Spider Plot Model for Analysis of Individual Appraisal Performance Towards Career Planning in Organizations
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Abstract. Career planning at the organizational level must be translated into career planning at the individual employee level. Performance appraisal can be used more broadly so that it can be the main tool for companies in employee career planning. The purpose of this study is to measure how much influence the Performance Evaluation of Career Planning from employees who have occupied managerial levels goes to the next career level. In this paper, analysis of individual employee performance is carried out using the Spider Plot model. The results of analyzing individual performance from managers in different units can explain quickly and easily the appearance of the Spider Plot diagram. So, it is expected that individual career planning can be easily mapped through performance appraisal so that it can be used in career planning.

1. Introduction

In corporate organizations, human resources as labor have a very important role in the continuity of the company’s operations. As human resources are in progress at the Surabaya Post Office (SPP). SPP office which has operational activities which at the beginning of its formation are directed as Hub and Spoke communication business, especially standard postal letters and time sensitive postal letters. And along with the need for downsizing the organization, in its development the Post Office Central Office was also directed as the Home fleet of the postal fleet and as a distribution center for postal packages (logistic), as a node to and from the Western Region and Eastern Region of Indonesia and centralized lift mail.

The smooth distribution of postal items in a timely, targeted and reliable manner must be supported and supported by a reliable managerial with an adequate level of competency, innovation,
smart, agile and communicative, resistant to stress, demands a time to work and a manager must be able to balance performance staff and keep up with the pace of operational development and organizational policies. A manager to fill managerial positions at the Post Processing Central Office has operational flying hours in all parts of the post office organization and needs career planning for manager rotation and subsequent career gaps every maximum 2 years carried out by HR Management where the career planning reference points use the Rating List Job Implementation (DP 3 or Peg.21 list) and DP3 are only made for employees for employees of class II / a to group IIIId while performance appraisal for class I and class IV employees is carried out without using Peg.21 list. Class II / a and above employees for Career Planning can not be separated from the DP3 assessment.

In the DP3 performance assessment it is not seen as a career planning tool to be used in decision making. This can be seen from the Peg 21 list value in the HR section that DP3 does not provide a relationship or influence on the position mutation carried out by the leadership, the implementation of career is not evenly distributed on nine managers in the 3 (three) year career journey, so that the assessment results Peg list. 21 (List of Job Implementation Assessments = DP3) is not used as an employee career planning tool because in the mutation of positions is not evenly distributed there are only one time for three years for Managers C, D, F and twice for Managers A, G, H, I and three times for Manager B, E.

Performance appraisal must be carried out in detail regarding various aspects of work to determine its relevance to the organization's business objectives therefore according to Akinbowale et al. [1], Daoanis [4], and DeNisi & Murphy [5], the instruments used in performance appraisal must fulfill the statement in order to disclose information about workers and the work that becomes its main tasks and obtain objective results.

According to Briel & Getzel [2], Salahat & Majid [10], and Tanoli [12], the term career is used to explain people in each role or status and in the literature on career behavior science with three meanings. Career as a promotion or transfer (lateral transfer) to positions that are more demanding or to better locations within or across the hierarchy of cooperative relationships during one's working life. Careers as a guide to jobs that form a systematic pattern of progress and career paths. Career as a person's work history, or a series of positions he holds during work life. In this context, everyone with their work history is called a career.

According to Circular Number: SE 51/DIR SDM/0403 dated 22 April 2003 concerning Career Planning for Employees at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero), namely individual career planning (career planning) is the process of employees / individuals to identify and implement their steps in achieving their career goals.

Using the spider plot personal method is expected that individual career planning can be mapped easily through performance appraisal, so that it can be used in employee career planning to occupy managerial level positions at the Surabaya Post Processing Central Office and Career Planning Manager of the Surabaya to Post Processing Central Office for the next Career level [3; 6; 11].

Based on the description above, in this study will be conducted "quantitative analysis of appraisal individual performance of career planning and career development at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero)". This study is intended to explain the variables of employee work performance simultaneously and partially that affect career planning and career development effectively.

2. Research methodology
Research for each individual's performance appraisal (individual performance assessment) uses the Personal Spider Plot model [6], which is a method that uses the mapping of strengths and weaknesses of individuals to company performance standards and spider plot diagram displays as an illustration of the mapping of each attribute is a Likert Scale which consists of more than five categories of assessment on each sub attribute [7; 9].

The conceptual framework in the form of research in the analysis of individual performance can be shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Conceptual framework in research

In the Spider Plot model as an illustration of the form of determination of each attribute, in this method the measurement used is the Likert Scale which consists of more than five categories of assessment on each sub attribute, as follows:

- very good = value or weight 5
- good = value or weight 4
- enough = value or weight 3
- less = value or weight 2
- low = value or weight 1

The population in this study were employees who held positions as managers who served in the Surabaya Post Processing Central Office 60900 and had attended the First Level Supervisor Assessment as a member of the respondents as many as 9 people.

Research Tools, as for the research tools used in this study in the form, namely:
a. Psychology Report.
b. Interview.
c. Personal Method of Spider Plots.
Meanwhile, the research instruments used in this study are:

1) Intelligence Tests, this test measures the intellectual abilities of individuals by measuring general intelligence, concentration, and numerical abilities.
2) Talent and Ability Tests, this test is intended to measure the attributes of work methods and work potential where aptitude tests measure a person's potential to be developed, while the test of the ability to measure one's skills.
3) Personality and Emotional Questions Tests, this test is to measure the level of characteristics of an individual from emotional stability, stress resistance, social maturity, independence, responsibility and honesty.
4) Interview Tests, this test is to test information that is relevant to the work and is designed to test the extent of information that an individual has with a job or position that has been carried out during his job career.
5) Personal Method Spider Plots is a method that uses the mapping of strengths and weaknesses of individuals to company performance standards and the appearance of spider plot diagrams as an illustration of the form of determination of each attribute.

In determining the company's performance standards, first a suggestion was made, the results of which were agreed upon by the Surabaya Post Management Center, Surabaya Regional Office 7 HR Psychology Team, East Java, HR Manager, Quality Control Manager with Researchers by using attribute agreements used to assess Level Supervisor Assessment I (Manager Level) and its value is stated in educational measuring instruments, psychograms and interviews [8].

3. Results and discussion
Standard Appraisal performance from the results of the bench marking (benchmark) in accordance with the measurement results can be illustrated in Table 1, below:

| No | Attributes          | Standards performance |
|----|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1  | Education           | 3.00                  |
| 2  | Intelligence Ability| 3.00                  |
| 3  | Ways of working     | 3.25                  |
| 4  | Job Potential       | 3.00                  |
| 5  | Personality / EQ    | 3.33                  |
| 6  | Managerial          | 3.40                  |
| 7  | Interview           | 3.00                  |

| Total Rating | 21.98 |
|--------------|-------|
| Total Score  | 313.75|

Table 1 is a description of plotting spider plots per item from each attribute as a Appraisal of Standard Performance.
The advantage of the Spider Plot method is that it is located on the display in the diagram image that maps the attributes of each attribute that is assessed, and the analysis in quantitative form in the interpretation of data in Table 2 is the result of the appraisal performance of each individual (manager).

Table 2. Performance Appraisal of Each Individual (Manager)

| No | Plotting Spider Plot per Item | Manager Performance Appraisal |
|----|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|    |                                | A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | F   | G   | H   | I   |
| 1  | Education                      | 3.00| 2.00| 3.50| 3.25| 2.00| 3.00| 2.00| 3.00| 3.00|
| 2  | Intelligence Ability           | 2.67| 4.00| 3.67| 3.33| 2.67| 4.00| 2.00| 4.00| 2.33|
| 3  | Ways of working                | 3.25| 3.75| 3.50| 3.50| 3.00| 4.00| 3.25| 3.25| 2.75|
| 4  | Job Potential                  | 3.33| 3.67| 3.33| 3.33| 2.67| 4.00| 3.00| 3.00| 3.00|
| 5  | Personality / EQ               | 3.50| 4.17| 3.50| 3.67| 3.00| 3.83| 2.67| 4.00| 3.00|
| 6  | Managerial                     | 3.60| 3.80| 3.00| 3.80| 3.00| 4.00| 3.00| 3.40| 3.00|
| 7  | Interview                      | 3.17| 2.50| 3.33| 3.67| 2.33| 3.67| 2.50| 3.17| 4.00|
|    | Total Rating                   | 22.52| 23.89| 23.83| 24.55| 18.67| 26.50| 18.42| 23.82| 21.08|
|    | Total Score                    | 326.99| 341.52| 338.26| 355.55| 269.39| 378.24| 265.91| 342.91| 308.93|

Source: Regional HR 2017
Mapping Standard Performance and Individual Performance. In mapping (mapping) there are gaps that show weaknesses and strengths of individuals compared to standards performance.

Table 3. Personal Results of Spider Plot Manager B

| No | Plotting Spider Plot Per Item | Standard Performance | Manager B | Gap | Conclusion |
|----|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----|------------|
| 1  | Education                      | 3.00                 | 3.00      | 0.00| good       |
| 2  | Intelligence Ability           | 3.00                 | 2.67      | -0.33| good       |
| 3  | Ways of working                | 3.25                 | 3.25      | 0.00| good       |
| 4  | Job Potential                  | 3.00                 | 3.33      | 0.33| good       |
| 5  | Personality / EQ               | 3.33                 | 3.50      | 0.17| good       |
| 6  | Managerial                     | 3.40                 | 3.60      | 0.20| good       |
| 7  | Interview                      | 3.00                 | 3.17      | 0.17| good       |
|    | Total Rating                   | 21.98                | 22.52     | 0.54| Recommended|
|    | Total Score                    | 313.75               | 326.99    | 13.24| Recommended|

Source: Regional HR 2017

The position of Manager B's performance appraisal results can be described as follows:

Figure 3. Performance Appraisal of Manager B
In Figure 3, Figure B of Manager B's Plot, the image display will quickly inform the superiority of Manager B's appraisal performance on the attributes of intelligence capabilities, work methods, work potential, personality / EQ, managerial.

Table 4. Plotting the Spider Plot of Manager G

| No | Plotting Spider Plot | 3.1. Performance Manager Standard | 3.2. Gap | Conclusion |
|----|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|
|    | Education            | 3.00                        | 2.00    | -1.00     | Less      |
| 2  | Intelligence Ability| 3.00                        | 2.00    | -1.00     | Less      |
| 3  | Ways of working     | 3.25                        | 3.25    | 0.00      | Enough    |
| 4  | Job Potential       | 3.00                        | 3.00    | 0.00      | Enough    |
| 5  | Personality / EQ    | 3.33                        | 2.67    | -0.66     | Enough    |
| 6  | Managerial          | 3.40                        | 3.00    | -0.40     | Enough    |
| 7  | Interview           | 3.00                        | 2.50    | -0.50     | Less      |

Total Rating 21.98 18.42 -3.56 Not recommended yet

Total Score 313.75 265.91 -47.84 Not recommended yet

The position of Manager G's performance appraisal results can be described as follows:

![Figure 4. Appraisal Performance of Manager G](image)

From the two results of the Individual Performance Analysis display from Manager B and Manager G can explain quickly and easily known from the appearance of the Spider diagram The plot of the
comparison of some attributes of Performance Appraisal Standard and Performance Appraisal Manager B and Manager G can be used as a comparison of the diagram display this.

**Figure 5.** Comparison of Appearance of Spider Plots Diagram of Manager B and Manager G
Likewise, a comparison of the Spider Plot diagram between the Spider Plot Diagram of Manager B and the Spider Plot Diagram of Manager G can be compared. You can also compare the Spider Plot Diagram of Manager A and the Spider Plot Diagram of Manager G in one Printout paper to be made as a management decision HR for the next plot of Career Planning Manager A or Manager B or Manager G gets more appropriate in planning their future career.

4. Conclusion

From the results of the study of respondents selected as samples, it can be stated as follows:

a) Performance appraisal at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) currently in the form of a Job Implementation Assessment List (DP3 or Peg.21 list) is only used by the Human Resources Department as a routine and the results of the assessment of work implementation have not been used as career planning because there is an assessment team under the human resources department in the Office Regions that will assess individual performance appraisal if there is a promotion level or employee career gap requirements. While the appointment of managerial positions is the right of authority of the Chairperson or Head of Office so that the subjectivity element is more dominant and mutations are not evenly distributed at the managerial level so that the individual career paths are uneven because career planning is not applied in the organization.

b) The attributes and variables used in the model can be tailored to the needs of various lines or departments in the organization or company concerned.

c) Design attributes and items that are in accordance with the needs and interests of each organization can be carried out by the Human Resources Department (HRD). Cross individuals can be carved for scores on line or department. (d) Each individual can be measured by the total score and rating value every year.

d) Variables / Attributes are not binding, according to the standard performance requirements of the company concerned.

e) Performance appraisal on the spider plot’s personal method shows the weaknesses and strengths of the individual so that the results of the performance assessment can be used as career planning for organizations and individuals (employees / employees).

f) Diagram images and rankings of rating tests and individual performance appraisal scores can be used as barometers of individual performance. The total score ranking of psychological tests is of course a benefit in terms of developing employees / employees / individuals to be promoted, opening channels of potential employees, motivating employees to grow and develop within the organization so that career planning can bring together the interests of individual careers and goals organizational development.
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