A SYSTEMS MODEL FOR TEACHING HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

George R. Greene
Margaret Ann Mi
University of Mary Washington
College of Business, Fredericksburg, Virginia
E-mail: grgreene@umw.edu

ABSTRACT

Efficient and effective human resource management is a complex, involved, and interactive process. This article presents and discusses a unique systems approach model for teaching human resource (people) management processes, and the important inter-relationships within that process. The model contains two unique components related to key sub-processes: incentives management and performance evaluation. We have not observed a model applying a systems thinking paradigm presented in any textbook, journal article, business publication, or other literature addressing the topic. For nearly three decades, the model has been used in teaching a comprehensive, meaningful understanding of the human resource management process that can be effectively implemented in both corporate and academic learning venues.

Key words: employees, resources, management, systems, model

INTRODUCTION

Efficient and effective human resource management is a complex, involved, and *interactive* process. We perceive the human resource management process as composed of a number of inter-related components or parts that are related to other components often in complex ways. In order for students to appropriately understand the *parts* of the process, and the overall process *globally (holistically)*, as well as the *key relationships* between component parts, students must clearly understand the inter-relationships between various components (or sub-systems) within the overall process. That understanding can enable students to more efficiently and effectively manage what is commonly referred to as *the most valuable asset* within any organization: the people who make the organization function, enable it to achieve its stated objectives, and thus survive, prosper, grow, and succeed over the long-term.

We have taught human resource management to line executives, traditional and nontraditional undergraduate and graduate students in a variety of venues for a combined total of nearly three decades. Thus, we understand the difficulty of conveying meaningful and comprehensive understanding of the overall human resource management process. More importantly, our model stresses the inter-relationships between component sub-systems so students can envision the positive impact that effective human resource management practices have on operating performance.

The teaching model presented in this paper can be used to teach the introductory or survey of Human Resource Management course and it can be used for a quick overview of the process and key inter-relationships within it, as well as in other leadership and management courses, e.g., a brief introduction in a Principles of Management course.

From an elementary perspective, organizations through which most work is completed are simply collections of a varying number of jobs, which are performed by employees or volunteers. Therefore, our discussion begins with a definition of the basic component in the model, the *job* itself; it then differentiates a *job* from a *position*. This is followed by a definition and explanation of the Job Analysis process, which is the fundamental starting point for the remainder of the model presented and described in this article.

The job analysis definition is followed by identification, exposition, and explanation of other major components in the systems model of the human resource management process, including how each of the components is interrelated with various other components of the model. When presented in the classroom using Power Point,

each component of the model, and its linkages to other components, is exposed as each is introduced and discussed.

Job versus Position Simply stated, we define a *job* as a collection of various tasks, duties, and responsibilities, and associated with expected results or outcomes related to each of those tasks, duties, responsibilities, which are to be implemented, executed, carried out, completed, or fulfilled by one or more human beings. In our definition, a job is not the same as a *position*. Correctly applied, the term *position* refers to a space or place occupied by an individual within an organization. For example, some military organizations refer to positions as "a *slot* on the unit manning document," or other similar expressions conveying the same idea.

Thus, within an organization, there could be a number of *different* jobs, i.e., collections of *different* kinds of work (tasks, duties, responsibilities, and related outcomes/results).For each different job, one or more individual employees are assigned to a *position* (that is, one person assigned to *each* of a number of positions created for that particular job) doing the *same* job. With these concepts clarified, further discussion centers on the most basic component of our systems model for managing the human resource process, strategic human resource planning, often referred to as workforce planning.

STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING

Strategic human resource planning is the process through which an organization's top-level human resource executives and support staff determine future human resource needs of the organization, and develop a strategy for matching future needs with the then-current existing resources; that strategy must be consistent with, and in consideration of, the over-arching organizational strategic plan. The process begins with the senior human resource executive reviewing the values, vision, mission, purposes, and long-term objectives of the entity, and the time horizon of the key objectives.

With that information, the human resource management team creates an inventory of the number of *positions* that will be required in *each* organizational *job* to efficiently and effectively achieve organizational goals and objectives at specified time intervals into the future. Next, the team assesses the *current inventory* of positions in each of those jobs within the organization. Simply put, subtracting current inventory from future needs arrives at (a) the number of new positions that must be filled, (b) the number of current positions that should be either retrained and/or transferred into other vacant or new positions, and (c) the number of existing positions that must be laid off, separated, or discharged from the organization. For example, the following table illustrates sample results of the process described above in a hypothetical organization at a particular point in time in the future:

Job Title	Positions Needed	Current Inventory	Net Result
Team Leader II	13	5	8
Technician B	9	14	-5
Lathe Operator C	17	31	-14
Custodian A	7	7	0

Once this process has been completed for every job, the team creates plans regarding recruiting, selection screening and hiring, training or re-training and outplacement. If the organization's future need for a particular specific set of skills and abilities (an identified job description) is smaller than the existing supply of individual employees fulfilling that job, the process necessitates planning for reduction in the number of employees currently on the payroll.

Ivancevich (2007) states that such reductions in workforce are frequently the result of organizational restructuring, reengineering, downsizing, and out-sourcing. For example, Bernardin (2007) notes that downsizing, outsourcing, and similar major competitive realignment efforts must include (if not begin with) revising human resource strategy and planning, since doing so is critical to the long-term organizational survival, effectiveness, and success. Further, periodic reviews are needed to be consistent with changes in the competitive environment,

as overall organizational designs change, and as the design of organizational workflows and tasks are modified to assure consistent competitive strategy execution.

JOB ANALYSIS

Matching the right people to specific job requirements can be a winning strategy in today's competitive environment. Job analysis is "the process of getting detailed information about jobs" (Noe et al., 2013: 170). Others refer to job analysis as a systematic process of collecting information used to make decisions about jobs" (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, Cardy, 2012: 65). Dessler (2012, 81) formulates the definition in reference to staffing and talent management, "The procedure for determining the duties and skill requirements of a job and the kind of person who should be hired for it." Whereas, Collins and Muchinsky (1993: 896) further expand the definition to include effective job performance. For this article, the definition of job analysis becomes a composite of the previous definitions. This new definition is: a systematic process to identify and verify job duties and skills to make intelligent decisions about talent management and employee performance appraisal.

As noted, different jobs consist of collections of different tasks, duties, and responsibilities. It is also true that each different job requires a different specific set of skills, abilities, knowledge, experience, etc., in order to effectively and successfully accomplishes the results and outcomes required by the organization to fulfill its overall objectives. Further, different individuals bring different kinds of traits, characteristics, knowledge, skills, abilities, experience, etc. to the organization when seeking employment (a job).Thus, to effectively match an individual seeking employment to the most appropriate job for that person, the organization must clearly understand the traits and characteristics of both the job and the individual.

Importance in the Organization

Correct examination and documentation during the job analysis is crucial in laying the groundwork for a systems approach to a human resource management process. Reasons for creating exact job analyses include documenting jobs that may later involve hiring the disabled, being proactive in mitigating lawsuits and serving as a basis for job enlargement for greater organizational flexibility. In fact, Noe et al. (2013: 171) stress the importance of job analysis to line managers because they need to: 1) understand the work-flow process, 2) make intelligent hiring decisions, 3) evaluate employee performance and give feedback for improvement, and 4) create a safe work environment. The intent of this article is to link incentives after the job analysis has been performed.

Methods of Collecting Job Analysis Information

Some of the various techniques used to collect data are employee interviews, questionnaires, observation, or employee diary or logs (Dessler, 2012). Newer methods involve, Intranet data collection that uses software to categorizes the input and the Department of Labor's O*NET (Occupational Information Network) that collects data on over 800 occupations (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, Cardy, 2012). DeNisi and Griffin (2010) prefer more scientific and systematic approaches to job analysis information collecting. These authors recommend the following job analysis methods: narrative, Fleishman, task-analysis inventory, functional, Position Analysis Questionnaire, Management Position Questionnaire and the critical incidents approach.

Components of Job Analysis

Job descriptions and job specifications are the two components of a job analysis (Dierdorf&Morgeson, 2009; DeNis& Griffin, 2011; Noe et al., 2013; Dessler, 2012). Lack of clear job descriptions that communicate the limits of a specific job lead to job conflict (Dierdorf&Morgeson, 2009). Early researchers about these two components found that, "If an employee does not know what he is expected to accomplish, and how he will be judged, he will hesitate to make decisions and will have to rely on a trial and error approach in meeting expectations of his superior" (Rizzo, House, &Lirtzman, 1970: 151).

Job Description
Most textbook authors (e.g., Noe et al., 2013; Dessler, 2012; Gomez-Mejia, Balki &Cardy, 2012; De Nisi & Griffin, 2011) define job description as a written document that identifies, defines and describes a list of tasks, duties, responsibilities, reporting relationships, working conditions, expected outcomes and/or results, and, where appropriate, supervisory responsibilities. Though this composite definition is all-inclusive of each authors' definition, explanations vary somewhat in describing the parts of the job description.

Noe et al. (2013) describe tasks, duties and responsibilities as observable actions that help managers evaluate employee performance (171). Whereas Gomez-Mejia, Balkin&Cardy (2012, 72) focus on "work-flow strategies that emphasize efficiency, control, and detailed work planning." Most textbook authors agree that the written job description should include the job title, salary range or wage per hour, job summary, scope of job, and required knowledge and experience.

Simply put, in addition to the information described above, at minimum an adequate job description should succinctly describe what management expects employees *to do* and the *job outcomes or results* management expects each employee to accomplish as the job is performed. This information should be assimilated into assessment criteria applied during the performance evaluation, or merit rating. A performance evaluation process incorporating the *unique bilateral performance evaluation process* proposed in this model is explained and discussed in a following section under the *performance evaluation* heading.

However, before moving into discussion of the next portion of the systems model, there is an on-going trend to replace *specific* job descriptions with *general* ones (Leonard, 2000; Gomez-Mejia, Balkin&Cardy, 2012).This trend is occurring because contemporary knowledge organizations have interwoven relationships among job duties and communication, especially those jobs requiring interaction with higher management. By examining today's work environment, the concept of competencies, are believed to be more meaningful than a specific list of duties and responsibilities in defining a job description (DeNisi&Griffin, 2011). In fact, in a more current trend, *dejobbing*, organizations are seen as a "field of work needing to be done rather than a set of discrete jobs held by specific individuals" (Noe et al., 2013: 175). Viewing organizational *jobs* in a much broader sense makes this observation a compatible fit in a systems model.

Job Specification
The job description is completed prior to specifications for the job being determined. Once a job is designed, and its tasks, duties, responsibilities, and results/outcomes are described, job specifications identify management's assessment of those necessary or desirable traits and characteristics that an employee brings to the job which empowers them to perform the tasks, duties, responsibilities, etc., efficiently and effectively, thus achieving desired results or outcomes.

Accordingly, Job specifications are really the human requirements needed to perform the job successfully Dessler, (2012: 81). Traditionally, job "specs" consist of *knowledge, skills and abilities* (KSAs). Noe, et al. (2013: 171) expand this definition to include *other characteristics* (KSAOs), such as motivation or persistence.

Job specifications should list the minimum qualifications to complete the job successfully (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin&Cardy, 2012). However, Burnkrant (2003: 1) warns, "Because job specifications describe group-level requirements, they are valid only to the extent that the requirements apply to all incumbents in the occupation." *Job knowledge* is considered the factual information employees innately hold about how to do a job or task (Noe et al., 2013). This knowledge is attributable to education and/or experience.

Noe et al. (2013: 171)define *jobskill* as, "… an individual's level of proficiency at performing a particular task." Another slant on the definition of job skill is, "…the competence to perform a learned activity" (Burnkrant, 2003: 3). In other words, skill is the minimum competency level needed to perform a learned activity. Various levels of competency can have different pay ranges for the initial hire (or subsequently).

Job Abilities refer to an individual's general enduring capabilities that are unobservable characteristics, such as intelligence(Noe et al., 2003).*Other characteristics* are defined as personality traits that relate to a specific job (Burnkrant, 2003).

Data Merged
Information stated in the job description and job specification (derived from job analysis) is combined into a separate module, labeled *data merged,* in the systems model. Pooling job description and job specification information becomes the basis upon which all other processes and components in the model rely.

Note that *two* paths are indicated in the systems model through which merged information flows toward other components in the model: one path flows toward the job evaluation and subsequent components in the model,

whereas the other path flows toward recruiting, selection screening and training and development and subsequent components (i.e., flowing in the *opposite* direction from the first path noted).

EVALUATION

The evaluation phase of the model is divided into three components: Job Evaluation, Incentives Management and Job Performance. Additionally, following the Job Performance component, Performance Evaluation is sub-divided into two separate evaluations, performance evaluation (a) and performance evaluation (b), which is unique to our model; these two components of the model are discussed subsequent to discussing the recruiting, screening and selection, training and development modules, below.

Job Evaluation

Sequencing this component at this point in discussion of the model is necessary because the job evaluation process establishes various job pay rates, scales, or grades which must be available for use *prior* to initiating and effectively completing recruiting and following steps in the model. Job evaluation relies on accurate job analysis information that is used to determine the *relative worth or value of a job* as compared to other jobs *within an organization*.

Thus, the results of the job evaluation process apply *within* an organization, and not generally across an industry. Therefore, job evaluation plans are customized to meet the organization's needs, and should take into consideration supply and demand, craft tradition, or seniority practices (Tilove, 1947: 160). Patton and Smith (1949) expanded on Johnson, Boise and Pratt's factors of job content by adding comparative rates for the same craft in other industries in the same area and comparative rates for the same craft in the same industry in other areas. Another major point is that, " ... it is tremendously important to management and to unions to have a clear understanding of the place of an evaluation system in the broader aspects of industrial relations" (Tilove, 1947: 160).

Within the legal environment, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 specified four attributes that must be present in evaluating the worth of a job: skill, responsibility, effort required for the job and working conditions associated with the job. Today, companies have the advantage of using "tested" methods to determine the relative worth or value of different jobs. Two of these more utilized methods are the Hay Guide Chart Profile Method and the Management Association of America (MAA) National Position Evaluation Plan.

Both plans rely on compensable factors (those valued by the organization) that use a point system with a scale of numbers and degrees (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin&Cardy, 2012). The Hay Method uses know-how, problem solving and accountability; whereas the MAA segregates jobs into hourly blue collar, nonexempt clerical, technical and service, and exempt supervisory, professional and management categories.

Once jobs are ranked in their relative importance and worth (i.e., from highest to lowest value within an organization), a hierarchy is produced that corresponds to pay grades and pay ranges. Of course, this hierarchy varies from one organization to another. Other job evaluation systems include: job ranking, classification, factor comparison, and policy capturing (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin&Cardy, 2012). Market surveys are often used to determine external equity. These surveys are used to create key or benchmark jobs that are similar across firms, and then institute pay policies.

Information created through the job evaluation process flows into the next step, *incentives* management. A system must be developed to ensure appropriate and effective management of employee incentives, which the authors believe is likely the least well-understood and most poorly managed process within the management discipline and skill set.

Incentives Management

As noted earlier, we believe the incentives management component in this model is unique. While we have observed the underlying concept elsewhere in the human resource literature, it is not presented in other teaching models in the manner described herein. Yet, we believe the process needs emphasis regarding its critically important role and impact on enhanced employee motivation, retention, and other key performance

variables. Properly designed and implemented, the incentives management system underscores and supports various motivational strategies designed to reinforce and reward overall achievement of organizational goals and objectives.

Review of the incentives management component of our model reveals that information flows *into* it from two sources. As noted above, information from the job evaluation process is used to create a hierarchy that corresponds to various pay rates, grades and ranges. Note that this information applies broadly across *jobs* (i.e., across the organization) rather than to an individual employee's level of job performance.

Individual employee job performance is measured through the second source of information, described below. Before describing that source of information, and its relations to incentives management, however, we move to the next chronological module in the overall process: recruiting a pool of job candidates.

Recruiting

Forecasting human resources requirements determines future labor shortages or surpluses. Based on these predictions, companies develop recruiting goals. These goals may include increasing the workforce through external hiring. The traditional definition of recruitment is the process of developing a pool of qualified applicants who are interested in working for the organization and how the organization might reasonably select the best individual or individuals to hire (Breaugh1992: 3-4). However, Breaugh (1992, 4) believes that the definition encompasses other "organizational activities that can influence the number and/or types of applicants who apply for a position" and "whether a job offer is accepted."Kleiman (2004) takes this definition a step further by adding that the basis of recruitment is to gain a competitive advantage. Locating and attracting the best qualified applicants postures organizations to achieve effective job performance, cost efficiency and retention.

In an earlier article, Breaugh (1981: 142) verified that employee performance, absenteeism and attitudes, like job satisfaction, are related to the method of recruitment. For instance, journal or convention ads and unsolicited contacts led to hiring good employees more so than newspaper ads and college placement offices. Newer forms of recruitment use the Internet. Company web sites, job boards, virtual job fairs and social networking sites are the latest forms of electronic recruitment methods (Dessler, 2012). Organizations are competitive when they can hire the best qualified and brightest who will stay with the organization, thus minimizing turnover costs.

The software industry is a good example of inter-firm competition for human resources. The results of Gardener's study (2005: 237) "suggest that attributes of hiring firms and of hired employees are associated with target firms' decisions to defend and retaliate against labor market rivals." In other words, firms may *pirate* talented employees from their competitors directly or through *head hunters*.

Screening and Selection

"But organizing men for work also means putting the man on the job he will do best. It goes beyond a potential worker's current abilities"(Drucker, 1954: 299). In regard to the selection process, he considers it a negative process because it "eliminates those who are unlikely to fit" by not considering growth potential and performance improvement (Drucker, 1954: 299).

Over 50 years after Drucker's book was published, Shaker Zahra (2003) believed that Drucker was the first to link human resources to company strategy. Because Drucker's book was able to present logical reasoning about the importance of strategic human resources, companies today have benefited by nurturing people as a resource (Zahra, 2003).

There are various ways to choose which applicants will be most successful on a job. However, there are various aspects to consider before officially hiring an applicant.

The foremost threat to companies during the screening process is achieving legal compliance. "Firms need to provide evidence that a selection procedure is job related or 'legitimate and nondiscriminatory' to rebut *prima facie* cases of discrimination"(Kleiman, 2004: 146). Reliability and validity are important factors in making hiring decisions to prevent discrimination.

Tests are classified according to whether they measure intelligence, personality, ability or achievement (Dessler, 2012). The key issue or question in making a selection/hiring decision is determining which measurement

instruments are both *valid* and *reliable*. Regardless of which tests are used, measurements must be reliable (an assessment to which a measuring instrument measures the same result on repeat applications) (DeNisi& Griffin, 2011). Validity means they must measure what they are supposed to measure, and to the extent a measurement tool predicts actual job performance (Noe et al., 2013).

Besides testing, employers must adhere to legal constraints during the screening process. These constraints not only include laws, but guidelines as well. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission interprets and enforces federal antidiscrimination laws. The *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures,* which applies to organizations with 15 or more employees, help employers understand how to comply with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, especially disparate impact claims (Kleiman, 2004). Other laws impacting the screening selection processes relate to sexual harassment, discrimination for pregnancy, age, religion, and disability.

Once the results of the tests are known and application of the laws is made, human resource or other professionals in an organization interview the applicant before offering the applicant the job. Next, employers perform more in-depth research to verify the applicant's background. Verification includes, but not limited to, reference checking, a felony check, and an immigration status check (usually through the government's *E-Verify* online).

Once this step is completed, those individuals selected are brought into the organization (hired), and the teaching model moves onward to the next step: initial employee training and/or development.

Training and Development
Initial training may include a new employee orientation program, introduction to and general familiarization with fellow employees and the work environment, the precise nature of the job, and similar factors. Further, employees selected from the available pool of recruits when the employment decision was made may not have *all* of the knowledge, skills, abilities, and responsibilities necessary to accomplish the work they are expected to accomplish; where this is the case, preliminary or remedial training may be necessary to enhance pre-employment levels.

Past investments in a worker's training are positively related to his/her wage (Frazis&Loewenstein, 2005). However, there is a limit to how much more additional training adds to the return on investment (Frazis&Loewenstein, 2005). With that thought in mind, Noe (2010: 345) defines training as a "planned effort by a company to facilitate employees' learning of job related competencies." In addition, lists of competencies that are essential for job success (knowledge, skills or behaviors)are added (Noe, 2010). Employee development, on the other hand, "refers to formal education, job experiences, relationships, and assessments of personality and abilities that help employees perform effectively in their current or future job or company" (Noe, 2010: 346).

Training and development costs cannot be ignored because their outcomes are linked to creating competitive advantage (Kleiman, 2004). Increasing worker competencies can lead to permanent changes in their job skill and job knowledge, thus preventing costly mistakes. Initial training, and further training to develop potential and current managers, ensures that the organization is poised for competitive interaction. There are many traditional and novel ways of training employees.

Noe (2010: 263-277) provided a comprehensive discussion of traditional training techniques. The first and foremost way to train employees is through *on-the-job* training (OJT). It appears that *informal learning* accounts for as much as 80% of how employees learn about a job (Weintraub& Martineau, 2002: 52). Other traditional training methods are apprenticeship, simulations, case studies, business games and behavior modeling, such as role playing (Dressler, 2012). Some companies deliberately create workplace environments where employees can *accidently* discuss how to use a tool to do a job or how to solve a problem (Dressler, 2012).

More novel approaches to training include combinations of electronics and the Internet. Distance learning through videoconferencing is a way to train a geographically dispersed workforce (Dressler, 2012). Other ways to utilize the computer as a training aide are though customized software, DVDs, virtual reality-type games, and a company's learning portal (Dressler, 2012). More forward-thinking companies, like Capital One Bank, loaned 3,000 iPods to trainees to download audio training books (Dressler, 2012: 167). Though some of the discussed

training methods can be applied to management training and development, there are special methods reserved to prepare employees for managerial positions.

Management development is critical for generating competent managers who can have "an enormous impact on competitive advantage" (Kleiman, 2004: 213). The Myer-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) psychological test, assessment centers and performance appraisals are used to identify employees who have potential to advance into management.

The difference between training and development is that training is required and concentrates on the current job with low work experiences while development is voluntary and focuses on future jobs that rely on high use of work experiences and prepares future managers for change (Noe, 2010: 347). Most large organizations have formal training programs for new hires and management development for current employees.

Assessing training programs for new-hires is much easier because many new hires do not know how to do the job, therefore, improvement is highly visible. Higher-order learning through judgments and application of derived knowledge is harder to evaluate for assessing development training for managers.
Job Performance

Once the employee has received appropriate initial (or subsequent) training and/or development, the next step in the overall HR management process is actual on-the-job performance. At this point, the employee executes the job*tasks, skills, duties and responsibilities* described in their job description in order to achieve the job *outcomes* and *results* desired by management. From this point in the process, the model next moves to the unique performance evaluation process modules that are a part of the model.

For purposes of this article, job performance is defined as the record of outcomes or results achieved from *specific* job activities or functions during a *specific* period of time. The outcomes from the process are used in making performance evaluation, internal staffing, and incentives management decisions, and training needs assessment (among others).

Performance Evaluation
The next step in the human resource management process is usually referred to as performance evaluation or merit rating. In this process, management compares an employee's (in some situations, a group of employees working on specific tasks) on-the-job performance against assessment *anchors* (specific expectations, measurement criteria or metrics set forth in the job description the employee is performing). However, although most organizations recognize the importance of job performance, and the periodic evaluation of job performance, as critically important keys to organizational success, few of them actually define clearly in measurable performance metrics *what* they are attempting to evaluate (Bernardin, 2007).

In many organizations, performance evaluations (merit ratings) are accomplished annually, using an evaluation instrument selected from the various types available. The more commonly applied methods include graphic rating scales, employee-to-employee comparison scales, factor comparison scales, behavior anchored rating scales, and management by objectives, among several others; each of these methods has a varying degree of validity and reliability.

We believe that one of the unique features of this teaching model is that performance assessment must be divided into *two separate assessments* in which, in the ideal situation, employees are rated or evaluated at two separate (different) times. These two ratings address the two major components of job performance described below:

Assessment of Job Behaviors
One set of assessment tools compares the employee's job performance *behaviors* against specific criteria related to how well an employee has mastered various behaviors (e.g., tasks, skills, abilities and responsibilities) management expects of employees, as set forth in an evaluation instrument, (e.g., a behavior-anchored rating scale, or "BARS" instrument). Different assessment scales are created for various blue-collar jobs, white-collar jobs, first line supervisors, middle management, and so forth.

In our teaching model, the *outcome* of this assessment becomes the *feedback loop input* into the *training and development* component of the model, as described above. This information is then used to design an appropriate job training agenda for each employee based on assessed training needs for each employee. Training is then delivered to the employee, with the expectation that enhanced knowledge, understanding, skills, etc., developed through training will then enhance the employee's future job performance during the *next* performance and evaluation cycle.

Assessment of Job Outcomes and Results
The second assessment measures the employee's job-related results or outcomes, that is, the degree to which the employee's job performance has produced those results and outcomes desired by management (as described in the job description).

One widely accepted strategy for assessing this component of job performance is the Management By Objectives (MBO) system. In MBO, management sets specific performance objectives (performance goals or metrics) the employee is expected to accomplish during the evaluation cycle; an employee's productivity is subsequently measured (assessed), and during this phase of the evaluation process, is assessed to determine whether those objectives/goals were actually achieved.

Our model uses the *results* of this assessment as another *feedback loop input* that goes into the *incentives management* component of the model. The information is used in making management decisions related to (a) wage or salary issues (e.g., step pay raise, piece rate incentive, bonus), (b) promotion from one level to the next within a job category, or disciplinary decisions (e.g., reduction in grade, layoff, discharge).

Back to Incentives Management
The second source of information flowing into the incentives management process is from the performance evaluation process (discussed in more detail below). Effectively executed, that information should include information related to the degree or level of satisfactory job performance achieved by *individual employees*.

Thus, if an employee successfully meets organizational performance standards, some form of incentive (reinforcement) would be applied to that employee to encourage similar or even better performance in the future. Likewise, if the employee's performance is substandard, some form of negative incentive would be applied to that employee in order to encourage better performance in the future. Examples of negative incentives include anything from withholding a positive incentive (e.g., disqualification for pay increase or a promotion), to reduction in pay, to various levels of disciplinary actions, to potential discharge from the organization.

When properly applied, application of appropriate incentives as noted above then flows outward into the job performance component presented in the model, thereby completing that part of the overall human resource management system.

Conclusion

Efficient and effective human resource management is appropriately perceived a complex, involved, and *interactive* process. The human resource management process can best be understood as a *system* consisting of several distinct sub-processes (modules) that must first be fully understood *individually*, then from a *holistic* or *systems* perspective, in order to manage those human resources efficiently and effectively. We believe our *Systems Model for Teaching Human Resource Management,* as discussed in the article, is both a *unique* and a *holisticsystem.* The model contains necessary feedback loops into other important modules within the model, thus linking the modules (and connecting them to other important functions), and completing the process.

We added one unique component to traditional perceptions of the process, and significantly modified another. Feedback loops point to, emphasize, and enable essential management control functions within the global model that are often either unstated or not illustrated, and thus are often not efficiently and effectively implemented and managed.

Incentives management is one unique aspect of the model. In addition, we divided accepted traditional explanations of what *performance evaluation* involves into *two* separate assessments. One important point the model stresses is that *job behavior* and *job outcome results* should be two distinct assessments that must be completed at *two separate (i.e., different* and *distinct) times* in order to avoid contamination of either process by referring to or using information generated in the other.

We strongly suggest that management should not attempt to evaluate employee job behaviors while employee incentives issues are being evaluated and discussed with an employee. One key objective of this separation is creation of an organizational culture that is much more supportive of enhanced future organizational outcomes, results and success. For example, separating the two assessments empowers a non-judgmental, and thus more effective, assessment of employee training and development needs (including design of an appropriate training agenda) for an employee (or group of employees) when *disconnected* from the incentive management functions that are related to employee job performance results and outcomes assessment.

Job behavior is measured against previously determined metrics and evaluation criteria. The human resource literature discusses several validated and reliable instruments an organization may use to complete this assessment.

In our model, the results from the *job behavior* component are fed back into the training and development component of the model where they are used to design training for employees based on observed behavior deficiencies and resulting needs assessment.

The *job outcomes or results* refer to how closely an employee's job performance has met the expected outcomes desired by management. The outcome of this procedure flows into the *incentives management* component of the model where it is used to make management decisions related to pay for performance issues, consideration for promotion, possible disciplinary actions, and similar incentives.

Future research related to our model may include revising, adding, separating, or combining various components of the model presented in this article. For example, Leonard (2000) has suggested that traditional *specific* job descriptions are "on their way out" of widespread use, to be replaced with *general* ones. Further, with increasing numbers of knowledge workers to be led and managed in contemporary working environments, as noted by Drucker (1993), Davenport (2005), and others, a separate or modified model may be necessary to explain these workers' unique situations and circumstances.

References

Bernardin HJ, 2007.Human Resource Management(4[th]ed.*).* New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Breaugh J., 1981. Relationships Between Recruiting Sources and Employee Performance, Absenteeism, and Work Attitudes. Academy of Management Journal*,* 24 (1): 142-147.

Breaugh J., 1992. Recruitment: Science and Practice. Boston: PWS-Kent.

Burnkrant S, 2003.Interrater Agreement of Incumbent Job Specification Importance Ratings: Rater, Occupation, and Item Effects. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.

Collins J, Muchinski P, 1993.An assessment of the construct validity of three job evaluation methods: A field experiment. Academy of Management Journal, 36(4): 895-904.

Davenport T, 2005.Thinking for a Living: How to get better performance and Results from Knowledge Workers. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

DeNisi A, Griffin R, 2011. HR. Mason, OH: South-Western.

Dessler G, 2012. Fundamentals of Human Resource Management(2[nd]ed.). Boston: Prentice Hall.

Dierdorf E, Morgeson F, 2009.Effects of Descriptors Specificity and Observability on Incumbent Work Analysis Ratings. Personal Psychology, 62: 601-628.

Drucker P,1954. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper & Row.

Drucker P, 1993. The Rise of the Knowledge Society. The Wilson Quarterly, 17: 2.

Frazis H, Loewenstein M, 2005.Reexamining the Returns to Training: Functional Form, Magnitude, and Interpretation. The Journal of Human Resources, 40 (2): 453-476.

Gardner T, 2005.InterfirmCompetition for Human Resources: Evidence from the Software Industry. Academy of Management Journal, 48 (2): 237-256.

Gomez-Mejia L, Balkin D, Cardy R, 2012.Managing Human Resources(7th ed.).Boston: Pearson.

Ivancevich JM,2007.HRM(10th ed.).New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Kleiman L, 2004. HRM: A Managerial Tool for Competitive Advantage(3rd ed.).Cincinnati: Atomic Dog.

Lanham E, 1955. Job Evaluation. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leonard S, 2000 August. The Demise of the Job Description.HR Magazine, 184.

Levitan S, 1956 October.[Review of the book Job Evaluation by E. Lanham].Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 10(1): 161-162.

Noe R,2010. Employee Training and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Noe R, Hollenbeck J, Gerhart B, Wright P, 2013.HRM(8th ed.).New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Rizzo J, House R, Lirtzman I, 1970.Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15(2): 150-163.

Tilove R, 1947. [Review of the book Job Evaluation by F. H. Johnson, R. W. Boise, D. Pratt] Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 1 (1): 160-161.

Weintraub R, Martineau J, 2002, June. The Just In Time Imperative. Training and Development, 56 (6): 50-58.

Zahra S, 2003, August. Peter F. Drucker's The Practice of Management. The Academy of Management Executive, 17 (3): 7-8.

A Systems Model:
Key components
of the HRM Process