

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Ali, O., Ibrahim, I., & Farouq Varouqa, I. (2020). *Materials Management on Construction Sites Using RFID Technique*.
- Amar, M. Yunus. (2020). *Identifikasi Gaya Kepemimpinan Manajer dan Hubungannya dengan Produktifitas Karyawan*. Unhas Press: Makassar
- Andi, Susandi, Wijaya. (2003). *On Representing Factors Influencing Time Performance Of Shop-House Constructions In Surabaya, Dimensi Tekhnik Sipil*. Vol. 5 No. 2, September.
- Antonacopoulou, E. P., & Sheaffer, Z. (2014). Learning in Crisis: Rethinking the Relationship Between Organizational Learning and Crisis Management. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(1), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492612472730>
- Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and Crisis Management: Integration, Interpretation, and Research Development. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1661–1692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316680030>
- Budihartono. (2008). *Management Proyek*.
- Cutlip, S. M. , A. H. Center. , & G. M. Broom. (2000). *Effective Public Relations* (Eight Edition). Prentice Hall.
- Dipohusodo, I. (1996). *Management Proyek dan Konstruksi (Jilid 2)*. Penerbit Kanisius.
- Djohanputro, B. (2008). *Management Risiko*. PPM.
- Elawi, G. S. A., Algahtany, M., & Kashiwagi, D. (2016). *Owners' Perspective of Factors Contributing to Project Delay: Case Studies of Road and Bridge Projects in Saudi Arabia*. *Procedia Engineering*, 145, 1402–1409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2016.04.176>
- Fahmi, I. (2010). *Management Risiko : Teori, Kasus, dan Solusi*. Alfabeta.
- Faisal Gerardo, B. S. S. E. S. H. W. W. (2016). *Analisis Perbandingan Tebal Lapis Tambah Perkerasan Lentur Menggunakan Metode AASHTO 1993 Dan Program Everseries Studi Kasus: Ruas BTS*. Pamanukan - Sewa Pantura.
- Fernandes, G., Ward, S., & Araújo, M. (2014). Developing a framework for embedding useful project management improvement initiatives in organizations. *Project Management Journal*, 45(4), 81–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21441>

- Ghozali, Imam. 2018. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS*. 25. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro: Semarang.
- Gajewska, E. and M. Ropel. (2011). *Risk Management Practices in a Construction Project—a case study*. Chalmers University of Technology.
- Heravi, G., & Gholami, A. (2018). The Influence of Project Risk Management Maturity and Organizational Learning on the Success of Power Plant Construction Projects. *Project Management Journal*, 49(5), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972818786661>
- Hon, A. H. Y., & Chan, W. W. (2013). The Effects of Group Conflict and Work Stress on Employee Performance. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(2), 174–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965513476367>
- Hopkin, Paul. (2010). *Fundamentals of Risks Management : Understanding, Evaluating and Implementing Effective Risk Management*. Kogan Page.
- Iskandar, Y., Susetyo, B., & Suroso, D. A. (2022). *Pengaruh Contract Change Order (CCO) Terhadap Kinerja Biaya Pada Proyek Hunian Bertingkat Tinggi*. In *Jurnal Konstruksia* | (Vol. 13).
- Jusoh, Z. M., & Kasim, N. (2017). *A Review on Implication of Material Management to Project Performance*.
- Kahn, W. A., Barton, M. A., & Fellows, S. (2013). Organizational crises and the disturbance of relational systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3), 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0363>
- Kementrian PUPR. (2017). *prosedur-pengajuan-persetujuan-kontrak-tahun-jamak-multi-years-contract*.
- Kountur, R. (2004). *Management Risiko Operasional: Memahami Cara Mengelola Risiko Operasional Perusahaan*. PPM.
- Latif, H., Tuğçe, &, & Ab, E. (2017). Strategic Communication in Chaos Management and a Case Study. In *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences* www.kspjournals.org (Vol. 4). www.kspjournals.org
- Latif, H. , & U. C. G. (2014). First 90 days of a sports manager: Chaos, Living two months as two years and regret. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(11), 125.
- Levy, D. (1994). CHAOS THEORY AND STRATEGY: THEORY, APPLICATION. AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS. In *Strategic Management Journal* (Vol. 15).
- Li, Q., Liu, R., Sun, Q., & Wang, F. (2014). *Research of Automatic Progress Report Generation for Railway Construction Projects in China*.

- Liu, B. F., & Fraustino, J. D. (2014). Beyond image repair: Suggestions for crisis communication theory development. In *Public Relations Review* (Vol. 40, Issue 3, pp. 543–546). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.04.004>
- Minooei, F., Sobin, N., Goodrum, P. M., & Molenaar, K. R. (2018a). Managing public communication strategies in accelerated highway construction projects. *Transportation Research Record*, 2672(26), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198118759943>
- Mills, A. (2001). *A systematic approach to risk management for construction*. *Structural Survey*, 19(5), 245-252.
- Minooei, F., Sobin, N., Goodrum, P. M., & Molenaar, K. R. (2018b). Managing public communication strategies in accelerated highway construction projects. *Transportation Research Record*, 2672(26), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198118759943>
- Mohamed, M., & Tran, D. Q. (2023a). Approach for Estimating Inspection Staffing Needs for Highway Construction Projects. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 036119812211502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981221150241>
- Mohamed, M., & Tran, D. Q. (2023b). Approach for Estimating Inspection Staffing Needs for Highway Construction Projects. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 036119812211502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981221150241>
- Morgan, Garet. (1997). *Images of Organization*. Sage Publication.
- Namaki, Z. (2018). THE APPLICATION OF CHAOS MANAGEMENT THEORIES IN ORGANIZATION. In *International Journal of Management Technology* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). www.eajournals.org
- Nandi. (2019). *Analisis penyebab dan dampak keterlambatan proyek konstruksi jalan Provinsi Sumatera Barat*. Universitas Bung Hatta.
- Nitisemito, A. S. (2010). *Management Personalia: Management Sumber Daya Manusia*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Nik Fatimah, Nik Man. (2013). *Studi Faktor Keterlambatan dan Keberhasilan pada Industri Kontruksi Malaysia*.
- Oskarsson, P.-A., Granåsen, M., & Olsén, M. (2019). Observability of Inter-Organizational Crisis Management Capability. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 63(1), 617–621. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1071181319631065>

- P Joko Subagyo. (2011). *Metode Penelitian dalam Teori dan Praktek*. Rineka Cipta.
- Perry, J.H., Hayes, R.W. (1985). *Risk and its management in construction projects*. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineering, 78(3),499-521.
- Priyo & Sumanto. (2016). *Analisis Percepatan Waktu Dan Biaya Proyek Konstruksi Dengan Penambahan Jam Kerja (Lembur) Menggunakan Metode Time Cost Trade Off: Studi Kasus Proyek Pembangunan Prasarana* (Vol. 19, Issue 1).
- Project Management Institute. (2004). *A Guide to the Project Management bod of Knowledge: PMBOK guide* (3rd edition). Project Management Institute, Inc.
- Raisio, H., & Lundström, N. (2015). Real leaders embracing the paradigm of complexity. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.emerg/10.17357.583ff4f75416d52b11d1a684687091a9>
- Rachman, Arrijal. (2023, Agustus 16). *Ini Daftar Proyek Infrastruktur Jokowi di 2024 Rp 422,5 T*. Diakses pada 15 April. <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20230816175510-4-463687/ini-daftar-proyek-infrastruktur-jokowi-di-2024-rp-4227-t>
- Rita, E., Carlo, N., & Nandi, D. (2021). *Penyebab Dan Dampak Keterlambatan Pekerjaan Jalan Di Sumatera Barat Indonesia*. 11(01), 27–37.
- R .Robert Ulmer; L Sellnow Timothy ;Seeger.W .Matthew. (2006). *Effective Crisis Communication: Moving From Crisis to Opportunity*. SAGE Publications.
- Sari, R. P. (2016). *Pengaruh Stres Kerja dan Konflik Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Hambuluwuk Malioboro Boutique Yogyakarta*.
- Schwalbe, K. (2006). *Introduction to Project Management*. Thomson Course Technology.
- Seeger, M. W. , S. T. L. , & U. R. R. (2003). *Communication and organizational crisis*. Greenwood.
- Seeger, M. W. , S. T. L. , & U. R. R. (2006). Cultural read-justment after crisis: Regulation and learning from crisis within the UK soccer industry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 289–317.
- Soeharto. (1995). *Management Proyek dari Konseptual Sampai Operasional*. Erlangga: Jakarta
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mix Methods)*. Alfabeta.

- Sugianto, Danang. (2019, Januari 14). *Soal Kontraktor Swasta Gulung Tikar, Ini Kata Adhi Karya*. Diakses pada 15 April 2024. <https://finance.detik.com/infrastruktur/d-4384475/soal-kontraktor-swasta-gulung-tikar-ini-kata-adhi-karya>
- Suharsimi Arikunto. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka.
- Tosin, A., & Zanella, M. (2018). *Control strategies for road risk mitigation in kinetic traffic modelling*. 51(9), 67–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.07.012>
- Youngblood, S. (2010). Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing, and Responding, 2nd Edition (Coombs, W. T.) and Handbook of Risk and Crisis Communication (Heath, R. L. and O’Hair, H. D., Eds.) [Book reviews. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 53(2), 174–178. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tpc.2010.2046099>

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran uji Coba

Chaos Management

	R HITUNG	R TABEL	KEPUTUSAN
x1.1	0,776	0,361	VALID
x1.2	0,480	0,361	VALID
x1.3	0,557	0,361	VALID
x1.4	0,782	0,361	VALID
x1.5	0,584	0,361	VALID
x1.6	0,640	0,361	VALID
x1.7	0,785	0,361	VALID
x1.8	0,778	0,361	VALID
x1.9	0,539	0,361	VALID
x1.10	0,501	0,361	VALID
x1.11	0,729	0,361	VALID
x1.12	0,578	0,361	VALID
x1.13	0,602	0,361	VALID
x1.14	0,541	0,361	VALID
x1.15	0,603	0,361	VALID
x1.16	0,505	0,361	VALID
x1.17	0,786	0,361	VALID

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,872	17

Hasil uji validitas Pearson Product Moment variabel chaos management menunjukkan Valid dengan hasil r hitung $>$ r tabel. Dan uji Reliabilitas menggunakan Cronbach's Alpha menunjukkan Reliable dengan hasil $0,872 > 0,6$

Crisis Management

	R HITUNG	R TABEL	KEPUTUSAN
x2.1	0,462	0,361	VALID
x2.2	0,634	0,361	VALID
x2.3	0,462	0,361	VALID
x2.4	0,845	0,361	VALID

x2.5	0,824	0,361	VALID
x2.6	0,649	0,361	VALID
x2.7	0,457	0,361	VALID
x2.8	0,764	0,361	VALID
x2.9	0,764	0,361	VALID
x2.10	0,579	0,361	VALID
x2.11	0,683	0,361	VALID
x2.12	0,807	0,361	VALID
x2.13	0,699	0,361	VALID
x2.14	0,721	0,361	VALID
x2.15	0,586	0,361	VALID
x2.16	0,647	0,361	VALID

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,863	16

Hasil uji validitas Pearson Product Moment variabel crisis management menunjukkan Valid dengan hasil r hitung $>$ r tabel. Dan uji Reliabilitas menggunakan Cronbach's Alpha menunjukkan Reliable dengan hasil $0,863 > 0,6$

Lampiran 2 Uji Normalitas

Test Of Normality			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
tes	0,080	136	0,037

Hasil uji normalitas Kolmogorov-Smirnov menginformasikan bahwa data berdistribusi tidak normal dengan nilai $[D(136) = 0,080; p = 0,037 < 0,05]$.

Lampiran 3 Uji Nonparametrik One-Way ANOVA

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.1. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.1.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	4,000	6,2	-0,24
2	6	4,000	4,0	-1,39
3	2	9,000	7,0	0,14
4	6	16,000	9,3	1,57
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 3,35 DF = 3 P = 0,341
H = 3,45 DF = 3 P = 0,328 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.2. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.2.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	5,6	-0,73
2	6	9,000	5,3	-0,65
3	2	9,000	6,5	0,00
4	6	12,000	9,2	1,48
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 2,27 DF = 3 P = 0,519
H = 2,58 DF = 3 P = 0,461 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.3. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.3.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	2,000	4,2	-1,87
2	6	6,000	6,5	0,00
3	2	4,000	4,5	-0,58
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 7,02 DF = 3 P = 0,071
H = 7,22 DF = 3 P = 0,065 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.4. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.4.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	2,000	4,1	-1,95
2	6	4,000	7,5	0,55
3	2	1,000	2,0	-1,30
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,68 DF = 3 P = 0,034

H = 9,29 DF = 3 P = 0,026 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.5. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.5.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	6,000	4,0	-2,03
2	6	9,000	8,3	1,02
3	2	4,000	2,0	-1,30
4	6	16,000	10,3	2,13
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,13 DF = 3 P = 0,043

H = 8,48 DF = 3 P = 0,037 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.6. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.6.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	4,000	5,6	-0,73
2	6	4,000	4,0	-1,39
3	2	12,000	8,5	0,58
4	6	16,000	9,8	1,85
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 4,63 DF = 3 P = 0,201

H = 5,01 DF = 3 P = 0,171 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.7. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.7.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	6,8	0,24
2	6	6,000	3,0	-1,94
3	2	12,000	9,0	0,72
4	6	12,000	8,7	1,20
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 4,43 DF = 3 P = 0,219

H = 4,69 DF = 3 P = 0,196 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.8. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.8.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	12,000	5,9	-0,49
2	6	15,000	6,0	-0,28
3	2	20,000	10,5	1,16
4	6	16,000	6,7	0,09
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 1,43 DF = 3 P = 0,698

H = 1,48 DF = 3 P = 0,687 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.9. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.9.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	12,000	6,8	0,24
2	6	9,000	6,3	-0,09
3	2	9,000	6,0	-0,14
4	6	9,000	6,3	-0,09
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 0,07 DF = 3 P = 0,996

H = 0,07 DF = 3 P = 0,995 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.10. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.10.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	12,000	5,8	-0,57
2	6	6,000	5,8	-0,37
3	2	4,000	3,0	-1,01
4	6	16,000	9,5	1,66
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 3,31 DF = 3 P = 0,346
H = 3,49 DF = 3 P = 0,322 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.11. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.11.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	5,8	-0,57
2	6	9,000	5,7	-0,46
3	2	16,000	8,0	0,43
4	6	16,000	8,0	0,83
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 1,04 DF = 3 P = 0,791
H = 1,15 DF = 3 P = 0,766 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.12. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.12.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	4,000	3,6	-2,35
2	6	4,000	6,3	-0,09
3	2	9,000	8,0	0,43
4	6	25,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,09 DF = 3 P = 0,044
H = 8,76 DF = 3 P = 0,033 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.13. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.13.

Kode

Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z1	10	9,000	5,7	-
0,65								
2	6	9,000	4,7	-1,02				
3	2	9,000	3,5	-0,87				
4	6	25,000	10,7	2,31				
Overall	24		6,5					

H = 5,72 DF = 3 P = 0,126

H = 6,65 DF = 3 P = 0,084 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.14. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.14.

Kode

Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z1	10	1,000	3,5	-
2,44								
2	6	9,000	6,7	0,09				
3	2	9,000	7,5	0,29				
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50				
Overall	24		6,5					

H = 8,22 DF = 3 P = 0,042

H = 8,87 DF = 3 P = 0,031 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.15. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.15.

Kode

Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	5,7	-0,65
2	6	9,000	5,5	-0,55
3	2	4,000	3,0	-1,01

4	6	16,000	10,0	1,94
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 4,25 DF = 3 P = 0,236

H = 4,76 DF = 3 P = 0,190 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.16. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.16.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	4,6	-1,54
2	6	16,000	6,3	-0,09
3	2	16,000	9,0	0,72
4	6	16,000	9,0	1,39
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 3,32 DF = 3 P = 0,345

H = 4,31 DF = 3 P = 0,230 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 1.17. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 1.17.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z1	10	4,000	3,7 -
2,27							
2	6	6,000	6,0	-0,28			
3	2	9,000	8,5	0,58			
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50			
Overall	24		6,5				

H = 8,05 DF = 3 **P = 0,045**

H = 8,20 DF = 3 P = 0,042 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.1. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.1.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	4,000	3,0	-2,84
2	6	16,000	7,7	0,65
3	2	25,000	11,5	1,45
4	6	16,000	9,5	1,66
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 9,03 DF = 3 P = 0,029

H = 9,56 DF = 3 P = 0,023 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.2. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.2.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	4,000	3,6	-2,35
2	6	9,000	8,7	1,20
3	2	4,000	3,0	-1,01
4	6	16,000	10,3	2,13
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,65 DF = 3 P = 0,034

H = 9,44 DF = 3 P = 0,024 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.3. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.3.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	1,000	5,3	-0,97
2	6	1,000	5,8	-0,37
3	2	1,000	3,5	-0,87
4	6	6,000	10,2	2,03
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 4,45 DF = 3 P = 0,217

H = 5,18 DF = 3 P = 0,159 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.4. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.4.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	1,000	4,5	-1,62
2	6	1,000	6,0	-0,28
3	2	1,000	4,5	-0,58
4	6	6,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 6,58 DF = 3 P = 0,087

H = 9,36 DF = 3 P = 0,065 (adjusted for ties).

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.5. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.5.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z1
1	10	4,000	5,0	-1,22
2	6	4,000	3,7	-1,57
3	2	9,000	9,0	0,72
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 7,87 DF = 3 P = 0,049

H = 9,79 DF = 3 P = 0,020 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.6. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.6.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z1
1	10	4,000	4,5	-1,62
2	6	4,000	5,3	-0,65
3	2	4,000	6,5	0,00
4	6	12,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 6,53 DF = 3 P = 0,089

H = 7,50 DF = 3 P = 0,058 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.7. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.7.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	1,000	4,1	-1,95
2	6	16,000	9,0	1,39
3	2	4,000	5,0	-0,43
4	6	12,000	8,5	1,11
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 4,75 DF = 3 P = 0,191

H = 5,13 DF = 3 P = 0,162 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.8. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.8.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	7,0	0,41
2	6	9,000	6,3	-0,09
3	2	4,000	3,0	-1,01
4	6	9,000	7,0	0,28
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 1,10 DF = 3 P = 0,776

H = 1,40 DF = 3 P = 0,707 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.9. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.9.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	6,000	5,0	-1,22
2	6	9,000	6,3	-0,09
3	2	9,000	8,5	0,58
4	6	9,000	8,5	1,11
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 2,10 DF = 3 P = 0,551

H = 3,04 DF = 3 P = 0,386 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.10. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.10.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	4,000	3,6	-2,35
2	6	4,000	6,0	-0,28
3	2	9,000	9,0	0,72
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,45 DF = 3 P = 0,038

H = 9,22 DF = 3 P = 0,027 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.11. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.11.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	4,5	-1,62
2	6	16,000	7,3	0,46
3	2	9,000	5,0	-0,43
4	6	16,000	9,5	1,66
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 3,95 DF = 3 P = 0,267

H = 4,59 DF = 3 P = 0,204 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.12. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.12.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z1
1	10	1,000	3,4	-2,52
2	6	4,000	7,0	0,28
3	2	4,000	7,0	0,14

4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,45 DF = 3 P = 0,038

H = 9,47 DF = 3 P = 0,024 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.13. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.13.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	1,000	3,6	-2,35
2	6	9,000	7,2	0,37
3	2	4,000	5,5	-0,29
4	6	16,000	11,0	2,50
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 8,09 DF = 3 P = 0,044

H = 8,57 DF = 3 P = 0,036 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.14. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.14.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	9,000	5,0	-1,22
2	6	9,000	6,8	0,18
3	2	9,000	5,0	-0,43
4	6	16,000	9,2	1,48
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 2,71 DF = 3 P = 0,439

H = 4,69 DF = 3 P = 0,196 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.15. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.15.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
--------------------	---	--------	-------------	---

1	10	1,000	6,6	0,08
2	6	1,000	5,3	-0,65
3	2	1,000	4,0	-0,72
4	6	4,000	8,3	1,02
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 1,57 DF = 3 P = 0,665

H = 2,05 DF = 3 P = 0,563 (adjusted for ties)

Kruskal-Wallis Test: V 2.16. versus Kode Pengalaman

Kruskal-Wallis Test on V 2.16.

Kode Pengalaman	N	Median	Ave Rank	Z
1	10	1,000	4,0	-2,03
2	6	2,000	6,7	0,09
3	2	4,000	9,5	0,87
4	6	4,000	9,5	1,66
Overall	24		6,5	

H = 5,18 DF = 3 P = 0,159

H = 6,73 DF = 3 P = 0,081 (adjusted for ties)