



Content Validity Results Of Students' Perceptions of Children With *Autism Spectrum Disorders*

Widia Maharani¹, Rahmahtrisilvia Rahmahtrisilvia², Mega Iswari³, Rila Muspita⁴

¹²³⁴ (Department Pendidikan Luar Biasa, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia).

* Corresponding Author. E-mail: ¹widiamaharani09@gmail.com

Receive: 10/02/2024

Accepted: 17/02/2024

Published: 01/03/2024

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bermaksud untuk melihat hasil Instrument penelitian yang telah diuji validitasnya memberikan data penelitian yang valid. Oleh karena itu, validitas isi instrumen penelitian harus diuji sebelum digunakan. content validity item CVI, yang dilakukan dengan pendekatan deskriptif kuantitatif, adalah salah satu metode yang dapat digunakan untuk menguji validitas isi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan validitas angket dan detail dari tiga ahli. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa validasi angket yang terdiri dari dua elemen isi dan bahasa memiliki nilai i-CVI rata-rata 0,87 dan s-CVI adalah 0,87. Angket tersebut dianggap layak, relevan, dan valid berdasarkan nilai-nilai tersebut. Sehubungan dengan validitas butir angket, hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa 13 soal memiliki kriteria validitas yang tinggi dengan i-CVI 0,67, 29 soal memiliki kriteria validitas yang sangat tinggi dengan i-CVI lebih dari 1,00, dan nilai s-CVI 0,87. Kesimpulannya adalah bahwa butir angket sangat valid.

Kata Kunci: *Persepsi Mahasiswa, Anak GSA, Validitas Isi*

Abstract

This research is intended to see the results of the research instrument that has been tested for validity to provide valid intersection data. Therefore, the validity of the contents of the research instrument should be tested before use. CVI, performed with a quantitative descriptive approach, is one of the methods that can be used to test the validity of content. The results showed that the validation of the lift consisting of two elements of content and language had an i-CVI average of 0.87 and the s -CVI was 0.87. The lift was considered appropriate, relevant, and valid based on those values. Regarding the validity of the trigger, the results showed that 13 issues had a high validity criterion with i-CVI 0.67, 29 issues had very high validation criteria with i -CVI more than 1,00, and the s - CVI value was 0.87.

Keywords: *Student Perceptions, GSA Children, Content Validity*

Introduction.

Perception can be said to be the core of communication, because if the perception received is inaccurate, then the communication that exists will be less effective (Yasir, 2020-2023: 169) in Riadi, Muchlisin (2020-2023). Perception helps individuals determine which messages they want to receive and which messages they do not want to receive. This perception can be formed according to the individual's perspective. Perception is a cognitive process experienced by every person who selects, organizes, interprets and interprets information and sensations received through smell, hearing, sight, touch, feeling and appreciation. Perception here discusses students' perceptions of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD).

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is a developmental disorder that occurs in children who experience a condition of being withdrawn. This disorder causes children to experience limitations in terms of communication, social interaction and behavior Atmaja, Rinakri, Jati. (2018). According to the book written by (Iswari, 2018) "Autism" comes from the words "auto" and "isme", which respectively mean self and understanding. Therefore, autism is defined as a concept that is focused on its own world. In a journal written by (Rahmatrisilvia, 2015) it is stated that people with autism become excessively afraid of loud/noisy sounds, this is called sound sensitivity. This excessive fear makes them confused, anxious or disturbed, which often manifests in the form of bad behavior.

Research is an activity that follows scientific principles and methods carried out systematically with the aim of extracting information and data from an understanding. Validity testing is feasibility testing. A research instrument that has been declared valid means that the

instrument can measure the variable to be measured (Sugiyono, 2014).

Testing the validity of research instruments can be carried out based on content, criteria and construct. Content validity is testing the feasibility of a research instrument by experts. Criterion validity is a feasibility test by comparing test scores with reference criteria. The last one is concept validity (construct) which is testing the feasibility of a research instrument by connecting the test results with the theory used (Salkind, 2018). This research will focus on content validity testing involving 3 experts in the process.

Validation tests can be used in quantitative, qualitative, or combined quantitative approaches to assess content validity. Aiken's V content validity coefficient, Lawshe's CVR content validity coefficient, Content Validity Index (CVI), and Interater Reliability (Static Kappa) are quantitative metrics that can be used in research. However, according to Yadi (2017), CVI is the statistical technique most commonly used to test research instruments.

One method for testing content validity is CVI, which involves a team of experts to ensure that each item in the questionnaire fits its construct. Content validity of individual items (i-CVI) and overall content validity (s-CVI) are two categories of CVI determination that developed after the development of this method (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021).

The step for testing validity with CVI is to calculate the percentage of items assessed by each expert and then the average congruence percentage, also known as the average congruence percentage, is calculated before testing the validity of the CVI (Yadi, 2017). For example, a questionnaire is assessed by three different experts. The percentage value of expert 1 is 96 percent, expert 2 is 100 percent, and expert 3 is 88 percent.

(Widia Maharani, Rahmahtrisilvia Rahmahtrisilvia, Mega Iswari, Rila Muspita)

The ACP value of the three experts is 95 percent. The criterion for drawing conclusions is that the research instrument is declared valid if the ACP value is more than 90 percent (Popham, 1978; Waltz et al., 2005). so that the questionnaire developed is declared valid based on the examples that have been explained.

Method

One of the research that will be carried out at Padang State University is descriptive research with a quantitative approach. The aim of this research is to determine the perceptions of non-disabled students towards children with autism spectrum disorders after watching Korean dramas.

The content validation test in this research uses a descriptive quantitative approach using research questionnaires. The questionnaire developed meets the Guttman yes/no scale. Content validity testing with a descriptive quantitative approach can be carried out with the Content Validity Index (CVI) because this test has been carried out frequently in the last 10 years (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021).

Furthermore, the statements for exploring the perceptions of non-disabled students consist of 42 (forty two) statements which are grouped into 6 groups, namely character characteristics with 13 question items, sound sensitivity with 6 question items, habits with 7 question items, verbal communication with 9 question items, and nonverbal communication with 7 question items. The questionnaire that will be used will first be tested for validity, namely the validity of the content to the validator. Then the results will be analyzed using the CVI statistical technique.

CVI tests validity by involving a team of experts to determine whether each item in the questionnaire is appropriate to its

construct. Then CVI is divided into 2 types, namely individual item content validity (i-CVI) and overall content validity (s-CVI). The step for testing validity with CVI is to calculate the percentage of items assessed by each expert and then calculate the average of these percentages which is called the average congruency percentage (ACP). Experts or experts are people with abilities according to the research carried out. The minimum number of experts is 3 people. (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021).

The measurement scale for the expert validation sheet is a Likert scale of 1 to 5. The measurement scale is 1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Very Good. Next, the ordinal scale is converted to dichotomous values 0 and 1 so that it can be processed using the CVI approach. Likert scale 1 to 3 falls into dichotomy 0 meaning not feasible while scales 4 and 5 fall into dichotomy 1 with the feasible category (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021). There are 20 assessment items on the validation assessment sheet that will be assessed by the validator.

The criteria that can be used to determine validation results are according to Guilford and Fruchter in the article (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021):

- a. $0.80 < \text{Mean } 1 - \text{CVI} < 1.00$: Very high validity (very good)
- b. $0.60 < \text{Mean } 1 - \text{CVI} < 0.80$: High validity (good)
- c. $0.40 < \text{Mean } 1 - \text{CVI} < 0.60$: Medium validity (fair)
- d. $0.20 < \text{Mean } 1 - \text{CVI} < 0.40$: Low validity (less)
- e. $0.00 < \text{Mean } 1 - \text{CVI} < 0.20$: Very low (bad) validity
- f. $\text{Mean } 1 - \text{CVI} < 0.00$: Invalid

Results and Discussion

The results of this research include two data, namely, validation data and questionnaire item validation data. Data

(Widia Maharani, Rahmahtrisilvia Rahmahtrisilvia, Mega Iswari, Rila Muspita)

from expert validation results are presented in Table 1. Meanwhile, item validation data for the questionnaire is presented in Table 2.

Table 1 is data from the validation results of the entire questionnaire content from content and language aspects by 3 validators. The relevant proportion is the value obtained by dividing the total expert assessment scores by the number of assessment items. Mean i-CVI is obtained from calculating the average i-CVI of each assessment item. Furthermore, the overall average of i-CVI is called s-CVI.

Based on Table 1, the mean i-CVI value for the content aspect is 0.87, and the language aspect is 0.87. Meanwhile, the s-CVI value is 0.87. The CVI acceptance criteria from Table 1 for 3 experts is 0.87 (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021). So, based on data from expert validation and calculation of i-CVI and s-CVI values, it can be concluded that the questionnaire is feasible or relevant with high/good mean validity results.

Tabel 1.
Validation

Aspek Penilaian	Proporsi Relevan			Mean i-CVI
	V1	V2	V3	
Isi	0,90	0,85	0,85	0,87
Bahasa	0,90	0,85	0,85	0,87
s-CVI				0,87

Tabel 2.
Data Hasil Validasi Butir Angket

Butir Ke	Proporai Relevan			i-CVI
	V1	V2	V3	
1.	1	1	1	1,00

2.	1	1	1	1,00
3.	1	1	1	1,00
4.	1	1	0	0,67
5.	1	1	1	1,00
6.	1	1	1	1,00
7.	1	1	1	1,00
8.	1	1	1	1,00
9.	1	1	1	1,00
10.	1	1	1	1,00
11.	1	1	1	1,00
12.	1	1	1	1,00
13.	1	1	1	1,00
14.	0	1	1	0,67
15.	1	1	1	1,00
16.	1	1	1	1,00
17.	1	1	1	1,00
18.	1	1	1	1,00
19.	1	1	1	1,00
20.	1	0	1	0,67
21.	1	1	1	1,00
22.	1	1	1	1,00
23.	1	1	1	1,00
24.	1	1	1	1,00
25.	0	1	1	0,67
26.	1	1	1	1,00
27.	0	0	1	0,30

(Widia Maharani, Rahmahtrisilvia Rahmahtrisilvia, Mega Iswari, Rila Muspita)

28.	0	0	1	0,30
29.	1	0	1	0,67
30.	1	0	1	0,67
31.	1	0	1	0,67
32.	1	0	1	0,67
33.	1	0	1	0,67
34.	1	0	1	0,67
35.	1	0	1	0,67
36.	1	1	1	1,00
37.	1	1	0	0,67
38.	1	1	1	1,00
39.	1	1	1	1,00
40.	1	1	1	1,00
41.	0	1	1	0,67
42.	1	1	1	1,00
s-CVI				0,87

Information:

V1 = Validator 1 RM

V2 = Validator 2 GK

V3 = 3 Z Validator

Apart from that, it can also be concluded that the questionnaire has very high (very good) validity because the i-CVI and s-CVI values are in the range $0.80 < Mean I-CVI < 1.00$ (Guilford & Fruchter, 1978).

Table 2 is validation data for each question item in the questionnaire. Furthermore, based on data from the validation results of the questionnaire items, the i-CVI value was obtained for

each question item in the questionnaire, namely the i-CVI value was 0.30 for items no. 27, and 28. For items no. 4, 14, 20, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37 and 40 the i-CVI value is 0.67. and i-CVI value 1.00 for items no. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42.

Based on the results of the i-CVI calculation, for items no. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42, it can be concluded that the questionnaire items are appropriate or relevant because they meet the minimum threshold of 1.00 Guilford & Fruchter in research (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021). Apart from that, 27 items in the questionnaire had i-CVI values that fell into the range of $0.80 < Mean I - CVI < 1.00$, which means that the items were declared to have very high or very good validity (Guilford & Fruchter, 1978).

Meanwhile, items no. 4, 14, 20, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37 and 40 with an i-CVI value of less than 1.00, namely 0.67, this value falls into the range $0,60 < Mean I - CVI < 0.80$ which has high validity of item conclusions (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021). And for items no. 27 and 28, the i-CVI value of 0.30 is declared to have moderate validity (sufficient) because this value is included in the value range $0,40 < Mean I - CVI < 0.60$. The s-CVI value obtained for the validity of the items in this questionnaire was 0.87. The conclusion that can be obtained from the s-CVI value is that all questionnaire items are feasible, relevant, and have very high validity because the value is more than 0.80 (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021).

Conclusion

The i-CVI value from the validation results for both aspects, namely Content and Language, is 0.87. Meanwhile, the s-

(Widia Maharani, Rahmahtrisilvia Rahmahtrisilvia, Mega Iswari, Rila Muspita)

CVI value obtained from the results for content validation was 0.87. Based on these results, it can be concluded that the questionnaire developed was declared feasible or relevant or had very high validity. Apart from that, based on the i-CVI value for the validity of the questionnaire items, 27 questions were obtained with very high validity categories, 13 questions with high validity and 2 questions with moderate/sufficient validity. Meanwhile, based on the s-CVI value, the validity of the questionnaire items has very high validity criteria. Based on these results, the questionnaire can then be used to collect research data on students' perceptions of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders, which has been categorized as a valid research instrument. In future research, it is recommended to use another content validity approach or add construct and criterion validity testing to prove more in-depth instrument validity for other research instruments..

References

Puspitasari, W. D., & Febrinita, F. (2021). Pengujian Validasi Isi (Content

Validity) Angket Persepsi Mahasiswa terhadap Pembelajaran Daring Matakuliah Matematika Komputasi. *Journal Focus Action of Research Mathematic (Factor M)*, 4(1), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.30762/factor_m.v4i1.3254

Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode Penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R & D* / Sugiyono | OPAC Perpustakaan Nasional RI. In Bandung : Alfabeta (pp. x, 334 hlm).

Yadi, H. (2017). Validitas isi: tahap awal pengembangan kuesioner. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Dan Bisnis (JRMB) Fakultas Ekonomi UNIAT*, 2(2), 169–178.

Guilford, J. P., & Fruchter, B. (1978). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Curriculum Vitae

Tanjung Bunian, 20 Juni 2002,
Pendidikan Luar Biasa, 2024.