

## Variations in the elements valuation that determine the Individual Performance according to the line of business of the SMEs in Mexico

### Variaciones en la valoración de los elementos que determinan el Desempeño Individual en función del giro de las pymes en México

VASQUEZ-TORRES, María del Carmen\*†, GARCÍA-REVILLA, Raquel and CANO-CARRASCO, Adolfo

*Instituto Tecnológico de Sonora  
Universidad a Distancia de Madrid  
Instituto Tecnológico de Sonora*

ID 1<sup>st</sup> Author: *María del Carmen, Vasquez-Torres*

ID 1<sup>st</sup> Coauthor: *Raquel, García-Revilla*

ID 2<sup>nd</sup> Coauthor: *Adolfo, Cano-Carrasco*

Received July 7, 2018; Accepted December 1, 2018

#### Abstract

Organizations need to identify the individual performance factors, which lead them to be competitive and confront the globalized world in which they find themselves. Therefore, the following approach is taken in the investigation: Are there differences in the valuation or perception of the people who occupy job positions at management level in relation to the elements that determine the individual performance (IP) depending on their line of the business? As a general objective, it is established that if there are variations in the perception of the people who occupy positions at management level in relation to the elements that determine the individual performance, depending on the line of the business of the companies. This research has a descriptive scope compared to a non-experimental design; it is considered a cross-sectional analysis between the industrial, commercial and service companies, and is included the variables that determine the individual performance. Among the most relevant results is that, depending on the line of the business, is the given weight to each element of individual performance. Consequently, it can be concluded that there are variations depending on the line of the business of the companies, as it is assigned a different value different from each one of the elements that determine the individual performance

#### Resumen

Las organizaciones requieren identificar los factores de desempeño individual, que las conduzca a ser competitivas y enfrentarse al mundo globalizado en el que se encuentran, por consiguiente se tiene el siguiente planteamiento en la investigación ¿Existen diferencias en la valoración o percepción que tienen las personas que ocupan puestos a nivel gerencial en relación a los elementos que determinan el desempeño individual (DI) dependiendo del giro de las empresas?; como objetivo general, determinar si existen variaciones en la percepción de las personas que ocupan puestos a nivel gerencial en relación a los elementos que determinan el desempeño individual, dependiendo del giro de las empresas. La investigación tiene un alcance descriptivo comparativo con un diseño no experimental, se considera un análisis de corte transversal, industrial, comercial y de servicios tienen acerca de las variables que determinan el Desempeño Individual. Entre los resultados más relevantes se tiene que dependiendo del giro de la empresa es el peso que se les da a cada elemento de desempeño individual, por tanto puede concluirse que existen variaciones dependiendo del giro de las empresas, ya que se asigna un valor diferente a cada uno de los elementos que determinan el desempeño individual.

#### Desempeño Individual, Pyme, Giros

#### Individual performance, SMEs, Lines of business

**Citation:** VASQUEZ-TORRES, María del Carmen, GARCÍA-REVILLA, Raquel and CANO-CARRASCO, Adolfo. Variations in the elements valuation that determine the Individual Performance according to the line of business of the SMEs in Mexico. RINOE Journal- Macroeconomics and monetary economy. 2018.2-3:22-30.

\* Correspondence to Author (email: mcvasquez@itson.edu.mx)

† Researcher contributing first author.

## Introduction

In the organization's performance field, the knowledge age where intellectual capital represents a large part of the value of a product, it is an important activity for organizations that want to be efficient in the market, and thus obtain a sustainable competitive advantage.

In recent years, the development of companies in performance issues has been very broad. Intellectual capital has played a big role due to the support aimed towards the directors of this resource; which is directly related to the individual performance of each collaborator of the company. Furthermore, is improving the knowledge, thus achieving that the productive activity is efficient.

The scientific development, as well as the technological one that imposes complex processes of changes and continuous social transformations, increases the cognitive necessities of the human capital to provide answers to the new demands in its professional performance. This brings with it an increase in the reflection on the ways for the formation and training of the employee. The training of the staff, as well as the executives, is a key activity for the survival of the companies; their adaptability to the environment, in the same way to the changes that are occurring, is the basic competitive advantage of the organizations. Since human capital possesses the capacity to transform the rest of the resources of the organization, this process should not be carried out in a random way, without a defined orientation, because it would create bewilderment and disorganization. From there, it generates the need to be planned, organized and controlled according to the achievement of the expected results (Salgado, 2017).

In Antalya, Turkey, an investigation was conducted related to the actions of part-time employees. Their number is significant and is believed to contribute more than it seems, and the differences in their feelings towards work are comparatively shown with full-time workers. In addition, it shows if their performance levels and their job satisfactions are affected or not by the state as workers, and to what extent job satisfaction can explain the difference in performance.

In this context, the questionnaires that were demographically included were about job satisfaction and individual performance; they were applied to 130 vendors who work in stores of an international sportswear brand in Istanbul (Dogan and Anil, 2016).

As can be seen in the globalized world, regarding the work environment, companies take into consideration the most important factors for them as they are obtaining profits. However, this is the furthest that can be achieved in the long term; they are losing sight of the important elements of the organization, such as the workers, who are the human capital and engine of the company. In addition, the employees are the ones who generate the products and services, and consequently bring the revenue to it. The human capital should begin to be considered a predominant factor for SMEs, regardless of their line of the business.

Within an organization, one of the problems that arise is that the part time and full time employees do not allow comparing their levels of performance and satisfaction at work. Also, it is important to analyze if these are being affected or not by the company, and to what extent the job satisfaction can explain the difference in their performance (Dogan and Anil, 2016).

Among the main problems to be presented in a company, is to observe the individual performance of each employee based on the impact of the leadership on the commitment to the organization, as well as their followers perceptions. Another issue is to analyze the virtues that this leader should have, and be valued by the employees and the organization. This is in order to identify how it contributes to the organizational commitment, especially in its affective and normative dimensions. Regarding to the last one, it is able to positively influence the individual performance (de Araujo & Lopez, 2014).

Therefore, the following question arises: Are there differences in the people's perception who occupy positions at the management level in relation to the elements that determine the individual performance, depending on the line of the business of the company?

**Hypothesis**

Depending on the line of the business, a different value is assigned to each of the elements that determine the individual performance.

**General Objective**

To determine if there are variations in the people's perception who occupy positions at the management level, in relation to the elements that establish the individual performance, depending on the line of the business of the company.

**Specific objectives**

1. To perform ANOVA of a factor to determine mean differences between the 14 factors determining the IP.
2. To perform a posteriori analysis to measure the mean differences in the different lines of business of the SMEs in Ciudad Obregon.

**Theoretical Framework**

The performance is the capacity of the individual, that is, the knowledge and skills that the worker possesses to develop a task, as well as the effort that the person carries out. It indicates that individual performance points to the difference between employee expectations and the performance it exhibits. It is an indicator of the effort that individuals or groups show thanks to the purpose they themselves determined (Çöl, 2008).

It is considered performance to all the behaviors or tasks observed in the workers that are relevant to the achievement of the organizational goals; in addition to being able to evaluate the competences of the people and the level of contribution to the company (Perez, 2009). Chiavenato (2000) defines the performance as the employee's behavior to achieve the objectives entrusted; therefore, it is part of the individual strategy to achieve the organizational goals.

According to Vasquez (2014), individual performance is the relevant behavior of the worker oriented to the achievement of the organizational goals. In this order of ideas, Spitz (2015) considers that individual performance should include the required skills, attributes and motivations of the individual employee.

Human capital is a fusion of genetic inheritance, attitude, education and the experience of people in life and business. The most valuable asset of any company is human resources compared to other resources or equipment. On the other hand, it is believed to be the most ignored asset by companies (Khan, Farooq and Hussain, 2010).

One of the models of individual performance is from Gilbert (2007), who identifies seven key factors that should be analyzed when there is the need to improve the performance of a person or a team. It refers to pose the classical questions that should be made to explore the problem, which are: clear standards, feedback, task support, incentives, knowledge and competencies, individual capacity and context.

Vasquez (2014) proposes 14 factors: best practices, clear objectives and standards, systemic vision, feedback, task support, resource management, process management, add value, incentives, sanctions, knowledge and competencies, individual capacity, context, and finally, monitoring and measurement.

**Research Methodology**

Considering the impact of this research, it has a descriptive range compared with a non-experimental design, because the data obtained were not manipulated and were calculated based on the response of each of the participants involved in the research. Based on the time in which the investigation was conducted, it is considered a cross-sectional analysis, because the responses are only being analyzed in a moment. Considering the research question, the analysis is quantitative since an instrument was applied to collect data about the people's perceptions that were occupying positions at management levels in the industrial, commercial and service companies; towards the variables that determine the individual performance.

## Operationalization of the variables

The classification of the business line of the companies is based on the agreement taken by the Ministry of Economy and published in the Official Journal of the Federation in 2009, and is presented in Table 1. For the specific purpose of this research, industrial, commercial and service companies were taken into consideration. In the same way, the dimensions that compose the variable of individual performance can be seen in Table 2.

variable	Definition	Classification
<b>Line of the business</b>	Classify companies by the type of activity they do.	Sector to which the company belongs: a) Commercial b) Industrial c) Services
<b>Size</b>	Classification of the companies by the amount of their sales or annual income.	Amount of sales or annual income (million pesos). a) from 4,01 to 100 (Small companies) b) from \$100,01 to 250 (Medium companies) c) from \$250,01 onwards (Large companies)

**Table 1** Dimensions of the variables: line of business and size of the company

Source: Ministry of Economy (2009).

Variables	Description	Items
Best practices	It refers to the actions that the company performs to improve quality and have clearly defined procedures	It includes the items from 1 to 10.
Clear standard objectives	To have clearly defined objectives and employees know what is expected from them.	It includes the items from 11 to 20.
Systematic Vision	To have established the mission, vision and values of the organization.	It includes the items from 21 to 23.
Feedback	To report how employees are performing in their activities	It includes the items from 24 to 33.
Task Support	Performers know when and why to act; they are coordinated with each other and have the resources to achieve the goals.	It includes the items from 34 to 42.
Resources management	To have the required resources for the good performance of the activities.	It includes the items from 43 to 44
Process management	To formally have the processes that help the realization of the activities	It includes the items from 51 to 53.
To add value	Actions that are generated for the benefit of the client, employee and organization.	It includes the items from 54 to 59.
Incentives	To have incentive programs aligned with the objectives and standards, which are timely, relevant and effective.	It includes the items from 60 to 68.
Sanctions	There is a formal regulation where the consequences of incomplection with the company's rules are established.	It includes the items from 69 to 73.
Knowledge and competences	The employees have the knowledge and information required to achieve the correct goals, abilities, attitudes and habits.	It includes the items from 74 to 81.
Individual capacity	The employees have the physical, intellectual, emotional and social capacity required to work satisfactorily.	It includes the items from 82 to 87
Context	It refers to the environment in which employees work, covering organizational culture and facilities.	It includes the items from 88 to 98.
Monitoring and measurement	They carry out evaluations of the employees performance and identify training needs	It includes the items from 99 to 103.

**Table 2** Characteristics that describe the individual performance.

Source: Own elaboration

## Statistical Method

For the quantitative and statistical analysis, it was used a test called analysis of variance (ANOVA) of a factor that serves to compare several elements or groups in a quantitative variable; therefore it is a generalization of the test T for two independent samples. The objective is to determine, with a confidence level of 95%, if there is equality of means between the groups or elements compared in relation to the quantitative variable.

It is intended to find out which of the elements that integrate the individual performance is the one that has more relevance, depending on the line of the business of the companies. With this, we mean to evaluate if there is difference in the perception that one has about the elements that compose the individual performance depending on the line of the business. If there is equality of means, regardless of the line of the business of the companies, it is assigned similar values to the elements that integrate the training.

With the above information, an independent variable was obtained (line of the business), whose levels were compared to each other and a categorical dependent variable (individual performance), in which the classifications were compared.

The strategy to test the equality of means hypothesis is to obtain a statistic, called F, which reflects the degree of similarity between the means that are being compared. If the equality of means hypothesis is assumed to be true, the probability of obtaining a value such as the one obtained or higher (Pardo and San Martin, 1998 pp. 248-250) can be known at all times.

An ANOVA of a factor is applied to determine the existing or null variability of the variance in each of the elements that compose the individual performance in relation to the line of the company, as shown in Table 3.

Independent variable		Dependent Variable	
Line of the business	Commercial Industrial Services	Individual performance	Best practices
			Standard objectives
			Systematic vision
			Feedback
			Task support
			Resource management
			Process management
			To add value
			Incentives
			Sanctions
			Knowledge and competences
			Individual capacity
			Context
			Monitoring and measurement

Table 3 Variables specification

Participants

The participants subject to the study were small and medium-sized enterprises in the industrial, commercial and service sectors. It was considered a non-probabilistic sample, and a total of 297 surveys were applied. The classification of the sample in relation to the line of the business of the companies is presented in Table 4.

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Commercial	97	32.7	32.7	32.7
	Service	100	33.7	33.7	66.3
	Industrial	100	33.7	33.7	100.0
	Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 Sample classification by line of the business

Materials

The instrument utilized was a questionnaire that included general aspects of the business and aspects related to the individual performance. In the section about the individual performance, the instrument is composed of items to measure 14 variables, with a total of 103 questions. The scale used was Likert with 5 response options ranging from 1) never, 2) almost never, 3) sometimes, 4) almost always and 5) always.

Below are the results that contrast the hypothesis and answer the research question and meet the objectives.

This section is distributed in the following way: The first part presents the results of the analysis of the variance by the line of the business; the second part contemplates the posteriori analysis based on Bonferroni and at a confidence level of 95%, which visualizes in a more specific way the differences in the perceptions.

The results of Table 5 allow us to reject with a confidence level of 95% the equality of means hypothesis in 13 of the 14 elements that determine the individual performance. Therefore, it can be argued that the valuation given by people at the management level to the different elements that compose the individual performance varies depending on the line of the business of the company.

The ANOVA allowed us to delimit those elements in which there are differences of perception. In this case in particular, the only element that does not vary according to the line of the business is the so-called "incentives". In order to determine the extent of the differences between the groups and within the groups, a post-hoc or a posteriori analysis based on Bonferroni was performed. The results are presented in Table 6.

		Sum of squares	df.	Root mean square	F	Sig.
Index_best_practices	Inter-groups	48,644	2	24,322	26,867	,000
	Intra-groups	266,158	294	,905		
	Total	314,802	296			
Index_Standard_objectives	Inter-groups	31,265	2	15,632	13,808	,000
	Intra-groups	332,850	294	1,132		
	Total	364,114	296			
Index_Systematic_vision	Inter-groups	56,057	2	28,029	17,890	,000
	Intra-groups	460,616	294	1,567		
	Total	516,673	296			
Index_Feedback	Inter-groups	21,570	2	10,785	9,598	,000
	Intra-groups	330,336	294	1,124		
	Total	351,905	296			
Index_Task_Support	Inter-groups	16,211	2	8,106	11,768	,000
	Intra-groups	202,514	294	,689		
	Total	218,726	296			
Index_Resources_Management	Inter-groups	10,878	2	5,439	7,184	,001
	Intra-groups	222,591	294	,757		
	Total	233,470	296			
Index_Process_Management	Inter-groups	19,497	2	9,748	10,647	,000
	Intra-groups	269,187	294	,916		
	Total	288,683	296			

Index _ Add_ Value	Inter-groups	37,309	2	18,654	17,374	,000
	Intra-groups	315,661	294	1,074		
	Total	352,969	296			
Index _Incentives	Inter-groups	5,747	2	2,874	1,541	,216
	Intra-groups	548,085	294	1,864		
	Total	553,832	296			
Index _Sanctions	Inter-groups	88,269	2	44,134	26,912	,000
	Intra-groups	482,150	294	1,640		
	Total	570,419	296			
Index _Knowledge_ Competences	Inter-groups	17,512	2	8,756	13,547	,000
	Intra-groups	190,018	294	,646		
	Total	207,529	296			
Index_ Individual_ Capacity	Inter-groups	13,896	2	6,948	8,397	,000
	Intra-groups	243,277	294	,827		
	Total	257,173	296			
Index _Context	Inter-groups	10,831	2	5,415	10,193	,000
	Intra-groups	156,203	294	,531		
	Total	167,034	296			
Index _Monitoring_ Measurement	Inter-groups	73,124	2	36,562	20,828	,000
	Intra-groups	516,105	294	1,755		
	Total	589,229	296			

Valid at a confidence level of 95%

Table 5 ANOVA (line of the business)

Source: Own elaboration

The previous table shows that in 13 of the 14 elements that determine the individual performance, there is a difference in the means; therefore, there are differences in the perception depending on the line of the business of the companies. The multiple comparisons based on Bonferroni determine that the differential line of the business in the perception is the one that classifies the companies within the area of services. Consequently, the industrial and commercial sectors do not have statistically significant differences in the individual performance valuation. However, in the case of service companies they have differences.

Bonferroni						
Dependent variable	(I) Line:	(J) Line:	Mean difference (I-J)	Typical error	Sig.	Confidence interval at 95%
						Lower limit
Index_best_practices	Commercial	Service	-.69901*	.13559	.000	-.8725
		Industrial	.25399	.13559	.186	.5805
		Commercial	.69901*	.13559	.000	.3725
		Industrial	.95300*	.13456	.000	.6290
	Service	Commercial	-.25399	.13559	.186	.5805
		Industrial	-.95300*	.13456	.000	-.6290
		Commercial	-.25399	.13559	.186	.5805
		Service	-.95300*	.13456	.000	-.6290
Index_Standard_objectives	Commercial	Service	-.63094*	.15163	.000	-.2658

Index_Systematic_Vision	Commercial	Industrial	.09906	.15163	1,000	-.2660	.4642
		Service	.63094*	.15163	.000	.2658	.9960
	Service	Industrial	.73000*	.15048	.000	.3677	1,0923
		Commercial	-.09906	.15163	1,000	-.4642	.2660
Index_Feedback	Commercial	Industrial	-.73000*	.15048	.000	-.3677	1,0923
		Service	-.74955*	.17838	.000	-.1,1790	.3201
	Service	Industrial	.27378	.17838	.378	.1557	.7033
		Commercial	.74955*	.17838	.000	.3201	1,1790
Index_Task_Support	Commercial	Industrial	1,02333*	.17702	.000	.5971	1,4495
		Service	-.27378	.17838	.378	-.7033	.1557
	Service	Industrial	-.1,02333*	.17702	.000	-.4,495	.5971
		Commercial	-.59321*	.15106	.000	-.9569	.3155
Index_Add_Value	Commercial	Industrial	-.04821	.15106	1,000	-.4119	.3155
		Service	.59321*	.15106	.000	.2295	.9569
	Service	Industrial	.54500*	.14991	.001	.1841	.9059
		Commercial	.04821	.15106	1,000	-.3155	.4119
Index_Incentives	Commercial	Industrial	-.54500*	.14991	.001	-.1841	.9059
		Service	-.46135*	.11828	.000	-.7461	.1766
	Service	Industrial	.05976	.11828	1,000	.2250	.3445
		Commercial	.46135*	.11828	.000	.1766	.7461
Index_Sanctions	Commercial	Industrial	.52111*	.11737	.000	.2385	.8037
		Service	-.05976	.11828	1,000	-.3445	.2250
	Service	Industrial	-.52111*	.11737	.000	-.2385	.8037
		Commercial	-.46881*	.12400	.001	-.7674	.1702
Index_Resources_Management	Commercial	Industrial	-.20881	.12400	.280	-.5074	.0898
		Service	.46881*	.12400	.001	.1702	.7674
	Service	Industrial	.26000	.12305	.106	.0363	.5563
		Commercial	.20881	.12400	.280	-.0898	.5074
Index_Process_Management	Commercial	Industrial	-.26000	.12305	.106	-.0363	.5563
		Service	-.48662*	.13636	.001	-.8150	.1583
	Service	Industrial	.09671	.13636	1,000	.2316	.4250
		Commercial	.48662*	.13636	.001	.1583	.8150
Index_Add_Value	Commercial	Industrial	.58333*	.13532	.000	.2575	.9092
		Service	-.09671	.13636	1,000	-.4250	.2316
	Service	Industrial	-.58333*	.13532	.000	-.2575	.9092
		Commercial	-.62854*	.14767	.000	-.9841	.1558
Index_Incentives	Commercial	Industrial	.19979	.14767	.531	.1558	.5553
		Service	.62854*	.14767	.000	.2730	.9841
	Service	Industrial	.82833*	.14654	.000	.4755	1,1812
		Commercial	-.19979	.14767	.531	-.5553	.1558
Index_Sanctions	Commercial	Industrial	-.82833*	.14654	.000	-.4755	1,1812
		Service	-.04622	.19458	1,000	-.4223	.5147
	Service	Industrial	.31511	.19458	.319	.1534	.7836
		Commercial	-.04622	.19458	1,000	-.4223	.5147
Index_Standard_objectives	Commercial	Industrial	.26889	.19309	.494	.1960	.7338
		Service	-.31511	.19458	.319	-.7836	.1534
	Service	Industrial	-.26889	.19309	.494	-.7338	.1960
		Commercial	-.58928*	.18250	.004	-.1,0287	.1499
Service	Industrial	.73672*	.18250	.000	.2973	1,1761	
	Commercial	.58928*	.18250	.004	.1499	1,0287	
Service	Industrial	1,32600*	.18111	.000	.8899	1,7621	

	Industrial	Commercial	-.73672*	.18250	.000	-	1,176	-.2973
		Service	1,32600*	.18111	.000	-	1,762	-.8899
Index_Knowledge_Competences	Commercial	Service	-.45490*	.11457	.000	-	.7308	-.1790
		Industrial	.10135	.11457	1,00	-	.1745	.3772
	Service	Commercial	.45490*	.11457	.000	-	.1790	.7308
		Industrial	-.55625*	.11369	.000	-	.2825	.8300
	Industrial	Commercial	-.10135	.11457	1,00	-	.1745	.3772
		Service	-.55625*	.11369	.000	-	.2825	.8300
Index_Individual_Capacity	Commercial	Service	-.45878*	.12964	.001	-	.7709	-.1466
		Industrial	-.00211	.12964	1,00	-	.3142	.3100
	Service	Commercial	.45878*	.12964	.001	-	.1466	.7709
		Industrial	.45667*	.12864	.001	-	.1469	.7664
	Industrial	Commercial	.00211	.12964	1,00	-	.3142	.3100
		Service	-.45667*	.12864	.001	-	.7664	-.1469
Index_Context	Commercial	Service	-.29199*	.10388	.016	-	.5421	-.0419
		Industrial	.16801	.10388	.321	-	.0821	.4181
	Service	Commercial	.29199*	.10388	.016	-	.0419	.5421
		Industrial	.46000*	.10308	.000	-	.2118	.7082
	Industrial	Commercial	-.16801	.10388	.321	-	.0821	.4181
		Service	-.46000*	.10308	.000	-	.7082	-.2118
Index_Monitoring_Measurement	Commercial	Service	-.28790	.18882	.385	-	.7425	.1667
		Industrial	.87410*	.18882	.000	-	.4195	1,3287
	Service	Commercial	.28790	.18882	.385	-	.1667	.7425
		Industrial	1,16200*	.18737	.000	-	.7108	1,6132
	Industrial	Commercial	-.87410*	.18882	.000	-	.4195	1,3287
		Service	1,16200*	.18737	.000	-	1,6132	-.7108

\*. The means difference is significant at level 0.05.

**Table 6.**  
Multiple comparisons  
Source: Own elaboration

**Table 6**

Also shows that in all cases service companies have a higher valuation than commercial enterprises, and a higher valuation than industrial companies to all the elements that showed mean difference.

In a valuation scale, it can be argued that service companies value more the elements that compose the individual performance in the following order:

1. Systematic vision.
2. Good practices.
3. Standard objectives
4. Add value.

At the end of the valuation scale is the individual capacity and the context.

## Conclusions

The following section presents the conclusions based on the results obtained. Accordingly, it is allowed to accept the hypothesis of the investigation, to answer the question and to meet the established objectives.

With a significance level of 95% the hypothesis is accepted, and it argues that there are variations depending on the line of the business of the company. It is assigned a different value to each of the elements that determine the individual performance.

Mean differences were found in thirteen of the fourteen individual performance factors. This means that the companies depending on their line of the business assign a different assessment to all factors, except the one that is called incentives.

In the posteriori analysis, differences are determined between the groups and within the groups that integrate the factors of the line of the business and the individual performance. The main results show that companies of industrial, commercial and service present differentiated valuations between them and between each element that compose individual performance.

The main variations show that in all cases the service companies have a higher valuation than the commercial.

On a scale of importance, those who value the elements of individual performance are the service companies followed by commercial companies, and in the end industrial companies.

Service companies give higher priority to individual performance factors in the following order:

- Systematic vision
- Good practices
- Standard objectives
- Add value

In other words, service companies consider the mission and the vision of the organization as a priority to be established; in a second place, everything that it is related to quality and to have clearly defined procedures; in third level of importance, is to have clearly defined objectives and that the employees know what is expected from them; and finally the services companies value the actions that are generated for the benefit of the client, employee and organization.

Finally, according to the obtained results, it can be mentioned the commercial and industrial companies need to work more on the factors of systemic vision and good practices.

## References

- Adenso D, B.; Lozano, S.; Gutiérrez, E.; Calzada, L.; & García, S. (2017). Assessing individual performance based on the efficiency of projects. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 107, 280-288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2017.03.026>
- Al, A., & Anil, I. (2016). The Comparison of the Individual Performance Levels Between Full-time and Part-time Employees: The Role of Job Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 382-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.048>
- Bernadez, M. L., (2009). Desempeño humano. Manual de consultoría. Volumen 1.
- Capuano, Andrea Miriam; (2004). Evaluación de desempeño: desempeño por competencias. *Invenio*, noviembre, 139-150.
- Chiavenato, Idalberto (2011). Capacitación y desarrollo del personal. Mares Jesús y Zúñiga Edmundo. Administración de recursos humanos, el capital de las organizaciones, pp321-346. México DF. McGraw-Hill/Interamericana editores, S.A. DE C.V.
- Çöl, G. (2008). Effect of Perceived Strengthening on the Performance of Employee. *Journal of Doğuş University*. 9.1, 35-46.
- De Araújo, M., & Lopes, P. (2014). Virtuous leadership, organizational commitment and individual performance. *Tékhne*, 12, 3 - 10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tekhne.2015.01.008>
- Dogan, A y Anil, I. (2016). The Comparison of the Individual Performance Levels between Full-time and Part-time Employees: The Role of Job Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 382-391.
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C. & Baptista, P. (2010). Metodología de la investigación. Quinta Edición. Perú: Mc Graw Hill.
- INEGI, (2009). Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. "Micro, pequeña, mediana y gran empresa: estratificación de los establecimientos: Censos Económicos 2009"
- Gilbert T. F. (2007). *Human Competence Engineering worthy performance*. San Francisco. CA. International Society for Performance Improvement. Published by Pfeiffer. USA.
- Khan, B., Farooq, A., & Hussain, Z. (2010). Human resource management: an Islamic perspective. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 2(1), 17-34. doi:10.1108/17574321011037558
- Kauffman G., S. H. (2001). El desarrollo de las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas: un reto para la Economía Mexicana. *Revista Ciencia Administrativa*. México: Universidad Veracruzana, IIESCA. No. 2001-1, pp. 40-48.
- Pérez, A. (2009). Evaluación del desempeño laboral. Repositorio digital: Instituto politécnico nacional. Recuperado el 09 de octubre de 2015 en: <http://www.repositoriodigital.ipn.mx/bitstream/handle/123456789/5384/50-51-2.pdf?sequence=2>
- Ramírez, F. (2015). Cómo Mejorar el Rendimiento de los Empleados: Mediante la Consultoría del Desempeño en su organización. Recuperado el 06 de octubre de 2015 en: <http://www.amauta-international.com/Ramirez.htm>
- Salgado C, M., Gómez F, O., & Carvajal, D. (2017). Niveles para la capacitación en una organización. *Ingeniería Industrial*, 38(2), 154-160.



Spitz,G. (2015). Mejorar el desempeño de la fuerza de trabajo. *Learning Review*. Recuperado de <http://www.learningreview.com/articulos-y-entrevistas-formacion/224-mejorar-el-desempee-la-fuerza-de-trabajo>.

Vásquez, T. M. C. (2014). Modelo de Gestión de Desempeño Individual a un Distrito de Riego. México: Instituto tecnológico de Sonora.

Yang, H., & Yang, X. (2010). Research on enhancing the effectiveness of staff-training in private enterprise. *iBusiness*, 2, 92-97. doi: 10.4236/ib.2010.21011

Yeganeh, H & Su, Z. (2008) "An examination of human resource management practices in Iranian public sector", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 37 Iss: 2, pp.203 – 221