



Determination of the Best Employee Using The Behavioral Anchor Rating Scale

Herman Sjahrudin¹, Poppy Hidayat², Irwan Moridu³, I Nyoman Tri Sutaguna⁴, Suratman³

¹Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Makassar Bongaya, Indonesia

²IIK Strada Indonesia, Indonesia

³Muhammadiyah Luwuk University, Indonesia

⁴Udayana University, Indonesia

⁵Semarang University, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Aug 25, 2022

Revised Aug 30, 2022

Accepted Sep 15, 2022

Keywords:

Behavioral Anchor Rating Scale

Human Resource Management

Management Decision Support

Selection Best Employee

ABSTRACT (9 PT)

Human resource management is essential in improving the competence of human resources in the company, especially every employee, in carrying out operational activities for the company's common goals. Increasing competence requires each individual to improve performance for the company's success further and consider the provision of bonuses and allowances. An objective employee performance appraisal can produce the best employee appraisal decisions that are carried out by selecting many employees from several assessment criteria. This study aims to determine the best employee ratings by applying the Behavioral Anchor Rating Scale (BARS) method so that each parameter of employee attitude and behaviour assessment can be made on a measurable scale with rating and anchor value scales that show performance on each dimension of the four assessment criteria. The study results of 5 alternative employee candidates have successfully completed an objective assessment to produce one best employee result.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Herman Sjahrudin,
Management Study Program,
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Makassar Bongaya,
28 Let. Jend. Mappaoddang Street, Bongaya, Makassar City, Sulawesi Selatan, 90131, Indonesia.
Email: herman.sjahrudin@stiem-bongaya.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

An organization or company needs human resources who have competence in their respective fields to support a company's operations. In carrying out operational activities in an organization or company, human resource management (HR) is also needed so that the activities to be carried out can run well and according to the desired target. Human resource management includes human resource development, which functions to plan (Halisa, 2020), implement, recruit, train, develop and appreciate the performance of each individual, in this case, an employee, in supporting the vision and mission and targets of a company (Hasibuan, 2018) (Soetrisno, 2016). Every organization will formulate a new strategy in human resource management. An important point in human resource management is the assessment or evaluation of employee performance to determine the

ability of human resources, as well as providing rewards and punishments to stimulate and motivate the workforce to be more productive in their work and company operational work (Tangkuman et al., 2015).

One form of company employee appreciation is to provide bonuses or additional allowances (Sugijono, 2015). Of course, in determining the award of this bonus, a determination mechanism is needed based on several performance evaluation parameters to produce the best employee candidates in the company. They are entitled to receive rewards or benefits, as is the case at PT. Global Extreme, which every period in a matter of 6 months, evaluates employee performance to determine the best employee candidates who receive bonuses and benefits. The assessment components also vary, such as performance results, attendance, responsibility, communication, target achievement, and others, so there is no fixed component (Halisa, 2020) used in performance appraisal.

The use of the Behavioral Anchor Rating Scale (BARS) in multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) problems (Sudipa et al., 2021) (Yeh & Willis, 2001), especially in evaluating employee performance, has been carried out by researchers (Rouza & Yanto, 2019) who use behavioural parameters in assessing employee performance, then research (Hutasoit et al., 2021) uses, the BARS method in determining the factors in the decline in performance and the criteria that need to be improved (Asana et al., 2020), other studies (Suradiraja, 2015) use BARS to create objectivity for employee performance appraisal models, and research (Evita et al., 2017) applies the BARS method to reduce the subjectivity of the daily report assessment of employee performance. The BARS method is considered capable of changing the parameters of the employee's attitude and behaviour assessment so that it becomes a measurable scale to facilitate decision-makers in making assessments and producing more objective decisions. This matter also underlies the study of applying the BARS method in modelling performance appraisals with an anchor on each criterion dimension.

This study uses a parameter scoring technique for evaluating employee performance using BARS because it can define various work behaviour variables into a rating scale (Matosas-López et al., 2019), with a Likert scale rating for the value of each criterion parameter (Martin-Raugh et al., 2016). The purpose of this research is to make an objective assessment model of employee performance produce the best employee candidates for receiving bonuses and employee benefits.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1. Human Resource Management

The definition of management is the science or art that regulates the process of utilizing human and other resources effectively and efficiently to achieve a company goal (Syarif et al., 2022). In improving the competence of human resources (HR), a company asset in driving operations in a company, it is necessary to evaluate employee performance as the primary benchmark in HR development. Good human resource management will improve employee and company productivity (Soetrisno, 2016).

2.2. Management Decision Support

The decision-making process often involves selecting many alternatives from several assessment criteria (Limbong et al., 2020). Decision-makers carry out the decision-making process to make decisions more objective and follow the assessment parameters. In the process, decision-makers often find it challenging to model the decision-making framework for routine and non-routine problems in management (Eom & Kim, 2006). A decision support system is a computerized system that can facilitate decision-makers in making decisions to benefit organizational or company goals.

2.3. Rating Scale

A rating Scale is an assessment based on a specific scale from low to high (Wright & Masters, 1982).. The Rating Scale uses raw data in the form of numbers which are then interpreted in a descriptive sense (Ilhami & Rimantho, 2017). The advantages of implementing this method are simple, easy to design, and easy to use. While the assessment is potentially objective, each assessment characteristic is equally important (Anwar, 2019).

Table 1. Criteria Data

Scale	Description
1	Unsatisfactory/Very Bad
2	Need Repair/Bad
3	Meeting Expectations/Enough
4	Exceeding Expectations/Good
5	Excellent/Very Good

2.4. Behaviour Anchor Rating Scale (BARS)

The BARS method defines definite, observable, and measurable job performance behaviours (Matosas-López et al., 2019). The BARS performance appraisal method combines a critical incident rating using a scale that describes good and bad performance (Kell et al., 2017) (Rouza & Yanto, 2019). Anchor assessment in question is behaviour that shows performance for each dimension, which can be arranged from the highest value to the lowest value. Anchor assessment uses a rating scale from 5 to 10 vertical behavioural scales for each performance indicator (Evita et al., 2017).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. Criteria and Alternative Data Analysis

This study uses the assessment criteria Discipline (C1), Honesty (C2), Responsibility (C3) and Teamwork (C4). With the five best alternative employee candidates, the employee alternative is symbolized by the Alternative symbol (A). The criteria data can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Criteria Data

Criteria	Criteria Name	Weight Value
C1	Discipline	35%
C2	Honesty	20%
C3	Responsibility	20%
C4	Teamwork	25%

In Table 2, it can be explained that in determining the priority of criteria in the decision-making process, each criteria is given a weight value that has been selected by the decision maker [22]. The weight value determines the most influential assessment criteria in the employee performance appraisal.

3.2. BARS Method Assessment Model

BARS implementation is used in determining the anchor of each assessment criteria. In this study, each criteria consists of 5 anchors representing employees' attitudes or behaviour at work. Each anchor is assigned a value scale with a rating scale of the most significant value of 5 and the lowest value of 1, according to Table 2. Each criteria anchor can be developed based on decision-makers needs and business processes applied in each company in assessing employee performance. The employee performance appraisal model using the BARS method can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Anchor Of Each Criteria Indicator

Criteria Indicator	Rating	Anchor
Discipline	5	Always present on time, with a 0% absenteeism rate
	4	Always present on time, with an absenteeism rate < 5%
	3	Always present but sometimes late and occasionally absent in some tolerable conditions
	2	Attendance rate > 10% and come sometimes late
	1	Often come late and absent for no apparent reason
Honesty	5	Always report the results of their work according to the actual situation
	4	Occasionally not reporting work results following the real situation
	3	The written work results do not match the actual situation.
	2	Reported work results are always better than the actual situation
Responsibility	1	Often reports that their work is not following the real situation
	5	Always do the task according to the instructions given
	4	Always do the assigned job well even though occasionally make mistakes
	3	Doing the tasks given is sometimes not good and not following the instructions given but still within reasonable limits
	2	The assigned reading is done, but errors often occur
Teamwork	1	often do not do the assigned tasks
	5	Able to coordinate and communicate with various parties and respect the opinions of others
	4	Knowing the duties of others related to their responsibilities and accepting suggestions from others
	3	Knowing the outline of other people's tasks related to their duties and occasionally having to be confirmed in advance to adjust their opinions
	2	Do not accept joint decisions if they conflict with their opinions and do not know for sure the duties of other people related to them
1	Completely unable to coordinate and communicate with various parties and unable to respect people's opinions	

3.3. Alternative Final Value Calculation

The next step is to determine each alternative's final value (V) based on the anchor rating in Table 3. Based on internal data at the research site, the scores of the five best alternative candidates are obtained.

Table 4. Alternative Values

Alternative	Criteria			
	C1	C2	C3	C4
A1	4	5	4	4
A2	5	3	4	3
A3	4	5	5	4
A4	4	4	4	5
A5	5	4	5	3

The final alternative value is calculated by adding up the alternative values on the criteria that have been multiplied by the weight of each criteria. The final value calculation is as follows:

$$V_{A1} = 4 * (0,35) + 5 * (0,2) + 4 * (0,2) + 4 * (0,25) = \mathbf{4,2}$$

$$V_{A2} = 5 * (0,35) + 3 * (0,2) + 4 * (0,2) + 3 * (0,25) = \mathbf{3,9}$$

$$V_{A3} = 4 * (0,35) + 5 * (0,2) + 5 * (0,2) + 4 * (0,25) = \mathbf{4,4}$$

$$V_{A4} = 4 * (0,35) + 4 * (0,2) + 4 * (0,2) + 5 * (0,25) = \mathbf{4,25}$$

$$V_{A5} = 5 * (0,35) + 4 * (0,2) + 5 * (0,2) + 3 * (0,25) = \mathbf{4,3}$$

3.4. Ranking of The Best Employee Candidates

The alternative ranking stage is based on calculating each alternative's final value (V). From five alternatives, one alternative will be selected for the best employee. The determination of the value of employee candidates is sorted from the most significant

value to the smallest value indicating rank 1 to rank 5. The final ranking of employee alternatives can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Best Employee Alternative Ranking

Alternative	Final Score	Ranking
A3	4,4	1
A5	4,3	2
A4	4,25	3
A1	4,2	4
A2	3,9	5

Based on table 5, it can be explained that the best employee alternative is alternative A3 with a value of 4.4 as ranking 1. Followed by ranking 2 is alternative A5 with a final score of 4.3. Rank 3 is alternative 4, with a final score of 4.25. Rank 4 is alternative A1 with a value of 4.2. And ranking 5 is alternative A2 with a value of 3.9.

A3 > A5 > A4 > A1 > A2

4. CONCLUSION

The best employees can be determined by evaluating employee performance by applying the Behavioral Anchor Rating Scale (BARS) method. The BARS method can measure attitudes, behaviour and assessment parameters according to the business processes of each company into a measurement scale, using anchors on each evaluation criteria. Employee performance appraisals that are carried out objectively can certainly produce maximum decisions by decision-makers, so consideration of giving bonuses or employee benefits can be carried out based on the best performance appraisal.

REFERENCES

- Anwar. (2019). Employee Performance Appraisal Analysis with Analytic Network Process (ANP) and Rating Scale Method in Baitul Mall Lhokseumawe. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 505(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/505/1/012065>
- Asana, I. M. D. P., Sudipa, I. G. I., & Wijaya, I. M. A. (2020). Decision Support System For Employee Assessment At PT. Kupu-Kupu Taman Lestari Using AHP And BARS Methods: Decision Support System For Employee Assessment At PT. Kupu-Kupu Taman Lestari Using AHP And BARS Methods. *Jurnal Mantik*, 4(1), 97–106.
- Eom, S., & Kim, E. (2006). A survey of decision support system applications (1995–2001). *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 57(11), 1264–1278.
- Evita, S. N., Muizu, W. O. Z., & Atmojo, R. T. W. (2017). Penilaian kinerja karyawan dengan menggunakan metode Behaviorally Anchor Rating Scale dan Management by Objectives (studi kasus pada PT Qwords Company International). *PEKBIS (Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Dan Bisnis)*, 9(1), 18–32.
- Halisa, N. N. (2020). Peran Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia" Sistem Rekrutmen, Seleksi, Kompetensi dan Pelatihan" Terhadap Keunggulan Kompetitif: Literature Review. *ADI Bisnis Digital Interdisiplin Jurnal*, 1(2 Desember), 14–22.
- Hasibuan. (2018). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. In *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*.
- Hutasoit, A. O., Triwibisono, C., & Nugraha, F. N. (2021). Perancangan Penilaian Kinerja Karyawan Menggunakan Metode Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (bars) Di Pt Widya Trans Cargo. *EProceedings of Engineering*, 8(2).
- Ihhami, R. S., & Rimantho, D. (2017). Jurnal Optimasi Sistem Industri. *Penilaian Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Metode AHP Dan Rating Scale*, 16,157.
- Kell, H. J., Martin-Raugh, M. P., Carney, L. M., Inglese, P. A., Chen, L., & Feng, G. (2017). Exploring Methods for Developing Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales for Evaluating Structured Interview Performance. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2017(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12152>
- Limbong, T., Muttaqin, M., Iskandar, A., Windarto, A. P., Simarmata, J., Mesran, M., Sulaiman, O. K., Siregar, D., Nofriansyah, D., & Napitupulu, D. (2020). *Sistem Pendukung Keputusan:*

Metode & Implementasi. Yayasan Kita Menulis.

- Martin-Raugh, M., Tannenbaum, R. J., Tocci, C. M., & Reese, C. (2016). Behaviorally anchored rating scales: An application for evaluating teaching practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 414–419.
- Matosas-López, L., Leguey-Galán, S., & Doncel-Pedreira, L. M. (2019). Converting Likert scales into Behavioral Anchored Rating Scales (Bars) for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for formative purposes. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 16(3), 9.
- Rouza, E., & Yanto, B. (2019). Penerapan BARS (Behaviorally Anchor Rating Scale) Berbasis Web Dalam Penilaian Kinerja Karyawan. *ZONasi: Jurnal Sistem Informasi*, 1(2), 115–129.
- Soetrisno, E. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Kencana.
- Sudipa, I. G. I., Asana, I. M. D. P., Wiguna, I. K. A. G., & Putra, I. N. T. A. (2021). Implementation of ELECTRE II Algorithm to Analyze Student Constraint Factors in Completing Thesis. *2021 6th International Conference on New Media Studies (CONMEDIA)*, 22–27.
- Sugijono. (2015). Pengembangan karyawan dalam manajemen sumber daya manusia. *Orbith Vol. 11 No. 2 Juli 2015: 110 – 117 Pengembangan*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr100233r>
- Suradiraja, H. (2015). Penyusunan Penilaian Kinerja Model Bars Untuk Meningkatkan Persepsi Karyawan Terhadap Objektivitas Penilaian Kinerja. *Jurnal SosioHumaniora*, 6(1).
- Syarief, F., Kurniawan, A., Widodo, Z. D., Nugroho, H., Rimayanti, R., Siregar, E., Isabella, A. A., Fitriani, F., Kairupan, D. J. I., & Siregar, Z. H. (2022). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*.
- Tangkuman, K., Tewal, B., & Trang, I. (2015). Penilaian kinerja, reward, dan punishment terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Pertamina (persero) cabang pemasaran suluttenggo. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 3(2).
- Wright, B. D., & Masters, G. N. (1982). *Rating scale analysis*. MESA press.
- Yeh, C., & Willis, R. J. (2001). *A validation procedure for multicriteria analysis: application to the selection of scholarship students*. 6, 39–52.