

e-ISSN:2587-2168



Year: 2023

Vol: 9 Issue: 52

pp 1314-1335

Article ID

71245

Arrival

22 July 2023

Published

30 December 2023

DOI NUMBER<http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ideas.71245>**How to Cite This****Article**

Abdulrahman, S.O.A. & Dağlar, H. (2023).

"Performance Evaluation in Strategic Human Resources Management: A Study on Bank Employees",

International Journal of Disciplines Economics & Administrative Sciences Studies, (e-ISSN:2587-2168), Vol:9, Issue:52; pp: 1314-1335



International Journal of Disciplines Economics & Administrative Sciences Studies is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Performance Evaluation in Strategic Human Resources Management: A Study on Bank Employees ¹

Stratejik İnsan Kaynakları Yönetiminde Performans Değerlendirme: Banka Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma

Salim Oudah Abdulrahman Abdulrahman ¹ Hasan Dağlar ² ¹ Master Degree Student, Çankırı Karatekin University, Banking and Finance, Çankırı, Türkiye² Asst. Prof. Dr., Çankırı Karatekin University, Banking and Finance, Çankırı, Türkiye**ABSTRACT**

In this study, performance evaluation system in strategic human resources management is examined in the sample of banking employees. Quantitative research methods were used in the research and the research data were collected using the survey technique. 'Employee satisfaction scale' and 'Competency based performance evaluation scale' were used as measurement instruments. A total of 410 bank employees, 175 female and 235 male, voluntarily participated in the study.

As a result of the statistical analysis of the research data, it was determined that bank employees' satisfaction with the working environment and job satisfaction and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the evaluation system applied to evaluate their job performance were positive. It was found that the perception levels of bank employees towards employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation system differed significantly according to their demographic characteristics. It was found that there is a statistically significant and positive relationship between employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale scores.

This research revealed that communication between some units within the institution is at a lower level. It is thought that this situation may have a negative impact on the bank's performance. It should not be forgotten that a higher level of communication in the organization will contribute to preventing communication accidents and increasing business performance. The research revealed that employees in private banks think that there is no performance system that supports or encourages individual development.

Keywords: Strategic Human Resources Management, Job Satisfaction, Performance Evaluation, Bank Management.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada, stratejik insan kaynakları yönetiminde performans değerlendirme sistemi bankacılık çalışanları örneğinde incelenmiştir. Araştırmada nicel araştırma yöntemleri kullanılmış ve bu doğrultuda araştırma verileri anket tekniği ile toplanmıştır. Ölçüm aracı olarak 'Çalışan memnuniyeti ölçeği' ve 'Yetkinlik bazlı performans değerlendirme ölçeği' kullanılmıştır. Araştırmaya 175'i kadın, 235'i erkek olmak üzere toplam 410 banka çalışanı gönüllü olarak katılmıştır.

Araştırma verilerinin istatistiksel analizi sonucunda, banka çalışanlarının çalışma ortamından ve iş tatmininden memnuniyetleri ile iş performanslarını değerlendirmek için uygulanan değerlendirme sisteminin etkinliğine ilişkin algılarının olumlu olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Banka çalışanlarının çalışan memnuniyeti ve yetkinlik bazlı performans değerlendirme sistemine yönelik algı düzeylerinin demografik özelliklerine göre anlamlı farklılık gösterdiği bulunmuştur. Çalışan memnuniyeti ile yetkinlik bazlı performans değerlendirme ölçeği puanları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitif bir ilişki olduğu bulunmuştur.

Bu çalışmada kurum içindeki bazı birimler arasında iletişimin daha düşük düzeyde olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu durumun bankanın performansına olumsuz yansıtılabileceği düşünülmektedir. Organizasyonda iletişimin daha yüksek düzeyde olmasının, iletişim kazalarının önlenmesine ve iş performansının artırılmasına katkı sağlayacağı unutulmamalıdır. Araştırmada özel bankalarda çalışanların bireysel gelişimi destekleyen veya teşvik eden bir performans sisteminin olmadığına düşündükleri ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Stratejik İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, İş Tatmini, Performans Değerlendirme, Banka Yönetimi.

1. INTRODUCTION

As a result of globalization, individual-oriented strategic human resource management comes to the fore in an increasingly intense competitive environment. Businesses that want to have a competitive advantage need to give the necessary importance to their employees and make their employees feel this in order to benefit from their employees more effectively and efficiently as well as technological innovations. In parallel with the increasing importance of employees for businesses, the understanding that human resources practices are of critical importance for businesses is becoming increasingly widespread (Reşitoğlu, 2011: 15).

Job satisfaction of employees leads to increased organizational performance and organizational development. Especially in the banking sector, where there are many competitors, an effective way to gain competitive advantage is to solve the problems of employees quickly and to make improvements by eliminating the issues

¹ This article is derived from the thesis entitled "Stratejik İnsan Kaynakları Yönetiminde Performans Değerlendirme: Banka Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma", written by Salim Oudah Abdulrahman Abdulrahman the supervision of Asst. Prof. Hasan DAĞLAR

that negatively affect their job satisfaction. This situation is important for both the success of the business and the achievement of quality and efficiency (Çetinkaya et al., 2019: 18).

In a business such as a bank, which is very sensitive and where mistakes can occur that are very difficult to compensate for, the implementation of a strategic human resources system and performance evaluation for employees is vitally important.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Human Resources Management

Human resource management (HRM) is a strategic approach that emphasizes the need to capitalize on people's strengths to achieve long-term competitive advantage. Human resource management responsibilities include planning, staffing, selection, evaluation and performance management, as well as reward management, development, employee relations, health and safety and union management (Bratton and Gold, 2017: 13).

HRM has experienced tremendous change in the last century and has come to be identified as a key factor for sustaining competitive advantage in dominant industries. With the changing trends of the industry in the competition-driven environment of open markets, human resource management has become an important variable for the efficient growth of any organization (Salvatore et al., 2005: 48).

In fulfilling the functional role of human resources, the human resources manager may sometimes manage payroll and employee benefits, although such activities are increasingly outsourced, the human resources manager plays an instrumental strategic role (Jackson, 2014: 32-34).

2.2. Strategic Human Resources Management

Strategic HRM is a combination of human resource management and strategic management. Strategic human resources management aims to bring both businesses and employees to their goals and increase their performance. For this purpose, it is determined by long-term policies with the help of analysis results (Barutçugil, 2004: 35).

The purpose of strategic human resource management can be defined as ensuring that HRM is integrated into strategic planning and that HRM policies are accepted and used by different lines of organizations. Taking into account the concepts of resource-based view and strategic fit, Delery and Doty (1996) argue that organizations adopting a particular strategy require different HR practices than those required by organizations adopting different strategies and should benefit from greater alignment and superior performance between HR strategies and business strategies.

In the implementation of processes, organizational members need to put various methods and strategies into practice. These methods and strategies need to be useful and beneficial for the members as well as for the organization as a whole. For the workforce, however, they need to understand these methods and approaches effectively and apply them appropriately (Dessler, 2013: 27-28).

2.3. Performance Management

Performance management is a systematic, knowledge-driven process that helps managers to manage their employees well in achieving their objectives and in executing programs and ensuring successful and desirable performance of assigned tasks and responsibilities. Performance management requires analyzing behaviors, measuring actions, giving feedback to employees and encouraging staff to behave better (Cansever, 2002: 57).

Performance management is a strategic and integrated approach to achieving lasting success in the work of organizations by improving the performance of the organization, teams and individuals. Performance management should be understood as a continuous process that reflects normal management practices, not as "special techniques" imposed on managers (Armstrong and Baron, 1998: 19).

The performance management process includes coaching, corrective action and termination. In the coaching phase, employees are trained in the performance of their job tasks. In the training, they are made aware of the methods and approaches necessary to achieve organizational goals and job satisfaction. Corrective action is the stage that involves the implementation of measures that will lead to corrections (Gabris and Ihrke, 2001: 158).

Information from performance evaluation can be used for managerial decisions linking evaluated performance to organizational rewards or penalties such as pay increases, promotions or dismissals. As a process that increases employees' awareness of what they are being measured, performance evaluation provides employees

with feedback that allows them to adjust their performance strategies to match desired performance (Uyargil, 2013: 143).

At a basic level, if performance evaluations are conducted, individuals in organizations will receive feedback on their performance and will have the opportunity to be more productive based on this constructive feedback (O'Boyle, 2013: 159-162; Schraeder et al, 2007: 22-23).

The purpose of performance evaluation is the process of obtaining information about employee performance, analyzing it and recording the outcomes. Performance evaluation aims to measure and improve the current and future potential of the employee. Performance evaluation is the process of identifying and measuring human performance in organizations and directing individuals to higher levels of performance by providing them with useful feedback (Najafi et al. 2011: 1761).

Performance evaluations are an important part of organizational life as they can serve a number of functions/purposes such as solving performance problems, setting goals, managing rewards and discipline, and dismissal. It is a powerful tool for calibrating, improving and rewarding employee performance. Performance evaluation is a management tool that helps to motivate human resources (Dickinson, 1993: 141).

Performance evaluation aims to recognize the current state of skills of the workforce. A standardized evaluation system consists of rating practice and the quantification and collection of data. Traditional methods of performance evaluation are relatively old approaches that focus only on past performance. Modern methods, on the other hand, try to overcome the shortcomings of older methods such as bias and subjectivity and focus on the future (Shaout and Yousif, 2014: 970).

2.4. Literature Review

The literature highlights the key role of human resource management in developing effective organizational performance measurement and management, and there is an extensive literature outlining the objectives of performance evaluation systems. While there are semantic differences, there is a general consensus on the goals that performance evaluation systems should be designed to achieve.

Werner (2014) argued that performance management is an area of research that can bridge HRM, given that evaluating employees is a core function of HRM and improving individual and organizational performance is key to HRM.

Klingner et al. (2010) stated that well-functioning performance evaluation systems should achieve four main objectives: communicating management's goals and objectives to employees; motivating employees to improve performance; distributing organizational rewards such as salary increases and promotions fairly; and providing management with information that can be used to improve employee productivity and job satisfaction.

Boice and Kleiner (1997) argue that although performance evaluation systems need to be tailored to the unique aspects of the work environment, effective systems share a number of common characteristics, such as linking organizational goals to the evaluation system, clearly defining job roles, and conducting evaluator training.

Rock and Jones (2015) found that about 30 large companies, such as Adobe, Deloitte, and others, have shifted their performance management systems away from performance evaluation ratings, annual performance targets, and mandatory rankings that traditionally compare employees to employees, and toward shorter-term use.

3. METHOD

In this part of the study, the purpose and importance of the research, problems and hypotheses, research method, population and sample, data collection tools and data analysis methods and findings are explained.

3.1. Purpose and Importance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the performance evaluation system in strategic human resources management on a sample of banking employees. In this direction, the aim of the study is to determine how and at what level bank employees' work satisfaction levels and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system are.

In the literature review, it was observed that there are few studies that include employees' perceptions and thoughts about the performance evaluation system. In this context, it is thought that this study will make a significant contribution to filling the gap in the literature.

3.2. Problem and Sub-Problems of the Study

The study is based on the problem "How are the perceptions of employees towards the performance evaluation system in strategic human resources management?". In the light of the determined problem statement, answers to the following sub-problems were sought in the study.

- 1) What is the level of job satisfaction of bank employees?
- 2) What is the level of bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system?
- 3) Do bank employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to demographic characteristics?
- 4) Is there a statistical relationship between bank employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions towards performance evaluation system?

3.3. Hypotheses of the Study

Considering the answers to the problem and sub-problems of the study, some hypotheses were established to test their validity in the study. Similar studies in the literature were taken into consideration in the establishment of hypotheses. Üstüner and Özçelik (2012), in their research on personnel working in the logistics service sector, stated that there is a dependent relationship between employees' job satisfaction and gender, education and working time variables. In their study, Güngör and Çetin (2018) found that employees' perception of job satisfaction differed according to their education level, age and position in the organization, while there was no significant difference in the perception of job satisfaction according to gender, number of children, the longest residential unit, income level and length of service in the organization.

The hypotheses established in this context are expressed as follows:

- H1: Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to gender.
- H2: Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to age.
- H3: Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to educational background.
- H4: Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to the total working time in the organization.
- H5: Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to the status of the bank.
- H6: Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to the unit of employment.

In their study, Bakan et al. (2012) examined the perceptions of employees regarding the relationship between performance evaluation and remuneration in banks and concluded that there are some significant differences in performance evaluation according to the type of domestic and foreign banks and whether they have banking experience or not. In a study conducted by Güğerçin and Çavuş (2021) on a similar subject, it was examined whether the perception of destructive management in employees differs according to their demographic characteristics, and it was stated that bank employees' perceptions of destructive management which is considered as performance evaluation in our study - do not differ according to demographic variables. Tanrıyisever (2018) found that employee perception of the personnel evaluation system did not differ according to gender, age and title in the organization.

The hypotheses established in this context are expressed as follows:

- H7: Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to gender.
- H8: Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to age.
- H9: Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to educational background.
- H10: Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to the total working time in the organization.
- H11: Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to the status of the bank.
- H12: Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to the unit of employment.

In Güngör and Çetin's (2018) study, it was determined that there is a strong positive relationship between employees' perception of job satisfaction and managers' attitudes. Dalyanoğlu (2019) states in his study that there is a positive correlation between bank employees' perceptions of fairness regarding the performance evaluation system and organizational citizenship behavior, which is considered as work satisfaction in this study. In Helvacıoğlu and Fırın's (2021) study, it was determined that organizational health has a positive and significant effect on satisfaction with the performance evaluation system.

The hypotheses established in this context are expressed as follows:

H13: There is a significant and positive relationship between bank employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system.

3.4. Methodology of the Study

This study, which examines the perceptions of banking employees towards the performance evaluation system implemented within the scope of strategic human resources management, was conducted as an 'explanatory research' in terms of its objectives. In explanatory research, the why or how of some events or phenomena is explained. In this type of research, the relationships between various variables related to events and phenomena are tried to be explained by using descriptive methods. In the study, hypotheses are put forward by using statistical techniques and it is examined whether the relationships in question exist or not (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008).

In this respect, quantitative research methods were utilized in this study. In this context, firstly, a literature review was conducted and the concepts related to the subject were described. Then, field research was conducted with questionnaire application and research data were collected. Finally, the findings obtained through statistical analysis of the data were reached and evaluations were made regarding the findings.

3.5. Population and Sample of the Study

The population of the study consists of banking employees working in Baghdad and Anbar provinces in Iraq. Accordingly, the sample group of the study was determined as the employees working in banks operating in Baghdad and Anbar provinces. The following formula was used to calculate the sample size (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008).

$$n = \frac{Nt^2 pq}{d^2(N-1) + t^2 pq}$$

n: Number of individuals to be sampled

N: Number of individuals in the target group, (3,000 people)

p: Prevalence of the event under examination (0.9)

q: Probability of not seeing the event under examination (0,1)

t: The value determined from the statistical t-table at a certain confidence interval level (1.96 for 95% confidence interval)

d: Standard deviation error according to prevalence of occurrence (0.05)

As a result of the calculation made, the minimum sample number to be reached in the study was found to be 341 people. In determining the participants, a similar homogeneous sampling method was used and voluntary participation was taken into consideration. Accordingly, 410 bank employees were applied a questionnaire and the questionnaire data were used in the analysis.

3.6. Data Collection Instruments

Questionnaire technique was used to collect research data. The questionnaires were filled in electronically. The questionnaire form of the research consists of three parts.

In the first part of the questionnaire form, the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including gender, age, educational background, total working time in the organization, status of the bank and the unit of employment, are determined.

The second and third sections of the questionnaire form include the questions that constitute the measurement instrument.

3.7. Employee Satisfaction Scale

The Employee Satisfaction Scale is based on the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Weiss et al. (1967). The employee satisfaction dimension consists of 22 questions and four sub-dimensions: (i) Management and internal relations (questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15), (ii) Career and development opportunities (questions 6, 16, 17, 18), (iii) Non-wage opportunities (questions 8, 19, 20, 21, 22), (iv) Communication (questions 5, 7). The answers to the questions that make up the scale were scored on a 5-point Likert scale as 1-Not Satisfied at all, 2-Not Satisfied, 3-Somewhat Satisfied, 4-Satisfied, 5-Very Satisfied. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability value of the original scale was found to be 0.960.

3.8. Competency Based Performance Evaluation Scale

The competency-based performance evaluation dimension is based on the Job Description Scale developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969). The scale consists of three sub-dimensions and 13 questions in total. These sub-dimensions are; (i) Education and satisfaction (questions 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13), (ii) Time management and communication (questions 4, 5, 6, 7), (iii) Wage and expectations (questions 1, 2, 3). These statements are evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale as 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Partially Agree, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree. The original scale's Cronbach's Alpha reliability value was found to be 0.901.

3.9. Analyses Related to Research Scales

In this section, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), validity and reliability analysis of the scales used in the research are presented.

3.10. Exploratory Factor Analysis

EFA was applied to calculate the factor loadings of the questions that make up the measurement instruments. In the EFA analysis, the principal components method was used to determine the sub-factor groups of the scales and varimax rotation was applied. EFA results for the employee satisfaction scale are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Exploratory factor analysis of employee satisfaction scale

Factor Load	Common Variance Ratio	Scale Expression
Management and internal relations dimension		
0.667	0.611	1. Seeing myself as a part of the bank
0.682	0.626	2. Explaining the Bank's mission, vision and objectives to employees in a clear and concise manner
0.623	0.579	3. Management establishes open relationships with employees
0.679	0.610	4. Effective and fast decision making by the management
0.780	0.731	9. Working in harmony with my colleagues
0.799	0.758	10. Giving importance to teamwork
0.710	0.627	11. I am satisfied with my work
0.541	0.641	12. Evaluation of my performance
0.717	0.680	13. Receiving feedback on my performance
0.656	0.591	14. Knowing what is expected of me because I have a job description
0.715	0.619	15. Giving importance to my opinion in decisions affecting my work
Dimension of career and development opportunities		
0.692	0.627	6. Effective horizontal and vertical information exchange between units
0.580	0.639	16. The opportunities provided for my personal development and education
0.512	0.575	17. Evaluation of my training requests by the organization
0.517	0.569	18. Having the opportunity for promotion
Non-wage opportunities dimension		
0.399	0.542	8. The fact that I can easily follow developments
0.752	0.705	19. Health services provided
0.787	0.770	20. Giving importance to occupational health and safety issues
0.799	0.732	21. Food and transportation services
0.663	0.630	22. Physical working conditions
Communication dimension		
0.721	0.665	5. Announcing achievements to other employees of the bank
0.496	0.529	7. Social activities to increase communication

KMO= 0.941; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity= 5314.572; Eigen value=63.886

According to the results of the EFA analysis in Table 1, the KMO coefficient of the employee satisfaction scale is 0.941; Bartlett's test value is 5314.572 and it is significant at 5% level ($p < 0.05$). The common variance explanation ratios of the scale questions are between 0.529-0.770 and the factor load values are between 0.399-

0.799. The scale has an eigenvalue of 63,886 with its four-factor structure. In other words, the questions that make up the scale can explain approximately 64% of the scale variance.

Table 2. Exploratory factor analysis of competency-based performance evaluation scale

Factor Load	Common Variance Ratio	Scale Expression
Dimension of wage and expectations		
0.772	0.768	1. Ensures a fair wage policy.
0.794	0.830	2. Ensures compatibility between the expectations of the job and the qualifications of the employee.
0.629	0.751	3. Ensures goal-oriented work.
Time management and communication dimension		
0.548	0.776	4. Ensures the correct and effective use of time.
0.644	0.737	5. Increases the ability to use initiative.
0.778	0.797	6. Increases external customer satisfaction.
0.584	0.727	7. Increases communication skills.
Education and satisfaction dimension		
0.563	0.692	8. Provides accurate identification of education needs.
0.677	0.713	9. Ensures that my personal development turns into usable information.
0.690	0.723	10. Ensures the unity of purpose of the employee and the organization.
0.617	0.712	11. Increases harmony with colleagues.
0.774	0.794	12. Provides job satisfaction.
0.760	0.799	13. Increases employee satisfaction.
KMO= 0.948; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity= 3584.391; Eigen value=75.536		

According to the results of the EFA analysis in Table 2, the KMO coefficient of the competency-based performance evaluation scale is 0.951; Bartlett's test value is 3875.840 and significant at the 5% level ($p < 0.05$). The common variance explanatory ratios of the scale questions are in the range of 0.692-0.830 and factor loading values are in the range of 0.534-0.801. The scale has an eigenvalue of 75,536 with its three-factor structure. In other words, the questions that make up the scale can explain approximately 76% of the scale variance.

The fact that the KMO coefficient obtained as a result of the exploratory factor analysis is 0.60 and above indicates that the sample size is suitable for factor analysis (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008). The fact that the common variance explanatory ratios and factor loading values are higher than the threshold value of 0.30 indicates that the measurement tool has sufficient validity to search for answers to the research problems (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014).

According to these results, it is evaluated that the question statements that make up the employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scales contribute to the scales at a sufficient level and that there are no questions that need to be removed from the scales.

3.11. Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's Alpha (α) analysis was applied to determine the reliability (internal consistency) levels of the measurement instruments used in the study. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Reliability analysis results

Scale Overall α	Sub-dimension α	Item Number	Sub-dimensions	Scale
0.946	0.895	11	Management and internal relations	Employee Satisfaction
	0.808	4	Career and development opportunities	
	0.872	5	Non-wage opportunities	
	0.640	2	Communication	
0.943	0.894	6	Education and satisfaction	Competency Based Performance Evaluation
	0.857	4	Time management and communication	
	0.853	3	Wage and expectations	

According to the reliability analysis results in Table 3, the Cronbach's Alpha (α) reliability coefficients of the employee satisfaction scale are 0.946 for the overall scale; 0.895 for the management and internal relations dimension; 0.808 for the career and development opportunities dimension; 0.872 for the non-wage opportunities dimension; and 0.640 for the communication dimension. The Cronbach's Alpha (α) reliability coefficients of the competency-based performance evaluation scale were 0.943 for the overall scale; 0.894 for the education and satisfaction dimension; 0.857 for the time management and communication dimension; and 0.853 for the wage and expectations dimension. Reliability coefficients greater than the threshold value of 0.60 indicate that the scale has sufficient reliability level (Yaşar, 2014).

According to these results, it can be said that employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scales have sufficient reliability levels.

3.12. Data Analysis

SPSS version 25 program was used in the statistical analysis of the research data. In this context, descriptive and interpretive statistical analyses were applied to the data. For descriptive analysis, frequency and percentage distributions of the data and arithmetic mean and standard deviation scores were used. In order to decide on interpretive statistical analyses, the normal distribution of the data was examined first. In addition, correlation (Pearson correlation) analysis was performed to determine the relationships between the variables in the study. In statistical analyses, the 95% confidence interval of the data was taken into consideration.

For normality analysis, Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test was applied and skewness and kurtosis values of the data were analyzed. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Normality analysis results of the research data

Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Scale dimensions
		p	sd	Statistics	
Employee Satisfaction Scale					
-0.043±0.240	-0.416±0.121	0.000	410	0.090	Management and internal relations
-0.067±0.240	-0.554±0.121	0.000	410	0.122	Career and development opportunities
-0.395±0.240	-0.465±0.121	0.000	410	0.120	Non-wage opportunities
0.004±0.240	-0.523±0.121	0.000	410	0.160	Communication
Competency Based Performance Evaluation Scale					
0.456±0.239	-0.569±0.120	0.000	410	0.118	Education and satisfaction
0.454±0.239	-0.642±0.120	0.000	410	0.136	Time management and communication
0.640±0.239	-0.721±0.120	0.000	410	0.161	Wage and expectations

According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test results shown in Table 4, it can be stated that the research data do not show normal distribution at 5% significance level ($p < 0.05$). However, it is stated that the skewness and kurtosis values of the data within the range of ± 1.5 are sufficient for normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). Accordingly, the assumption that the data are normally distributed is accepted.

In line with these results, it was decided to apply parametric Independent Samples t test and One Way Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) tests in the study. Regarding the difference tests, the mean scores of the groups were compared to determine the differences between the paired groups, and Post-hoc (LSD) difference test was applied for three or more groups.

4. FINDINGS

In this section, the SWOT In this section, the findings obtained as a result of the statistical analysis of the research data and the comments made on the findings are presented.

4.1. Findings Regarding the Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Information on the demographic characteristics of the bank employees participating in the study is given in Table 5 in the form of percentage and frequency distributions.

Table 5. Frequency and percentage distributions of participants' demographic characteristics

%	N (410)	Group	Demographic Characteristics
42.7	175	Female	Gender
57.3	235	Male	
26.8	110	Between 20-25 years old	Age
33.7	138	Between 26-35 years old	
24.4	100	Between 36-45 years old	
11.0	45	Between 46-55 years old	
4.1	17	56 yaş ve üstü	
14.9	61	High School	Educational status
14.6	60	Associate degree	
53.9	221	Bachelor's degree	
13.4	55	Master's Degree	
3.2	13	Doctorate	
16.3	67	Less than 1 year	Total working time in the enterprise
24.9	102	1-5 years	
17.1	70	6-10 years	
23.2	95	11-15 years	
8.0	33	16-20 years	

10.5	43	21 years and above	
59.8	245	Public Bank	Status of the bank of employment
24.9	102	Private Bank	
15.4	63	Participation Bank	
12.2	50	Manager / Branch Manager	Unit of employment
10.0	41	Commercial / SME Marketing	
11.5	47	Individual Marketing	
8.5	35	Operasyon	
57.8	237	Other	

According to the findings expressed in Table 5, it was determined that 42.7% of the bank employees participating in the research were female (175 people) and 57.3% were male (235 people). The age groups of the participants were 20-25 years old 26.8%; 26-35 years old 33.7%; 36-45 years old 24.4%; 46-55 years old 11.0% and 56 years old and over 4.1%, and the mean age of the individuals was 34.05 years old. The educational status of the participants varies as follows: high school 14.9%; associate degree 14.6%; bachelor's degree 53.9%; master's degree 13.4% and doctorate 3.2%.

When the total working time of the bank employees participating in the study was analyzed, it was determined that 16.3% of the participants had less than 1 year of employment, 24.9% had 1-5 years of employment, 17.1% had 6-10 years of employment, 23.2% had 11-15 years of employment, 8.0% had 16-20 years of employment, and 10.5% had 21 years or more of employment, and the mean working time was calculated as 8.94 years.

The status of the banks where the individuals work is as follows: 59.8% public banks, 24.9% private banks and 15.4% participation banks. The unit in which the individuals work in their banks is distributed as manager/branch manager with 12.2%, commercial/business marketing with 10.0%, individual marketing with 11.5%, operations with 8.5% and other duties with 57.8%.

4.2. Findings on Participants' Perceptions of Employee Satisfaction and Competency-Based Performance Evaluation

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation scores of the answers given by the participants to the scale questions were analyzed in order to search for answers to the sub-problems established in the research; 'What is the level of work satisfaction of bank employees?' and 'What is the level of perceptions of bank employees towards the performance evaluation system?' The obtained scores are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Mean scores given to employee satisfaction scale questions

Mean. ± Ss.	Scale Expression
Management and internal relations	
3.83 ± 0.983	1. Seeing myself as a part of the bank
3.74 ± 1.002	2. Explaining the Bank's mission, vision and objectives to employees in a clear and concise manner
3.82 ± 1.016	3. Management establishes open relationships with employees
3.66 ± 1.067	4. Effective and fast decision making by the management
4.16 ± 0.929	9. Working in harmony with my colleagues
4.16 ± 0.925	10. Giving importance to teamwork
Management and internal relations	
4.27 ± 0.806	11. I am satisfied with my work
4.00 ± 0.891	12. Evaluation of my performance
4.00 ± 0.856	13. Receiving feedback on my performance
3.94 ± 0.978	14. Knowing what is expected of me because I have a job description
3.94 ± 0.978	15. Giving importance to my opinion in decisions affecting my work
3.97 ± 0.935	Mean
Career and development opportunities	
3.79 ± 0.962	6. Effective horizontal and vertical information exchange between units
3.91 ± 1.004	16. The opportunities provided for my personal development and education
3.85 ± 1.026	17. Evaluation of my training requests by the organization
4.04 ± 0.957	18. Having the opportunity for promotion
3.90 ± 0.987	Mean
Non-wage opportunities	
3.93 ± 0.956	8. The fact that I can easily follow developments
3.62 ± 1.169	19. Health services provided
3.80 ± 1.113	20. . Giving importance to occupational health and safety issues
3.59 ± 1.192	21. Food and transportation services
3.69 ± 1.054	22. Physical working conditions
3.73 ± 1.097	Mean
Communication	
3.75 ± 1.039	5. Announcing achievements to other employees of the bank
3.84 ± 1.032	7. Social activities to increase communication

3.79 ± 1.035	<i>Mean</i>
3.89 ± 0.990	<i>Mean of Scale</i>

When the mean scores in Table 6 are analyzed, it is determined that the bank employees participating in the research received a mean score of 3.89 from the employee satisfaction scale and according to this result, the satisfaction of the employees towards the working environment and job satisfaction is close to the 'satisfied' option and at a high level.

When the mean scores of the sub-dimensions are analyzed, it is seen that the highest scores of the bank employees are given to the dimensions of 'management and internal relations' (3.97) and 'career and development opportunities' (3.90), while the lowest scores are given to the dimensions of 'communication' (3.79) and 'non-wage opportunities' (3.73). Considering the mean scores obtained and the scale scoring of "4-Satisfied", it can be said that banking employees are more satisfied with the bank management, attitudes and behaviors in their work environment, and career and development opportunities offered to them, while they have some reservations about communication with other colleagues or managers and non-wage reward systems such as salary.

Table 7. Average scores given to competency-based performance evaluation scale questions

Mean \pm Ss.	Scale Expression
Education and satisfaction	
3.85 ± 0.986	8. Provides accurate identification of education needs.
3.81 ± 0.990	9. Ensures that my personal development turns into usable information.
3.89 ± 0.902	10. Ensures the unity of purpose of the employee and the organization.
4.02 ± 0.890	11. Increases harmony with colleagues.
4.01 ± 0.865	12. Provides job satisfaction.
3.99 ± 0.933	13. Increases employee satisfaction.
3.93 ± 0.927	<i>Mean</i>
Time management and communication dimension	
3.96 ± 0.966	4. Ensures the correct and effective use of time.
3.86 ± 0.896	5. Increases the ability to use initiative.
3.86 ± 0.967	6. Increases external customer satisfaction.
3.86 ± 0.977	7. Increases communication skills.
3.88 ± 0.951	<i>Mean</i>
Wage and expectations	
3.66 ± 1.119	1. Ensures a fair wage policy.
3.73 ± 1.007	2. Ensures compatibility between the expectations of the job and the qualifications of the employee.
3.87 ± 0.922	3. Ensures goal-oriented work.
3.75 ± 1.016	<i>Mean</i>
3.87 ± 0.955	<i>Mean of Scale</i>

When the mean scores in Table 7 are analyzed, it is determined that the banking employees participating in the research received a mean score of 3.87 from the competency-based performance evaluation scale and according to this result, it is found that the employees have a positive perception of the evaluation system applied to evaluate their job performance, which is close to the 'agree' option.

When the mean scores for the sub-dimensions are analyzed, it is seen that the participants gave the highest scores to the questions in the 'education and satisfaction' dimension (3.93) and the lowest scores to the questions in the 'time management and communication' (3.88) and 'remuneration and expectations' (3.75) dimensions. Considering the mean scores obtained and the scale scoring of "4-Agree", it can be said that the perceptions of banking employees towards job satisfaction and performance evaluation system overlap, individuals have a higher level of perception towards supporting opportunities such as education opportunities for the evaluation system, and a lower level of perception towards improving communication within the organization or with managers and colleagues.

4.3. Differentiation of Participants' Perceptions of Employee Satisfaction and Competency-Based Performance Evaluation According to Demographic Characteristics

Parametric statistical analyses were applied to determine whether banking employees' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation differ according to their demographic characteristics.

The results of the independent sample t-test showing the comparison of the mean scores of the participants regarding the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to gender variable are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Comparison of participants' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation by gender

p	t	ss.	\bar{x}	n	Group	Scale and sub-dimension		
0.010	-2.578	.582	3.88	175	Female	Management and internal relations	Employee satisfaction	
		.698	4.04	235	Male			
0.346	-0.943	.723	3.86	175	Female	Career and development opportunities		
		.831	3.93	235	Male			
0.408	-0.828	.781	3.68	175	Female	Non-wage opportunities		
		.971	3.76	235	Male			
0.058	-1.898	.802	3.70	175	Female	Communication		
		.942	3.86	235	Male			
0.032	-2.155	.645	3.84	175	Female	Education and satisfaction		Competency Based Performance Evaluation
		.814	4.00	235	Male			
0.196	-1.297	.654	3.82	175	Female	Time management and communication		
		.871	3.92	235	Male			
0.017	-2.388	.677	3.90	175	Female	Wage and expectations		
		.830	4.09	235	Male			

When the analysis results shown in Table 8 are examined; it was found that there were statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in the mean scores of bank employees according to gender in the dimensions of *management and internal relations* from the sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale and in the dimensions of *education, satisfaction, wage and expectations* from the sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale, but there was no difference ($p > 0.05$) in the dimensions of *career and development opportunities, non-wage opportunities and communication* from the sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale and in the dimensions of *time management and communication* from the sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale.

In the analysis, it is seen that the mean scores of male individuals in the dimensions where significance is found are significantly higher than those of female individuals. According to these results, it can be concluded that the gender of banking employees has determinant effects on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation and that male individuals have higher levels of job satisfaction and positive perceptions towards the evaluation system than female individuals.

The results of the ANOVA analysis showing the comparison of the mean scores of the participants regarding the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to the age variable are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Comparison of participants' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation by age

Post-hoc	p	F	ss.	\bar{x}	n	Group	Scale and sub-dimension	
c>b. a	0.025	2.823	.647	3.91	110	20-25 years ^a	Management and internal relations	Employee satisfaction
			.651	3.87	138	26-35 years ^b		
			.732	4.12	100	36-45 years ^c		
			.461	4.09	45	46-55 years ^d		
			.556	4.03	17	56 years and above ^e		
			.656	3.97	410	Total		
No difference	0.089	2.030	.761	3.86	110	20-25 years	Career and development opportunities	
			.705	3.80	138	26-35 years		
			.871	4.09	100	36-45 years		
			.772	3.87	45	46-55 years		
			.988	3.90	17	56 years and above		
			.787	3.90	410	Total		
No difference	0.248	1.356	.791	3.83	110	20-25 years	Non-wage opportunities	
			.827	3.61	138	26-35 years		
			1.062	3.82	100	36-45 years		
			.821	3.64	45	46-55 years		
			1.114	3.68	17	56 years and above		
			.895	3.73	410	Total		

No difference	0.120	1.844	.799	3.80	110	20-25 years	Management and internal relations
			.924	3.66	138	26-35 years	
			.969	3.96	100	36-45 years	
			.775	3.89	45	46-55 years	
			.811	3.71	17	56 years and above	
			.888	3.79	410	Total	
c>b	0.021	2.935	.721	3.92	110	20-25 years ^a	Education and satisfaction
			.731	3.79	138	26-35 years ^b	
			.851	4.10	100	36-45 years ^c	
			.569	3.95	45	46-55 years ^d	
			.709	4.11	17	56 years and above ^e	
			.750	3.93	410	Total	
No difference	0.190	1.541	.753	3.83	110	20-25 years	Time management and communication
			.764	3.78	138	26-35 years	
			.898	4.03	100	36-45 years	
			.628	3.93	45	46-55 years	
			.803	3.88	17	56 years and above	
			.786	3.88	410	Total	
c>b	0.019	2.972	.748	4.00	110	20-25 years ^a	Wage and expectations
			.767	3.86	138	26-35 years ^b	
			.848	4.18	100	36-45 years ^c	
			.597	4.04	45	46-55 years ^d	
			.737	4.20	17	56 years and above ^e	
			.773	4.01	410	Total	

Competency Based Performance Evaluation

When the analysis results in Table 9 are examined; it was found that there were statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in the mean scores of bank employees in the dimensions of *management and internal relations*, which are sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale, and in the dimensions of *education and satisfaction and wage and expectations*, which are sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale, according to age; however, there were no differences ($p > 0.05$) in the dimensions of *career and development opportunities, non-wage opportunities and communication*, which are sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale, and in the dimensions of *time management and communication*, which are sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale.

As a result of the post-hoc (LSD) analysis, it was found that the mean scores of individuals between the ages of 36-45 were significantly higher than those of individuals between the ages of 20-25 and 26-35 in the dimension of management and internal relations; and the mean scores of individuals between the ages of 36-45 were significantly higher than those of individuals between the ages of 26-35 in the dimensions of education and satisfaction and wages and expectations.

According to these results, it is concluded that the age of banking employees has a determinant effect on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation, and that the positive perception levels of individuals reach the highest level in the 36-45 age range, and that these individuals are more satisfied with their workplaces. In addition, although statistically insignificant, it is observed that the positive perceptions of individuals towards the workplace and the evaluation system begin to decrease after the 36-45 age range.

The results of the ANOVA analysis showing the comparison of the mean scores of the participants regarding the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to the educational status variable are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Comparison of participants' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation by educational status

Post-hoc	P	F	ss.	\bar{x}	n	Group	Scale and sub-dimension	
No difference	0.898	0.269	.720	3.99	61	High School	Management and internal relations	Employee satisfaction
			.623	4.00	60	Associate Degree		
			.659	3.96	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.561	3.93	55	Master's Degree		
			.849	4.12	13	Doctorate		
			.656	3.97	410	Total		
No difference	0.228	1.416	.805	3.98	61	High School	Career and development opportunities	
			.794	3.89	60	Associate Degree		
			.783	3.88	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.733	3.77	55	Master's Degree		
			.896	4.31	13	Doctorate		
			.787	3.90	410	Total		
No difference	0.146	1.714	.894	3.87	61	High School	Non-wage opportunities	
			.883	3.65	60	Associate Degree		
			.904	3.69	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.837	3.65	55	Master's Degree		
			.927	4.23	13	Doctorate		
			.895	3.73	410	Total		
No difference	0.404	1.006	.900	3.86	61	High School	Communication	
			.881	3.83	60	Associate Degree		
			.889	3.77	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.869	3.69	55	Master's Degree		
			.925	4.19	13	Doctorate		
			.888	3.79	410	Total		
No difference	0.286	1.258	.688	4.06	61	High School	Education and satisfaction	
			.783	3.92	60	Associate Degree		
			.769	3.92	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.675	3.79	55	Master's Degree		
			.828	4.17	13	Doctorate		
			.750	3.93	410	Total		
No difference	0.547	0.768	.720	4.00	61	High School	Time management and communication	
			.803	3.86	60	Associate Degree		
			.806	3.87	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.708	3.75	55	Master's Degree		
			.993	3.97	13	Doctorate		
			.786	3.88	410	Total		
No difference	0.377	1.058	.698	4.15	61	High School	Wage and expectations	
			.828	4.02	60	Associate Degree		
			.783	3.99	221	Bachelor's Degree		
			.727	3.87	55	Master's Degree		
			.846	4.15	13	Doctorate		
			.773	4.01	410	Total		

When the analysis results in Table 10 are analyzed, it is determined that there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in the mean scores of bank employees regarding the sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to their educational status.

According to these results, it can be stated that the educational level of banking employees does not have a determining effect on their perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation; in other words, regardless of their educational level, bank employees have similar perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation.

The results of the ANOVA analysis showing the comparison of the mean scores of the participants regarding the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to the variable of total working time in the organization are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Comparison of participants' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation by working time in enterprise

Post-hoc	p	F	ss.	\bar{x}	n	Group	Scale and sub-dimension	
f>c e>c. a d>c. b. a	0.000	4.703	.578	3.82	67	Less than 1 year ^a	Management and internal relations	Employee satisfaction
			.694	3.95	102	1-5 years ^b		
			.642	3.77	70	6-10 years ^c		
			.686	4.19	95	11-15 years ^d		
			.558	4.11	33	16-20 years ^e		
			.552	4.03	43	21 years and above ^f		
.656	3.97	410	Total					
f<e. d e>f. c. a d>f. c. b. a	0.001	4.119	.614	3.76	67	Less than 1 year ^a	Career and development opportunities	
			.821	3.87	102	1-5 years ^b		
			.738	3.70	70	6-10 years ^c		
			.792	4.14	95	11-15 years ^d		
			.707	4.15	33	16-20 years ^e		
			.918	3.78	43	21 years and above ^f		
.787	3.90	410	Total					
No difference	0.062	2.121	.735	3.62	67	Less than 1 year	Non-wage opportunities	
			.884	3.76	102	1-5 years		
			.834	3.51	70	6-10 years		
			.972	3.91	95	11-15 years		
			.958	3.88	33	16-20 years		
			.954	3.62	43	21 years and above		
.895	3.73	410	Total					
f<d e>c d>f. c. b. a	0.006	3.309	.675	3.70	67	Less than 1 year ^a	Communication	
			.967	3.75	102	1-5 years ^b		
			.908	3.54	70	6-10 years ^c		
			.906	4.05	95	11-15 years ^d		
			.819	3.97	33	16-20 years ^e		
			.841	3.73	43	21 years and above ^f		
.888	3.79	410	Total					
f>c d>c. a b>c	0.008	3.195	.657	3.84	67	Less than 1 year ^a	Education and satisfaction	
			.753	3.96	102	1-5 years ^b		
			.789	3.67	70	6-10 years ^c		
			.782	4.12	95	11-15 years ^d		
			.725	3.97	33	16-20 years ^e		
			.664	3.98	43	21 years and above ^f		
.750	3.93	410	Total					
f>c e>c d>c. a b>c	0.004	3.480	.664	3.82	67	Less than 1 year ^a	Time management and communication	
			.835	3.92	102	1-5 years ^b		
			.754	3.57	70	6-10 years ^c		
			.825	4.07	95	11-15 years ^d		
			.766	3.94	33	16-20 years ^e		
			.708	3.88	43	21 years and above ^f		
.786	3.88	410	Total					
f>c d>c. a b>c	0.010	3.054	.661	3.88	67	Less than 1 year ^a	Wage and expectations	
			.804	4.03	102	1-5 years ^b		
			.824	3.78	70	6-10 years ^c		
			.745	4.20	95	11-15 years ^d		
			.770	4.03	33	16-20 years ^e		
			.745	4.12	43	21 years and above ^f		
.773	4.01	410	Total					

When the results of the analysis in Table 11 are examined, it is determined that there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in the *non-wage opportunities* dimension of the employee satisfaction scale sub-dimensions of the bank employees according to the length of employment, while there are significant differences ($p<0.05$) in the *management and internal relations, career and development opportunities and communication* dimensions and competency-based performance evaluation scale sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale.

As a result of the post-hoc (LSD) analysis, it was determined that the mean scores of individuals with a total working period between 6-10 years in the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction were significantly at the lowest level, while the mean scores after this period increased significantly.

It can be said that individuals' job satisfaction and perceptions of the performance evaluation system followed a fluctuating course in the first years, satisfaction and perception levels decreased to the lowest level in the 6-10 year interval, after this period, a great increase was observed in job satisfaction and evaluation perceptions, this level started to decrease again over time. However, it can be said that individuals still have a higher level of perception and satisfaction than in the first years of their profession.

The results of the ANOVA analysis showing the comparison of the mean scores of the participants regarding the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to the status of the bank in which they work are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Comparison of participants' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation by bank status

Post-hoc	P	F	ss.	\bar{x}	n	Group	Scale and sub-dimension	
No difference	0.105	2.262	.654	4.01	245	Public Bank	Management and internal relations	Employee satisfaction
			.675	3.85	102	Private Bank		
			.613	4.00	63	Participation Bank		
			.656	3.97	410	Total		
No difference	0.133	2.031	.789	3.91	245	Public Bank	Career and development opportunities	
			.779	3.79	102	Private Bank		
			.777	4.04	63	Participation Bank		
			.787	3.90	410	Total		
No difference	0.220	1.520	.912	3.75	245	Public Bank	Non-wage opportunities	
			.878	3.60	102	Private Bank		
			.845	3.84	63	Participation Bank		
			.895	3.73	410	Total		
No difference	0.283	1.267	.874	3.84	245	Public Bank	Communication	
			.858	3.68	102	Private Bank		
			.982	3.79	63	Participation Bank		
			.888	3.79	410	Total		
c>b a>b	0.015	4.216	.776	3.97	245	Public Bank ^a	Education and satisfaction	Competency Based Performance Evaluation
			.706	3.75	102	Private Bank ^b		
			.677	4.06	63	Participation ^c		
			.750	3.93	410	Total		
No difference	0.089	2.437	.808	3.91	245	Public Bank	Time management and communication	
			.733	3.73	102	Private Bank		
			.767	3.97	63	Participation Bank		
			.786	3.88	410	Total		
No difference	0.056	2.900	.801	4.04	245	Public Bank	Wage and expectations	
			.744	3.86	102	Private Bank		
			.676	4.14	63	Participation Bank		
			.773	4.01	410	Total		

When the results of the analysis in Table 12 are analyzed, it is determined that there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in the mean scores of bank employees in the sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale and the sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale, *time management and communication and wage and expectations* dimensions according to the status of the bank, but there are some

differences ($p < 0.05$) in the *education and satisfaction* dimension of the competency-based performance evaluation scale.

As a result of the post-hoc (LSD) analysis, it was determined that the mean scores of public bank and participation bank employees were significantly higher than private bank employees in the dimension of education and satisfaction.

According to these results, it can be stated that the status of the bank in which banking employees work has no effect on employee satisfaction and all individuals are satisfied with the work environment regardless of the status of the bank they work in. But the status of the bank has a determining effect on the perception of competency-based performance evaluation and individuals working in public and participation banks think that the performance system is applied in a way that increases opportunities such as education etc. compared to those working in private banks.

The results of the ANOVA analysis showing the comparison of the mean scores of the participants regarding the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale according to the unit of employment variable are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Comparison of participants' perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation by unit of employment

Post-hoc	P	F	ss.	\bar{x}	n	Group	Scale and sub-dimension	
No difference	0.069	2.196	.648	3.94	50	Manager / Branch Manager	Management and internal relations	Employee satisfaction
			.641	3.75	41	Commercial / SME Marketing		
			.537	3.89	47	Individual Marketing		
			.595	3.92	35	Operasyon		
			.682	4.04	237	Other		
			.656	3.97	410	Total		
No difference	0.179	1.580	.774	3.81	50	Manager / Branch Manager	Career and development opportunities	Employee satisfaction
			.760	3.71	41	Commercial / SME Marketing		
			.789	3.77	47	Individual Marketing		
			.734	3.94	35	Operasyon		
			.797	3.97	237	Other		
			.787	3.90	410	Total		
No difference	0.075	2.139	.999	3.59	50	Manager / Branch Manager	Non-wage opportunities	Employee satisfaction
			.770	3.62	41	Commercial / SME Marketing		
			.884	3.48	47	Individual Marketing		
			.716	3.94	35	Operasyon		
			.908	3.79	237	Other		
			.895	3.73	410	Total		
e>a. b d>a. b	0.024	2.853	1.056	3.58	50	Manager / Branch Manager ^a	Communication	Employee satisfaction
			.840	3.51	41	Commercial / SME Marketing ^b		
			.721	3.73	47	Individual Marketing ^c		
			.848	4.03	35	Operasyon ^d		
			.879	3.86	237	Other ^e		
			.888	3.79	410	Toplam		
e>a. b d>a. b	0.033	2.640	.805	3.73	50	Manager / Branch Manager ^a	Education and satisfaction	Competency Based Performance Evaluation
			.741	3.70	41	Commercial / SME Marketing ^b		
			.612	3.90	47	Individual Marketing ^c		
			.671	4.09	35	Operasyon ^d		
			.765	3.99	237	Other ^e		
			.750	3.93	410	Toplam		
No difference	0.081	2.096	.826	3.72	50	Manager / Branch Manager	Time management and communication	Competency Based Performance Evaluation
			.701	3.67	41	Commercial / SME Marketing		
			.638	3.77	47	Individual Marketing		
			.689	3.99	35	Operasyon		
			.823	3.95	237	Other		

			.786	3.88	410	Total	
			.808	3.86	50	Manager / Branch Manager	
			.785	3.75	41	Commercial / SME Marketing	
No difference	0.055	2.333	.607	4.04	47	Individual Marketing	Wage and expectations
			.692	4.18	35	Operasyon	
			.794	4.06	237	Other	
			.773	4.01	410	Total	

When the analysis results in Table 13 are examined; It was found that there were statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in the mean scores of bank employees in the communication dimension from the sub-dimensions of the employee satisfaction scale and in the *education and satisfaction* dimensions from the sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale according to the unit of employment; however, there was no differentiation ($p > 0.05$) in the dimensions of *management and internal relations, career and development opportunities and non-wage opportunities* of the employee satisfaction scale and in the dimensions of time management and communication and wage and expectations from the sub-dimensions of the competency-based performance evaluation scale.

As a result of the post (hoc) analysis, it was found that the average scores of individuals working in operations and other units were significantly higher than those of individuals working in manager / branch manager and commercial / SME marketing units in the dimensions of communication and education and satisfaction.

According to these results, it is concluded that the department in which banking employees work has a determinant effect on their perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation and that employees working in operations and other departments think that they can communicate better within the organization and that the performance system encourages them more in terms of professional advancement such as education etc. compared to employees working in manager/branch manager and commercial/SME marketing departments.

4.1. Correlation Analysis between Employee Satisfaction and Competency-Based Performance Evaluation Perception Levels of Participants

Correlation analysis was applied to the mean scores obtained from the measurement tools in order to search for answers to the sub-problem of the study, "Is there a statistical relationship between bank employees' satisfaction with their work and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system?". The results of this analysis in this context are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Correlation analysis results between employee satisfaction and perception levels towards competency-based performance evaluation scale

9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Mean ± Ss.	Scale and sub-dimensions			
			-	-	-	-	-	1	3.89±0.681	1. Employee Satisfaction			
			-	-	-	-	1	.939**	3.97±0.656	2. Management and internal relations			
			-	-	-	1	.758**	.885**	3.90±0.787	3. Career and development opportunities			
			-	-	1	.759**	.707**	.882**	3.73±0.895	4. Non-wage opportunities			
			-	1	.702*	.701**	.731**	.828**	3.79±0.888	5. Communication			
			-	1	.695**	.740**	.688**	.710**	.790**	3.87±0.739	6. Competency Based Performance Evaluation		
			1	.950**	.659**	.705**	.659**	.685**	.757**	3.93±0.750	7. Educationa and satisfaction		
			1	.864**	.947**	.639**	.667**	.651**	.657**	.728**	3.88±0.786	8. Time management and communication	
			1	.767**	.934**	.879**	.612**	.680**	.628**	.657**	.724**	4.01±0.773	9. Wage and expectations

** Correlation is significant at 1% Level

When the results of the correlation analysis in Table 14 are examined. it is determined that there is a statistically significant and positive correlation between the perception levels of the bank employees participating in the study towards employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scale ($p < 0.05$).

In line with the correlation results obtained in this context;

- ✓ There is a very high correlation between the employee satisfaction scale. management and internal relations. career and development opportunities. non-wage opportunities and communication dimensions; a high correlation between career and development opportunities and non-wage opportunities and communication dimensions; and a high correlation between non-wage opportunities and communication dimensions.
- ✓ There is a very high correlation between the dimensions of competency-based performance evaluation scale, management, training and satisfaction and time management, communication, wage and expectations, and a high correlation between the dimensions of time management, communication, wage and expectations.

- ✓ There is also a significant positive and high correlation between employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scales. According to this result, it can be stated that job satisfaction or satisfaction with the working environment increases the positive perceptions of banking employees towards competency-based performance evaluation system.

Based on the results obtained in the study, the acceptance and rejection of the hypotheses established to test their validity are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Acceptance/rejection status of research hypotheses

Hypothesis Number	Hypothesis	Acceptance / Rejection status
H1.	Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to gender.	Accepted
H2.	Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to age.	Accepted
H3.	Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to educational background.	Rejected
H4.	Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to the total working time in the organization..	Accepted
H5.	Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to the status of the bank.	Rejected
H6.	Job satisfaction of bank employees differs according to the unit of employment.	Accepted
H7.	Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to gender.	Accepted
H8.	Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to age.	Accepted
H9.	Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to educational background.	Rejected
H10.	Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to the total working time in the organization.	Accepted
H11.	Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to the status of the bank.	Accepted
H12.	Bank employees' perceptions towards performance evaluation system differ according to the unit of employment	Accepted
H13.	There is a significant and positive relationship between bank employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system.	Accepted

As can be seen in Table 15, the hypotheses that bank employees' job satisfaction differs according to gender, age, total working time in the organization and unit of employment are accepted. The hypotheses that bank employees' job satisfaction differs according to educational background and status of the bank are rejected.

The hypotheses that the perceptions of bank employees towards performance evaluation system differ according to gender, age, total working time in the organization, the status of the bank and the unit of employment are accepted. The hypothesis "Perceptions of bank employees towards performance evaluation system differ according to educational background" is rejected.

The hypothesis "There is a significant and positive relationship between bank employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system." is accepted.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study, which examines the performance evaluation system in strategic human resources management, was conducted as a quantitative research on a sample of banking employees. In this direction, the study examined the level of work satisfaction of bank employees and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system, whether these levels differ according to some demographic characteristics of individuals and whether there is a statistical relationship.

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation scores of the answers given by the participants to the questions in the measurement instruments were analyzed to determine the level of bank employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system. As a result of these analyzes;

- ✓ The bank employees who participated in the research received a mean score of 3.89 from the employee satisfaction scale and a mean score of 3.87 from the competency-based performance evaluation scale, and according to this result, it was determined that the satisfaction of the employees towards the working environment and job satisfaction and their perceptions towards the evaluation system applied to evaluate their job performance were at a high level.
- ✓ Independent sample t-test and ANOVA tests were applied to determine whether the perceptions of banking employees towards employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation system differ according to their demographic characteristics. As a result of these analyzes, it was determined that:

- ✓ The gender of the bank employees participating in the research has determinative effects on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation. Male individuals have higher levels of job satisfaction and positive perceptions of the evaluation system than female individuals.
- ✓ The age of banking employees has a determinant effect on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation. The positive satisfaction and perceptions of individuals between the ages of 36-45 reached the highest level.
- ✓ The educational background of banking employees does not have a determinant effect on their perceptions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation.
- ✓ The total length of employment of banking employees in the organization has a determinant effect on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation, and the satisfaction and perception levels drop to the lowest level between 6-10 years, after this period, a significant increase in job satisfaction and evaluation perceptions is observed, this level starts to decrease again over time, but even in this period, individuals have a higher level of perception and satisfaction than in the first years of their profession.
- ✓ The status of the bank in which banking employees work has no effect on employee satisfaction but individuals working in public and participation banks think that the performance system is applied in a way that increases opportunities such as education etc. compared to those working in private banks.
- ✓ The department in which banking employees work has a determinant effect on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation, and employees working in operations and other departments think that they can communicate better within the organization and that the performance system encourages them more in terms of professional advancement compared to those working in manager/branch manager and commercial/SME marketing departments.

Correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is a statistical relationship between the bank employees' satisfaction with their work and their perceptions of the performance evaluation system. As a result of correlation analysis; it was determined that:

- ✓ There are statistically significant and positive correlations between employee satisfaction and perception levels of bank employees towards competency-based performance evaluation scale.
- ✓ Significant and positive correlations were found between the sub-dimensions of employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation scales.
- ✓ An increase or decrease in the scale dimensions causes an increase or decrease in the same direction in another dimension.

The findings of this study were compared with the results of similar studies in the literature and evaluations were made.

In a study conducted by Erbaşı et al. (2014), it was determined that the gender and education level of banking employees had an effect on job satisfaction and that female employees and employees with master's and associate degree were more satisfied with their jobs. The finding that male employees in this study are more satisfied with their jobs and the finding that educational attainment does not have a determinant effect on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation differ from this study in the literature.

In a study conducted by Güner and Bozkurt (2018), no significant difference was found between the subjective well-being of individuals working in the banking sector in terms of work satisfaction in their workplaces according to gender, and the result of the difference analysis for the age factor was considered significant. This study differs from the finding that male employees are more satisfied with their jobs and that the positive satisfaction and perceptions of individuals in the 36-45 age range reach the highest level.

Atış (2011) examined the effects of service quality on employee satisfaction in the banking sector and found that there is a significant relationship between the service management factors of the bank and employee satisfaction, the type of bank, position in the organization and wage level affect employee satisfaction. While the variables of working time in the organization, gender, educational status, age, and marital status do not have a determining effect on employee satisfaction. This study differs from the findings of this study, which revealed differences according to gender, age and educational status.

When the data obtained from a study conducted by Erbaşı and Akdeniz (2021) were examined, it was found that bank employees' perceptions of performance evaluation were at a medium level. This result is partially similar to the finding that there is a statistically significant and positive correlation relationship between the perception levels towards the competency-based performance evaluation scale in this study.

Based on the results of the study, the following suggestions were developed for researchers interested in the subject.

- ✓ In the study, it was determined that bank employees' perceptions of the employee satisfaction competency-based performance evaluation system were positive and at a high level. It should not be forgotten that this is an important result for strategic human resources management in the banking system. Therefore, the belief of the staff in the system should be taken into consideration in the steps to be taken in this direction.
- ✓ The demographic characteristics of the bank employees participating in the study were found to have determinant effects on employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation. In this context, it is recommended that internal surveys should be conducted to determine the factors that lead to lower levels of job satisfaction and perceptions of female employees towards the evaluation system and improvements should be made to eliminate the factors that cause this.
- ✓ It has been determined that employee satisfaction and competency-based performance evaluation perceptions of banking employees decrease as their age increases and in parallel, as their years of employment increase. In order to overcome this situation, it may be suggested to minimize some policies that lead to differences within the organization.
- ✓ In the study, it was found that employees in private banks think that there is no performance system that supports or encourages individual development. Therefore, it is thought that private bank managers should develop a career system incentive similar to those in public and participation banking, so that negative perceptions on the staff can be reduced.
- ✓ The study found that there is a lower level of communication between some units within the organization. This situation may have negative repercussions on the performance of the bank. It should be kept in mind that higher levels of communication in the organization will contribute to preventing communication accidents and increasing business performance.
- ✓ The study revealed that there is a high and positive correlation between employee satisfaction and perceptions of competency-based performance evaluation. This situation should be taken into consideration in all practices within the organization and the policies implemented should be evaluated holistically. In other words, it should be known that a decision to be taken within the scope of strategic human resources management directly affects another issue in the organization and the steps to be taken should be designed accordingly.
- ✓ It is considered that this study will make significant contributions to the literature. In this respect, it is recommended to conduct new studies on similar topics involving different sectors.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (1998). Performance management handbook, London: IPM.
- Atış, A. (2011). Bankacılık sektöründe hizmet kalitesinin çalışan memnuniyetine etkileri, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Bakan, İ., Doğan, İ. F., Erşahan, B., & Eyitmiş, A. M. (2012). Bankalarda performans değerlendirme ve ücretleme ilişkisine dair çalışanların algılamaları: Yerli ve yabancı menşeli banka uygulamalarının karşılaştırılmasına yönelik bir alan araştırması, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(1), 1-26.
- Barutçugil, İ. (2004). Stratejik insan kaynakları yönetimi, İstanbul: Kariyer Yayıncılık.
- Boice, D. F., & Kleiner, B. H. (1997). Designing effective performance appraisal systems, Work Study, 46(6), 197-201.
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2017). Human resource management: theory and practice, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan,

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri, (34. Baskı), Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cansever, A. F. (2002). Performans yönetimi sistemi, Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Çetinkaya, F. F., Şimşek, H., & AYTEKİN, C. (2019). Örgütsel kalite göstergesi olarak çalışan memnuniyeti: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 29(2), 233-245.

Dalyanoğlu Ç. H. (2019). Kamu ve özel sektör banka çalışanlarının performans değerlendirme sistemine ilişkin adalet algılarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkileri, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Delery, J.E. & Doty, D.H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: tests of universalistic contingency and configurational performance predictions, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802-835.

Dessler, G., (2013). Human resource management, New York: Pearson.

Dickinson, T. L. (1993). Attitudes about performance appraisal. In: H. Schuler, J. L. Farr, & M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel selection and assessment: industrial and organizational perspectives*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum: 141-161.

Erbaşı, A., Ünüvar, O., & Arat, T. (2014). Banka çalışan performanslarının etkileyen örgütsel stres faktörlerinin ve memnuniyet düzeylerinin tespiti, *Verimlilik Dergisi*, (3), 97-114.

Erbaşı, A. & Akdeniz, G. (2021). Performans değerlendirme hatalarına ilişkin algının çalışan sessizliği üzerindeki etkisi, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 46, 243-253.

Gabris, G.T. & Ihrke, D. M. (2001). Does performance appraisal contribute to heightened levels of employee burnout? The results of one study, *Public Personnel Management*, 30 (2), 157-172.

Gügerçin, S. & Çavuş, M. F. (2021). Yıkıcı yönetim algısı: demografik değişkenlere göre bankacılık sektöründe bir araştırma, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(2), 1523-1537.

Güner, F., & Bozkurt, Ö. Ç. (2018). İşgörenlerin öznel iyi olma düzeylerinin farklı sosyo-demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Banka çalışanları üzerinde bir araştırma, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Uygulamalı Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), 1-21.

Güngör, B., & Çetin, S. (2018). İş tatmini algısının çalışanların demografik özelliklerine göre farklılıkları: Kastamonu ili kamu sektörü ve özel sektör kurumlarında bir araştırma, *Uluslararası Toplumsal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), 50-73.

Helvacıoğlu, E. T., & Fırın, S. (2021). Bankacılık sektöründe örgüt sağlığının performans değerlendirme sisteminden duyulan memnuniyete etkisi, *The Journal of Business*, 2, 146-157.

Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R.S., & Jiang, K. (2014). Strategic HRM: a review and framework, *Academy of Management Annals*, 8, 1-56.

Klingner, D., J. Nalbandian, & J. Llorens. (2010). *Public personnel management: Contexts and strategies*, (6th ed.). New York: Longman.

Najafi, L., Hamidi, Y., & Ghiasi, M., (2011). Performance evaluation and its effects on employees job motivation in hamedan city health centers, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12), 1761-1765.

O'Boyle, I. (2013). Individual performance management: a review of current practices, *Asia-Pacific Management and Business Application*, 1(3), 157- 170.

Reşitoğlu, R. (2011). Yetkinlik Bazlı Performans Değerlendirme ve Çalışan Memnuniyeti, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Rock, D., & Jones, B. (2015). Why more and more companies are ditching performance ratings, *Harvard Business Review*, 8, 2-4.

Salvatore, P., Weitzman, A., & Halem, D. (2005). How the law changed HR, *HR Magazine*, 13 (50), 47-56.

Schraeder, M. Becton, J., & Portis, R. (2007). A critical examination of performance appraisals, *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 30(1), 20-25.

- Shaout, A. & Yousif M. K. (2014). Performance evaluation methods and techniques survey, *International Journal of Computer and Information Technology*, 3(5), 966-1002.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidel, L.S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics. (Sixth Edition)*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tanrıyisever, Ş. A. (2018). *Çalışanların performans değerlendirme algısının örgütsel sinizme etkisi*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Uyargil, C. (2013). *Performans yönetimi sistemi bireysel performansın planlanması değerlendirilmesi ve geliştirilmesi*, İstanbul: Beta Basım A.Ş.
- Üstüner, M., & Özçelik, E. (2012). *Çalışanların demografik özelliklerine göre iş tatminindeki tutumsal farklılıkların bir lojistik işletmesinde uygulama örneği*, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (28), 225-235.
- Van Dijk, D. & Schodl M. M. (2015). *Performance Appraisal and Evaluation*. In: James D. Wright (editor-in-chief), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 17, 716–721.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Werner, J. M. (2014). *Human resource development human resource management: so what is it?*. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25, 127-139.
- Yaşar, M. (2014). *İstatistiğe yönelik tutum ölçeği: geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması*, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36(36), 59-75.