four dimensions of democratic attitudes, including freedom of expression, willingness to acknowledge mistakes, rejection of authoritarian attitudes, and commitment to collective decision-making. Overall, the developed instrument demonstrated acceptable validity and reliability and may serve as an alternative tool for assessing democratic attitudes in Islamic Religious Education. Further validation involving larger and more diverse samples is recommended to strengthen its psychometric properties.

Keywords: *Assessment Instrument, Democratic Attitudes, Instrument Development, Islamic Religious Education*

INTRODUCTION

Religion plays a fundamental role in shaping individuals' moral values, ethical principles, and social behavior (Chan et al., 2022). In Islam, religious teachings provide comprehensive guidance for human life by regulating relationships with God, other people, and the surrounding environment (Munawar et al., 2024). Consequently, the internalization of religious values through education is considered essential for developing individuals' character and influencing their attitudes and behaviors (Syihabuddin, 2022). These values serve as guiding principles that shape individuals' perspectives and decision-making processes in their daily lives.

The internalization of Islamic values can be implemented through formal, informal, and non-formal educational settings (Reza Cahya Alfandi & Nurul Latifatul Inayati, 2025). Within formal education, Islamic Religious Education (IRE) is designed not only to strengthen students' spiritual development but also to cultivate moral character, social responsibility, and ethical behavior in accordance with the objectives of the Indonesian national education system (Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 57 of 2021). Accordingly, IRE is expected to promote balanced learning outcomes encompassing cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (Aisyah et al., 2024).

Teachers therefore have responsibilities beyond knowledge transmission. They are expected to facilitate students' holistic development by integrating cognitive achievement with affective and behavioral competencies. In Islamic Religious Education, students are expected to demonstrate religious understanding through observable attitudes and behaviors that reflect democratic values, responsibility, respect for diversity, and constructive participation in social interactions (Fatimah et al., 2025).

Despite these educational objectives, assessment practices in Islamic Religious Education remain predominantly focused on cognitive achievement, while affective learning outcomes receive considerably less attention. Assessing students' attitudes objectively remains a significant challenge because affective competencies are inherently more complex to measure than cognitive outcomes (Ismail, 2023). Consequently, teachers frequently encounter difficulties in selecting or developing valid and reliable instruments capable of evaluating students' democratic attitudes in authentic learning contexts (Susmiyati et al., 2023).

Educational evaluation plays a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of learning programs and provides evidence for instructional improvement and educational decision-making (Isma & Yusuf, 2025). High-quality evaluation requires assessment instruments that possess adequate validity and reliability to ensure that the collected data accurately represent students' affective characteristics. Therefore, developing a psychometrically sound instrument for assessing democratic attitudes is essential to support comprehensive evaluation in Islamic

Religious Education and to facilitate the achievement of its intended educational outcomes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a design adapted from the Borg and Gall (1989) model to develop and validate an assessment instrument for measuring democratic attitudes in Islamic Religious Education. The research was conducted from February to April 2026 and consisted of four stages: (1) preliminary study, (2) instrument design, (3) instrument development and expert validation, and (4) field testing of the developed instrument.

An initial pool of 15 Likert-scale items was constructed based on indicators of democratic attitudes relevant to Islamic Religious Education. Each item was measured using a four-point Likert scale consisting of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The initial instrument was reviewed by three education experts to evaluate the relevance, clarity, and appropriateness of each item. Based on the experts' recommendations, the instrument was revised, resulting in 13 items considered suitable for empirical testing.

The population of this study comprised all Grade XII students at Madrasah Aliyah (MA) Sunan Gunung Jati in Gurah, Kediri, East Java. A total of 34 Grade XII students were randomly selected as respondents for the pilot study. The revised 13-item instrument was administered to the selected respondents to evaluate its empirical validity and reliability. Data collection was conducted through the trial and administration of the validated democratic attitude Likert-scale instrument.

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 16.0 for Windows. Item validity was evaluated using the Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient by comparing each item's correlation coefficient with the predetermined critical value. With 34 respondents (df = 32) at a 5% significance level, the critical r-value was 0.339. Items with an r-count greater than or equal to 0.339 were considered valid. Instrument reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to determine its internal consistency. Items that met the validity criterion and contributed to satisfactory overall reliability were retained as components of the final democratic attitude assessment instrument.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The item validity analysis showed that two items did not meet the predetermined validity criterion, while the remaining items demonstrated acceptable validity. The reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.729, indicating satisfactory internal consistency. The blueprint of the democratic attitude assessment instrument was submitted to education experts for review. First, verification from Prof. Dr. Imam Makruf, M.Pd regarding the use of Indonesian. The two recommendations of Dr. Rustam Ibrahim, M.Pd, (Head of

moderation division) are related to the interrelationship of the value of the instrument of assessment of democratic attitudes. According to him, Instruments number 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 have a very high weight to measure democratic attitudes; furthermore, 2, 6, and 8 are sufficient to measure democratic attitudes; then numbers 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 are very high for measuring counter-democratic attitudes; While numbers 12 and 15 have a high weight to measure counter-democratic attitudes.

The results of the validity test obtained 13 valid statements from 15 statements. The statement items compiled include indicators that have been formulated, namely stating or expressing feelings as they are in a forum/organization as many as 4 items, paying attention to the willingness to admit shortcomings and mistakes in the forum/organization as many as 4 items, paying attention to the rejection of authoritarian attitudes in forums/organizations as many as 3 items, paying attention to democracy as living together as many as 4 items, Valid statement items can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 Valid Instrument Assessment of Democratic Attitudes

No	Indicator	No	Statements
1	Expressing feelings as they are in a forum/organization	P1	In the discussion, I allowed other groups to have an opinion
		P2	When the discussion I need to consider the proposals of the friends
		P3	During the discussion, I still maintained my opinion even though I knew I was wrong
		P4	In my opinion, the proposal presented by the head of the organization was immediately approved, there is no need to tidy up because it will consume time
2	Willing to admit shortcomings and mistakes in the forum/organization	P5	Within the organization, each program must be decided together through meetings/discussions
		P6	I was disappointed that my proposal was not accepted at the meeting
		P7	I am reluctant to respond to the proposals of people who are different from me
3	Rejecting authoritarian attitudes in forums/organizations	P8	When I lead an organization, I need to be open to criticism from friends
		P9	I'd rather get criticism and suggestions than get flattery/praise from others
4	Democracy is the basis of living together	P10	I am willing to support the decision that has been mutually agreed upon

No	Indicator	No	Statements
		P11	I am willing to support the program/proposal put forward by a friend if it is for the common good
		P12	I felt no need to take responsibility for the course of the program because none of my proposals were accepted in the meeting
		P13	I don't need to support a friend's proposed program even if it has been approved at a meeting, because I think the program is worse than what I proposed

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Item validity was determined by comparing the Pearson correlation coefficient (r-count) with the critical r-value (r-table). With 34 respondents (df = 32) at a 5% significance level, the critical r-value was 0.339. An item was considered valid when the r-count was greater than or equal to 0.339. There are 2 invalid statements, this is because the correlation coefficient is below 0.339. Invalid instruments are contained in the indicator of willingness to admit shortcomings and errors in the forum/organization as much as 1 point of statement and indicator of rejection of authoritarian attitudes. Invalid statement items can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Invalid Instrument Assessment of Democratic Attitudes

No	Indicator	Statements
P14	Willing to admit shortcomings and mistakes in the forum/organization	I am willing to accept the decisions set out in the deliberations/meetings.
P15	Rejecting authoritarian attitudes in forums/organizations	I feel offended that a friend criticizes my proposal

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Thus, there are 13 items of instruments that have excellent construct validity. The reliability of the test was analyzed using the Alpha (α) formula from Cronbach. The calculation was carried out using the help of the SPSS program version 16.0 Windows and obtained a coefficient of 0.729. By the decision-making criteria according to, the coefficient of 0.729 is categorized as excellent. Thus, it can be stated that the affective assessment instruments for measuring student attitudes developed in this study have excellent reliability. The acquisition of the coefficient of reliability can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3 Reliability Statistics

Statements	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha
P1	49,2647	22,019	,487	,703
P2	49,2941	22,578	,377	,713
P3	49,8824	20,289	,347	,717
P4	49,5000	22,197	,448	,706
P5	49,2941	22,275	,352	,713
P6	50,0294	19,120	,470	,696
P7	50,7941	21,381	,306	,720
P8	49,5000	23,045	,250	,723
P9	50,0000	24,485	-,060	,774
P10	49,3529	22,538	,390	,712
P11	49,3824	22,486	,406	,710
P12	49,3824	20,001	,618	,680
P13	49,5000	19,773	,543	,686
Total 13 Items				**,729**

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Table 4 Validity Statistics

		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	TOTAL
P1	Pearson Correlation	1	,286	,147	,331	,243	,315	,143	,217	,000	,386*	,633**	,379*	,150	,570**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,101	,406	,055	,165	,070	,419	,217	1,000	,024	,000	,027	,399	,000
P2	Pearson Correlation	,286	1	,289	,167	,201	,302	-,088	,328	-,118	,233	,379*	,337	,166	,472**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,101		,097	,344	,255	,082	,621	,059	,505	,185	,027	,051	,349	,005
P3	Pearson Correlation	,147	,289	1	,296	,037	,248	,085	,182	-,053	,032	,077	,339	,433*	,533**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,406	,097		,089	,836	,157	,632	,304	,767	,857	,666	,050	,010	,001
P4	Pearson Correlation	,331	,167	,296	1	-,019	,452*	,072	-,033	-,099	,220	,151	,518*	,513*	,536**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,055	,344	,089		,915	,007	,685	,853	,578	,211	,394	,002	,002	,001
P5	Pearson Correlation	,243	,201	,037	-,019	1	,051	,267	,131	,529*	,445*	,239	,111	-,012	,465**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,165	,255	,836	,915		,775	,127	,462	,001	,008	,173	,534	,946	,006
P6	Pearson Correlation	,315	,302	,248	,452*	,051	1	,313	-,027	-,218	,133	,170	,471*	,620*	,634**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,070	,082	,157	,007	,775		,072	,878	,215	,454	,335	,005	,000	,000
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P7	Pearson Correlation	,143	-,088	,085	,072	,267	,313	1	,223	,056	,024	,081	,099	,442*	,471**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,419	,621	,632	,685	,127	,072		,205	,753	,893	,648	,578	,009	,005
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P8	Pearson Correlation	,217	,328	,182	-,033	,131	-,027	,223	1	-,139	,290	,405*	,161	,088	,364*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,217	,059	,304	,853	,462	,878	,205		,433	,096	,017	,363	,620	,034
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P9	Pearson Correlation	,000	-,118	-,053	-,099	,529*	-,218	,056	-,139	1	,069	,003	,002	-,262	,144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1,000	,505	,767	,578	,001	,215	,753	,433		,697	,986	,990	,135	,416
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P10	Pearson Correlation	,386*	,233	,032	,220	,445*	,133	,024	,290	,069	1	,459*	,325	,139	,483**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,024	,185	,857	,211	,008	,454	,893	,096	,697		,006	,061	,433	,004
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P11	Pearson Correlation	,633**	,379*	,077	,151	,239	,170	,081	,405*	,003	,459*	1	,284	,034	,496**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,027	,666	,394	,173	,335	,648	,017	,986	,006		,103	,848	,003
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P12	Pearson Correlation	,379*	,337	,339	,518*	,111	,471*	,099	,161	,002	,325	,284	1	,631*	,710**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,027	,051	,050	,002	,534	,005	,578	,363	,990	,061	,103		,000	,000
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
P13	Pearson Correlation	,150	,166	,433*	,513*	-,012	,620*	,442*	,088	-,262	,139	,034	,631*	1	,663**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,399	,349	,010	,002	,946	,000	,009	,620	,135	,433	,848	,000		,000
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	,570**	,472**	,533**	,536**	,465**	,634**	,471**	,364*	,144	,483**	,496**	,710**	,663**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,005	,001	,001	,006	,000	,005	,034	,416	,004	,003	,000	,000	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

The validity test is useful for determining the validity or suitability of the questionnaire used by researchers in measuring and obtaining research data from respondents. The basis for taking the pearson yaiotu validity test by comparing the calculated r value with the table r. Valid value if r count > r table. Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that the value of r of the table with N = 34 at 5% significance is 0.339, so it can be concluded that the entire question instrument is valid because it has a value greater than 0.339. The significance value obtained < 0.05 so that it can be concluded that all statement instruments are valid. Table-5 to table 17 explained the respondent's responses from valid Instrument Assessment of Democratic Attitudes.

Table 5 Percentage of P1 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	4,00	15	44,1	44,1	47,1
	5,00	18	52,9	52,9	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 52.9% of respondents strongly agreed that in the discussion participants allowed other groups to have an opinion. There were 44.1% rated affirmative, and 2.9% rated quite agreeable. P1 reflects students' ability to freely express their opinions during classroom discussions while respecting the views of others.

Table 6 Percentage of P2 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	4,00	16	47,1	47,1	50,0
	5,00	17	50,0	50,0	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 50.0% of respondents strongly agreed that when discussing participants need to consider proposals from friends. There were 47.1% rated as agreeing, and 2.9% rated as quite agreeable. Participation-based behavioural engagement, which includes participation in academic, social, or extracurricular activities, is regarded as essential for achieving positive academic outcomes.

Table 7 Percentage of P3 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2,00	6	17,6	17,6	17,6
	3,00	4	11,8	11,8	29,4
	4,00	12	35,3	35,3	64,7
	5,00	12	35,3	35,3	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 35.3% of respondents strongly agreed that when discussing, participants still maintained opinions even though participants knew that it was wrong. There were 35.3% rated in agreement, and 11.8% rated quite agreeable.

Table 8 Percentage of P4 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3,00	2	5,9	5,9	5,9
	4,00	21	61,8	61,8	67,6
	5,00	11	32,4	32,4	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 32.4% of respondents strongly agreed that the proposal submitted by the head of the organization was immediately approved, there was no need to tidy up because it would consume time. There were 61.8% rated as agreeing, and 5.9% rated as quite agreeable.

Table 9 Percentage of P5 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	4,00	15	44,1	44,1	47,1
	5,00	18	52,9	52,9	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 52.9% of respondents strongly agreed that in organizations, each program must be decided together through discussion. There were 44.1% rated affirmative, and 2.9% rated quite agreeable.

Table 10 Percentage of P6 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	2,00	5	14,7	14,7	17,6
	3,00	5	14,7	14,7	32,4
	4,00	14	41,2	41,2	73,5
	5,00	9	26,5	26,5	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 26,5% of respondents strongly agreed that the participants were disappointed because my proposal was not accepted in the meeting. There were 41.2% rated as agreeing, and 14.7% rated as quite agreeable.

Table 11 Percentage of P7 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	2,00	11	32,4	32,4	35,3
	3,00	11	32,4	32,4	67,6
	4,00	10	29,4	29,4	97,1
	5,00	1	2,9	2,9	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 2.9% of respondents strongly agreed that participants were reluctant to respond to the proposals of people who were different from me. There were 32.4% rated in favor, and 33.4% rated quite agreeable.

Table 12 Percentage of P8 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3,00	3	8,8	8,8	8,8
	4,00	19	55,9	55,9	64,7
	5,00	12	35,3	35,3	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 35.3% of respondents strongly agreed that when participants lead the organization, they need to be open to accepting the criticism of friends. There were 55.9% rated in agreement, and 8.8% rated quite agreeable.

Table 13 Percentage of P9 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	2,00	2	5,9	5,9	8,8
	3,00	10	29,4	29,4	38,2
	4,00	12	35,3	35,3	73,5
	5,00	9	26,5	26,5	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 26.5% of respondents strongly agreed that participants would rather get criticism and advice than get flattery/praise from others. There were 35.3% rated in favor, and 29.4% rated quite agreeable. The item analysis showed that P9 had a negative item-total

correlation, indicating that the item was not consistent with the overall construct measured by the instrument. Furthermore, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient increased from 0.729 to 0.774 when P9 was removed, indicating improved internal consistency. Therefore, P9 was excluded from the final instrument, resulting in a 12-item democratic attitude assessment instrument with satisfactory internal consistency. Accordingly, the previous statement that the retained items demonstrated acceptable item-level validity and satisfactory internal consistency.

Table 14 Percentage of P10 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	4,00	18	52,9	52,9	55,9
	5,00	15	44,1	44,1	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 44.1% of respondents strongly agreed that participants were willing to support decisions that had been mutually agreed upon. There were 52.9% rated in agreement, and 2.9% rated quite agreeable.

Table 15 Percentage of P11 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3,00	1	2,9	2,9	2,9
	4,00	18	52,9	52,9	55,9
	5,00	15	44,1	44,1	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 44.1% of respondents strongly agreed that participants were willing to support the program/proposal submitted by friends if it was for the common good. There were 52,9% rated in agreement, and 2.9% rated quite agreeable.

Table 16 Percentage of P12 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2,00	2	5,7	5,7	5,7
	4,00	15	44,1	44,1	50,0
	5,00	17	50,0	50,0	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 50.0% of respondents strongly agreed that participants felt no need to be responsible for the course of the program because none of my proposals were accepted in the meeting. There were 44.1% rated in agreement, and 5.7% rated quite agreeable.

Table 17 Percentage of P13 Statement Response

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2,00	3	8,8	8,8	8,8
	3,00	1	2,9	2,9	11,8
	4,00	14	41,2	41,2	52,9
	5,00	16	47,1	47,1	100,0
	Total	**34**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Source: Researchers Analysis (2026)

Based on the results of the statistics above, it was found that 47.1% of respondents strongly agreed that participants did not need to support the program proposed by friends even though it had been approved at the meeting, because I think the program is worse than what I proposed. There were 41.2% rated affirmative, and 8.8% rated quite agreeable.

In order to motivate their students and improve their daily practice duration and success, instrument educators should monitor their students' levels (Hoek et al., 2025). When instructing works in accordance with their students' levels, educators should exercise caution (Olugbenga, 2022). The core competence of learning PAI class XII high school from the aspect of spiritual attitude is to live and practice the religious teachings it adheres to, and the core competence of the social attitude aspect is to show honest, disciplined, responsible, caring behavior (cooperation, cooperation, tolerant, peaceful), polite, responsive, and proactive as part of the solution to various problems in effectively interacting with the social and natural environment and placing oneself as Reflection of the nation in world associations (Silalahi, 2025).

The findings demonstrate that the developed instrument has acceptable psychometric properties for measuring democratic attitudes among Grade XII students in Islamic Religious Education. The satisfactory validity and reliability indicate that the retained items consistently represent the intended constructs of democratic attitudes, including freedom of expression, willingness to acknowledge mistakes, rejection of authoritarian behavior, and commitment to collective decision-making (Akar & Uluçınar, 2023). These findings support the importance of developing standardized affective assessment instruments to complement cognitive evaluation, as teachers are expected to assess students holistically across cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (Mijdal et al., 2026). The results are also consistent with previous studies emphasizing that affective assessment remains one of the most challenging aspects of educational evaluation because attitudes and

values are more difficult to measure objectively than cognitive achievement (Qorrifada et al., 2025). Therefore, the availability of a valid and reliable democratic attitude instrument may assist teachers in conducting more objective assessments while supporting the implementation of character education and democratic values within Islamic Religious Education.

CONCLUSION

This study developed and evaluated a democratic attitude assessment instrument for Grade XII students in Islamic Religious Education. The findings demonstrated that the instrument possesses acceptable validity and reliability for assessing students' democratic attitudes. The retained items represent key dimensions of democratic attitudes, including freedom of expression, willingness to acknowledge mistakes, rejection of authoritarian attitudes, and commitment to collective decision-making. These findings suggest that the instrument can be used as an alternative assessment tool to support the evaluation of affective learning outcomes in Islamic Religious Education.

Despite these promising findings, this study was limited by the relatively small sample size and its implementation in a single school, which may limit the generalizability of the results. Therefore, further studies involving larger and more diverse populations are recommended to strengthen the psychometric properties of the instrument and examine its applicability across different educational settings. Future research may also employ more advanced psychometric analyses to further validate the instrument and enhance its usefulness in educational assessment.

REFERENCES

Aisyah, A., Saona, S., & Sadaat, S. H. (2024). Implementation of Authentic Assessment of Islamic Religious Education in the Merdeka Curriculum: Qualitative Studies in the Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor Domains in Vocational High Schools. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *5*(4), 189–203. https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v5i4.9663

Akar, C., & Uluçınar, U. (2023). A scale development study on democratic attitude among third and fourth grade students. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *7*(4), 203–216. https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202320926

Chan, C., Ananthram, S., Thaker, K., & Liu, Y. (2022). Do religiosity and ethical principles influence ethical decision-making in a multi-faith context? Evidence from India. *Journal of Business Research*, *149*(May), 772–785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.05.065

Fatimah, R. A., Rahman, A., & Bustam, B. M. R. (2025). The Implementation of Democratic Education in Islamic Religious Education (PAI) Learning to Shape the Creative Character of Students in Madrasah Aliyah. *Edusoshum : Journal of Islamic Education and Social Humanities*, *6*(1), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.52366/edusoshum.v6i1.170

Hoek, L., Munniksma, A., & Dijkstra, A. B. (2025). Students' attitudes towards fundamental democratic values: The construction of a measurement

instrument. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *20*(2), 280–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979241227848

Isma, N., & Yusuf, M. (2025). *The Influence of the Implementation of Extracurricular Activities of the Islamic Propagation Agency on the Practice of Religious Worship at Mutia Rahma Bulu Cina Middle School , Hamparan Perak District*. *5*(1), 211–215. https://doi.org/10.30596/jcositte.v1i1.xxxx

Ismail, F. (2023). The Use of Diagnostic Test for Islamic Education Subject in The Affective Domain Assessment. *Ta'dib: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *28*(1), 35–43. https://doi.org/10.19109/td.v28i1.17150

K, M., Rahim, A., Ismawati, I., & Mutmainna, F. (2024). Islamic Religious Education in Student Character Development. *Al-Hayat: Journal of Islamic Education*, *8*(1), 236. https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v8i1.475

Mijdal, B. S., Hamami, T., Aula, I. A., Anggraini, A., & Sulvaningsih, E. (2026). *Curricula : 5*(2), 847–866.

Olugbenga, M. (2022). Education and Humanity. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *1*, 16–24. https://doi.org/10.56943/jmr.v1i2.77

Qorrifada, I., Nikmah, A., & Sabila, K. (2025). Challenges and Strategies of Assessing Affective Aspects in Learning Islamic Religious Education (Pai). *As Sunniyah: Jurnal of Islamic*, *1*(1).

Reza Cahya Alfandi, & Nurul Latifatul Inayati. (2025). Strategies for Internalizing Islamic Education Values through Nonformal Learning to Support the Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Profetika: Jurnal Studi Islam*, *25*(02), 351–362. https://doi.org/10.23917/profetika.v25i02.8236

Silalahi, V. A. J. M. (2025). the Role of Teachers in Shaping Students' Character and Competence Towards a Progressive Indonesia. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *4*(3), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.56943/jmr.v4i3.857

Susmiyati, S., Zurqoni, Z., Abdillah, M. H., & Saugi, W. (2023). Challenges of Affective Assessment of Islamic Religious Education Learning in Merdeka Curriculum. *Al-Hayat: Journal of Islamic Education*, *7*(2), 710. https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v7i2.675

Syihabuddin, S. (2022). Strategies for internalizing the values of Islamic religious education: implementation and their relation to student character of pancasila in SMPIT Daarut Tauhiid Bandung. *TARBAWY: Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education*, *9*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.17509/t.v9i1.46366