

THE CONTENT VALIDITY OF THE TEACHER APTITUDE INSTRUMENT

Wasidi

Universitas Bengkulu/PEP 10701261001

Abstract

The concept of teacher aptitude has been derived from the three-ring concepts theory by Renzulli. The teacher aptitude consists of three dimensionals, there are creativity pedagogy, pedagogical commitment, and emotional intelligence. The purpose of this study was to determine the content validity of each dimension of the teacher aptitude concept. The determination of the content's validity was implemented using focus group discussion by seven experts, they were two education experts, two measurement experts, two psychologists, and a linguist. Instrument was assessed using the assessment form. The gradation assessing are excellent, good, adequate, less, and very less. The content validity was analyzed by the Aiken's formula. The result of the analysis showed that the index content validity of teacher aptitude construct were 0.835, $p = 0.024$, creativity pedagogy has content validity index of 0.847, $p = 0.019$, commitment pedagogy has content validity index of 0.842, $p = 0.021$, and emotional intelligence has a content validity index of 0.85, $p = 0.018$. This means that the construct validity of teacher aptitude instrument has a good content validity.

Keyword: *Content Validity, Pedagogy Creativity, Pedagogy Commitment, Emotional Intelligence.*

Introduction

Implementation of the Law number 20 in 2003 about educational system, law number 14 in 2014, government regulation number 19 in 2005 requires that teacher have the ability ideal among other aptitudes, interests, calls the soul, and idealism. The result of research by Block (2008) showed that mentions the role of the teacher is very great in the changing world. Sudarnoto (2009) mentions that the teacher is a crucial factor in the success of education as assessed student achieve. Dicky (2011) mentions that the graduate education of primary school teachers are not ready to teach to all levels of classes, still needs a few more years of teaching experience. The result of research that has been done by Alkharusi (2011) indicated that inservice teachers had a lower level of knowledge, a higher level of perceived skilfulness, and a more favourable attitude toward educational measurement than preservice teachers. Research by Fokkens-Bruinsma (2012) showed that affective commitment was predicted by the motivations of teaching ability, working with children, prior teaching and learning experiences, and time for family, as well as satisfaction with the choice of teaching and perceived task demand. Macklem (1990) said that the aptitude test is a good predictor of future achievement. Character, personality, and aptitude fatigue will affect teachers teaching process in the classroom. Aptitude is a variable that has a significant contribution to the

achievement of learning in the future. Now, the teacher aptitude instrument did not available. This reasearch will create the teacher aptitude instrument that it can be applied in Indonesia.

Constructs of teacher aptitude instrument was developed based on the theory of the threering giftedness concepts by Renzulli (1986). The three ring concept by Renzulli's theory consists of three dimensions: the ability above average, creativity, and commitment. The ability above average can be substitution by intelligence. Renzulli (no year), while there are eight intelligences by Gardner (2006). Intrapersonal intelligence and interpersonal intelligence is an important factor in education (MLPTS, 1992; Suryadi, 2009). Both of these are included in the intelligence of emotional intelligence (Chan, 2008; Gardner, 1993; Goleman, 2006; Salovey, 2004; Sigmar, 2010). Thus the construct of teacher aptitude instrument consist of three dimensions, namely creativity pedagogy, pedagogical commitment, and emotional intelligence.

Creativity is the process of feeling and observing the problem, making guesses about the short comings of this problem, assess, and test the conjecture or hypothesis, then change and test it again, and finally preparing the results. Aspects of product creativity emphasize that what comes out of the processof creativity is something new, original (Torrance, 1969). The hall mark of creativity is a new product. New products in this case can be either developmentor completely different from existing products. New product development process is required divergent thinking (Kaufman, 2008; Purwanto, 2008). The thoughtof peoplecame up witha fairly new idea or with a number of alternative ideas, and then he said to the creative. (DeBono, 1998). The characteristics associated with the ability to think creatively is fluency, flexibility, originality (Elliot, 2000; Munandar, 1999), (Kim, 2006) added elaboration into the creativity concept.

Work commitments reflect the level of identification and involvement of the individual in his work and devotion to the job. Commitment to the task or task commitment teacher is a teacher's commitment to the completion of tasks that boreh is responsibilities include the ability or capacity, motivation, work discipline, and task orientation (Greenberg, 1993). Binding themselves to the task or task commitment is to approach the task as a form of internal motivation that drives a person to be diligent and tenaciousin their work, despite of the many obstacle (Munandar, 1999) The pedagogy commitment is the degree of teacher pedagogical positive, effective bond between the teacher and the school community (Crosswell, 1997) consists off our dimensions, namely motivation to the task, the discipline of the assignment, the responsibility for the task, and thetenacity of the task.

The emotional intelligence as a subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor their own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and use this information to guide one's thinking and actions (Patton, 1977). The emotional intelligence consists of the ability to recognize emotions, emotional self-management skills, ability to motivate themselves, the ability to recognize emotions in others, and the ability to build relationships with others (Goleman, 2006).

The research problems are construct of teacher aptitude instrument, and the content validity of the teacher aptitude instrument. The aim of the research is to determine of construct content validity of the teacher aptitude instrument. The result of this research can contribute in educational as a selection of student teachers.

Research Method

This research include development research that has be done by Gable (1986). The phase research development were predevelopment, development, and application model. The pre development research phase has be done explore the theory concept, literature, and the results of relevant research. The construct of teacher aptitude instrument has 3 dimensions, that were pedagogy creativity, pedagogy commitment, and emotional intelligency. The pedagogy creativity consists of 4 indicators, that each indicator consists of 8 items. The pedagogy commitment consists of 4 indicators, that each indicator consists of 8 items. The emotional intelligency consists of 5 indicators, that each indicator consists of 8 items. Thus each instrument consists of 32 items, 32 items, and 40 items respectively. I have get a mature concept of the teacher aptitude instrument. The instrument model has exposed to focus group discussion. The teacher aptitude instrument has be validated by seven experts. There are two measurement experts, two educators, two psychologist, and linguistics. The experts judgement has evaluated by form that containt of 5 options. There are excellent, good, adequate, less, much less. The excellent be scored 5, good be scored 4, adequate be score 3, less be scored 2, and much less be score 1. The result of scoring by experts judgement be analysed by Aiken's formula (Aiken, 1980).

Result and Discussion

The results of this study are presented below. Each result will be explained directly.

Table 1. The validity index of the construct teacher aptitude instrument

Dimension	Indikator	S	iv	z	p
Pedagogy creativity	Fluency	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
	flexibility	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
	Originality	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
	Elaboration	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
commitment	Motivation	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
	responsibility	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
	Discipline	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
	Tenacity	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
Emotional intelligency	to recognize emotions	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
	emotional self- management skills	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
	ability to motivate themselves	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
	Empathy	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
	Social relationship	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
Average		23.385	0.835	2.375	0.024

In Table 1, there are two indicators of the construct validity of the probability of validity index of more than 5 %, i.e. the elaboration and Recognize emotion. The probability of each indicator is 5.4%. Overall probability of teacher talent construct instruments 2.4%, including both $p < 5\%$. The probability of two indicators showed more than 5%, can be caused because there is a score of 3 is given by the validator third, while the six validator provide scoring 4 and 5.

Table 2. The content validity index of the pedagogy creativity

Item	S	iv	z	p
1	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
2	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
3	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
4	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
5	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
6	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
7	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
8	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
9	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
10	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
11	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
12	26	0.929	3.074	0.004
13	25	0.893	2.806	0.008

14	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
15	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
16	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
17	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
18	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
19	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
20	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
21	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
22	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
23	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
24	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
25	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
26	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
27	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
28	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
29	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
30	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
31	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
32	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
	23.719	0.847	2.464	0.019

In Table 2, the validity of pedagogical creativity instrument consisting of 32 items of questions, there is one that has a probability of $p > 5\%$. Item number 22 has a probability of 5.4%. The probability of item number 22 is because the validator third scoring 2. Overall, pedagogical creativity has content validity content validity of 0.847 with a probability of $p = 0.019$. thus including both pedagogical creativity.

Table 3. The content validity index of the pedagogy commitment

Item no.	S	iv	z	p
1	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
2	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
3	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
4	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
5	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
6	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
7	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
8	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
9	21	0.750	1.737	0.088
10	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
11	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
12	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
13	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
14	23	0.821	2.272	0.030

15	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
16	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
17	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
18	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
19	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
20	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
21	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
22	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
23	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
24	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
25	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
26	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
27	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
28	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
29	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
30	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
31	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
32	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
	23.563	0.842	2.422	0.021

In Table 3, the content validity pedagogical commitment, item numbers 8, 9, and 26 have more than 5% probability. Overall index of the validity of pedagogical commitment is 0.842 with a probability of 0.021

Table 4. The content validity index of the emotional intelligency

Item no.	S	iv	z	p
1	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
2	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
3	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
4	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
5	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
6	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
7	22	0.786	2.004	0.054
8	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
9	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
10	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
11	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
12	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
13	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
14	26	0.929	3.074	0.004
15	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
16	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
17	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
18	25	0.893	2.806	0.008

19	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
20	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
21	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
22	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
23	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
24	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
25	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
26	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
27	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
28	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
29	25	0.893	2.806	0.008
30	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
31	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
32	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
33	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
34	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
35	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
36	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
37	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
38	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
39	23	0.821	2.272	0.030
40	24	0.857	2.539	0.016
	23.850	0.852	2.499	0.018

In Table 4, the content validity of emotional intelligence instrument as a whole is 0.852 with a probability of $p=0.018$. But there are two items that have content validity index value is less good because $p>5\%$. These items are numbers 6 and 7.

Conclusion and Suggestion

The Teacher aptitude instrument, overall that has good content validity index. Thus the teacher aptitude instruments can be done to test for testing the model. It is recommended for expert justification should be no shared understanding of the instrument of accession of teacher aptitude, and that the score be obtain balanced scoring.

References

- Anomin.(2003). *Undang-undang no 20 tahun 2003*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Anonim.(2005). *Undang-undang No 14 tahun 2005*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

- Anonim.(2005). *Peraturan pemerintah nomor 19 tahun 2005*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Aiken, L. R. (1980). Content Validity and Reliability of Single Items or Questionnaires. *Educational and psychological measurement.*, 40(4), 955-959.
- Alkharusi, H., Ali Mahdi Kazem, & Ali Al-Musawai. (2011). Knowledge, skills, and attitudes of preservice and inservice teachers in educational measurement. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Educational* 39(2), 113–123.
- Block, A. A. (2008). Why should I be a teacher? . *Journal of teacher education*, 59, 416-427.
- Chan, D. W. (2008). Emotional intelligence, self efficacy, and copying among Chinese prospective and in service teachers in Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology*, 28(4), 397–408.
- Crosswell, R. L., & Elliott (1997). *Teacher professionalization and teacher commitment : a multilevel analysis*. Washington: Departemen of Educational Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- DeBono, E. (1998). *Practical thinking* (Budi, Trans.). Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
- Dicky, N. (2011). Indonesian primary teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching geometry: implications for educational policy and teacher preparation programs. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Educational*, 39(2), 151–164.
- Elliot, S., et al. (2000). *Educational psychology*. Boston: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., and Esther T. Canrinus. (2012). The factors Influencing teaching (FIT)- choice scale in a Dutch teacher education program. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Educational*, 40(3), 249–269.
- Gable, R. K. (1986). *Instrument development in affective domain*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind*. New York Basics Book.
- Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Book.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Dell.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, Robert. (1993). *Behavior in organizations*. (4th ed.). Singapore: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kaufman, J. C., Jonathan A. Plucker, & John Baer. (2008). *Essentials assessment of creativity*. New Jersey: John Willey & Sons Inc.
- Kim, K. H. (2006). Can we trust creativity tests? A review of the Torrance tests of creative thinking (TTCT). *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(1), 3-14.

- Macklem, G. L. (1990). Measuring aptitude. *Practical assessment, research & evaluation*, 2(5).
- MLPTS. (1992). *Peraturan besar dan piagam Persatuan Taman Siswa*. Yogyakarta: MLPTS.
- Munandar, S. C. U. (1999). *Pengembangan kreativitas anak berbakat*. . Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Patton, P. (1977). *Emotional Intelligence*. Singapore: SNP Publishing Pte Ltd.
- Purwanto. (2008). Kreativitas berpikir menurut Guilford. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 74(14), 856- 867.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1986). *The three-ring conception of giftedness: A developmental model for creative productivity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (no year). The three ring conception of giftedness, retrieve from http://www.gifted.uconn.edu/sem/pdf/the_three_ring_conception_of_giftedness.pdf
- Salovey, P., Mare A. Brackett, & John D. Mayer. (2004). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: DUDE.
- Sigmar, L., Geraldine Hynes, & Tab Cooper,. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Pedagogical considerations for skills-based learning in business communication courses. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 3(June), 1-13.
- Sudarnoto, L. F. N. (2009). *Memberdayakan profesi pendidik untuk mencapai peningkatan kualitas kehidupan kerja*. Universitas Atma Jaya. Yogyakarta.
- Suryadi, A. (2009). Ajaran Ki Hajar Dewantara: Butiran mutiara yang hilang. *Medik*, 1(Januari - April).
- Torrance, E. P. (1969). *Issues and advances in educational psychology*. Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publisher Inc.