

Performance Strategy to Evaluation Employer Performance

Alla Talal Yassin

ICCI, Iraq, Baghdad, www.allatalal.com

Abstract—Performance strategy is complementary activities and its indicators are appropriate are often important data sources for evaluation activities. The Objective Here, is to measure factors effect (Age, Gender, level of education, experience) employer performance using questioner to calculate sum rank which depend on performance strategy factors(5 dimension)⁽¹⁾ for each employer, and compare Performance Evaluation Employer of these two-independent-samples (groups). The study used a descriptive and comparative design, and it was conducted on (ICCI) in Iraq. The sample (n =30)⁽²⁾. The data were collected by questionnaires, and were analyzed statistically. The present research investigated that using the performance Strategy to Evaluating will raise performance.

Keyword: employment, performance, evaluation, Strategy, sum rank.

I. INTRODUCTION

Performance strategy refers to the systematic collection and analysis of information and data to monitor the progress of the achievement its intended objectives, The (PDP)⁽³⁾ is a tool to support effective employee performance management and formatted to facilitate both performance planning and feedback at the end of the performance period. Planning process, good team leaders, solid understanding was other principles to support effective employee. [13, 14] The basis of any good strategy is a set of definite standards. These must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-framed. [1,4,8,25,]. This article presents the framework methodology which is aim to Measure the performance, using analytic tools to evaluate the performance periodically. It presents a methodology steps to compare performance. Performance evaluation could be defined as systematic process of observing, it is an approach for evaluating performance of a trainee in a given task. Assessing, and interpreting one's actual performance. [22, 24, 25] Measurement scope refers to the use of sample populations. Performance indicators sometimes measure results directly for an entire target population through administrative records, observations. [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] Often, however, the scope of measurement is limited to a sample of targets or sites. Sometimes performance is measured in only one project setting, or in a very few, as case studies instead of statistical sampling. [23,26] While case studies can provide useful information on how projects work (or why they do not work as expected) and how they can be improved, care must be taken not to assume that results from one site necessarily represent project performance overall. Accordingly, such case studies are usually conducted in the context of special studies rather than as a replacement for broader performance data. [21,27,28]Regular performance evaluations may allow an employee to avoid forming bad habits before they get started. There are different ways to measure performance for any given variable (objective, impact, outcome, output, and input). [21,25] For new employees, instruction and guidance will most likely be viewed as helpful while employees that have been on the job for a while may view it as insulting or criticism.[18,20,23]Competency of an individual trainee of doing or carrying out an assigned task to its expected minimum satisfactory standard. Evaluation is an aid to training. [1,] Training employees is absolutely vital in preparing them for success. They will need advice on everything from the informal relationships among work to their specific job responsibilities. Frequently, it is helpful to instigate a mentor relationship between new employees and existing employees that know the ropes. [16, 17, 29] Some times it Called systematic process of obtaining relevant information and interprets data to facilitate decision making. Evaluation can take place at any point in time in a training programmed. [18, 19] By providing answers to questions relevant to training, it is a decision- making tool. The best thing can do while training is to create the kind of environment where employees are not afraid to ask questions and Taking the time to listen to both questions and ideas. [4, 16] this method may bring an approach to old problems or utilize fresh perspective. The best advice for managers who are looking to recruit is to be innovative, persistent, and realistic. to recognizing the strengths of business and the positions offer which will go a long way toward enticing quality people for build careers with farm.[18,19,20,30,32] A good performance evaluation system requires knowing the expected tasks or activities that a trainee should perform, Training sequence adopted in the training, and expected minimum satisfactory standard of performance that a trainee should attain.[11,12] First step towards developing a performance evaluation system, the expected job performance needs to be analyzed. Performance analysis will visualize the training steps, conditions, sub-skills, results and standards. [7, 10] Results indicators measure employer results relative to project objectives. Results are measured at the level determined by a project's objectives. [21, 33] This analysis will help develop a systematic performance evaluation method.

⁽¹⁾ job improvement , Personal behavior, learning and training , Acknowledgment, penalty

⁽²⁾Prepared in 2009.

⁽³⁾Performance and Development Plan

II. PERFORMANCE STRATEGY

Key performance indicators are measured regularly in order to provide with information for management, learning, and accountability purposes. In some cases, it focuses on the five levels identified in the logic model and provides specific details with respect to the performance area, the key performance indicators, data collection methodologies, responsibility for performance area, and information use and users. Three strategies could be defined: Data Collection strategy, Evaluation Strategy, and Outcome Strategy [21].

III. PERFORMANCE STRATEGY BENEFITS TO I.J.P⁽⁴⁾

The effective performance strategy provides a solid foundation for all aspects of the employer/employee relationship. [2, 21] And to make the best impression, it could do in the work place. Learn to develop some good habits these steps aren't hard to do--but may be a hard for some to stick to--but those who do will find themselves rising to the top. [3,6] Benefits when employees feel like part of a team loyal to their work , their company, its sound policy to reward good employees, encourage productive employees to strive for more, and help wayward employees get back on track. On occasion, it will need to let go of problem employees who, despite all efforts, or will not do their jobs satisfactorily. [2,5] job descriptions and job analysis is using from Many companies and managers to set employee goals and objectives, so they are tied into the needs of the work unit or company.[4] Employee evaluations help solve and prevent employee problems massive employee issues are most often solved by stopping the problem before it becomes a big issue. Periodic evaluations will help to spot possible roadblocks to success before they become large setbacks for the company. Questionnaire Systems creates, executes, and customizes evaluation forms towards the needs of each company. Company has the benefit of choosing between two or more successful strategies. [5] Performance strategy has many benefits, it determine how the job of each employee can further the overall goals of the organization , identify, reward good employees, in order to foster loyalty and motivate to continue of achievement , allowing employees to work under the mistaken belief that they are doing well, thereby never giving them the information they need to improve , tolerating poor performers and the burdens they place on other employees and company , surprising poor performers with negative decisions, and facing difficulty in terminating bad employees because have not laid the proper groundwork. keep employee morale high through continuous feedback stay on top of the needs of workforce to ensure employee retention and increase productivity , innovation , or reduce the risk of complaints and litigation by ensuring that employees feel treated fairly and are not surprised by management decisions, it could also identify and deal with problem employees to either turn those employees into valuable, examine each employee as an individual to evaluate the employee's strengths and weaknesses, productive workers or lay the groundwork for discipline and, if necessary, termination [2].

IV. METHODOLOGY

Aim

The aim is to measure factors (Age, Gender, level of education, experience) employer performance using questioner to calculate sum rank which depend on performance strategy factors(5 dimension)⁽⁵⁾ for every employer. . In addition it interested to compare Performance Evaluation Employer of these two-independent-samples (groups) or exploring the relationship between G1, G2 ⁽⁶⁾ variables.

Research questions

We had the following research questions:

- (i) Dose the four ⁷ factors effect in sum rank?
- (ii) Does Group1 differs from Group2?"

Sample and data collection

The study population consisted of Sample from one randomly selected ICCI during a 1-month period in 2009. The questionnaires concerning with many variables as we mentioned in the section (Questionnaire form). Altogether 75 employer were recruited 62 employer completed questionnaire . Only these responses were included in the analysis. The final response rate was 80%.

Questionnaire form ⁽⁸⁾

Questionnaire form describe the basic purpose of Evaluation Employment Performance, it content of five dimension(9), job improvement the first dimension about (20) Questions deal with performance Indicators experience and practice that job required , Commitment on job systems which is penetrating ,Commitment on job rule work law , Ability for self- job development ,Innovation Ability . The second dimension is Personal behavior about (10) Questions deal with commitment in job Privacy, job Secret, Tendency for enjoyment to common or disease permission, Psycho-balance, Confidence and trust, Acceptance the advice and guidance from direct or manager, the Possession cooperation soul , the Possession aid soul in job , Proprieties or behavior with employed or directs. The dimension learning and training indicated the ability to How much learning and training is being achieved to performance about (6) Questions deal with and linked to

⁽⁴⁾ Improve Job Performance

⁽⁵⁾ job improvement , Personal behavior, learning and training , Acknowledgment, penalty

⁽⁶⁾ group1 and group2

⁽⁷⁾ Age, Gender, level of education, experience

⁽⁸⁾ See additional Questionnaire form Appendix 1.

⁽⁹⁾ It used (Likert -type).

business and performance needs with other performance systems and factors, designs be improved, applied, program effective. Finally the dimension penalty indicated to kind penalty which the employ could have like Attention, warning, cut Salary, scolding, decrease salary or other.⁽¹⁰⁾

Data analysis

Summative variables were constructed on the five dimensions of Evaluation Employment Performance, by calculating the mean values of the corresponding items. In additional (60%) of the first group was males while (70%) of the second.(11) Generally, the question of interest is of the form "Does Group1 differs from Group2?" Because the sample sizes are the same in the tow groups fixed by design (assuming a stratified random sample), Descriptive statistics (i.e. frequency, mean, standard deviation and range) were considered with sample characteristics as shown in table(1,2).the null hypothesis stated in terms of multinomial parameters is the alternative being inequality: (Ho: $d_1 = f_2$, Ha: $d_1 \neq f_2$), The difference between sum rank of G1 and sum rank for G1 was calculated by analysis of variance for repeated measurements, first without and later with a grouping variable (i.e. age, gender and Experience)as shown in table(3). The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between factors and sum rank for each employer. In all tests, the level of statistical significance was set at P, 0.05.(table4) in additional There are four appropriate test statistics that can be used here .The best known statistic is (MANN-WHITNEY) tests; the other statistic is based on the (Two-Independent-Samples Test) too . (MANN-WHITNEY)⁽¹²⁾ The Mann-Whitney U test is the most popular of the two-independent-samples tests like in our case. It is equivalent to the Wilcoxon rank sum test and the Kruskal-Wallis test for two groups. it tests whether two independent samples that are defined by a grouping variable are from the same population. The test statistic uses the rank of each case to test whether the groups are drawn from the same population. The output shows as shown in (table 5) the number of valid cases of each group (30),(30) ; the mean rank of the variable within each group (32.60),(28.40) and the sum of ranks (978.00), (852.00) in the Ranks table in our case and the Mann-Whitney U (387.00) (table 5) ; Wilcoxon W (table 6) (the rank sum of the smaller group) which was (852.00) ; Z statistic (-.935); and probability Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed) which was (.350) in the Test Statistics (table 6) . The 2-tailed probability associated with units under the normal curve is $p = 0.350$. As our $p < \alpha$ we reject the null hypothesis at the 95% level in favor of the alternative that, in fact, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean annual population aggregations of groups. As the rank sum for the G2 sample is much less than the G2 sample we could further conclude that "on average" population aggregations are larger in G1. in our test (Mann-Whitney) tests that two sampled populations are equivalent in location. The observations from both groups are combined and ranked, with the average rank assigned in the case of ties. The number of ties should be small relative to the total number of observations.

If the populations are identical in location, the ranks should be randomly mixed between the two samples. The test calculates the number of times that a score from group 1 precedes a score from group 2 and the number of times that a score from group 2 precedes a score from group1. The Mann-Whitney U statistic is the smaller of these two numbers. The Wilcoxon rank sum W statistic, also displayed, is the rank sum of the smaller sample (table6). If both samples have the same number of observations, W is the rank sum of the group that is named first in the Two-Independent-Samples Define Groups dialog box. Only results with statistical significance are reported. Computations were done using the SPSS System for Windows XP, release 15/2001. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov¹³ Z test and the Wald-Wolfowitz (table 8) runs test are more general tests that detect differences in both the locations and shapes of the distributions and we also use it to test groups (1&2). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (it was = 0.776) is based on the maximum absolute difference (positive) which was(.200) between the observed cumulative distribution functions for both samples (0.067) as shown in table (7) .When this difference is significantly large (in our case = 0.586), the two distributions are considered different. In our case the Wald-Wolfowitz runs test combines and ranks the observations from both groups as shown in table(8)(minimum possible = 13a , maximum possible = 36a). If the two samples are from the same population, the two groups should be randomly scattered throughout the ranking. The sig. (0.000) for the minimum and (0.904) for the maximum, while the z value be (-4.687),(1.302).

Another test was used in our case , The Moses result as shown in table (9) extreme reactions test which assumes that the experimental variable will affect some subjects in one direction and other subjects in the opposite direction the observed control (56) with sig.(1-tailed = 0.177) . The test tests for extreme responses compared to a control group.

This test focuses on the span of the control group and is a measure of how many extreme values in the experimental group influence the span when combined with the control group , Trimmed control (56) sig.(1tailed = 0.823) . The control group is defined by the group 1 value in

The Two-Independent-Samples Define Groups dialog box. Observations from both groups are combined and ranked. The span of the control group is computed as the difference between the ranks of the largest and smallest values in the control group plus 1. Because chance outliers can easily distort the range of the span, 5% of the control cases are trimmed automatically from each end, the outliers Trimmed from each end was(= 1).

⁽¹⁰⁾ See additional List of variable case Information available in separate document Appendix 2.

¹¹ see appendix 3 distributions (a,b,c,d).

¹² SPSS software Help Functions

¹³ SPSS software Help Functions .

V. CONCLUSIONS

- (i) Our results show that the differences between G1,G2 were the smallest on the Gender factor in spite of 0.6 of G1, 0.7 of G2 male .while the other have.
- (ii) Our most important finding is that rank sum in G1 more then in G2 in spite of Experience distribution that view (0.66) have from (10 to 20)years of Experience .
- (iii) The study shown the maximum absolute difference, which mean there is variance between G1, G2 and we reject the null hypothesis at the 95% level in favor of the alternative.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study has been carried out by the author for the (ICCI). We would like to thank the institution, for the support provided throughout the research. We would also like to thank **Dr.Moshabaki Asghar** to provide advice and assistance, and our assistants for their input. The data and analysis presented in this research are the responsibility of author under a contract with the (ICCI). The authors are thankful to the Editor and the anonymous referees for their careful reading, critical comments and constructive suggestions that enhanced the presentation of the paper. It is not necessarily in agreement with the analysis presented and the views expressed do not necessarily represent the official position of the (ICCI).

REFERENCE

- [1]. Performance,(2008) Evaluation, Risk, and, Audit Framework, Canada foundation for innovation, (PERAF), March.
- [2]. www.nolo.com
- [3]. Kristin Andrews, How to Improve Our Job Performance, e How Editor, www.ehow.com/members/ds_kristin4550.html
- [4]. Uses of the Job Description & Job Analysis, Amarendra bhushan Dhiraj Athens, Greece PH-0030-6947667507 abdhiraj@mail.gr <http://performance-appraisals.org/>
- [5]. A Properly Used Employee Evaluation Form Yields More Productive, Upbeat, and Satisfied Management, <http://www.sur-sys.com>
- [6]. Adams, Fagot, & Robinson. (1965). A theory of appropriate statistics. *Pm*, B(2): 99-127.
- [7]. Chapman, J.W. (1976). A comparison of the X², -2 log R, and multinomial probability criteria for significance tests when expected frequencies are small. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 71: 854-863.
- [8]. Dawis, R.V. (1987). Scale construction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* ,34: 48 1-489.
- [9]. Fienberg, S.E. (1977). *The Analysis of Crossclassified Categorical Data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [10]. Goodman, L.A., & Kruskal, W.H. (1979). *Measures of Association for Crossclassification*.New York: Springer-Verlag.
- [11]. Goldstein, G., & Hersen, M. (1984). *Handbook of Psychological Assessment*. New York:Pergamon Press.
- [12]. Likert, R. (1932). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: Archives of Psychology.
- [13]. Mood, A.M., Graybill, F.A., Boes, D.C. (1971). *An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics*.New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [14]. Sisson, D.A., & Stocker, H.R. (1989). Analyzing and interpreting Likert-type survey data. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 31(2): 81-85.
- [15]. Analyzing Data Measured by Individual Likert-Type Items Dennis L. Clason, Associate Professor ,Thomas J. Dormody , Assistant Professor, New Mexico State University.
- [16]. Sample Small Institution Performance (2005), Evaluation*Public Disclosure (Date Of Evaluation) Community Reinvestment Actperformance Evaluation ,Small Institution Performance Evaluation September.
- [17]. Billikopf, Gregory. *Labor Management in Ag: Cultivating Personnel Productivity*. Agricultural Extension: University of California.
- [18]. Ervin, Bernie. *Recruiting and Hiring Outstanding Staff*. Agricultural Extension: The Ohio State University.
- [19]. Fogleman et. al. *Employee Compensation and Job Satisfaction on Dairy Farms in the Northeast*. April 1999.Cornell University, RB99-02.
- [20]. Rosenberg, Howard. (1999), *Labor Management Decisions*. University of California APMP Research Papers, Volume8, Number 1, Winter-Spring.
- [21]. Schuler, R. (1998). *Managing Human Resources*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.
- [22]. Performance Monitoring Indicators ,A handbook for task managers, operations policy department world bank , Washington ,(1996).
- [23]. Performance Indicators for Microinsurance Practitioners – Summary More information: www.microinsurancefocus.org Contact :insurance@microfinance.lu, LUXEMBOURG, February 2007
- [24]. Irwin L. Goldstein, Ph.D. & Kathleen K. Lundquist, Ph.D. , Bill Lann Lee Partner ,Lief, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP , Current Best Practices For Human Resource Processes , 415-956-1000 ,Bllee@Lchb.Com
- [25]. canada foundation for innovation foundation canadienne pour innovation , Performance, Evaluation, Risk, and Audit Framework (PERAF) , March 2008
- [26]. Performance and Development Plan (PDP) Instructions, <http://hr.dop.wa.gov/Guidance/performance/PDPGuide.htm>.
- [27]. University of California , office of the president , "Employee Performance Evaluation Guide ,
- [28]. Galen W.Rapp, *Appraising Manager Performance*, Education/Member Relation Program Area Rural Development Administration, Cooperative Services, AG BOX 3255, Washington, D.C. 20250-3255.
- [29]. Nancy W. Burton, (1977)" *Performance Standards*", New York, December

- [29]. Kanungo, R.N. and Mendonca, M. (1994), "Culture and performance improvement", Productivity, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp.447-53.
- [30]. Kishita, T. (2006), "The HRM of Japanese Firms in the Days to Come of Global Competition, Research and Practice in Human Resource Management, 14(1), pp. 29-48.
- [31]. Shruti gupta,(2008) Indian and Japanese HRM practices: Similarities and differences with Analysis of automobile sector in India Sr lecturer, army institute of management and technology, greater noida ,Issn –155,Year september volume2, issue 3/4,.
- [32]. Herbig, Paul, (1995) "Marketing Japanese Style", Quorum Books,London.
- [33]. N. E. Fried And Associates, Inc.,California Office 7564 Romeria Street ,Carlsbad, Ca 92009 ,Phone: 760-633-4444 ,Fax: 760-633-1044 ,Ohio Office 5590 Dumfries Court West ,Dublin, Oh 43017 ,Phone: 614-766-9800email: Info@Nefried.Com ,Www.Nefried.Com

Std. Error	Statistic	
5.543	123.27	Mean
		Lo 95% Confidence
	111.93	wer Interval for Mean
		Bo
		und
		Up
	134.60	per
		Bo
		und
	124.91	5% Trimmed Mean
	132.00	Median
	921.65	Variance
	1	
	30.359	Std. Deviation
	61	Minimum
	156	Maximum
	95	Range
	36	Interquartile Range
.427	-1.152	Skewness
.833	.193	Kurtosis

Table (1) Descriptive statistics Group1

Std. Error	Statistic	
6.745	112.40	Mean
		Degry
	98.60	Lower Bound
	126.20	Upper Bound
	112.98	5% Trimmed Mean
	127.00	Median
	1365.007	Variance
	36.946	Std. Deviation
	61	Minimum
	156	Maximum
	95	Range
	76	Interquartile Range
.427	-.448	Skewness
.833	-1.674	Kurtosis

Table (2) Descriptive statistics Group2

Std. Error of the Estimate	Adjusted R Square	R Square	R
34.067	.008	.026	.161(a)

Table (3) Std. Error of the Estimate

Sig.	T	Standardized Coefficients	Unstandardized Coefficients	
		Beta	Std. Error	B
.000	7.866		12.997	102.234
.228	1.220	.161	.778	.949

Table (4) Coefficients

Degree	
387.000	Mann-Whitney U
852.000	Wilcoxon W
-.935	Z
.350	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)

Table (5) Mann-Whitney U

Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	N	Group
978.00	32.60	30	Groub1
852.00	28.40	30	Groub2
		60	Total

Table (6) Wilcoxon W

Degree	
.200	Absolute Most Extreme Differences
.067	Positive
-.200	Negative
.775	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
.586	

Table (7) Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z

Asymp. Sig. (1-tailed)	Z	Number of Runs	
.000	-4.687	13(a)	Minimum Possible
.904	1.302	36(a)	Maximum Possible

Table (8) Wald-Wolfowitz Test

Degree	
56	Observed Control Group Span
.177	Sig. (1-tailed)
56	Trimmed Control Group Span
.823	Sig. (1-tailed)
1	Outliers Trimmed from each End

Table (9) Moses Test

Appendix (3)

Range	Count G1	%	Count G2	%
20-30	5	17 %	5	17 %
30-40	10	33 %	12	40 %
40-50	15	50 %	10	33 %
50-60	0	0 %	3	10 %
Total	30	100%	30	100%

Table (a) the distribution of age

Range	Count G1	%	Count G2	%
0-5	4	13 %	4	14 %
5-10	1	3 %	0	0 %
10-15	4	13 %	10	33 %
15-20	15	50 %	10	33 %
20-25	5	18 %	6	20 %
25-30	1	3 %	0	0 %
Total	30	100%	30	100%

Table (b) the distribution of Experience

Range	G1	%	G2	%
high school education	2	6 %	8	26 %
university graduate	7	24 %	8	26 %
Master	13	43 %	10	34 %
Doctorate	8	27 %	4	14%
Total	30	100%	30	100%

Table (c) the distribution of education level

Range	G1	%	G2	%
60-70	3	10 %	7	24 %
70-80	1	3 %	4	13 %
80-90	1	3 %	0	0 %
90-100	2	6 %	0	0 %
100-110	1	3 %	0	0 %
110-120	4	13 %	0	0 %
120-130	2	6 %	6	20 %
130-140	2	6 %	4	13 %
140-150	3	10 %	7	24 %
150-160	4	13 %	1	3 %
160-170	7	23 %	1	3 %
Total	30	100 %	30	100 %

Table (d) pointes distribution questionnaire Sum Rank