Relationship between Different Work Arrangements and Generation Z Employees Individual Work Performance

Salma Indira Putri[1], Achmad Fajar Hendarman[2]
[1,2]School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: Salma Indira Putri

ABSTRACT *: Companies are beginning to use hybrid and on-site work as COVID-19 instances drop. Some businesses are still implementing remote work. In general, Generation Z is the generation that has recently entered the labor field during the pandemic, which has an impact on their work performance. Generation Z has adapted to remote and hybrid work after two years of the pandemic, and they are less willing to travel to the workplace. The purpose of this study is to assess the prevalence of Generation Z employees working on-site, remotely, or in a hybrid capacity following the pandemic. It also investigates the relationship between various work arrangements and individual work performance of Generation Z employees following the epidemic. This study took a quantitative method, delivering questionnaires to 202 people in the Jabodetabek and Bandung areas. According to the respondents, the prevalence of Generation Z working in hybrid is higher than on-site and remote. On-site employees are more than just distant employees. To prove the hypothesis, data was processed using the Simple Linear Test technique and a partial T-test. As a result, no positive and substantial association exists between various work arrangements and individual job performance.*

KEYWORDS – *Covid-19, Work performance, Generation Z, Individual Work Performance*

I.   INTRODUCTION

One of the worst pandemics in recent history is COVID-19. In less than 18 months since the epidemic started, there have been approximately 200 million confirmed cases and four million losses worldwide [1]. The epidemic has changed humanity as a whole in numerous ways. Several aspects of life are changing as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in Indonesia where the government has enacted a measure known as PSBB (Large-Scale Social Restrictions) to stop the virus' spread. Many firms decreased or discontinued their regular workday operations as a result of government-ordered shutdowns and stay-at-home directives [2]. The existence of social distancing, or PSBB, has been declared mandatory in all nations impacted by COVID-19, including Indonesia. As a result, practically all enterprises in Indonesia have implemented work from home policies [3].

The employees experience a wide range of effects as a result of working from home. Many employees, it has been discovered, find it difficult to keep a good balance or establish distinct boundaries between their personal and professional lives, leaving them vulnerable to conflicts in their private lives [4]. On the one hand, this might increase their job satisfaction, but on the other, it's important to recognize the stress that comes with it [5]. Working from home has a significant positive impact on employee performance through work discipline, despite claims made by some researchers that it has a negative effect on employees [6].

The business made the decision to gradually replace the policy and convert it to a hybrid work policy after implementing work from home for several months. Following the government's announcement of a drop in the COVID-19 case, hybrid work policies began to be put into place. According to past research, a hybrid system is a system that combines two distinct types of demands that must be balanced in order to avoid conflict [7]. To stop the transmission of the COVID-19 virus in this instance. The management uses a system where people go to work in shifts or on different days or weeks. Workers commute from home to the office on days when they do not go into the office. After doing so for the preceding three years, a lot of young employees (Generation Z) are used to it and even love it. The pandemic that has been raging for the past three years has undoubtedly changed people's habits, including the way they approach their jobs. Many young individuals would rather work from home than in an office.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1   Generation Z

A generation known as Generation Z was comprised of people who were born between 1995 and 2012 [8]. The generation that is being referenced is the one that was born following the millennial generation. Although Generation Z adds new behavioral tendencies, both groups are comparable in many aspects [9]. Generation Z, the first generation to grow up in the digital age, has acquired the necessary skills for their

employment and is aware that continuing education is necessary to stay current with technology because the world and information change quickly as a result of current technological developments [10]

Transparency, independence, adaptability, and personal freedom are the fundamental elements of Generation Z work ethics in the workplace, according to a study [11]. If these qualities are overlooked, it may cause peer resentment, poor productivity, low morale, and a lack of employee engagement. In Stillman's book, Generation Z is characterized as always looking for the most up-to-date information and, when it comes to the workplace, as wanting to encourage businesses to engage in novel activities that are currently being debated. Generation Z expects to be informed, given the chance to respond, and having their opinions heard and acknowledged since they don't like being left behind.

II.2   Work Arrangement

On-site employment is a common or established form of employment. Office workers are required to be on time and to present themselves professionally in accordance with company guidelines. It is possible for organizational well-being, productivity, and professional success to be impacted by the workplace when people work in an office, both individually and collectively [12]. Working onsite is advantageous because it enhances employee engagement, eliminates distractions, and facilitates internal communication, according to Kreshwandani [13].

Hybrid work, also referred to as blended work or flexible work, is a type of work arrangement that incorporates elements of remote and onsite labor [14]. In this arrangement, employees alternate between working remotely and in an office setting. With a hybrid work system, employees are not required to be on-site full-time because the business combines fully virtual and in-person work at the same time. When an employee or firm needs to have some employees work remotely and some in-person, the term "hybrid work" is widely used [15].

Work from home is a method of performing tasks connected to one's obligations while remaining at home [16]. Working outside of the typical office setting brings new opportunities and challenges for both businesses and individuals [17]. Being able to control one's own work schedule is one of the advantages and difficulties of working from home. This suggests that flexibility is possible when working remotely. The line between a worker's function in their profession and their position in their family might become muddled or unclear with flexible working hours that can be completed from home [18].

II.3   Individual Work Performance

Individual job performance is described as employee attitudes or behaviors connected to achieving organizational goals [19]. Individual work performance focuses on the conduct or attitude that is displayed rather than the products that are generated by employees [20]. Individual work performance (IWP) comprises three main components, according to several analyses of the literature [21] [22] [23]. The first one is Task Performance. Task performance is "the proficiency with which individuals perform the core substantive or technical tasks central to his or her job." [19]. Futhermore, it refers to those essential actions and behaviors that directly progress the goals of the company [24]. The second component is Contextual Performance. Contextual performance affects the psychological, social, and organizational setting of the workplace and contributes to organizational effectiveness [25]. The last component, Counterproductive Work Behavior, is negative activities that affect the organization or its stakeholders [26]. Unproductive work habits and attitudes are harmful to the survival of the organization [22].

II.4   Hypothesis

• H_0: Different work arrangements have no positive and significant relationship with individual work performance

• H_1: Different work arrangements have a positive and significant relationship with individual work performance

III. METHODOLOGY

The distribution of questionnaires to research participants is a quantitative method used in this study. A quantitative research approach works with identifying and assessing variables in order to produce results. The data obtained from questionnaire survey results. The questionnaire will be given to Generation Z workers who have done remote, hybrid, or office-based work in Jabodetabek and Bandung area for the past years, after COVID-19 case decrease. In this study, the researcher utilized the purposive sampling method, giving the survey to participants who she thought would make good samples. A suitable sample size for study is between 30 and 500 [23].

A questionnaire with two sections was given out by the researchers. The first portion asked questions about the respondent's identify, including questions about name, age, employment categories, and various work arrangements. The Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ), which was created by Koopsman [20], was the questionnaire assessment that the researchers used. This study utilized the use of the Indonesian version of the IWPQ created by Widyastuti & Hidayat [24]. IWPQ was developed as a quick survey for research purposes to evaluate individual work performance in a general population [25]. The researchers used simple linear regression analysis to assess the data and decide whether to accept or reject the hypothesis.

IV. RESULT

Based on the survey conducted by the researchers, there were 202 respondents with different demographic backgrounds. The researchers divided the respondents' demographics into four categories: gender, age, working arrangement (completely on-site, hybrid, or entirely remote) over the previous year, and employment type. There are 76 respondents who work on-site, 41 who work remotely, and 85 who do a hybrid work. It is clear that, following the Covid-19 outbreak, the proportion of Generation Z workers with hybrid arrangements has increased beyond on-site and remote. Then on-site work arrangements are more than remote workers. Also, over 51.98% workers are still working as an intern.

IV. 1 Validity Test

The Individual Work Performance questionnaire in this study had 18 questions and 202 respondents. Task Performance, Contextual Performance, and Counterproductive Work Behavior are the three subdimensions or subscales that make up the questionnaire itself. According to the findings of who initially evaluated the instrument on a subscale-by-subscale basis, researchers tested the validity for each subscale [26].

Table IV. 1 Task Performance Validity

Item	r-test	r-table	Result
TP1	0.703	0.137	Valid
TP2	0.629	0.137	Valid
TP3	0.624	0.137	Valid
TP4	0.681	0.137	Valid
TP5	0.764	0.137	Valid

According to the table above, all of the Task Performance subdimensions questions are acceptable or approved since the r-test results exceed the r-table. The r-table for sample 202 is 0.137. Because all of the r-test results for the five items are greater than r-table, it can be assumed that all of the Task Performance items are valid and may be utilized to measure the study variable.

Table IV. 2 Contextual Performance Validity

Item	r-test	r-table	Result
CP6	0.482	0.137	Valid
CP7	0.645	0.137	Valid
CP8	0.358	0.137	Valid
CP9	0.500	0.137	Valid
CP10	0.589	0.137	Valid
CP11	0.665	0.137	Valid
CP12	0.623	0.137	Valid
CP13	0.503	0.137	Valid

According to the table above, when r-test results > r-table, all of the Contextual Performance subdimensions items are valid or accepted. The r-table for sample 202 is 0.137. Considering all of the r-test

outcomes of the eight items are greater than r-table, it may be stated that all of the Contextual Performance items are valid and can be utilized to evaluate the study variable.

Table IV. 3 Counterproductive Work Behavior Validity

Item	r-test	r-table	Result
CWB14	0.620	0.137	Valid
CWB15	0.605	0.137	Valid
CWB16	0.682	0.137	Valid
CWB17	0.711	0.137	Valid
CWB18	0.720	0.137	Valid

Based on the table above, all of the Counterproductive Work Behavior subdimensions item can be said valid or accepted when r-test results are greater than the r-table. The r-table of 202 sample is 0.137. It can be concluded that all of the Counterproductive Work Behavior items are valid and can be used to measure the research variable since all the r-test outcomes of the 5 items are greater than r-table.

IV. 2   Reliability Test
Reliability of a measurement is verified by testing for consistency and stability [27]. Cronbach's alpha is a reliability coefficient that measures how well each of the components of a set are positively associated. Cronbach's alpha is acceptable if it is > 0.6 [28]. The closer Cronbach's alpha is to one, the more reliable a questionnaire.

Table IV. 4 Independent Work Performance Questionnaire Reliability

Independent Work Performance Questionnaire	Item	Cronbach's Alpha	Result
Task Performance	5	0.716	Reliable
Contextual Performance	8	0.676	Reliable
Counterproductive Work Behavior	5	0.689	Reliable

IV. 3   Descriptive Analysis
In the Descriptive Statistics of On-site Work table outcomes, the largest average value for the Task Performance subdimension is 4.51, namely item TP1 which can be seen in the table. This indicates that respondents are capable of planning work so that they can complete work in a timely manner. In the Contextual Performance subdimension, item CP8 gets the highest average value where the most dominant attitude for On-site workers is to update work-related knowledge. As for Counterproductive Work Behavior which has a negative connotation, the lowest average value is 1.68 with the item sound "*I made problems at work bigger than they were*" which indicates that On-site workers do not exaggerate problems at work.

Table IV. 5 On-site Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mode
TP1	76	3	5	4.51	5
TP2	76	2	5	4.37	5
TP3	76	3	5	4.37	5
TP4	76	3	5	4.16	4
TP5	76	1	5	4.01	5
CP6	76	2	5	4.20	4
CP7	76	2	5	4.03	4
CP8	76	2	5	4.41	5
CP9	76	1	5	4.22	4
CP10	76	1	5	4.12	4
CP11	76	1	5	3.89	5

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mode
CP12	76	2	5	3.99	4
CP13	76	2	5	4.04	5
CWB14	76	1	5	2.82	2
CWB15	76	1	5	1.68	1
CWB16	76	1	4	1.89	2
CWB17	76	1	5	2.18	1
CWB18	76	1	5	2.14	2
Total_All	76	52	75	65.04	64
Total_TP	76	15	25	21.42	22
Total_CP	76	24	40	32.89	33
Total_CWB	76	5	18	10.72	11
Valid N (listwise)	76				

Remote workers have the highest average score of 4.61 on item TP3 based on the Descriptive Statistics of Remote Work table outcomes. for things related to Task Performance, they are able to set priorities at work. Then, the highest average value in the Contextual Performance subdimension is 4.54 whose the question is written "*I worked on keeping my work skills up-to-date*". In Counterproductive Work Behavior, the lowest average value is found in CWB15 and the highest is CWB14. Remote workers do not exaggerate problems, but they complain about small problems that occur in their work.

Table IV. 6 Remote Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	**Minimum**	**Maximum**	**Mean**	**Mode**
TP1	41	2	5	4.49	5
TP2	41	3	5	4.49	5
TP3	41	3	5	4.61	5
TP4	41	2	5	4.20	4
TP5	41	2	5	4.34	5
CP6	41	2	5	4.17	4
CP7	41	1	5	4.15	5
CP8	41	3	5	4.39	5
CP9	41	3	5	4.54	5
CP10	41	2	5	4.00	4
CP11	41	1	5	3.59	4
CP12	41	2	5	3.98	4
CP13	41	2	5	4.12	4
CWB14	41	1	4	3.00	2
CWB15	41	1	5	1.80	1
CWB16	41	1	5	2.10	2
CWB17	41	1	5	2.17	2
CWB18	41	1	5	2.02	2
Total_All	41	50	76	66.51	64
Total_TP	41	17	25	22.12	23
Total_CP	41	26	39	33.29	36
Total_CWB	41	5	23	11.10	12
Valid N (listwise)	41				

Based on the Descriptive Statistics results from the Hybrid Work table that can be seen in Fig. 3, the highest mean score for the Task Performance subdimension is 4.36 on TP2, indicating that hybrid workers keep in mind the work targets they must achieve. In contrast to remote workers, hybrid workers have the highest mean score on CP8 where they are more focused on updating knowledge about work. Then for Counterproductive Work Behavior, just like remote workers, the average value on CWB15 is lowest and CWB14 is highest. Which means that hybrid workers do not exaggerate if work problems occur, but they complain about small problems that occur in their work.

Table IV. 7 Hybrid Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mode
TP1	85	2	5	4.19	4
TP2	85	1	5	4.36	5
TP3	85	1	5	4.21	4
TP4	85	2	5	4.06	4
TP5	85	1	5	4.02	4
CP6	85	2	5	4.07	4
CP7	85	1	5	3.92	4
CP8	85	2	5	4.40	5
CP9	85	1	5	4.28	4
CP10	85	1	5	4.06	4
CP11	85	1	5	3.84	4
CP12	85	1	5	3.68	4
CP13	85	2	5	3.86	4
CWB14	85	1	5	2.76	2
CWB15	85	1	5	1.87	1
CWB16	85	1	5	2.14	2
CWB17	85	1	5	2.25	2
CWB18	85	1	5	2.25	2
Total_All	85	41	80	64.22	66
Total_TP	85	7	25	20.85	20
Total_CP	85	17	40	32.11	30
Total_CWB	85	5	23	11.27	10
Valid N (listwise)	85				

IV. 4   Linear Regression

Researchers used the SPSS 25 program in data processing. After fulfilled the classic assumption test, the results of data processing were analyzed by researchers. There are two variables in this study, which are the Different Work Arrangements as the independent variable and Individual Work Performance as the dependent variable. The following table are model summary generated from the simple linear regression process.

Table IV. 5 Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.056[a]	0.003	-0.002	1.64111
a. Predictors: (Constant), Different Work Arrangement				

According to the model summary table above, it can be seen in R that the independent variable has a 5.6% correlation with the dependent variable. The relationship is expressed as a weak relationship. Besides, it can also be seen that the R square value is 0.003 or 0.3%, which means that the diversity of Y (Individual Work Performance) can only be explained by X (Different Work Arrangement) in the 0.3% model, while the remainder is explained by other changes outside the model that are not discussed in this study.

Table IV. 6 Simple Linear Regression

Coefficients[a]					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	33.728	0.289		116.765	0.000
DWA	-0.104	0.129	-0.056	-0.800	0.425
a. Dependent Variable: IWP					

Based on the calculations in the table above, the simple linear regression equation obtained as follows:

Y = 33.728 - 1.104 X

The explanation can be described as follows:
   a. X is the Different Work Arrangements variable and Y is Individual Work Performance.
   b. The constant value of 33.728 explains that if there are no Different Work Arrangements variable, the Individual Work Performance value is 33.728.
   c. The independent work performance value is 1.104 with a negative sign. Since a positive and significant relationship was not found in the calculation, these -0.104 values have no effect on the hypothesis, and we can ignore this value.

IV. 5   Partial T-test
The T statistical test essentially reveals how far one explanatory or independent variable can explain variance in the dependent variable on its own [28]. If the significance value obtained is smaller than 0.05, the two variables can be said to have a significant relationship. Futhermore, the criteria for the T-Test are:
   a. If the t-test > t-table, then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.
   b. If the t-test < t-table, then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected.

In this study, the t-table is 1.978. The following table shows the results of the calculation of the T-test results.

Table IV. 7 Partial Test

Coefficients[a]					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	33.728	0.289		116.765	0.000
DWA	-0.104	0.129	-0.056	-0.800	0.425
a. Dependent Variable: IWP					

Referring on the calculation of the table above, it can be seen that the significance value obtained is 0.425. This value is greater than 0.05 (0.425 > 0.05), which means that the two variables do not have a related and significant relationship. The t-test value obtained from the calculation of the table is -0.800 which is smaller than 1.971 (0.800 < 1.971), hence H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. It can be concluded that after comparing the sigma value with 0.05 and comparing the t-test value with the t-table that Different Work Arrangements have no positive and significant relationship with Individual Work Performance.

V.   CONCLUSION
The result of this study found that Different Work Arrangements does not have a positive and significant relationship with Individual Work Performance. Before conducting hypothesis testing, researchers conducted validity and reliability tests, which resulted in valid and reliable research measuring instruments. Then the researchers conducted a normality test and a heteroscedasticity test. The results obtained are normally distributed, and there are no symptoms of heteroscedasticity. After carrying out hypothesis testing, researchers found that the two variables had no positive and significant relationship where the significant value is greater

than 0.05 and the t-test value obtained is smaller than the t-table value.

The previous research stated that during the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia, employee performance was affected by the different work arrangements such as work from home [29] [30]. In contrast to the previous studies, this study focuses on events after the Covid-19 pandemic where cases have decreased. Nonetheless, after the Covid-19 pandemic no relationship was found between Different Work Arrangement and Individual Work Performance. This can happen because when viewed from reality, Generation Z employees were already accustomed to the different work arrangements, especially hybrid and remote. Individual Work Performance deals with matters related to the core tasks associated with the job itself, the nature of the worker towards their work, and the traits of the worker in contradiction with the company. In terms of age and type of employment, Generation Z employees is mostly new to the workforce in the pandemic era. The workforce is also shifting as Generation Z started to enter the workforce. Generation Z will be easier to adapt to teleworking.

For the business company, the researchers suggests that for certain fields of work, working in any arrangement will not affect the work performance of employees since the relationship does not exist, especially for Generation Z employees, based on the discussion in this study. Indonesian government should advise companies or create a regulation, especially in Jabodetabek area, not to keep their employees in the office all the consecutive days since the employees can work well remotely or hybrid. If employees do not always go to the office, the density of office hours will not always occur and of course this has a good impact on the city and environment. There has to be more research done on various work arrangements because it is currently highly underdeveloped in Indonesia. In the future, researchers can conduct surveys and interviews to understand and learn about Generation Z employees' perspectives. Improve the demographic distribution of occupations in particular industries to further the research. Beyond that, to better understand the characteristics of the data, divide and further define the independent variable Different Work Arrangements into three variables: On-site, Remote, and Hybrid. This is done to give upcoming researchers more focused results.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ndwandwe, D. & Wiysonge, C. S., COVID-19 vaccines, *Current Opinion in Immunology*, 71, 2021, 111-116.

[2]. Bick, A., Blandin, A. & Mertens, K., Work from Home After the COVID-19 Outbreak, *Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Working Papers*. 2020.

[3]. Tinekaningrum, Y., Wibowo, K. A. & Mulyani, H. S., Pengaruh Personal Traits Pegawai Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Work from Home (WFH) Saat Pandemi Covid-19, *Jurnal Sosioteknologi, 20(1)*. 2021.

[4]. Anugrah, P. G. & Priyambodo, A. B., Peran Work-Life Balance terhadap Kinerja Karyawan yang Menerapkan Work From Home (WFH) di Masa Pandemi COVID-19: Studi Literatur, *Buku Abstrak Seminar Nasional: "Memperkuat Kontribusi Kesehatan Mental dalam Penyelesaian Pandemi Covid 19*, 2021, 340-349.

[5]. Irawanto, D. W., Novianti, K. R. & Roz, K., Work from Home: Measuring Satisfaction between Work–Life Balance and Work Stress during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia, *The Economics of Health Outbreaks and Epidemics*, *9(3)*, 2021, 96.

[6]. Wolor, C. W., Understanding Employee Performance During Work from Home in Indonesia, *The Journal of Behavioral Science, 16(3)*, 2021, 99-108.

[7]. Budiman, N., Hidayat, N. K. & Basbeth, F., The Impact of Hybrid Working in the Post-Pandemic Covid19 on Employee Job Satisfaction through Work-Life Balance and Workload in Indonesia Leading Heavy Equipment Company, *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute November, 5(4)*, 2022, 29811-29826.

[8]. Stillman, D. & Stillman, J., *Gen Z @ Work: How the Next Generation Is Transforming the Workplace* (Harper Collins Business, 2017)

[9]. Schroth, H., Are You Ready for Gen Z in the Workplace?, *California Management Review, 61(2)*, 2019, 5-18.

[10]. Chillakuri, B., Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding, *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 33(7)*, 2020, 1277-1296.

[11]. Bascha, Z: The Open Source Generation, 2011.

[12]. Otterbring, T., Danielsson, C. B. & Pareigis, J., Office types and workers' cognitive vs affective evaluations from a noise perspective, *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 36(4)*, 2021, 415-431.

[13]. Linggar, Work From Office (WFO) 2023, Pasca Transisi Work From Home (WFH), 2022.

[14]. Luqmana, H. A. & Hendarman, A. F., *The Relationship between Working Arrangements (Remote, Onsite, and Hybrid) and Burnout Among Employees in Indonesia*, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Bandung, 2023.

[15]. Chafi, M. B., Hultberg, A. & Yams, N. B., Post-Pandemic Office Work: Perceived Challenges and Opportunities for a Sustainable Work Environment, *Sustainability, 14(1)*, 2022.

[16]. Muhliansyah, M. et al., Work From Home: Life Solution on Psychology's Perspective, *PLAKAT : Jurnal Pelayanan Kepada Masyarakat, 2(2)*, 2020.

[17]. Popovici, V. & Popovici, A.-L., Remote Work Revolution: Current Opportunities and Challenges for Organizations, *Economic Sciences Series, 20(1),* 2020, 682-672.

[18]. Wirawati, F. S. & Kadiyono, A. L., Hubungan Antara Work Family Integration dan Meaningful Work pada Remote Worker, *Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia, 6(5)*, 2021.

[19]. Campbell, J., Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology, in M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, (s.l.:Consulting Psychologists Press, 1990) 687-732.

[20]. Koopmans, L. et al., Improving the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire using Rasch analysis, *Journal of Applied Measurement, 15(2)*, 2014. 160-75.

[21]. Koopmans, L. et al., Conceptual Frameworks of Individual Work Performance, Journal of occupational and environmental medicine, *American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 53(8)*, 2011, 865-66.

[22]. Rotundo, M. & Sackett, P. R., The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy-Capturing Approach, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(1)*, 2002, 66-80.

[23]. Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D., Perspectives on Models of Job Performance, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8(4)*, 2002, 216-226.

[24]. Widyastuti, T. & Hidayat, R., Adaptation of Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ) into Bahasa Indonesia, *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology, 7(2)*, 2018.

[25]. Koopmans, L. et al., Cross-cultural adaptation of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire, *Work, 53(3)*, 2015, 609-19.

[26]. Koopmans, L. et al., Development of an Individual Work Performance Questionnaire, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 62(1)*, 2013, 6-28.

[27]. Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R., *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach* (West Sussex: Wiley & Sons, 2016)

[28]. Ghozali, I., *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25* (Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2018)

[29]. Ones, D. S. & Dilchert, S., Counterproductive work behaviors: Concepts, measurement, and nomological network, in K. F. Geisinger, et al. (Ed.), *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology Vol 1. Test theory and testing and assessment in industrial and organizational psychology*, (s.l.:American Psychological Association, 2013) 643-659.

[30]. Fauzi, A., Satris, R. & Estiningsih, Pengaruh Work From Home terhadap Kinerja dan Produktivitas Karyawan di Masa Pandemi Covid 19. *Publik: Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Adminsitrasi dan Pelayanan Publik, 9(2)*, 2022, 205-219.

Corresponding Author: Salma Indira Putri
[1]School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia