

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Ace, M. E., & Dawis, R. V. (1974). Type of Content, Type of Score, and Response Inconsistency in Comparison Measures of Preference. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34(2), 221–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447403400202>
- American Psychological Association. (1986). *Guidelines for computer-based tests and interpretations*. The Association.
- Anderson, N. (2003). Applicant and Recruiter Reactions to New Technology in Selection: A Critical Review and Agenda for Future Research. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(2–3), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00235>
- Azwar, S. (1993). Azwar, S. (1993). Berkenalan dengan Teori Respons Aitem. *Buletin Psikologi No 1*, 9–16. *Buletin Psikologi No 1*, 9–16.
- Azwar, S. (2015). *Dasar-dasar Psikometrika Edisi II*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Babbie, E. R. (2015). *The practice of social research*. Nelson Education.
- Barak, A. (2011). Internet-based Psychological Testing and Assessment. In *Online Counseling* (pp. 225–255). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-378596-1.00012-5>
- Beach, D. A. (1989). Identifying the Random Responder. *The Journal of Psychology*, 123(1), 101–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1989.10542966>
- Boo, J., & Vispoel, W. (2012). Computer versus Paper-and-Pencil Assessment of Educational Development: A Comparison of Psychometric Features and Examinee Preferences. *Psychological Reports*, 111(2), 443–460. <https://doi.org/10.2466/10.03.11.PR0.111.5.443-460>
- Buchanan, T. (2000). Potential of the Internet for Personality Research. In *Psychological Experiments on the Internet* (pp. 121–140). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012099980-4/50006-X>
- Buchanan, T. (2002). Online assessment: Desirable or dangerous? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33(2), 148–154. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.33.2.148>
- Buchanan, T., & Smith, J. L. (1999). Using the Internet for psychological research: Personality testing on the World Wide Web. *British Journal of Psychology*, 90(1), 125–144. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712699161189>
- Clariana, R., & Wallace, P. (2002). Paper-based versus computer-based assessment: Key factors associated with the test mode effect. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(5), 593–602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8535.00294>
- Clark III, J. M. (2010). *Aberrant response patterns as a multidimensional phenomenon: Using factor-analytic model comparison to detect cheating* [PhD Thesis]. University of Kansas.
- Conijn, J. M., Emons, W. H. M., van Assen, M. A. L. M., Pedersen, S. S., & Sijtsma, K. (2013). Explanatory, Multilevel Person-Fit Analysis of Response Consistency on the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 48(5), 692–718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2013.815580>
- Corrigan, M., & Miller, H. G. (2011). Toward a User-Centric Digital Ecosystem. *IT Professional*, 13(4), 12–15. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MITP.2011.72>

- Czaja, S. J., & Sharit, J. (1998). Age Differences in Attitudes Toward Computers. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 53B(5), P329–P340. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/53B.5.P329>
- Drasgow, F., Levine, M. V., & Williams, E. A. (1985). Appropriateness measurement with polychotomous item response models and standardized indices. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 38(1), 67–86.
- Dwight, S. A., & Feigelson, M. E. (2000). A quantitative review of the effect of computerized testing on the measurement of social desirability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(3), 340–360.
- Emons, W. H. M. (2009). Detection and Diagnosis of Person Misfit From Patterns of Summed Polytomous Item Scores. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 33(8), 599–619. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621609334378>
- Ferrando, P. J. (2014). A General Approach for Assessing Person Fit and Person Reliability in Typical-Response Measurement. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 38(2), 166–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621613497532>
- Hayslett, M. M., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2004). Pixels or pencils? The relative effectiveness of Web-based versus paper surveys. *Library & Information Science Research*, 26(1), 73–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2003.11.005>
- Hendrawan, I., Glas, C. A. W., & Meijer, R. R. (2005). The Effect of Person Misfit on Classification Decisions. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 29(1), 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621604270902>
- Jay, G. M., & Willis, S. L. (1992). Influence of Direct Computer Experience on Older Adults' Attitudes Toward Computers. *Journal of Gerontology*, 47(4), P250–P257. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/47.4.P250>
- Keeley, J. W., Webb, C., Peterson, D., Roussin, L., & Flanagan, E. H. (2016). Development of a Response Inconsistency Scale for the Personality Inventory for DSM–5. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(4), 351–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2016.1158719>
- Kurtz, J. E., & Parrish, C. L. (2001). Semantic Response Consistency and Protocol Validity in Structured Personality Assessment: The Case of the NEO-PI-R. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 76(2), 315–332. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA7602_12
- Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Lee, J. A. (1986). The effects of past computer experience on computerized aptitude test performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 46(3), 727–733.
- Linacre, J. M., & Wright, B. D. (1993a). *A user's guide to BIGSTEPS: Rasch-model computer program*. Mesa Press.
- Linacre, J. M., & Wright, B. D. (1993b). *A user's guide to BIGSTEPS: Rasch-model computer program*. Mesa Press.
- Lukin, M. E., Dowd, E. T., Plake, B. S., & Kraft, R. G. (1985). Comparing computerized versus traditional psychological assessment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 1(1), 49–58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0747-5632\(85\)90006-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0747-5632(85)90006-8)
- Lumsden, J. A., Sampson, J. P., Reardon, R. C., Lenz, J. G., & Peterson, G. W. (2004). A Comparison Study of the Paper-and-Pencil, Personal Computer,

- and Internet Versions of Holland's Self-Directed Search. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 37(2), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2004.11909752>
- Mackie, R. R., & Wylie, C. D. (1988). Factors influencing acceptance of computer-based innovations. In *Handbook of human-computer interaction* (pp. 1081–1106). Elsevier.
- Martin, C. L., & Nagao, D. H. (1989). Some effects of computerized interviewing on job applicant responses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 72.
- McDonald, A. S. (2002). The impact of individual differences on the equivalence of computer-based and paper-and-pencil educational assessments. *Computers & Education*, 39(3), 299–312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1315\(02\)00032-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1315(02)00032-5)
- Mead, A. D. (2001). How well does web-based testing work? Results of a survey of users of NetAssess. *FL Oswald (Chair), Computers= Good*.
- Mead, Alan D, & Drasgow, F. (1993). *Equivalence of Computerized and Paper-and-Pencil Cognitive Ability Tests: A Meta-Analysis*. 10.
- Meijer, R. R., Egberink, I. J. L., Emons, W. H. M., & Sijtsma, K. (2008). Detection and Validation of Unscalable Item Score Patterns Using Item Response Theory: An Illustration with Harter's Self-Perception Profile for Children. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890701884921>
- Meijer, R. R., Muijtjens, A. M. M., & van der Vlueten, C. P. M. (1996). Nonparametric Person-Fit Research: Some Theoretical issues an Empirical Example. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 9(1), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324818ame0901_7
- Meijer, R. R., Niessen, A. S. M., & Tendeiro, J. N. (2016). A Practical Guide to Check the Consistency of Item Response Patterns in Clinical Research Through Person-Fit Statistics: Examples and a Computer Program. *Assessment*, 23(1), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191115577800>
- Meijer, R. R., & Sijtsma, K. (2001). Methodology Review: Evaluating Person Fit. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25(2), 107–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01466210122031957>
- Naus, M. J., Philipp, L. M., & Samsi, M. (2009). From paper to pixels: A comparison of paper and computer formats in psychological assessment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.05.012>
- Otto, R. K., & Butcher, J. N. (1995). Computer-Assisted Psychological Assessment in Child Custody Evaluations. *Family Law Quarterly*, 29(1), 79–96.
- Pinsonneault, T. B. (1998). A Variable Response Inconsistency Scale and a True Response Inconsistency Scale for the Jesness Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 10(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.10.1.21>
- Prasasto, M. R., & Widhiarso, W. (2016). Perbandingan Properti Psikometris Skala Kesehatan Mental (SKM) antara Metode Administrasi Paper-and-Pencil dan Web-Based. *Gadjah Mada Journal of Professional Psychology (GamaJPP)*, 2(1), 37. <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamajpp.32317>
- Reips, U.-D. (2000). The Web Experiment Method. In *Psychological Experiments on the Internet* (pp. 89–117). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012099980-4/50005-8>

- Richman, W. L., Kiesler, S., Weisband, S., & Drasgow, F. (1999). A meta-analytic study of social desirability distortion in computer-administered questionnaires, traditional questionnaires, and interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(5), 754.
- Rosenfeld, P., Doherty, L. M., Vicino, S. M., Kantor, J., & Greaves, J. (1989). Attitude Assessment in Organizations: Testing Three Microcomputer-Based Survey Systems. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 116(2), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.1989.9711119>
- Ryan, J. M., Corry, J. R., Attewell, R., & Smithson, M. J. (2002). *A comparison of an electronic version of the SF-36 General Health Questionnaire to the standard paper version*. 8.
- Salgado, J. F., & Moscoso, S. (2003). Internet-based Personality Testing: Equivalence of Measures and Assesses' Perceptions and Reactions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(2–3), 194–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00243>
- Scheuermann, F., & Björnsson, J. (2009). The transition to computer-based assessment. *Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities*.
- Schulenberg, S. E., & Yutrzenka, B. A. (2001). Equivalence of computerized and conventional versions of the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II). *Current Psychology*, 20(3), 216–230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-001-1008-1>
- Sijtsma, K. (1986). A coefficient of deviance of response patterns. *Kwantitatieve Methoden*, 7(22), 131–145.
- Sijtsma, Klaas, & Meijer, R. R. (1992). A Method for Investigating the Intersection of Item Response Functions in Mokken's Nonparametric IRT Model. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 16(2), 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662169201600204>
- Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1986). Reducing social context cues: Electronic mail in organizational communication. *Management Science*, 32(11), 1492–1512.
- Sumintono, B., & Widhiarso, W. (2013). *Aplikasi model rasch: Untuk penelitian ilmu-ilmu sosial*. Trim Komunika Publishing House.
- Sykes, R. C., & Ito, K. (1997). The Effects of Computer Administration on Scores and Item Parameter Estimates of an IRT-Based Licensure Examination. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 21(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621697211004>
- Terzis, V., & Economides, A. A. (2011). The acceptance and use of computer based assessment. *Computers & Education*, 56(4), 1032–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.11.017>
- The International Test Commission. (2006). International Guidelines on Computer-Based and Internet-Delivered Testing. *International Journal of Testing*, 6(2), 143–171. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327574ijt0602_4
- Vispoel, W. P., Boo, J., & Bleiler, T. (2001). Computerized and Paper-and-Pencil Versions of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale: A Comparison of Psychometric Features and Respondent Preferences. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(3), 461–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640121971329>

- Wang, S., Jiao, H., Young, M. J., Brooks, T., & Olson, J. (2008). Comparability of computer-based and paper-and-pencil testing in K–12 reading assessments: A meta-analysis of testing mode effects. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68(1), 5–24.
- Ward, M. K., & Pond, S. B. (2015). Using virtual presence and survey instructions to minimize careless responding on Internet-based surveys. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 554–568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.070>
- White, D. M., Clements, C. B., & Fowler, R. D. (1985). A comparison of computer administration with standard administration of the MMPI. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 1(2), 153–162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0747-5632\(85\)90028-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0747-5632(85)90028-7)
- Widhiarso, W. (2016). Eksplorasi Gaya Respons Ekstrem dalam Mengisi Kuesioner. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 43(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.8703>
- Widhiarso, W., & Sumintono, B. (2016). Examining response aberrance as a cause of outliers in statistical analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 98, 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.099>
- Wijndaele, K., Matton, L., Duvigneaud, N., Lefevre, J., Duquet, W., Thomis, M., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Philippaerts, R. (2007). Reliability, equivalence and respondent preference of computerized versus paper-and-pencil mental health questionnaires. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(4), 1958–1970. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.02.005>
- Wright, B. D., & Stone, M. H. (1979). *Best test design*.