

Implikasi

Penelitian ini menambah kajian tentang ciri-ciri item Tes Penilaian Situasi yang bagus secara properti psikometris. Sebelumnya sudah terdapat beberapa penelitian untuk mengetahui seperti apa TPS yang bagus, namun belum menggunakan metode ini. Metode penelitian seperti ini dapat dilakukan lagi dengan sampel yang berbeda dan klasifikasi yang baru.

Limitasi

Klasifikasi pada setiap atribut TPS tidak memiliki jumlah yang berimbang, bahkan hingga sangat timpang. Ketimpangan yang disebabkan pada klasifikasi tersebut sebenarnya wajar terjadi dengan metode yang dilakukan, namun perbedaan jumlah membuat perhitungan tidak dapat dilakukan dengan seimbang dan ketika dicoba melakukan analisis statistik pun, analisis yang digunakan adalah uji non parametrik. Bahkan tidak hanya ketimpangan jumlah klasifikasi, jumlah item yang dites juga tergolong sedikit, yakni 40. Jumlah tersebut mempersempit penelitian sehingga ketika terjadi ketimpangan, dampaknya akan sangat terasa.

Kesimpulan

Penelitian ini menunjukkan adanya perbedaan kecil antara klasifikasi item berdasarkan properti psikometrisnya. Perbedaan yang paling besar ditemui pada

klasifikasi berdasarkan bentuk respons, dengan perbedaan lain cenderung kecil karena kualitas dari item TPS yang tergolong tinggi. Dari kesimpulan tersebut, penulis item TPS selanjutnya dapat membuat item dengan memperhatikan CIIAs antara lain Tipe situasi *decontextualized*, model respons nominal, pelibatan dilema kecil, kompleksitas tinggi, bentuk respon berupa aksi/perilaku, dan peranan non profesional apabila ingin mendapatkan bobot faktor atau daya diskriminan yang tinggi. Adapun berdasarkan tingkat kesulitan, pengembang dapat membuat item dengan tipe situasi *contextualized*, Model Respons Nominal, Pelibatan dilema tinggi, Kompleksitas rendah, Bentuk respon pendapat/sikap, dan peranan profesional untuk mendapatkan item dengan tingkat kesulitan tinggi.

Saran

Penelitian selanjutnya disarankan untuk menentukan CIIAs terlebih dahulu lalu membuat item berdasarkan klasifikasi. Dengan demikian, setiap CIIAs dari Tes Penilaian Situasi nantinya memiliki jumlah yang sama dan diharapkan dapat lebih valid menunjukkan perbedaan. CIIAs kemudian dapat menjadi lebih bebas dari pengaruh konstruk atau konten dari TPS itu sendiri. Selain itu, metode pemetaan ini merupakan metode yang dapat dilakukan lebih banyak karena potensinya. Untuk memaksimalkannya, pada penelitian selanjutnya dapat dibuat CIIAs lain yang dapat lebih menggambarkan macam-macam item dari TPS.

Daftar Pustaka

- Aldrup, K., Carstensen, B., Köller, M. M., & Klusmann, U. (2020). Measuring Teachers' Social-Emotional Competence: Development and Validation of a Situational Judgment Test. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00892>
- Allen, M. J., & Yen, W. M. (1979). *Introduction to measurement theory*. Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.
- Azwar, S. (2017). *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi* (2 ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Bardach, L., Rushby, J. V., Kim, L. E., & Klassen, R. M. (2021). Using video- and text-based situational judgement tests for teacher selection: A quasi-experiment exploring the relations between test format, subgroup differences, and applicant reactions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30*(2), 251–264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1736619>
- Cabrera, M. A. M., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational Judgment Tests: A Review of Practice and Constructs Assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(1–2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00167>
- Campion, M. C., Ployhart, R. E., & MacKenzie, W. I. (2014). The State of Research on Situational Judgment Tests: A Content Analysis and Directions for Future Research. *Human Performance, 27*(4), 283–310.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2014.929693>

- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (1997). Video-based versus paper-and-pencil method of assessment in situational judgment tests: Subgroup differences in test performance and face validity perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1), 143–159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.143>
- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational Judgment and Job Performance. *Human Performance*, 15(3), 233–254.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327043HUP1503_01
- Christian, Michael. S., Edwards, Bryan. D., & Bradley, J. C. (2010).
SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TESTS: CONSTRUCTS ASSESSED AND A
META-ANALYSIS OF THEIR CRITERION-RELATED VALIDITIES.
Personnel Psychology, 63(1), 83–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01163.x>
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309–319.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309>
- Clevenger, J., Pereira, G. M., Wiechmann, D., Schmitt, N., & Harvey, V. S. (2001).
Incremental validity of situational judgment tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 410–417. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.410>
- Crocker, L. M., & Algina, J. (2008). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Cengage Learning.
- Delellis, T., Maerten-Rivera, J. L., Zhao, Y., Noureldin, M., Chen, A. M. H., & Park, S. K. (2023). Examining Validity for the Pharmacy Affective Domain

- Situational Judgment Test. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 87(3), 338–344. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8932>
- Furr, R. M. (2022). *Psychometrics: An introduction* (Fourth edition). SAGE.
- Golubovich, J., Lake, C. J., Anguiano-Carrasco, C., & Seybert, J. (2020). Measuring Achievement Striving via a Situational Judgment Test: The Value of Additional Context. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones*, 36(2), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2020a15>
- Graham, K. E., Mcdaniel, M. A., Douglas, E. F., & Snell, A. F. (2002). Biodata validity decay and score inflation with faking: Do item attributes explain variance across items? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(4), 573–592. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015454319119>
- Grand, J. A. (2020). A general response process theory for situational judgment tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(8), 819–862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000468>
- Gustafson, C. E., Johnson, C. J., Beck Dallaghan, G. L., Knight, O. J., Malloy, K. M., Nichols, K. R., & Rahangdale, L. (2023). Evaluating situational judgment test use and diversity in admissions at a southern US medical school. *PLoS ONE*, 18(2 February). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280205>
- Harenbrock, J., Forthmann, B., & Holling, H. (2023). Retest Reliability of Situational Judgment Tests: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 1866–5888/a000323. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000323>

- Kanning, U. P., Grewe, K., Hollenberg, S., & Hadouch, M. (2006). From the Subjects' Point of View: Reactions to Different Types of Situational Judgment Items. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 22(3), 168–176. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.22.3.168>
- Krumm, S., Lievens, F., Hüffmeier, J., Lipnevich, A. A., Bendels, H., & Hertel, G. (2015). How “situational” is judgment in situational judgment tests? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 399–416. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037674>
- Landers, R. N., Auer, E. M., & Abraham, J. D. (2020). Gamifying a situational judgment test with immersion and control game elements. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 35(4), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-10-2018-0446>
- Lievens, F., Peeters, H., & Schollaert, E. (2008). Situational judgment tests: A review of recent research. *Personnel Review*, 37(4), 426–441. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480810877598>
- Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. (2012). The validity of interpersonal skills assessment via situational judgment tests for predicting academic success and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 460–468. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025741>
- Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and Quantification Of Content Validity. *Nursing Research*, 35(6).

https://journals.lww.com/nursingresearchonline/fulltext/1986/11000/determination_and_quantification_of_content.17.aspx

Martin-Raugh, M. P., & Kell, H. J. (2021). A process model of situational judgment test responding. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(2), 100731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100731>

McDaniel, M. A., List, S. K., & Kepes, S. (2016). The “Hot Mess” of Situational Judgment Test Construct Validity and Other Issues. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(1), 47–51. Cambridge Core. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.115>

McDaniel, M. A., Morgeson, F. P., Finnegan, E. B., Campion, M. A., & Braverman, E. P. (2001). Use of situational judgment tests to predict job performance: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 730–740. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.730>

Motowidlo, S. J., Dunnette, M. D., & Carter, G. W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6), 640–647. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.6.640>

Motowidlo, S. J., Hooper, A. C., & Jackson, H. L. (2006). Implicit policies about relations between personality traits and behavioral effectiveness in situational judgment items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 749–761. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.749>

Mumford, T. V., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2008). The Team Role Test: Development and validation of a team role

knowledge situational judgment test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 250–267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.250>

Nisa, Y. F., Umar, J., Arista, P. D., Widaningrum, H., & Hayat, B. (2022).

Development and Validation of Situational Judgement Test to Measure Continuous Learning Competency. *Jurnal Pengukuran Psikologi Dan Pendidikan Indonesia*, 11(1), 34–44. Scopus.
<https://doi.org/10.15408/jp3i.v11i1.25302>

Oostrom, J. K., de Vries, R. E., & de Wit, M. (2019). Development and validation of a HEXACO situational judgment test. *Human Performance*, 32(1), 1–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2018.1539856>

Oostrom, J. K., Köbis, N. C., Ronay, R., & Cremers, M. (2017). False consensus in situational judgment tests: What would others do? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 71, 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.09.001>

Patterson, F., Ashworth, V., Zibarras, L., Coan, P., Kerrin, M., & O'Neill, P. (2012). Evaluations of situational judgement tests to assess non-academic attributes in selection. *Medical Education*, 46(9), 850–868.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2012.04336.x>

Patterson, F., Cousans, F., Edwards, H., Rosselli, A., Nicholson, S., & Wright, B. (2017). The Predictive Validity of a Text-Based Situational Judgment Test in Undergraduate Medical and Dental School Admissions: *Academic Medicine*, 92(9), 1250–1253.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001630>

- Peus, C., Braun, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Situation-based measurement of the full range of leadership model—Development and validation of a situational judgment test. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(5), 777–795.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.07.006>
- Ployhart, R. E., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2003). Be Careful What You Ask For: Effects of Response Instructions on the Construct Validity and Reliability of Situational Judgment Tests. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00222>
- Sackett, P. R., Zhang, C., Berry, C. M., & Lievens, F. (2022). Revisiting meta-analytic estimates of validity in personnel selection: Addressing systematic overcorrection for restriction of range. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(11), 2040–2068. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000994>
- Schäpers, P., Mussel, P., Lievens, F., König, C. J., Freudenstein, J.-P., & Krumm, S. (2020). The role of Situations in Situational Judgment Tests: Effects on construct saturation, predictive validity, and applicant perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(8), 800–818.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000457>
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262–274.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262>

- Schmit, M. J., Ryan, A. M., Stierwalt, S. L., & Powell, A. B. (1995). Frame-of-Reference Effects on Personality Scale Scores and Criterion-Related Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(5), 607–620. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.607>
- Secord, P., & Backman, C. (1964). *Social psychology*. McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, K. J., Neely, S., Dennis, V. C., Miller, M. M., & Medina, M. S. (2022). Use of Situational Judgment Tests to Teach Empathy, Assertiveness, Communication, and Ethics. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 86(6), 673–678. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8761>
- Soemantri, D., Findyartini, A., Yolanda, S., Morley, E., & Patterson, F. (2022). Evaluation of Situational Judgment Tests in student selection in Indonesia and the impact on diversity issues. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03247-4>
- Walker, J. S. (2004). *Comprehensive handbook of psychological assessment. 4: Industrial and organizational assessment / Jay C. Thomas, vol. ed.* Wiley.
- Warwas, J., Vorpahl, W., Seeber, S., Krebs, P., Weyland, U., Wittmann, E., Wilczek, L., & Strikovic, A. (2023). Developing and validating an online situational judgment test on the stress coping competence of nursing apprentices. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 15(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-023-00145-x>

- Weekley, J. A., & Ployhart, R. E. (2005). Situational Judgment: Antecedents and Relationships with Performance. *Human Performance*, 18, 81–104.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1801_4
- Weekley, J. A., & Ployhart, R. E. (2006). *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application*. (hlm. xxvi, 379). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Weekley, J. A., Ployhart, R. E., & Holtz, B. C. (2006). On the Development of Situational Judgment Tests: Issues in Item Development, Scaling, and Scoring. *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application.*, 157–182.
- Whetzel, D. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2009). Situational judgment tests: An overview of current research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(3), 188–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.007>
- Whetzel, D. L., McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2008). Subgroup Differences in Situational Judgment Test Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Human Performance*, 21(3), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959280802137820>
- Whetzel, D. L., Sullivan, T., & McCloy, R. (2020). Situational Judgment Tests: An Overview of Development Practices and Psychometric Characteristics. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2020.01.001>
- Whetzel, D. L., & Wheaton, G. R. (Ed.). (2007). *Applied measurement: Industrial psychology in human resources management*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Widhiarso, W., Hidayat, R., & Anggoro, W. J. (2018). *PANDUAN*

PENGEMBANGAN TES PENILAIAN SITUASIONAL. Fakultas Psikologi

UGM & Pusat Penilaian Pendidikan Balitbang Kemdikbud.

Widhiarso, W., Steyer, R., & Ravand, H. (2019). Exploring a proactive measure of

making items of a personality questionnaire resistant to faking: An

employee selection setting. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 149, 1–7.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.05.040>

Zu, J., & Kyllonen, P. C. (2020). Nominal Response Model Is Useful for Scoring

Multiple-Choice Situational Judgment Tests. *Organizational Research*

Methods, 23(2), 342–366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118812669>