

THE INDIVIDUAL WORK PERFORMANCE SCALE: A PSYCHOMETRIC STUDY AND ITS APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Zulmi Ramdani

Faculty of Psychology, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

Roslenny Marliani

Faculty of Psychology, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

Agus Abdul Rahman

Faculty of Psychology, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

Purpose: This research aims to get an individual work performance scale of the modified version which is more acceptable and has a good psychometric property.

Methodology: This study was conducted using a modified measuring instrument approach. Researchers use existing theories and then make items according to the context in which this research will be conducted. The advantage of this modification approach is getting a more comprehensive understanding of the subject we are researching.

Main Findings: Of the 303 employees that were tested in the research, the modification scale of the individual work performance has a good psychometric property with the criteria of reliability more than 0.8 and the fit model that has a good item with RMSEA score (0.062). Other than that, the modification scale of individual work performance shows a good convergent validity with presenteeism and correlate with job burnout.

Applications of this study: The Individual Work Performance Scale has a comprehensive methodology and good psychometric properties. This instrument is appropriate to be the general instrument for seeing the employee situation. In addition, this instrument can also be used as a set of tests that are suitable for use by those who will conduct an assessment of employee performance.

Novelty: This scale was made as a form of development from previous research which did not explore and develop forms of assessment that were specific to an employee's performance. There is not much-related research that focuses on many dimensions that are actually important to assess in employee performance.

References

1. Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (2007). *Tes Psikologi : Psychological Testing (Terjemahan)* (Ketujuh). Jakarta: PT Indeks.
2. Apak, S., Gümü, S., Öner, G., & Gülnihal, H. (2016). Performance appraisal and a field study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 104-114. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.119
3. Appelbaum, S. H., Roy, M., & Gilliland, T. (2011). Globalization of performance appraisals : theory and applications. *Management Decision*, 49(4), 570-585. doi.org/10.1108/00251741111126495
4. Arnăutu, E., & Panc, I. (2015). Evaluation criteria for performance appraisal of faculty

- members. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 203, 386-392.
doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.313
5. Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the Process of Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Self-Report Measures, 25(24), 3186-3191.
 6. Berry, L. M. (2003). *Employee selection*. Canada: Thomson & Wadsworth.
 7. Bh Hatta, W. B. (2014). *Pengaruh Pelatihan Hatha Yoga Terhadap Job Burnout Masa Kerja Sebagai Kovariabel*. Yogyakarta.
 8. Blumberg, M., & Pringle, C. D. (1982). The missing opportunity in organizational research: Some implications for a theory of work performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(4), 560-569.
 9. Bowden, H. M., & Sandlund, E. (2019). Knowledge talk in performance appraisal interviews. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21(December 2018), 278-292.
doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.03.012
 10. Bretz, R., Milkovich, G., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 321-352.
 11. Bullinger, M., Alonso, J., Apolone, G., Leplège, A., & Sullivan, M. (1998). Translating health status questionnaires and evaluating their quality : The IQOLA project approach. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 51(11), 913-923.
 12. Callen, B. L., Lindley, L. C., & Victoria, P. (2013). Health risk factors associated with presenteeism in the workplace. *JOEM*, 55(11), 1312-1317.
doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e3182a200f4
 13. Carlton, I., & Sloman, M. (1989). Performance appraisal in practice. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 2(3), 80-94.
 14. Choon, L. K., & Embi, M. A. (2012). Subjectivity, organizational justice and performance appraisal: Understanding the concept of subjectivity in leading towards employees' perception of fairness in the performance appraisal. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 62, 189-193. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.030
 15. Crocker, L., Crocker, L., Algina, J., Staudt, M., Mercurio, S., Hintz, K., & Walker, R. A. (2008). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. United State of America: Cengage Learning.
 16. Darcy, M. U. A., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2007). Circumplex structure of holland ' s RIASEC interests across gender and time. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(1), 17-31.
doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.1.17
 17. Dew, K., Keefe, V., & Small, K. (2005). Choosing to work when sick : Workplace presenteeism. *Social Science & Medicine*, 60, 2273-2282.
doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.10.022
 18. Dijk, D. Van, & Schodl, M. M. (2015). Performance appraisal and evaluation. *International Encyclopedia of Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 17, 716-721.
doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.22034-5
 19. Dunn, J. G. H., & Bouffard, M. (2009). Assessing item in sport psychology research : Issues and recommendations. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 3(1), 37-41. doi.org/10.1207/s15327841mpee0301
 20. Gudono. (2016). *Analisis data multivariat (Keempat)*. Yogyakarta: BFFE-Yogyakarta.
 21. Harari, M. B., & Rudolph, C. W. (2017). The effect of rater accountability on performance ratings : A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 121-133.
doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.09.007
 22. Hobson, C. J. (1981). Clarifying performance appraisal criteria. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 188, 164-188.
 23. Holzman, J. B., & Valentiner, D. P. (2016). Self-focused attention affects subsequent processing of positive (but not negative) performance appraisals. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 50, 295-302. doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2015.10.008
 24. Hongmei, Z., & Tianyi, Z. (2014). The study of the differences of appraisal results by self and appraisal results by Line-manager in performance appraisal. *Journal of Statistics and Management*, (December 2014), 37-41. doi.org/10.1080/09720510.2010.10701497

25. Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S., Budhwar, P., & Shah, S. Z. A. (2019). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: Evidence on the utilization criteria. *Journal of Business Research*, 101(May 2018), 285–299. doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.035
26. Jewell, L., & Siegall, M. (1998). *Psikologi industri/organisasi modern*. (A. Danuyasa, Ed.) (Second edi). USA: Arcan.
27. Kessler, R. C., Barber, C., Beck, A., Berglund, P., Ba, M., Cleary, P. D., ... Ustun, T. B. (2003). The world health organization health and work performance questionnaire (HPQ). *JOEM*, 45(2), 156–174. doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000052967.43131.51
28. Koopmans, L. (2015). *Individual work performance questionnaire : Instruction manual*. TNO innovation for Life - VU University Medical Center.
29. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., & Hildebrandt, V. (2012). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(No. 1, 2013), 6–28. doi.org/10.1108/17410401311285273
30. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Cw, H., & Vet, D. (2013). Measuring individual work performance : Identifying and selecting indicators. *Galley Prof*, 00, 1–10. doi.org/10.3233/WOR-131659
31. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Vet, H. C. W. De, & Beek, A. J. Van Der. (2014). Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire. *JOEM*, 56(3), 331–337. doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000113
32. Mateen, B. A., Doogan, C., Hayward, K., Hourihan, S., Hurford, J., & Playford, E. D. (2017). Systematic Review of Health-Related Work Outcome Measures and Quality Criteria-Based Evaluations of Their Psychometric Properties. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 98(3), 534–560. doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2016.06.013
33. Maul, A., Torres, D., & Wilson, M. (2016). On the philosophical foundations of psychological measurement. *Measurement*, 79, 311–320. doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2015.11.001
34. Meng, L., & Jin, Y. (2017). A confirmatory factor analysis of the utrecht work engagement scale for students in a chinese sample. *Nurse Education Today*, 49, 129–134. doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2016.11.017
35. Muda, I., Rafiki, A., & Harahap, M. R. (2014). Factors Influencing Employees ' Performance : A Study on the Islamic Banks in Islamic Science University of Malaysia University of North Sumatera. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(2), 73–81.
36. Mustafa, M. N. (2012). Teacher perspectives on work performance: A review in high school Riau province, Pekanbaru, Indonesia. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences*. doi.org/10.3923/rjasoci.2012.458.465
37. Mustafa, M. N., & Othman, N. (2010). The Effect of Work Motivation on Teacher ' s Work Performance in Pekanbaru Senior High Schools , Riau Province , Indonesia. *Sosiohumanika*, 3(2), 259–272.
38. Nair, M. S., & Salleh, R. (2015). Linking performance appraisal justice, trust, and employee engagement: A conceptual framework. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 1155–1162. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.154
39. Pines, A., & Maslach, C. (1978). Characteristics of staff burnout in mental health settings. *Hospital & Community Psychiatry*, 29(4), 233–237.
40. Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1), 69–85. doi.org/10.1177/2278533716671630
41. Ramdani, Zulmi. (2018). Construction of academic integrity scale. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 7(1), 87–97. doi.org/10.5861/ijrsp.2018.3003
42. Rehan, M., Iqbal, M. Z., Fatima, A., & Nawab, S. (2017). Organizational cynicism and its relationship with employee's performance in teaching hospitals of pakistan. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, 6(3). doi.org/10.4172/2162-6359.1000413
43. Russell, S., & Brannan, M. J. (2016). Getting the right people on the bus: Recruitment , selection and integration for the branded organization. *European Management Journal*, XXX, 1–11. doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.01.001
44. Rusu, G., Avasilcăi, S., & Huțu, C.-A. (2016). Organizational context factors influencing employee performance appraisal: A research framework. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral*



- Sciences, 221, 57-65. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.090
45. Selvarajan, T. T., Singh, B., & Solansky, S. (2018). Performance appraisal fairness, leader member exchange and motivation to improve performance: A study of US and Mexican employees. *Journal of Business Research*, 85(April 2016), 142-154. doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.11.043
 46. Thompson, B. (2004). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
 47. Turner, M. J., & Allen, M. S. (2018). Confirmatory factor analysis of the irrational performance beliefs inventory (iPBI) in a sample of amateur and semi-professional athletes. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*. doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.11.017
 48. Vet, H. C. W. De, Mokkink, L. B., Mosmuller, D. G., & Terwee, C. B. (2017). Spearman-brown prophecy formula and cronbach's alpha: Different faces of reliability and opportunities for new applications. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.01.013
 49. Wallace, J. C., & Chen, G. (2005). Development and validation of a work-specific measure of cognitive failure : Implications for occupational safety. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 615-632. doi.org/10.1348/096317905X37442
 50. Wang, P. S., Beck, A., Berglund, P., Leutzinger, J. A., Pronk, N., Schenk, T. W., ... Kessler, R. C. (2003). Chronic medical conditions and work performance in the health and work performance questionnaire calibration surveys. *JOEM*, 45(12), 1303-1311. doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000100200.90573.df
 51. Wild, D., Grove, A., Eremenco, S., McElroy, S., Verjee-Lorenz, A., & Erikson, P. (2005). Principles of good practice for the translation and cultural adaptation process for patient-reported outcomes (PRO) measures: Report of the ISPOR task force for translation and cultural adaptation. *Value in Health*, 8(2), 94-104. doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.04054.x