

# **Volatility in the Relative Standard Deviation of Target Fulfilment as Key Performance Indicator (KPI)**

Andreas Bauer<sup>1</sup>, Jasna Omeragic<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Mendel University in Brno, Faculty of Business and Economics,  
Provozně-ekonomická fakulta, Zemědělská 1, 613 00 Brno, Czech Republic*

<sup>2</sup> *Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technologies,  
SS Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia*

*Corresponding author. E-Mail: [a.bauer@netvance.com](mailto:a.bauer@netvance.com)*

# **Volatility in the Relative Standard Deviation of Target Fulfilment as Key Performance Indicator (KPI)**

In this study, we identify the relative standard deviation volatility (RSD volatility) in the individual target time fulfilment in relation to the total set of comparables (e.g., all individuals in the same organisational structure) as a possible key performance indicator (KPI) for predicting employee job performance. KPIs represent a well-established, measurable benchmark of an organisation's critical success metrics; therefore, in this paper, we attempt to find a new comprehensible and definable way utilising the RSD volatility method to identify employees who are experiencing a transition in their RSD towards a higher percent deviation, thus, indicating emerging suboptimal work conditions. We believe that RSD volatility can be utilised as an additional assessment factor, particularly in profiling.

Keywords: employee job performance, target time fulfilment, key performance indicator, relative standard deviation, RSD volatility

Subject classification codes: J24 (Labour Productivity), J22 (Time Allocation), M12 (Personnel Management)

## **Introduction**

Relative Standard Deviation (RSD) volatility in target achievements is a straightforward metric and yet, it is critical for developing an optimal work environment. The target time of the indicator is a quantifiable feature, and key performance indicators (KPIs) are a quantifiable representation of an organisation's critical success factors. Thus, KPIs should be selected based on the context of the organisation. Each KPI should be aligned with and quantified against business objectives. KPIs aid in the definition of critical roles and the development of departmental performance indicators. Consequently, the performance of an organisation can be quantified. Performance management requires the establishment of specific and attainable KPIs.

### ***Benefits of this research***

The findings of this study can guide future research, in addition to creating a baseline for evaluating employees' working conditions where RSD volatility in target time fulfilment represents an intervening variable to consider.

### ***Profiling of employees***

As a component of workforce planning, profiling focuses on matching individuals to workloads and ensuring enough manpower to account for cyclical activity level volatility (Thain et al. 2002). Profiling methods are applied when quantifiable work volumes can be determined and anticipated correctly. We take RSD volatility as a supplemental assessment factor used in conjunction with other KPI factors, specifically in the context of profiling. A similar study that provided support for our method used logistic regression to analyse worker turnover over a one-year period to find a way to reduce the number of workers from approximately 4,000 (Setiawan et al. 2020).

### ***Daily fluctuations in relation to monthly fluctuations***

In past studies, the focus was primarily on short-term daily influences. We see that, particularly in our RSD volatility model, overriding influences are uncovered. While overall work engagement levels are generally stable (e.g. Mauno et al. 2007), daily levels vary significantly (Sonnentag et al. 2012). At times, a highly motivated individual is disengaged from work, whereas an unmotivated individual under certain circumstances can account for daily shifts in work commitment (Bledow et al. 2011). A 1989 historical study identified employees with low employee reliability scores as more hostile, impulsive, insensitive, self-absorbed, and unhappy, according to standard inventories (Hogan and Hogan 2018).

However, these approaches are very much related to individual surveys and therefore cannot

be used neutrally as a KPI in the same manner as the proposed RSD volatility KPI.

## **Research methodology**

### ***Target hours vs achieved hours***

As a data source, we used daily performance assessment measurements from an internal enterprise resource planning (ERP) system: The productivity of individual employees (actual working times) and target working times (target times) were recorded. Our study utilized data on actual and target working hours of 19 employees between January 2016 and October 2021.

### ***RSD anomalies in target time fulfilment***

We determine the relative standard deviation (RSD) we process  $\sigma$ , such that  $RSD = \frac{\sigma}{\mu}$ , where

$\sigma = \sqrt{\sum\{x_{at} - \mu(x_{tt}; x_{at})^2\} + \{x_{tt} - \mu(x_{tt}; x_{at})^2\}}$ , and  $x_{tt}$  is the target time and  $x_{at}$  is the actual time.

In our study, we define RSD volatility as a factor in which the response time value serves as a proxy for more in-depth analysis. A low RSD indicates that the data points are more stable, or performance is consistent throughout the system. A large RSD, on the other hand, typically indicates that the data span a wide range of values, and that target time fulfilment is more unpredictable and unstable than total quantity. With the help of the RSD volatility method, we can identify the employees who are experiencing a transition in their RSD towards a higher percentage deviation as shown in Figure 1 below. This is consistent with the findings of Nanda et al. (2020) on the effects of change in individual work environment on performance. The study's limitation lies in the study's small sample size; the long observation period is an effort to partially make up for this shortcoming.




Figure 1. Sample data distribution: working time and duration of employment

The differences between  $x_{at}$  and  $x_{tt}$  are as follows: each employee's  $x_{tt}$  and  $x_{at}$  are presented as the target time difference  $\Delta x_{tt}$ , and  $\Delta x_{at}$  for the employee's first target time  $x_{tt}^n$  and the previous  $x_{tt}^{n-1}$ . Using employee WO10 as a sample data point in Figure 2, employee WO10 has an output of 373.75h for  $\Delta x_{at}$  and -416h for  $\Delta x_{tt}$ .




Figure 2. Data for the analysis of movement through years, showing spread in target time fulfilment for sample employees (WO01 to WO24)

## **Results**

The proposed RSD volatility method allows for the identification of an indication of a decrease in the hourly target achievement rate for an individual employee by visualising a shift in the RSD value to a larger deviation value when using the hourly target achievement rate. The fact that the total number of employees is considered in the equation means that parameters that affect the entire group are effectively filtered out, and the predictive accuracy of disturbing influences that only affect individual employees increases. Figure 3 is a graph for the evaluation of the sample data. One can see a substantial volatility in the RSD of employees in the sample (WO03 to WO24) in relation to the entire team over six years of observation.




Figure 3. Data on RSD volatility of employees in the sample during an observation period of six years.

## Conclusion

Our study demonstrates that a straightforward variable, such as the volatility of the target time fulfilment ratio, calculated as the relative standard deviation (RSD), can be incorporated into the key performance indicators (KPIs) used in an assessment of employee performance predictability. On the one hand, the addition of target agreements with employees and the usage and application of KPIs to evaluate the efficiency and predictability of employees' work performance are now feasible by using the RSD variation method. When the RSD variation increases, it can serve as an early warning system for potential vulnerabilities and emerging difficulties in an employee's work environment and function as an early trigger for implementing measures to make improvements in operations.

## References

Bledow, R., A. Schmitt, M. Frese, and J. Kühnel. 2011. "The Affective Shift Model of Work Engagement." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 96 (6): 1246–1257.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024532>.

Hogan, J., and R. Hogan. 2018. "How to Measure Employee Reliability." *Occupational Crime* 74 (2): 377–384. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315193854-21>.

Mauno, S., U. Kinnunen, and M. Ruokolainen. 2007. "Job Demands and Resources as Antecedents of Work Engagement: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 70 (1): 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.09.002>.

Nanda, A., M. Soelton, S. Luiza, and E.T.P. Saratian. 2020. "The Effect of Psychological Work Environment and Work Loads on Turnover Interest, Work Stress as an Intervening



Variable.” Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Management, Economics and Business (ICMEB 2019), 120, 225–231. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200205.040>.

Setiawan, I., S. Suprihanto, A.C. Nugraha, and J. Hutahaeen. 2020. “HR Analytics: Employee Attrition Analysis Using Logistic Regression.” *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* 830 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/830/3/032001>.

Sonnentag, S., E.J. Mojza, E. Demerouti, and A.B. Bakker. 2012. “Reciprocal Relations Between Recovery and Work Engagement: The Moderating Role of Job Stressors.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 97 (4): 842–853. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028292>.

Tannenbaum, S. 2002. “A strategic view of organizational training and learning.” In K. Kraiger (ed.) *Creating, Implementing, and Managing Effective Training and Development*, 10-52. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.