

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Anastasi, A. & Urbina. (1998). *Tes Psikologi (terjemahan)*. Jakarta: Prenhallindo
- Ary, D. Jacobs, & L.C.Razavieh. A. (1982). *Pengantar Peneitian dalam Pendidikan*. (Penerjemah Furchan,A). Surabaya: Usaha Nasional
- _____. (1985). *Introduction to Research in Education. 3 rd. ed.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Azwar S. (2013). *Sikap Manusia: Teori dan Pengukurannya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- _____. (1995). *Reabilitas dan Validitas*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar
- Azwar, S. (2016). Reliabilitas Dan Validitas Aitem. *Buletin Psikologi*, 3(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.22146/bps.13381>
- Baltees, P.B., Reese, H.W., & Nesselroads, J.R. (1988). *Introduction to research Methods in Life span Developmental Psychology*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- Bendig, A. . (2015). The Realiability of Letter Grade. *Educational and Psychological Meansurement*, 6.
- Bishop, G. F. (1987). Experiments with the middle response alternative in survey questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51, 220–232.
- Capik, C., & Gozum, S. (2015). Psychometric Features of an Assessment Instrument with Likert and Dichotomous Response Formats. *Public Health Nursing*, 32(1), 81–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.12156>
- Colquitt, J. A., Lepine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2005). Improving performance and outcomes. In *Practice Development in Health Care* (Vol. 4, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pdh.22>
- Cox, E. (1980). The optimal number of response alternatives in a scale: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 407–422
- Credé, M., Harms, P., Niehorster, S., & Gaye-Valentine, A. (2012). An evaluation of the consequences of using short measures of the Big Five personality traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 874–888. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027403>
- Dawes, J. (2008). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5-point, 7-point and 10-point scales. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(1), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530805000106>
- Dillman, D. A. (2015). The Logic and Psychology of Constructing Questionnaires. *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, December. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203843123.ch9>
- Elmes, D.G., Kantowitz, B.H., & Roedriger III, H.L. (1992). *Research methods in Psychology*. 4th. ed. New York: West publishing Company

- Faber, J., & Fonseca, L. M. (2014). How sample size influences research outcomes. *Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics*, 19(4), 27–29. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-9451.19.4.027-029.ebo>
- Finn, J. A., Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Tellegen, A. (2015). Dichotomous versus polytomous response options in psychopathology assessment: Method or meaningful variance? *Psychological Assessment*, 27(1), 184–193. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000044>
- Friday, A. S. (2004). Criterion-Related Validity of Big Five Adolescent Personality Traits. In *Doctoral Dissertations University*.
- Friedenberg, Lisa. (1995). *Psychological Testing. Design, Analysis, and Use*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Hancock, G. R., & Klockars, A. J. (1991). The effect of scale manipulations on validity: Targetting frequency rating scales for anticipated performance levels. *Applied Ergonomics*, 22(3), 147–154. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870\(91\)90153-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870(91)90153-9)
- Hirsh, J. B. (2014). Environmental sustainability and national personality. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 38, 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.02.005>
- Hobart, J. C., Cano, S. J., Warner, T. T., & Thompson, A. J. (2012). What sample sizes for reliability and validity studies in neurology? *Journal of Neurology*, 259(12), 2681–2694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-012-6570-y>
- Jones, W. P., & Loe, S. A. (2013). Optimal number of questionnaire response categories: More may not be better. *SAGE Open*, 3(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013489691>
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765–780. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765>
- Kalton, G., Roberts, J., & Holt, D. (1980). The effects of offering a middle response option with opinion questions. *Statistician*, 29, 65–78
- Kim, S., von Davier, A. A., & Haberman, S. (2011). Practical application of a synthetic linking function on small-sample equating. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 24(2), 95–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2011.554601>
- Kim, S., Von Davier, A. A., & Haberman, S. (2008). Small-sample equating using a synthetic linking function. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 45(4), 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.2008.00068.x>
- Kulas, J. T., & Stachowski, A. A. (2013). Respondent rationale for neither agreeing nor disagreeing: Person and item contributors to middle category endorsement intent on Likert personality indicators. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(4), 254–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.01.014>
- Lietz, P. (2010). Research into questionnaire design: A summary of the literature. *International Journal of Market Research*, 52(2), 249
- Lissitz, R.W., & Green, S. B. (1975). Effect of the number of scale points on

- reliability: A Monte Carlo approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 10–13
- Livingston, S. A., & Kim, S. (2010). Random-groups equating with samples of 50 to 400 test takers. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 47(2), 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.2010.00107.x>
- Markowitz, E. M., Goldberg, L. R., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2012). Profiling the “pro-environmental individual”: A personality perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 80(1), 81–111.
- Matell, M. S., & Jacoby, J. (1972). Is there an optimal number of alternatives for Likert-scale items? Effects of testing time and scale properties. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(6), 506–509. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033601>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2004). A contemplated revision of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(3), 587–596. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00118-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00118-1)
- Memon, M. A., Ting, H., Cheah, J.-H., Thurasamy, R., Chuah, F., & Cham, T. H. (2020). Sample Size for Survey Research: Review and Recommendations. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, 4(2), i–xx. [https://doi.org/10.47263/jasem.4\(2\)01](https://doi.org/10.47263/jasem.4(2)01)
- Nadler, J. T., Weston, R., & Voyles, E. C. (2015). Stuck in the middle: The use and interpretation of mid-points in items on questionnaires. *Journal of General Psychology*, 142(2), 71–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.2014.994590>
- Naga, D. S. (2004). Ketidaktepatan Penggunaan Validitas Butir dan Koefisien Reliabilitas dalam Penelitian Pendidikan dan Psikologi. *Ilmu Pendidikan, jilid II*, nomor 2.
- Oaster, T. R. F. (1989). Number of alternatives per choice point and stability of Likert-type scales. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 68, 549–550.
- Parshall, C. G., Houghton, P. D. B., & Kromrey, J. D. (1995). Equating Error and Statistical Bias in Small Sample Linear Equating. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 32(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.1995.tb00455.x>
- Presser, S., Couper, M. P., Lessler, J. T., Martin, E., Martin, J., Rothgeb, J. M., & Singer, E. (2004). Methods for testing and evaluating survey questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(1), 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfh008>
- Rijanto, T. (2012). Pengaruh Metode dan Ukuran Sampel Terhadap Varians Skor Hasil Penyetaraan. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 3, 365–383.
- Simms, L. J., Zelazny, K., Williams, T. F., & Bernstein, L. (2019a). Does the Number of Response Options Matter? Psychometric Perspectives Using Personality Questionnaire Data. *Psychological Assessment*, 31(4), 557–566. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000648>
- Simms, L. J., Zelazny, K., Williams, T. F., & Bernstein, L. (2019b). Does the Number of Response Options Matter? Psychometric Perspectives Using Personality Questionnaire Data. *Psychological Assessment*, 31(4), 557–566.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000648>

Skaggs, G. (2005). Accuracy of random groups equating with very small samples. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 42(4), 309–330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.2005.00018.x>

Smith, G. T. (2005). On the complexity of quantifying construct validity. *Psychological Assessment*, 17(4), 413–414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.17.4.413>

Suchindran, C. M. (2014). Sample Size Sample Size. *Sampling and Choosing Cases in Qualitative Research: A Realist Approach*, 3(X), 2014.

Thalmayer, A. G., Saucier, G., & Eigenhuis, A. (2011). Comparative Validity of Brief to Medium-Length Big Five and Big Six Personality Questionnaires. *Psychological Assessment*, 23(4), 995–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024165>

Tulka, S., Geis, B., Baulig, C., Knippschild, S., & Krummenauer, F. (2019a). Validity of sample sizes in publications of randomised controlled trials on the treatment of age-related macular degeneration: Cross-sectional evaluation. *BMJ Open*, 9(10). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030312>

Tulka, S., Geis, B., Baulig, C., Knippschild, S., & Krummenauer, F. (2019b). Validity of sample sizes in publications of randomised controlled trials on the treatment of age-related macular degeneration: Cross-sectional evaluation. *BMJ Open*, 9(10), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030312>

Vicente-Molina, M. A., Fernández-Sáinz, A., & Izagirre-Olaizola, J. (2013). Environmental knowledge and other variables affecting pro-environmental behaviour: Comparison of university students from emerging and advanced countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 61, 130–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.05.015>

Weems, G. H., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2001). The impact of midpoint responses and reverse coding on survey data. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 34, 166–176

Zhang, X., Wang, M. C., He, L., Jie, L., & Deng, J. (2019). The development and psychometric evaluation of the Chinese Big Five Personality Inventory-15. *PLoS ONE*, 14(8), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221621>