



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



DESIGN OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF A MOTORCYCLE WORKSHOP USING 360 DEGREE FEEDBACK WITH RATING SCALE METHOD AND ANALYTIC HIERARCHY PROCESS (AHP)

Rifky Naufal, Novie Susanto * and Chaterine Alvina Prima Hapsari

Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia.

* Corresponding Author

ORCID Details

Novie Susanto: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7837-0253>

Chaterine Alvina Prima Hapsari: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6363-5044>

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 31(03), 1969–1978

Publication history: Received on 21 August 2026; revised on 27 September 2026; accepted on 29 September 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.31.3.2479>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

A MSME engaged in automotive repair services, plans to expand its business by adding more branches. The addition of these branches has the potential to exacerbate a common problem in MSMEs, namely the lack of control over employee performance, resulting in uneven service quality at each business location. In line with this, this study aims to design a performance assessment to determine the level of employee performance objectively and measurably and provide recommendations for the division of work locations for each employee to obtain balanced performance and service quality. Based on the validation results using CVI and weighting using AHP, eight criteria with fourteen sub-criteria for employee performance assessment with their respective weights were obtained, as well as three performance assessors, namely superiors with a weight of 0.721; self 0.093; and coworkers 0.186, which were then all used to assess the performance of mechanical and part counter employees using the 360-degree feedback method and rating scale. Based on the results of the employee performance assessment, two mechanical employees worked with average and below average work evaluation results. Meanwhile, the assessment of part counter employees revealed that two employees performed well, but their performance was still below average. Based on these results, the eleven employees were assigned to work locations, with the top three employees assigned to each location, followed by employees with lower performance according to the ranking order.

Keywords: Employee Performance Appraisal, 360 Degree Feedback, Rating Scale Method, Division of Work Locations

1 INTRODUCTION

Commitment to service quality, with a primary focus on customer satisfaction, is a crucial factor in supporting the success of a service-based business (Santoso, 2006). Many customers make decisions to purchase or use a particular service not only based on the price of the product but also on the level of customer service associated with that product. Quality and service to customers provide greater competitive strength, customer loyalty, and increased profits for an organization or company (Kanovska, 2009). Based on this, it can be seen that the quality of

service provided to consumers by employees is crucial for companies operating in the service industry. The success of a company, especially those operating in the service sector, is significantly determined by employee performance (Siddiqui, 2014). High-performing employees not only help the organization achieve its strategic goals but also play a vital role in increasing its competitiveness (June et al., 2013). Performance appraisal is the most influential variable on employee performance, followed by planning, *feedback*, and training (Siraj & Hågen, 2023). Performance appraisal is the process of measuring and controlling individual performance to integrate it with organizational goals to achieve expected results (Sanyal & Biswas, 2014).

Problems regarding employee performance can be found in the object of this research, namely the MSME Rims Motor Workshop located on Jl. Klepu-Pituruh Km. 2, Pituruh District, Purworejo Regency, Central Java. Problems regarding employee performance began with the business owner's plan to increase business competitiveness, namely by adding workshop business locations. The main business location for MSMEs does play an important role in efforts to maintain business competitiveness (Banwo et al., 2017). In addition, increasing the number of business branches does have a positive impact on increasing a business's profits (Grigoroudis et al., 2013). Rims Motor Workshop plans to build new business branches that were originally located in two locations, by the end of the year it is planned to be located in four different locations, namely one central workshop and three branch workshops. The addition of these business branches has the potential to increase problems that commonly occur in MSMEs, namely lack of control over employee performance and limited resources (Harney et al., 2022).

Therefore, monitoring employee performance is a matter that requires attention, in addition to the business owner's efforts to expand the business to overcome competition from conventional motorcycle repair shops, which are growing very rapidly. Rims Motor currently has a total of eleven employees, consisting of seven mechanics and four *part counter* employees with the division of employee work locations based only on the length of time worked and periodically without any fixed time provisions, the mechanics and *part counter* will have their work locations exchanged when needed such as under certain conditions when an employee is absent and causes a shortage of manpower at one of the workshop locations.

Furthermore, data on absenteeism and unfinished work indicate that mechanical employees at the main workshop actually had higher absences and unfinished work than the branch workshop, even though according to the workshop owner, the conditions of both workshops were relatively similar based on the number of customers who came from October 2023 to March 2024. This is in line with research that employees with longer tenure in a job position do not guarantee that the employee works with better performance (Ng & Feldman, 2013). Therefore, it is necessary to divide the work locations not based on the length of time the employee has worked at a company but based on the employee's work performance to obtain relatively even performance results at each business location so that customers can receive relatively the same quality of service at each workshop location. Considering that the quality of employee performance provided at each different business location is positively related to customer satisfaction and also retention or the company's ability to maintain customer loyalty (Khwaja & Yang, 2022).

The design of the performance assessment of Rims Motor workshop mechanic employees is not only used to assess the performance of mechanic employees but is applied to all employees including *part counter* employees. Assessment of both types of employees is considered important because based on the results of interviews with the workshop owner, it is known that both mechanics and *part counter* employees both play the same role and interact directly in providing services to consumers with their respective duties according to the service flow to consumers who come for on-site repairs or customers who only buy *spare parts*. Direct interaction between employees and customers is important in achieving customer satisfaction, especially for businesses operating in the service industry (Khwaja & Yang, 2022).

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Performance

Performance is the behavior and actions of employees that support the achievement of organizational goals (van der Vaart, 2021). Furthermore, employee performance can also be defined as a measure of an employee's success in performing their work well over a specific period of time, assessed based on various aspects, such as: work result standards, work targets, and performance criteria. In addition, employee performance is also influenced by the work environment, quality of work life, and employee commitment to the organization (Karoso et al., 2022)

2.2 Employee Performance Assessment

Employee performance management is defined as the process of communicating performance expectations to employees, evaluating employee performance against established expectations, and guiding decision-making regarding employee performance. The main objective of employee performance management is to align employee behavior and

development with the goals and strategies of the organization or company (Church et al., 2019). As previously mentioned, one of the processes of employee performance management is performance appraisal or employee performance evaluation as a formal system to review and evaluate individual performance, especially for the company, with most of its focus on individual employee performance (Grobler et al., 2011).

2.3 Employee Performance Appraisal

Employee performance assessment or also called employee performance evaluation is a process that estimates the overall performance of employees during a certain period, this performance assessment is important because it is an instrument that encourages employees, organizational areas, and the entire company to have appropriate behavior and continuous improvement (Aguilar Lasserre et al., 2014).

In addition, performance appraisal is useful in making decisions about personnel allocation, productivity bonuses, incentives, promotions, disciplinary actions, and dismissals (Aguilar Lasserre et al., 2014). The following are methods that can be used in employee performance assessment (Grobler et al., 2011)

- **360 Degree Feedback Method.** This method differs from traditional employee performance appraisal methods, where the employee performance appraisal process only involves the supervisor as the assessor. This method involves all parties around the employee who are involved in the employee's work, including senior managers, the employee themselves, *supervisors*, coworkers, and both internal and external consumers.
- **Rating Scale Method.** *The rating scale* method is a performance appraisal method that evaluates employees based on predetermined factors, with a rating scale for each specific criterion. This employee performance appraisal method allows assessors to record their assessments on a scale with several categories, generally consisting of 5-7 criteria. The scale definition for each criterion is usually defined using the word "rating." traits of being exceptional, meeting expectations, or needing to be improved
- **Critical Incident Method.** The Critical Incident Method is a performance appraisal method that requires keeping written records of both highly favorable and highly unfavorable employee actions in a job and that significantly impact department effectiveness. At the end of the appraisal period, the employee's performance appraiser uses the supervisor's notes along with other data to evaluate the employee's performance.

2.4 Selection of 360 Degree Feedback Method and Rating Scale

Designing a *360 Degree Feedback* performance appraisal system requires considering the assessment scale used to ensure that there is a scale used to differentiate performance levels. employees (Church et al., 2019). One reliable, valid, and easily understood performance appraisal method for assessors is the *rating scale method* (Church et al., 2019). A *rating scale*, also known as a *graphic rating scale*, is a method of measuring employee performance that assesses employee performance based on factors or classifications that have been determined on a specific scale and defined with specific adjectives or sentences such as very good, sufficient, or needs improvement (Grobler et al., 2011). In addition, *the rating scale* has flexibility in terms of selecting the range of assessment numbers as long as the instrument compiler can interpret each number given to the answer alternatives on each instrument item (Sugiyono, 2013). The combination of these two methods allows performance assessors to record their assessments on a performance assessment sheet using a scale with several specific value categories according to certain behaviors or performance results, making it easier for assessors to understand what indicators are used to assess an employee's performance.

2.5 Content Validity Index (CVI)

The testing process using CVI begins by calculating the percentage of items assessed by each expert assessing one or more instruments. The average percentage of each instrument is then calculated, known as the Average Congruency Percentage (*ACP*). CVI is divided into two types of validity: individual item content validity (i-CVI) and overall content validity (s-CVI). A research instrument is considered to have high validity if its i-CVI value is between 0.80 and 1.00 (Puspitasari & Febrinita, 2021).

2.6 Software Expert Choice

Expert Choice software is a software that supports decisions. It is collaborative and can assist in group decision-making. This *software* combines an intuitive *user interface* with automatic priority calculations, inconsistencies, and several ways to process sensitivity analysis (IshWizhaickha & Labib, 2009). *Expert Choice* software can facilitate AHP analysis process in making decisions based on several complex system alternatives and providing a comparison of problems in hierarchical form (Yulianto, 2017).

3 METHODS

Research design is a blueprint of activities, procedures, and strategies to be followed to obtain the most valuable answers to research questions or to achieve research objectives (Jongbo, 2014). Research design, as a stage in creating a research work plan, is an important step to be carried out so that researchers can conduct research with clear goals and steps. The research design used in this study is exploratory research. The nature of exploratory research is used to discover new ideas or relationships from certain phenomena (Purba & Simanjuntak, 2012).

The data collection conducted in this study used a communication approach conducted by conducting direct interviews and filling out questionnaires with the sources related to this study, namely several business actors in the automotive repair service industry and the manager of a national standard automotive repair shop, namely Astra Motor Center Semarang. Through these interviews, qualitative data were obtained in the form of criteria and sub-criteria related to the performance assessment of automotive repair shop mechanic employees and quantitative data in the form of validation values for each criteria and sub-criteria for performance assessment as well as the assessment weights for performance assessors. The time dimension used in this study is *cross-sectional* as an observational study that analyzes data from a population at a certain point in time (Wang & Cheng, 2020).

The variables used in this study consist of employee performance assessment criteria and sub-criteria obtained based on previous research literature studies and employee performance assessments at Astra Motor Center Semarang, which are then adjusted to the needs and conditions of the Rims Motor workshop as the research object. The research variables will then be validated first by experts, namely practitioners in the field of automotive repair services, using the *Content Validity Index* (CVI) method.

Data collection in this research was carried out through literature studies, interviews, field observation, and primary data collection through direct research with four experts as sources and data collection on the research objects. The data collection process began with the design of a *Content Validity Index* (CVI) questionnaire and a weighting questionnaire using paired comparisons.

Data processing was performed after all the validation questionnaire data for the assessment criteria and sub-criteria, as well as the pairwise comparison data for the assessor, criteria, and sub-criteria weightings, were validated. The validation questionnaire data were processed using the *Content Validity Index* (CVI), while the pairwise comparison data were processed using the *Analytic Hierarchy Process* (AHP) to obtain the weights for each valid criterion and sub-criteria as research variables. There are two stages in data processing:

- Validation of Criteria Assessment and Sub-Criteria of Performance assessment
- Weighting using *Analytic Hierarchy Process* (AHP)

4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Validation Of Criteria and Sub-Criteria

After the respondents have assessed the results, the next step is calculating the I-CVI for each research variable, namely the performance assessment of criteria and sub-criteria. Validated variables that achieve an I-CVI value of 1 are considered valid and will be used in the next research stage (Table 1). Similar to the assessment criteria, the assessment sub-criteria are also validated using CVI, with validation results that obtain an I-CVI value equal to 1 being said to be valid and will be used in the next research stage (Table 2). After obtaining the list of performance assessment criteria and sub-criteria, the next step is to assign weights to each criterion and sub-criteria for employee performance assessment as research variables, as well as assign weights to the performance assessors using the AHP method with the assistance of *Expert Choice* software. The following are the results of the calculation of the performance assessor weights: supervisor (0.721), self (0.093) and peer (0.186) and variables (Table 3).

4.2 Results of Employee Performance Assessment

The final results of employee performance assessments use integration between *360 Degree Feedback* and the *Analytical Hierarchy Process* (AHP) to obtain the final employee performance. This integration utilizes the results of assessments from various perspectives of Rims Motor workshop *stakeholders*, namely the workshop owner as the superior and employees, which are then divided into two perspectives, namely the employees themselves and their co-workers.

The calculation of employee performance assessment produces a Final Value (*NA*) which is the result of the integration between the *360 Degree Evaluation* method and *The rating scale* is obtained by calculating as follows (Rosmawati Hutabarat et al., 2015):

- $NA = [NK(1)(a/d/r) \times GW(1) \dots GW(8)(a/d/r) \times GW(18)]$
- NA = final value
- NK = criteria or sub-criteria value
- a/d/r = weight of each assessor whether superior, self, or co-worker
- GW = global weight, which is the multiplication of the criteria weight and the sub-criteria weight

The following is an example of an employee performance appraisal sheet for a mechanical employee named Wahyu, which is shown in table 4.

Table 1: Validation of Criteria Assessment

Criteria	Respondents				I-CVI	Information
	R1	R2	R3	R4		
Attitude and discipline work	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Honesty	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Daily unit entry target achievement	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Revenue achievement (Service and sold part)	1	0	0	0	0.25	Invalid
Customer satisfaction	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Work neatness	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Administration neatness	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Obedient of work procedure	1	0	1	0	0.5	Invalid
Effort to reach the achievement	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Cooperation	1	1	1	1	1	Valid

Table 2: Validation of Sub-Criteria Assessment

Criteria	Respondents				I-CVI	Information
	R1	R2	R3	R4		
On time arrival	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
On time break	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
On time after work	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Absent from work	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Comply with SOP	1	0	0	0	0.25	Invalid
Accuracy of crosschecking the number of jobs	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Accuracy of crosschecking the number of spare part	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Compliance income (for the part counter)	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Compliance number of sold part (for the part counter)	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Service responsiveness	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Work Result	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Placement of work tools	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Arrangement of used part packaging	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Arrangement of spare parts	1	1	1	1	1	Valid
Spare part storage	1	1	1	1	1	Valid

Table 3: Variables Weighting

Assessor	Weight
Superior	0,721
Self-assessment	0.093
Work Colleague	0.186

Table 4: Example of final score calculation

Criteria	Criteria Weight	Sub-Criteria	Sub-criteria Weight	Global Weight	Score			Final Score
					Superior	Self-assessment	Work colleague	
Attitude and discipline work	0.222	On time arrival	0.501	0.111	3	3	3.17	0.337
		On time break	0.125	0.026	4	3	3	0.103
		On time after work	0.054	0.012	3	3	3.83	0.038
		Absent from work	0.320	0.071	4	3	4	0.278
Honesty	0.213	Accuracy of crosschecking the number of jobs	0.084	0.018	4	3	4	0.070
		Accuracy of crosschecking the number of spare part	0.091	0.019	4	3	4	0.076
Honesty	0.213	Compliance income (for the part counter)	0.458	0.098				
		Compliance number of sold part (for the part counter)	0.367	0.078				
Daily unit entry target achievement				0.058	3	3	3.17	0.176
Customer satisfaction	0.186	Service responsiveness	0.205	0.148	4	3	3.83	0.148
		Work Result	0.795	0.573	4	3	3.83	0.573
Neatness of work	0.052	Placement of work tools	0.256	0.190	4	4	4	0.190
	0052	Arrangement of used part packaging	0.094	0.017	4	4	4	0.070
		Arrangement of spare parts	0.325					
		Spare part storage	0.325					
Administrative neatness				0.407	4	4	4	0.188
Effort to achieve the results				0.123	4	4	4	0.492
Cooperation				0.099	3	3	3.67	0.309
Final Score								3.048

4.3 Recapitulation of Final Results of Performance Assessment Employee

The following are the final results of the performance assessment of Rims Motor workshop employees, which have been given weighting for each assessor, criteria, performance sub-criteria, and also show the percentage of performance values to then be used as material for determining the division of employee work locations, as shown in table 5.

Table 5: Recapitulation of final assessment

Nr. respondent	Final Value	Percentage	Ranking	Suggestion
1-mech	3.048	76.19%	4	Main
2-mech	3.017	75/42%	5	Branch 1
3-mech	3.085	77.13%	3	Branch 2
4-mech	2.991	74.78%	6	Branch 2
5-mech	3.165	79.13%	2	Branch 1
6-mech	3.169	79.23%	1	Main
7-mech	2.787	69.68%	7	Main
8-PC	3.889	97.22%	1	Main
9-PC	3.472	86.81%	4	Main
10-PC	3.706	92.65%	2	Branch 1
11-PC	3.624	90.59%	3	Branch 2

Mech = mechanic, PC = Part counter

Recommendation

- The performance assessment of the mechanical and *part counter* employees at the Rims Motor workshop that has been carried out broadly provides two recommendations, namely recommendations regarding the division of employee work locations and recommendations regarding actions that business owners can do to employees based on the final results of their employee performance appraisals:
- Grouping employees into several groups is done by dividing employees into different groups based on work location or in other words, dividing employee work locations for different locations. Employees are one way that has a positive impact on individual employee performance (Zhang & Huai, 2016) and is also able to provide a positive contribution to the overall Grouping performance of the organization or company (Collings & Mellahi, 2009). The division of work locations for each employee aims to obtain a relatively balanced quality of employee performance for each business location or in other words between the main workshop, branch workshop 1, branch workshop 2, and later branch workshops 3 and 4 have a relatively balanced quality of employee performance. Service quality as a result of employee performance at each different business location is positively related to customer satisfaction and also retention or the company's ability to maintain customer loyalty (Khawaja & Yang, 2022). The employee grouping used in this study represents the researcher's recommendations for the research object, which aims to provide input to workshop owners in determining the work location allocation for each employee based on the performance assessment. Details of the recommended employee work location allocation can be seen in Table 6.
- The performance assessment carried out on eleven Rims Motor workshop employees resulted in a recapitulation of final scores as follows in table 6. The table, in addition to containing a list of final performance appraisal scores, also contains the percentage of each employee's score and the division of employee work locations based on the results of the performance appraisal. It is known that there is a mechanic employee named Huda who has a performance score percentage of 69.68% or is included in the medium score range. (Hartati & Hikmah, 2022). The calculation results show that eight of the fourteen assessment indicators performed at the lowest level compared to the other six mechanics and also at the lowest level among the ten other employees overall. The performance assessment indicators are C11 (attending work on time), C14 (absent from work), C3 (achieving daily *unit entry* targets), C41 (service responsiveness), C42 (work results), C51 (work tool placement), C6 (administrative neatness), and C7 (efforts to achieve results). Based on this, the business owner is recommended to communicate the results of the evaluation to the mechanic named Huda because employees need to know which parts of their work need improvement (Zondo, 2018).

5 CONCLUSION

The design of Rims Motor workshop employee performance assessment to determine the level of employee performance begins with the identification of things needed in designing employee performance assessment, namely the selection of assessment methods, determination of assessment *stakeholders*, determination of criteria and sub-criteria for performance assessment for workshop employees, both mechanics and *part counters*, determination of the weight of each *stakeholder*, namely as a performance assessor, to the determination of the weight of each criteria and sub-criteria for performance assessment.

Researchers based on the results of literature studies, interviews with *stakeholders*, and analysis concluded that the appropriate performance assessment method used for Rims Motor workshops is 360 *degree feedback* as an assessment method that utilizes assessments based on the perspectives of various assessors, namely the workshop owner as a superior, themselves, namely each workshop employee, and coworkers combined with *the Scale Rating* assessment method combining assessment numbers with certain performance results or certain habits of employees expected experienced practitioners with more than ten years of experience. The validation results eliminated two of the ten criteria and one of the seventeen sub-criteria for performance assessment from literature studies and adaptation of employee performance assessments belonging to Astra Motor Center Semarang. The valid performance assessment criteria and sub-criteria were then weighted using the AHP method which then produced a weight for each assessment indicator which was then combined with the assessment scale resulting from discussions with the head of the Astra Motor Center Semarang workshop and the owner of the Rims Motor workshop which then produced a performance assessment sheet for each employee of the Rims Motor workshop.

The division of work locations for workshop employees, both mechanics and *part counters*, which is recommended by the researcher is based on the final assessment score after weighting. The division of work locations that was originally planned to divide eleven employees into four different locations according to the business owner's plan to establish two new branch locations by the end of the year cannot be done and can only be done for three different locations considering that the business owner requires each location to have a minimum of two mechanic employees and a minimum of one *part counter* employee with the main workshop must have a minimum of three mechanics with two *part counters*. So to be able to meet these criteria, the business owner must also increase the number of mechanic employees by two people and one *part counter employee*.

The following recommendations are provided for further research purposes:

- Subsequent research can carry out further weighting compared to the use of the AHP method in this study. It is hoped that further research will not only obtain weights for each assessment indicator but also the relationship between assessment indicators so that more comprehensive assessment results for employee performance evaluation can be obtained to be able to find out the causes and effects of employee performance more accurately by superiors during employee work.
- Further research can be conducted with a wider scope of automotive workshop objects so that the employee. In addition to the two assessment methods, the design of the performance assessment also requires a list of specific employee performance assessment criteria and sub-criteria to be applied to the research object by conducting a literature study and direct interviews with *stakeholders* of a business entity that is also engaged in the field of motorcycle after-sales services and already has an employee performance assessment system, namely the head of the Astra Motor Center Semarang workshop. The results of the literature study and interviews with the head of the Astra Motor Center Semarang workshop produced a list of criteria and employee performance assessments that still need to be validated by the parties.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Funding Source

This study was funded by Diponegoro University within Basic Research (Penelitian Dasar, SPK Nr. 030/Dasar/Teknik Industri/5/UN7.F3/PP/III/2026, 2 Maret 2026).

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aguilar Lasserre, AA, Lafarja Solabac, MV, Hernandez-Torres, R., Posada-Gomez, R., Juárez-Martínez,U., & Fernández Lambert, G.(2014). Expert System for Competences
- [2] Evaluation 360° Feedback Using Fuzzy Logic.*Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2014(July), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/789234>
- [3] Banwo, A. O., Du, J., & Onokala, U. (2017). The determinants of location specific choice: small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-017-0074-2>
- [4] Church, AH, Bracken, DW, Fleenor, JW, & Rose, D. S. (2019). The Handbook of Strategic 360 Feedback. In AH Church, DW Bracken, JW Fleenor, & DS Rose (Ed.), *Handbook of Strategic 360 Feedback*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190879860.003.0031>
- [5] Collings, D. G., & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), 304–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.04.001>
- [6] Grigoroudis, E., Tsitsiridi, E., & Zopounidis, C. (2013). Linking customer satisfaction, employee appraisal, and business performance: An evaluation methodology in the banking sector. *Annals of Operations Research*, 205(1), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-012-1206-2>
- [7] Grobler, P.A., Wärnich, S., Carrell, M.R., Elbert, N. F., & Hatfield, R.D. (2011). HRM in Action: Employee Engagement as a Strategic HR Tool. In J. Seth (Ed.), *Human Resource Management in South Africa* (4 ed., Vol. 8, pp. 234–261). Cengage Learning EMEA.
- [8] Harney, B., Gilman, M., Mayson, S., & Raby, S. (2022). Advancing understanding of HRM in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs): critical questions and future prospects. In *International Journal of Human Resource Management* (Vol. 33, Number 16, pp. 3175–3196). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2109375>
- [9] Ishizaka, A., & Labib, A. (2009). Analytic Hierarchy Process and Expert Choice: Benefits and limitations. *OR Insight*, 22(4), 201–220. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ori.2009.10>
- [10] June, S., Kheng, Y. K., & Mahmood, R. (2013). Determining the Importance of Competency and Person- Job Fit for the Job Performance of Service SMEs Employees in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 9(10), 114. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n10p114>
- [11] Kanovska, L. (2009). Customer Services and Their Role for Industrial Small and Medium Companies. *Economics & Management*, 14, 413–421. <http://eduedi.dongguk.edu/files/20130306172120568.pdf>
- [12] Karoso, S., Riinawati, R., Ilham, RN, Rais, RGP, & Latifa, D. (2022). Analyzing the Relationship of Work Environment and Quality of Work Life on Employee Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Civil Society*, 1(3), 167–173. <https://doi.org/10.56225/jmsc.v1i3.140>
- [13] Khwaja, A., & Yang, N. (2022). Quantifying The Link Between Employee Engagement, and Customer Satisfaction and Retention in The Car Rental Industry. *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 20(3), 275–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11129-022-09253-6>
- [14] Ng, T.W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (2013). Does longer job tenure help or hinder job performance? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(3), 305–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.012>
- [15] Puspitasari, WD, & Febrinita, F. (2021). Content Validity Testing of Student Perception Questionnaire on Online Learning of Computational Mathematics Courses. *Focus Action of Research Mathematics*, 4(1), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.30762/factor-m.v4i1.3254>
- [16] Rosmawati Hutabarat, E., Nugroho, SW, & Puspitasari, D. (2015). 360 Degree Feedback Performance Assessment Model for Production Operators using the Fuzzy AHP Method at PT. Berkas Manunggal Jaya. *Journal of Industrial Engineering*.
- [17] Santoso, H. (2006). Improving the Quality of Service in the Service Industry Through an Integration Approach of the Servqual-Six Sigma or Servqual-QFD Method. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12777/jati.1.1.85-106](https://doi.org/10.12777/jati.1.1.85-106)
- [18] Sanyal, M. K., & Biswas, S. B. (2014). Employee Motivation from Performance Appraisal Implications: Test of a Theory in the Software Industry in West Bengal (India). *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 11(14),184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(14\)00187-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00187-7)
- [19] Siddiqui, M. N. (2014). Success of an Organization is a result of Employees Performance. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 1(4), 179–201. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.14.280>

- [20] Siraj, N., & Hågen, I. (2023). Performance Management System and Its Role for Employee Performance: Evidence from Ethiopian SMEs. *Heliyon*, 9(11), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e21819>
- [21] Sugiyono. (2013). *Quantitative Qualitative Research Methods and R&D*. van der Vaart, L. (2021). The performance measurement conundrum: Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economic and management Sciences*, 24(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v24i1.3581>
- [22] Wang, X., & Cheng, Z. (2020). Cross-Sectional Studies: Strengths, Weaknesses, and
- [23] Recommendations. In *Chest* (Vol. 158, Number 1, pp. S65–S71). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.03.012>
- [24] Yulianto, J. (2017). Selection of Piling Equipment Using Expert Choice. *Journal of Civil Engineering Research, Sebelas Maret University*, 1(1), 2579–7999.
- [25] Zhang, Y., & Huai, M.Y. (2016). Diverse Work Groups and Employee Performance: The Role of Communication Ties. *Small Group Research*, 47(1), 28–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496415604742>.