



JOB EVALUATION PRACTICES AND EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

¹Thirupathi Naik Bhukya, ²Prof. D. Sreeramulu

¹Research Scholar, Department of Business Management, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telanagna

²Professor, Department of Business Management, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telanagna

ABSTRACT

Job evaluation is an essential procedure for improving organisational performance. The research aims to determine the effect of job assessment methods on employee motivation, performance, and responsibility. A standardised questionnaire was used to collect data from a convenience sample of 1000 respondents, and methods such as percentage analyses, ANOVAs, and independent t-tests were used. According to the study's results, job assessment techniques significantly impacted employee motivation and performance. Furthermore, it has been shown that job assessment methods are significantly related to employee motivation and performance. The study's findings indicate significant variations in job evaluation techniques, employee motivation and performance, and staff responsibilities between the public and private sectors.

KEYWORDS: *Motivation and Performance, Job evaluations, Employee, Public and Private sector*

1. INTRODUCTION

Job evaluation aims to conduct a longitudinal examination of operations. Assessing workers' strengths and weaknesses enables businesses to make more informed hiring decisions (Ivibhogbe, 2005). It establishes a framework for organisational growth and productivity by identifying potential senior management talent (Abiodun 1999). Assessment tools contribute to job performance accuracy by reducing worker mistakes. Evaluation is used to identify particular accomplishments in all areas of work and to improve workplace productivity. Employee morale is boosted by worker efficiency, and measuring it would be not easy. Numerous factors may be used to determine employee morale, including disputes, accidents, labour turnover, absenteeism, and illness.

Additionally, organisational records, observation, attitude surveys, and performance coaching are used to access it (Obisi, 1996). Employees are appreciative of receiving objective assessments that accurately reflect their job performance. The employee may discuss his rating with his supervisor. Objective assessments eliminate disputes, allowing performance assessment to aid in the achievement of performance objectives. Employee performance issues may stymie company growth and development. Job evaluations should provide comments on current performance to assist

workers in improving their current and future performance. Employees must be informed of the results, interpretations, and recommendations of the evaluation—understanding how they rank in the eyes of their superiors and the organisation aides in this process. Employees will have no clue how much work is needed to improve their productivity unless they become aware of their actual level of productivity (Flanaholtz, 1994). Job evaluation often includes human biases since people are known to make more mistakes while doing evaluations. Man demonstrates norm clarity, moderation, the halo effect, homophily, and central tendency via his errors.

Similarly, Abiodun (1999) notes that raters have a natural tendency to be swayed when assigning a rating to another factor. If a rater develops an impression of a man's goodness, he will give him a high rating in all categories. A single exceptional good or adverse event or characteristic may affect the rater's assessment of the employee. Raters are prone to get enthralled or captivated by a single characteristic or action of an employee. Raters' preconceived notions about such characteristics may be detrimental to the whole process. A general evaluation in which all those evaluated is often rated as "not very good" or "not too bad" (Abiodun, 1999).



2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The organization aims to make the best possible use of its human capital to accomplish its strategic objectives. Businesses that disregard employee assessment jeopardize their efficiency, product quality, innovation, and ability to respond effectively to market and customer demands (Bratton & Gold, 2007). Benchmarking may help the company improve, showing a possibility for development and success. The assessment of human resources is essential to a business's future performance. In today's competitive business climate, HR must show its value to the company and its stakeholders. One must analyze human resource management techniques that define company goals and the capabilities for pursuing, achieving, and exceeding those objectives. As a result, companies should assess their workers' ability to provide customer services.

Bratton (2007) evaluates the whole human resource management system and all of its procedures. It is assessed based on how effective, efficient, productive, and organized human resource management is. The following factors need an examination of HRM and its impacts. The human resources department may earn credibility and legitimacy by demonstrating the benefits of human resource management initiatives. It is modifiable and modifiable (Mwendwa, P. 2011). Thirdly, HRM assessment offers senior management and human resource experts feedback, allowing them to identify potential issues and shortcomings. In an organization, job assessment requires the participation of senior management (Rynes, 2009). He asserts that senior management must grasp the critical nature of assessment in order for it to occur. To guarantee job evaluation, it is critical to educate and inculcate senior management on the importance of job assessment. The attitude of senior management toward the assessment process has a significant effect on how the evaluation is performed inside the organization. According to Hayton (2005), four approaches to the efficacy of human resource management may be integrated into a model. Models of best practices, alignment with the organization, benchmarking against excellence, and employee and management perspectives. Employee assessments may not always correspond directly with organizational goals and values. Numerous perspectives exist on the effect of job evaluation. According to Gibb, the success of human resource management may be measured on two fronts (2000). The second component examines how internal or external universal standards determine human resource management effectiveness.

The human resources manager's involvement in the job assessment approach should significantly impact the job evaluation process. As a result, it is

essential to include everyone in a company's job evaluation process to guarantee that desired results are achieved. A constant job assessment is sufficient. Monitoring, coaching, counselling, feedback, and record-keeping regularly are critical. As a result, performance problems are identified and resolved quickly before they cause delays and inefficiencies. As a tool for enhancing employee performance or preserving excellence, work assessment results should be communicated regularly. Fletcher (2008) observes that job evaluations should be conducted to understand the organization's objectives clearly. Supervisors should follow an employee's development for a year or maintain detailed records. This scenario does not need accessing memory, which is more accurate and trustworthy than in the earlier age in the months before the evaluation. To achieve this objective, workers and supervisors should often engage throughout the year without regard for set assessment times. A problem must be identified before the annual review to prevent unpleasant surprises. By 1900, job assessment as a management method had been established. It evolved to become one of the instruments managers use to comprehend and manage companies. The early theorists of organizations concentrated on the relationship between professions and organizations. However, this early emphasis on employment analysis waned as the human relations movement shifted its focus to other problems. Until the 1960s, psychologists and other behavioural scientists had not rediscovered labour as a research topic in organizations (Aseka, 2002). The United States Labor Department has been involved in employment assessment for the most extended period (DOL).

Numerous variables, according to ACAS, affect job assessment (2000). Included is some knowledge of the incumbent, work control, daily interactions, physical settings, and decision-making. Job evaluations rely nearly exclusively on labour market data. The job assessment technique in this example compares market rate information for a substantial part of the organization's activity to a 5% graded scale. These schedules include a variety of intermediate regions and vary from 30% and 60%. To get employment, one should take advantage of market pay rates. An additional degree may be added to account for internal interactions. Significant occupations are classified, and everything else is listed beside.

Bernadin and Russell (2003) advocate for implementing an assessment system to aid in the achievement of stated objectives. A thorough assessment assembles data from various sources, including user input, validity, discriminating power, and adverse impact. The assessment system's final efficiency is contingent upon such attitudes and responses. The assessor should be questioned on the



system's ease of use and its inclusion of work content. It is also important to inquire about these pupils' training and availability time for examinations. Yoder and Staudohar (2002) emphasize the importance of emotional intelligence and sensitivity in evaluating contributions and abilities. Workers have many concerns and misconceptions regarding the assessment process, which may harm their performance. Employees' knowledge of the attitudes they utilize to oppose or enhance positive sentiments toward the system. It is finished. According to Davis and Newstrom (2003), individuals work toward shared goals to accomplish their aspirations. Management assumes that some individuals want to satisfy needs via work and will do so if encouraged. Subscribers are invited to give anonymous comments on the performance of their supervisor. Senior managers may use this technique to detect possible personnel issues and, if required, diagnose and improve management styles. It should not be a top-down exercise. Ratings are beneficial when used to determine the development ratio.

3. OBJECTIVES

- To provide a standard procedure for determining the relative worth of each job in an organization.
To promote a fair and accurate consideration of all employees for advancement and transfer.
To provide a factual basis for considering wage rates for similar jobs in a community and an industry.
To provide information for work organization, employees selection, placement, training and numerous other similar problems.

4. HYPOTHESES

- H01: There is no significant relationship between job evaluation practices and equitable salary structure

- H02: There is no significant relationship between job evaluation practices and employee motivation and performance
H03: There is no significant relationship between employee responsibilities and salary structure
H04: There is no significant relationship between job evaluation practices, employee responsibilities and equitable salary structure across the study sector

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- Research Design: Descriptive research
Sources of data: Primary source of data is collected from the respondents through a structured questionnaire, and it was to collect data for understanding the employee's perception, views, and experiences toward job evaluation. Secondary data is collected from various Journals, Periodicals such as Magazines, Business newspapers, and subject related books and websites.
Data collections methods: Data has been collected using a structured questionnaire through the customer survey method and personal interviews from the employees of the selected companies of the private and public sector through structured Questionnaires from twin cities of Telangna state.
Sampling Area: Employees from Hyderabad city, Telangna state
Sampling Method: The convenience sampling method has been used to collect a sample of 1000 respondents.
Statistical Tools used: ANOVAs and independent t-test using SPSS 23.0 software

6. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1 Respondents Socio economic profile

Table with 3 columns: Age, No of Responses, Percentage. Rows include age groups (18-25, 26-33, 34-41, 42-50, 51-60) and Gender (Male).



Female	166	16.6
Education		
Degree	174	17.4
PG	540	54.0
Professional/Mtech	185	18.5
Ph.D	55	5.5
Others	46	4.6
Experience		
0-5years	571	57.1
6-10 Years	166	16.6
11-15 Years	188	18.8
16-20 Years	33	3.3
21-25 Years	42	4.2
Salary structure (In Rupees)		
Upto 25,000	281	28.1
26,000-40,000	311	31.1
41,000-60,000	161	16.1
61,000-80,000	40	4.0
Above 80,000	207	20.7
Working sector		
Public Sector	500	50.0
Private sector	500	50.0
Total	1000	100.0

It is found that 41.4 percent of the respondents aged between 18-25 years, 26.9 percent of the respondents aged between 26-33 years, 22.9 percent of the respondents aged 34-41 years, 4.6 percent of the respondents aged between 42-50 years and 4.2 percent of the respondents aged 51-60 years and above; 83.4 percent of the respondents were male respondents, and the remaining 16.6 percent of the respondents were female; 54% of respondents belong to Post Graduation. Followed by 18.5 percent of the respondents belong to Professional/Mtech, 17.4 percent of the respondents belong to degree, 5.5 percent of the respondents belong to Ph.D, and 4.6 percent belong to others; 57.1% of respondents

belong to 0-5 years. Followed by 18.8 percent of the respondents had 11-15 Years of experience, 16.6 percent of the respondents had 6-10 Years of experience, 4.2 percent had 21-25 Years of experience, and 3.3 percent had 16-20 Years of experience; 31.1 percent of the respondents earn monthly income level is 26,000-40,000 rupees. Followed by 28.1 percent of them earn Up to 25,000 rupees, 16.1 percent of them earn 41,000-60,000 rupees, 20.7 percent earn Above 80,000 rupees, and 4 percent of them earn 61,000-80,000 rupees monthly; 50 percent of the respondents worked in the public sector, and the remaining 50.0 percent of the respondents worked in the private sector.

Table 2 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.820	0.790	13

Table 1 indicated that the questionnaire was checked for its reliability and provided the findings below. The questionnaire produced is pre-tested and checked

by face validity as it has been sent to a carefully selected sample of experts and has a sufficiently good reliability score. The result was given the value of



0.820. It means that the data has a high degree of reliability and validity.

6.1 ANOVA

It is conducted for comparing the means from two selected variables, with respect of employee responsibilities and salary structure has been considered for the study is explained in the table.

- **H01: There is no significant relationship between job evaluation techniques and equitable salary structure**

Table 3 ANOVAs

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	79.183	4	19.796	13.153	.000
Within Groups	1497.533	995	1.505		
Total	1576.716	999			

Table 3 shows that job evaluation factors show that 79.183 is the between-group variation in the population. 1497.533 is the variation within groups of variation. It also shows that F-distribution and its value 13.153. Finally, the results reveal that the job evaluation factor's significance value has less than

the p-value. Thus, it concluded that there is a significant relationship between job evaluation programs and equitable salary structure.

- **H02: There is no significant relationship between employee responsibilities and salary structure**

Table 4 ANOVAs

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	134.386	1	134.386	132.578	.000
Within Groups	1011.614	998	1.014		
Total	1146.000	999			

Table 4 shows that job evaluation factors show that 134.386 is the between-group variation in the population. 1011.614 is the variation within groups of variation. It also shows that F-distribution and its value 132.578. Finally, the results reveal that the job

evaluation factor's significance value has less than the p-value. Thus, it concluded that there is a significant relationship between employee responsibilities and salary structure.

- **H03: There is no significant relationship between job evaluation practices and employee motivation and performance.**

Table 5 ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	515.207	10	51.521	101.632	.000
Within Groups	501.356	989	.507		
Total	1016.563	999			

Table 4 results reveal that job evaluation factors show that 515.207 is the between-group variation in the population. 501.356 is the variation within groups of variation. It also shows that F-distribution and its value 101.632. Finally, the results reveal that the job evaluation factor's significance value has less than the p-value. Thus, it concluded a significant relationship between job evaluation programs and employee motivation and performance.

6.2 Independent t - Test

The Independent Samples *t-Test* compares the means of two independent groups to determine whether there is statistical evidence that the associated population means are significantly different. The Independent Samples *t-Test* is a parametric test.



H04: There is no significant relationship between job evaluation technique and equitable salary structure across the study sector

Table 6 Independent Samples Test

Variables	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	
	F	Sig.
Job evaluation factors	43.303	.000
Employee responsibilities	7.470	.000
Employee motivation and performance	129.541	.000

The *p*-value of Levene's test value is ".000" ($p < 0.001$), so the researcher has rejected the null of Levene's test and conclude that the variance in Job evaluation factors is significantly different from that of public and private sectors. Similarly, Employee responsibilities, employee motivation and performance factors show significant mean differences among the two selected sectors because of sig. Value is less than the *p*-values.

7. CONCLUSION

As the study findings indicate, job assessment is critical for organisational development and work efficiency improvement. The study aims to identify the impact of job evaluation practices on employee motivation, performance, and responsibilities. For that, the researcher selected the public and private sector in Hyderabad, Telangana, with a sample of 1000 employees from the public and private sector aid of non-probability sampling. According to the study's results, job assessment methods substantially affected employee motivation and performance. Additionally, it was shown that job assessment programmes are strongly linked with employee motivation and performance. The study's results show that mean differences in job assessment methods, employee motivation and performance, and staff duties exist between the public and private sectors.

REFERENCES

1. Abiodun, D. J. (1999). *Performance System in the Civil Service, Problems and Prospects*, Seminar paper presented in the Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan.
2. Advisory, Conciliation & Arbitration Service (ACAS.) (2000). *Job Evaluation Guide No. 34*, London: H.M.S.O.
3. Aseka, J. (2002). *Personnel Management in the Public Service*. Unpublished paper presented during the training and retraining of facilitators for the Public Sector Integrity Programme on July 27, 2002 in Mombasa, Kenya
4. Bernadin & Russel (2003). *Researcher methodology, a step by step guide for Beginners*. New Delhi: Sage.
5. Bratton, J. Gold, J. (2007), *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

6. Davis, K & Newstrom. (2003) *Human Behaviour at work: Organizational Behaviour*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.
7. Fisher, P. (2002) *Job Evaluation: A Trade Union Assessment from Some Approaches to National Job Evaluation*, London: Foundation for Business Responsibilities.
8. Flanaholtz, E. G. (1994). *Human Resources: A Review of Theory and Research*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 11(1), 23-31.
9. George, S. (1960). *The Human Problems of Management*. Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall.
10. Haralambos, M. and Holborm, M. (1980). *Sociology Themes and Perspectives*. London: University Tutorial Press.
11. Hayton, J. (2005), "Promoting corporate entrepreneurship through human resource management practices: A review of empirical research", *Human Resource Management Review*, 15(1).
12. Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation in Work*, New York: Wiley and Sons.
13. Ivibhogbe, S. O. (2005). *Employee Performance Evaluation: Union Bank of Nigeria Plc as a case study*", Seminar paper presented at Mills, Ilorin, Nigeria.
14. Mwendwa, P. (2011). *Factors affecting job evaluation in state corporations with reference to Kenya institute of Education*. Unpublished Research, JKUAT
15. Obosi, C. (1996). *Personnel Management*, Ibadan: Jackbod Enterprises
16. Ubeku, A. K. (1975). *Personnel Management in Nigeria, Benin- City: Ethiope Publishing Corporation*.
17. Wisner, A. (2002). *Performance Appraisal: Holt Richard and Elston*, New York: Academic Press.
18. Yaro, Y. (1967). *Statistics: an introductory analysis (2nd ed.)*, New York: Harper and Row.
19. Yesufu, T. M. (1982). *The Dynamics of Industrial Relations: The Nigerian Experience*, Ibadan: University Press Limited
20. Yoder and Staudohar (2002). *Research Methods in Business Studies*. London: Prentice Hall.