Psychometric Characteristics of Test Anxiety Analysis Tools

Justice Dadzie[1], Ruth Annan-Brew[1], Vida Adjeley Akai-Tetteh[2], Afua Twiba Ahenkora[1]

[1]*Department of Education and Psychology, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana*

[2]*Department of Health Physical Education and Recreation (HPER), University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana*

***Abstract*: An individual's test anxiety might be high, normal, or low, according to Casbarro (2005). The instrument's scores range from 30 to 120, with a lower score suggesting minimal test anxiety and a higher score indicating high test anxiety. Individuals with scores ranging from 30 to 59 inclusive have mild test anxiety, those with scores ranging from 60 to 89 have normal test anxiety, and those with scores ranging from 90 to 120 have significant test anxiety.**

The study was conducted in sekondi-takoradi using all the 10 senior high schools, a multi-stage sampling technique was used in deriving the sample size of 370 respondents. It is preferable to have little test anxiety. According to Akanbi (2013), a modest degree of worry might be beneficial since it functions as motivation and can boost success by pushing pupils to perform their best. In circumstances of severe test anxiety, the client should consult with a competent counsellor. This is because excessive anxiety might impair mental abilities required for exam achievement (Casbarro, 2005).

I. INTRODUCTION

It is an evident reality that students of all levels confront the task of coping with assessments all over the world (Ringeisen, Buchwald, & Hodapp, 2010). This is due to the fact that the test output is used to make critical decisions concerning the individual who takes it, which causes some anxiety among individuals who take the exam. Test anxiety is defined as a sensation of unease or apprehension before to, during, or after a test as a result of concern or fear (Shokrpour, Zareii, Zahedi, & Rafatbakhsh, 2011). It should be noted that exam anxiety affects persons of all ages who are evaluating, assessing, and grading their talents or achievements.

As a result, test anxiety is a significant issue at all academic levels of education, including elementary, secondary, and university (Akanbi, 2013). In the mid-1980s, around 10 million basic and secondary school children had test anxiety, according to Hill and Wigfield (as reported in Fulton, 2016). It was discovered that in a typical classroom of 25 students, between one and three kids, including children of ordinary intellect, students with learning impairments, and even talented students, were at risk of acquiring test anxiety.

People differ in their levels of test anxiety, as reported by Betrams, Englert, and Dickhauser (2013). A tiny bit of worry may be beneficial in that it serves as motivation and can boost success by pushing pupils to do their best (Akanbi, 2013). In contrast, excessive worry can disrupt mental abilities that kids use to succeed on exams; consequently, test anxiety might be low, normal, or severe (Casbarro, 2005). Many students with test anxiety are unable to concentrate on the task given, resulting in poor test performance. In this perspective, Atasheneh and Izadi (2012) contend that test anxiety has been demonstrated to be one of the significant emotional filters relating to success and/or failure in learning.

Students racing through exams to avoid the unpleasant experience, students refusing to finish any section of the test, and students abandoning after just completing a few issues are all examples of test anxiety behaviours (Rubenzer, 1988). This suggests that test anxiety, if not recognised and managed appropriately, will have a detrimental impact on test takers' performance or achievements, regardless of level. In this context, the purpose of this study is to examine the notion of test anxiety and to establish an instrument to detect the amount of anxiety among test takers, especially students the senior high school.

The study also captures and addresses the concerns of validity and reliability, the instrument's purpose and objectives, population, sample, and sampling methods, as well as the instrument's relevance and limitations.

Background (literature) of test anxiety

A test is an activity or set of tasks designed to assess certain qualities or characteristics in people (Amedahe & Asamoah-Gyimah, 2016). Anxiety is therefore defined as a sensation of fear, uncertainty, or tension caused by the expectation of a perceived or imaginary threat, which might appear as tachycardia, palpitation, perspiration, disordered breathing, shaking, or even paralysis (Cassady, 2001). Several learners must deal with various levels of anxiousness throughout examinations. According to Sarason and Stoops (as mentioned in Ali & Moshin, 2013), anxiety has an undesirable and detrimental influence on the test process.

It is unnecessary to state that learners who perform poorly on tests are less bright. It might be due to test anxiety. Test anxiety is described as an emotional state with psychological and behavioural consequences that occurs during formal testing or other evaluative circumstances (Duesek, as cited in Ali & Moshin, 2013). Test anxiety, according to Zeidner (1998), is "the combination of phenomenological, physiological, and behavioural reactions that accompany concern about probable negative repercussions or failure on the examination or comparable evaluative circumstance."

There are three types of exam anxiety: personality attribute, emotional state, and clinical state. It is anticipated that the tests are viewed as frightening when it is considered a personality attribute. Zeidner (1998) defined the emotional state as the level of anxiety that students experience just before a test. Sapp, Durand, and Farrel (1995) defined test anxiety as a subset of a general anxiety condition associated to taking an examination. This definition discusses the clinical condition or disease, which is the third component of test anxiety (Spielberger, as cited in Ali & Moshin, 2013).

As part of the educational accountability and the frequency of standardized tests, there has been an increased prevalence of anxiety among students (Putwain, 2008). Test anxiety can affect any student, regardless of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, grade level, and intellectual capacity. It can affect students' performance on standardized tests and thus, test anxiety has been identified as a two-factor construct, consisting of the cognitive (often referred to as worry) and emotional (or affective) components.

According to the prevalent perspective of the link between these two components, the cognitive component has a direct impact on performance, whilst the emotional component is connected but does not have a direct impact on test performance (Cassady, 2001). According to research, excessive cognitive exam anxiety in pupils leads to poorer test performance and a greater sense of powerlessness (Cassady, 2004; Chavous, 2008; Markman et al., 2010). Test anxiety not only lowers exam results, but it also affects a student's ability to learn and perform in test scenarios (Chavous, 2008). Test anxiety has been measured on three different levels: test preparation, performance, and reflection. According to studies, test anxiety impairs one's capacity to perform successfully in test settings, as well as hinders a student's ability to prepare for a test and study the provided information in order to do well in a test situation (Cassady, 2004; Chavous, 2008).

According to Cassady (2004), students with high cognitive exam anxiety report inferior study abilities, see tests as scarier, and create less useful notes for taking tests during the preparation stage. In terms of performance, the high-anxiety group performs worse on tests and reports higher levels of emotional stress, but in the reflection stage, reflection demonstrates a link between cognitive test anxiety and emotions of helplessness. According to the findings of this study, test anxiety occurred during all three periods (Cassady, 2004).

According to Markman et al. (2010), test anxiety increases at higher educational levels throughout study time and testing. It was shown that learners at higher educational levels experience test anxiety before being tested and even before test notifications are issued. It was discovered that variables such as social stigma, time, place, expense, and mental impediments to obtaining counselling for exam anxiety may exist. Physical considerations (money, time, and location) accounted for 57% of the reasons given for not getting therapy (Markman et al., 2010). According to Chavous (2008), test anxiety grew in the early 2000s and is projected to grow further. This is due to the growing emphasis on testing in schools, which is a source of anxiety not only for pupils, but also for instructors (Chavous, 2008). Students' low-test grades and preparation skills are plagued by test anxiety. It is critical for students who experience moderate-high test anxiety to be able to receive test anxiety desensitisation or study therapy.

Test anxiety reduction programmes are frequently associated with higher GPAs and test scores. Interventions that focus on study skills and test taking abilities, paired with a sort of anxiety reduction therapy, are likely to improve students' test performance (Chavous, 2008). These strategies may help students adopt coping skills, build better test preparation, and have a better general orientation to courses and materials, as well as minimise test anxiety and raise test results (Cassady, 2004). Kassim, Hanafi, and Hancock (2008) investigated test anxiety and its effects on academic performance among university students. According to the findings of this study, test anxiety was negatively associated to academic achievement. Similarly, Farooqi, Rafiq, and Ghazal (2007) examined the amount of test anxiety in semester and yearly system pupils. Their data show no substantial difference in test anxiety between students enrolled in the two educational systems.

It is apparent that, according to Farooqi et al. (2007), test anxiety has no effect on students' performance. Vogel and Collins (2002) also explored the impact of test anxiety on academic achievement. Students with significant test anxiety, as well as those with minimal test anxiety, performed worse academically. Furthermore, pupils with moderate degrees of exam anxiety outperformed others. This is to claim that test anxiety affects student performance, as seen by the findings presented. According to the data shown above, test anxiety is often seen as having a detrimental impact on students' academic performance. As a result, test anxiety has received a lot of attention in the literature, and methods for overcoming it have been highlighted. As part of carrying out this report, it has become critical to create a test anxiety instrument to explore the amount to which students are concerned about taking exams at various stages of their academic careers.

Purpose of the instrument

The primary objectives of this study were to identify, establish, and validate a construct for an updated and more refined measure of test anxiety among students. The instrument's objective is thus to assess students' test anxiety levels. Casbarro (2005) states that exam anxiety might be minimal, ideal, or high. A low degree of test anxiety is characterised by little attention on test preparation, little time spent examining information, and test outcomes that are not regarded as crucial. Similarly, optimal test anxiety is characterised by an appropriate amount of test preparation, adequate levels of content review, and test results viewed as important, whereas high-test anxiety is characterised by an excessive emphasis on test preparation, constant preoccupation with the upcoming test, massive time spent on studying (cramming), and test results viewed as extremely important. As

a result, the instrument includes tasks to assess whether test takers exhibit the aforementioned characteristics.

Significance of the instrument

It is predicted that when the instrument is completed, the results will add to the area of education's understanding of test anxiety. The instrument will also be used as a standardised test tool in the future to assess students' test anxiety levels. The findings of the instrument will clearly reveal the amount of test anxiety among learners, directing stakeholders to give methods to control the worries when appropriate. The tool gives information regarding test anxiety that administrators and teachers may use to assist their students to achieve success.

Delimitation of the instrument

The instrument's scope is confined to measuring the characteristic of test anxiety among learners. As a result, the scope of the study is confined to the respondents' level of text anxiety.

Limitation of the instrument

The tool is only available to students who take any type of test. Because of the nature of evaluating test anxiety, some respondents may offer incorrect replies about themselves in order to feel better about the idea of test anxiety. This may have an impact on the validity and reliability of the instrument's usage and interpretation of the results.

Population

The primary audience for the test is any student who takes a test in any subject of study. The target population is obvious since, as students and in carrying out their programmes, they must complete a series of tests to demonstrate mastery of the subjects they have been exposed to in their particular professions. As a result of this, it is considered that they may be experiencing some anxiousness.

Sample and sampling technique

A sample is made up of a single unit that has been carefully chosen to represent all of the population's categories (Sarantakos, 2005). According to Sarantakos, there are many different approaches to estimating sample sizes, with some researchers focusing just on quantity, others on quality, and yet others mixing several sources, data, and procedures in a process known as triangulation. The sample distribution of teachers and pupils in Sekondi-Takoradi is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 3: Distribution of Teachers and Students

Name of Senior High Schools	Population of Students (N)	Sample of Students (S)
Adiembra	1248	46
Ahantaman	1122	42
Archbishop Porter Girls'	1181	44
Bompeh Senior	738	27
Daibene	571	21
Fijai	1203	45
G.S.T.S	1175	44
Methodist	484	18
Sekondi College	1262	47
St. John's	964	36
Total	9949	370

Source: Sekondi-Takoradi Metropolitan Education Statistics Unit (2022)

For the study, a total of 370 forms (3) students were chosen from a pool of potential participants. A multi-stage sampling procedure was relied upon in this investigation which comprises two or more sampling techniques. In multistage sampling, the first stage involved the use of the purposive sampling technique in the selection of schools, all schools in Sekondi-Takoradi were used. The second stage involved the use of a proportionate stratified sampling technique in selecting the number of 370 forms (3) students out of the total of 9,949 students as respondents (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Again, this is necessary since the various schools vary in the numerical strength of the students. The third stage was involve using the simple random sampling (lottery method) mode in selecting the specific students from these schools to be partakers in this investigation.

Description of the instrument

The tool included 30 items designed to assess learners' levels of test anxiety. We were inspired to create the items by the technique used by Wren and Benson (2004) to assess test anxiety in children: scale creation and internal concept validation. The items were scored on a four-point likert scale, with 1 indicating practically never, 2 indicating some of the time, 3 indicating most of the time, and 4 indicating very frequently. It is important to remember that the scores vary from 30 to 120. Because the exam has a handbook, topics such as validity and reliability, construction, administration, scoring, and interpretation, among others, are covered.

How to use the Manual

When utilising the handbook, set aside time to read the information and strictly adhere to it. If you are unsure about the content of the handbook, please consult the manual's developers or other specialists in counselling or testing.

II. MANUAL TO THE INSTRUMENT

Introduction

The test handbook documents the procedures for creating, administering, scoring, and interpreting the exam. It should be noted that the handbook addresses concerns of validity and reliability. It is critical to understand that a valid and reliable test cannot be created in a vacuum. As a result, in order to produce trustworthy and valid findings, focus must be given on the techniques used in developing the test. In this light, precautions were taken when constructing the test. Amedahe and Asamoah-Gyimah (2016) proposed seven elements to

consider when developing a test, and efforts were taken in the construction of the test to closely comply to the guidelines.

Planning of the test instrument

First and foremost, adequate planning was implemented prior to the construction of the instrument. This is critical for logical or sampling validity (Allen & Yen, 2002). Sufficient time and attention were devoted to the development of the questions, with special consideration given to examining and modifying the test items. According to Amedahe and Asamoah-Gyimah (2016), examining the test items ensures that the test measures the desired objectives, that the phrasing of items is basic and clear to students, and that the difficulty of questions fits the students' maturity level. It should be mentioned that the thirty instruments took three weeks to make.

The planning step included identifying the theoretical and empirical domains of the construct as well as establishing the target population for which the instrument was designed. Defining the theoretical and empirical areas of students' test anxiety was also part of the preparation process. The theoretical domain was developed based on research literature. Based on the test anxiety literature, we considered test anxiety in students to be a situation-specific feature that manifests as an unpleasant emotional state during formal evaluation settings.

Test anxiety in students is hypothesised to show as cognitions, physical symptoms, and test-irrelevant behaviours. It should be noted that the target group, as well as the testing anxiety instrument, were considered as part of the planning. Test anxiety in students is hypothesised to show as cognitions, physical symptoms, and test-irrelevant behaviours. It should be noted that the target group, as well as the testing anxiety instrument, were considered as part of the planning.

Construction phase of the instrument

The building phase included the establishment of the first item pool, item evaluation, preliminary item try-outs, and final item editing. As the item answer format, the Likert style of summarised ratings was adopted, with four response options: practically never = 1, some of the time = 2, most of the time = 3, and very frequently = 4. During the planning phase, a pool of items was created based on content analysis in the literature. More than 30 items were crafted in order to provide way for unacceptable ones to be replaced. Notably, the bulk of the items were written in the first person singular, as in "I believe I will receive an inadequate score," etc.

Furthermore, when designing the test, care was taken to ensure that the breadth of the items was clearly constrained for specificity of answer. Items on the exam guaranteed that students could function since clear and suitable instructions were provided to guide students' replies. In this sense, test takers are constrained to the scope of each question. Furthermore, when creating the test, the developers made certain that all thirty (30) items were answered by the pupils. This really aids in avoiding optional inquiries. When optional questions are included, as stated by Amedahe and Asamoah-Gyimah (2016), it becomes harder to build items of similar complexity, and good students are punished, among other things.

Answering all of the questions offers a full image of mastery and comparison, which is the purpose of this test. Again, the exam items limit or demand learners to express their perspective on the statements presented. According to Amedahe & Asamoah-Gyimah (2016), limiting learners minimises sampling mistakes as well as prejudice in teachers who grade for quantity rather than quality.

Norm of group of the instrument

It should be noted that the instrument should only be administered if the counselee or test taker exhibits indications of test anxiety after the counsellor has established rapport with the counselee. Furthermore, the equipment can be utilised at the request of a person who may require it.

Validity of the instrument

According to Nitko (2004), validity refers to the evidences that support the suitability or soundness of using and interpreting students' assessment findings. It should be emphasised that the test developers took certain significant precautions to verify that the instrument findings are accurate and dependable. In terms of content-related evidence, the assessors ensured that the instruments' content and answers sampled the domain in order to draw stronger conclusions. In other words, the assessors ensured that the questionnaire responses were a representative sample of their (students') replies to a real or imagined universe of scenarios. The universe of scenario encompasses the general regions of concern that represent the area of interest to the person reading the instrument's results, and this was made feasible by a thorough assessment of literature.

In order to ensure content related validity, the domains captured by the instrument were properly specified in accordance with the behavioural objectives, and items were carefully chosen to produce a representative sample of the domain. In this regard, sufficient pieces were carefully constructed to allow for amending and reviewing, ensuring content-related authenticity. Overall, the assessors made sure to keep all the elements impacting validity to a bare minimum while guaranteeing content, criteria, and construct related evidences of validity.

Factors in the instrument itself such as unclear directions, writing the items in complex language that is beyond the students' level, ambiguity of items, insufficient time limits, difficulty of test items, poor construction of items, improper arrangement of items, and factors relating to administration of the instrument such as emotional disturbances, over anxiety, scoring factors such as favouring some students, nature of the group such as age, gender, ability level, and educational background were all checked and dealt with accordingly.

Above all, to ensure construct, criterion, and content validity of the instrument's results, a duplicate of the test instrument was sent to measurement and evaluation experts at

the University of Cape Coast's Department of Education and Psychology under the Faculty of Educational Foundations to review, edit, and make enviable suggestions and constructive criticisms. The wonderful proposal and corrections were quickly implemented.

Reliability of the instrument

According to Amedahe and Asamoah-Gyimah, (2016) the term "reliability" refers to the consistency of assessment results on a population of individuals or groups throughout time. As a result, efforts were taken to ensure that the items on the instrument are consistent with the concept in question. After confirming validity, reliability, which is an essential condition for validity, was carefully examined. The elements that tend to restrict the dependability of the instruments were addressed in order to ensure reliability.

Test duration, time given, subjectivity in scoring, testing settings, and group characteristics that impede reliability were reduced, if not eliminated. In doing so, attempts were made to construct 30 items, and 40 minutes were allocated for responding to the instrument. Scoring was also objective because respondents were asked to choose from a list of possibilities, and the group had comparable features. Furthermore, the tool was tested on students from senior high school in the Sekondi-Takoradi metropolis.

Ten students participated in the pilot testing. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was used to assess the internal consistency of the pilot test. According to Eccles (2007), the internal consistency reliability of any scale is a measure of the amount to which items within the same scale evaluate the same construct after the analysis, and the instrument produced a reliability coefficient of 0.897, that is extremely sufficient. Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha coefficient) findings for the instrument's items revealed that the test anxiety instrument is trustworthy. According to Ali (2012), a reliability value of.80 to 1.0 is highly excellent, and the items on the instrument may be utilised to appropriately assess the construct in issue. In this aspect, the coefficient as depicted makes the instrument more than adequate for measuring students' exam anxiety.

Furthermore, the adjusted item total correlation was observed in order to ensure consistency of the items on the instrument, all of the items reported positive values. This added to the instrument's overall dependability.

Administration of the instrument for Pilot Testing

The instrument underwent a test of internal consistency using Cronbach Alpha after it had been put through pilot testing in the Cape Coast Metropolis. After the pilot testing, the instrument was evaluated (r). A reliability value of 0.897.

Because the students were preparing for their exams, the day was picked. The instrument lasted 40 minutes in total. On the day of administration, administrators ensured that all test administration rules were followed correctly and that responders were impartial. After completion, the instruments were collected; in all, 370 instruments were administered and gathered.

Scoring of the instrument

With regard to the rating, practically never = 1, some of the time = 2, most of the time = 3, and very frequently = 4, it is apparent that the scoring runs from 1 to 4, with 1 being the lowest score and 4 being the highest score. The scoring is done based on the rating, and each respondent's total mark on the items in the instrument must be up to 120. In terms of scoring, the least is 30 points and the highest is 120 points. It must be noted that, for a positive statement regarding test anxiety, a higher mark (say 4) is favourable whereas for a negative statement regarding test anxiety, a high score (say 4) is unfavourable.

Interpreting the scores of the instrument

An individual's test anxiety might be high, normal, or low, according to Casbarro (2005). The instrument's scores range from 30 to 120, with a lower score suggesting minimal test anxiety and a higher score indicating high test anxiety. Individuals with scores ranging from 30 to 59 inclusive have mild test anxiety, those with scores ranging from 60 to 89 have normal test anxiety, and those with scores ranging from 90 to 120 have significant test anxiety.

It is preferable to have little test anxiety. According to Akanbi (2013), a modest degree of worry might be beneficial since it functions as motivation and can boost success by pushing pupils to perform their best. In circumstances of severe test anxiety, the client should consult with a competent counsellor. This is because excessive anxiety might impair mental abilities required for exam achievement (Casbarro, 2005).

III. CONCLUSION

The overarching aim of this research was to develop a brief and psychometrically sound test anxiety analysis tools for students through a series of rigorous procedures. The validation procedures employed helped in establishing the construct's validity. This study should be viewed as a preliminary validation of a test anxiety analysis tools for students. Importantly, there is the need to mention that the validation of this test anxiety analysis tools is not exhaustive. Further validation is needed to strongly establish its usefulness and applicability in other contexts. There is no clarity as to whether this instrument is bias-free in terms of participant characteristics such as ethnicity, language, religious affiliation and age, as this information is beyond the scope of this article. The recommendation here is that future studies should incorporate measurement invariance estimations based on the mentioned demographic characteristics of the participants. Further validation studies should be conducted by translating the instrument to local languages in Ghana, with the goal of creating a psychometrically sound version of the scale that the indigenes can relate to more, especially those who are not of the elite class. This study is the starting point in developing a

culturally valid and acceptable test anxiety analysis tools in Africa, and specifically in Ghana.

REFERENCE

[1] Akanbi, S. T. (2013). Comparisons of test anxiety level of senior secondary school students across gender, year of study, school type and parentaleducational background. Ife Psychologia, 21, 40–54.

[2] Ali, M. S., & Mohsin, M. N. (2013). Test Anxiety Inventory (TAI): Factor analysis and psychometric properties. Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 8 (1), 73-81.

[3] Allen, M. J., & Yen, W. M. (1979). Introduction to Measurement Theory. NJ: Waveland Press Inc.

[4] Atasheneh, N., & Izadi, A. (2012). The role of teachers in reducing/increasing listening comprehension test anxiety: A case of Iranian EFL learners. English Language Teaching, 5, 178 – 187.

[5] Bertrams, A., Engelert, C., & Dickhauser, O. (2013). Role of self-control strength in the relation between anxiety and cognitive performance. Emotion, 13, 668– 680.

[6] Casbarro, J. (2005). Test anxiety & what you can do about it. New York: Dude Publishing.

[7] Cassady, J. C. (2001). The stability of undergraduate students' cognitive test anxiety levels. Melbourne: TEE Publications. Available at: http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=20.

[8] Cassady, J. C. (2004). The impact of cognitive test anxiety on text comprehension and recall in the absence of external evaluative pressure. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18, 311 – 325.

[9] Chavous, M. T. (2008). Evaluation (test) anxiety. Psychology of classroom learning, 1, 387-389.

[10] Duesek, J. B. (1980). The development of test anxiety in children: Theory, research, and applications. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[11] Eccles, L. (2007). Gender differences in teacher-student interactions, attitudes and achievement in middle school science Doctoral Thesis, Curtin University of Technology.

[12] Fulton, B. A. (2016). The relationship between test anxiety and standardized test scores. Doctoral Thesis, Walden University.

[13] Gyimah, A., & Amedehe, F. (2016). Introduction to measurement and evaluation (6th ed.). Hampton press, Cape Coast.

[14] Hill, K. T., & Wigfield, A. (1984). Test anxiety: A major educational problem and what can be done about it. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 105 - 126.

[15] Kassim, M. A., Hanafi, R. M., & Hancock, D. R. (2008). Test anxiety and its consequences on academic performance among university students. Advance in Psychology Research. 53, 75-95.

[16] Markman, U., Balik, C., Braunstein-Bercovitz, H., & Ehrenfeld, M. (2010). The effects of nursing students' health beliefs on their willingness to seek treatment for test anxiety. Journal of Nursing Education, 50, 248-251.

[17] Nitko, A. J. (2004). Educational assessment of students. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Merrill, Prentice Hall.

[18] Putwain, D. W. (2008). Test anxiety and GCSE performance: The effect of gender and socio-economic background. Educational Psychology in Practice, 24, 319 – 334.

[19] Rafiq, R., Ghazal, S., & Farooqi, Y. N. (2007). Test anxiety in students: semester's vs. annual system. Journal of Behavioural Science, 17 (1-2), 79-95.

[20] Ringeisen, T., Buchwald, P. & Hodapp, V. (2010). Capturing the multidimensionality of test anxiety in cross-cultural research: An English adaptation of the German test anxiety inventory. Cognition, Brain, Behaviour: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 14, 347 – 364.

[21] Rubenzer, R. L. (1988). Stress management for the learning disabled. Reston, VA: ERIC Digest 452.

[22] Sapp, M., Durand, H., & Farrel, W. (1995). The effects of mathematics, reading and writing tests in producing worry and emotionality test anxiety with economically and educationally disadvantaged college students. College Students Journal, 29 (1), 122-125.

[23] Sarason, I. G., & Stoops, R. (1978). Test anxiety and the passage of time. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 102-109.

[24] Shokrpour, N., Zareii, E., Zahedi, S., & Rafatbakhsh, M. (2011). The impact of cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies on test anxiety and students' educational performance. European Journal of Social Science, 21, 177– 188.

[25] Spielberger, C. D., & Sarason, I. G. (1978). Stress and anxiety. Washington, D.C: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.

[26] Vogel, H. L., & Collins, A. L. (2002). The relationship between test anxiety and academic performance. NJ: Prentice Hall. Retrieved June 24, 2009, from http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/333.php

[27] Wren, D. G. & Benson, J. (200). Measuring test anxiety in children: scale development and internal construct validation. Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 17 (3), 227-240.

[28] Zeidner, M. (1998). Test anxiety: The state of the art. New York: Plenum Press.

TEST ANXIETY INSTRUMENT

INSTRUCTION

The items in the instrument refer to experiences that may cause fear or apprehension before, during and after taking a test. For each of the items, kindly write in the box the corresponding number of points. Try as much as possible to be frank in the responses you give and treat each item independently.

1 = practically never 2 = some of the time

3 = most of the time **4 =** very frequently

Items	practically never	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	very frequently
1. I have less difficulty than the average student when taking a test				
2. I think about the consequences of my failure				
3. I worry about what my parents and peers will say				
4. After a test, I worry about whether I did well enough				
5. I worry that I might forget the materials I have read on the day of test				
6. I worry about what my grade will be				
7. I am calm than the average student when taking a test				
8. On a whole, I think every test I take is difficult				
9. There is a fear in me when taking a test				
10. I am emotionally unstable a day before the test				
11. I think that I should have studied harder				
12. I feel nervous when taking a test				
13. I check the time constantly when taking a test				
14. I find it very difficult to sit still				
15. On the whole, my heart beats fast				
16. My hand shakes when taking a test				
17. I have to go to the washroom severally				
18. I finally recall the answers after a test				
19. I find it difficult to concentrate when the test gets closer				
20. On the whole, I feel uncomfortable when taking a test				
21. I cannot sleep over worrying about test				
22. I even wonder if I will pass the test				
23. I think other students will do better than me				
24. On a whole, I am confident before, during and after taking a test				
25. I think I am going to get unsatisfactory score				
26. I do well in speed test in which there are time limits				
27. I make careless mistakes when taking a test				
28. I do not panic when I see unexpected questions				
29. During the test, I feel I studied the wrong things				
30. I think that majority of my answers were wrong				

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	370	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	370	100.0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.897	30

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I have less difficulty than the average student when taking a test	83.2514	223.522	.348	.490	.896
I think about the consequences of my failure	83.1622	224.754	.325	.493	.896
I worry about what my parents and peers will say.	83.2216	220.753	.461	.379	.894
After a test, I worry about whether I did well enough	83.0649	223.058	.355	.382	.896
I worry that I might forget the materials I have read on the day of test	83.0432	219.088	.520	.390	.893
I worry about what my grade will be	83.1919	219.435	.480	.362	.893
I am calm than the average student when taking a test.	83.2000	220.475	.416	.346	.895
On a whole, I think every test I take is difficult	83.1405	220.441	.485	.362	.893
There is a fear in me when taking a test.	83.0973	219.551	.504	.374	.893
I am emotionally unstable a day before the test.	83.1622	220.310	.456	.383	.894
I think that I should have studied harder	83.0703	217.301	.541	.454	.892
I feel nervous when taking a test.	83.2027	220.520	.432	.332	.894
I check the time constantly when taking a test.	82.9324	220.546	.498	.411	.893
I find it very difficult to sit still.	83.0568	217.972	.536	.454	.892
On the whole, my heart beats fast.	83.4622	218.471	.455	.319	.894
My hand shakes when taking a test	82.7892	220.909	.528	.468	.893
I have to go to the washroom severally.	83.3595	218.637	.543	.436	.892
I finally recall the answers after a test.	83.3054	219.638	.461	.388	.894
I find it difficult to concentrate when the test gets closer.	82.9108	221.203	.471	.456	.894
On the whole, I feel uncomfortable when taking a test.	83.3703	218.955	.509	.376	.893
I cannot sleep over worrying about test.	83.0946	220.449	.498	.357	.893
I even wonder if I will pass the test.	83.4892	217.887	.517	.499	.893
I think other students will do better than me	83.1892	218.696	.497	.330	.893
On a whole, I am confident before, during and after taking a test.	83.5243	220.987	.384	.447	.895
I think I am going to get unsatisfactory score.	83.4892	221.297	.409	.448	.895
I do well in speed test in which there are time limits	83.6703	222.688	.346	.407	.896
I make careless mistakes when taking a test.	83.8081	222.649	.333	.415	.896
I do not panic when I see unexpected questions.	83.6649	220.045	.448	.430	.894
During the test, I feel I studied the wrong things.	83.3027	221.583	.410	.414	.895
I think that majority of my answers were wrong.	83.4568	221.501	.393	.307	.895