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Abstract: Group counseling as a guidance and counseling service does not have a standard instrument yet in assessing its activities. This study was designed to develop a group counseling assessment instrument. Specifically, this study conducted content validity, empirical validity, and internal reliability of group counseling assessment instruments. The results of the study revealed that the group counseling assessment instrument was effective for assessing group counseling activities in senior high school (SMA) settings. This was tested from the results of the analysis of content validity (CVR) above 0.62. The results of empirical validity show a good coefficient of validity where the highest coefficient is 0.609 and the lowest is 0.300. The results of the analysis of internal reliability showed a high level of reliability, with (α) = 0.935. From the analysis by the SEM method shows that the relationship between variables in each dimension shows the highest correlation coefficient is 0.84 while the lowest is 0.60. This group counseling assessment instrument also has high external validity because it is assessed by experts (panelists) with different educational and cultural backgrounds and respondents who also have different demographic and cultural backgrounds.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Group counseling programs provide individuals with types of group experiences that help them learn how to give function effectively, to develop tolerance for stress and anxiety, and to find satisfaction in working and living with others (Berg & Landreth, 2011) so that, it can construct a conducive learning environment that makes students learn comfortably (Amri & Elisah, 2011: 57). The advantage of group counseling services is, there is group dynamics shown by active, vibrant and dynamic conditions (Walgito 2010) that make group activities happy, fun and not monotonous. Group counseling is more effective in facilitating the alleviation of problem compared to individual counseling because the client is assisted by several people who are members of the group (Pérusse, Goodnough, & Lee, 2009). In addition, when compared with the services available in guidance and counseling, group counseling is a service that able to reach many people in a fast, precise and short time.

Students in Senior High Schools have a lot of needs in their development for being an optimal personalities (Lian et al, 2018; Renata et al, 2018; Andriani et al, 2018; Tobari et al, 2018; Apriana et al, 2019). One of the duty of the development of senior high school age students is wanting to be part of a group, wanting to be accepted in a group, wanting to gain self-understanding from others, and wanting to be involved in the process of interpersonal relations (Wibowo, 2001; Hurlock, 1999; Irmayani et al, 2018). Individual counseling services have not been able to meet these needs in a relatively short and concurrent time so that the use of group counseling is the most strategic alternative choice, effective and has an adequate contribution in developing personal, prevention and alleviation problems (Wibowo, 2001). Various studies reveal the magnitude of the benefits of group counseling activities. Among them is group counseling at school is the main tool to support student growth and development (Pérusse, Goodnough, & Lee, 2009), improve student learning discipline (Mardia 2014) and increase student self-esteem (Tri Oktha, Muswardi and Shinta, 2014).

Not only that, group counseling can increase student confidence (Imro‘atun, 2017). To see the success of group counseling services, it is necessary to do an assessment of group counseling. The assessment is carried out in order to find out or obtain accurate information about the success of the activities that have been carried out (Anjar, 2012; Kristiawan and Elnanda, 2017; Kristiawan et al, 2016; Wandasari et al, 2019) and as a form of accountability for guidance and counseling services (Farozin, 2017). So that one of the professional competencies of the supervisors listed in the Minister of National Education Regulation No. 27/2008 is to assess the process and results of the guidance and counseling activities. Evaluation and follow-up activities become useful assessment tools if held every week (Bates, 1968; Swank, Lambie, & Witta (2012) explain that the Council Standards for Accreditation of Counseling and Educational Programs (CACREP) and the American Counseling Association (ACA) Code of Ethics discuss the importance of counselors' professional attitudes and behavior in providing ethical and effective services. However, difficulties arise in identifying and measuring counseling skills. Like a wise with the skills in carrying out group counseling. Based on field analysis, group counseling assessment is only focused on the results obtained by students who participate in these activities. Assessment only focuses on the success of group counseling in alleviating problems of students in the group. assessment so far is only subjective because it does not have standardized instruments (Anjar, 2012; Mashudi, 2018; Kristiawan et al, 2019). The assessment of group counseling should not only focus on results but also on the process (Prayitno, et al, 2017). From that, in this study will develop an effective group counseling assessment instrument for students at the Senior High School level.

2 THEORITICAL REVIEW

2.1 Group Counseling

Group counseling is an activity that provides a therapeutic effect (Gadza, George, 1989; Winkel & Hastuti, 2006) for group members who follow it. Group counseling can solve problems experienced by students in school (Prayitno, et al, 2017) and personal and interpersonal problems (DeLucia-Waack, Janice L, 2004). In addition to solving problems, group counseling provides a miniature of community life so students
can develop communication and socialization skills (Prayitno, et al., 2017; Elida Prayitno, 2007; Winkel & Hastuti, 2006; Wibowo, 2001) and can enhance the interpersonal skills needed (Shakoor, 2004). Why does group counseling have such a positive impact on group members? Because in group counseling there is group dynamics that make the group atmosphere active and happy (Prayitno, et al., 2017). The dynamics of this group will arise if all the components in group counseling contribute to the creation of group dynamics. There are two components in group counseling, namely group members and group leaders (Prayitno, et al., 2017; Elida Prayitno, 2007; Winkel & Hastuti, 2006; Wibowo, 2001). Components of group members who contribute to group dynamics are if group members are minded and willing to follow the process of group activities, familiar, open to all their feelings and thoughts, respecting other group members by giving them the opportunity to think, appreciate and realize that group counseling is very important for him (Prayitno, et al., 2017). The second component is group leaders. Even though group members play a very large role in group dynamics, this role will not occur if the group leader does not perform his role (Yocum, 2017).

2.2 Assessment in Group Counseling
Assessment provides an interpretation of the measurement data whether it is appropriate or deviates from existing criteria (Sudijono, 2001). Assessment according to Yusuf (2017: 14) is the process of collecting data and/or information (including processing and documentation) systematically about an attribute, person or object, both in the form of qualitative and quantitative data about the amount, condition, ability and progress of an attribute, object or person, individual being assessed, without reference to a value judgment. Winkel & Hastuti (2006) explained that assessment activities meant forming opinions about the efficiency and effectiveness of all efforts to achieve a goal by using certain standards or criteria as a benchmark. Assessment of counseling activities is a demand for a counselor in increasing the accountability of their services. This greatly influences the counselor's responsibility to improve his services to clients (Wheeler & Loesch, 1981). In group counseling, assessment is not based on the criteria of right-wrong but more development-oriented. So the assessment in group counseling is more on the service process (Prayitno, et al., 2017). Badrujaman (2011) explains that process assessment aims to provide information as a basis for improving services and assessing service procedures. Group counseling as one of the activities that utilize groups so that to analyze group processes can be done by assessing the content and service processes (Winkel & Hastuti, 2006; Furr & Barret, 2000; Wheeler & Loesch, 1981; Pattison, 1965). The dimension of content refers to what is the focus of the group's attention, related to the goals to be achieved relating to what is done, what is discussed and what is talked about. Prayitno, et al (2017) explain that the dimensions of this content relate to the material discussed, the extent to which the material is understood and what the benefits are obtained by group members from the material. Winkel & Hastuti, (2005: 548) explained that the dimension of process in groups shows how content is handled, by how the group works, by how the group organizes discussion traffic, by how the group analyzes the problems encountered and seeks problem solving together, in a way how the group maintains and fosters togetherness in the group so that all members feel involved. Group processes are interpersonal interactions that take place in a group at a certain time (Garrett, 2005). Based on the opinion above, the basic components in the process dimension are: organizational structure and the purpose of group formation, interaction and communication between group members, cohesion and togetherness as cohesion units, forward movement or steps needed by the group to arrive on goals and leadership.

3 RESEARCH METHODS
This research develops a group counseling assessment instrument that starts from examining group counseling assessment so far, then examines concepts, determines dimensions and indicators, prepares the grids, arranges instrument points, expert studies, analyzes expert studies, refines the instruments, field trials and analysis of validity and reliability and finally a group.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
This research began by collecting information related to the assessment of group counseling. From the information collection, obtained the results that the assessment of group counseling which has been carried out in a group counseling activities are done without using any methods and tools to assess. According to Winkel & Hastuti (2006) the assessment which done by not using certain methods and tools to assess is informal in which the assessment is not strong enough to be used as the basis for decisions taking. This informal assessment is also subjective or just a consideration of feelings that scientifically cannot be accounted for. Furthermore, the weakness of the assessment so far, only assessing in terms of results obtained by students as members of the group after they joined the group counseling activities. Whereas, the assessment in guidance and counseling is not only in terms of results but also in terms of the service process. Prayitno, et al (2017) explain that the assessment in group counseling is more emphasized on the development, so that the assessment is done on the service process. Another weakness is the assessment of group counseling so far, is only analyzing or assessing one dimension of group counseling, namely group members. Whereas, in assessing a group, can be assessed in the terms of the material discussed and the achievement of group goals by group members, in terms of group organizing, in the terms of group cohesion, and in the terms of group steps in achieving group goals and the role of group leaders (Winkel & Hastuti, 2006; Furr & Barret, 2000; Wheeler & Loesch, 1981). A literature study conducted to find the dimensions and indicators for evaluating group counselling activities. The dimension's formulation and group counselling's indicators assessment instruments then obtained. The assessment of group counselling in this study consist of two dimensions, they are the dimensions of the content and dimensions of the process. The dimensions of content's indicators are the objectives and material in group counselling. The purpose of group counselling is to develop group members' views of their problems and feelings and help them to understand the causes of their problems (Elida, 2007; Winkel & Hastuti, 2006; Dinkmayer & Muro, 1979) the material in group counseling based on research conducted by Distefano, Holimah & Barker (2015) who developed GTES (Group Topic Evaluation Scale) to evaluate client responses to topics discussed in groups. Based on research conducted by Destefano, et al, it can be
concluded that in assessing the content dimensions of group counselling can be seen by benefits of the topics for group members, the relevance of topics to the needs of group members, the development of skills felt by group members of the topics discussed and the changes occur in group members after understanding the topic. The dimension of process in group counselling assessment shows how group counselling work to achieve its goals. Indicators in the dimension process include organizational structure and the purpose of group formation, interaction and communication between group members, cohesion and togetherness as a unit that is mutually bound (cohesion), forward movement or steps taken by the group to reach the goals and leadership (Yocum, A., 2017; Lee, A., 2014; Winkel & Hastuti, 2006). Indicators of organizational structure and the purpose of forming groups shows that the group in the process of implementing group counselling is an informal group type of during the activity there is no distribution of tasks within the group (Winkel & Hastuti, 2006). This informal organizational structure is related to the goals of group counselling where the purpose of group counselling is to solve problems experienced by members of group counselling (Winkel & Hastuti, 2006; Wibowo, 2001; Prayitno, 2017). All group members have an obligation to solve the problem that is being experienced by the group members. Not only can solve group member problems, group counselling can also indirectly developed the social skills of group members. The purpose of group counselling must also be understood by group members. These goals must be explained in advance by the group leader so that the goals can be agreed and accepted by all group members (Irmaryani et al, 2018; Andriani et al, 2018; Salwa et al, 2019; Khasanah et al, 2019; Apriana et al, 2019; Sarina et al, 2019). Furthermore Prayitno, et al (2017: 40) explain that the importance of shared goals is accepted and agreed upon by all group members will make group members act in accordance with these goals. In addition, this goal must be attractive to group members, appropriate to the needs of each group member, can be reached in a short time, quite challenging and gives satisfaction to group members when it is achieved (Berg, RC, & Landreth, G. L., 2011; Winkel & Hastuti, 2006). The interaction’s indicator and communication between group members shows that group counselling should be dynamic where Jacob, et al (2015) explain the characteristics of dynamic group counselling communication is the improvement of each group’s member participation in expressing ideas or opinions, the occurrence of collaborative activities in sharing ideas in solving problems, the creation of close interactions, the attainment of a deep awareness of group problems and democratic group leadership. Indicators of cohesion and togetherness as interdependent units (cohesion) indicate the presence of all members when gathering, coming on time and not leaving the meeting before its end, expressing mutual trust and mutual support, accepting each other’s personality traits of group members, the excitement atmosphere during group meetings, and no clashes appearing that pursue their own interests apart from group interests (Macgoan, 2003). The step’s indicators which done by the group counselling to achieve the target indicated in some steps of group counselling the first is opening, this is a process for group members to understand and follow group counselling activities (Prayitno, et al, 2017), the second step is the stage of explaining problem (Winkel & Hastuti, 2006), the third step is the stage of excavating the problem and solving the problem. The fourth stage is the process of evaluating the understanding, satisfaction and effort that will be done by group members after the group counselling activity ends. The final indicator of the dimension process is leadership which can be seen from the ability of group leaders to carry out group counselling in terms of active listening, reflecting, ability to explain and ask questions, use voice, use eyes, conclude, provide descriptions and information, provide encouragement and support, regulate atmosphere group, model and open oneself, and identify allies (Furr & Barret, 2000; Ohrt, Robinson & Hagedorn, 2013; Yacob, Masson & Harvill, 2015). Then, the group counselling assessment instrument was tested for content validity by 10 panelists consist of experts in guiding and counselling, instrumentation experts and linguists. Content validation is analysed by the CVR formula or content validity ratio (Cohen & Swerdlik: 2010). From the CVR calculation results, the group counselling assessment instrument consist of 46 items and assessed by 10 panelists, has 43 items with a CVR coefficient of more than 0.62 where the highest item has a CVR coefficient of 1 and the lowest is 0.6. Whereas 3 more items have a CVR coefficient under 0.62. This means that out of 46 instrument items there are 43 valid items and 3 invalid items. Besides carrying out CVR calculations, panelists also provided notes of improvement. These improvement notes make the instrument get additional points. The group counselling instrument analyzed from CVR had 43 valid items, becoming 50 items because of the addition of the note. After the content validity test, a limited field test was conducted at SMA N 2 Rejang Lebong and SMA N 4 Rejang Lebong with a total of 100 students filling up the instrument. The results of limited trials show the highest validity coefficient is 0.662 and the lowest is 0.238 so that of the 50 instruments that have been formulated, 49 items are declared valid with a good coefficient reliability of 0.929. After a limited test, the group counselling assessment instrument carried out a wider test conducted at 4 schools consisting of SMA N 1 Kepahyang, SMA N 2 Bengkulu, SMA N 1 North Bengkulu and SMA N 1 South Bengkulu with a total number of students is 200 people who have done group counselling activities. Broader trial results indicate that 49 items are declared valid because the coefficient correlation is more than 0.3. In the content dimension’s validity analysis, the highest coefficient correlation is 6.09 and the lowest is 0.300. Whereas in the process dimension analysis, the highest correlation coefficient is 6.03 and the lowest is 3.27 with a high reliability coefficient that is alpha at 0.935. When compared with the Group Topic Scale (GTS) instrument, which has good internal consistency, α = 0.86 with a total of 190 respondents, the group counselling assessment is 7 points superior to the GTS instrument and when compared to the Group Engagement Measurement (GEM instrument) with internal consistency α = 0.93, the group counselling assessment instrument is quite consistent with the previous instrument. Furthermore, the instruments were analyzed through SEM (Structural Equation Modelling). From SEM model, the number of instrument items was initially 49 to 42. This point reduction is because the coefficient correlation obtained below 0.40 or only 40% contributes to the instrument indicator. 42 items have coefficient correlation between variables in the content dimension of 0.88 or a correlation between variables of 88%. On the process dimension, the highest correlation coefficient between variables is 0.79 or the correlation between variables is 79%. This 0.79 correlation
found in the interaction variable with the group leadership variable and the group interaction variable with the variable steps in the group items. The lowest coefficient correlation in the process dimension is 0.58 or the correlation between variables is 58%. This 0.58 correlation is found in the group structure variable with the variable steps taken by the group. The results of the SEM analysis shows that the group counselling assessment instrument has high level of validity and good so that this assessment instrument already has fulfill the requirement as a good measurement tool. This group counselling assessment instrument has good practicality because it is very easy to use. Only by asking group members to give scores on statement items in the instrument, the teacher can process the scores to get a conclusion on the quality of the group counselling services they did. Even in terms of cost, assessments using this instrument are also inexpensive because they only multiply the instrument sheets and are distributed to group members including approximately 8 to 10 people. The processing of the instruments that have been filled out does not require large costs because the teacher's guidance and counselling simply sums the scores of each instrument that has been filled out by group members. In terms of administration, group counselling assessment instruments are very easy to administer. Simply by reading the instrument use guidelines, guidance and counselling teachers can find out and understand how to administer the group counselling assessment instruments. The instrument scoring method has also been stated in the assessment guidance so that the guidance and counselling teacher would not be confused in correcting and determining the quality of the group counselling services they did. Likewise in the terms of time, the time spent is also short because group members only give an assessment for 42 points contained in the group counselling assessment instrument. Matondang (2009) explains that in the preparation of a measuring instrument expected to facilitate its use, both for the teacher themselves and other people who will use and objects that will be used. The implementation instructions are needed in order to facilitate implementation. The group counselling assessment instrument has been equipped with instructions on how to use it, the answer key and scoring guidelines and its scoring determination. The implementation instructions are not only aimed at group members but how the procedures for carrying out the assessment can be understood and carried out properly by others who will use the assessment. The instructions contained in this instrument are a requirement that a good instrument has a norm. Yusuf (2017) explains that norms are a benchmark, criteria or measurement used to determine the standard of success of an assessed activity. In the group counselling assessment instrument, norms/criteria/measures of the quality of group counselling activities have been provided by the guidance and counselling teacher.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The research results showed that the counselling teacher’s assessment instrument in group counselling activities had good instrument requirement where the instrument's validity was good, the instrument's reliability was good, it was practically used and had guidelines in carrying out the assessment. From this point, it is expected that the supervisor will be able to use the group counselling assessment instrument to assess the activities that have been done.
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