

# “IMPACT OF JOB AND SKILLS PLANNING ON INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE”

**RANDRIANASOLO Jean de Dieu**

*PhD in Human Resources Management.*

*Prenslake Intercontinental University, Hungary*

**ANDRIANONY Victorien**

*Master of Conferences*

*University of Mahajanga, Madagascar*

**RANDRIANIRIANA Anjarasoa Mamilalaina**

*Master of Conferences*

*University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

**ANDRIANARIZAKA Marc Tiana**

*Doctor in cognitive sciences and applications*

*University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

## ABSTRACT

Globalisation and the evolution of competition are forcing companies to prioritise human resources. Indeed, human resources are becoming central to the success of companies. Innovation and creativity, on which the development of organisations depends, are the work of human action. The latter depend on the skills and motivation of the individuals they mobilise. As a result, human resource management has become a factor in the competitiveness of companies. Thus, it is important to know how to guide employees into careers that are better adapted to the skills and aptitudes they possess in order to ensure their performance. But the problem is how the forward-looking management of jobs can and skills contribute to the individual performance of employees? Through a sample of employees from large companies, this research aims to analyse the dependence of individual employee performance on GPEC.

**Keywords:** *Human resources - GPEC - Skills - employees - Performance*

---

## INTRODUCTION

The definition of human resources has changed significantly over time. Previously, human resource management referred to the management of people only. Now this has changed; as **Peretti** mentions in his book "Human Resource Management": To speak of human resources is not to consider that people are resources, but that people have resources. The human resources function used to refer only to personnel administration such as payroll management and employment contracts, but today's human resources management function allows for the mastery of more fundamental and specific areas. Job and skills planning (GPEC) is a concept to be exploited to ensure HRM performance.

The main objective of human resource management is the performance of the organisation by objectively exploiting the capabilities of human resources. Performance is the ability of an individual or a group to achieve the objectives that they have set for themselves or that have been set for them. Individual performance is the ability of an employee to meet the expectations expressed by his or her management, to satisfactorily fulfil the tasks attached to his or her position. Effective management of employee performance helps to motivate employees and give them the means to achieve their objectives.

The GPEC is surely one of the best tools used in human resources to manage employees and the work environment. As a tool used and a new concept to facilitate the management of human resources, the GPEC has many advantages for its users. These advantages concern the following points: firstly, it allows anticipating change and resource needs in order to obtain a better result and avoid risks, to favour coherence between strategy and HR orientations and to raise the levels of multi-skilling.

But skills management is difficult to implement in relation to the identification of skills, the observation of development and recognition can vary from one situation to another. Also, anticipating the needs of companies is often difficult in a context of constant change. Finally, the wishes of employees are not necessarily taken into consideration.

These contexts lead to an analysis of the role of forward-looking employment and skills management on the individual performance of employees. The problem that arises is therefore to know how GPEC contributes to the individual performance of employees?

The concept of competence management is part of the field of forward-looking employment and competence management. The term competence refers to the set of skills which is a person's ability, and to an individual's know-how which is his human behaviour. According to **Scheler (1998)**, the concept of competence is a combination of knowledge (savoir) and practices (savoir-faire) and its evaluation is carried out by performance.

So to speak of competence management is to speak of management, of the way in which a person or company steers an individual to be able to achieve the objectives with the strategies implemented.

This study therefore aims to understand the relationship between GPEC and individual employee performance. Based on the hypothesis that the GPEC contributes to individual performance, this analysis is based on the exploitation of data from an opinion survey of a sample of 153 employees of large Malagasy companies. The analysis of the results relating to their opinions on the GPEC within their company and their individual performance will serve to demonstrate the dependence between these two variables.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

GPEC is an anticipation and planning of the jobs and competences needed by a company. This simple definition of the GPEC has a double objective, firstly it allows to foresee the changes in the company in the future; secondly it also concerns the maintenance of employment and an efficient management of the employees' careers.

The objective of management planning is to project a company's human resources needs in the medium and long term. It must enable decisions to be taken and the human needs inherent in this strategy to be matched.

Thus, management planning must know how to analyse the past and identify all the trends to be taken into account before building the future. It is a method designed to anticipate HR needs in the short and medium term. Management planning aims to adapt jobs, staff and skills to the requirements arising from changes in the economic, social and legal environment.

For **Peretti (2007)**, forward-looking management of jobs and skills (GPEC) is an HR approach that consists of implementing and monitoring policies and practices aimed at reducing in advance the gaps between the company's needs and resources, both quantitatively (in terms of staff numbers) and qualitatively (in terms of skills); it is a tool at department level for anticipating HR needs.

According to **Gilbert (2006)**, GPEC would introduce the notion of time into management on a voluntary basis via appropriate analyses (age pyramids, statistical analyses) to shed light on certain HR issues (upstream) and HR performance management (downstream). It would thus make it possible to reduce the generation of reflection on the future and the decisions that should result from it.

Individual performance is the ability of an individual to achieve the goals that he or she has set or been given. Therefore, performance management aims to define the performance objective, activities and target according to the individual accountability plan and to measure performance periodically - annually or quarterly. Therefore, talking about performance often refers to the following concepts: result, achievement of objectives, effectiveness, efficiency and means used (**Gilbert 1980**). In other words, individual performance is the ability of the employee to meet the objectives of his or her job. Furthermore, performance is important to individuals in the sense that task accomplishment and high performance can be a source of satisfaction and feelings of mastery and pride.

The performance evaluation process consists of setting objectives, measuring their achievement, explaining any discrepancies and, above all, informing the decisions to be taken. This is why it is essential to approach it in terms of the purpose of performance and to specify what indicators of means, products or results are.

GPEC takes into consideration the future needs of the company so that it can anticipate the risks arising from these needs and perhaps at the same time contribute to the individual performance of employees.

## RESULTS

The identification of the respondents will allow us to further develop the analyses related to our study variables. Thus, the table below shows the information on the sampled respondents.

**Table 1: Identification of respondents**

		Frequencies
Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Male</li> <li>• Woman</li> </ul>	66.2% 33.8%
Age group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 40 ;</li> <li>• From 41 to 50 years old ;</li> <li>• Over 50 years old ;</li> </ul>	26.0% 28.6% 45.5%
EXPERIENCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 6 years old ;</li> <li>• 7-15 years;</li> <li>• over 15 years ;</li> </ul>	55.8% 17.5% 26.6%
OLD BUSINESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 6 years old ;</li> <li>• 7-15 years;</li> <li>• over 15 years ;</li> </ul>	14.3% 15.6% 70.1%
DIPLOMAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BEPC ;</li> <li>• LAC ;</li> <li>• BAC+2 ;</li> <li>• BAC+3 ;</li> <li>• BAC+4/5 and above;</li> </ul>	11.0% 22.7% 21.4% 13.6% 31.2%
CSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Department</li> <li>• Head of Department</li> <li>• Responsible for</li> <li>• Supervisory officer</li> <li>• Implementing agent</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	14.3% 27.3% 30.5% 14.3% 9.1% 4.6%

Source: Authors, 2020

### Characteristic of GPEC at company level

The following table summarizes employees' opinions of career management in their organizations according to response modalities measured by Likert scale.

**Table 2: Respondents' views on career management in their company**

Variables	Average	Standard deviation
<b><u>GPEC :</u></b>		
Items 8 : Existence of GPEC	4.38	1.990
Items 9: GPEC - an opportunity to be seized	4.63	1.711
Items 10: GPEC = career success	4.71	1.620
Items 11: Career path improved by GPEC	4.55	1.601

Source: Authors, 2020

For the four GPEC items (items 8, 9, 10 and 11), the respondents gave fairly positive answers, the majority ranging from "neither agree nor disagree to totally agree".

**Table 3: Analysis of the reliability of GPEC**

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items
0,912	7

Source: Authors, 2020

The GPEC variable has 7 elements, and the reliability analysis of these 4 elements gives a Cronbach's alpha of 0.912, which is well above average. These variables are therefore 91.2% reliable and very satisfactory.

The result proves a positive correlation between the socio-professional category and the GPEC with a correlation of 2.739, the higher the CSP, the more the person feels the need to have job and skills management.

**Table 4: Correlation test table between employee characteristics and career management**

Dimension	SEX	AGE	DIPLOMA	EXPERIENCE	OLD BUSINESS	CSP
GPEC	0.213	-0.036	-0.023	0.111	0.148	2.739**

### Individual performance assessment

With regard to individual performance, the respondents evaluated their performance positively, as the majority of responses ranged from "slightly agree to totally agree" on the four items selected.

**Table 5: Respondents' views on their individual performance**

Variables	Average	Standard deviation
<b><u>Individual performance :</u></b>		
Item 18 : Performing tasks efficiently and effectively	6.01	1.048
Item 19 : Skills needed to perform the job	6.18	0.923
Item 20 : Knowledge of weekly objectives	5.87	1.153
Item 21 : Achievement of weekly objectives	5.61	1.062

Source: Authors, 2020

The table below shows an approximate Chi-square of 285.568 and degree of freedom of 6 and with a significance level of 0.000 which is less than 0.005. This means that the items are factorizable. Factor analysis is the next step.

**Table 6: KMO index of individual performance**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index for measuring sampling quality.	,789	
Bartlett Sphericity Test	Chi-square approx.	285,568
	Ddl	6
	Meaning	,000

Source: Authors, 2020

Five items were used to evaluate individual performance, but four of them were retained for factor analysis. These 4 items are greater than 0.05 which means that they are all factorizable.

**Table 7: Total variance explained on individual performance**

Component	Initial eigenvalues			Sums extracted from the load square		
	Total	of variance	Cumulative	Total	of variance	Cumulative
1	2,805	70,116	70,116	2,805	70,116	70,116
2	,536	13,392	83,507			
3	,422	10,561	94,068			
4	,237	5,932	100,000			

Extraction method: Principal component analysis.

Source: Authors, 2020

After removing the questionable item, it was deduced that individual performance is represented by only one dimension or factorial axis. This model represents the initial value at 70.116%, which is a relevant result. The components of this dimension are illustrated in the table below.

**Table 8: Matrix of individual performance components**

	Component
	1
I am confident in my ability to perform the tasks assigned to me in my current job efficiently and effectively.	,865
I have the skills and experience required for my job	,880
I know what I want to achieve each week.	,783

I am able to achieve the goals set each week	,818
Extraction method: Principal component analysis. a. 1 component extracted.	

Source: Authors, 2020

Individual performance includes items relating to confidence in the ability to perform tasks effectively and efficiently, possession of the skills and experience required for the job, knowledge of objectives and achievement of objectives per week.

According to the reliability test that follows the four items are 85.2% reliable and very satisfactory, as the test of these four items gave a Cronbach's alpha of 0.852 which is well above 0.7.

**Table 1: Analysis of item reliability**

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items
,852	4

Source: Authors, 2020

### IMPACT OF GPEC ON INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE

The table below shows the dependency between the independent variable (GPEC) and the dependent variable (Individual performance).

**Table 10: ANOVA on GPEC and individual performance**

Model		Sum of squares	Ddl	Medium square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	62,525	6	10,421	0,547	0,772b
	Residue	2799,585	147	19,045		
	Total	2862,110	153			
2	Regression	466,749	7	66,678	4,064	0,000c
	Residue	2395,361	146	16,407		
	Total	2862,110	153			

a. Dependent variable : PERFORMANCE

b. Predictors: (Constant), YEARS\_2, Gender\_2, What is your socio-professional category, EXPERIENCES\_2, Degree-2, Age\_2

c. Predictors: (Constant), YEARS\_2, Gender\_2, What is your socio-professional category, EXPERIENCES\_2, Degree-2, Age\_2, GPEC

Source: Authors, 2020

This table shows the dependence of GPEC on performance. Here, model 1 shows a P-value of 0.772 greater than 0.5, so this model is not significant.

Model 2 gives a P-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05 and therefore this model is significant. Therefore, this model has a dependency of 40.64% with the dependent variable (individual performance).

The summary table of the models below shows that model 1 has a P-value of 0.772 which is greater than 0.05 so this model is not significant while model 2 on the other hand has a P-value of 0.000 so this model is significant.

**Table 11: Summary of models on GPEC and individual performance**

Model	R	R-two	R-two adjusted	Standard error of the estimate	Editing statistics				
					Variation of R-two	Change in F	ddl1	ddl2	Sig. Change in F
1	,148a	,022	-,018	4,36403	,022	,547	6	147	,772
2	,404b	,163	,123	4,05050	,141	24,638	1	146	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), YEARS\_2, Gender\_2, What is your socio-professional category, EXPERIENCES\_2, Degree-2, Age\_2

b. Predictors: (Constant), YEARS\_2, Gender\_2, What is your socio-professional category, EXPERIENCES\_2, Degree-2, Age\_2, GPEC

Source: Authors, 2020

- The R-squared value of model 1 is 2.2%,
- By introducing the explanatory variable which is the GPEC a variation of 14.1% is obtained which is why the result of R square is 16.3%.

The econometric modelling coefficient includes the percentage coefficient of the variable

**Table 12: Coefficient of correlation**

Model		Non-standardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Standard error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	31,462	3,077		10,224	,000
	What is your socio-professional category?	,086	,304	,027	,283	,778
	Age_2	-,677	,589	-,130	-1,149	,252
	Diploma-2	-,339	,311	-,110	-1,090	,278
	Genre_2	-,206	,762	-,023	-,271	,787
	EXPERIENCES_2	-,130	,459	-,026	-,283	,778
	OLD_2	,437	,767	,074	,570	,570
2	(Constant)	28,428	2,921		9,733	,000
	What is your socio-professional category?	-,041	,284	-,013	-,145	,885
	Age_2	-,089	,560	-,017	-,158	,874
	Diploma-2	-,492	,290	-,160	-1,696	,092
	Genre_2	,046	,709	,005	,065	,948
	EXPERIENCES_2	-,307	,427	-,061	-,719	,473
	OLD_2	-,554	,739	-,094	-,750	,454
GPEC	,277	,056	,395	4,964	,000	

a. Dependent variable : PERFORMANCE

Source: Authors, 2020

According to this table, in model 1: the control variables are not significant. Whereas in model 2, with the variable GPEC a significant P-value is obtained. As a result, 27.7% of the variation in the dependent variable (individual job performance) is explained by the GPEC.

GPEC exists first and foremost to meet the needs of organisations. Thus, it is committed to a better anticipation of the adaptation of key skills to the evolution of jobs. GPEC enables HRM managers to do their job properly, which will then have a positive impact on individual performance. Indeed, according to the results of our survey, the majority of our respondents' answers indicate that GPEC is indispensable for the individual performance of employees.

According to the ANOVA, 40.64% of individual performance in this company is explained by the GPEC. Thus, the implementation of the GPEC in this company favours the individual performance of employees. This validates our hypothesis.

## CONCLUSION

In practice, human resources is a heterogeneous department that deals with many different tasks. It plays both a strategic and an operational role, and has dealt with all the support functions of the company. The forward-looking management of jobs and skills is an important source of mobilisation of human resources. It also plays a very important role insofar as it anticipates future changes likely to occur in the company. Therefore, in order to see the individual performance of employees, it is necessary to take into account the GPEC in the company. The analysis of the dependencies between the individual performance of employees and the opinion of workers on the GPEC through a sample of employees of large companies has made it possible to affirm that the GPEC plays a preponderant role in the individual performance of employees.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

**ARNAUD Stéphanie, SOUFYANE Frimousse and PERETTI Jean-Marie;** "gestion personnalisée des ressources humaines: implications et enjeux", 2009.

**HOSDAIN Marie Françoise,** "Réussir une GPEC en 9 étapes", 2006.

**JACQUET Stephan,** "Performance Management", 2017.

**LE BOULAIRE Martine and RETOURS Didier,** "Gestion des compétences, stratégie et performance de l'entreprise: quel est le rôle de la fonction RH? », 2001.

**MOHAMED Bayad;** "Gestion Stratégique des Ressources Humaines: Fondements et modèles", 2004.

**PATRICK Gilbert;** "la gestion prévisionnelle des ressources humaines: histoire et perspectives"; 2006.

**GYSLAINE Samson-Saulnier;** "Performance: everyone's business... Everyone's responsibility", 2001.

**CHRISTOPHE Nordman;** "diffusion of human capital and firm effects", 2000.

