

Assessment of Individual Performance at Work in Companies: A Critical Study

*Mohammed Mouchaouri¹, Mohammed Faridi²

¹Encg, Hassan First University Settat, Morocco

²Encg, Hassan First University Settat, Morocco

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Mouchaouri

Abstract: *The evaluation of individual performance at work is a highly sought tool increasingly used by companies, governments, local authorities ... and paradoxically highly contested at all levels of the organization: employers, HR managers, evaluators and evaluated. Indeed, the choice of evaluation criteria is delicate and performance evaluation in companies is often considered unsatisfactory, both from the point of view of employers than the employees. Thus, the problem addressed in this research can be formulated as follows: "Despite efforts regarding the evaluation of individual performance at work, the evaluation criteria widely used by companies constitute a handicap to constructive evaluation". To discuss this issue, we relied on the results of a study conducted in 2010 by Jocelyne IENTILE-YALENIOS and Alain ROGER, « What's new in the personnel evaluation systems? »*

Keywords: *HRM, Individual performance, Evaluation criteria, French companies, Assessment models.*

Date of Submission: 24-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 28-07-2017

I. Introduction

Twenty-four vice presidents of human resources major US corporations (Fortune 100) met to discuss the effectiveness of employee performance evaluation modes. From the outset, the facilitator of the meeting asked how many of them are satisfied with the valuation methods used in their business. All burst of nervous laughter, and after a long hesitation, a participant decides to raise their hands. He was immediately peppered with questions by his counterparts, who hope to finally know the key to success of this major headache. The host, meanwhile, is rather skeptical about the statements made by the Vice President as it is precisely to study the performance evaluation mode in this business. It is true that it has worked hard and focused on research for decades to improve its evaluation practices. But even better than elsewhere, these practices are still far from the ideal described the vice president. Moreover, several managers interviewed by the moderator questioned the usefulness of this method of evaluation, some even claim that the company would be better to abandon it.

This story was reported by Morhman, Resnick-West and Lawler (1989) and adopted by Gosselin and Murphy (1994) as an introduction to their article "The failure of the performance evaluation." It reflects very well the problems addressed in this work. The evaluation of individual performance to corporate job is a constant topic of interest for services human resources, often the main initiators and drivers of this process in organizations. It has been the subject of much criticism, and while some may have to consider its removal, it is experiencing a resurgence of interest when the professional interviews are imposed by different regulations. Collective agreements and certification standards also give an increasing place in various forms of assessment staff. In the civil service, recent legislative developments provide for the gradual but widespread extension of professional interview principle instead of scoring. All this helps to raise the issue of formalization of personnel evaluation systems, which have become essential tools in the management of human resources. Placed in the "heart of the HR system," they are connected to the training process, skills development, evolution and career guidance. This is a highly sought tool increasingly used by companies, governments, local authorities ... and paradoxically highly contested at all levels of the organization: management, HR, evaluators and evaluated. Moreover, the choice of evaluation criteria is delicate and performance evaluation in companies is often considered unsatisfactory, both from the point of view of employers than the employees. Printed appreciation generally impose a framework with specific sections to be completed and recommendations relating to the conduct of the interview. Trépo et al. (2002) recall the topics in this formalization supports the appreciation of staff: the balance sheet of the past year, defining and setting future goals, career guidance (geographical and functional mobility) or action professionalization.

It sometimes happens that the assessor and the assessed do not agree on the performance achieved by the employee, but not on the merits of the evaluation criteria.

Based on this fact, our problem can be formulated as follows:

Despite efforts regarding the evaluation of individual performance at work, the evaluation criteria widely used by companies constitute a handicap to constructive evaluation.

To discuss this issue, we began with a review of the literature concerning the criteria and job evaluation systems and an overview on the development of evaluation criteria through a number of stages. Then we set out the basic dimensions and major job evaluation models used as the basis for the critical study of the evaluation criteria widely used by businesses.

Regarding the identification of evaluation criteria widely used by companies, we relied on the results of a study conducted in 2010 by Jocelyne IENTILE-YALENIOS and Alain ROGER, "What's new in the personnel evaluation systems?" on the forms of assessment that are used to support the annual interviews by analyzing 109 forms used in 85 organizations belonging to various sectors in industry or in services, and their size varies from one hundred to several thousands. This is both French companies (46) including 25 multinationals, French subsidiaries of multinationals (26) that public sector enterprises (9) or voluntary (4). Finally, we concluded with the presentation of a number of recommendations that can serve as areas for improvement of any option or obligation relating to the choice of evaluation criteria when formalizing or updating evaluation system of individual performance at work.

II. Evolution Of Evaluation Criteria

The first evaluation system (or appreciation) can be attributed to Robert Owen. In 1800, in Scotland, it devised its cotton mills in New Larnark a technique based on the use of books and cubes assigned to each worker. The books were intended to receive the daily reports prepared by each employee. As for cubes, each face was colored differently, they were designed to represent the performance levels and were placed on the desktop of every employee. The first annual appreciation formalized system dates back to 1912 for his part in New York in the US department stores Lord & Taylor.

During the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, a new organization of work is systematic practice of assessing: the scientific organization of work initiated by Taylor and Ford. By mid-century, with the flow of human relationships, the emphasis is on communication between the employee and the supervisor. Thus, interview becomes the "keystone" of the appraisal system. Finally, in the fifties, Management By Objectives (DPO), initiated by Peter Drucker, made its debut refocusing reporting relationships not on knowledge, attitudes and other personal qualities, but on the objectives and results to be achieved .

2.1. Assessment of people

Historically, the first company of the staff appraisal systems have long relied on the assessment of personal and professional qualities. But this method of assessment of people has been widely condemned by MacGregor in his book "Leadership and Motivation" published in 1966. According to MacGregor:

"The traditional methods used to record and assess the business value of employees must be banished relationships with staff. They put line managers in a difficult position, as they require them to judge what is a subordinate and then act accordingly. However, no liability has neither can acquire the skills necessary to make such judgments. This still poorly known aspect of the effects of the traditional scoring method explains the unconscious malaise coaching and his distaste for these processes, particularly for interview. "

The personal qualities were the first historical assessment criteria of staff in the company.

2.1.1. Personal qualities

The criteria for so-called personal qualities or personality have been a more comprehensive list and standardized form of a catalog of criteria for intellectual, moral and psychological allowing a quantified evaluation through rubrics:

a- intellectual capacity criteria: memory, intuition, written and oral expression, capacity for analysis and synthesis, professional imagination.

b- psychological capacity Criteria: There are three types of criteria for assessing the relationship to self, relationships with others and the ability to command.

- **The relationship to oneself:** self-confidence, emotional stability, competitive spirit, sense of adaptation, the presentation, the outfit.

- **The relationship to others:** a taste for human contact, persuasiveness, the sense of the human.

- **Command ability:** the ability to command, control, monitoring the work of others, decisiveness, teamwork.

c- moral capacity Criteria: sense of duty, sense of discipline, loyalty, reliability, punctuality.

d- Criteria of effectiveness at work: the direction of the organization, working capacity, the ability to anticipate, learn to delegate.

2.1.2. Professional qualities

The criteria for so-called behavioral or professional qualities came superadded to those personal qualities and to assess the behavior required by the function. They include:

- Behavior towards colleagues, superiors, customers.
- Behavior towards organization of work, attendance, punctuality, management, information transmission, improving productivity.

In the assessment of those systems, personal and professional qualities form a whole, even if the criteria are intended separated, because the distinction between personality and behavior criteria is very blurred.

2.2. Performance assessment

Performance appraisal is a new staff evaluation emerged from the 1950s in the USA. Today, the notion of performance appraisal has declined to the point that the very notion tends to generically refer to any personnel evaluation system business, including the annual assessment interview. In this system, the evaluation criteria refer to the activities and not to individuals. Some criteria are objective, quantifiable, it is business or production, such as: the amount of production, productivity rates, turnover ... But, there are activities that are difficult to quantify, include for example: the establishment of a new distribution network, forming a subordinate ...

Performance assessment criteria will therefore follow function and will be linked to the job description. For example, for a sales position, these criteria will be:

- The implementation of the training plan.
- The turnover achieved.
- The budget is not exceeded.
- The organization of data.
- The holding of client files.
- Other activities related to the function of the administrative, technical, financial and human.
- The achievement of objectives.

Performance appraisal leads to the appreciation of the achievement of objectives.

Moreover, the performance appraisal system is logically connected with:

- The concept of Direction by Objectives: goal setting makes it possible to evaluate the result of concrete actions.
- The concept of personal employee development plan: in addition to the measurement of the activity and the objectives, performance assessment also takes into account the personal development plans.

2.2.1. The evaluation of performance and management by objectives

The assessment of performance should be accompanied by a Direction by Objectives policy. The general framework of the objectives set by senior management. Each of the objectives are discussed between hierarchical subordinates and superiors as part of a position, a function, a well-defined mission.

According to Enriquez (In " Assessing Men ", 1991):

"Function definitions are needed to set realistic goals and to harmonize the mutual objectives of the various functions. A good definition of functions should include the list of critical management points to indicate the individual it is crucial that takes into account and leave the initiative to the other points management service.

These definitions are intended to define the scope of the function, ongoing objectives, goals and variables, quantitative targets and qualitative objectives, list the activities and connections necessary to achieve these objectives, clarify the power making and control of the individual."

2.2.2. The evaluation of performance and personal development plan

The installation of a performance appraisal system was accompanied by the installation of a personal development program. These two systems, far from being exclusive, can complement wisely.

In this context, one can cite as performance criteria: the progression of man in his work, its mode of participation in the life of the group, its integration into the team.

According to Enriquez (In " Assessing Men ", 1991), this is an "exploration of attitude of others possibilities. The individual is receiving attention and understanding to improve the functioning of the organization and better enable it to carry out its work force. "

The following table juxtaposes performance appraisal and personal development program system:

Points of comparison	Overall Objectives	
	Assessment	Development
Time horizon	Past Performance	Preparation time horizon of future performance
Objective	Improved performance by changing driving through the reward system performance	Performance improvement through self-education and personal growth
Method	Using a rating scale for comparison and distribution of marks	Council, mutual trust, defining a goal and career planning
Role of the evaluator (supervisor)	Judges and evaluates	Advisor encouraging, listen, help and guide
Role of assessed (contributor)	Listen, reacts and tries to defend past performance	Actively involved in the definition of future professional performance plans

Source: Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly, « Organizations », 1979.

III. Dimensions and Models of Evaluation of Work

Since the mid-1990s, job evaluation systems have attracted the attention of analysts transformations of organizations. To enrich the current views on business practices regarding the evaluation of staff, both allocation and incentive dimensions were mobilized to study the job evaluation devices.

3.1. The incentive and allocative dimensions of evaluation of work devices

Based on the fact that the assessment of work means, broadly speaking, the action to determine within the firm value and the quality of work performed by an employee, the evaluation will be specifically analyzed in terms of the devices instrumentent that is to say, through formal rules defined and arranged predominantly within the company, and collectively. Thus, two fundamental dimensions allocation and incentive serve to differentiate ideal types of job evaluation models in the business. - The allocative dimension that is found especially in the Coasian perspective and pregnant incentive dimension among theorists incentives (Dubrion, 2004). In this context, employees management systems have two functions: an allocation function and an incentive function.

3.1.1. The allocative dimension

Some economists consider the firm as a fundamentally different allocative fashion market in that it is based on a relationship of authority between the members of the organization. This idea, originally developed by Coase (1937), was formalized in an industrial economy reference article by Simon (1951). Extending the Coasian design, the work of Arrow (1974), Williamson (1975) and Masten (1991) led to design the firm as a way of organizing economic activities based on the employer's authority over its employees. The management of a device allocation function refers to the idea that the device facilitates the relationship between individual productive skills of a worker and the work situation to which he is assigned. Using the concepts conventionally used in economic theory, we say that the device supports the correspondence between supply and demand for labor, not in a competitive market but on an internal market: the company's employees (labor supply) face to vacancies within the firm (labor demand). In human resource management, the allocation dimension refers to what Peretti (2001) calls the question of "fitness men jobs," which is at the heart of human resource management policies many companies in recent years. This setting adequacy suppose to know and be able to describe not only the company's jobs but also individual productive skills of members, that allow more or less the job evaluation devices.

3.1.2. The incentive dimension

Other theorists have instead emphasized the incentive dimension of the firm. They then perceive the firm as a mode of coordination which differs from the market not in terms of kind of degrees, and more specifically how incentives of agents. Some authors reject even the idea of the existence of a relationship between employer and employee Authority (Alchian and Demsetz, 1972). Theorists incentives like Holmström, Milgrom and Roberts explicitly show the firm as an "incentive system" (Holmström and Milgrom, 1994). In tracing the evolution of economic thought about the company, Holmström and Roberts (1998) highlighted the emphasis in recent years on incentive agents problems at the expense of allocation problems.

The function of incentives provided by a device is closer to that of the theorists of transaction costs than that of incentives theorists. For the latter, in fact, employees incentives are reduced incentives to effort resulting from remuneration. Thus, in the authors' models of the New Economics of Personnel (Lazear, 1993), the incentive to effort is always determined ex ante through incentive constraint that leads to the act omniscient point where employee the marginal disutility of his effort equates its marginal utility - that is to say, finally the salary level that will touch. If we not reason in a world where agents would have a substantial rationality but in a

world of limited rational agents and acting of radical uncertainty situation the question of incentives in the firm takes on another meaning. The incentive is not reduced to an incentive "to adequate or optimal effort" (Laffont, 1993), but rather an incentive for cooperation between members of the employment relationship, as pregnant incentive in theory transaction costs (Menard, 1994). In this world, agents need formalized frameworks offering benchmarks in order to stabilize their behavior and to facilitate their cooperation. The job evaluation devices ensure in particular such a function, provided their "philosophy Manager" (Hatchuel and Weil, 1992) is understood by all agents of the firm. Ill-defined rules and evasive or, conversely, too precise and complex, provide benchmarks unstable and may lead to cost misinterpretations and renegotiation costs that favor the development of opportunistic behavior and ultimately destabilize the cooperation of members of the employment relationship. The problem for all members of the firm is to find a level of precision that allows rules to develop reasonable degree of freedom and channel the development of opportunistic behavior.

3.2. Impersonal and personal assessment models

Both models of impersonal and personal assessment of the work have been defined on the basis of two-dimensional allocation and incentives from the economic theories of the firm and based on empirical studies.

3.2.1. Impersonal assessment model

In this model, the evaluation of the work is based on the importance given to employment defined as a set of prescribed tasks. Employment is considered relevant organizational unit to manage employees and classification systems are at the heart of the assessment procedures to the extent that they focus on the tasks performed by the employee. In this context, the prioritization of jobs directly led to the prioritization of remuneration. In practice, this means the establishment of a general nature job descriptions and often very short, mainly focusing on the tasks to be performed without the specific productive characteristics of individuals are necessarily taken into account. The allocative dimension of impersonal evaluation model is based on the fact that in referring to general descriptions of jobs that are collectively developed at branch level and upstream of the classification stage, each agent is able to know what is expected of them within the organization. Descriptions clarify what the employee is supposed to do, and possibly how it must do so, in what context, what physical place, with what tools, etc. The collective effort of formalization is deployed to objectify the work situation of employees based on the job at which they are assigned clarifies the function of each.

The classification grids based on the job as a set of tasks provide incentives based agents to cooperate "flat putting" the eyes of the employee and his supervisor, the responsibilities of each. Indeed, without description of the work, the top may still require the employee to execute a set of tasks deemed by him to be not acceptable. The supervisor can enjoy the authority he has towards his subordinate to make him behave in certain ways and demand that perform tasks that until then, it did not used to perform. In other words, the top can abuse his authority. Symmetrically, the employee may also seek to cheat do not necessarily doing what the employer is entitled to require it. It may tend to favor the most pleasant tasks for him, that it considers the most rewarding or for which it is likely to receive compensation increase. Potentially opportunistic behavior of the superior and his subordinate within that Marsden (1999) called the problem of "borders of the job." In this respect, focusing on practical tasks to perform, descriptions of work situations of impersonal evaluation model can be partly considered as solutions to the previous problem. In the impersonal evaluation model, the rules are collectively defined within the branches are applied without the employee making himself the subject of precise and regular assessment. It is implied that the employee will properly hold his job, given their past achievements such as graduation, experience and seniority.

3.2.2. Personal assessment model

The personal assessment model is opposed to that of impersonal evaluation by relativizing the role of employment - and more specifically the tasks that are performed within it - as part of determining the qualification. This is addition to studying the abstract actions to take but individual productive skills of the employee - skills - and the results it finally gets in keeping his job - performance. In general, in this model, the job evaluation process is done in two stages. Initially, the company's jobs are described. Descriptions are less general and more contextualized in the impersonal assessment model. They mention the main tasks to be performed by emphasizing the activities to be performed. These are analyzed in terms of expected individual skills in employment. Is thus determined a kind of "ideal profile" of the employee. In this specification the skills required plus a performance level expected, a priori level set by the superior form of measurable objectives for the employee in a given period. In a second step, the employee is assessed periodically by his immediate supervisor as part of a personal interview. The objective is to compare the actual profile of the candidate to that required in employment in a bargaining face-to-face between the employee and the supervisor. It appreciates the performance obtained by the employee by comparing the objectives achieved with those defined earlier period.

The table below shows a comparison between the two models of impersonal and personal evaluation of work:

	Impersonal assessment model	Personal assessment model
Main purpose of evaluation	Job	Individual
Nature of the object	Set of prescribed tasks	Skills and expected results
Central evaluation device	Device job classification	Appreciation devices skills and performance
Language of devices	Branch	Company
Features of the evaluation criteria	Exogenous to real work situations and impersonal	Explicitly defined in relation to working conditions and customized
Characteristics in terms of allocation and incentive		
Main allocation methods prior	Acquired impersonal (Diplomas, seniority, experience collectively recognized)	Recurrent Evaluation of the adequacy of wage employment (competence profile and individual performance)
Principal incentive terms	Jobs with clear contours and validated collectively	Skills and individual performance recognized by the hierarchical

Source: Baudry and Dubrion, " Which job evaluation models? ", 2005.

IV. Critical Study of Evaluation Criteria Widely Used by Companies

The imperfections are inevitable in business personal evaluation systems: the focus is on some elements and hides others. It is therefore extremely difficult to evaluate everything in a fair and equitable manner. The use of a performance evaluation system in order to "find" the bad elements in a unique perspective of control is a common mistake. However, the system must be an employee motivation for the part of a dynamic perspective of progression and professional development. The main difficulties are the criteria to choose well, place the assessment at the heart of HR decision-making and increase the professionalism of evaluators. In this critical review, I tried to analyze a number of criteria widely used by some companies here based on examples from a study conducted in 2010 by Jocelyne IENTILE-YALENIOS and Alain ROGER.

4.1. Presentation and analysis of evaluation criteria widely used

The most common method of evaluation is the annual assessment interview face-to-face with the supervisor. The interview of content is prepared by both parties (evaluated and evaluator):

- ▶ Review of the year (objectives / areas for improvement);
- ▶ Discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated;
- ▶ Setting new goals / areas for improvement;
- ▶ Wish training;
- ▶ Wish mobility (functional, geographical, hierarchical);
- ▶ Final Document of synthesis, signed by both parties.

Evaluation is an award dedicated to the hierarchy ($n + 1$ or $n + 2$). Each team leader and supervisor's role is to assess the individual and collective performance of his team.

The evaluation criteria vary depending on the grade and accountability.

Thus, there are two types of criteria:

- For supervisors, assess the results obtained based on the contract of objectives defined earlier this year (quality, management...)
- For running trades, identify potential areas for improvement and appreciate the efforts of one year to the next by the agent.

In our case, and the purpose of identifying the evaluation criteria widely used by companies, we used the results of a 2010 study by Jocelyne IENTILE-YALENIOS and Alain ROGER. This study focuses on the evaluation forms that are used to support the annual interviews by analyzing 109 forms used in 85 organizations. The analysis of the themes and methods of assessment highlights, beyond the classic themes of evaluating behavior and achieving goals, more recent developments, eg greater involvement demand is observed from the line managers and the recognition of skills, even if they are still evaluated in a little less than half of the companies. The content of the forms seems pretty standard, but some significant differences exist depending on the population or type of business. Among the studied forms, 12 indicate that they are intended for managers or engineers, 6 non-executives, 16 employees, technicians or supervisors, and 6 to workers or the staff of workshop. In some cases, multiple forms belonging to the same organization were studied when applied to different categories of staff or the form was changed. Companies are very diverse. They belong to various sectors in industry or in services, and their size varies from one hundred to several thousand. This is both French companies (46) including 25 multinationals, French subsidiaries of multinationals (26) that public sector

enterprises (9) or voluntary (4). The analysis was conducted in two stages. Initially, the researchers used an analytical framework to highlight the main features of the forms at the themes and measurement scales used. Then, in a second phase, they studied several forms that had some degree of originality to determine to what extent they could be the beginning of more innovative approaches in the design of forms of appreciation. The analytical framework allows to highlight themes or topics formalized in interview media: what is assessed? (The "what") and what is the treatment method (the "how"). Concerning the processing mode, one can distinguish "which assesses". The "how to assess" results in the inclusion or not of ladders, free fields (comments) or directed (frame accurate reflection). The "evaluates" reflects the recommendations of self-assessment or dual assessment that explicitly appear in both the view of the manager and that of the employee. It may also reveal new players such as the functional manager or head of the project to which the employee participated. This is to see how far the classically identified in the literature themes are still relevant. New categories appear? Some themes have they gone? Be they traditional or emerging themes, there are differences in how to deal with?

4.1.1. Presentation of results

According to the results from the above study, we highlighted the following key elements:

- Regarding the title of the form: the terms "assessment" or "evaluation" used traditionally evoke the notion of price or value that many companies do not want to associate with this procedure. They prefer to use the term "interview" today, reflecting a growing emphasis in the exchange and dialogue. The terms "performance", "result" or "objective" are sometimes found, but tend to make way for "development", "progress", "guidance" or "evolution".
- Topics related to the conformity to the expected behavior in a post, the achievement of results against goals or mastery of skills. 74% of the forms (81 out of 109) require setting goals for the coming period, but only 63% formally evaluate the achievement of these objectives to measure the results. Compliance with respect to the position or mission remains an essential part of the process. Training and personal development are addressed in three-quarters of the interviews. One could expect a greater consideration of skills assessment given their institutionalization in ISO 9000. In fact, it is only mentioned in 45% of forms.
- Concerning the manner in which these topics are evaluated. When it comes to assessing compliance with the post, predefined behaviors corresponding to job descriptions are often offered with scales in the majority of cases, sometimes supplemented by free fields for adding Comments (simple or with guidance on the type of the expected commentary).
- The forms often include a definition of training needs, adaptation needs and development opportunities, but it is rare that a formal evaluation of the potential is requested. Sometimes separate specific forms of the annual interview procedure may exist to identify and analyze the potential career opportunities.
- Some grids provide an item using a specific questioning about the difficulties, sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the employee, his perception of the team. The assembly is then referred to an exchange of views between the employee and his manager, as evidenced by this excerpt from a form used in a large semi-public service organization, "what facilitated the Working? What has made your job more difficult? Your view? That of your manager? What are you most satisfied with this year? Are you satisfied with the dynamics of your team? Why? ".
- The media frequently contain predefined criteria and standards proposed for assessment. They correspond to the skills, behaviors or values expected by the organization "sense of initiative, sense of purpose, a sense of sharing, sense of compliance, sense of ethical, sense mutual support and sense of innovation ...".
- The forms generally provide a first part dedicated to the recall of missions collaborator and fairly regularly to update its application station or job description. It is then usually asked to forward this update to the human resources department.
- Some forms propose to highlight aspects of task or skill held by not directly related to the function in the organization employees. Where we see the solicitation of skills developed in projects around initiatives or participation in working groups, and even extra-enterprise activities. For example, a construction company encourages taking into account elements such as "External Missions (education, office, association...)". A large industrial company request, in the balance of the annual performance review: "what new skills he has acquired the employee or implemented during the year? Outlook: why and how the employee he wants to move forward? What knowledge or practical experience that the employee has (it incompletely or not used at all in the exercise of his profession), and he would like to share? ". The concept of competence, rarely found in conventional systems focused on behaviors or objectives, is now taking an increasing role in the management of human resources, especially since the Social Cohesion Act of 28 January 2005 in France, which imposed on more than 300 employees of companies an obligation to begin negotiations on the theme of forward planning of employment and skills.

- A large construction firm demand at the end of interview, based on analysis of training needs, a free comment on "Balance work / life". This is the only interview of the 109 that addresses this topic, but we can expect it to be generalized, given the current situation where companies must take into account the stress phenomena.
- In the section "assessment of results against targets," a large public enterprise application such as free text to "clarify the conditions in which the results were achieved: to highlight the action of the interested and specify the elements of the environment that proved favorable and unfavorable to achieving its objectives. "
- The forms may reflect a certain requirement towards the responsible as to the mode of conduct interview to improve the quality of dialogue: In an insurance company, a section asks what such mutual expectations: no only "expected by the hierarchy of the employee? "But also" expected by the employee to his superiors? ". In the part of the professional assessment of a large oil company, found in the evaluation of the goals, "the manager helped you in achieving the objectives? "; similarly, the form of a luxury industry company includes a section for the employee asking "how your manager can it help you in your work? ".

4.1.2. Analysis of results

According to the above-mentioned results, our analysis will focus on two important elements, namely:

- The subjectivity in the evaluation process.
- An individualistic approach of the employee.

a- The subjectivity in the evaluation process

Subjectivity can be present in the evaluation process, both in the choice of criteria and their weightings, as well as the relationship assessor / evaluated. In addition, any interview includes a behavioral component.

When establishing repositories of skills or competency frameworks by the company, these grids are supposed to reflect the knowledge, skills and attitudes required in a job. It is therefore necessary to analyze it to determine a grid. During the analysis, it is possible that certain skills are not identified, or some unwittingly or not, underestimated or overestimated.

In one of the studied companies, employees are also assessed about their "commitment to the values" of the enterprise. These values are: 'sense of initiative, sense of purpose, sense of sharing, sense of compliance, sense of ethical, sense of caring and sense of innovation. " Employees must show involved in these values, preferred by their company. But other values could be added, such as communication skills or sense of responsibility. In addition to this arbitrary selection criteria, criticism can be amplified when we know that the line can evaluate his "collaborator" according to the jargon used on new criteria he himself had invented. In addition, some criteria are rather vague and are not understood in the same way by all evaluators. Thus, one can not seriously claim that the choice of criteria and their weighting the result of a democratic procedure, or even entirely scientific. We can not say that reviewers are objective. Subjectivity is present throughout the evaluation process, since the development of criteria to the processing of data relating to the assessment by the decision-making center, through the interview itself in which the appraiser may not be objective. So it seems that using the same grid for all employees is relatively well received, because it means that they are all valued in the same way. In addition, if a criterion appears blurry, or both parties are not in agreement, it does not matter: "It can be difficult to judge certain criteria, such as mutual aid; but all is to discuss. "

These remarks involve three observations. First, a measurable criterion, quantifiable, verifiable, is likely to be considered objective. It is difficult to dispute the result, and measurability assigns a certain scientific aura.

b- An individualistic approach to employee

This individualistic approach is based on two ideas: first, the evaluation measures concerning agreements tend to be less often developed collectively; then the assessment interview is individual in nature, which is a problem because the work is more collective. But the interview is not the only tool that is based on an individualistic conception of the employee. The most obvious example of this design is the individualized compensation of the employee, a topic much discussed by the authors, and therefore a source of many quotes. Since the individualization of the evaluation and the compensation based on the same approach, we can infer that what applies to one applies to the other on the collective dimension of work including. Indeed, in countries like France where these sectoral agreements govern the negotiations in the company, the definition of evaluation criteria upsets traditions, as it is most often at the organizational level, "the diversification of local measurement instruments, the use of experts and individualization measured qualities affect the collective control of measuring labor agreements. " In fact, the various evaluation criteria by companies are part of the phenomenon of "diversification of local measuring instruments"; sometimes these criteria are developed by outside firms expertise in the organization (probably with a view to greater objectivity), so no possibility of cooperation in trade unions; Finally, the individual nature of the evaluation problem of unions by carriers essence of the

collective dimension of the organization. Unions are also much lower in France at the company, while present at the level of the branch. Despite this, they collaborated in the selection criteria?

Baraldi and al. (2001) make the determination that the unions do not participate in the development of competency frameworks, for several reasons. First, they "remain extremely cautious, given the fact that the handling skills have a direct impact on career development, or on the determination of salary scales"; they seem so lacking courage to tackle these issues. Second, "given the habits and routines created by decades of union divestment on such issues, and conversely employer decision-monopoly on the practice ranking within companies, different workstations, employee organizations do not seem equipped to deal with this problem in all its fullness."

In fact, this lack of equipment is valid at the level of the organization, because at the branch, unions have participated in job descriptions, they have them in any case validated. The table at the end of the second chapter, from an article by Baudry and Dubrion (2005) compares the impersonal evaluation model of work and the personal assessment model. It is clear that unions are more involved in the first model.

4.2. Comments and recommendations

There are multiple evaluation criteria, more or less formalized. Some relate to the work done and the resources used, others are more focused on results or behavior. The choices are going to be many limitations to the evaluation system.

At the RATP Group - France, for example, interview crews escalators are evaluated on clear objectives delays on construction sites, public information, taking into account the user and costs.

To meet these objectives, teams must bring coherence to the associated means:

- Cost constraint: the changed part will be of inferior quality;
- Time constraint: is repaired which has failed; if by opening the staircase, we find that other parts are worn, they will not be changed;
- Constraint information to the public: the time of the site will be announced to the public artificially "inflated" to anticipate potential hazards and avoid discontent;
- Constraint consideration of the user (provide maximum availability of stairs) : all fault prevention actions will not be taken to avoid machine downtime.

In doing so, no preventive interview can be performed on the stairs. The direct consequence is the deterioration of the park and the increasing number of global outages, so the deterioration in the quality of service. This example shows that, regardless of the diversity of the criteria, they inevitably put aside other important elements of employment: what is the work done even if it does not immediately meet the objectives? What behavior is the least expensive in the long term for the company: be careful and change parts even if they are not broken or just change what is necessary and wait failures? All these questions need to be asked clearly if we want the performance evaluation is both fair and efficient for employees for the company.

4.2.1. Why are these criteria disabilities to constructive evaluation?

The previously presented research revealed some critical of the evaluation criteria widely used, including:

• The subjectivity of the criteria widely used

The evaluation criteria include a subjectivity: problem of distinguishing between personal and professional aspects. The performance review is to evaluate the performance of employees according to criteria set by the hierarchy. These criteria may include, behavioral, for example: taking initiative, adherence to company values, the ability to work in a team ... These criteria can sometimes be perceived by employees as non-transparent and biased.

The current, temporary blurring of the evaluation system helps make very dependent assessors and their willingness to make this living system procedure. Thus, the system provides a space for dialogue when relations are good, but hardly effective when relationship problems exist before. Rather, the assessment interview would tend to foster misunderstandings and stir up opposition.

• The inconsistency between individual assessment and collective performance

The evaluation device has few links with the collective performance and teamwork. Thus, the assessment interview would affect the well-being of employees: the principle of assessing individual performance would promote a climate of competition between employees, not conducive to cooperation and the interview of a good social and up to harm their mental equilibrium climate.

Today, teamwork is essential, and despite his obvious conflict with an individual type of evaluation, it is in no way questioning in companies.

- **The compliance with the guidelines and procedures**

This approach, reflected in the evaluation forms through a number of evaluation criteria, is not energizing and motivating little because it does not take into account the initiative, it focuses only on enforcement, it centers the individual on task and its function; it can thus promote rigid behavior and induce coordination difficulties inter-service and inter functions.

- **The evaluation of the intrinsic qualities, behaviors and attitudes**

Some criteria referring to the supposed intrinsic qualities, behaviors and attitudes do not evaluate the employee in relation to what he has done but compared to what it is. They confuse a single approach of potential assessment and evaluation of the performance and may therefore enhance the parasites psychological phenomena related to hierarchical relationships.

4.2.2. How to ensure a constructive evaluation?

After presenting the various criticisms of the evaluation criteria widely used by enterprises, it seems appropriate to offer some recommendations for improving carrier tracks to make such choices more rational and profitable criteria for employees like the company.

Indeed, the main recommendations are presented below:

- **Sufficient objectivity and limited subjectivity**

To meet the expectations of employees and the company, the assessment must satisfy two conditions: present sufficient guarantees of objectivity and leave only a limited subjectivity. To satisfy these two conditions, it should not be confused in the same evaluation process: assessment of the benefit, assessment of the competence and evaluation of potential because they fall under different mental operations: observation - diagnosis - prognosis. They do not mobilize the same resources and do not have the same guarantees of objectivity. Separate helps control well the role played by each of them in the overall evaluation process and to better understand their impact on the management decision. In addition, the evaluation system must be explicit and organized. So, it must be based on criteria known to all, be developed using a servicing facility to make a connection between the assessment made and the career development prospects and remuneration offered. The assessment then is likely to be standardized, coordinated, transparent and objective enough to meet the requirements and limited subjectivity.

- **Initiative and Development**

Many employees make daily efforts to enable the company to operate, but fewer people who invest their share of initiatives in the development and change. The principle of compliance outweighs the principle of opportunity and entrepreneurship. So there is at present a real challenge for an evaluation system based on carefully selected criteria, which encourages employees to invest their initiatives towards carriers directions of development and progress.

- **Participation of the leaders in the selection and communication of evaluation criteria**

Top Management should decide on the criteria and personnel evaluation methods. The important feature of the evaluation criteria is that they constitute the element that the company should be based to a fair application to all employees. So should they be chosen with a certain technique so that the entire top management is recognized in the criteria adopted. The delicacy of such a process is not limited to the choice of criteria. There is a most important activity, the selected criteria must be communicated to all employees so they get impregnated. Executives and managers are key entities in the appraisal process, hence the importance of taking into account their opinion.

- **Union involvement in the development process of evaluation criteria**

Unions must participate in the development of evaluation criteria as they represent employees and play an intermediary role between managers and employees.

V. Conclusion

In conclusion, we can say that developments in assessment systems are permanent, and most of the traditional bureaucratic rating systems modeled on those of the civil service have now disappeared to be replaced by instruments usually containing a conversation between a supervisor and colleagues. The forms then insist on the quality of the dialogue and the search for transparency to improve communication and work together to find constructive solutions.

Companies are encouraged to conduct their assessment of ongoing and regular basis to maintain the performance and employee involvement in the activities throughout the year. In this context, the ability to feedback provided daily by the employee has become an important area of development of an accompaniment to enhance the effectiveness of managers in their assessment function. Individual interviews from shared items

throughout the year can be analyzed with back and synthesized for decisions. Develop the quality of the exchange between the leaders and the employee becomes a way to build mutual trust, which will facilitate the acceptance of proposals for change, the internalization of rules, constructive expression of criticism. Despite the discourse on assessment of the functional (targets both informational, organizational and motivational) and the means deployed (formalization of interview materials, training of assessors and appreciated, translation group targets contributing individual goals, development of repositories of activities or skills ...), the appreciation of the staff still a lot of dissatisfaction at all levels of the company:

- HR functional and directions consider this system expensive and generating little effect. In any case, its effects are difficult to measure.
- Appraisers apprehend appreciation to the staff as a heavy additional burden, as a practical imposing an ambiguous hierarchical position (being both judge and coach). They see it as a practical sown many implementation difficulties.
- Preferred highlight the gap between the device presented to them (objectivity, transparency, quality of dialogue ...) and the practices they experience: managerial discourse "waffle" implicit goals of weight reduction wage, justification for dismissal decisions, etc. This study has allowed us to clarify a number of points relating to the evaluation criteria widely used by businesses, but new issues deserve consideration from us:
- Why would assess employees individually?
- Why maintain an apparent objectivity of the criteria seems so important?
- Why rely on an individualistic approach in a collective organization?

References

- [1]. Alchian, A. and demsetz, H., 1972, « Production, Information Costs and Economic Organization », *American Economic Review*, vol. 62, n° 5, p. 777-795.
- [2]. Arrow, K. J., 1974, « The Limits of Organization », Norton and Company, New York.
- [3]. Baraldi, L., dumasy, J.P. and troussier, J.F., 2001, « Accords salariaux innovants et rénovation de la relation salariale : quelques cas de figure », *Travail et Emploi*, n° 87, p. 81-94.
- [4]. Barreau, J. and brochard, D., 2003, « Les politiques de rémunération des entreprises : écarts entre pratiques et discours », *Travail et Emploi*, n° 93, p. 52.
- [5]. Baudry, B. and dubrion, B., 2005, « Quels modèles d'évaluation du travail? », *Travail et emploi*, n°104, p. 7-18.
- [6]. Cascio, W., 1991, « Applied Psychology in Personnel Management », Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- [7]. Coase, R., 1937, « The nature of the firm », *Economica*, vol. 4, p. 386-405.
- [8]. De coninck, F., 2004, « Du post-taylorisme à l'effritement des organisations », *Travail et Emploi*, n° 100, p. 139-149.
- [9]. Dubrion, B., 2004, « Economie et gestion des ressources humaines : une synthèse des apports et limites des théories des contrats », *Revue d'Economie Industrielle*, n° 106, p. 7-29.
- [10]. Eustache, D., 1996, « Les nouvelles politiques de rémunération des entreprises et les réactions des salariés », *Etudes du CEREQ*, n° 69.
- [11]. Fourgous, J.M. and Lambert, H.P., 1991, « Evaluer les Hommes : Recrutement – Performance – Motivation et climat social », Paris, Editions Liaisons.
- [12]. Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M. and Donnelly, J.H., 1979, « Organizations ».
- [13]. Gosselin, A. and Murphy, K.R., 1994, « L'échec de l'évaluation de la performance », *Revue Gestion*, vol. 19, n° 3, p. 17-28. HATCHUEL, A. et WEIL, B., 1992, « L'expert et le système », *Economica*, Paris.
- [14]. Henriot, B., 1999, « La gestion des ressources humaines face aux transformations organisationnelles », *Revue Française de Gestion*, n° 124, p. 82-93.
- [15]. Holmstrom, B. and Milgrom, P., 1991, « Multi-task principle agent analysis : incentive contracts, asset ownership and job design », *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, vol. 37, p. 24-52.
- [16]. Holmstrom, B. and Milgrom, P., 1994, « The Firm as an Incentive System », *American Economic Review*, vol. 84, n° 4, p. 972-991.
- [17]. Holmstrom, B. and Roberts, J., 1998, « The Boundaries of the Firm Revisited », *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 12, n° 4, p. 73-94.
- [18]. Ientile-Yalenios, J. and Roger, A., 2010, « Quoi de neuf dans les systèmes d'appréciation du personnel ? », 21ème Congrès AGRH – Association Francophone de Gestion des Ressources Humaines, Rennes / Saint-Malo.
- [19]. Klarsfeld, A. and Saint-Onge, S., 2000, « La rémunération des compétences : théorie et pratique », in Peretti J.M., et Roussel P., « Les rémunérations, politiques et pratiques pour les années 2000 », Vuibert, Paris.
- [20]. Laffont, J.J., 1993, « A propos de l'émergence de la théorie des incitations », *Revue Française de Gestion*, n° 96, p. 13-19.
- [21]. Lapra, J.P., 1992, « L'évaluation du personnel dans l'entreprise : un nouveau dynamisme dans la gestion des ressources humaines », Dunod, Paris.
- [22]. Lawler, E., 1991, « Paying the Person : A Better Approach to Management », *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 2, n° 1, p. 145-154.
- [23]. Lazear, E. P., 1993, « The New Economics of Personnel », *Labour*, vol. 7, n° 1, p. 3-23.
- [24]. Linhart, D., Rozenblatt, P. and Voegele, S., 1993, « Vers une nouvelle rémunération scientifique du travail ? », *Travail et emploi*, n° 57, p. 30-47.
- [25]. Locke, E., 1984, « Les techniques tayloriennes considérées du point de vue des théories et des pratiques contemporaines », in Montmollin, M. et Pastré O., « Le taylorisme », La Découverte, Paris, p. 273-285.
- [26]. Mac Gregor, D., 1976, « La dimension humaine de l'entreprise », Paris ; (« Leadership and Motivation », 1966).
- [27]. Marbach, V., 1999, « Evaluer et rémunérer les compétences », Editions d'Organisation, Paris.
- [28]. Marsden, D., 1999, « A Theory of Employment Systems », Oxford University Press, New York.
- [29]. Masten, S., 1991, « A legal Basis for the Firm », in Williamson, O. et Winter, S., « The Nature of the Firm, Origins, Evolution and Development », Oxford University Press, New York, p. 196-212.
- [30]. Menard, C., 1994, « Comportement rationnel et coopération: le dilemme organisationnel », *Cahiers d'Economie Politique*, n°24-25, p. 184-207.

- [31]. Milgrom, P. and Roberts, J., 1990, « Bargaining costs, influence costs, and the organization of economic activity », in Alt, J. et Shepsle, K., « Perspectives on political economy », Cambridge University Press.
- [32]. Peretti, J.M., 2001, « Ressources Humaines », 6^{ème} édition, Vuibert, Paris.
- [33]. Reynaud, J.D., 2001, « Le management par les compétences : un essai d'analyse », *Sociologie du Travail*, vol. 43, p 7-31.
- [34]. Ropé, F. and Tanguy, L., 1995, « La codification de la formation et du travail en termes de compétences en France », *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, volume 21, n° 4, p. 731-754.
- [35]. Schmidt, G. and Mercier, E., 2004, « Gestion des ressources humaines », Paris, Editions e-node/ Pearson Education.
- [36]. Simon, H.A., 1951, « A formal Theory of the Employment Relationship », *Econometrica*, vol. 19, p. 293-305.
- [37]. Trepo, G., Estellat, N. and Oiry, E., 2002, « L'appréciation du personnel : Mirage ou oasis ? », Editions d'organisation.
- [38]. Williamson, O., 1975, « Market and Hierarchies », The Free Press, New York.

Mohammed Mouchaouri. " Assessment of Individual Performance at Work in Companies: a critical Study." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, vol. 19, no. 8, 2017, pp. 63–74.