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Introduction

• Competency is complicated; hence the competency assessment should be done elaborately deeply, and variedly. This is in accordance with the concept of Baartman et al. (2006) which said that the competency assessment is very complex, one single assessment method seems not to be sufficient.
Moreover, Koeppen et al. (2008) suggested that the competencies are conceptualized as complex ability constructs. For the challenge point of this research about competency assessment, one of the points is about psychological models (Frey & Hartig, 2009).
Introduction

• Competency which had complexity, therefore competency assessment has to be done elaborately and with in-depth. The importance of assessment is that it has to show the evidence of validity.
Introduction

• The purpose of research is to examine the validity of assessment of performance competency by the methods of Rash Analysis, Inter-Subtest Correlation Analysis, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis.
Methodology

• The sample group consisted of directors and employees.

• The instruments included three volumes: Assessment by Director (Volume I), Self-Assessment (Volume II), and Supervisor Assessment (Volume III).

• The data were analyzed by the Rash Analysis, Inter-Subtest Correlation Analysis, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis.
Results

1. The Rash Analysis Volume I (the INFIT MNSQ value between .79 and 1.45) were fit almost all of the items, whereas Volume II (the INFIT MNSQ value between .98 and 1.01) and Volume III (the INFIT MNSQ value between .88 and 1.09) had all values in the range of statistically acceptable.
Results

2. The Inter-Subtest Correlation Analysis in all volumes had a high level of relationship. The Volume I, Assessment by Director had the value between .675 and .940. The Volume II, the Self-Assessment had the value between .441 and .650. And the Volume III, the Supervisor Assessment, the value was between .519 and .884.
Results

3. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis for all volumes had concordant with the empirical data. The Assessment by Director volume had the Chi square $= 1.93$ (df=2, $p=.38$), GFI = 1.00, AGFI = 1.00, RMR = .00, RMSEA = .00, the Self-Assessment had the Chi square $= 5.65$ (df = 2, $p = .059$), GFI = 1.00, AGFI = 1.00, RMR = .00, RMSEA = .02, and the Supervisor Assessment had the Chi square $= 4.30$ (df = 4, $p = .37$), GFI = 1.00, AGFI = .99, RMR = .01, RMSEA = .01.
Implications for policy/Practice

The instruments for competency assessment of performance have various volumes, and they are conducted under the organizations which can control the examination effectively. For the further research, it should apply the technology to help originate the quickness, and saving.
Conclusion

The evidences of examination on three methods based on the measurement standard for Item Response Theory and Classical Test Theory, these can indicate the quality of assessment of performance competence very well.
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