

## Assessment of Employees: An Individualistic Approach

\*Mohammed Mouchaouri<sup>1</sup>, Mohammed Faridi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ENCG, Hassan First University Settat, Morocco

<sup>2</sup>ENCG, Hassan First University Settat, Morocco

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Mouchaouri

---

**Abstract:** *The assessment of employees is a subject that is currently experiencing a revival of interest among both researchers and managers when job interviews are imposed by different regulations. This is a highly sought after tool increasingly used by companies and paradoxically very challenged at all levels of the organization: Managers, Assessors and Assesseees. Indeed, several questions need to be asked clearly if we want the evaluation of employees is both fair to employees and efficient for the company:*

- *Why will we assess employees individually?*
- *Why rely on an individualistic approach in a collective organization?*

*To address these issues, this paper revolves around a literature review on the evaluation of employees, it's interest in business and criticism that have been reserved for it in order to clarify the nature of the questioning.*

**Keywords:** *HRM, Literature review, Assessment of employees, Professional interviews, Individualistic approach.*

---

Date of Submission: 24-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 28-07-2017

---

### I. Introduction

Being a small business or a large company, employees assessment systems are constantly changing and most traditional bureaucratic systems of notation based on those of the civil service have now gone to be replaced by instruments usually based on a professional interview between a supervisor and his staff. The evaluation forms then insist on the quality of dialogue and the search for transparency to improve communication and generate constructive solutions.

Indeed, companies are encouraged to undertake this practice of continuous and regular basis to maintain the performance and employee involvement in the activities throughout the year. In this context, the feedback capacity supplied daily by the employee has become an important area of development of an accompaniment to enhance the effectiveness of managers in their evaluation function. Individual interviews from shared items throughout the year can be analyzed and synthesized in hindsight to make decisions. Develop the quality of the exchange between the manager and the employee becomes a way to build mutual trust, which will facilitate the acceptance of proposals to change the rules of the internalization, constructive expression of critics...

Thus, this research, based on a literature review, specifically with a problem caused by the evaluation of employees, namely: is it relevant to measure and reward individual performance if we want to simultaneously develop the collective work and cooperation between actors?

### II. The Concept Of Assessment

The terms "assessment of employees; staff evaluation; performance evaluation; performance measurement; staff assessment; skills assessment; assessment or evaluation for short ... "are all terms used by the authors in HRM and that refer to a managerial act very well known today in the companies. However, the authors in Human Resources Management didn't all agree on the meaning of these terms because while some find it necessary to distinguish between the two concepts: evaluation and assessment, others do not see in these words a significant difference. In fact, Campoy and al. (2008) say that "assessment means an underlying activity in all social practice as soon as any decision must be made"; assessment for its "specifically refers to all standardized and periodic situations in which the company measures the performance of each employee." Boyer (2006) for its part is not a very big difference between the terms "assessment" and "evaluation" as he says "... The assessment of employees (also called performance evaluation) is the subject of a more general attention ...".

Marbot and al. (2007) don't distinguish between the terms "assessment" and "evaluation" but noted the ambiguity that still exists between these terms: "the terms" assessment "or" evaluation "will be used indiscriminately well ... A number of researchers, such Galambaud, say that the both concepts refer to paradigms of actions and thoughts very different. "

Thus, in the present research, we use the two terms interchangeably because no denomination is precisely in this area. First, we present some definitions of advanced evaluation concept by some authors who dealt with the subject. For Guillot-Soulez (2008), "Evaluation is a judgment on the behavior of an employee in the performance of his duties. The judgment can be expressed in different ways: by a credit rating; with an inventory of strengths and weaknesses in relation to the function; by a professional report to the objectives of the previous maintenance period ...". Martory and Crozet (2005) define the assessment as "a judgment made by a supervisor or co-workers on the behavior of an employee in the performance of his duties." According to Saba and al. (2008), the performance evaluation can be defined as "a structured, formal system to measure, evaluate and modify the characteristics, behaviors and results of an employee in a particular position." Campoy and al. (2008) perceive the assessment as "all standardized and periodic situations in which the company measures the performance of each employee. These assessment or "formal evaluation" devices condition in depth, individually and collectively, HRM decisions as a whole remuneration, training, mobility...".

### **III. Evolution Of Assessment Systems**

According to Cadin and al. (1997), the first evaluation system of employees can be attributed to Robert Owen. In 1800, in Scotland, the latter devised in its cotton mills of 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 the 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 US department stores Lord & Taylor. During the late 19th century and early 20th century, a new organization of work is systematic practice of evaluation: 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, maintenance becomes the "keystone" of the appraisal system. According to Dhénin and Fournier (1998), "the annual assessment interview allows for a professional assessment: it consists of a direct meeting between the employee and his immediate superior where career development and promotion are considered". In the 1950s, Management By Objectives (MBO), initiated by Peter Drucker, made its debut refocusing reporting relationships not on knowledge, attitudes and other personal qualities, but on the objectives and outcomes. Finally, we must distinguish the assessment of performance evaluation of skills emerged in the 1980s (Zarifian, 1999), evaluation of job performance "task performance" and evaluation in terms of potential to organize "contextual performance", distinction explicated by Borman and Motowidlo (1997a, 1997b).

#### **3.1 ASSESSMENT OF PERSONS**

Cadin and al. (1997) state that the first employees of rating systems have long relied on the assessment of personal and professional qualities. But this method of assessment of persons 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 should be removed from relationships with staff. They place the line managers in a difficult position, as they require them to judge the worth of a subordinate and then act accordingly. But no manager has neither can acquire the skills to make such judgments. This still poorly known aspect of the effects of the traditional scoring method explains unconscious malaise coaching and his distaste for these processes and in particular for maintenance. " The criteria for personal qualities were the first historical assessment criteria of employees in the company. They have been more comprehensive, standardized list as a catalog of intellectual capacity criteria, moral and psychological allowing a quantified assessment through rubrics.

#### **The Criteria For Behavioral Professional Qualities Came Be Superimposed On Those Personal Qualities And To Assess The Behaviors Required By The Function. They Include:**

- The behavior vis-a-vis colleagues, superiors and customers.
- The behavior vis-a-vis the organization of work.

In the evaluation system of persons, personal and professional qualities form a whole, even if the criteria are intended to be separated, because the distinction between personality and behavior criteria is very blurred.

#### **3.2 ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE AND SKILLS**

According to Cadin et al. (1997), the performance evaluation is a different type of evaluation of employees emerged from the 1950s to the USA. The concept of performance assessment has declined to the point that the very notion tends to designate generically any personnel evaluation system, including the annual assessment interview. In this system, the evaluation criteria refer to the activities and not to individuals. Some criteria are objective, quantifiable, whether it is commercial or production activity, 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 ... The performance evaluation leads to the assessment of the achievement of agreed targets. In the mid-1980s with the emergence of the model of competence, a new employee assessment model appeared. According to Zarifian (1999), we had to rethink the evaluative judgment mode which was based on the physical capacity of employees to count as well on intellectual capacity. It is from this finding what appeared, as a quality, employee initiative taken to provide solutions at hazards in the production chain. Indeed, the company is seeking "responsibility" vis-a-vis the employee's development of its own powers. She expects more of the employee to implement its ability to adapt to change and it mobilizes its potential.

Out with the model of "post logic" based in turn on the notion of prescribed work, "the" logic of competence "in turn suggests that something more is required of the employee and his qualification can no longer appoint or guarantee. A competent employee is the one that proves efficient in the new conditions of production needs require assessment capabilities, making and autonomous action and not just obedience to the established guidelines "(Lichtenberger, 1999). However, engaging in a competence logic doesn't necessarily mean a complete break with the post logic (Marbach, 1999; Stankiewicz, 2003).

#### **IV. Assessment Of Employees: Contributions And Limitations**

The evaluation of employees is a critical time for both the assessee, the assessor and the company. The three parties benefit from this HR practice but at the same time express their dissatisfaction with its individualistic approach.

##### **4.1 CONTRIBUTIONS**

Cadin and al. (1997) report, according to Caspar and Millet, that the evaluation of the employees is used to conduct a formal review of the activities performed and the results obtained over a given period; set new goals and negotiated action plans, to adopt a strategy; manage human resources by locating more precisely the employees in terms of skills, potential and desire to change; facilitate the development of skills (management of jobs); changing staff (skills planning); strengthen membership, develop motivation; support management responsibilities at each hierarchical level; increase the coherence between individual and collective orientations; create a dynamic of continuous improvement of the quality of contributions made, inside and outside the company; develop clarity of relationships and transparency of the firm; create, enriching dialogue that share the facts and leads to action...

Indeed, this practice allows the assessment to take stock of their current situation in terms of skills and performance, it also has a more strategic role for the company because as indicated Boyer (2006) speaking of assessee, "the assessment system is a moment of exchange to make up the field of information, to make suggestions and proposals to take stock of its activities, as well as skills and areas for improvement possible and analyze the evolution of his career by making more rational decisions. "

Evaluation is also a crucial time for the assessor because it is considered as a special time which helps to step back from its management practice and better visibility on work to establish lines. Boyer (2006) states that for the assessor, the assessment is a "moment of exchange for performing an analysis of its practice of management and fully play its role as manager, to set goals and work orientations, taking into account the suggestions and aspirations of employees to negotiate the necessary resources and to identify and plan actions to provide training. " In addition, the evaluation can be considered as a tool for decision support service managers and a way for them to detect dissatisfaction, discomfort, frustration... And therefore reverse the trend by developing corrective actions.

Evaluation is also an act that the company uses to evaluate or test the reliability of the actions and thus, it can take concrete and targeted measures to fill the gaps, the criticisms and observations made in the evaluation of its employees. According to Boyer (2006), the company may, for example "clarify the positioning of the assessee and his environment, capitalize structured information and maintain job descriptions through the skills to keep them." For the HR department, evaluation serves human resource balance sheet in terms of skills by trade and employment. This allows the HR department to establish reliable forecasts for investments, reorganizations, outsourcing, or draw up working methods and planning training.

##### **4.2 AN INDIVIDUALISTIC APPROACH**

This individualistic approach is based on two ideas: first, the evaluation measures conventions tend to be less and less often developed collectively; Then, the assessment interview is individual in nature, which is a problem because the work is more collective. In reality, the individualistic approach that drives employee evaluation criteria is also characterized, above all, the difficult balance between individual assessment and teamwork. First, the constitution of working groups may refer to the need to be in class to better control the work process, and secondly, employees can also somehow "choose" the groups they will fit, just as one chooses his friends in society. Employees are therefore now more independent and have greater scope for initiative on

cooperation in the organization. The obstacle posed by the contributions of each tie is important, but what is really at stake is the future of the group within the organization.

Indeed, regarding the evaluation of performance, employees will focus on objectives, which will "in general against the necessary cooperation within a team," Furthermore, it "exacerbates competitive individual behavior." De Coninck (2004) shows that changes in work organization are not within the post-Taylorism, contrary to what could have been asserted in the 1980s or 1990s. This mismatch between collective work and individual assessment can certainly prove to be a more indicating that one can't speak definitively post-Taylorism. Indeed, the changes observed in the 1980s established that "collective autonomy of the group [...] was then put forward"; Today, it is individuals who are carriers of this autonomy, "with less support [their] working group."

Moreover, in a logic of skills assessment, Zarifian (1999) notes that individual competence is hardly assignable because it depends on many factors such as sources of knowledge, experience and business development level. The collective competence is more than the sum of individual skills as it develops a synergy of skills and social interaction created by the group. For this collective skill works, it is necessary that the different actors of the group speak the same professional language and have the same issues. Paradoxically, the more collective expertise, the greater the individual skills become difficult to substitute.

Thus, if the fact to make an individual assessment while asking employees to perform work increasingly collective may appear contradictory, it seems that this individualistic approach to employee bonus anyway.

## V. Conclusion

Despite the discourse of managers on evaluation (informational, organizational and motivational objectives) and the means deployed (formalization of maintenance support, training of assessors and assessees, translation group targets contributing individual goals, development of repositories of activities or skills ...), this practice still raises many dissatisfaction at all levels of the company. The evaluation device has few links with the collective performance and teamwork. Thus, the assessment interview would affect the welfare of employees: the principle of evaluation of individual performance would promote a climate of competition between employees, not conducive to cooperation and the maintenance of a social good and up to harm their mental equilibrium climate. Today, teamwork is essential, despite its obvious contradiction with individual type of evaluation, it is in no way called into question in companies.

## References

- [1]. Baraldi, L., Dumasy, J.P. & Troussier, J.F. 2001. Accords salariaux innovants et rénovation de la relation salariale : quelques cas de figure. *Travail et Emploi*, 87: 81-94.
- [2]. Barreau, J. & Brochard, D. 2003. Les politiques de rémunération des entreprises : écarts entre pratiques et discours. *Travail et Emploi*, 93: 45-59.
- [3]. Baudry, B. & Dubrion, B. 2005. Quels modèles d'évaluation du travail?. *Travail et Emploi*, 104: 7-18.
- [4]. Borman W.C. & Motowildo S.J. 1997. Introduction: Organizational citizenship behaviour and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10: 67-69.
- [5]. Borman, W.C. & Motowildo, S.J. 1997. Task Performance And Contextual Performance. *Human Performance*, 10: 99-109.
- [6]. Boyer, L. 2006. *Management des hommes - historique, grands acteurs et auteurs, méthodes, outils, perspective*. Paris. Editions d'Organisation.
- [7]. Cadin, L., Guerin, F. & Pigeure, F. 1997. *Gestion des ressources humaines : pratique et éléments de théorie*. Paris. Editions Dunod.
- [8]. Campoy, E., Maclouf, E., Mazouli, K. & al. 2008. *Gestion des ressources humaines*. Paris. Collection Synthex, Pearson.
- [9]. De Coninck, F. 2004. Du post-taylorisme a l'effritement des organisations. *Travail et Emploi*, 100: 139-149.
- [10]. Dhenin, J.F. & Fournier, B. 1998. 50 thèmes d'initiation à l'économie d'entreprise. Paris. Editions Breal.
- [11]. Dubrion, B. 2004. Economie et gestion des ressources humaines : une synthèse des apports et limites des théories des contrats. *Revue d'Economie Industrielle*, 106: 7-29.
- [12]. Ferris, G.R., Munyon, T.P., Kevin, B. & Buckley, M.R. 2008. The Performance Evaluation Context: Social, Emotional, Cognitive, Political, And Relationship Components. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18: 146-163.
- [13]. Fourgous, J.M. & Lambert, H.P. 1991. *Evaluer les hommes : recrutement – performance – motivation et climat social*. Paris. Editions Liaisons.
- [14]. Gosselin, A. & Murphy, K.R. 1994. L'échec de l'évaluation de la performance. *Revue Gestion*, 19: 17-28.
- [15]. Guillot-Soulez, C. 2008. *La gestion des ressources humaines*. Paris. Gualino, Lextenso Editions.
- [16]. Holmstrom, B. & Milgrom, P. 1991. Multi-task principle agent analysis : incentive contracts, asset ownership and job design. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 37: 24-52.
- [17]. Holmstrom, B. & Milgrom, P. 1994. The firm as an incentive system. *American Economic Review*, 84: 972-991.
- [18]. Kesti, M. 2012. Organization Human Resources Development Connection To Business Performance. *Procedia Economics And Finance*, 2: 257 – 264.
- [19]. Marbach, V. 1999. *Evaluer et rémunérer les compétences*. Paris. Editions D'organisation.
- [20]. Marbot, E. 2007. *L'évaluation : le cœur de la gestion des personnes*. Paris. Pearson Education.
- [21]. Martory, B. & Crozet, D. 2005. *Gestion des ressources humaines : pilotage social et performances*. Paris. Dunod.
- [22]. Laffont, J.J. 1993. A propos de l'émergence de la théorie des incitations. *Revue Française de Gestion*, 96: 13-19.
- [23]. Lapra, J.P. 1992. L'évaluation du personnel dans l'entreprise : un nouveau dynamisme dans la gestion des ressources humaines. Paris. Dunod.
- [24]. Lene, A. 2008. Rémunérer les compétences, l'entreprise peut-elle tenir ses promesses ? *Revue Française de Gestion*, 184: 51-69.
- [25]. Lichtenberger, Y. 1999. Compétence, organisation du travail et confrontation sociale. *Formation- Emploi*, 76: 93-107.

- [26]. Obisi, C. 2011. Employee performance appraisal and its implication for individual and organizational growth. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1: 92-97.
- [27]. Petruta, B. & Boer, J. 2014. Increasing human resource efficiency in the production process. *Procedia Technology*, 12: 469 – 475.
- [28]. Stankiewicz, F. 2003. Des Compétences de la firme aux compétences des salariés - Le point de vue non autorisé d'un économiste du travail. *Revue d'Economie Industrielle*, 102: 55-68.
- [29]. Trepo, G., Estellat, N. & Oiry, E. 2002. *L'appréciation du personnel : mirage ou oasis ?* Paris. Editions d'Organisation.
- [30]. Zarifian, P. 1999. *Objectif compétence. Pour une nouvelle logique.* Paris. Editions Liaisons.

IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) is UGC approved Journal with SI. No. 4481, Journal no. 46879.

Mohammed Mouchaouri. "Assessment of Employees: An Individualistic Approach ." IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), vol. 19, no. 8, 2017, pp. 75–79.