

:

*

:

.1

.(Boice and Kleiner,1997: 197)

.(Saad, 2001: 2)

.(Wiese and Buekey, 1998: 1)

.(Woodford and Jeane: 1)

.2006/2/8

2005/4/18

*

/

2002

(167-150 :1979)	.1
(167-150 :1979)	.2
(86-61 :1991)	.3
	.4
	.5
-307 :1994 2592-2537 :1995)	(
3-1 :1996 103-84 :1993 344	.6
.(Gill, 1998: 113-114)
	(
	.7
)
308-277 :1994)	(
.(174-129 :1991 81-63 :1991	.8

.1988 (1) -)
 .1998 (1) - (Boice, (Allen, 1994: 1-24) (114-113 :1996
 .2002 (55) - (Saad, 2001: 2) (Mcbey, 1997: 197-201) 1994: 201)
 .(Wiese, 1998: 1)

1966 (23)

1966 :

1988

:

-

(57)

-

(Allan, 1994: 12)

(Boice and Kleiner, 1997: 18- (Mcbey, 1994: 24-26)

(Woodford and Mase, (Longenecker, 1999) 24)

.(Losky, 2002:11) (Lemon, 1998: 6) 2002: 1-8)

.2

-

-

) 1966

(

1966

23

:

-

.1966 (23)

-

	-		
	-		-
1966	-		
	-		-
	:		
	-		
(1988)	-		-
	(50)		
	-	1988	(1)
		1966	
		1998	(1)
1988			
			-
1988			
		1998	
2002	(55)		

(289 :)

:

()

1966

. 2002

.3

(1

.(%87)

:

:

-

(4-1)

:

-

)

%92.5

%84

(

%14

(2

%58

%35

(299)

(160)

(%53.5)

(14)

(1)

5.5	8	
9.6	14	
44.5	65	
40.4	59	
100	146	

(%48.8)

(146)

(2)

12.3	18	25-18
37.7	55	35-26
42.5	62	45-36
7.5	11	46
100	146	

(15)

):

(

(5)

(1) :

(3)

(%48)
(%39)
(%13) (%19.9)

13.7	20	
28	41	
14.4	21	
43.8	64	
100	146	

(4)

(%41) (5)
(%35)
(%24)

34.9	51	5-1
19.9	29	10-6
22.6	33	15-11
14.4	21	20-16
8.2	12	21
100	146	

.4

(5)

4-1

:

(%47)

(%34)

(6)

(15)

(14)

(%48)

(%39)

(4)

(%35)

(
(3.69 3.97 3.92)

.(4)

(2.96)

(5)

%41

(5)

146 %100	68 %46.6	29 %19.9	49 %33.6	.1
146 %100	57 %39	19 %13	70 %47.9	.2
146 %100	57 %39	19 %13	70 %47.9	.3
146 %100	60 %41	35 %24	51 %34.9	.4

(6)

0.48	4.66	
0.81	4.13	
0.53	4.66	
0.67	4.66	
0.73	4.51	
0.81	4.23	
0.69	4.28	
0.90	4.20	
0.97	3.92	
0.95	4.06	
0.87	4.39	
0.91	3.97	
1.27	2.96	
1.35	3.69	
0.58	4.66	
0.94	3.28	

(7)

)

(

%72.6

%18.5

%8.9

.05 0.01

(8)

(9)

(0.503 0.563 1.443 2.271)

F

()

Sign.	F	DF	Sum of Squares	
0.770	0.376	3	0.944	
0.887	0.213	3	0.534	
0.467	0.861	3	2.158	
0.854	0.333	3	1.114	

.(0.05) = *

.(0.01) = **

(7)

19.2	28	
53.4	78	
18.5	27	
8.9	13	
100	146	

(10)

(8)

[()]

()

()

.(0.01)

Sign.	F	DF	Sum of Squares	
0.682	0.503	3	1.158	
0.240	1.443	3	3.322	
0.090	2.271	3	5.23	
0.690	0.563	3	1.729	

.(0.01) = **

(3.28)

(6)

)

(

(9)

(11)

()

0.861

F

0.213

(0.376) (0.672)
 .(0.1)

(10)

0.780	0.439	0.383	1.061	0.549	0.713	0.703	0.472	
0.760	0.467	0.983	0.056	0.834	0.288	0.574	0.671	
0.522	0.813	0.476	0.844	0.743	0.415	0.772	0.374	
0.564	0.747	0.241	1.439	0.155	1.815	0.615	0.604	
0.398	1.034	0.406	0.986	0.257	1.385	0.616	0.603	
0.398	1.034	0.435	0.924	0.506	0.787	0.654	0.544	
0.838	0.357	0.752	0.402	0.180	1.685	0.287	1.290	
0.653	0.615	0.196	1.613	0.108	2.119	0.037	3.025	
0.839	0.356	0.540	0.707	0.985	0.051	0.666	0.527	
0.926	0.220	0.655	0.543	0.326	1.177	0.960	0.100	
0.612	0.674	0.343	1.134	0.701	0.475	0.100	2.178	
0.958	0.159	0.800	0.335	0.754	0.399	0.290	1.279	
0.918	0.233	0.013	3.921	0.827	0.298	0.579	0.662	
0.12	3.548	0.040	2.951	0.439	0.916	0.232	1.471	
0.134	1.836	0.0	1.938	0.194	1.622	0.596	0.634	

.(0.05) = *
 .(0.01) = **

(11)

0.376	0.672	

.(0.01) = **

:

.5

:

.2

.1

(2002)

.3

(4)

()

.2

.4

.5

.6

.3

:

.1

1987

.166-131 55
1992

1979

:

-7 76

.167-150

1991

.39

1994

-61

70

.83

.308-277 3 10
1995

1987

.2592-2537 6 22

1980

1991

.62-48

.271-270

1996

.174-129 2
1994

:

.113 67

34

2

1987

.344-307

.146

1989

:

1993

.103-84 4 20
1986

.8420-425 38
1988

.39-38 49

.4 36

- McBey, Kenneth. 1994. Perfecting Performance Appraisal. *Security Management*, 38 (11): 24-26.
- Neal, Jr. and James, E. 2001. Doing Performance Appraisals Right. *Credit Union Executive Newsletters*, 27 (29).
- Saad, Germaine H. Strategic Performance Evaluation: Descriptive and Perspective Analysis. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 101 (8m): 390-399.
- Sanderson, Ian. 2001. Performance Management, Evaluation and Learning in Modern Local Government. *Public Administration*, 79 (2).
- Vallance, Sarah. 1999. Performance Appraisal Singapore-Thailand and the Philippines: A Cultural Perspective. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 58 (4).
- Wiese, Danielle S. and Buckley, Ronald M. 1998. The Evaluation of the Performance Appraisal Process, *Journal of Management History*, 4 (3): 233-249.
- Woodford, Kelly and Mase, Jenne D. 2002. Employee Performance Evaluation: Administrating and Writing them Correctly in the Multinational Settings. *Equal Opportunities International*, 21 (4):1-8.
- Allan, Peter. 1994. Designing and Implementing an Effective Performance Appraisal System. *Review of Business*, 16 (2): 1-24.
- Anumba, C. F. and Scott, D. 2002. Performance Evaluation of Knowledge-based Systems for Subsidence Management, *Structural Survey*, 19 (5): 222-232.
- Boice, Deborah, and Kleiner, Brain. 1997. Designing Effective Performance Appraisal System. *Work Study*, 46 (6):197-201.
- Chan, Donald C. K. et al. 2002. An Application of Fuzzy Sets to Process Performance Evaluation. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 13 (4): 237-245.
- Gill, Brain. 1998. Effective Performance Appraisals. *American Printer*, 221 (5): 1-3.
- Lemon, Kathryn. 1998. 10 Ways to Improve Employee Evaluation. *Physician Management*, 138 (6): 6.
- Longenecker. 1999. Clinton. Creating Effective Performance Appraisals. *Industrial Management*, 41 (5): 18-24.
- Losky, Bob. 2002. How to Conduct a Performance Appraisal. *Public Management*, 45, 84(3): 11.

...

Evaluation of Employees' Performance in Jordan Civil Service Statute: Perspectives of the Employees of the Ministry of Interior in the Northern Governorates of Jordan (A Field Study)

*Muhamad A. Al-Agiel and Ahmad M. Abdel-Haleem**

ABSTRACT

The study aims at identifying the evaluation of employee performance in Jordan. The study underlines the components that positively influence the process of evaluating the performance. It also identifies the elements that impede the whole system of evaluation. In addition, the study explores the relevant points of view of the employees at the Ministry of Interior. On the one hand, the study determines the extent to which the evaluation system delivers its main objectives, on the other hand, the study identifies the level of competence inherent in the components of the evaluation process.

The study finds out that the Civil Service Code lacks certain important components that focus on the need for significant items such as knowledge of relevant procedures, training workshops, desire to work and skillful decision making.

Moreover, the study concludes that the demographic characteristics of the sample members, i.e., the official position, age, level of education, years of experience, have no influence on their tendency towards emphasizing the necessity of setting standards for the evaluation of employee performance.

The study also notes that there is a feeling of unfairness among the sample in the way the system was applied. Finally, the study states that there is a strong correlation between the level of satisfaction among employees and their feelings about the issues of fairness and objectivity.

Keywords: Civil Service Statute, Evaluation of Employee Performance.

* Department of Public Administration, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan. Received on 18/4/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 8/2/2006.