The Influence of Assessment System of Employee Achievement towards Apparatus State Performance
(Case study towards government employee in Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia)

Budi Santoso, Nani Imaniyati, Ikaputra Waspada
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Bandung, Indonesia
budisantoso@upi.edu

Abstract—Assessment system of employee achievement policy is done to produce professional, responsible, honest, and equitable government employee through training which is held based on the job achievement system and carrier system focused on job achievement system. It is also to guarantee the objectivity in considering raised position and promotion. Assessment system of government employee is an assessment which is done by assessor apparatus systematically towards Target Individual Work and Government Employee’ working attitude. Work achievement assessment will effect apparatus state performance which is government employee. The issue of this research is the effect of assessment system of employee achievement towards apparatus state performance. This research takes place in Government Institution, Indonesia University of Education. This research uses descriptive and analytical method. The object of this research is government employee in Indonesia University of Education. The technique of collecting data uses questionnaires and observation. The technique of analyzing data uses inferential statistic and regression test. It is hoped that the result from the influence of assessment system of employee achievement towards apparatus state performance research gives beneficial and significant development in government employee carrier, either practically or theoretically. Practically, it is hoped that this research result can be implemented to increase apparatus performance particularly for those government employee who work in Indonesia University of Education. While theoretically, this research will be used for scientific references in Personnel Management field. Besides, it is also used for source reference and study references for those who need.
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I. INTRODUCTION

According to 12th section and 1st verse of Constitution of republic Indonesia Number 43 Year 1999 about the changing of Constitution of Republic Indonesia Number 8 Year 1974 about employment principals stated that it is needed professional, responsible, honest, and equitable government employee to develop government tasks. However, to develop government tasks is needed employee training. The training is based on working achievement system and carrier system yet focused on employee achievement system. Moreover, section 20 stated that to guarantee the objectivity in considering raised of position and promotion need to hold working achievement system.

According to section 12 and 20, government employee of working achievement assessment is hold to valuate government employee’s performance individually, it can hint for management to evaluate unit and organization performance. The result of government employee’s achievement assessment is used as a basis for considering of management policy decision of government employee carrier.

Empiric result shows assessment process of government employee’s job which is stated in Government Regulation Number 10 Year 1979 about Government Employee Job’s assessment tends to stuck in formality process. DP3 Government Employee loses the meaning and substantive understanding and that does not related to what is Government Employee has done. Whereas working achievement assessment is a rein so that each Government Employee’s principals activities in tune with aims in Renstra and Renja organization.

As an effort to improve DP3 Government Employee generally in accordance with the development of human resource (government employee) quality to improve productive working behavior. Government has published Government Regulation Number 46 Year 2011 about the achievement assessment system of Government Employee which is started on 1 January 2014. It combines both employee goal setting work and working behavior assessment. So that the objectivity of working achievement assessment can be attained.

According to Ministerial Circulars PAN-RB Number 02 Year 2013 date 15th of February 2013 about Government Employee’s implementation of performance appraisal – a new system so it can work effectively—started on this 1 January 2014.on that Ministerial Circulars, it mentions that Government Employee’s implementation of performance appraisal to make professional employees in supporting acceleration of bureaucratic reforms. Because of it, each Government Employee need having annual planning and target every year based on their own major.

To make it work effectively in each institution, PAN-RB minister hopes that government institution leaders are able to prepare needed steps to apply new assessment system of employee’s working achievement system. It is done to combine
perceptions between the implementation of the performance appraisal system of new employees.

Since the newest system has been enforced, each universities apply the system either. Indonesia University of Education as one of government institutions which manage and build the state apparatus – as we called Government Employee—also apply the employee performance appraisal system.

This research is proposed to find out the influence of employee performance appraisal system towards Government Employee performance in Indonesia University of Education as one of government institution. This research entitled “The Influence of Assessment System of Employee Achievement towards Apparatus State Performance”.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The following statements are theories which stated by experts. Working achievement assessment is an evaluation which is done regularly and systemically about employee job performance included development potential. Working achievement system is a regular assessment system which is done systematically towards someone’s performance role in company or organization is to find out whether the goals of organization are success or not. Most of leaders or managers often neglect their employee performance unless if the condition or their performance goes bad. Managers’ dereliction in paying attention towards employee’ performance can make the company bankrupt. Then that situation is not something they hope for.

Performance is defined as gained result from job’s function or particular activities in particular period. Performance is the quality or quantity of working output which is gained by employees in doing their job based on the responsible given [1]. Performance as achievement which is gained by people after finishing their jobs in accordance with standard or criteria given [2].

III. METHODS

This research uses descriptive method and survey approach. Descriptive research method is method that is used to analyze happening issues. The method is not limited in collecting and arranging the data but also analyzing and interpreting the meaning of the data [8-10].

Survey is a process of collecting information about characteristics, actions, and opinion from selective respondent. Survey is taken by collecting sample from a population and using questionnaire as main data collection.

The tabulation is computed by using inferential statistic technique. The technique is statistical analysis related to sampling process and choosing sample which is assumed has relation with population where the research takes place. The aims of using inferential statistic characteristic is to draw a conclusion about population which is based on observation output sample. The computation data is used regression analysis.

Population is an object or subject in a region and fulfill particular requirements related to the research questions. Population is a generalized region consist of object or subject which has particular characteristics and has been settled by researcher then draw the conclusion [3].

Sample which the total amount is as same as population called as total. If the subjects are less than 100, it is better to take all the respondents [4-7]. So, that means the researcher uses population not sample. Unless the subjects are more than 100, it is only taken either 10%-15% or 20% - 25%.

TABLE I. POPULATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE IN INDONESIA UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION

| No. | No. Res | Respondents genre | Total |
|-----|---------|-------------------|-------|
| Faculty of Science Education | 1 | Education Labor | 206 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 44 |
| Total | | | 250 |
| Faculty of Science Education | 1 | Education Labor | 109 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 30 |
| Total | | | 139 |
| Faculty of Sport and Health Education | 1 | Education Labor | 205 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 31 |
| Total | | | 236 |
| Faculty of Language and Literature Education | 1 | Education labor | 217 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 36 |
| Total | | | 253 |
| Faculty of Technique and Vocational Education | 1 | Education labor | 179 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 25 |
| Total | | | 204 |
| Faculty of Economy and Business Education | 1 | Education labor | 180 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 10 |
| Total | | | 190 |
| Faculty of Post-Graduate | 1 | Education labor | 247 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 35 |
| Total | | | 282 |

Source: Indonesia University of Education Human Resource, 2015

TABLE II. SAMPLES OF INDONESIA UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE

| No | No. Res | Respondents Genre | Total | Sample Total |
|----|---------|-------------------|-------|--------------|
| Faculty of Science Education | 1 | Education Labor | 206 | 41 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 44 | 9 |
| Total | | | 250 | 50 |
| Faculty of Science Education | 1 | Education Labor | 109 | 22 |
| 2 | Non-Education Labor | 30 | 6 |
| Total | | | 139 | 28 |
Table 2. Cont.

| No | No. Res | Respondents Genre | Total | Sample Total |
|----|---------|--------------------|-------|--------------|
| Faculty of Sport and Health Education | 1 | Education Labor | 205 | 41 |
| | 2 | Non-Education Labor | 31 | 6 |
| Total | | | 236 | 47 |
| Faculty of Language and Literature Education | 1 | Education Labor | 217 | 43 |
| | 2 | Non-Education Labor | 36 | 7 |
| Total | | | 253 | 50 |
| Faculty of Technique and Vocational Education | 1 | Education Labor | 179 | 36 |
| | 2 | Non-Education Labor | 25 | 5 |
| Total | | | 204 | 41 |
| Faculty of Economy and Business Education | 1 | Education Labor | 180 | 36 |
| | 2 | Non-Education Labor | 10 | 2 |
| Total | | | 190 | 38 |
| Faculty of Post-Graduate | 1 | Education Labor | 247 | 50 |
| | 2 | Non-Education Labor | 35 | 7 |
| Total | | | 282 | 57 |
| Total Sample | | | 331 | |

Source: Indonesia University of Education Human Resource, 2015

This research discusses X variable (Performance Appraisal System) and Y variable (State Apparatus Performance) in details presented in below.

IV. RESEARCH RESULT

Performance Appraisal System in this research is defined as one way or method to see the development of employee’s working performance in company or institution activities. There are four dimension of performance appraisal system which are aspect target, aspect of assessment, and aspect or management.

The recapitulation of those dimensions are presented in the following table.

TABLE III. THE RECAPITULATION OF RESPONDENT’S REACTION VARIABLE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

| Performance Appraisal System | Result | Category |
|------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Aspect of Target | 3.32 | Medium |
| Aspect of Behaviour | 3.65 | High |
| Aspect of Assessment | 3.77 | High |
| Aspect of Management | 3.38 | Medium |
| TOTAL | 3.53 | High |

Source: Data Processing, 2015

Based on respondents' reaction result on table 4, the average score is 3.53. Referring to scale table of respondent score interpreting scale, the result places in range 3.40-4.19. This score shows that transformational leadership perceived by respondents is in high category. The researchers analyze the factors which influence that condition, those are the lack of system improvement, the accuracy of particular assessment, lack of system formation and tends to be subjective, influences from leaders, and the main factor is lack of system updates toward organization development.

Performance Appraisal System is measured by four dimensions which are (1) aspect target, (2) aspect of assessment, and (3) aspect or management. The average score of each dimensions shows the level of achievement of performance appraisal system. It is presented in the table 5.1.

![Fig. 1. Transformational leadership level chart.](image)

Figure 1 shows that aspect of assessment dimension has highest score which is 3.65 while aspect of target has lowest score which is 3.32. This can mean that aspect of target is one of achievement assessment system. It also means that it is one of subsystem or formal regulation to assess and to see employee achievement development. Aspect of target has important role in seeing employee’s development or whether they are responsible in doing their job or not and also in their company or organization. It is because aspect of target is to assess whether an employee can finish the job accurately and effectively or not and also to assess the responsibility of the current position in company or organization. In this research, aspect of target has lowest score compare to another dimension. This should be concerned because it is the most important aspect in assessing employee.

Aspect of assessment dimension is as one of subsystem or formal rules in assessing employee’s achievement. Aspect of assessment has several matters that need to be concerned. One of assessing aspect role is to see employee’s development. Whether the employee has finished the job based on the given time and target or not.

State apparatus performance can be defined as result of attainment from an employee who does the job in organization or company environment. This research is based on eight dimensions which are Quantity of work, Quality of work, Job Knowledge, Creativeness, Cooperation, Dependability, Initiative, and Personal Qualities. Those are recapitulated in the following table.

TABLE IV. RECAPITULATION RESPONDER PERFORMANCE VARIABLE

| Performance Appraisal System | Result | Category |
|------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Quantity of work | 3.20 | Medium |
| Quality of work | 3.38 | Medium |
| Job Knowledge | 3.31 | Medium |
| Creativeness | 3.32 | Medium |
| Cooperation | 3.27 | Medium |
| Dependability | 3.11 | Medium |
| Initiative | 2.64 | Medium |
| Personal | 2.69 | Medium |
| TOTAL | 3.30 | Medium |

Source: Data Processing, 2015
Based on the table above, the average score is 3.30. Referring to scale table of respondent score interpreting scale, the result places in range 3.40–4.19. This score shows that the performance of state apparatus perceived by respondents is in medium category. The researcher analyzed factors which influence the condition such as lack of compensation, lack of salary amount, excessive workload, assessment system is not objective, and lack of employees’ work motivation is not supportive.

State apparatus performance can be defined as result of attainment from an employee who does the job in organization or company environment. This research is based on eight dimensions which are Quantity of work, Quality of work, Job Knowledge, Creativeness, Cooperation, Dependability, Initiative, and Personal Qualities. Those are recapitulated in the following table.

Based on table 5.2, it shows that quantity of work dimension has highest score which is 3.38, while initiative dimension has lowest score which is 3.32. This means that state apparatus performance still not in well performance. It is because several aspects do not fulfilled well.

Quality of work dimension means whether results performed by employees is in conformity or not and the target has achieved or not. Quality or work has different standard in accordance with the system and position carried. Quality or work takes important role in gaining benefit for the company or the organization. Quality of work looks good if it is judged objectively and do not contain any subjectivity. Based on the previous explanation, it is needed a system that can help employees be judged based on their job result.

Creativeness dimension in this research means the result of employee’s creation in finishing their duties. Initiative brings something new in solving problems. It also helps employees to adapt to any new problems they will face. Initiative is needed to help creating superior organizational culture. It also helps company and organization to sturdy in any kind of issues in changing time and condition.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the research result and computation result, it can be concluded that X variable (Performance Appraisal System) have positive and significant effect on Y variable (State Apparatus Performance). X variable is measured by four dimensions which are Quantity of work, Quality of work, Job Knowledge, Creativeness, Cooperation, Dependability, Initiative, and Personal Qualities. The optimum of the performance of the apparatus should be given special concern because it belongs to medium category. Moreover, performance appraisal system needs to be made more objective to avoid subjectivity.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the observations of researchers in the field, there are some issues that should be given special treatment in order to create the effectiveness of both X variable (Performance Appraisal System) and Y variable (State Apparatus Performance). The following are recommendations that can be given:

- Performance appraisal system is not optimal yet, it is needed reforming the performance appraisal system, changing paradigms, there should be no longer subjective assessment for the sake of effectiveness, and giving the best service for systems. Adaptation of new system updates in the workplace and create new system adapts to the present state of the organization or institution.

- State apparatus performance is not optimal yet due to internal reasons, thus it is necessary to have a treatment that can improve state apparatus performance. One system that can be done is to look at performance appraisal system, labor compensation, workload in accordance with the working portion, and supported the work motivation, it can be either the direction or the training of leaders and motivation in the form of salary increase or bonus to increase state apparatus performance.
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