

Reprinted From

ISSN: 1936-6612, E-ISSN: 1936-7317

Advanced Science Letters

Volume 21, Number 7, July 2015, pp. 2438-2441

<http://www.aspbs.com/>

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY IN NEURORESEARCH

¹Sasmoko, ²Yi Ying

¹ Primary Teacher Education Department, Faculty of Humanities,
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 11480

¹ Research Interest Group in Educational Technology,
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 11480

²Chinese Department, Faculty of Humanities,
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 11480

URL: <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/asp/asl/2015/00000021/00000007/art00061?crawler=true#expand/collapse>



Document details

< Back to results | 1 of 1

Save to Mendeley Download Print E-mail Save to PDF Save to list More... >

Create bibliography

Advanced Science Letters
Volume 21, Issue 7, July 2015, Pages 2438-2441

Construct validity in neuroresearch (Article)

Sasmoko^a, Ying, Y.^b ^aResearch Method and Statistics at Binus University, Jakarta, Indonesia^bBinus University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

View references (16)

Neuroresearch is an integrated research method between qualitative method and quantitative method. This paper examines how prove the academic predictions (construt) in Neuroresearch through the construct validity. There are two (2) phases. Phase One, Orthogonal iteration approach. If the results of the Orthogonal iteration have been counted few times, and it is proved the instrument items to be significant with the variable (total score) and each indicator is minimum represented by at least 1 (one) point, then the academic predictions about the variables is proved. But if there is at least one indicator that is not represented by a minimum of 1 point, then the Orthogonal Iteration is not fit and had to go to the second stage. Second stage is Varimax Iterations approach through Principle Component Axis. The analogy of the variable is like a community that consists of a group of people (instrument item). Community (variable) is formed by a small group (indicator) and the members of the group (item) are not always correlated with the group (indicator). Proof of academic prediction of the second phase by calculating rotated component matrix which in the end, will "determine the new name of the indicators". © 2015 American Scientific Publishers.

Author keywords

A model research methods Construct validity approach

ISSN: 19366612

Source Type: Journal

Original language: English

DOI: 10.1166/asl.2015.6301

Document Type: Article

Publisher: American Scientific Publishers

References (16)

View in search results format >

 All Save to Mendeley Print E-mail Save to PDF Create bibliography

1 Anne, A.
(1982) *Psychological Testing*. Cited 2 times.
5th edn., Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc., New York

2 Arthur, A., Elaine, A.N.
(1999) *Statistic for Psychology*
2nd edn., Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey

Metrics View all metrics >

10 Citations in Scopus
91st Percentile

2.80 Field-Weighted
Citation Impact



PlumX Metrics

Usage, Captures, Mentions,
Social Media and Citations
beyond Scopus.

Cited by 10 documents

Applying indonesian teacher
engagement index (ITEI) apps:
Self-diagnostic apps for teachers
in IndonesiaSasmoko, Noerlina, Indrianti, Y.
(2018) *ICIC Express Letters, Part
B: Applications*Develop applications based on
android: Teacher Engagement
Control of Health (TECH)Sasmoko, Manalu, S.R.,
Widhoyoko, S.A.
(2018) *Journal of Physics:
Conference Series*Indonesian Teacher Engagement
Index (ITEI): An Emerging
Concept of Teacher Engagement
in IndonesiaSasmoko, Doringin, F.,
Indrianti, Y.
(2018) *IOP Conference Series:
Materials Science and
Engineering*

View all 10 citing documents

Inform me when this document
is cited in Scopus:

Related documents

3 Comrey
(1973) *Factor Analysis*
Sagre Press, Chicago

Find more related documents in
Scopus based on:

Authors > Keywords >

4 Dimitrov, D.M.
(2015) *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Sage Journal*
<http://mec.sagepub.com>

5 Gordon, F.D.
(2011) *Eksegesis Perjanjian Baru*
Literatur SAAT, Malang

6 Laurence, G.G., Paul, Y.R.
(1995) *Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics*
American Psychological Association, Wahington

7 Larry, H.V., Ingram, O.
(1985) *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. Cited 7684 times.
Academic Press Inc., New York

8 Fred, K.N., Elazar, P.J.
(1973) *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research*. Cited 1630 times.
Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York

9 Fred, K.N.
(1990) *Asas-Asas Penelitian Behavioral, Terjemahan oleh Landung R. Simatupang*
Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta

10 Lehman
(1991) *Statistics and Research Design in the Behavioral Sciences*. Cited 64 times.
Wadsworth Publishing Company, California

11 Roderick, M.P.
(1999) *Test Theory: A Unified Treatment*
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher, New Jersey

12 Lopez, M.Y.
(2013) *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review*, p. 4.
(24 April 2015)
<http://ejournals.ph/index.php>

□ 13 France, M.K.
(2015) *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Sage Journal*
(24 April)
<http://mec.sagepub.com/>

□ 14 Wu, P.-C., Huang, T.-W.
(2015) *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Sage Journal*
(24 April)
<http://mec.sagepub.com/content/43/3/155.abstract>

□ 15 Sasmoko
(2012) *Metode Penelitian Eksplanatori-Konfirmatori*. Cited 2 times.
Edisi ke 11, Media Plus, Jakarta

□ 16 Sasmoko
(2007) *Metode Penelitian Eksplanatori-Konfirmatori (Neuroresearch)*
Edisi 12, Media Plus, Jakarta (2013); Sasmoko, *Aplikasi Tes dan Pengukuran*, Edisi 2, Jakarta

👤 Sasmoko, ; Research Method and Statistics at Binus University, Jakarta, Indonesia
© Copyright 2015 Elsevier B.V., All rights reserved.

< Back to results | 1 of 1

^ Top of page

About Scopus

What is Scopus
Content coverage
Scopus blog
Scopus API
Privacy matters

Language

日本語に切り替える
切换到简体中文
切换到繁體中文
Русский язык

Customer Service

Help
Contact us

ELSEVIER

[Terms and conditions](#) [Privacy policy](#)

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. Scopus® is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.

Cookies are set by this site. To decline them or learn more, visit our [Cookies page](#).

 RELX Group™

Aims and Scope
Editorial Board
Instructions for Authors
Contact Information
Subscription Information
Copyright Transfer Agreement
Indexed/Abstracted
Cover Library
Contents

Advanced Science Letters

ISSN: 1936-6612 (Print): EISSN: 1936-7317 (Online)
 Copyright © 2000-2018 American Scientific Publishers. All Rights Reserved.

EDITORIAL BOARD

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Hari Singh Nalwa, USA

Editorial Office:

ADVANCED SCIENCE LETTERS
 American Scientific Publishers
 26650 The Old Road, Suite 208
 Valencia, California 91381-0751, USA
 Tel. (661) 799-7200
 Fax: (661) 799-7230
 E-mail: science@aspbs.com

ASIAN EDITOR

Dr. Katsuhiko Ariga, PhD
 Advanced Materials Laboratory
 National Institute for Materials Science
 1-1 Namiki, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0044, JAPAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Diederik Aerts (Quantum theory, Cognition, Evolution theory)
 Brussels Free University, Belgium.

Yakir Aharonov (Physics, Quantum Physics)
 School of Physics and Astronomy, Israel.

Peter C. Aichelburg (Gravitation)
 University of Vienna, Austria.

Jim Al-Khalili (Foundations of Physics, Nuclear Reaction Theory)
 University of Surrey, UK.

Jake Blanchard (Engineering Physics, Nuclear Engineering)
 University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA.

Simon Baron-Cohen (Cognitive Neuroscience)
 University of Cambridge, UK.

Franz X. Bogner (Cognitive Achievement)
 University of Bayreuth, Germany.

John Borneman (Anthropology)
 Princeton University, USA.

John Casti (Complexity Science)
 Internationales Institut für Angewandte Systemanalyse, Austria.

Masud Chaichian (High Energy Physics, String Theory)
 University of Helsinki, Finland.

Sergey V. Chervon (Gravitation, Cosmology, Astrophysics)
 Ulyanovsk State Pedagogical University, Russia

Kevin Davey (Philosophy of Science)
 University of Chicago, Chicago, USA.

Tania Dey (Colloids/Polymers/Nanohybrids)
 Canada.

Roland Eils (Bioinformatics)
 Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum Heidelberg, Germany.

Thomas Görnitz (Quantum theory, Cosmology)
 University of Frankfurt, Germany.

Bert Gordijn (Nanoethics, Neuroethics, Bioethics)
 Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Ji-Huan He (Textile Engineering, Functional Materials)
 Soochow University, Suzhou, China.

Nongyue He (Biosensors/Biomaterials)
 China.

Irving P. Herman (Materials and Solid State Physics)
 Columbia University, USA.

Dipankar Home (Foundations of Quantum Mechanics)
 Bose Institute, Kolkata, India.



Jucundus Jacobeit (Climate, Global Change Ecology)
University of Augsburg, Germany.

Yuriy A. Knirel (Bioorganic Chemistry)
N. D. Zelinsky Institute of Organic Chemistry, Russia.

Arthur Konnerth (Neurophysiology, Molecular Mechanisms)
University of Munich, Germany.

G. A. Kourouklis (Physics Solid State Physics)
Aristotle University Thessaloniki, Greece.

Peter Krammer (Genetics)
Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum Heidelberg, Germany.

Andrew F. Laine (Biomedical Engineering)
Columbia University, USA.

Minbo Lan (Organic Functional Materials)
China.

Martha Lux-Steiner (Physics, Materials Science)
Hahn-Meitner-Institut Berlin, Germany.

Klaus Mainzer (Complex Systems, Computational Mind, Philosophy of Science)
University of Augsburg, Germany.

JoAnn E. Manson (Medicine, Cardiovascular Disease)
Harvard University, USA.

Mark P. Mattson (Neuroscience)
National Institute on Aging, Baltimore, USA.

Lucio Mayer (Astrophysics, Cosmology)
ETH Zürich, Switzerland.

Karl Menten (Radioastronomy)
Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, Germany.

Yoshiko Miura (Biomaterials/Biosensors)
Japan.

Fred M. Mueller (Solid State Physics)
Los Alamos National Laboratory, USA.

Garth Nicolson (Illness Research, Cancer Cell Biology)
The Institute for Molecular Medicine, Huntington Beach, USA.

Nina Papavasiliou (DNA Mutators, Microbial Virulence, Antiviral Defence, Adaptive Immunity, Surface Receptor Variation)
The Rockefeller University, New York, USA.

Panos Photinos (Physics)
Southern Oregon University, USA.

Zhiyong Qian (Biomedical Engineering, Biomaterials, Drug Delivery)
Sichuan University, CHINA.

Reinhard Schlickeiser (Astrophysics, Plasma Theory and Space Science)
Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Surinder Singh (Sensors/Nanotechnology)
USA.

Suprakas Sinha Ray (Composites/Polymer Science)
South Africa.

Koen Steemers (Architecture, Environmental Building Performance)
University of Cambridge, UK.

Shinsuke Tanabe (Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology)
Ehime University, Japan.

James R. Thompson (Solid State Physics)
The University of Tennessee, USA.

Uwe Ulbrich (Climat, Meteorology)
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.

Ahmad Umar (Advanced Materials)
Najran University, Saudi Arabia.

Frans de Waal (Animal Behavior and Cognition)
Emory University, USA.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Filippo Aureli, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

Marcel Ausloos, Université de Liège, Belgium

Martin Bojowald, Pennsylvania State University, USA

Sougato Bose, University College, London, UK
Jacopo Buongiorno, MIT, USA
Paul Cordopatis, University of Patras, Greece
Maria Luisa Dalla Chiara, University of Firenze, Italy
Dionysios Demetriou Dionysiou, University of Cincinnati, USA
Simon Eidelman, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Russia
Norbert Frischauf, QASAR Technologies, Vienna, Austria
Toshi Futamase, Tohoku University, Japan
Leonid Gavrilov, University of Chicago, USA
Vincent G. Harris, Northeastern University, USA
Mae-Wan Ho, Open University, UK
Keith Hutchison, University of Melbourne, Australia
David Jishiashvili, Georgian Technical University, Georgia
George Khushf, University of South Carolina, USA
Sergei Kulik, M.V.Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia
Harald Kunstmann, Institute for Meteorology and Climate Research, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, Germany
Alexander Lebedev, Laboratory of Semiconductor Devices Physics, Russia
James Lindesay, Howard University, USA
Michael Lipkind, Kimron Veterinary Institute, Israel
Nigel Mason, Open University, UK
Johnjoe McFadden, University of Surrey, UK
B. S. Murty, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India
Heiko Paeth, Geographisches Institut der Universität Würzburg, Germany
Matteo Paris, Università di Milano, Italia
David Posoda, University of Vigo, Spain
Paddy H. Regan, University of Surrey, UK
Leonidas Resvanis, University of Athens, Greece
Wolfgang Rhode, University of Dortmund, Germany
Derek C. Richardson, University of Maryland, USA
Carlos Romero, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Brazil
Andrea Sella, University College London, London, UK
P. Shankar, Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research, Kalpakkam, India
Surya Singh, Imperial College London, UK
Leonidas Sotiropoulos, University of Patras, Greece
Roger Strand, University of Bergen, Norway
Karl Svozil, Technische Universität Wien, Austria
Kit Tan, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Roland Triay, Centre de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Marseille, France
Rami Vainio, University of Helsinki, Finland
Victor Voronov, Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Dubna, Russia
Andrew Whitaker, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland
Lijian Xu, Hunan University of Technology, China
Alexander Yefremov, Peoples Friendship University of Russia, Russia
Avraam Zeligidis, University of Patras, Greece
Alexander V. Zolotaryuk, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Ukraine

[Terms and Conditions](#) [Privacy Policy](#), Copyright © 2000-2018 American Scientific Publishers. All Rights Reserved.



AMERICAN
SCIENTIFIC
PUBLISHERS

Copyright © 2015 American Scientific Publishers
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Advanced Science Letters
Vol. 21, 2438–2441, 2015

Construct Validity in NeuroResearch

Sasmoko^{1,*} and Yi Ying²

¹Research Method and Statistics at Binus University, Jakarta, Indonesia

²Binus University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Neuroresearch is an integrated research method between qualitative method and quantitative method. This paper examines how prove the academic predictions (construt) in Neuroresearch through the construct validity. There are two (2) phases. Phase One, Orthogonal iteration approach. If the results of the Orthogonal iteration have been counted few times, and it is proved the instrument items to be significant with the variable (total score) and each indicator is minimum represented by at least 1 (one) point, then the academic predictions about the variables is proved. But if there is at least one indicator that is not represented by a minimum of 1 point, then the Orthogonal Iteration is not fit and had to go to the second stage. Second stage is Varimax Iterations approach through Principle Component Axis. The analogy of the variable is like a community that consists of a group of people (instrument item). Community (variable) is formed by a small group (indicator) and the members of the group (item) are not always correlated with the group (indicator). Proof of academic prediction of the second phase by calculating rotated component matrix which in the end, will “determine the new name of the indicators.”

Keywords: A Model Research Methods, Construct Validity Approach

IP: 78.154.116.126 On: Mon, 17 Oct 2016 10:26:22
Copyright: American Scientific Publishers

1. INTRODUCTION

Neuroresearch is a method of social science research that tried to proportionately combine the qualitative research methods (exploratory research) and quantitative research method (explanatory and confirmatory). This method has been developed by Sasmoko since 1995 up to now for his master’s programs and doctoral studies.^a With the balanced combination of qualitative method and quantitative method, it needs valid and reliable research instruments (calibration). One of the calibration phase is testing the construct validity. This paper specifically examines the construct validity which appropriates to Neuroresearch through Orthogonal Iteration approach and/or Varimax Iteration.

2. CONSTRUCT VALIDITY APPROACH IN NEURORESEARCH

Neuroresearch method is not contradicting the quantitative research and qualitative research. In addition, Neuroresearch method wants to present alternative research methods that combining qualitative method with quantitative method, so it will complement one another. The result of qualitative research is in the form of the theoretical construct results that is the

researchers’ conclusion on theoretical study contextualized to the conditions of research population on research variables. The content of theoretical construct is the conceptual definition, dimensions, and research variables’ indicators. Due to the academic predictions, the researchers need to test these predictions through construct validity. Lopez^b said that the meaning of the construct validity is as a proof of its complex academic prediction.

Empirical analysis of construct validity are reviewed internally is how researchers describe the relationship of each instrument item with the variables that reflected as it was predicted by theoretical construct.^c This paper proposes two (2) alternative construct validity approaches which suitable with Neuroresearch method.

The first Alternative Construct Validity Approach in Neuroresearch is the approach with the concept of correlation. Instrument item is valid if the item scores were significantly correlated with the variables score of that is the total item of each respondent.^d

^bMarcos Y. Lopez, “Determining the Construct Validity of a Critical Thinking Test,” *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review*, Vol. 4, No 1 (2013), <http://ejournals.ph/index.php>, accessed on 24 April 2015.

^cMegan K. France an, “Conceptualization and Utility of University Matterng: A Construct Validity Study d Sara J. Finney,” *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, Sage Journal, <http://mec.sagepub.com/>, accessed on 24 April 2015.

^dMakna unidimensional satu dimensi yaitu variabel penelitian yang sedang dikaji ditandai dengan “semua” indikator-indikator yang ditemukan setelah melalui kajian teoritis secara mendalam. Dan semua indikator tersebut harus muncul dalam diri

*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

^aThe implantation result of Construct Validity in Neuroresearch can be read in Binus University Library, Universitas Kristen Indonesia Library, and Harvest International Theological Seminary Library.

Table I. Recapitulation of calculation result of orthogonal iteration to find valid instruments.

Ind	No of construct items	First calculation—Orthogonal iteration 1 (not yet valid)		Re-calculation result—Orthogonal iteration 2 (final)		Number of "valid" item
		Valid	Drop	Valid	Drop	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X ₁	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1, 2, 5	3, 4	1, 2, 5	–	1, 2, 5
X ₂	6, 7, 8, 9	8	6, 7, 9	8	–	8
X ₃	10, 11, 12, 13, 14	10, 14	11, 12, 13	10, 14	–	10, 14
Total	14 items	8 items	6 items	6 items	–	6 items

Table II. Recapitulation of orthogonal iteration calculation result, with the final result was found that the approach is not able to proof as valid instrument.

Ind	No item from construct	First calculation—Orthogonal iteration 1 (not valid)		Re-calculation result—Orthogonal iteration 2 (final)		Number of "valid" item
		Valid	Drop	Valid	Drop	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X ₁	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1, 2, 5	3, 4	–	1, 2, 5	–
X ₂	6, 7, 8, 9	8	6, 7, 9	8	–	8
X ₃	10, 11, 12, 13, 14	10, 14	11, 12, 13	10, 14	–	10, 14
Total	14 items	6 items	8 items	3 items	3 items	3 items

Table III. Recapitulation of orthogonal iteration calculation result, with final result was found that the approach is not able to proof as valid instrument.

Ind	No item from construct	First calculation—Orthogonal iteration 1 (not valid)		Description
		Valid	Drop	
1	2	3	4	7
X ₁	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9, 10	
X ₂		–	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	Not qualify because there was no valid item
X ₃	21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29	21, 22, 23, 24, 25	26, 27, 28, 29	
X ₄	30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40	–	30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40	Not qualify because there was no valid item
X ₅	41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55	41, 42, 43, 44	45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55	
Total	55 items	15 items	40 items	–

Mathematical approach is the Orthogonal Iteration (rotation) approach with the correlation formula of Product Moment. Orthogonal Iteration is used if the theoretical review of variable research is unidimensional concept.^e There is a requirement in Orthogonal Iteration that is any indicator of the research should be represented at least with 1 (one) valid instrument item. Here is an example of recapitulation result of Orthogonal Iteration.

The table shows that researchers are testing a variable research instrument with 14 items (column 2). Calculation results of correlation (First Orthogonal Iteration) produce 8 valid items (column 3) and 6 drop/invalid items (column 4). Because the calculation results of First Orthogonal Iteration still has dropped

items (invalid), then it must be recalculated or going to second Orthogonal Iteration phase. Calculation results of correlation (Second Orthogonal Iteration) produces 6 valid items (column 5) and there is no drop item (invalid). Calculation results of second Orthogonal iteration proved that each indicator is represented at least by 1 item. Based on Second Orthogonal Iteration calculation, then through the sixth instrument item may be referred to as "valid instrument."

The Second Alternative Approach of Construct Validity Neuroresearch is the approach with Cluster concept. A simple simulation can be seen in Table II. This second approach is simulated if the first approach failed, which there are indicators that are not represented by at least 1 instrument item (column 5). It means the academic prediction of researchers on research variables can be seen as failure. This failure is because the researcher were not too sharp in defining contextual indicators of the research population, it also because the lack of validity during content validity phase, perhaps also because of some problems in sentence constructing of instrument items, and etc.

responden baik secara bersama-sama maupun tidak secara bersama. The meaning of one dimension of unidimensional is research variable that being studied are marked with "all" indicators found after a depth theoretical study. And all indicators must appear in respondent either together or alone.

^eMultidimensional meaning is research variable which being studied are marked with "some indicator" from "all the indicators that were found" through theoretical study. It means that significance of each item score is not based on total score of variable, but the total score of indicator.

Table IV. Result of 55 instrument items, total of iteration is 25 times.

Component	Total variance explained. ^a		
	Extraction sums of squared loadings		
	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	14,767	29,534	29,534
2	5,044	10,088	39,621
3	3,808	7,617	47,238
4	3,214	6,480	53,718
5	2,592	5,184	58,903
6	2,554	5,108	64,010
7	2,246	4,492	68,502
8	2,039	4,077	72,579
9	1,836	3,672	76,252
10	1,696	3,392	79,643
11	1,470	2,941	82,584
12	1,093	2,185	84,770
13	1,025	2,051	86,820

Note: ^aCompiled based on calculation result with the help of SPSS program.

Because the first approach is failed (Table II), then the calculation of Construct Validity in Neuroresearch changes into the next step by changing the mathematical approach through Varimax iteration (Rotation), called Second Alternative Approach. Varimax Iteration assume that:

- (1) the indicator is a cluster,
- (2) each indicator contains instrument items,
- (3) each instrument item in indicator is not always mathematically correlated with its indicators, and
- (4) the instrument item in an indicator may have high weighs for other indicators.

In Varimax Iterations, the weight is determined based on Eigen Value.

Here is an example of the construct validity approach in Neuroresearch which is through Varimax Iteration with Principle Component Axis.^f

Based on Table III, it was found there are two (2) indicators, X_2 and X_4 which are not represented by a minimum of 1 (one) instrument item. So the first stage of construct validity is failed and must move to the second stage of construct validity through Varimax Iteration with Principle Component Axis. The results are as following.

Based on Table IV, the number of indicators that are suitable with the context of the research population should have 13 indicator items with Eigen Value 86.820% from 100%. Sasmoko¹⁶ decided that the Cumulative Eigen Value which was required by valid instrument have a minimum of >50%. This means the total of contextual indicators with the population for research variables is “4 indicator items” with a weight of 53.78% from 100%.

Furthermore, based on the analysis (Table IV), the next stage is to analyze the matrix component on 4 indicators which was rotated (rotated component matrix). At this stage, it was found the distribution of items by 4 indicators that have been in Varimax Iteration (rotation). Based on rotation results, it

^fComparing with Dimitar M. Dimitrov, “Testing for Factorial Invariance in the Context of Construct Validation,” *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, Sage Journal, <http://mec.sagepub.com/content/43/2/121.abstract>, akses 24 April 2015.

Table V. A new name of indicator based on result of grouping items in Table IV.

No	Item number based on grouping items of Varimax iteration	Indicator new name
1.	24, 22, 23, 49, 26, 8, 14, 29, 42	X_1
2.	48, 44, 43, 47	X_2
3.	45, 12, 13, 25	X_3
4.	20, 36, 38, 18, 4, 17	X_4
Total of items	23 items	

produced items distribution into 4 “New Indicators” as seen in Table V.

The determination of 4 “New Indicators” and also a new distribution of items, then the researcher should give a new name for the indicators.

A new name is giving by combining the meaning of item in some indicators and keeps linking the name meaning of the indicator with variable being studied.

Giving a new name for an indicator is an art for researchers itself. By specifying the name of the new indicator, the researcher does not necessarily conduct a theoretical study and add new theory. Because in giving a new name for indicators, researchers must consider the research variables and the result of past research.

Based on the findings of Table V above, it shows some consequences that Neuroresearch Research Methods can provide opportunities rebuilding framework of thinking and also reviewing the research hypothesis.

3. CONCLUSIONS

1. Construct validity in research of Neuroresearch can be done through the Correlation approach which is through Orthogonal iteration (Rotation)
2. If Orthogonal Iteration (rotation) is failed (indicator is not represented by instrument item), the researcher is does not need to do the test on research’s instruments or take the test data of research instruments to its sample.
3. If Orthogonal Iteration (rotation) is failed (indicator is not represented by instrument item), the Varimax Iteration approach is another way of Construct validity on Neuroresearch which is by giving a new name to the indicator because composition changes of instrument item.
4. The suitable Varimax Iteration (rotation) is with Principle Component Axis approach.

References and Notes

1. A. Anne, *Psychological Testing*, 5th edn., Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc., New York (19982).
2. A. Arthur and A. N. Elaine, *Statistic for Psychology*, 2nd edn., Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey (1999).
3. Comrey, *Factor Analysis*, Sagre Press, Chicago (1973).
4. D. M. Dimitrov, *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, Sage Journal (2015), <http://mec.sagepub.com>.
5. F. D. Gordon, *Eksegesis Perjanjian Baru, Literatur SAAT*, Malang (2011).
6. G. G. Laurence and Y. R. Paul, *Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics*, American Psychological Association, Wahington (1995).
7. H. V. Larry and O. Ingram, *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*, Academic Press Inc., New York (1985).
8. K. N. Fred and P. J. Elazar, *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research*, Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York (1973).
9. K. N. Fred, *Asas-Asas Penelitian Behavioral*, Terjemahan oleh Landung R. Simatupang, Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta (1990).

10. Lehman, *Statistics and Research Design in the Behavioral Sciences*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, California (1991).
11. M. P. Roderick, *Test Theory: A Unified Treatment*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher, New Jersey (1999).
12. M. Y. Lopez, *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review* 4 (2013), (24 April 2015), <http://ejournals.ph/index.php>.
13. M. K. France, *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Sage Journal*, (24 April 2015), <http://mec.sagepub.com/>.
14. P.-C. Wu and T.-W. Huang, *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Sage Journal*, (24 April 2015), <http://mec.sagepub.com/content/43/3/155.abstract>.
15. Sasmoko, *Metode Penelitian Eksplanatori-Konfirmatori*, Edisi ke 11, Media Plus, Jakarta (2012).
16. Sasmoko, *Metode Penelitian Eksplanatori-Konfirmatori (Neuroresearch)*, Edisi 12, Media Plus, Jakarta (2013); Sasmoko, *Aplikasi Tes dan Pengukuran*, Edisi 2, Jakarta (2007).

Received: 28 April 2015. Accepted: 17 June 2015.

Delivered by Ingenta to: Paul Overend
IP: 78.154.116.126 On: Mon, 17 Oct 2016 10:26:22
Copyright: American Scientific Publishers