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**Abstract.** The Law of Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2003 on National Education System serves as a foundation for the government to be responsible in providing special educational services for citizen with extraordinary intelligence and talents. Theoretically, this citizen is known as gifted person, who is capable of a high quality performance by having an above average intelligence, above average creativity, and a high level of task commitment (Renzulli, 1986). In responds to this obligation, various types of educational services have been established, such as acceleration class and Semester Credit System. To ensure that the service is delivered to those who are in need, Indonesia adopts the gifted identification guideline as proposed by Renzulli, in which the three traits mentioned are all assessed for every potential student. Unfortunately, Indonesia still has no specific measurement tool to assess the third trait of giftedness namely task commitment. This trait is usually inferred solely from the student grades record. Several researches have highlighted the drawbacks of using only grade record for assessing task commitment (Achir, 1990; Hawadi, 2004). The main reason is grade might be misleading since it has never been intended to measure task commitment precisely, while it is known that this trait is actually the one which functions to keep the gifted students as a persisting learner and avoid them for being an underachiever. As a responds, two measurement tools to specifically assess task commitment have been created, but are still limited of use because the tests are addressed for elementary and high school student. Therefore, this current study aims to create a new task commitment scale addressing specifically for junior high school students. All the findings of the test properties, applicability, and limitations are discussed.
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**Introduction**

Indonesia as a nation pays special attention to the educational process of all its citizens, including those with special intelligence and talents. Based on the Law of Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2003 (article 5, paragraph 4) on National Education System, Indonesian government is responsible for providing special educational services to every citizen with extraordinary intelligence and talents. In other words, this law serves as a foundation for the need of differentiated learning curriculum, aside from the national education program. Those with special intelligence and talents are theoretically known as gifted children. Gifted children are characterized by having a combination of three different traits, which are above average intelligence, followed by above average creativity and a high level of task commitment (Renzulli, 1986). This combination of traits makes gifted children are believed to be able to conduct a high quality performance by transforming their potential capacity in their daily life (Davis, Rimm, & Siegle, 2011).

In responds to the obligation to provide special education for gifted children, various types of educational services have been established by the Indonesian government. In 1984, the government established an accelerated learning program known as acceleration class (Balitbang Dikbud RI, 1986). Acceleration class is an educational service that aims to shorten the time in learning the subject matter compared to regular classes (Davis, Rimm, & Siegel, 2011). In its implementation, acceleration class in Indonesia is held in the form of special classes where gifted students are grouped into one class. Their learning period is shorten by a year so that they will be faster to graduate from school in order to pursue a higher level of learning (Ministry of National Education, 2003). In 2015, acceleration class is replaced with another type of services for gifted student, namely Semester Credit System (Sistem Kredit Semester/SKS). This type of educational service is actually established for all school students, in which they can choose and plan their study period by themselves instead of merely following an even curriculum. Therefore, gifted children are still allowed to graduate faster than their peers if they are capable to complete all the compulsory subjects. However, it is still mandatory for school to assess the student potential first before they are allowed to take a maximum credit for study (BNSP, 2010).

Since the first initiation of acceleration class until now, Indonesia adopts the Three Rings Conception proposed by Renzulli (1986) as the identification guideline of gifted students e.g. has an above average intelligence, high level of creativity, and a high level of task commitment (Balitbang Dikbud RI, 1986). Various data sources considered in this identification process include grades, achievement tests result, intelligence test result, and creativity test results (Ministry of National Education, 2001). Specifically, an above average ability is inferred from the child's grades, achievement tests results, and intelligence tests results. Meanwhile, creativity is inferred from creativity tests results adopted from Munandar (1977), while task commitment is inferred from the student grades record.

On the other hand, referring solely to student's grade is considered insufficient to gain insight and describe the students' task commitment. The main reason is that grade is a measurement to reflect the student learning outcomes and is not intended to explain their task commitment (Hawadi, 2004). In fact, according to the findings of Achir (1990) tasks commitment significantly differentiates between gifted students who are successful achievers and gifted students who then becomes underachiever. Task commitment affects gifted students behavior in a way that makes them become a more focused and disciplined learner. In addition, task commitment is also important to predict the persistence of gifted students while studying in acceleration classes. Because the use of the grade record is not enough to describe the student task commitment, there is a need for a specific measuring tool to measure task commitment.

Based on the need for a specific measurement instrument, the first task commitment scale is developed in 1994 as a research instrument (Achir, 1990, Suralaga, 1997). Later, the scale was revised and enhanced by Hawadi (2002), namely TC-Rendi Scale and TC-YA/FS Scale-Revision, with the aim of identifying gifted students in schools. However, the TC-Rendi Scale and TC-YA/FS Scale-Revision are still limited of use because it is developed only for student in elementary and high school level. Meanwhile, acceleration class and other special educational service for gifted students are implemented not only in elementary and high school level, but also in junior high school.

The TC-Rendi Scale and TC-YA/FS Scale-Revision are unsuitable to be used for assessing junior high school students regarding the characteristics of the students themselves. First, it is during junior high school that the adaptation process related to the student's physical, emotional, and learning change is starting to occur (Soekadji, 2000). Physical and emotional changes occur because junior high school students begin to enter puberty, which makes them commonly experience an emotional instability. On the process of learning in school, it is the first time for junior high school students to be taught by various teachers for different subjects. Therefore, the students must adapt to the different characteristics and methods of teaching each teacher posed. These three clusters of changes stand as a challenge for students to be able to manage themselves in order to succeed in school, which then affects their task commitment in learning. Furthermore, the language used in TC-Rendi Scale and TC-YA/FS Scale-Revision is designed to high school students and elementary school students. Meanwhile, the language used in the scale are measurement tool addressed for junior high school students has to be simpler than for high school students and more complex than elementary school students. As we know, language used in the measurement tool will influence the test taker understanding of the item presented and their corresponding responds to the item (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010).

The creation of task commitment scale addressed for junior high school students will complement the current conduct of gifted student identification process. It is known that for junior high school level, the process is flawed since there is no specific measurement tool to assess task commitment. In addition, many schools are found to make an excuse by holding a faulty priority to assess only the intelligence aspect of students. For example, one public school named SMPN 1 Madiun only considers student's grade and intelligence score (Jawa Pos, 2014). The same situation is found in SMPN 2 Solo, SMPN 9 Solo, and SMPN 1 Palu ((Juniati, 2012; Bustan, 2014). In fact, Renzulli (1978) has already warned that the identification process which focuses only on one characteristic of giftedness is a common mistake. This is due to a mismatch between the concept of giftedness that is used as a reference for identification and the actual assessment process executed (Hansen & Linden, 1990 in Hawadi, 2002).

Based on the background explained, this research is conducted to develop a new task commitment scale addressing specifically for junior high school students. This paper describes the process of the task commitment scale development with the aim of identifying gifted students in schools.

**Theoretical Background**

a. Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness

Renzulli (1978) describes giftedness as a potential possessed by a person in various aspects. This leads to the identification process of gifted children that should assess the multiple aspects of potentials. He then proposed The Three-Rings Conception of Giftedness to describe the interaction of the three characteristics that make up giftedness, which are above average ability, high level of creativity, and high level of task commitment. A person is said to have an above average ability if he/she is classified as having the best 15-20% ability of the population. A high level of creativity can be inferred from the person creation, his/her novel ideas for solving a problem, and his/her understanding of the interrelationship between the new things and the long existing ones. Furthermore, the task commitment represents motivation for a specific task (Renzulli, 1998). A more specific explanation of task commitment will be described as follows.

b. Task Commitment

To describe task commitment, Renzulli (1978) stated that:

*“Whereas motivation is usually defined in terms of general energizing process that trigger responses in organism, task commitment represents energy brought to bear on a particular problem or specific performance area. The terms that are most frequently used to describe task commitment are perseverance, endurance, hard work, dedicated practice, self-confidence, and a belief in one's ability to carry out important work”* (Renzulli, 1978, p. 13)

Based on the definition of task commitment as stated above, Renzulli (in Rezulli & Reis, 1997) revealed that individuals with a high level of task commitment will possess five behavior manifestations as follows:

1. The capacity for high levels of interest, enthusiasm, fascination, and involvement in a particular problem, area of study, or form of human expression.
2. The capacity for perseverance, endurance, determination, hard work, and dedicated practice.
3. Self-confidence, a strong ego and a belief in one's ability to carry out important work, freedom from inferiority feelings, drive to achieve.
4. The ability to identify significant problems within specialized areas; the ability to tune in to major channels of communication and new developments within given fields.
5. Setting high standards for one's work; maintaining an openness to self and external criticism; developing an aesthetic sense of taste, quality, and excellence about one's own work and the work of others.

The five behavior manifestations of task commitment above are operational and can be observed through behavior. These behavior manifestations are used as an indicator in developing task commitment scale.

c. Review of The Available Task Commitment Scale

The first measurement tool of task commitment in Indonesia is developed by Achir (1990) as a research instrument in gifted high school children. The scale consists of 60 items in the form of 5-point Likert scale. The reliability is measured using Cronbach's Alpha value with the result ranging from 0.68 - 0.83 for each of the scale components. The coefficient of item validity is ranging from 0.23 - 0.66. This scale is then modified by Suralaga (1997) for research purpose into 41 items in the form of 5-point Likert scale. The Cronbach's Alpha value of each component is ranging from 0.476 - 0.8. The coefficient of item validity is ranging from 0.083 - 0.693.

Furthermore, Hawadi (1993) revised the task commitment scale in order to be used as an instrument in the process of identifying gifted students in high school levels. She named the revised version of task commitment scale as TC-YA/FS Scale-Revision. She also developed the new task commitment scale to be used for identifying gifted students in elementary school levels. This scale is named TC-Rendi, which consists of 47 items in the form of 5-point Likert scale. The reliability is measured using Cronbach's Alpha value with the result of 0.964. Therefore, the available task commitment scale in Indonesia to this day is limited for its use which is addressing only the elementary and high school student.

**Method**

a. Participant

The population of this study is junior high school students in Indonesia. The sample chosen is 7th grade junior high school who study in acceleration class. After data collection period, starting from 10 to 21 November 2014, 99 students were obtained from five different public and private schools. The sample consists of 39 male and 60 female, with an age ranging from 11 years - 13 years old. The sampling technique used is accidental sampling, considering that the number of population is unknown and for the ease of the data collection.

b. Test Development

Test Conceptualization

Task Commitment Scale is aimed as a measurement tools of task commitment construct from Renzulli (1978). This test can be used and administered by the school committee on student admission every year. The test is administered in a group format as a paper and pencil test.

Test Construction

Task Commitment is a unidimensional construct in which each item will be scored and summed up to form a single score of task commitment. The scale used in the tool is the Likert scale with four available answers, which are never, rarely, often, and always. This type of answers is chosen to describe the frequency of task commitment behavior experienced by the participants.

Item Specification

The targeted total of items in Task Commitment Scale is 35-40 items. According to De Vellis (2003), the minimum number of items created must be 50% more than the items targeted. Therefore, 60 items is constructed which consist of 30 favorable items and 30 unfavorable items. The item constructed is balance for each indicator, thus every indicator is represented by 12 items which consist of 6 favorable items and 6 unfavorable items. A favorable item represents a high task commitment, where unfavorable items represent a low task commitment. For favorable items, the answer "never" is scored 1, "rarely" is scored 2, "often" is scored 3, and "always" is scored 4. For unfavorable item, the answer of "never" is scored 4, "rarely" is scored 3, "often" is scored 2, and "always" is scored 1. Finally, the range of possible score gained from 60 items is 60 to 240.

Qualitative Review

Test content validity is enforced through the selection of items to represent task commitment indicator as far as possible. It is known that facilitating an expert to give a judgment of the item created is a typical procedure to ensure its content validity (Crocker & Algina, 2008). After pooling the items, thus we conducted an expert judgment by asking a group of experts to give their feedback of the item appropriateness. The experts consist of 2 persons with the background as school psychologist and also lecturer in psychological measurement and 19 graduate psychology students. All the experts are asked to give their rating for each item for its representativeness related to the indicator. A total of 27 items is revised by taking into account the feedback gained from the experts, ranging from a nuance of social desirability, ambiguities, double negative sentences, ineffective sentences, irrelevant items, the use of difficult terms, and the use of too many "I" word in the sentences.

The items revised are then delivered to 16 junior high school students from acceleration class to examine its readability. The test item readability was conducted on 13 October 2014. We aim to check the students understanding of the item created based on the feedback given by the experts. They are allowed to fill the questionnaire and also give their comment on the test items, introduction, questionnaire layout, and questionnaire guideline. Generally, all the students understand what the item means. However, there are several items which contain unfamiliar word for the students, such as "voluntarily". The students also gave feedback for changing the sentence in introduction and guideline to be more effective. From the answer given, we found that 2 items were homogenously answered so these items were also revised to reduce its social desirability. The final revised version of Task Commitment Scale is then administered to the sample of acceleration class student to gather quantitative feedback obtained from statistical analysis.

**Result**

From the data collection, below are the descriptions of the sample's responds recorded.

Reliability

Of the four types of reliability described by Cohen & Swerdlik (1997), internal consistency technique is chosen in the form of Cronbach's Alpha. Internal consistency method is used to test the consistency of response given to all items on the test. Especially for a polytomous type of test, it is mandatory to use the Cronbach's Alpha value. The Task Commitment Scale itself is a polytomous scale where there are several respond options with no right and wrong answer. From the data obtained in, the obtained coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha is 0.874. It means that 87.4% variance on the observed score is a true score and 12.6% is an error variance. Anastasi & Urbina (1997) states that the desired reliability coefficient is typically range from 0.80 to 0.90. Therefore, it can be concluded that Task Commitment Scale is a reliable measure of task commitment in terms of its internal consistency. In other words, the items on the scale are homogeneous or the items measure the same attribute.

Item Analysis

The item analysis is conducted using the corrected item-total correlation (crit) as a part of item discrimination index. Corrected item total correlation (crit) is used to examine if the test as a whole and each of its item measures the same construct. In addition, we can also gather information about which item is a good one to distinguish between individuals who has the measured characteristic and individuals who do not have that characteristic (Cohen, 2010). We use the standard crit  0.2 as stated by Nunnally & Bernstein (1994) to be sure that the items have the capacity to differentiate between those with high task commitment and those with low task commitment. We also considered the Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted, in which we eliminated the items that are shown to increase the overall alpha level if being removed. In addition, the representativeness of each indicator within the test as a whole is also considered. By holding to these standards, each 60 items of Task Commitment Scale is analyzed. Those items that have not met these requirements are eliminated. The result of item analysis is listed below:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Behavior Indicator** | **crit Before Elimination** | **No. of Item**  **Eliminated** | **List of Item(s) Eliminated** | **crit After Elimination** | **No. of**  **Final Item** |
| 1 | Have a high level of interest to engage in activities at school | 0.071 – 0.795 | 3 | Item 11, item 36, item 41 | 0.220 – 0.795 | 9 |
| 2 | Work hard in the area of academic and learning activities | 0.595 – 0.881 | - | - | 0.595 – 0.881 | 12 |
| 3 | Have the confidence and belief in one's ability to excel in academic and learning activities | 0.200 – 0.565 | 2 | Item 44, item 54 | 0.021 – 0.565 | 10 |
| 4 | Have the ability to identify significant problems which impedes performance | 0.085 – 0.497 | 2 | Item 8,  item 13 | 0.247 – 0.497 | 10 |
| 5 | Set a high standards on personal and group work | 0.055 – 0.593 | 3 | Item 5,  item 25, item 55 | 0.237 – 0.593 | 9 |
|  | **Total** |  | **10 items** |  |  | **50 items** |

After the completion of item analysis, we retest the reliability of 50 items-Task Commitment Scale. The reliability test shows that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is increase from 0.874 to 0.907. Thus, the elimination of 10 unqualified items leads to a more homogenous group of items to measure task commitment. We can see that the Task Commitment Scale is a reliable measure of task commitment in terms of internal consistency.

Validity

In this study, the scale is validated from the perspective of construct validity. Construct validity answers how good the test item actually measures the theoretical constructs that are meant to be measured. The methods chosen to examine this validity are factor analysis and correlation with other test. By using factor analysis, the test is validated by looking at the correlation obtained between its total score and the factor score gained that theoretically known as the part of the construct measured (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). We used Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in which the structure of the factors as explicitly illustrated in theory is tested for its compatibility with the measured data obtained (Floyd & Widaman 1995 in Anastasi & Urbina 1997).

In contrast, correlation with other test is used by looking at the relationship between the test created and the other test measuring similar construct, which is already known as valid (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). Thus, Achievement Motivation Scale is chosen to be the validation criterion. This scale is considered suitable as the criterion since the task commitment itself is often equated with motivation (Renzulli, 1978). We used Achievement Motivation Scale created by Maria Theresia Anindita (2012), which is developed for junior high school students. The test consist of 36 items with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.915 and item validity ranges from 0.304 - 0.640.

By using CFA analysis performed on 50 items-Task Commitment Scale with a five factor model, there are several modifications to obtain the fit model for each of the factor. There are 13 items eliminated because it has a t-value below 1.96 and factor loading rate below 0.2. After modification, all the factors now have Chi-Square with P-value > 0.05 and RMSEA < 0,05, which means that the model is finally fit the data. The validated version of Task Commitment Scale thus has 38 items with statistical properties listed as follow:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Behavior Indicator** | **Factor Loading** | **Chi- Square** | **Sig.** | **RMSEA** | **α** | **No. of Item Eliminated** | **No. of**  **Final Item** |
| 1 | Have a high level of interest to engage in activities at school | 0.40 – 0.88 | 11.09 | 0.43576 | 0.009 | 0.692 | 2 (Item 1, item 21) | 7 |
| 2 | Work hard in the area of academic and learning activities | 0.22 – 0.85 | 25.15 | 0.24075 | 0.045 | 0.715 | 3 (Item 2, item 37, item 57) | 9 |
| 3 | Have the confidence and belief in one's ability to excel in academic and learning activities | 0.36 – 0.69 | 9.61 | 0.47518 | 0.000 | 0.662 | 3 (Item 10, item 34, item 46) | 7 |
| 4 | Have the ability to identify significant problems which impedes performance | 0.27 – 0.82 | 10.50 | 0.48590 | 0.000 | 0.514 | 3 (Item 3, item 45, item 53) | 7 |
| 5 | Set a high standards on personal and group work | 0.34 – 0.83 | 11.70 | 0.63046 | 0.000 | 0.599 | 1 (Item 15) | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **13 items** | **38 items** |

For the revised set of scale, the item analysis of both crit and Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted is once more conducted. For the 38 items-Task Commitment Scale, we found the corresponding item characteristics are as follow:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Behavior Indicator** | **crit Before Elimination** | **No. of Item**  **Eliminated** | **List of Item(s) Eliminated** | **crit After Elimination** | **No. of**  **Final Item** |
| 1 | Have a high level of interest to engage in activities at school | 0.262 – 0.573 | - | - | 0.262 – 0.573 | 7 |
| 2 | Work hard in the area of academic and learning activities | 0.222 – 0.596 | 2 | Item 42, item 47 | 0.248 – 0.567 | 7 |
| 3 | Have the confidence and belief in one's ability to excel in academic and learning activities | 0.206 – 0.556 | - | - | 0.206 – 0.556 | 7 |
| 4 | Have the ability to identify significant problems which impedes performance | 0.200 – 0.426 | - | - | 0.200 – 0.426 | 7 |
| 5 | Set a high standards on personal and group work | 0.069 – 0.560 | 1 | Item 14 | 0.203 – 0.627 | 7 |
|  | **Total** |  | **3 items** |  |  | **35 items** |

For indicator 2 and 5, we eliminated several items from the scale for two reasons. First, the removal of 2 items from indicator 2 will increase the reliability of the corresponding factor. The 9 items of indicator 2 yields Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.715, while by removing 2 items in this indicator yields Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.734. The same applies to indicator 5 as well. After removing 1 item from this indicator, the corresponding factor reliability is increase from 0.599 o 0.642. The second reason is qualitative considerations, which is the representativeness of item for each indicator. We aim to adequately represent the measured construct by balancing the number of item for each indicator. Therefore, this 35 items-Task Commitment Scale is considered as the final version of the test. The overall reliability of the test consisting these 35 items is 0.884 (measured by Cronbach's alpha), which is still on the acceptable or desirable value according to Anastasi & Urbina (1997). Every item on the scale as a whole has crit value ranging from 0.206 to 0.622, which is a satisfactory value according to by Nunnally & Bernstein (1994).

To confirm the construct validity of the test, we use another method which is correlation with other test (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). The 35 items-Task Commitment Scale is then correlated to Achievement Motivation Scale by Maria Theresia Anindita (2012) as the criterion. Using Pearson correlation we found that Task Commitment Scale is significantly correlated to Achievement Motivation Scale. The correlation is positive with the value of r (99) = 0.698 (p <0.05, one tailed). This means that 48.72% of the variance in Task Commitment Scale measures the similar construct as in Achievement Motivation Scale. Therefore, Task Commitment Scale is considered as valid to measure the task commitment construct by Renzulli. As stated before, Achievement Motivation Scale is a suitable criterion since the task commitment itself is often equated with motivation (Renzulli, 1978).

Final Scale

The final set of Task Commitment Scale consists of 35 items which represents 5 indicators as stated by Renzulli (in Rezulli & Reis, 1997). The scale is constructed as unidimensional so the score obtain from each item can be summed up to form a single score of task commitment. The respond format is Likert-type with four available answers, which are never, rarely, often, and always. The possible score obtained from the Task Commitment Scale is ranging from 35 to 140.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis conducted from the data, the findings related to the construction of Task Commitment Scale are as follow:

1. Reliability testing of Task Commitment Scale using Cronbach's Alpha yields α = 0.884 (p < 0.05). These results show that Task Commitment Scale is a reliable measure of task commitment in terms of internal consistency. This also means that all the items are homogenous and measure similar construct. Theoretically, this result confirms that task commitment is a unidimensional construct as proposed by Renzulli.
2. In terms of content validity, the items in Task Commitment Scale are said to represent the behavior domain of task commitment construct as reviewed by the expert.
3. In terms of construct validity, the model of Task Commitment Scale items and its corresponding factors is accepted by the data. Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis, we found that all five the factors have Chi-Square with P-value > 0.05 and RMSEA < 0.05. Every items included in the test has t-value > 1.96 with factor loading ranging from 0.200 – 0.596. Therefore, this model of Task Commitment Scale is valid to measure the task commitment construct by Renzulli.
4. Using correlation with other test to confirm test's construct validity, Achievement Motivation Scale is chosen as the criterion. From Pearson correlation we found that Task Commitment Scale is significantly correlated to Achievement Motivation Scale with r (99) = 0.698 (p <0.05, one tailed). Therefore, Task Commitment Scale is considered as valid to measure the task commitment construct by Renzulli.
5. The Task Commitment Scale items have a discriminatory ability with crit value ranging from 0.206 to 0.622. Therefore, every item in the test has the capacity to differentiate between those with high task commitment and those with low task commitment.

**Limitation**

There are several limitations of this study. The first is the small number of participants from where the data is analyzed. The objective of the study is to create a Task Commitment Scale to be use for identifying gifted children in junior high school. We choose the participant from the acceleration class, which already established, as a means to ensure that the scale is analyzed based on the specific characteristic possess by the gifted children. Unfortunately, the abolishment of acceleration class in 2015 makes the attempt to obtain a suitable research participants be more challenging. It is due to the unavailable number and source of data to meet the required participant characteristics for continuing the research. Although we have chosen schools that previously had an acceleration class or a school well known for their outstanding students' achievement, the number of gifted students detected is still insufficient. Therefore, it is recommended for further research to conduct more rigorous stages for recruiting the participant. A screening to grab the junior high school student with above average intelligence and high creativity is advisable. Further research is also expected to gather the data from various sources to gain a maximum number of gifted students as participants. Second limitation is on the level of factor loading applied on selecting the items. Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson (2010) stated that for ±100 number of sample included in the research, the adequate level of factor loading should be 0.55. However, we use 0.2 as a standard level of factor loading to select the appropriate item because this current level of value has already yield a satisfactory items as shown by the general Cronbach's alpha value of the scale (α = 0.884). In addition, using factor loading of 0.55 as the requirement not only reduces the number of item in each factor but also the general scale's Cronbach's alpha value to around 0.3-0.4. Considering this fact, combined with the qualitative property of the scale and the number of sample successfully gathered, therefore we choose factor loading 0.2 as the satisfactory level of item's factor loading. The third limitation is the inequality between the amount of favorable and unfavorable item in the test. As stated by De Vellis (2003), it is advisable that the favorable and the unfavorable items have the same amount of item. For the whole scale, the favorable items outnumber the unfavorable, in which there are 20 favorable items compared to only 15 unfavorable one. In respect to each factor, the equality between the two types of item is unattainable since the factor is represented by an odd amount of 7 items. Although we have already tried to balance the item type in test specification phase of research, the resulting items obtained from the final analysis cannot satisfy the corresponding advice.
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