
Development of an individual work performance and work design questionnaire

Mohd Faizal Hamzah*

University of Malaya Library,
Lembah Pantai,
50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
and
Information Management Faculty,
UiTM Puncak Perdana Campus,
Seksyen U10, 40150, Shah Alam,
Selangor, Malaysia
Email: faizal586@um.edu.my
*Corresponding author

**Mohamad Noorman Masrek and
Irwan Kamaruddin Abdul Kadir**

Information Management Faculty,
UiTM Puncak Perdana Campus,
Seksyen U10, 40150, Shah Alam,
Selangor, Malaysia
Email: mnoorman@uitm.edu.my
Email: irwan@uitm.edu.my

Abstract: Study in work design and work performance concepts is incredibly limited in library fields. The instrument of both concepts is almost non-existence. Therefore, the objective of this study is to propose a set of instrument to measure both concepts. The questionnaire was developed based on, task performance, contextual performance, task character and knowledge characteristic. The items in the questionnaire were developed based on the proposed conceptual framework of the previous study. To report content validity for the instrument, the researcher conducted several pretesting sessions to review the instrument. The feedbacks from experts during pretesting were analysed. 326 respondents were involved during the pilot test session of the instrument. The data were analysed using SmartPLS to identify the convergent validity (AVE), Cronbach's alpha, and factor loading for each dimension. The reliability of the proposed instrument was identified, the results of Cronbach's alpha for each dimension are strong to represent the study.

Keywords: work performance; work design; questionnaire; work design; work performance instrument.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Hamzah, M.F., Masrek, M.N. and Kadir, I.K.A (2020) 'Development of an individual work performance and work design questionnaire', *Int. J. Society Systems Science*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.65–85.

Biographical notes: Mohd Faizal Hamzah is a Senior Librarian at the University of Malaya Library. He is currently working at TJ Danaraj Library (Medical Library). His expertise is including information and literacy skills, librarian performance, social media experts, digital literacy, library marketing.

Mohamad Noorman Masrek is a Senior Lecturer at Information Management Faculty, UiTM Puncak Perdana Campus. His expertise is including evaluation of IT effectiveness and success, organisational and individual IT adoption and behaviour, systems development methodologies, and data mining.

Irwan Kamaruddin Abdul Kadir is a Senior Lecturer at Information Management Faculty UiTM Puncak Perdana Campus. His expertise is including qualitative study, data analysis for qualitative, data management, and information management and records.

This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper entitled 'Development of an individual work performance and work design questionnaire' presented at 4th ASIA International Conference (AIC2018), Langkawi, Malaysia, 8–9 December 2018.

1 Introduction

The revolution of the working environments had to change the motivation indicators of the work performance among employees. In any profession, work performances and work design are becoming the key to derive the survival of the organisation. Work performance and work design is not a new term in various researches. The topics are still never failed to captures researchers interest. Plentiful initiative on work performance and work design proposed in developed countries. In Malaysia perspective, Malaysia Productivity Corporation (MPC) was among the earlier initiative by the government to boost the productivity (Malaysia Productivity Corporation, 2018). Later in 2009, the Prime Minister of Malaysia had highlighted on the performance as one the important key in guiding the government sector to succeed. The outcome from it, a special unit has been established to supervise the performance. The unit is known as the Performance Management and Delivery Unit (PEMANDU) (Gavril, 2015). This initiative will drive economic growth (Campbell and Wiernik, 2015). The action taken shows the importance of performance. However, even though there are various initiatives taken the influence of work design is still very limited. Compared to other developed countries the numbers of research on work design in Malaysia are still limited. Some professions are totally ignored to important of work design. To study on this matter, the researcher decided to focus on work performance and work design in the library fields. Librarian as a knowledge worker is a dynamic profession. Miller (2013) believed that librarian face a lot of challenges in the working environment and this contributes to the risk of becoming dissatisfied with their job. The librarian needs to adopt change quickly to meet the expectation of the stakeholders. Therefore, Farooq et al. (2016) and Robinson et al. (2015) thought that the changing of research landscape and information needs require diverse competencies and performance in library fields.

Even though a study in work performance among librarians is not a new topic, there is still a gap need to fulfil. This is because most of the organisation have explicitly failed to addressed issues related to the performance of the knowledge worker (Davenport, 2008). Huynh et al. (2017) found that instrument to measured performance among the leader in the organisation is still insufficient. Davenport (2008) and Koopmans et al. (2014) believed that this could cost the organisation in their future. Current practice has ignored an indicator of work performance and work design for librarians during the work task process, which causes well-being and job satisfaction among librarians are not clear (Panatik, 2012). Furthermore, Shupe et al. (2015) and Jordan (2014) found that role-related to stress among librarians have been ignored in many types of research. The lack of research on well-being among academic librarians is surprising because the roles of librarians are changing (Shupe et al., 2015). As a result, librarians are becoming dissatisfied with their job and starting to leave the profession (Miller, 2013). A study conducted by Dahan et al. (2016) found that assessment of performances is very important to identify user satisfaction. Librarian's performance is one of the indicators that have a significant towards job dissatisfaction (Miller, 2013). Unfortunately, most of the librarian's performance instrument is totally ignored of the significance of work design. Based on the literature search, the number of the instrument on work performance and work design are almost non-existing in library fields. Liu et al. (2010) added, knowledge about work design among librarians is still very rudimentary. Therefore, the number of instrument related to work performance and work design among librarian is almost none-existing. Previous studies on librarian performance are focusing on work performance dimension only. The ignorance of work design element contributes to the less empirical evidence on job satisfaction among librarian. Therefore there is no validate instrument can be used to study the relationship between work performance and work design among librarian. In present practice, work performances of the librarians are measured by performance appraisal using a key indicator and examination session. Some library management considers user survey and results from internal and external auditors as a part of the dimension of work performance. Clearly, no work design approached adapted to measure the librarian performance. Numerous work performance studies have been conducted such Khan et al. (2015), Masrek et al. (2012) and DeNisi and Gonzalez (2017), however, the study failed to relate work design in work performance. The instruments proposed are not based on work design. Due to this reason, this study will look into a new perspective on work performance approached, whereby the element of work design will be part of the approached. The intention of this study is to propose a set of validate instrument to be used to study work performance and work design study among librarian in Malaysia.

2 History and definition

According to Goodson (1997), work performance has been used as standard evaluation during Wei-Dynasty. Up to the present time, assessing the performance has been a central principle of management thinking (Morgan, 1995). Roe (1999), Perera et al. (2014), and Bilal et al. (2014) defined work performance as the ability of employees to perform and fulfil task given to meet the organisation's expectation. In line with that, Perera et al. (2014) added, work performance also refers to the employee's outcome, whether the

employees able to perform well or not. Work design, on the other hand, drives the positive momentum among employees. Work design promotes positive outcomes for the organisation and promotes well-being (Panatik, 2012). The concept of work design has been discussed since 1970 to till around the mid-1830s during the industrial revolution in Great Britain (Katz, 2015; Sharon and Wall, 1998). Work design issues have received major attention from researchers (Garg and Rastogi, 2006) to understand what motivate employees and caused by job dissatisfaction (Bakker and Demerouti, 2014). There are various terms of work design (Kirkman, 1981). Work design can be defined as improving work standard, get rid of hazards for the better working process, promote effectiveness, and conserve the physical effort to fulfil and accomplish the job. Likewise, the terms have also been defined as how jobs, roles, and responsibility of the employees are shaped, strategised and modified which have a significant contribution towards structures and functionality on the individual, team, group, and institution (Abadie et al., 2015).

3 Methods

There is no previous validate theoretical framework or model that the researcher can refer to this matter. The previous study, especially in library fields, did not highlight work design as a part in work performance models. However, there is an established understanding of knowledge that certain jobs and goal setting can enhance work performance among employees (Garg and Rastogi, 2006). The proposed conceptual framework was developed based on several theories and model. The modification of the theories and model was made to suit the librarian working environment. The individual work performance for the librarian was developed based on the three-dimensional conceptual frameworks, in which consist of work performance, core competencies, and work design. The original conceptual framework has been modified to fit the nature of the academic librarian. The conceptual framework was adapted from the previous studies from Koopmans et al. (2014b), Hackman and Oldham (1976) and Khan (2015). To develop items in the questionnaire, the researchers had adopted several established set of the questionnaire as an instrument namely, Morgeson and Humphrey (2006), Koopmans et al. (2012), Khan (2015) and Masrek et al. (2012). The structure of the questionnaire was divided into several sections; consist of the introduction of the questionnaire (definition of the terminology), Section A – Work performance, Section B – core competency and Section C – work design.

There are two indicators of work performance which are task performance and contextual performance. The indicator was the most dominant indicator for work performance study (Koopmans et al., 2012, 2011, 2014a). The researchers had compiled several core competencies from Masrek et al. (2012), Khan (2015), and Fraser-Arnott (2017). As a result, seven indicators of core competencies have been proposed that comprises of emotional intelligence, cognitive abilities, library leadership, collection management, technology management, research and reference service, content organisation and structure. Furthermore, two indicators of work design have been adopted to generalise the work design of a professional librarian. The measurement of work design was adapted from Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). The indicator was task characteristic and knowledge characteristic. There are four items for task characteristics which consist of autonomy, task variety, task significance, and task identity. Similarly, four items for knowledge characteristic consist of job complexity, information

processing, problem-solving, and skill variety. For each indicator, four to eight questionnaire items were chosen, resulting in the 97 items in the questionnaire. The task performance scale consisted of four questionnaire items and contextual performance of six. On the other hand, the total number of items for librarian competencies was 47 items. The emotional intelligence scale consisted of nine questionnaire items, cognitive abilities of six, library leadership of six, collection management of eight, technology management of six, research and reference service of seven, and content organisation and structure of five. There are 40 questionnaire items for work design indicator.

3.1 Rating scales

There is various type of rating scale has been developed in the past research. In work performance study, Koopmans et al. (2012) adapt raking scale as the main instrument scale. Similarly, Masrek et al. (2012), Khan and Bhatti (2017) and Abrizah (1999) adopt the rating scale to study the competencies of para-professionals who work in library service and school library. On the other hand, Panatik (2012) and Morgeson and Humphrey (2008) also use a rating scale to study work design. According to McLeod (2008) and Hinkin et al. (1997) in survey research, the Likert scale is the most adopted. The wide scales of Likert scale are at least five points of the scale. It is suggested to develop five or seven points of scale because it helps the researcher to examine the relationship between items (Hinkin et al., 1997). Apart from that it also creates adequate coefficient alpha. Thus, the questionnaire used a seven-point Likert scale as scale format for the survey. The measurement scale proposed are (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) slightly disagree, (4) neither, (5) slightly agree, (6) agree, and (7) strongly agree.

3.2 Pretesting the instrument

To report content validity for the instrument, the researcher conducted several pretesting sessions to review the instrument. A systematic form of pretesting was provided to the panel experts. It is important to conduct a pretesting of the instruments, before conducting a pilot test. Pretesting is one of the important steps in the questionnaire development process (Hunt et al. 1982). Pretesting is a test of the appropriateness and understanding of the question in the survey (Hilton, 2015; Sekaran and Bougie, 2013b). Moreover, there are no alternative ways can substitute the amount of intellectual exercise other than feedback from the potential respondents (Backstrom and Hursc, 1963). The aim of pretesting is not to act as data collection but to identify feedback and identify a problem in the questions (Kumar, 2014). Besides that, pretesting helps the researcher to identify any problems such as misleading questions, grammatical errors, incomplete questions, misspellings (Collins, 2003; Malhotra, 2006; Wildemuth, 2009) and also content adequacy (Hinkin et al., 1997). There is no standard number of evaluators in pretesting the questionnaire. Kianpour et al. (2017) suggested three is the minimum number of the panel for pretesting the instrument. On the other hand, Babonea and Voicu (2008) suggested that the number of a panel of expertise should be three to eight expertise. Sekaran and Bougie (2013a), and Hulland et al. (2017) the number of expertise should be limited and not too big.

Table 1 Feedback from the pretesting of the questionnaire

Section	Question	Expertise comments/feedback	Action
1	Work performance		
1.1.	Task performance	8. I always separate my main issues from side issues at work	Senior librarian 1: The question is not clear Senior librarian 2: "Main issues" is too general Senior librarian 3: Consider replacing "issues" with other words, for example, "work"/"task". A word that reflects more to the original content.
2	Librarian competencies		
2.1	Emotional intelligence	26. I am able to provide services that meet the users' needs	Senior librarian 3 and Senior librarian 4: This question is more suitable for skills (cognitive)
2.3	Library leadership	34. I am able to promote and improve professional identity	Experts 1: Double barrel question
		37. I am able to build up an image of how the academic library should be operated under ideal conditions	Experts 1 and Senior librarian 4: Not clear and proposed researcher to remove this question. Experts 2: If the research decided to remind the question Experts 2 suggest to delete 'up'
2.4	Collection management	42. I am able to understand the process of acquisition	Senior librarian 1 and Senior librarian 2: The question is almost the same as a question no. 41. "4.1. I am able to understand the acquisition procedures and policies in the library"
		47. I am able to understand preservation and conservation methodologies for digital and physical resources	Senior librarian 3 and Senior librarian 4: 'methodologies' is limited to those staff involved only
2.5	Technology management	52. I am able to understand and master the handling and disseminating of information process	Senior librarian and Senior librarian 2: Not clear
		54. I am able to develop and assess technology performance measurement indicators	Experts 1: double barrel
3	Work design		
3.2.4	Skill variety	105. My job requires a variety of skills	Senior librarian 1: This question is similar to no. 106 "My job requires me to utilize a variety of different skills in order to finish the work"

To perform the pretesting exercises, six experts were requested to review the instruments for this study. The questionnaire was pre-tested by one associate professors and one senior lecturer from the Faculty of Computer Science (Department of Library Science) University of Malaya and Faculty of Information Management, University of Technology MARA. These academicians were highly experienced and highly qualified in library science fields and research methodologies for social sciences. Other than this, four potential respondents were also involved in the pretesting the questionnaire. Four senior librarians from the University of Malaya Library involved in pretesting the questionnaire. Once permission was granted via e-mails, the researcher made a follow-up call and arranges a date to meet the respective experts. The researcher emails the questionnaire and pretesting checklist before meet up for face to face interview. One to two weeks is given for the evaluators to read and understand the questionnaire. The panel experts were encouraged to comment on the formatting and content of the questionnaire. There are two items in the questionnaire were evaluated. The first items are the formatting of the questionnaire such as font, page layout, numbering, and second items is content validity, spelling, variable, language, and instruction.

The experts have identified few items in the questionnaire that need to re-check again. Several grammatically error and unclear sentence was identified. During the sessions, several issues were identified including, spelling mistakes, double barrel questions, inaccurate terms in questions, and comment on the length of the questionnaire. The researchers had changed and updated the questionnaire according to the feedback from the experts. The results of pretesting were discussed with the supervisor to finalise the action taken. The researcher then proceeds to conduct pilot testing the questionnaire right after no further amendments by the experts. As a result, five items have been a drop from the questionnaire due to the double barrel and the question is difficult to understand. The researcher had revised the questionnaire by following the guideline provided by the expertise. Table 1 shows some of the highlights from the feedback from the expertise. The researcher then proceeds to conduct pilot testing the questionnaire right after no further amendments by the experts.

4 Pilot-testing

After pre-tested, 326 respondents were involved during the pilot test session of the instrument. The data were analysed using SmartPLS to identify the convergent validity (AVE), Cronbach's alpha, and factor loading for each dimension. The reliability of the instrument was reported in the table. The questionnaire was sent through e-mail to all academic librarian in the public university in Malaysia. In total there is 20 academic library involve. In total, 340 questionnaires were distributed to all public academic library in Malaysia. There are 20 academic library in Malaysia which has been divided into three categories which are a library in research universities, comprehensive universities and focused universities. The full list of the universities can be accessed at <https://www.mohe.gov.my/institusi/universiti-awam/kategori-ua>. A total of 326 (95.88%) were returned.

5 Results and discussions

Table 2 presents the usable responses from three categories of universities. In total, 315 responses out of 326 returned were used. The first categories is research university (n = 131, 41.6%) which divided into five universities which is UM 14.6 % (or n = 46), UKM 7.6% (or n = 24), UPM 7.3% (or n = 23), USM 4.8% (or n = 15), and UTM 7.3% (or n = 23). Meanwhile comprehensive university (n = 95, 30.2%) are divided into four universities which is UiTM 16.2% (or n = 51), IIUM 8.6% (or n = 27), UNIMAS 1.9% (or n = 6) and UMS 3.5% (or n = 11). For focused university (n = 89, 28.2%), i.e., UMP 2.2%, (or n = 7), UUM 3.8% (or n = 12), UPSI and USIM 3.5% each (or n = 11), UMT 1.9% (or n = 6), UTHM 3.5% (or n = 11), UTeM 1.6% (or n = 5), UniMAP 2.9% (or n = 9), UNISZA 2.5% (or n = 8), UMK 1.6% (or n = 5), and UPNM 1.3% (or n = 4).

Table 2: The respond rate by university categories

University	Total distributed		Total returned		Total usable	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Research universities	140	41.17	136	41.8	131	41.6
Comprehensive universities	100	29.42	98	30	95	30.2
Focused universities	100	29.41	92	28.2	89	28.2
	340	100.00	326	100.0	315	100.0

In the assessment of measurement of the model, internal consistency reliability and indicator reliability (factor loading) were observed. In the context of this study, SEM-SmartPLS were used to measure the reliability. According to Ramayah et al. (2018), Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability have been used predominantly to measure the internal consistency of the data. The acceptance of Cronbach's alpha value is at 0.7 (Gliem and Gliem, 2003; Santos, 1999; Tavakol and Dennick, 2011). On the other hand, the acceptable construct reliability of composite reliability (CR) value is $CR > 0.7 - 0.9$ (Ramayah et al., 2018) or 0.7 and higher (Carter et al., 2000). The indicator loading for indicator reliability was suggested at loading 0.708 or higher (Ramayah et al., 2018). However loading > 0.7 (Hair et al., 2014), 0.6 and 0.5 (Byrne, 2016), is adequate if AVE and CR was complement by other items that have high scores of loading. The factor loading value for each item is adequate after third analysis. Table 3 shows the value of factor loading for each item in the questionnaire.

Eight items (8.24%) were removed during the measurement analysis. Therefore, the values of all variable (indicator loading > 0.70 or if less it is adequate to complement AVE and CR value, and the value of AVE > 0.50) in the context of this study are sufficient to support the reliability and validity in the measurement model. Table 4 presents the Cronbach's value (α), Composite Reliability (CR) and AVE. The Cronbach's value for this study reported from 0.838 to 0.976 and the value for CR is from 0.891 to 0.977. The complete questionnaire is presented in Appendix.

Table 3 The factor loading value

Constructs	Indicator	1st run				2nd run				3rd run			
		Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE
Task performance	WP_TP1	0.896	0.883	0.920	0.744	0.896	0.883	0.920	0.744	0.896	0.883	0.92	0.744
	WP_TP2	0.918				0.918				0.919			
	WP_TP3	0.739				0.739				0.738			
	WP_TP4	0.885				0.885				0.885			
Contextual performance	WP_CP1	0.789	0.877	0.907	0.621	0.789	0.877	0.907	0.621	0.790	0.877	0.907	0.621
	WP_CP2	0.834				0.834				0.834			
	WP_CP3	0.792				0.792				0.792			
	WP_CP4	0.812				0.812				0.812			
	WP_CP5	0.751				0.751				0.751			
	WP_CP6	0.746				0.746				0.745			
Emotional intelligence	C_EI1	0.769	0.918	0.933	0.614	0.777	0.929	0.942	0.668	0.777	0.929	0.942	0.668
	C_EI2	0.811				0.814				0.814			
	C_EI3	0.830				0.834				0.834			
	C_EI4	0.782				0.785				0.785			
	C_EI5	0.843				0.846				0.846			
	C_EI6	0.852				0.854				0.853			
Competencies	C_EI7	0.460				-				-			
	C_EI8	0.838				0.836				0.836			
	C_EI9	0.794				0.792				0.792			
	C_CA1	0.676	0.925	0.942	0.733	-	0.937	0.952	0.801	-	0.937	0.952	0.801
	C_CA2	0.793				0.805				0.805			
	C_CA3	0.914				0.923				0.923			
Cognitive abilities	C_CA4	0.914				0.923				0.923			
	C_CA5	0.907				0.916				0.916			
	C_CA6	0.905				0.902				0.901			

Table 3 The factor loading value (continued)

Constructs	Indicator	1st run				2nd run				3rd run			
		Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE
Library leadership	C_LL1	0.882	0.942	0.954	0.774	0.882	0.942	0.954	0.774	0.883	0.942	0.954	0.774
	C_LL2	0.898				0.898				0.898			
	C_LL3	0.886				0.886				0.886			
	C_LL4	0.881				0.881				0.881			
	C_LL5	0.870				0.870				0.870			
	C_LL6	0.862				0.862				0.861			
Collection mgf.	C_CM1	0.789	0.940	0.950	0.706	0.789	0.94	0.95	0.706	0.790	0.94	0.95	0.706
	C_CM2	0.820				0.820				0.820			
	C_CM3	0.851				0.851				0.852			
	C_CM4	0.868				0.868				0.869			
	C_CM5	0.827				0.827				0.826			
	C_CM6	0.894				0.894				0.894			
	C_CM7	0.841				0.841				0.841			
Technology mgf.	C_TM8	0.825				0.825				0.824			
	C_TM1	0.836	0.91	0.931	0.693	0.836	0.91	0.931	0.693	-	0.867	0.909	0.715
	C_TM2	0.839				0.839				-			
	C_TM3	0.859				0.859				0.829			
	C_TM4	0.875				0.875				0.867			
	C_TM5	0.728				0.728				0.800			
	C_TM6	0.849				0.849				0.884			
Research and reference service	C_RRS1	0.812	0.929	0.943	0.703	0.812	0.929	0.943	0.703	0.823	0.928	0.943	0.736
	C_RRS2	0.813				0.813				0.833			
	C_RRS3	0.736				0.735				-			
	C_RRS4	0.878				0.878				0.880			
	C_RRS5	0.879				0.879				0.864			
	C_RRS6	0.905				0.905				0.900			
	C_RRS7	0.834				0.834				0.844			

Table 3 The factor loading value (continued)

Constructs	Indicator	1st run			2nd run			3rd run						
		Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	
Competencies	C_COS1	0.906	0.944	0.957	0.816	0.906	0.944	0.957	0.816	0.922	0.934	0.953	0.836	
	C_COS2	0.899				0.899				0.912				
	C_COS3	0.934				0.934				0.939				
	C_COS4	0.885				0.885				-				
	C_COS5	0.893				0.893				0.882				
Work design	Task characteristic													
	Autonomy	WD_TCAU1	0.816	0.956	0.961	0.673	0.816	0.956	0.961	0.673	0.816	0.956	0.961	0.673
		WD_TCAU2	0.834				0.834				0.834			
		WD_TCAU3	0.829				0.829				0.829			
		WD_TCAU4	0.732				0.732				0.732			
		WD_TCAU5	0.834				0.834				0.834			
		WD_TCAU6	0.788				0.788				0.788			
		WD_TCAU7	0.755				0.755				0.755			
		WD_TCAU8	0.829				0.829				0.829			
		WD_TCAU9	0.864				0.864				0.864			
		WD_TCAU10	0.836				0.836				0.836			
		WD_TCAU11	0.852				0.852				0.852			
	WD_TCAU12	0.867				0.867				0.867				
Task variety	WD_TCTV1	0.876	0.855	0.903	0.700	0.876	0.855	0.903	0.700	0.906	0.868	0.92	0.792	
	WD_TCTV2	0.905				0.905				0.921				
	WD_TCTV3	0.831				0.831				0.842				
	WD_TCTV4	0.724				0.724				-				
Task significant	WD_TCTS1	0.845	0.838	0.891	0.672	0.845	0.838	0.891	0.672	0.845	0.838	0.891	0.672	
	WD_TCTS2	0.800				0.800				0.799				
	WD_TCTS3	0.820				0.820				0.820				
	WD_TCTS4	0.814				0.814				0.815				
Task identity	WD_TCTI1	0.893	0.907	0.934	0.781	0.893	0.907	0.934	0.781	0.893	0.907	0.934	0.781	
	WD_TCTI2	0.905				0.905				0.905				
	WD_TCTI3	0.886				0.886				0.886				
	WD_TCTI4	0.849				0.849				0.849				

Table 3 The factor loading value (continued)

Constructs	Indicator	1st run				2nd run				3rd run			
		Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE
Knowledge characteristic	WD_KCJC1	0.886	0.760	0.850	0.602	0.898	0.842	0.905	0.761	0.898	0.864	0.907	0.71
	WD_KCJC2	0.896				0.906				0.906			
	WD_KCJC3	0.803				0.810				0.81			
	WD_KCJC4	0.416				-				-			
Information processing	WD_KCIP1	0.829	0.864	0.907	0.71	0.829	0.864	0.907	0.71	0.829	0.864	0.907	0.71
	WD_KCIP2	0.849				0.849				0.850			
	WD_KCIP3	0.877				0.877				0.877			
	WD_KCIP4	0.814				0.814				0.813			
Problem-solving	WD_KCPS1	0.813	0.875	0.914	0.728	0.813	0.875	0.914	0.728	0.812	0.875	0.914	0.728
	WD_KCPS2	0.843				0.843				0.843			
	WD_KCPS3	0.861				0.861				0.861			
	WD_KCPS4	0.894				0.894				0.894			
Skill variety	WD_KCSV1	0.882	0.906	0.935	0.783	0.882	0.906	0.935	0.783	0.882	0.906	0.935	0.783
	WD_KCSV2	0.944				0.944				0.944			
	WD_KCSV3	0.827				0.827				0.827			
	WD_KCSV4	0.882				0.882				0.882			

Table 4 Cronbach's value (α) CR and AVE for this study

Construct	Indicators	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	Average variance extract (AVE)
Task performance	Work performance WP_TP1, WP_TP2, WP_TP3, WP_TP4	0.883	0.920	0.744
Contextual performance	WP_CP1, WP_CP2, WP_CP3, WP_CP4, WP_CP5, WP_CP6	0.877	0.907	0.621
Competencies	Core competencies	0.976	0.977	0.513
Emotional intelligence	C_EI1, C_EI2, C_EI3, C_EI4, C_EI5, C_EI6, C_EI8, C_EI9	0.929	0.942	0.668
Cognitive abilities	C_CA2, C_CA3, C_CA4, C_CA5, C_CA6	0.937	0.952	0.801
Library leadership	C_LL1, C_LL2, C_LL3, C_LL4, C_LL5, C_LL6	0.942	0.954	0.774
Collection management	C_CM1, C_CM2, C_CM3, C_CM4, C_CM5, C_CM6, C_CM7, C_CM8	0.940	0.950	0.706
Technology management	C_TM3, C_TM4, C_TM5, C_TM6	0.867	0.909	0.715
Research and reference service	C_RRS1, C_RRS2, C_RRS4, C_RRS5, C_RRS6, C_RRS7	0.928	0.943	0.736
Content organisation and structure	C_COS1, C_COS2, C_COS3, C_COS5	0.934	0.953	0.836
Task characteristic	Work design	0.967	0.968	0.581
Autonomy	WD_TCAU1, WD_TCAU2, WD_TCAU3, WD_TCAU4, WD_TCAU5, WD_TCAU6	0.956	0.961	0.673
Task variety	WD_TCAU7, WD_TCAU8, WD_TCAU9, WD_TCAU10, WD_TCAU11, WD_TCAU12	0.868	0.920	0.792
Task significance	WD_TCTV1, WD_TCTV2, WD_TCTV3, WD_TCTV5 WD_TCTS1, WD_TCTS2 WD_TCTS3, WD_TCTS4	0.838	0.891	0.672
Task identity	WD_TCTI1, WD_TCTI2, WD_TCTI3	0.907	0.934	0.781
Knowledge characteristic	WD_KCIC1, WD_KCIC2, WD_KCIC3	0.941	0.948	0.552
Job complexity	WD_KCIP1, WD_KCIP2, WD_KCIP3, WD_KCIP4	0.842	0.905	0.761
Information processing	WD_KCPS1, WD_KCPS2, WD_KCPS3, WD_KCPS4	0.864	0.907	0.710
Problem-solving	WD_KCSV1, WD_KCSV2, WD_KCSV3, WD_KCSV4	0.875	0.914	0.728
Skill Variety		0.906	0.935	0.783

6 Conclusions

Developing a questionnaire for quantitative research is very crucial. The researchers need to start with developing the conceptual framework, identify the items and constructs. Additionally, the researchers also need to conduct pretesting and pilot-testing of the questionnaire. The processes will guide researchers to develop a good questionnaire before collecting the data for the research. Feedback from the expertise and the result from the pilot test show that the questionnaire can be used as an instrument to study work performance and work design. Moreover, the value of the Cronbach's alpha shows that the reliability of the instrument is strong to represent the study. The overall range of the items in the questionnaire is 0.885 to 0.982. Thus, no further amendment was needed and the questionnaire can be used to study the work performance and work design. Appendix 1 shows the final draft of the questionnaire proposed for this study. The number of the respondent for the pre-testing and pilot-testing can be greater for better results. Not only that, the questionnaire also can be adapted to study work performance and work design in other fields in social science. The future researcher can replace the core competencies to suit the work nature of the potential respondents.

References

- Abadie, A., Diamond, A. and Hainmueller, J. (2015) 'Comparative politics and the synthetic control method', *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 59, No. 2, pp.495–510.
- Abrizah, A. (1999) 'Competencies for teacher librarians in Malaysia', *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.21–40.
- Babonea, A-M. and Voicu, M-C. (2008) 'Questionnaire pretesting in marketing research', *Challenges of the Knowledge Society*, Vol. 1, pp.1323–1330.
- Backstrom, C.H. and Hursc, G.D. (1963) *Survey Research*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL.
- Bakker, A.B. and Demerouti, E. (2014) 'Job demands-resources theory', in Chen, P.Y. and Cooper, C.L. (Eds.): *Work and Wellbeing: Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide*, Vol. 3, John Wiley & Son Inc., United Kingdom, DOI:10.100/9781118539415.wbwell019.
- Bilal, H., Shah, B., Qureshi, Q.A. and Khan, I. (2014) 'Impact of performance appraisal on job performance of employees in private sector universities of developing countries', *Public Policy and Administration Research*, Vol. 4, No. 7, pp.110–114.
- Byrne, B. M. (2016) *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*, Routledge.
- Campbell, J.P. and Wiernik, B.M. (2015) 'The modeling and assessment of work performance', *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.47–74.
- Carter, C.R., Kale, R. and Grimm, C.M. (2000) 'Environmental purchasing and firm performance: an empirical investigation', *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp.219–228.
- Collins, D. (2003) 'Pretesting survey instruments: an overview of cognitive methods', *Quality of Life Research*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp.229–238.
- Dahan, S.M., Taib, M.Y., Zainudin, N.M. and Ismail, F. (2016) 'Surveying users' perception of academic library services quality: a case study in Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP) Library', *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp.38–43, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.10.006>.

- Davenport, T.H. (2008) 'Improving knowledge worker performance', *From Strategy to Execution*, pp.215–235.
- DeNisi, A.S. and Gonzalez, J.A. (2017) 'Design performance appraisal systems to improve performance', *The Blackwell Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behaviour*, pp.63–75.
- Farooq, M.U., Ullah, A., Iqbal, M. and Hussain, A. (2016) 'Current and required competencies of university librarians in Pakistan', *Library Management*, Vol. 37, Nos. 8/9, pp.410–425, DOI: doi:10.1108/LM-03-2016-0017.
- Fraser-Arnott, M. (2017) 'Competencies for information specialists in emerging roles', *Library Management*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp.65–76, DOI: doi:10.1108/LM-09-2016-0074.
- Garg, P. and Rastogi, R. (2006) 'New model of job design: motivating employees' performance', *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp.572–587, DOI: doi:10.1108/02621710610670137.
- Gavril, O. (2015) 'How KPIs changed a government. A Malaysian approach', [online] <http://www.performancemagazine.org/how-kpis-changed-a-government-a-malaysian-approach/> (accessed 16 April, 2017).
- Gliem, J.A. and Gliem, R.R. (2003) 'Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales', paper presented *Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, October 8–10.
- Goodson, C.F. (1997) *The Complete Guide to Performance Standards for Library Personnel*, Neal Schuman, New York.
- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1976) 'Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory', *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp.250–279.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2014) *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM)*, SAGE Publication, Carlifornia.
- Hilton, C.E. (2015) 'The importance of pretesting questionnaires: a field research example of cognitive pretesting the exercise referral quality of life scale (ER-QLS)', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp.21–34.
- Hinkin, T.R., Tracey, J.B. and Enz, C.A. (1997) 'Scale construction: developing reliable and valid measurement instruments', *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp.100–120.
- Hulland, J., Baumgartner, H. and Smith, K.M. (2017) 'Marketing survey research best practices: evidence and recommendations from a review of JAMS articles', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, pp.1–17.
- Hunt, S.D., Sparkman, R.D. and Wilcox, J.B. (1982) 'The pretest in survey research: issues and preliminary findings', *Journal of Marketing Research*, pp.269–273.
- Huynh, T.T., Reynolds, S. and Mercieca, P. (2017) 'Succession planning in Vietnamese libraries: challenges and solutions', *The Palgrave Handbook of Leadership in Transforming Asia*, pp.381–396, Springer.
- Jordan, M.W. (2014) 'All stressed out, but does anyone notice?: stressors affecting public libraries', *Journal of Library Administration*, Vol. 54, No. 5, pp.291–307, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2014.924318>.
- Katz, J. (2015) 'A theory of qualitative methodology: the social system of analytic fieldwork', *Méthod (e) s: African Review of Social Sciences Methodology*, Vol. 1, No. 1–2, pp.131–146.
- Khan, A. (2015) *The Acquired and Required Competencies of Pakistani University Librarians: Determining the Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Training Needs*, Doctor of Philosophy Unpublished, University Technology MARA.
- Khan, A., Masrek, M.N. and Nadzar, F.M. (2015) 'Analysis of competencies, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as indicators of job performance: a conceptual framework', *Education for Information*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp.125–141.

- Khan, S.A. and Bhatti, R. (2017) 'Digital competencies for developing and managing digital libraries: an investigation from university librarians in Pakistan', *The Electronic Library*, Vol. 35, No. 3, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EL-06-2016-0133>.
- Kianpour, K., Jusoh, A., Mardani, A., Streimikiene, D., Cavallaro, F., Nor, K.M. and Zavadskas, E.K. (2017) 'Factors influencing consumers' intention to return the end of life electronic products through reverse supply chain management for reuse, repair and recycling', *Sustainability*, Vol. 9, No. 9, p.1657.
- Kirkman, F. (1981) 'Who cares about job design? Some reflections on its present and future', *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.3–13.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., Hildebrandt, V., Buuren, S.V., Beek, A.J.v.d. and Vet, H.C.W.d. (2012) 'Development of an individual work performance questionnaire', *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 62, No. 1, pp.6–28, DOI: [doi:10.1108/17410401311285273](https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401311285273).
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V.H., Schaufeli, W.B., de Vet Henrica, C. and van der Beek, A.J. (2011) 'Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: a systematic review', *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Vol. 53, No. 8, pp.856–866.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V.H., Vet, H.C.d. and Beek, A.J.V.D. (2014) 'Measuring individual work performance: Identifying and selecting indicators', *Work*, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp.229–238.
- Koopmans, L., Coffeng, J.K., Bernaards, C.M., Boot, C.R., Hildebrandt, V.H., Vet, H.C.d. and Beek, A.J.V.d. (2014) 'Responsiveness of the individual work performance questionnaire', *BMC Public Health*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.1–11.
- Kumar, R. (2014) 'The research design', in Metzler, K. (Ed.): *Research Methodology: A Step by Step Guide for Beginners*, 4th ed., p.123, SAGE Publication, London.
- Liu, K-L. and Chang, C-C. and Hu, I-L. (2010) 'Exploring the effects of task characteristics on knowledge sharing in libraries', *Library Review*, Vol. 59, No. 6, pp.455–468.
- Malaysia Productivity Corporation (2018) (3 March 2016) *Background of Malaysia Productivity Corporation* [online] <http://www.mpc.gov.my/background/> (accessed 11 July 2018).
- Malhotra, N. (2006) 'Questionnaire design and scale development', in Grover, R. and Vriens, M. (Eds.): *The Handbook of Marketing Research: Uses, Misuses, and Future Advances*, pp.pp.84–94, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Masrek, M.N., Saad, M.S.M., Johare, R., Rahim, H. and Masli, J.B. (2012) 'The competencies needed by para-professionals in library services: a case study of Sarawak State Libraries', Paper presented at the *The 18th International Business Information Management (IBIMA) Conference*, Istanbul, Turkey.
- McLeod, S. (2008) 'Likert scale' [online] <https://www.simplypsychology.org/likert-scale.html> (accessed 15 April 2017).
- Miller, R.K. (2013) 'Helping new librarians find success and satisfaction in the academic library', in Hrycaj, P. (Ed.): *Workplace Culture in Academic Libraries*, pp.81–96, Chandos Publishing.
- Morgan, S. (1995) *Performance Assessment in Academic librarians*, Mansell Publishing, London.
- Morgeson, F.P. and Humphrey, S.E. (2006) 'The work design questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91, No. 6, pp.1321–1339, DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321
- Morgeson, F.P. and Humphrey, S.E. (2008) 'Job and team design: toward a more integrative conceptualization of work design', *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, pp.39–91, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Panatik, S.A.B. (2012) 'Impact of work design on employee psychological strain among Malaysian technical workers', *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 40, pp.404–409, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.207>.

- Perera, G.D.N., Khatibi, A., Navaratna, N. and Chinna, K. (2014) 'Job satisfaction and job performance among factory employees in apparel sector', *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.96–104.
- Ramayah, T., Cheah, J., Chuah, F., Ting, H. and Memon, M.A. (2018) *Partial Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using SmartPLS 3.0: An Updated and Practical Guide to Statistical Analysis*, 2nd ed., Pearson Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.
- Robinson, K.P., Runcie, R., Manassi, T.M. and Mckoy-Johnson, F. (2015) 'Establishing a competencies framework for a Caribbean academic library: the case of the UWI library, Mona campus', *Library Management*, Vol. 36, No. 1/2, pp.23–39, DOI: doi:10.1108/LM-10-2014-0123.
- Roe, R.A. (1999) 'Work performance: a multiple regulation perspective', *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp.231–336.
- Santos, J.R.A. (1999) 'Cronbach's alpha: a tool for assessing the reliability of scales', *Journal of Extension*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp.1–5.
- Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. (2013a) *Element of Research Design Research Methods for Business*, 6th ed., John Wiley and Sons, West Susses.
- Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. (2013b) *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-building Approach*, 6th ed., Wiley, United Kingdom.
- Sharon, P. and Wall, T. (1998) *Job and Work Design: Organizing Work to Promote Well-being and Effectiveness*, SAGE Publication, Oaks, California.
- Shupe, E.I., Wambaugh, S.K. and Bramble, R.J. (2015) 'Role-related stress experienced by academic librarians', *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp.264269, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.03.016>.
- Tavakol, M. and Dennick, R. (2011) 'Making sense of Cronbach's alpha', *International Journal of Medical Education*, Vol. 2, p.53.
- Wildemuth, B.M. (2009) *Application of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*, Libraries Unlimited, London.

Appendix**Table A** Individual work performance and work design questionnaire for librarian

1	Work performance
1.1	Task performance
	WP_TP1: I always plan my work so that it will be completed on time
	WP_TP2: I always prioritise and organise my work
	WP_TP3: I always execute my work well with minimal time and effort
	WP_TP4: I always use my time efficiently to finish my tasks
1.2	Contextual performance
	WP_CP1: I am always able to assemble my appointments
	WP_CP2: I am always able to execute my responsibilities
	WP_CP3: I always can collaborate/work together with others
	WP_CP4: My co-worker understand me well when I tell them something
	WP_CP5: I always use feedback that I obtain from my co-workers
	WP_CP6: I believe that library users/patrons are satisfied with my work
2	Librarian competencies
2.1	Emotional intelligence
	C_EI1: I am able to voice my opinion to new viewpoints
	C_EI2: I am able to identify my own potentials and capabilities
	C_EI3: I am able to execute my tasks according to the professional standards
	C_EI4: I am able to maintain and establish close relationships with my coworkers
	C_EI5: I am able to adapt my own strategies and responses to fit changed conditions
	C_EI6: I am able to change to another approach if one is not working
	C_EI8: I am able to face difficult situations and search for the solutions
	C_EI9: I am able to identify what users' need
2.2	Cognitive abilities
	C_CA2: I am able to talk and consult with my coworker on how to solve problems especially when I am not sure about my tasks
	C_CA3: I am able to make a decision and understand the consequences
	C_CA4: I am able to make a decision as an opportunity to solve a problem
	C_CA5: I am able to investigate and identify an issue to find the best solution that is beneficial to all
	C_CA6: I am able to fit in with new ideas to solve issues
2.3	Library leadership
	C_LL1: I am able to contribute to the professional goals
	C_LL2: I am able to promote the librarianship's professional identity
	C_LL3: I am able to review the job description, job scope and update it if necessary
	C_LL4: I am able to motivate and influence coworkers/employees for training when needed
	C_LL5: I am able to build up an image of how the academic library should be operated under ideal conditions
	C_LL6: I am able to identify indicators to evaluate the performance of librarians

Table A Individual work performance and work design questionnaire for librarian (continued)

2.4	Collection management
	C_CM1: I am able to understand the circulation procedures and policies in the library
	C_CM2: I am able to develop remote access to resources
	C_CM3: I am able to understand the acquisition procedures and policies in the library
	C_CM4: I am able to understand the policies and plans in collection development
	C_CM5: I am able to select and evaluate non-standard and standard bibliographic resources
	C_CM6: I am able to develop library resource sharing policies
	C_CM7: I am able to develop partnerships and networks for resources sharing
	C_CM8: I am able to develop and put into practice the library's disaster plan
2.5	Technology management
	C_TM3: I am be able to understand the information security policies in the library
	C_TM4: I am be able to use and understand the library content management system
	C_TM5: I am be able to understand the use of social media for library
	C_TM6: I am be able to incorporate technology such as social media into a library's technology development plan
2.6	Research and reference service
	C_RRS1: I am be able to modify and evaluate methods of information analysis
	C_RRS2: I am be able to understand and develop information literacy program
	C_RRS4: I am be able to identify and evaluate physical and digital the reference tools
	C_RRS5: I am be able to create and customise a reference management system
	C_RRS6: I am be able to customise and apply library reference, and research tools
	C_RRS7: I am be able to select and evaluate local and international databases for research purpose and reference
3	Work design
3.1	Task characteristic
3.1.1	Autonomy
3.1.1.1	Work scheduling autonomy
	WD_TCAU1: My job allows me to plan how I do my work
	WD_TCAU2: My job allows me to decide the order in which things are done
	WD_TCAU3: My job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work
	WD_TCAU4: My job allows me to have a flexible working schedule so that I can complete my tasks
3.1.1.2	Decision-making autonomy
	WD_TCAU5: My job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in carrying out the work.
	WD_TCAU6: My job allows me to make decisions on my own
	WD_TCAU7: My job provides me with significant autonomy in making decisions.
	WD_TCAU8: My job allows me to propose new solutions for decision making

Table A Individual work performance and work design questionnaire for librarian (continued)

3.1.1.3	Work methods autonomy
	WD_TCAU9: I can make decisions to choose suitable methods in completing my work.
	WD_TCAU10: I am given freedom and opportunity to choose how I complete my work
	WD_TCAU11: I can make my own decisions on how I can complete my work.
	WD_TCAU12: The methods that I choose to improve the way I organise my work
3.1.2	Task variety
	WD_TCTV1: My job involves a great deal of task variety
	WD_TCTV2: My job requires me to perform a number of different tasks
	WD_TCTV3: My job is not boring but satisfying because it involves a variety of tasks
3.1.3	Task significance
	WD_TCTS1: My job is very significant in the broader scheme of things.
	WD_TCTS2: The output of my work significantly affects my coworker in the library
	WD_TCTS3: My job has a larger significance on people outside the library
	WD_TCTS4: My job might influence the decision making in the library
3.1.4	Task identity
	WD_TCTI1: My job allows me to identify my work.
	WD_TCTI2: My job allows me to arrange my own work so that I can complete it well
	WD_TCTI3: My job is arranged so that I can complete my work
	WD_TCTI4: My job requires me to complete a piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end
3.2	Knowledge characteristic
3.2.1	Job complexity
	WD_KCJC1: My job scope is complex
	WD_KCJC2: My job requires me to do complicated tasks
	WD_KCJC3: I need to perform multitasking task at a time
3.2.2	Information processing
	WD_KCIP1: My job requires me to observe a great deal of information.
	WD_KCIP2: I need to think critically to perform my job
	WD_KCIP3: My job requires me to keep track of more than one thing at a time.
	WD_KCIP4: My job requires me to analyze a lot of information and data
3.1.4	Problem-solving
	WD_KCPS1: My job requires me to solve problems that have no obvious/direct answer
	WD_KCPS2: I need to be creative to perform my job
	WD_KCPS3: My job often requires me to solve problems that I have not encountered before
	WD_KCPS4: My job requires me to produce unique ideas to solve the problems

Table A Individual work performance and work design questionnaire for librarian (continued)

3.1.5	Skill variety
	WD_KCSV1: My job requires a variety of skills
	WD_KCSV2: My job requires me to utilise a variety of different skills in order to finish the work.
	WD_KCSV3: My job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills
	WD_KCSV4: I need to learn a number of new skills to complete my tasks.
2.7	Content organisation and structure
	C_COS1: I am be able to understand and interpret bibliographic records
	C_COS2: I am be able to understand the use of metadata
	C_COS3: I am be able to use bibliographic and authority records
	C_COS5: I am be able to understand and apply classification standards
