

**PENGEMBANGAN INSTRUMEN KREATIVITAS PESERTA
DIDIK SEKOLAH DASAR**

SKRIPSI

diajukan untuk memenuhi sebagian syarat untuk memperoleh gelar
Sarjana Pendidikan dalam Bidang Bimbingan dan Konseling



oleh
Lulu Noorkholisoh
NIM 1906225

**PROGRAM STUDI SARJANA BIMBINGAN DAN KONSELING
FAKULTAS ILMU PENDIDIKAN
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA
2023**

LEMBAR HAK CIPTA

**PENGEMBANGAN INSTRUMEN KREATIVITAS PESERTA DIDIK
SEKOLAH DASAR**

oleh
Lulu Noorkholisoh

Sebuah skripsi yang diajukan untuk memenuhi salah satu syarat memperoleh gelar
Sarjana Pendidikan pada Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling

© Lulu Noorkholisoh
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Agustus 2023

Hak Cipta dilindungi Undang-Undang.
Skripsi ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagian,
dengan dicetak ulang, difoto kopi, atau cara lainnya tanpa izin penulis.

LEMBAR PENGESAHAN

LEMBAR PENGESAHAN

LULU NOORKHOLISOH
NIM 1906225

PENGEMBANGAN INSTRUMEN KREATIVITAS PESERTA DIDIK
SEKOLAH DASAR

disetujui dan disahkan oleh pembimbing:

Pembimbing I



Dr. Nandang Budiman, M.Si
NIP 19710219 199802 1 001

Pembimbing II



Dr. Dodi Suryana, M.Pd
NIPT 92020011 990050 9 101

Mengetahui
Ketua Program Studi Bimbingan dan KOnseling
Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia



Prof. Dr. Juntika Nurihsan M.Pd.
NIP 19660601 199103 1 005

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan bahwa skripsi dengan judul "**Pengembangan Instrumen Kreativitas Peserta Didik Sekolah Dasar**" beserta seluruh isinya adalah benar-benar karya saya sendiri. Saya tidak melakukan penjiplakan atau pengutipan dengan cara-cara yang tidak sesuai dengan etika ilmu yang berlaku dalam masyarakat keilmuan. Atas pernyataan ini, saya siap menanggung risiko/sanksi apabila di kemudian hari ditemukan adanya pelanggaran etika keilmuan atau ada klaim dari pihak lain terhadap keaslian karya saya ini.

Bandung, Agustus 2023



Lulu Noorkholisoh
NIM 1906225

UCAPAN TERIMA KASIH

Alhamdulillah segala puji bagi Allah Swt. sebab berkat rahmat dan karunia-Nya penulis dapat menyelesaikan skripsi. Selama proses penyusunan skripsi tidak terlepas dari bantuan serta dukungan berbagai pihak, baik secara moril maupun materil. Dalam kesempatan ini penulis mengucapkan terima kasih dan menyampaikan penghargaan yang setinggi-tingginya kepada:

1. Dr. Nandang Budiman M.Si., selaku Dosen Pembimbing I sekaligus Dosen Pembimbing Akademik, terima kasih atas ilmu, bimbingan, arahan, waktu, pelajaran, dukungan, dan motivasi yang telah diberikan selama proses penyusunan skripsi berlangsung.
2. Dr. Dodi Suryana, M.Pd., selaku Dosen Pembimbing II, terima kasih atas waktu, bimbingan, dukungan, dan motivasi yang telah diberikan selama proses penyusunan skripsi berlangsung.
3. Prof. Dr. Juntika Nurihsan, M.Pd. selaku Ketua Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling yang telah memberikan bantuan dan kemudahan selama proses perkuliahan.
4. Dr. Ipah Saripah, M.Pd. selaku sekretaris Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling yang telah memberikan bantuan dan kemudahan selama proses perkuliahan.
5. Bapak dan Ibu Dosen Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling yang telah membimbing dan memberikan ilmu pengetahuan dari awal perkuliahan sampai dengan selesainya penulisan skripsi.
6. Drs. Sudaryat Nurdin Akhmad, M.Pd. dan Dr. Eka Sakti Yudha, M.Pd. yang telah berkenan untuk memberikan penilaian dan rekomendasi untuk pengembangan dan perbaikan instrumen yang dikembangkan pada penelitian skripsi ini.
7. Ibu Fiji Indriani dan Bapak Rahadian selaku Staf Tata Usaha Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling yang telah banyak membantu administrasi selama perkuliahan.

8. Kepala Sekolah dan Guru Sekolah Dasar di Kabupaten Sumedang yang telah memberikan izin untuk melaksanakan penelitian.
9. Peserta didik Sekolah Dasar di Kabupaten Sumedang yang telah bersedia berpartisipasi sebagai responden penelitian.
10. Ibu Karyati yang selalu mendoakan, memberikan dukungan, motivasi, dan semangat untuk dapat menyelesaikan skripsi ini tepat pada waktunya.
11. Cecep Somantri dan Selsya Nurhabibah yang telah membiayai dan mengatur keuangan untuk keperluan studi ini bahkan dari mulai proses seleksi masuk perguruan tinggi negeri hingga selesai.
12. Keluarga besar Bani Ating yang selalu mendoakan dan memberikan dukungan.
13. Anak Om Hajee, Ghaida, Nela, Aisyah dan Resa yang selalu membantu, kebersamai, dan memberikan motivasi hingga skripsi ini selesai.
14. Geng Gincu, Resni, Novi, dan Dwina yang selalu memberikan dukungan dan saling menguatkan di tengah penyelesaian skripsi ini sampai dengan selesai.
15. Teman-teman KMBK 2019 yang telah berjuang bersama selama empat tahun perkuliahan sampai dengan selesai.

Ucapan terima kasih juga disampaikan kepada semua pihak yang telah memberikan dukungan dan doa yang tidak dapat penulis sebutkan satu per satu. Semoga Allah Swt. membalas semua kebaikan yang telah diberikan.

Bandung, Agustus 2023



Lulu Noorkholisoh
NIM 1906225

ABSTRAK

Lulu Noorkholisoh. 1906225. Pengembangan Instrumen Kreativitas Peserta Didik Sekolah Dasar. Bimbingan dan Konseling. Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Penelitian dilatarbelakangi oleh pentingnya pengembangan instrumen kreativitas bagi peserta didik di Sekolah Dasar sebagai alat untuk mengukur dan mengembangkan kreativitasnya. Tujuan penelitian ini untuk mengembangkan instrumen tes kreativitas berdasarkan teori Torrance yang terdiri dari empat aspek yaitu *fluency*, *flexibility*, *originality*, dan *elaboration*. Metode yang digunakan yaitu survei dengan *crosssectional study design*. Jumlah partisipan pada penelitian ini 772 orang peserta didik Sekolah Dasar dari salah satu Kabupaten di Indonesia. Analisis data menggunakan *Rasch Model* pada aplikasi *Winsteps Versi 3.73*. Hasil unidimensionalitas menunjukkan bahwa nilai *unexplained variance in 1st to 5st contrast* kurang dari 15% artinya konstruk instrumen tes kreativitas hanya mengukur satu variabel kreativitas secara utuh tanpa dipengaruhi variabel lain. Hasil analisis *item measure* menunjukkan tingkat kesukaran *item* menyebar terbagi empat mulai dari *item* yang sangat sulit, sulit, mudah dan sangat mudah. Seluruh *item fit* pada analisis *Rasch Model* menunjukkan isi instrumen sudah sesuai untuk mengukur kreativitas peserta didik di Sekolah Dasar. Analisis *summary statistic* menunjukkan instrumen sudah reliabel dengan nilai *Alpha Cronbach* 0.9, nilai *person reliability* 0.91 dan *item reliability* 1.00 menunjukkan konsistensi jawaban peserta didik pada kategori bagus sekali dan kualitas *item* pada instrumen kategorinya istimewa. Instrumen kreativitas yang valid dan reliabel dapat digunakan sebagai alat ukur asesmen program kurikulum merdeka yang hasilnya digunakan sebagai bahan pertimbangan pembuatan program pembelajaran untuk mengembangkan hasil belajar peserta didik di Sekolah Dasar.

Kata Kunci: instrumen, kreativitas, *rasch* model, sekolah dasar, validitas.

ABSTRACT

Lulu Noorkholisoh. 1906225. *Development of Creativity Instrument for Elementary School Students. Guidance and Counseling. Faculty of Education. Indonesian University of Education*

The research is motivated by the importance of developing creativity instruments for elementary school students as a tool to measure and develop their creativity. The purpose of this research is to develop a creativity test instrument based on Torrance's theory which consists of four aspects, namely fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration. The method used is a survey with a cross-sectional study design. The number of participants in this study were 772 elementary school students from one of the districts in Indonesia. Data analysis used the Rasch Model on the Winsteps Version 3.73 application. The unidimensionality results show that the value of unexplained variance in 1st to 5th contrast is less than 15%, meaning that the construct of the creativity test instrument only measures one creativity variable as a whole without being influenced by other variables. The results of the item measure analysis show that the difficulty level of the items is divided into four, starting from very difficult, difficult, easy and very easy items. All fit items in the Rasch Model analysis show that the contents of the instrument are suitable for measuring the creativity of elementary school students. Statistical summary analysis shows that the instrument is reliable with a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.9, a person reliability value of 0.91 and item reliability of 1.00 indicating the consistency of student answers in the excellent category and the quality of the items in the instrument category are special. Valid and reliable creativity instruments can be used as a measuring tool for assessing independent curriculum programs whose results are used as material for consideration in making learning programs to develop student learning outcomes in elementary schools.

Keywords: instrument, creativity, Rasch model, elementary school, validity.

DAFTAR ISI

LEMBAR HAK CIPTA	i
LEMBAR PENGESAHAN	ii
LEMBAR PERNYATAAN	iii
UCAPAN TERIMA KASIH	iv
ABSTRAK	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
DAFTAR ISI	viii
DAFTAR TABEL	x
DAFTAR GAMBAR	xi
DAFTAR LAMPIRAN	xii
BAB I PENDAHULUAN	1
1.1 Latar Belakang Masalah.....	1
1.2 Rumusan Masalah	6
1.3 Tujuan Penelitian	7
1.4 Manfaat Penelitian	7
1.5 Struktur Organisasi Skripsi	8
BAB II KAJIAN PUSTAKA	10
1.1 Konsep Dasar Kreativitas.....	10
2.1.1 Definisi Kreativitas	10
2.1.2 Aspek-aspek Kreativitas	11
2.1.3 Dinamika Perkembangan Kreativitas	12
2.1.4 Pendekatan 4-P Kreativitas	14
2.1.5 Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kreativitas	15
2.1.6 Intervensi Kreativitas	18
2.1.7 Alat Ukur Kreativitas	19
2.2 Pengembangan Instrumen	29
2.2.1 Konseptualisasi konstruk ukur	30
2.2.2 Penulisan butir	31
2.2.3 Uji coba alat ukur	32
2.2.4 Analisis butir	33
2.2.5 Merakit alat ukur	34
2.3 Model analisis instrument	34
2.3.1 Teori Tes Klasik.....	34
2.3.2 Teori Respon Butir.....	36
2.4 Pengembangan Instrumen Kreativitas di Indonesia.....	41
2.5 Penelitian Terdahulu	42
BAB III METODE PENELITIAN	44
3.1 Paradigma dan Pendekatan Penelitian	44
3.2 Metode dan Desain Penelitian.....	44
3.3 Partisipan Penelitian.....	45
3.4 Instrumen Penelitian.....	46
3.5 Penimbangan Instrumen Penelitian.....	51
3.6 Prosedur Penelitian.....	52
3.7 Analisis Data	54

BAB IV TEMUAN DAN PEMBAHASAN	56
4.1 Temuan Penelitian.....	56
4. 1. 1 Unidimensionalitas	56
4. 1. 2 Tingkat kesukaran <i>Item (Item Measure)</i>	58
4. 1. 3 Tingkat Kesesuaian <i>Item</i>	60
4. 1. 4 Deteksi <i>Item</i> Bias.....	62
4. 1. 5 Uji Reliabilitas Instrumen.....	67
4.2 Pembahasan Penelitian	69
4.3 Keterbatasan Penelitian	74
BAB V SIMPULAN DAN REKOMENDASI.....	76
5. 1 Simpulan	76
5. 2 Rekomendasi	76
DAFTAR PUSTAKA	78
LAMPIRAN.....	84

DAFTAR TABEL

Tabel 3.1	Partisipan Penelitian.....	42
Tabel 3.2	Kisi-kisi Butir Instrumen Tes Kreativitas Peserta Didik.....	45
Tabel 3.3	Pedoman Penyekoran.....	47
Tabel 3.4	Uji Keterbacaan.....	48
Tabel 3.5	Analisis Instrumen Tes Kreativitas Peserta Didik Sekolah Dasar Melalui Rasch Model.....	52
Tabel 4.1	Kriteria Unidimensionalitas (<i>Explained variance</i>).....	54
Tabel 4.2	Kriteria Unidimensionalitas (<i>Unexplained variance</i>).....	54
Tabel 4.3	Hasil Uji Unidimensionalitas Instrumen Kreativitas.....	55
Tabel 4.4	Kategori Tingkat Kesukaran Item.....	56
Tabel 4.5	Tingkat Kesukaran Item.....	56
Tabel 4.6	Kriteria <i>Misfit</i>	58
Tabel 4.7	Tingkat Kesesuaian Butir Item.....	58
Tabel 4.8	Bias Gender.....	59
Tabel 4.9	Bias Usia.....	60
Tabel 4.10	Bias Tingkat Kelas.....	62
Tabel 4.11	Bias Asal Sekolah.....	63
Tabel 4.12	<i>Summary Statistic</i>	65

DAFTAR GAMBAR

Gambar 2.1	Peta Penelitian Kreativitas melalui <i>Vos Viewer</i>	40
Gambar 3.1	Prosedur Pengembangan Instrumen.....	49
Gambar 4.1	DIF Gender.....	60
Gambar 4.2	DIF Usia.....	61
Gambar 4.3	DIF Tingkat Kelas.....	62
Gambar 4.4	DIF Asal Sekolah.....	64

DAFTAR LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1	Administrasi Penelitian.....	81
Lampiran 2	Instrumen Penelitian.....	103
Lampiran 3	Hasil Pengolahan Data.....	116
Lampiran 4	Dokumentasi Penelitian.....	136
Lampiran 5	Riwayat Hidup Peneliti.....	130

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Abeare, C., Sabelli, A., Taylor, B., Holcomb, M., Dumitrescu, C., Kirsch, N., & Erdodi, L. (2019). The importance of demographically adjusted cutoffs: age and education bias in raw score cutoffs within the trail making test. *Psychological Injury and Law*, *12*(2), 170–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-019-09353-x>
- Alencar, E., Feldhusen, J. F., & Widlak, F. W. (1975). Creativity training in elementary schools in Brazil. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *44*(2), 23–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1976.11011544>
- Alfonso-Benlliure, V., Meléndez, J. C., & García-Ballesteros, M. (2013). Evaluation of a creativity intervention program for preschoolers. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *10*, 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2013.07.005>
- Amabile, T. M. (2001). Beyond talent. *Journal American Psychologist*, *56*(4), 333–336. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.333>
- Amelia, R. N. (2021). Identifikasi item fit dan person fit dalam pengukuran hasil belajar. *Jurnal Ilmiah WUNY*, *3*(1), 13–26.
- Barraza, P. (2019). The development of creativity in Chilean kindergarten and school children / Desarrollo de la creatividad en párvulos y escolares chilenos. *Estudios de Psicología*, *40*(3), 608–634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02109395.2019.1655220>
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control. *Child Development*, *37*(4), 887–907. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1126611>
- Beghetto, R. A., Kaufman, J. C., & Baxter, J. (2011). Answering the unexpected questions: Exploring the relationship between students' creative self-efficacy and teacher ratings of creativity. *Creativity, and the Arts*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/journals/aca/5/4/342/>
- Bolarinwa, O. (2015). Principles and methods of validity and reliability testing of questionnaires used in social and health science researches. *Nigerian Postgraduate Medical Journal*, *22*(4), 195. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1117-1936.173959>
- Bond, T., & Fox, C. (2015). *Applying the rasch model; fundamental measurement in the human sciences*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Boone, W., & Noltemeyer, A. (2017). Rasch Analysis: a primer for school psychology researchers and practitioners. *Cogent Education*, *4*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1416898>
- Brown, A. L., & Johnson, C. M. (2020). Developing gender-fair assessments: practical considerations and recommendations. *Educational Assessment*, *25*(1), 1-15.
- Carson, S. H., Peterson, J. B., & Higgins, D. M. (2005). Reliability, validity, and

- factor structure of the creative achievement questionnaire. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17(1), 37–50. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1701_4
- Chiu, F. C., Hsu, C. C., Lin, Y. N., Liu, C. H., Chen, H. C., & Lin, C. H. (2019). Effects of creative thinking and its personality determinants on negative emotion regulation. *Psychological Reports*, 122(3), 916–943. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294118775973>
- Cho, Y., Chung, H. Y., Choi, K., Seo, C., & Baek, E. (2013). The emergence of student creativity in classroom settings: A case study of elementary schools in korea. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 47(2), 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.29>
- Claxton, A. F. (2005). Developmental trends in the creativity of school-age children. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17(4), 327–335. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1704_4
- Craft, A. (1999). Implications of policy for practice creative development in the early years : some implications of policy for practice. *Curriculum Journal*, 10(1), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0958517990100110>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: qualitativ, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. In *SAGE Publications Inc*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22118993-90000268>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative. In *Pearson (Fourth Edi)*. Pearson.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). Scale development theory and applications. In *SAGE Publication (Fourth Edi)*.
- Dori, Y. J., Zohar, A., Fischer-Shachor, D., Kohan-Mass, J., & Carmi, M. (2018). Gender-fair assessment of young gifted students' scientific thinking skills. *International Journal of Science Education*, 40(6), 595–620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1431419>
- Doron, E. (2017). Fostering creativity in school aged children through perspective taking and visual media based short term intervention program. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 23, 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2016.12.003>
- Ershadi, M., Winner, E., College, B., Hill, C., & States, U. (2020). *Children ' s Creativity*. 1, 144–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809324-5.23693-6>
- Fearon, D. (2013). The relationship between parenting styles and creativity in a sample of jamaican children. *Creativity Research Journal*, 25(1), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2013.752287>
- Feist, G. (1998). Personality and social psychology review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(4), 290–309. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0204>
- Fleith, D. D. S., Renzulli, J. S., & Westberg, K. L. (2002). Effects of a creativity training program on divergent thinking abilities and self-concept in monolingual and bilingual classrooms. *Creativity Research Journal*, 14(3–4),

373–386. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1434_8

- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). Educational Research: An Introduction. In *Allyn & Bacon*
- Garaigordobil, M. (2006). Intervention in creativity with children aged 10 and 11 years: Impact of a play program on verbal and graphic-figural creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(3), 329–345. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1803_8
- Guilford, J. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444–454. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063487>
- Guilford, J. (1957). Creative abilities in the arts. *Psychological Review*, 64(2), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048280>
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The Nature of Human Intelligence*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Guo, J., & Woulfin, S. (2016). Twenty-first century creativity : An investigation of How the partnership for 21st century instructional framework reflects the principles of creativity. *Roepers Review*, 38(3), 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2016.1183741>
- Hamdu, G., Fuadi, F. N., Yulianto, A., & Akhironi, Y. S. (2020). Items Quality analysis using rasch model to measure elementary school students' critical thinking skill on stem learning. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 9(1), 61. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i1.20884>
- Hayat, B., Putra, M. D. K., & Suryadi, B. (2020). Comparing item parameter estimates and fit statistics of the Rasch model from three different traditions. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 24(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.21831/pep.v24i1.29871>
- Hébert, T. P. (2013). Illuminating our understanding of creativity: The life and legacy of E. Paul Torrance (1915–2003). In *A Century of Contributions to Gifted Education: Illuminating Lives* (pp. 163–180). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203154489>
- Huang, S. Y., Ko, P. J., Lin, H. H., Dai, R. H., & Chen, H. C. (2021). Creative thinking counseling teaching program can improve the creativity, creative tendency, and self-concept of grade 7 students: a quasi-experimental Study. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 55(3), 819–838. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.491>
- Ishak, A. H., Osman, M. R., Mahaiyadin, M. H., Tumiran, M. A., & Anas, N. (2018). Examining unidimensionality of psychometric properties via rasch model. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 9(9), 1462–1467.
- Karabatsos, G. (2003). Comparing the aberrant response detection performance of Thirty-Six Person-Fit Statistics. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 16, 277–298. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324818AME1604_2
- Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (2019). The cambridge handbook of creativity. In

Cambridge University Press (Second Edi). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/9781316979839>

- Kim, K. (2006). The latent structure and measurement invariance of scores on the torrance tests of creative thinking-figural. In *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(3), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282456>
- Kim, K H. (2006). Is creativity unidimensional or multidimensional? Analyses of the torrance tests of creative thinking. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(3), 251–259. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1803_2
- Kim, Kyung Hee. (2006). Can we trust creativity tests? A review of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT). *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1801_2
- Kim, Kyung Hee. (2011). The creativity crisis: the decrease in creative thinking scores on the Torrance tests of creative thinking. *Creativity Research Journal*, 23(4), 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2011.627805>
- Kupers, E. (2019). Children’s creativity: a theoretical framework and systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(1), 93–124. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318815707>
- Licul, N., & Jurišević, M. (2020). The perception of creative classroom climate in elementary school students: Comparison between regular and enriched visual art classes. *High Ability Studies*, 1(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2020.1855124>
- Lim, S., Smith, J., & Lim, S. (2008). The Structural Relationships of Parenting Style , Creative Personality , and Loneliness The Structural Relationships of Parenting Style , Creative Personality , and Loneliness. *Journal Creative Behavior*. 20(4), 412–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400410802391868>
- Mackinnon, D. (1967). Assessing creative persons. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 1(3), 291–304. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.1967.tb00030.x>
- MacKinnon, D. W. (2014). The nature and nurture of creative talent. *The Discovery of Talent*, 184–211. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674864207.c8>
- Magno, C. (2009). Demonstrating the difference between classical test theory and item response theory using derived test data. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 1(1), 1–11.
- Mehrinejad, S. A., Rajabimoghadam, S., & ... (2015). The relationship between parenting styles and creativity and the predictability of creativity by parenting styles. *Procedia-Social*, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815050326>
- Moltafet, G., Sadat, S., Firoozabadi, S., Pour-raisi, A., & Moltafet, G. (2018). parenting style , basic psychological needs , and emotional creativity : a path analysis parenting style , basic psychological needs , and emotional creativity : a path analysis. *Creativity Research Journal*, 30(2), 187–194.
- Moss, P. A. (2003). Reconceptualizing validity for classroom assessment.

- Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 22(4), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2003.tb00140.x>
- Neel, M. L. M., Stark, A. R., & Maitre, N. L. (2018). *Parenting style impacts cognitive and behavioural outcomes of former preterm infants : A systematic review*. 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12561>
- Nurhudaya, Taufik, A., Yudha, E. S., & Suryana, D. (2019). The Raven's advanced progressive matrices in education assessment with a Rasch analysis. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(9), 1996–2002. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.070921>
- Pichotac, N., Bonettoabc, E., Pavanaia, J. B., Arciszewskia, T., Bonnardel, N., & Weisbergd, R. W. (2020). The construct validity of creativity: empirical arguments in favor of novelty as the basis for creativity. *Review of Research in Education*, 46(1), 288–323. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/wtd8n>
- Piirto, J. (2011). Creativity for 21st Century skills: how to embed creativity into the curriculum. In Sense Publisher.
- Rhodes, M. (1961). An analysis of creativity. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 42(7), 305–310. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20342603>
- Runco, M. A. (1999). A longitudinal study of exceptional giftedness and creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 12(2), 161–164. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1202_8
- Runco, M. A. (2014). Creativity: theories and themes: research, development, and practice. In Elseiver. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2012-0-06920-7>
- Runco, M. A., Johnson, D. J., Runco, M. A., & Johnson, D. J. (2010). *Parents ' and Teachers ' Implicit Theories of Children ' s Creativity : A Cross-Cultural Perspective Parents ' and Teachers ' Implicit Theories of Children ' s Creativity : A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. 14(3), 37–41.
- Saggar, M., Xie, H., Beaty, R. E., Stankov, A. D., Schreier, M., & ... (2019). Creativity slumps and bumps: Examining the neurobehavioral basis of creativity development during middle childhood. *NeuroImage*, 94–101. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811919302794>
- Sak, U., & Maker, C. J. (2010). Developmental Variation in Children ' s Creative Mathematical Thinking as a Function of Schooling , Age , and Knowledge. *Creativiti Research Journal* 18(3), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1803>
- Smith, J. K., & Johnson, L. M. (2019). Gender Bias in Educational Measurement: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 56(1), 121–141.
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sumintono, B., & Widhiarso, W. (2014). *Aplikasi model Rasch untuk penelitian ilmu-ilmu sosial*. Trim Komunikata Publishing House.

- Sumintono, B., & Widhiarso, W. (2015). *Aplikasi Permodelan Rasch Pada Assessment Pendidikan*. Trim Komunikata.
- Taufiq, A., Yudha, E. S., Md, Y. H., & Suryana, D. (2021). examining the supervision work alliance scale: a rasch model approach. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 14(1), 179–184. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874350102114010179>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach’s alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Torrance, E P. (1966). *Torrance test of creative thinking. Figural íest Booklet A*. Personnel Press, Massachusetts.
- Torrance, E P. (1971). *creativity in communication with young children*. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED073835>
- Torrance, E P. (1972). *Can we teach children to think creatively?.* ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED061544>
- Torrance, E Paul. (1967). Understanding the fourth grade slump in creative thinking. Final report. *Final Report of USOE Cooperative Research Project*, 443. <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:understanding+the+fourth+grade+slump+in+creative+thinking#0>
- Torrance, E Paul. (1968). A longitudinal examination of lifestyles. *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 26(3), 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698626801200401>
- Wibisono, S. (2018). The application of rasch model for moslem fundamentalism instrument validation [In Bahasa]. *Jurnal Pengukuran Psikologi Dan Pendidikan Indonesia (JP3I)*, 5(1).
- Williams, R. K., & Martinez, J. K. (2019). Developing age-neutral assessment instruments: strategies and considerations. *Educational Assessment*, 24(3), 245-262.
- Willis, G. (2005). Cognitive Interviewing: a tool for improving questionnaire design. In *Sage Publications*.
- Zachopoulou, E. (2009). Evaluation of children’s creativity: psychometric properties of torrance’s “thinking creatively in action and movement” test. *Early Child Development and Care*, 179(3), 317–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430601078669>
- Zainudin, M., Subali, B., & Jailani. (2019). Construct validity of mathematical creativity instrument: First-order and second-order confirmatory factor analysis. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 595–614. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12336a>