

CrossRef DOI of original article:

1 Scan to know paper details and author's profile

2

3 *Received: 1 January 1970 Accepted: 1 January 1970 Published: 1 January 1970*

4

5 **Abstract**

6

7 *Index terms—*

8 **1 INTRODUCTION**

9 The present research work with the theme "the process of performance evaluation in the civil service: a
10 comparative analysis of the legal to the practice of performance evaluators in the district government of
11 Nacarôa", focuses on the process of performance evaluation, as an instrument for measuring the progress or
12 setback of employees as public servants. As has been the practice of many public administration institutions, this
13 measurement is made using the so-called evaluation forms. In addition to these records, it is required, by those
14 who conduct, the mastery of the procedures to be observed by the evaluators in the operational field, as well as
15 the actions that take place in such a way that the employee works London Journal of Research in Humanities
16 and Social Sciences in the direction of results, ensuring compliance with the plans and deadlines.

17 It is in this context that we intend to assess the perception that officials of the institutions of the District
18 Government of Nacarôa have about the performance evaluation, in order to identify the needs of the Development
19 Plan resulting from this process; understand the organizational environment variables that can positively or
20 negatively affect the performance of the evaluated person and the feedback given to the employee about their
21 performance; and to establish a comparison between the practice of the institutions of the District Government
22 of Nacarôa, with the one recommended in. Decree No. 54/2009 of 12 October, which aims to make institutions
23 productive and competitive, allowing employees to be recognized for their professionalism.

24 In order for this performance evaluation process to be effective and efficient, institutions are called on to take
25 action to create change, ensuring a stance that meets the requirements of the regulation, thereby seeking to
26 improve the services provided by citizens. In this perspective, we also try to understand the extent to which the
27 performance of each employee is conducted as a human resources management mechanism to improve the provision
28 of services. Thus, in the context of the evaluation of employees, the institutions of the Public Administration of
29 the District Government of Nacarôa are called to observe the legal instrument of performance evaluation, for a
30 feedback process, to review their strategies and working methods, so that the effects of the tendency to entropy
31 are recycled, oxygenated and made capable of surviving in turbulent and changing environments.

32 It is necessary that, when evaluating employees, institutions free themselves from tendencies to subjectivity, so
33 as to move away from the space for questioning in Human Resources Management, or even from the questioning
34 about the professional preparation of evaluators for the correct use of Decree No. 54/2009, of October 12.

35 **2 II. TEXTUAL DEVELOPMENT**

36 In textual development, we present the theoretical framework of several authors who addressed this theme on
37 the evaluation of performance in the public function. Performance evaluation is a systematic assessment of
38 the performance of each employee or worker in the position and their potential for future development. Every
39 evaluation is a process to stimulate or judge the value, excellence, qualities of anyone. It is a fact that those who
40 judge or evaluate may, of course, not consider the negative aspects of the person to be evaluated. It is in this
41 context that, in this research, we will focus, in a special way, on the performance evaluation process, that is, the
42 practice that conducts this process in the district government of Nacarôa.

43 **3 III. THE CONCEPT OF EVALUATION**

44 For the definition of performance evaluation in the civil service, we use Neto (2014) which refers to it as a scientific
45 domain and a social practice, increasingly indispensable, to characterize, understand, disseminate and improve

6 THE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

46 a wide variety of problems affecting contemporary societies, such as the quality of education and education, the
47 provision of health care, distribution of resources and poverty.

48 Evaluating is, first of all, putting into practice and making work the constant structural element that allows
49 to identify the evaluation facts, because it characterizes them ??Neto, 2014). It can also be understood as
50 the strategy that demonstrates the reality of each institution in the scope of the performance and provision of
51 service. Furthermore, to evaluate is to enrich the work of civil servants and civil service institutions, because
52 when the problems or satisfaction of each sector are discovered, the mechanisms to solve or further increase
53 positive achievements will be searched.

54 We understand the evaluation as the process of measuring the degree of compliance with what has been planned,
55 the level of implementation, progress and setbacks recorded, to outline the best strategies for overcoming the
56 future plans of the institution, i.e. the process of measuring the London Journal of Research in Humanities and
57 Social Sciences achievements or meeting the objectives outlined by an area, institution and services.

58 Therefore, the evaluation always implies the relationship between who evaluates (evaluator or evaluators) and
59 who is evaluated, and it is up to the former to evaluate, reflect, analyze certain aspects -which will be evaluated
60 -considered as significant. If there is evaluation, there is judgment, which takes place in a context of valorization,
61 which requires proper care with the use of power and with the greater or lesser influence of subjectivity in the
62 act of judging.

63 4 IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CONCEPTS: HIS- 64 TORICAL EVOLUTION

65 Over the years, numerous reflections have emerged around the evaluation of performance in the management of
66 organizations. According to Grote (2002), references on performance evaluation emerged more than 100 years
67 ago.

68 There are references that indicate the year 1842, in which the public service, in the United States, developed
69 a performance evaluation system to evaluate its workers. In 1918, General Motor's also developed an evaluation
70 system to evaluate its executives ??Chiavenato, 1996).

71 5 Performance Evaluation Nature

72 From the establishment of goals/objectives for the organizational system and the stipulation of performance stan-
73 dards, the performance evaluation consists in the analysis of the information associated with the measurements
74 of the costs of the activities and their relationship with the actions of the people (Silva, 1999).

75 The above author believes that while the adoption of the costs of activities, such as performance indicators,
76 is a dimension of the evaluation, the observation/analysis of cost drivers provides other essential factors for
77 evaluations of other dimensions, such as quality and time. The factors causing the costs of the activities identify
78 the activities that consume resources while converting inputs in to products. Therefore, organizations seek
79 to develop procedures that involve and commit employees to new challenges. In this way, human resources
80 management is currently a determining factor in the success of organisations.

81 In terms of human resources management, performance evaluation has played a prominent role in that it
82 can have significant consequences on productivity, either directly, as a performance control process or indirectly,
83 through its relations with the selection, training, professional development, promotion and remuneration of the
84 organization (Caetano, 1996).

85 6 The Instruments Used in the Performance Evaluation

86 In this section, we present the instruments used in the evaluation of employee performance in public administra-
87 tion. These instruments are referenced in the approaches of several authors, as presented below. Bergamini (1992)
88 cit. in Silva (1999) presents two groups of instruments: the first group is related to direct or absolute evaluation,
89 in which the individual is considered the "center of interest" of the evaluator, being observed its performance
90 pattern as opposed to what is desirable in his work. The second group concerns the relative assessment or by
91 comparison, in which the individual positioned in a working group (his team) and verified his "level of efficiency".
92 It considers the choice of one of these methods as being "partial and dangerous", stating that there is a need to
93 use both groups.

94 For the first group, the best known instruments are:

95 ? Verbal Reports: describes the "behavior" of each individual at work. ? Written Reports: the "behavior" of
96 each individual is described in the form of a report.

97 ? Composition of Analytical Charts: based on a set of pre-established criteria, the evaluator only identifies
98 where the evaluated one fits. The points are connected and a description of the profile of the evaluated person
99 is given.

100 ? Descriptive Patterns: from a set of characteristics of specific positions, the evaluator should point out the
101 statement that "best describes the evaluated".

102 ? Checklist: from a series of sentences, the evaluator should identify the ones that "best describe the subject".

103 For the second group, the best known instruments are:

104 ? Classification System: the evaluator will have to identify, in the group, the best and worst of the individuals,
105 within a scale. ? Binary or Peer comparison: the evaluator compares the evaluated with another of the group,
106 "in each trait or performance characteristic".

107 ? Forced Evaluation System: used especially with large groups and for the difficulty of using Binary
108 Comparison. The evaluator should group the evaluated into similar sets and, from a scale, compare them.

109 **7 V. METHODOLOGY**

110 In the methodology we present the method we chose for this research in order to have the answer to the research
111 question. In this research, we focus on the comparative method. Fachin (2005) understands that this method
112 consists of investigating things or facts and explaining them according to their similarities and differences.
113 Generally, the comparative method addresses two series or facts of a similar nature, taken from social media
114 or from another area of knowledge, in order to detect what is common to both.

115 Focused on studying similarities and differences, this method makes comparisons with the aim of verifying
116 similarities and explaining divergences. When dealing with the explanations of phenomena, the comparative
117 method allows analyzing the concrete data, deducing constant, abstract or general elements present in them
118 (Prodanov&Freitas, 2013).

119 Being a qualitative research, using the comparative method, in which we perspective obtain the answers of
120 the research questions and variables, naturally, we used the techniques of content analysis, as an instrument that
121 helps in the categorization of the questions enunciated in the semi-structured interview conducted in the five
122 institutions in research.

123 **8 Type of Research**

124 This research is qualitative in nature, because we seek to analyze the perceptions of the employees responsible
125 for the process of evaluation of performance in the civil service. Considering that the method of this research is
126 comparative, we chose qualitative research, guided by the interpretative process and the research questions and
127 the theoretical-methodological framework functioned as a compass in the moments of analysis and interpretation
128 of the data, guiding our gaze, guiding us to the participants of the research where the interpretation orbited.

129 **9 The Nature**

130 This research is basic, which aims to generate new knowledge useful to serve in the analysis of the perception of
131 employees responsible for the performance evaluation process, as a practice of human resources management in
132 public administration institutions in the district government of Nacarôa. Prodanov and Freitas (2013) define basic
133 research as being one that aims to generate new knowledge useful for the advancement of science without intended
134 practical application. It involves universal truths and interests. By opting for basic research, for this study, we
135 wanted to expand knowledge and understanding of the practices conducted in the performance evaluation process
136 in the District Government of Nacarôa.

137 **10 The Objectives**

138 The general objective of this study is to analyze the perceptions of officials responsible for the process of assessing
139 the performance of civil servants in the civil service, so, as to the objectives, it is descriptive. It is in this
140 perspective that Prodanov and Freitas (2013) base that descriptive research is responsible for observing, recording,
141 analyzing and ordering data, without manipulate them, that is, without interference from the researcher. It seeks
142 to find out how often a fact occurs, its nature, its characteristics, causes, relationships with other facts. Thus, to
143 collect such data, specific techniques are used, among which stand out the interview, the form, the questionnaire,
144 the test and the observation.

145 London

146 **11 The Approach**

147 As for the approach, this is a qualitative research.

148 In the qualitative approach, the scientist aims to deepen his understanding of the phenomena he studies -
149 actions of individuals, groups or organizations in their environment or social context -interpreting them according
150 to the perspective of the subjects themselves who participate in the situation, without worrying about numerical
151 representativeness, statistical generalizations and linear relations of cause and effect (Guerra, 2014). Therefore,
152 with this study, we sought knowledge about the practices of the employees responsible for the performance
153 evaluation process in the institutions of the District Government of Nacarôa, in order to contribute to the
154 improvement of the quality of human resources management of the Public Administration, that is, we seek to
155 understand how this process is being managed, so that we could bring answers to the challenges imposed on
156 them.

157 **12 The Procedures**

158 As for the procedures, this research is a case study. Prodanov&Freitas (2013) report that this consists of collecting
159 and analyzing information about a particular individual, a family, a group or a community, in order to study
160 various aspects of their life, according to the subject of the research.

161 In this sense, we qualify as a case study, because, from the five institutions of the District Government of
162 Nacarôa, we thoroughly researched the performance evaluation process, because we found that there was a
163 tendency to non-comply with the evaluation procedures established by SIGEDAP. Therefore, this tendency on
164 the part of the evaluators in the evaluation process is a basis in the case study research procedures.

165 **13 Study Participants**

166 The principals of schools are participants in this research; district service directors; heads of offices; heads of
167 administrative posts and localities, a total of 18 participants involved in the process evaluation of employee
168 performance.

169 Each participant was assigned a code, as a way to safeguard their identity, for ethical reasons.

170 In Table 1, we present the distribution of participants, for each institution where the research took place and
171 its codes. The interviewees were classified as "Performance Evaluators", and we used the following codes: AD1,
172 AD2, (...) and AD18.

173 **14 Content Analysis**

174 Content analysis is a technique of information processing that allows inferences, based on an explicit logic, of
175 messages whose characteristics have been inventoried and systematized, is therefore the transition from description
176 to interpretation ??Vala, 1987;War, 2006).

177 Thus, considering the objectives of the research and according to the problem addressed, we are anchored
178 in two instruments of analysis, namely: Content analysis, to answer the second question of London Journal of
179 Research in Humanities and Social Sciences the research in which it was intended to analyze what has been
180 the practice of the officials responsible for the Performance Evaluation process in the institutions of the District
181 Government of Nacarôa; (e) category analysis (which consists of decomcommenting the text in to units and
182 categories), to measure the interviewee's attitudes, taking into account the opinions, acts or reactions in certain
183 objects.

184 **15 VI. DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES AND INSTRU-
185 MENTS**

186 We developed this study based on an interview addressed to performance evaluators to describe the mechanisms
187 or instruments used in the evaluation process of employees in the institutions where our research took place, then
188 compared to verify whether they fit the legally established practices. As for data collection instruments, in this
189 research we used the interview technique.

190 **16 VII. DATA ANALYSIS**

191 In this subchapter, we analyze the data from the interview addressed to the 5 institutions of the District
192 Government of Nacarôa: SDEJT, SDSMAS, SDAE, SDPI and SSD. With the interview we intended to confirm
193 the occurrence or not of the problem raised in this research: Employees do not care about their performance
194 assessments, often they worry only when administrative acts are about to be carried out (promotion, progression,
195 career change, appointment in service committee and definitive appointment) in their institutions.

196 Below we present the categories of analysis and the speech fragments of the interviews.

197 **17 Table 2: Categories of discourse analysis and fragmentation
198 of the Interviews of the AD**

199 **18 Category Speech Fragments**

200 The practice and use of the performance evaluation instrument

201 Of the 18 research subjects, 17 answered that they had heard about performance evaluation, through the
202 evaluation forms, an instrument that serves to measure the degree of compliance with the objectives, plans
203 and goals outlined in the Institution. (AD2; AD3; AD18). AD1, although AD11 understands that the
204 performance evaluation is subdivided into two parts: the first part in which public administration institutions
205 are evaluated during the sessions of the district government, by quarter; and the second part that is addressed
206 to employees.

207 The responsibility and periodicity of the performance evaluation

208 The 18 interviewees answered that the performance evaluation process is the responsibility of the competent
209 authority and that the heads of the subsectors evaluate the subordinate employees and, in turn, they are evaluated

210 by their respective hierarchical superiors. Regarding periodicity, they answered that the evaluation is done once a
211 year (AD1; AD2;, AD18).

212 **19 Presentation and monitoring of annual activity plan**

213 Of the 18 interviewees, they answered that they presented their activity plans, according to the Performance
214 Evaluator (AD1; AD2; AD4; AD5; AD6; AD7; AD8; AD9; AD10; AD11; AD12; AD13; AD14; AD15; AD16 and
215 AD18).

216 Respondents AD3 and AD17 stated that, in their institutions, not all employees present annual activity plans.

217 **20 Communication in the performance evaluation process**

218 The monitoring of the annual plans of activities of the employees, which is carried out quarterly and/or every
219 six months to verify their degree of compliance, is that it keeps them in permanent communication with the
220 evaluated and also stressed that, in case of need, the plans are adjusted (AD4, AD8, AD9, AD13, AD15 and
221 AD18). Respondents (AD3 and AD17), this is not always the case, because there are employees who do not
222 present their activity plans, it is not possible to establish any kind of dialogue with them.

223 **21 London Journal of Research in Humanities and**

224 The professional suitability of evaluators in the performance evaluation process

225 The interviewees AD3 and AD17 answered that the process of performance evaluation for human resources
226 management, in force in their institutions, is ineffective.

227 The interviewees AD1, AD2, AD4, AD5 and AD12, during the performance evaluation process, the evaluator
228 is not always in good condition to evaluate the employee, because, like any human being, he can make errors of
229 understanding.

230 **22 The effectiveness of the performance evaluation process**

231 The interviewees (AD3 and AD17) of the 18 participants interviewed assumed that they have no mastery of the
232 aspects considered in the performance evaluation process at SIGEDAP;

233 The remaining 16 interviewees (AD1; AD2; AD4; AD5; AD6; AD7; AD8; AD9; AD10; AD11; AD12; AD13;
234 AD14; AD15; AD16 and AD18) answered that the mechanisms/aspects that have used/considered to evaluate
235 the performance of employees are included in SIGEDAP.

236 **23 Source: Own**

237 **24 VIII. DISPLAY OF THE CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS 238 OF THE INTERVIEW DATA**

239 The first category of content analysis (Domain of the use of performance evaluation instrument), which we used,
240 in the interview script, as a data collection instrument, was defined, with the summative purpose of analyzing
241 the process of performance evaluation in the civil service: a comparative analysis of the legal to the practice
242 of performance evaluators in the district government of Nacarôa. According to the results, the performance
243 evaluators revealed to have the perception of the existence of SIGEDAP, as an instrument used by the evaluators
244 in the sectors or offices of public administration institutions.

245 In this category, the results led us to conclude that the 18 interviewees have heard about the performance
246 evaluation and that it is addressed to employees, using the performance evaluation form, the heads of the offices
247 and the hierarchical superiors of public administration institutions, in order to measure the degree of compliance
248 with the objectives, plans and targets outlined in the institution.

249 In the second category (Responsibility and periodicity of the performance evaluation), we wanted to analyze
250 the perception of the evaluators about their responsibility as well as the periodicity of the performance evaluation
251 in the institutions of the Civil Service. According to the results, we can conclude that the interviewees know
252 who is responsible for doing the performance evaluation, as well as their periodicity, because of the 18 interviewees,
253 16 answered that the competent authority to evaluate the performance of employees in public administration
254 institutions are the hierarchical superiors of each sector and that it is done every six months, but the evaluation on
255 the verification of compliance with the objectives, plans and targets the evaluation has been quarterly, although
256 2 of the participants have replied that this evaluation is done annually and, this periodicity, has not facilitated
257 the proper monitoring of the activities carried out by the evaluated.

258 Through the results, we can conclude that, for the research subjects, evaluating the performance of employees
259 in public administration institutions means seeking to formulate judgments about their competence; and certify
260 the competence of the evaluator for the exercise of professional activity, as well as its impact on career progression.

261 The third category of content analysis (Presentation and monitoring of annual activity plan) had the purpose
262 of inferring the monitoring of activities and the dialogue between the evaluator and the evaluated. Of the
263 total number London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences of interviewees, 16 Performance
264 Evaluators stated that the follow-up, to subordinates, it is through plans of activities that they must present

25 IX. CONSIDERATIONS

265 to their hierarchical superiors, as a presupposition of the process of dialogue and communication between them.
266 The remaining two respondents reported that it is not often that all employees submit annual activity plans.
267 Therefore, it can be concluded that the evaluation process, in the institutions of the District Government of
268 Nacarôa, complies with the provisions of SIGEDAP, which recommends in point (b) of Article 10 (1) and article
269 10 (b) that officials must submit their annual activity plans, which may, for significant reasons, be adjusted.

270 In this category, the results are relatively controversial, because some claim that the periodicity of monitoring
271 the activities plans of employees is annual, while others claim that it is done every six months. And a third group
272 that states that, in these institutions, officials do not present the activity plan and do not monitor the activities
273 of the evaluated.

274 In the fourth category of analysis (Communication in the performance evaluation process), relating to
275 communication, in the performance evaluation process, which allows the evaluator to monitor the annual activity
276 plans of the evaluated, the objectives were: to understand whether there has been communication in the
277 performance evaluation process in the institutions of the Public Administration, in the district government
278 of Nacarôa; to analyze the level of implementation of the scheduled activities, their adjustment, when there is
279 deviation of the plans, objectives and targets, as well as the degree of compliance with the deadlines set; and
280 identify the mechanisms used in the assessment of officials in their sectors/offices. The results of this category lead
281 us to conclude that, for the implementation of the evaluation, it is practical to use the performance evaluation
282 forms. It is known that human beings have an ability to change and adapt/adapt to functions, as people are
283 increasingly unpredictable, so it is necessary to establish more and more means and instruments to monitor
284 and monitor the evaluation process throughout the year. Therefore, in the institutional context, performance
285 evaluation is now mandatory and necessary, and assumes a capital importance, in the promotion and promotion
286 of improving people's performance and, consequently, of the success of public administration institutions.

287 In the fifth category of analysis (Professional adequacy of evaluators for the performance evaluation process),
288 related to the participation of respondents in induction processes (training, training and training) in performance
289 evaluation subjects in the institutions of the district government of Nacarôa, the results show the existence of a
290 dichotomy: one half of the respondents (AD1, AD2, AD8, AD9, AD11, AD14, AD15, AD16 and AD18) declares
291 that it has participated in at least one induction (training, training or training), while the other half (AD3, AD4,
292 AD5, AD6, AD7, AD10, AD12, AD13 and AD17), declares never to have participated. This disparity, over the
293 domain of SIGEDAP, is probably the result of the lack of frequent reading of the instrument for the consolidation
294 of knowledge acquired during the evaluation process.

295 In this category, the results may lead us to conclude that the officials responsible for the evaluation process
296 understand that the convictions for assessing the performance of officials in their respective sectors, may vary
297 depending on the mood, availability, or fatigue state of the evaluator at the time of evaluation, which often tends
298 to be more subjective than integrated by lack of training, training or training, which would allow the mastery of
299 the instrument that guides this process in the civil service. Therefore, the evaluators with training are those who
300 realize that the performance evaluation process is the expression of what each is most sensitive, in addition to
301 the impression immediately produced (a given evaluator can give more importance to the mastery of objectives,
302 even if the exercise is of attendance, and the other to the presentation, for example).

303 In the sixth category of analysis (Effectiveness of the performance evaluation process), we address London
304 Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences the practice that conducts the process of evaluating the
305 performance of employees in the institutions of the District Government of Nacarôa, and the domain of evaluators
306 on the mechanisms of performance evaluation, with a view to their effectiveness.

307 25 IX. CONSIDERATIONS

308 In the considerations, we present the main conclusions about the process of performance evaluation in the civil
309 service: a comparative analysis of the legal to the practice of performance evaluators in the district government
310 of Nacarôa has in relation to the process of evaluation of performance in the civil service.

311 The results of the interviews were analyzed using content analysis, based on six categories: a) the perception
312 and destination of the evaluation; b) the adequacy of the general profile of the evaluator (the capacity and mastery
313 of the procedures); c) the adequacy of the Annual EmployeeS Activity Plan; (d) the direct relationship between
314 the evaluator and the evaluated; e) the reduction of the productivity of the evaluated through the evaluation of
315 inadequate performance; f) the consequences of the lack of the evaluator's domain of the mechanisms used in the
316 performance evaluation process, through a comparative methodology.

317 The results lead us to conclude that performance evaluators in the district government of Nacarôa know of
318 the existence of performance evaluation, in the civil service, directed to officials and agents of the State, and
319 to those who hold positions of direction, leadership and trust; officials are normally assessed by their heads of
320 sectors/offices and these, in turn, are assessed by the hierarchical superior of the institution; and all employees
321 are evaluated once a year, although these assessments are not always preceded by monitoring of their activities.

322 Regarding the mastery of the procedures to be observed in the performance evaluation process, the results
323 reveal that the lack of training, training or training by some performance evaluators is probably a reason for the
324 existence, in institutions, of evaluators who do not master performance evaluation procedures. As a consequence,
325 the performance evaluation process, in the institutions of the district government of Nacarôa, does not always

326 comply with the procedures established in Decree No55/2009 of 12 October, which dictates the criteria to be
327 followed in the act of performance evaluation from the planning to the award of the final grade.

328 With regard to the performance evaluation process, as a procedure established in Article 11 of IACSEDAP,
329 the results lead us to conclude that some employees receive the performance evaluation forms already completed
330 by the evaluator, without first having an interview between the evaluator and the evaluated in order to assess
331 the level of execution of the plans, objectives, targets, as well as to verify the degree of compliance with planned
332 activities, thereby giving, the opportunity for the evaluator to agree or not to the grade awarded, and only
333 after this phase, the form can be taken to the hierarchical superior of the institution for its approval. The lack
334 of interviews with employees in the performance evaluation process in public administration institutions blocks
335 communication between the evaluator and the evaluated, because, since the public service is an interconnected
336 system, the lack of communication between its employees contributes to an entropy.

337 The evaluation process serves to know the deviations between what is expected and what is also obtained, the
338 necessary transparency and accuracy attribute, to the evaluation process, an increased singularity and complexity,
339 appearing to be an important instrument for the regularization of performance problems and the improvement
340 of quality in the work of employees, as well as in life in public administration institutions.

341 As for the way in which the evaluation process is directed, in the five institutions, the results reveal that it is
342 effective, on the part of those who monitor the evaluated on the degree of compliance with the plans and goals,
343 maintaining a permanent dialogue between the parties until the final phase of the performance evaluation, made
through interviews, as a form of good human resources management in public administration. ^{1 2 3}



Figure 1:

344

¹ Volume 23 | Issue 3 | Compilation 1.0 © 2023 London Journals Press The Process of Evaluation of Performance in the Civil Service: A Comparative Analysis of the Legal to the Practice of Performance Evaluators in the District Government of Nacarôa

² Volume 23 | Issue 3 | Compilation 1.0 © 2023 London Journals Press The Process of Evaluation of Performance in the Civil Service: A Comparative Analysis of the Legal to the Practice of Performance Evaluators in the District Government of Nacarôa

³ The Process of Evaluation of Performance in the Civil Service: a Comparative Analysis of the Legal to the Practice of Performance Evaluators in the District Government of Nacarôa

Figure 2:



Figure 3:

1

Institution	Assigned Code
District Education, Youth and Technology	AD1; AD2; AD3; AD4 e AD5
Service	
District Health, Women and Social Action	AD6; AD7; AD8; AD9; AD10
Service	
District Economic Activities Service	AD11; AD12; AD13
District Infrastructure Planning Service	AD14; AD15
District Secretariat Sector	AD16; AD17 e AD18.

Source: Own elaboration

Figure 4: Table 1 :

345 Milital Academy ” Marechal Samora Machel” (Nampula); Graduated in Public Administration from the
346 Catholic University of Mozambique (Nampula, 2018) Professor at UCM (Institute of Distance Learning, Nampula)
347 and Human Resources Manager at the District Secretariat of Nacarôa. ?: Master’s degree in Administration and
348 Regulation of Education at the Milital Academy ” Marechal Samora Machel” (Nampula); Graduated in Public
349 Administration from the Catholic University of Mozambique (Nampula, 2018) and Financial Manager at the
350 District Secretariat of Nacarôa.

351 [London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences] , *London Journal of Research in Humanities
352 and Social Sciences*

353 [London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences] , Compilation 1.0. *London Journal of Research
354 in Humanities and Social Sciences* 42 (3) .

355 [Sarmento et al. ()] , M Sarmento , A Rosinha , Silva . *J. Performance Evaluation. Lisbon: Escolar Editora* 2015.

356 [Aguinis ()] ‘An Expanded view of performance management’. H Aguinis . *Performance Management: Putting
357 Research into Action*, J Smith , M London (eds.) (San Francisco) 2009. CA Jossey-Bass/Wiley. p. .

358 [Ditch ()] ‘Content analysis’. Jorge Ditch . *org) Methodology of social sciences*, A Silva , J (Pinto (eds.) (Porto)
359 1987. p. . (Hot flashes Editions)

360 [Fachin ()] *Fundamentals of methodology*, Odília Fachin . 2005. Ribeirão Preto, Brazil: Saraiva.

361 [Marras et al. ()] *Human performance evaluation*, J Marras , M Lima , S Tose . 2012. Brazil: Elsevier Editora.

362 [Levieque ()] ‘Human Resources Management In Public’. Augustine Levieque . *Administration In Mozambique.
363 Maputo: Editorial Ndjira* 2011.

364 [Moura ()] ‘Human Resources Management: Influences and determinants of performance’. Stephen Moura .
365 *Syllable Editions*, (Lisbon) 2000.

366 [Silva and Oliveira ()] *Importance of performance evaluation*, Maria Deolinda Silva , Oliveira . 1999.

367 [Brandão et al. ()] ‘Management of competencies and performance management: different technologies or
368 instruments of the same construct?’? Hugo Brandão , Pena & Guimarães , A Tomás . *Business Administration
369 Journal* 2001. 41 p. .

370 [Cunha et al. ()] *Manual of People Management and Human Capital.2nd Edition*, Miguel Cunha , Armenian ;
371 Pina; Rego , Rita Cunha , & Campos , Carlos Cardoso-Cabral . 2010. Lisbon: Silabo Editions.

372 [Grandson ()] *Master’s Thesis: Performance Evaluation and Quality Management at the Institution. Case Study:
373 Efp -Chimoio*, Modlaine Grandson . 2014. Chimoio: UCM.

374 [Prodanov et al. ()] *Methodology of scientific work: Methods and Techniques of Research and Academic Work*,
375 Cristiano Prodanov , Cleber , Cesar Ernani Freitas , De . 2013. Novo Hamburgo -Rio Grande do Sul:
376 EditoraFeevale.

377 [Bergamini and Whitaker ()] ‘Motivation in Organizations’. Cecilia Bergamini , Whitaker . *São Paulo: Atlas*,
378 1992. (th ed.)

379 [Russo et al. ()] *Performance evaluation: Case study in the paper and forest products sector*, Carla Russo , Rosa
380 Isabel , Rufino . 2017. Setúbal.

381 [Caetano (ed.) ()] *Performance evaluation: Metaphors, Concepts and Practices*, Antonio Caetano . R.H. Editora
382 (ed.) 1996. Lisbon.

383 [War and Carvalho ()] *Qualitative Research and content analysis: Meanings and forms of use*, Isabel War ,
384 Carvalho . 2006. Cascais: Principia Editora.

385 [Guerra et al. ()] *Qualitative research manual*, Elaine Guerra , Linhares , Assisi . 2014. Belo Horizonte. Grupo
386 ?nima Educação

387 [Resolution of the National Council of civil service (CNFP) no11/79 (July)] *Resolution of the National Council
388 of civil service (CNFP) no11/79*, July. 29.

389 [SIGEDAP -Performance management system in public administration] _____ Decree 55/2009. *SIGEDAP -
390 Performance management system in public administration*, (Maputo) National Press Of Mozambique.

391 [Grote ()] *The performance appraisal question and answer book: a survival guide for managers*, D Grote . 2002.
392 Amacom.