

Validation of the Bahasa version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire III in Indonesia

Henndy Ginting¹, Hary Febriansyah¹, Lisandy A. Suryana¹, Gérard Näring²

¹School of Business and Management,
Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia

²Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Psychosocial factors at Work

- The way work is carried out (deadlines, workload, work methods).
- The context (relationships and interactions with managers and supervisors, colleagues and coworkers, and clients/customers).

Psychosocial Factors at Work

Organizations that make the effort to address psychosocial risks and create a psychologically healthy workplace:

- Will have healthier and happier employees.
- Are likely to reap benefits in productivity, sustainability and growth.

Psychosocial Factors in Indonesia

- Often overlooked by companies.
- Personal affairs' intervention, abandonment, unfriendly communication, inconsiderate behavior, and privacy invasion (Handoyo, 2018).
- Work stress and acute fatigue symptoms (Widanarko & Modjo, 2017).
- Validity of the measures was not reported comprehensively.

Psychosocial Factors Measure

- To guide early prevention
- Strong theoretical Framework
- COPSQQ: Well developed theoretically and more comprehensive concept.

COPSOQ in Indonesia

- Linguistic validation and psychometric properties formulation are needed.
- Might be suitable information in order to propose intervention programs for the workers and companies in the country.

COPSOQ in Indonesia

- Few studies have used COPSOQ in some Indonesian populations, and those studies did not cover larger and various companies.

The aims of the Study

To validate the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire, COPSOQ III, in Indonesia:

- Internal Consistency and Reliability
- Construct Validity
- Discriminant Validity
- Factorial Structure

Participants

N = 1587 (from a largest Indonesian state owned company and an Indonesian private company).

Gender	Male (75%)
Educational Level	Senior High School (20%) Diploma (36%) Bachelor (42%) Graduate (2%)
Ethnicity	Javanese (42%) Non-Javanese (58%)
Work Location	Java Island (31%) Outer Java 1 (59%) Outer Java 2 (10%)
Working Years	< 5 years (33%) 6 – 10 years (24%) > 10% years (43%)



Andaman Sea

Gulf of Thailand

Ho Chi Minh City

Palawan

Panay

Negros
Mindanao

Basilan Island

Malaysia

Kuala Lumpur

Singapore

Celebes Sea

Indonesia

Jakarta

Java Sea

Banda Sea

GREATER SUNDA ISLANDS

Arafura Sea

Timor Sea

Measures

- The COPSQQ III
- The 6 items Aon Hewitt Questionnaire of Employee Engagement (cronbach's alpha = .89)
- The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ; Hills & Argyle, 2002) with Cronbach's Alpha = 0.90
- A questionnaire to measure employee perceived performance (cronbach's alpha = .85).

Results

(Internal Consistency and
Reliability)

Table 2. COPSQQ-III Factors, Item-total Item Correlation, and Cronbach's Alpha

No.	Factors/Variables	Item-total Item Correlation (<i>r</i>)	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Quantitative demands	.58 - .80	.67
2	Work place	.73 - .83	.68
3	Cognitive demands	.69 - .82	.74
4	Emotional demands	.68 - .85	.70
5	Demands for hiding emotions	.45 - .66	.37
6	Influence at work	.40 - .75	.72
7	Possibilities for development (Skill discretion)	.84 - .89	.85
8	Variation of work	.65 - .68	-.26
9	Control over working time	.32- .72	.49
10	Meaning of work	.89 - .92	.78
11	Predictability	.90 - .92	.79
12	Recognition	.90 - .96	.91
13	Role clarity	.86 - .91	.87
14	Role conflicts	.79 - .88	.56

Requirement

Item-total Item Correlation (*r*) > .30

Cronbach's Alpha > 0.6

Note:



Does not match the requirement

Table 2. COPSQQ-III Factors, Item-total Item Correlation, and Cronbach's Alpha (Cont.)

No.	Factors/Variables	Item-total Item Correlation (<i>r</i>)	Cronbach's Alpha
15	Quality of leadership	.89 – .92	.92
16	Social support from supervisor	.85 - .90	.86
17	Social support from colleagues	.80 - .87	.76
18	Sense of community at work	.84 - .90	.84
29	Commitment to the workplace	.24 - .78	.70
20	Work engagement	.68 - .83	.64
21	Insecurity over employment (Job insecurity)	.79 - .85	.76
22	Insecurity over working conditions	.33 - .87	.77
23	Quality of work	.88 - .91	.75
24	Satisfaction with work (Job satisfaction)	.70 - .86	.87
25	Work life conflict	.56 - .89	.83
26	Horizontal trust	.68 - .90	.78
27	Vertical trust	.62 - .83	.71
28	Organizational justice	.86 - .89	.90

Requirement

Item-total Item Correlation (*r*) > .30

Cronbach's Alpha > 0.6

Note:



Does not match the requirement

Table 2. COPSOQ-III Factors, Item-total Item Correlation, and Cronbach's Alpha (Cont.)

No.	Factors/Variables	Item-total Item Correlation (<i>r</i>)	Cronbach's Alpha
29	Bullying	.67 - .89	.39
30	Self-rated health	.87 - .96	.74
31	Sleeping troubles	.85 - .89	.88
32	Burnout	.81 - .91	.90
33	Stress	.89 - .92	.89
34	Somatic stress	.79 - .84	.83
35	Cognitive stress	.86 - .90	.90
36	Depressive symptoms	.86 - .88	.89
37	Self-efficacy	.72 - .88	.91

Requirement

Item-total Item Correlation (*r*) > .30

Cronbach's Alpha > 0.6

Note:

- Two factors with only one item (e.g. Illegitimate Tasks and Conflict and Quarrels) and six factors with multiple response (e.g. Gossip and Slander) were excluded


-  → Does not match the requirement

Table 2. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors

	QD	WP	CD	ED	HE	IN	PD	VA	CT	MW	PR	RE	CL	CO	QL
QD	1														
WP	.199**	1													
CD	.121**	.524**	1												
ED	.419**	.348**	.394**	1											
HE	.194**	.285**	.344**	.427**	1										
IN	0,041	.380**	.496**	.290**	.240**	1									
PD	-.246**	.233**	.327**	-.099**	.063*	.314**	1								
VA	-0,049	.120**	.128**	-.030	-.046	.141**	.242**	1							
CT	-.055*	-.121**	-.050	.019	.008	.173**	-.031	-.078**	1						
MW	-.254**	.219**	.291**	-.083**	.069*	.277**	.704**	.154**	-.051	1					
PR	-.333**	.120**	.152**	-.143**	.012	.190**	.544**	.073**	.023	.536**	1				
RE	-.320**	.112**	.139**	-.182**	-.004	.221**	.512**	.103**	.033	.509**	.625**	1			
CL	-.273**	.242**	.302**	-.083**	.066*	.315**	.609**	.059*	-.049	.653**	.586**	.589**	1		
CO	.224**	.231**	.289**	.386**	.267**	.209**	.069*	.062*	-.014	.025	-.006	-.076**	0,047	1	
QL	-.327**	.061*	.087**	-.182**	-0,031	.155**	.507**	.108**	.056*	.471**	.589**	.684**	.489**	-.090**	1

Note:

 → Correlation score ≥ .5

Table 3. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors (Cont.)

	QD	WP	CD	ED	HE	IN	PD	VA	CT	MW	PR	RE	CL	CO	QL
SS	-.188**	.068*	.166**	-.061*	.029	.252**	.357**	.082**	.115**	.291**	.424**	.486**	.349**	-.060*	.611**
SC	-.176**	.140**	.250**	.016	.065*	.321**	.384**	.075**	.126**	.306**	.388**	.421**	.384**	.037	.397**
SW	-.333**	.123**	.222**	-.152**	.062*	.246**	.485**	.069**	.023	.455**	.462**	.459**	.488**	-.079**	.408**
CW	-.190**	.193**	.269**	-.025	.079**	.289**	.486**	.108**	.072**	.497**	.412**	.479**	.513**	.068*	.478**
WE	-.212**	.228**	.275**	-.082**	.119**	.271**	.488**	.134**	-.075**	.475**	.395**	.388**	.476**	-.007	.359**
JI	.021	-.066*	-.089**	-.010	.014	-.125**	-.084**	-.034	.044	-.027	.048	.006	-.069*	.002	.042
IW	.266**	-.087**	-.119**	.181**	.063*	-.152**	-.343**	-.123**	.077**	-.306**	-.233**	-.312**	-.342**	.097**	-.262**
QW	-.273**	.207**	.229**	-.103**	.031	.286**	.532**	.116**	-.014	.512**	.466**	.515**	.577**	.037	.505**
JS	-.354**	.115**	.141**	-.191**	-.055*	.208**	.509**	.128**	-.010	.508**	.478**	.552**	.492**	-.073**	.523**
WF	.515**	.263**	.244**	.502**	.272**	.116**	-.177**	-.033	-.104**	-.200**	-.226**	-.307**	-.209**	.368**	-.284**
TE	-.312**	-.003	.011	-.273**	-.042	.051	.336**	.081**	-.069*	.335**	.348**	.434**	.370**	-.207**	.399**

Note:

 → Correlation score ≥ .5

Table 3. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors (Cont.)

	QD	WP	CD	ED	HE	IN	PD	VA	CT	MW	PR	RE	CL	CO	QL
JU	-.371**	.072**	.086**	-.203**	-.011	.165**	.505**	.096**	.048	.487**	.586**	.717**	.498**	-.114**	.725**
BU	.385**	.122**	.107**	.360**	.188**	.096**	-.219**	-.025	.077**	-.242**	-.267**	-.382**	-.251**	.224**	-.331**
SL	.339**	.112**	.145**	.307**	.192**	.028	-.131**	-.034	-.053*	-.167**	-.135**	-.184**	-.166**	.171**	-.146**
TM	-.345**	.072**	.118**	-.201**	.024	.183**	.483**	.091**	.020	.465**	.516**	.572**	.487**	-.128**	.600**
BO	.472**	.158**	.175**	.411**	.223**	.044	-.191**	-.113**	-.039	-.217**	-.223**	-.322**	-.198**	.219**	-.286**
ST	.465**	.173**	.180**	.407**	.233**	.073**	-.205**	-.062*	-.097**	-.223**	-.235**	-.283**	-.227**	.218**	-.273**
SO	.333**	.072**	.095**	.310**	.172**	-.005	-.183**	-.065*	-.030	-.210**	-.157**	-.214**	-.204**	.168**	-.192**
CS	.388**	.037	.075**	.330**	.193**	-.024	-.227**	-.077**	.033	-.225**	-.223**	-.237**	-.240**	.167**	-.208**
DS	.363**	.030	.061*	.358**	.218**	-.035	-.279**	-.099**	.017	-.284**	-.228**	-.300**	-.263**	.173**	-.271**
SE	-.078**	.363**	.297**	.101**	.122**	.402**	.316**	.090**	.099**	.250**	.178**	.199**	.303**	.149**	.140**

Note:

 → Correlation score ≥ .5

Table 3. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors (Cont.)

	QD	WP	CD	ED	HE	IN	PD	VA	CT	MW	PR	RE	CL	CO	QL
JU	-.371**	.072**	.086**	-.203**	-.011	.165**	.505**	.096**	.048	.487**	.586**	.717**	.498**	-.114**	.725**
BU	.385**	.122**	.107**	.360**	.188**	.096**	-.219**	-.025	.077**	-.242**	-.267**	-.382**	-.251**	.224**	-.331**
SL	.339**	.112**	.145**	.307**	.192**	.028	-.131**	-.034	-.053*	-.167**	-.135**	-.184**	-.166**	.171**	-.146**
TM	-.345**	.072**	.118**	-.201**	.024	.183**	.483**	.091**	.020	.465**	.516**	.572**	.487**	-.128**	.600**
BO	.472**	.158**	.175**	.411**	.223**	.044	-.191**	-.113**	-.039	-.217**	-.223**	-.322**	-.198**	.219**	-.286**
ST	.465**	.173**	.180**	.407**	.233**	.073**	-.205**	-.062*	-.097**	-.223**	-.235**	-.283**	-.227**	.218**	-.273**
SO	.333**	.072**	.095**	.310**	.172**	-.005	-.183**	-.065*	-.030	-.210**	-.157**	-.214**	-.204**	.168**	-.192**
CS	.388**	.037	.075**	.330**	.193**	-.024	-.227**	-.077**	.033	-.225**	-.223**	-.237**	-.240**	.167**	-.208**
DS	.363**	.030	.061*	.358**	.218**	-.035	-.279**	-.099**	.017	-.284**	-.228**	-.300**	-.263**	.173**	-.271**
SE	-.078**	.363**	.297**	.101**	.122**	.402**	.316**	.090**	.099**	.250**	.178**	.199**	.303**	.149**	.140**

Note:

 → Correlation score ≥ .5

Table 3. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors (Cont.)

	CW	WE	JI	IW	QW	JS	WF	TE	JU	BU	SL	TM	BO	ST	SO	CS	DS	SE
CW	1																	
WE	.397**	1																
JI	.026	-.020	1															
IW	-.258**	-.243**	.516**	1														
QW	.548**	.411**	-.045	-.305**	1													
JS	.475**	.442**	.025	-.335**	.564**	1												
WF	-.145**	-.157**	.082**	.339**	-.176**	-.329**	1											
TE	.261**	.290**	-.147**	-.371**	.371**	.398**	-.457**	1										
JU	.442**	.382**	.033	-.286**	.542**	.565**	-.344**	.496**	1									
BU	-.182**	-.155**	.060*	.264**	-.246**	-.306**	.433**	-.441**	-.380**	1								
SL	-.120**	-.136**	.070**	.216**	-.146**	-.236**	.397**	-.236**	-.188**	.361**	1							
TM	.414**	.365**	-.090**	-.357**	.504**	.478**	-.345**	.628**	.704**	-.337**	-.199**	1						
BO	-.175**	-.187**	.016	.268**	-.203**	-.367**	.517**	-.309**	-.329**	.401**	.681**	-.276**	1					
ST	-.175**	-.182**	.038	.248**	-.195**	-.361**	.517**	-.315**	-.314**	.418**	.686**	-.293**	.805**	1				
SO	-.155**	-.160**	.053	.237**	-.137**	-.271**	.380**	-.255**	-.233**	.339**	.653**	-.240**	.685**	.720**	1			
CS	-.162**	-.186**	.096**	.272**	-.202**	-.310**	.368**	-.254**	-.227**	.363**	.603**	-.223**	.681**	.711**	.729**	1		
DS	-.210**	-.226**	.135**	.329**	-.245**	-.351**	.384**	-.309**	-.288**	.402**	.613**	-.289**	.696**	.737**	.730**	.794**	1	
SE	.253**	.216**	-.183**	-.269**	.327**	.264**	-.009	.110**	.171**	.049	-.054*	.206**	-.069*	-.049	-.088**	-.140**	-.159**	1

Note:

 → Correlation score ≥ .5

Discussion

1. Internal consistency and reliability are confirmed. Low reliability on Demands for Hiding Emotions might be due to the eastern culture which has experience and prefer to experience low arousal emotions (Lim, 2016; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).
2. Correlations between related factors (in the same cluster, Dicke et al., 2018) also indicate internal consistency.

Results

(Construct Validity)

Table 2. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors and Other Variables

No.	COPSOQ-III Factors	Perceived Performance	Oxford Happiness Questionnaire	Employee Engagement
1	Quantitative demands	-.280**	-.338**	-.272**
2	Work place	.155**	.148**	.167**
3	Cognitive demands	.167**	.185**	.208**
4	Emotional demands	-.140**	-.217**	-.091**
5	Demands for hiding emotions	-.023	-.005	.012
6	Influence at work	.260**	.244**	.271**
7	Possibilities for development (Skill discretion)	.538**	.506**	.492**
8	Variation of work	.170**	.131**	.132**
9	Control over working time	.005	-.035	-0.019
10	Meaning of work	.478**	.480**	.509**
11	Predictability	.541**	.371**	.428**
12	Recognition	.644**	.427**	.481**
13	Role clarity	.486**	.518**	.532**
14	Role conflicts	-.046	-.070*	-.011
15	Illegitimate tasks	-.185**	-.208**	-.147**

Note:

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

 → indicates high correlation

Table 2. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors and Other Variables (Cont.)

No.	COPSOQ-III Factors	Perceived Performance	Oxford Happiness Questionnaire	Employee Engagement
16	Quality of leadership	.657**	.339**	.431**
17	Social support from supervisor	.455**	.269**	.294**
18	Social support from colleagues	.369**	.336**	.335**
19	Sense of community at work	.390**	.478**	.389**
20	Commitment to the workplace	.480**	.386**	.523**
21	Work engagement	.371**	.429**	.381**
22	Insecurity over employment (Job insecurity)	-.015	-.227**	-.039
23	Insecurity over working conditions	-.353**	-.447**	-.386**
24	Quality of work	.519**	.465**	.522**
25	Satisfaction with work (Job satisfaction)	.607**	.472**	.555**
26	Work life conflict	-.259**	-.364**	-.262**
27	Horizontal trust	.383**	.427**	.354**
28	Vertical trust	.542**	.404**	.507**
29	Organizational justice	.657**	-.326**	-.243**
30	Gossip and slander	-.184**	-.225**	-.142**

Note:

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

 → indicates high correlation

Table 2. Correlation Matrix Between COPSOQ-III Factors and Other Variables (Cont.)

No.	COPSOQ-III Factors	Perceived Performance	Oxford Happiness Questionnaire	Employee Engagement
31	Conflicts and quarrels	-.124**	-.236**	-.136**
32	Unpleasant teasing	-.227**	-.264**	-.167**
33	Harassment in social media (Cyber bullying)	-.092**	-.193**	-.081**
34	Sexual harassment	-.117**	-.261**	-.145**
35	Threats of violence	-.113**	-.199**	-.136**
36	Physical violence	-.128**	-.275**	-.185**
37	Bullying	-.296**	.412**	.333**
38	Self-rated health	.296**	-.329**	-.202**
39	Sleeping troubles	-.190**	.464**	.477**
40	Burnout	-.322**	-.389**	-.307**
41	Stress	-.275**	-.408**	-.279**
42	Somatic stress	-.250**	-.374**	-.263**
43	Cognitive stress	-.281**	-.426**	-.312**
44	Depressive symptoms	-.346**	-.470**	-.336**
45	Self-efficacy	.282**	.360**	.325**

Note:

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

 → indicates high correlation

Discussion

Construct validity of the COPSQQ III was confirmed by significant correlations between hypothesized related dimensions of COPSQQ III with perceived performance, happiness and employee engagement (e.g., positive correlations with Possibilities for Development, Meaning at Work, Role Clarity, Quality of Leadership, Commitment to the Workplace, Quality of Work, Trust and Justice; and negative correlations with Insecurity over Employment and Working Conditions, Burnout, Cognitive Stress, and Depressive Symptoms).

Results

(Discriminative Power)

Table 3. Means and Standard of COPSOQ-III Factors in Two Different Companies

No.	Factors/Variables	State Own Company (N=11377)	Private Company (N=210)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
1.	Quantitative demands	45.47 (14.45)	36.98 (13.13)
2.	Work place	67.05 (14.06)	68.00 (13.81)
3.	Cognitive demands	73.09 (14.07)	76.90 (12.51)
4.	Emotional demands	51.19 (16.92)	46.27 (17.25)
5.	Demands for hiding emotions	61.46 (12.59)	63.40 (15.22)
6.	Influence at work	62.32 (12.51)	62.47 (12.58)
7.	Possibilities for development (Skill discretion)	80.77 (13.66)	85.20 (14.47)
8.	Variation of work	59.77 (12.75)	65.70 (10.57)
9.	Control over working time	54.37 (11.28)	53.48 (11.07)
10.	Meaning of work	83.54 (14.20)	94.90 (8.93)
11.	Predictability	78.84 (14.17)	82.90 (15.48)
12.	Recognition	77.23 (14.98)	84.00 (18.26)
13.	Role clarity	84.09 (13.07)	93.93 (10.66)
14.	Role conflicts	63.17 (15.63)	62.30 (17.73)
15.	Illegitimate tasks	55.61 (19.52)	44.60 (20.40)

Note:



-  State Owned Company has higher scores compared to Private company
-  Private company has higher scores compared to State Owned Company

Table 3. Means and Standard of COPSOQ-III Factors in Two Different Companies (Cont.)

No.	Factors/Variables	State Own Company (N=11377)	Private Company (N=210)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
16.	Quality of leadership	75.48 (15.89)	83.00 (11.84)
17.	Social support from supervisor	72.22 (16.74)	73.27 (18.60)
18.	Social support from colleagues	71.92 (14.77)	91.50 (18.37)
19.	Sense of community at work	83.62 (14.23)	87.13 (11.92)
20.	Commitment to the workplace	69.50 (8.28)	85.76 (9.04)
21.	Work engagement	74.88 (13.99)	84.20 (11.67)
22.	Insecurity over employment	55.14 (19.23)	50.20 (21.80)
23.	Insecurity over working conditions	51.33 (14.54)	46.05 (14.66)
24.	Quality of work	76.73 (13.19)	86.30 (11.59)
25.	Satisfaction with work – job satisfaction	77.38 (12.74)	79.00 (10.08)
26.	Work life conflict	53.35 (15.68)	43.96 (15.17)
27.	Horizontal trust	74.22 (14.96)	71.93 (15.78)
28.	Vertical trust	75.02 (12.31)	77.20 (13.35)
29.	Organizational justice	73.75 (14.83)	83.00 (11.02)
30.	Gossip and slander	27.84 (14.61)	25.40 (9.54)

Note:





-  State Owned Company has higher scores compared to Private company
-  Private company has higher scores compared to State Owned Company

Table 3. Means and Standard of COPSOQ-III Factors in Two Different Companies (Cont.)

No.	Factors/Variables	State Own Company (N=11377)	Private Company (N=210)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
31.	Conflicts and quarrels	25.37 (12.37)	25.40 (11.32)
32.	Unpleasant teasing	29.20 (15.25)	27.60 (9.90)
33.	Harassment in social media	23.03 (10.85)	21.20 (4.84)
34.	Sexual harassment	21.76 (8.67)	20.20 (1.94)
35.	Threats of violence	23.40 (11.16)	20.40 (2.74)
36.	Physical violence	21.76 (8.39)	20.40 (2.74)
37.	Bullying	33.58 (12.30)	23.70 (6.22)
38.	Self-rated health	72.82 (11.85)	54.20 (11.64)
39.	Sleeping troubles	39.93 (15.79)	41.15 (13.98)
40.	Burnout	44.69 (15.20)	50.05 (12.18)
41.	Stress	41.03 (15.51)	44.67 (14.97)
42.	Somatic stress	39.97 (13.34)	42.20 (11.86)
43.	Cognitive stress	40.76 (13.98)	44.75 (11.84)
44.	Depressive symptoms	39.40 (14.19)	41.85 (12.62)
45.	Self-efficacy	80.60 (19.44)	91.90 (13.42)

Note:

-  State Owned Company has higher scores compared to Private company
-  Private company has higher scores compared to State Owned Company

Discussion

The different nature of governmental organizations compared to private organizations:

Most of those positive factors in COPSQ such as variation of work, recognition, role quality, quality of leadership, engagement, Organizational Justice, self-efficacy and meaning of work are higher in private company. But those negative factors such as quantitative demand, illegitimate tasks, work-life conflict, and bullying are higher in state owned company.

Results (Factorial validity)

- Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) indicated the 37 factors model (72.59% of cumulative variance accounted, factor loading $\geq .30$) -- an over-estimation of 16.4%.
- The EFA in the second order factors with seven factors model (Dicke, et al., 2018) indicated a cumulative variance accounted for of 46.44% (factors loading ≥ 0.3), explaining seven factors model (Eigenvalues > 1) from of 37 dimensions of COPSQ III.

Discussion

Initial Eigen values indicated that the first seven factors explained 13%, 10%, 6%, 6%, 4%, 4%, and 3% of the variance respectively. The seven factor solution, which explained 46% of the variance, was preferred because of: (a) its previous theoretical support; (b) the 'leveling off' of Eigen values on the scree plot after seven factors; and (c) the insufficient number of primary loadings and difficulty of interpreting the eight factor and subsequent factors.

CONCLUSION

the Bahasa version of COPSOQ III is a valid and reliable measure of psychosocial factors for Indonesian employees.

The latest study (Brief Report)



PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS AMONG ONLINE MOTORCYCLE TAXI DRIVERS

Contribute 2.83 Billion US Dollar for Indonesian Economic growth.

More than 1 Million labors have been working as partners in both companies.



Survey Results (N = 687)

Factor	Score (%)
QUANTITATIVE DEMANDS	63.4
WORK PACE	48
EMOTIONAL DEMANDS	69.8
COMMITMENT TO THE WORKPLACE	56.8
BURNOUT	59.6
INFLUENCE AT WORK	69.8
SOCIAL SUPPORT FROM SUPERVISOR	49
SOCIAL SUPPORT FROM COLLEAGUES	75.4
SENSE OF COMMUNITY AT WORK	86
WORK ENGAGEMENT	82.6

Survey Results (N = 687)

Factor	Score (%)
ROLE CONFLICTS	65.2
INSECURITY OVER EMPLOYMENT	53.6
INSECURITY OVER WORKING CONDITIONS	57.8
WORK LIFE CONFLICT	65.8
POSSIBILITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT	79.4
MEANING OF WORK	83.4
PREDICTABILITY	74.6
RECOGNITION	63.8
ROLE CLARITY	74.4
QUALITY OF LEADERSHIP	60.2

Survey Results

(N = 687)

Factor	Score (%)
VERTICAL TRUST	73.8
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE	61
COMMITMENT TO THE WORKPLACE	73.2
QUALITY OF WORK	82.6
JOB SATISFACTION	75.6
SELF RATED HEALTH	60.4