

AN EVALUATION OF CURRENT HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
PRACTICES IN THE TURKISH PRIVATE SECTOR

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

SERAY SÖZER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

DECEMBER 2004

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer
Head of the Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Reyhan Bilgiç

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Canan Ergin

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Seray Sözer :

Signature :

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF CURRENT HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE TURKISH PRIVATE SECTOR

Sözer, Seray

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

December, 2004, 198 pages

This study explored human resource management (HRM) functions of 200 work organizations operating in Turkey using a questionnaire. The participating organizations were the members of either the Personnel Managers Association or the Quality Association in Turkey. Job analysis and design, recruitment and selection, orientation and employee training, performance appraisal, career planning and development, human resource planning, compensation management and incentives, managing employee health and safety were among the fields that were examined. In addition to the prevalent HRM functions, the profile of Human Resource Departments of the organizations (i.e., title, size, number of hierarchical levels, etc.), the characteristics of HRM managers (education, age, gender, experience, etc.) were also examined. For example, it was found

that the departments operating in field of HRM were named Human Resource Department in 59.5% of the organizations in the sample. Moreover, the results indicated that the main HRM areas practiced by the private sector organizations operating in Turkey were personnel selection, employee recruitment, training and development, compensation management, and employee orientation. Nevertheless, the other essential functions of HRM, such as job analysis, human resource planning and career planning, and development were not practiced as frequently. Whether those functions were frequently practiced or not, each of them was further analysed in terms their specific applications. Another aim of the present study was to compare the practices of HRM in Turkey with its applications in the world. For instance, the results demonstrated that recruiting via internet was practiced frequently in the surveyed organizations and in the US companies. The present study also revealed that personnel selection methods, such as interviews, were popular among surveyed organizations and organizations in Eastern European countries, England, and the US.

Keywords: Human Resource Management, HRM Functions, HRM in Turkey, Cross-Cultural Comparison of HRM functions

ÖZ

TÜRK ÖZEL SEKTÖRÜNDE UYGULANAN GÜNCEL İNSAN KAYNAKLARI FAALİYETLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR DEĞERLENDİRME

Sözer, Seray

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

Aralık 2004, 198 sayfa

Bu çalışma Türkiye’de faaliyet gösteren 200 organizasyonun insan kaynakları alanındaki (İK) uygulamalarını 200 katılımcının ankete verdiği cevapları inceleyerek araştırmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında Türkiye’de değişik sektörlerde faaliyet gösteren ve Personel Yöneticileri Derneği’ne veya Kalite Derneği’ne üye organizasyonlar yer almaktadır. Araştırma dahilinde, iş analizi ve tasarımı, başvuru sağlama ve personel seçme, oryantasyon ve eğitim, performans değerlendirme, kariyer planlama ve gelişim, insan kaynakları planlaması, ücret yönetimi, işçi sağlığı ve güvenliği gibi insan kaynakları uygulamaları incelenmiştir. Bunlara ek olarak, İnsan Kaynakları Departmanlarının profili (departman adı, çalışan kişi sayısı, hiyerarşik düzeyleri vb.) ve İK yöneticilerinin özellikleri de (eğitim, yaş, cinsiyet, deneyim, vb.) incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın

sonuçlarına göre; Türkiye’deki organizasyonların %59.5’inde İK uygulamalarını yürüten departmanlar İnsan Kaynakları Departmanı olarak adlandırılmaktadır. Ayrıca, Türkiye’de faaliyet gösteren firmalar çoğunlukla personel seçme, başvuru sağlama, eğitim ve gelişim, ücret yönetimi ve oryantasyon gibi insan kaynakları faaliyetlerini uygulamaktadırlar. Ancak, iş analizi, insan kaynakları planlaması ve kariyer planlama gibi bazı önemli İK süreçleri aynı çoğunlukta uygulanmamaktadır. Araştırmaya katılan firmalar tarafından uygulansın yada uygulanmasın, bütün bu İK fonksiyonlarının herbiri detaylı olarak analiz edilmiştir. Son olarak, araştırmanın bir diğer amacı Türkiye’deki İK uygulamalarını kalitatif olarak dünyadaki uygulamaları ile benzerlik ve farklılıklarını ortaya koymaktır. Bu bağlamda, araştırma sonuçları internet yolu ile başvuru sağlamanın araştırmaya katılan organizasyonlar ile Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’nde faaliyet gösteren firmalarda yaygın olarak kullanıldığını ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca araştırma sonuçları, personel seçme yöntemlerinden görüşme yönteminin araştırmaya katılan firmalar ile Doğu Avrupa’daki ülkelerde, İngiltere’de ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’nde faaliyet gösteren organizasyonlarda yaygın olarak kullanıldığını ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, İK uygulamaları, Türkiye’de İK, Farklı Ülkelerde İK Uygulamaları

To my family...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Initially I would like to express my special thanks to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. H. Canan Sümer for her valuable guidance. This thesis would not have been completed without her continuous support and supervision. I also would like to thank members of my examining committee; Assoc. Prof. Reyhan Bilgiç and Assoc. Prof. Canan Ergin for their valuable suggestions and comments.

I also wish to express my great thanks to METU Career Planning Center for their permission to put my questionnaire on their web page, especially to Eray Özkan and Selen Arda for their valuable technical support and warm friendship.

This thesis would not have been possible without unlimited support of my friends Adonis Çiğdem Erkunt, Pınar Kocabıyıkoglu, Bengü Tunçludemir, Nihal Doğrusöz, Nilay Aygüney and İrem Palalıoğlu. I also would like to express my thanks to Erkin Ataman for his technical assistance, great understanding and genuine patience.

Above all I would like to express my gratitude to my parents; Serpil Sözer and Tayfun Sözer for their endless love and warm support that they have given me all through out of my life. They were the heroes for their psychological and economical support.

Finally, I thank to my participants for their contributions by participating in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	
Overview.....	1
1.1 What is Human Resource Management?.....	1
1.2 Human Resource Management Today.....	4
1.3 Objectives of Human Resource Management Functions.....	6
1.4 Human Resource Management Practices.....	7
1.4.1 Job Analysis.....	7
1.4.2 Recruitment and Selection.....	8
1.4.3 Orientation and Employee Training.....	11
1.4.4 Performance Appraisal.....	13
1.4.5 Career Planning and Development.....	16
1.4.6 Human Resource Planning.....	17
1.4.7 Compensation Management and Incentives.....	18

1.4.8 Managing Employee Health and Safety.....	20
1.4.9 Managing Union Relationships.....	21
1.5 Current Human Resource Practices in Turkey.....	22
1.5.1 Job Analysis.....	24
1.5.2 Recruitment and Selection.....	25
1.5.3 Training and Development of Employees.....	26
1.5.4 Performance Appraisal.....	28
1.5.5 Career Planning and Development.....	29
1.5.6 Compensation Management.....	30
1.6 Human Resource Management Practices in Different Countries.....	31
1.6.1 United States of America.....	33
1.6.2 Canada.....	34
1.6.3 Japan.....	35
1.6.4 European Human Resource Management.....	37
1.6.5 Eastern Europe.....	39
2. METHOD	
2.1 Sample.....	41
2.1.1. Profile of the Organizations.....	42
2.1.2 Sector of the Organizations.....	42
2.1.3 Age of the Organizations.....	42
2.1.4 Size of the Organizations.....	43
2.2 Measure.....	44
2.3 Procedure.....	45

3. RESULTS

3.1 HRM Departments in Organizations.....	47
3.1.1 Functioning Areas of HRM Departments.....	53
3.1.1.1 Correlations Among HRM Functions.....	56
3.2 Job Analysis.....	58
3.3 Recruitment.....	63
3.4 Position Norm Analysis.....	68
3.5 Personnel Selection.....	68
3.6 Orientation.....	74
3.7 Training and Development.....	78
3.8 Performance Appraisal.....	86
3.9 Career Planning.....	92
3.10 Human Resource Planning.....	97
3.11 Compensation and Benefits.....	100
3.12 Job Evaluation.....	107
3.13 Managing Union Relations.....	109
3.14 Employee Health and Safety.....	110

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 HRM Practices in Turkey.....	113
4.2 Comparison of HRM Practices across Different Countries.....	121
4.3 Conclusion.....	133
4.3.1 Limitations and Suggestions.....	136

REFERENCES.....	137
APPENDICES.....	146
A. Questionnaire (Anket).....	146
B. Crosstabs Analysis (Organization Size by HRM Function.....	162
C. Correlations Among HRM Functions.....	166
D. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Job Analysis Methods)	167
E. Correlations Among HRM Functions in Which Results of Job Analysis were Used.....	170
F. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Methods Used to Select Managers.....	171
G. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Methods Used to Select Non- managers.....	173
H. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Kinds of Interviews).....	175
I. Correlations Among Methods of Orientation Programs.....	178
J. Correlations Among the Positions That Orientation Programs were Applied For.....	179
K. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Training Methods.....	180
L. Correlations Among Methods of Need Analysis.....	182
M. Correlations Among Methods of Performance Appraisal.....	183
N. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Performance Appraisal Methods.....	184
O. Correlations Among the Functions in Which Performance Results were Used.....	186

P. Correlations Among Assessors of Employer Performance.....	187
Q. Crosstab Analysis (Organization Size by Career Development Activities.....	188
R. Correlations Among the Activities of Career Development.....	190
S. Correlations Among the Individuals Performing Career Planning.....	191
T. Correlations Among Activities of Human Resource Planning.....	192
U. Correlations Among the Factors That Affect Salary Increment.....	193
V. Correlations Among the Factors and Individuals Playing a Role in Managers' Salary Increment.....	194
W. Correlations Among the Factors and Individuals Playing a Role in Non-Managers' Salary Increment.....	195
X. Correlations Among Managers' Benefits.....	196
Y. Correlations Among Non-Managers' Benefits.....	197
Z. Correlations Among the Methods of Job Evaluation.....	198

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

1.1	HRM Activities in Different Countries.....	32
2.1	Distribution of the Participating Organizations by Sector.....	42
2.2	Age Profile of the Organizations.....	43
2.3	Size Profile of the Organizations.....	43
2.4	The Frequency Distribution of the Size of Organizations Sector.....	44
3.1	Name of the Departments Operating in HRM Functions.....	47
3.2	Frequency Distribution of Number of Employees in HRM Department.....	49
3.3	Frequency Distribution of Number of Hierarchy Levels in HRM Department....	50
3.4	Title of Primary Responsible Persons of HRM Functions.....	50
3.5	Executive Managers Reported by HRM Managers.....	51
3.6	Education Level of HRM Managers.....	51
3.7	Education Fields of HRM Managers.....	52
3.8	Age of HRM Managers.....	52
3.9	Gender of HRM Managers.....	53
3.10	Frequency Distribution of Experience Duration of HRM Managers.....	53
3.11	HRM Functions.....	54
3.12	Job Analysis.....	58
3.13	The Fields in Which the Results of Job Analysis were Used.....	59
3.14	Frequency Distribution of Job Analysis Performers.....	60

3.15 The Methods of Job Analysis.....	60
3.16 Frequency of Job Analysis.....	63
3.17 Recruitment Methods for Non-Managerial Positions.....	64
3.18 Recruitment Methods for Managerial Positions.....	65
3.19 Effective Recruitment Methods for Non-Managerial Positions.....	66
3.20 Effective Recruitment Methods for Managerial Positions.....	67
3.21 The Ways of Internal Recruitment.....	67
3.22 Methods Used to Select Non-Managers.....	69
3.23 Methods Used to Select Managers.....	70
3.24 Effective Methods of Selection Used for Managerial Positions.....	72
3.25 Effective Methods of Selection Used for Non-Managerial Positions.....	72
3.26 Techniques of Interviews.....	73
3.27 Performers of Orientation Programs.....	75
3.28 Techniques of Orientation Programs.....	76
3.29 Length of Orientation Programs.....	77
3.30 Length of the Trial Period.....	78
3.31 Training Department.....	79
3.32 Divisions That the Training Departments were Under.....	79
3.33 Frequency Distribution of Number of Employees in Training Department.....	80
3.34 Training Techniques Used.....	80
3.35 The Ways of Determining Training Programs.....	82
3.36 Methods of Determining Training Programs.....	82
3.37 Methods of Need Analysis.....	83

3.38 The Profile of the Trainers.....	84
3.39 Methods of Training Evaluation.....	84
3.40 Receivers of Training Programs.....	85
3.41 Amount of Training Budget.....	85
3.42 Methods of Performance Appraisal.....	87
3.43 The Functions for which PA results were Used.....	88
3.44 The Frequency of Performance Appraisal for Managers.....	89
3.45 The Frequency of Performance Appraisal for Non-Managers.....	89
3.46 Assessors of Performance.....	90
3.47 Feedback of Performance Appraisal.....	91
3.48 The Content of PA Form.....	92
3.49 The Activities of Career Development.....	93
3.50 The Stages of Career Planning System.....	95
3.51 The Evaluation Criteria of Employee KSA's for Career Planning Purposes.....	95
3.52 The Profile of the Managers Performing Career Management System.....	97
3.53 The Length of HR Plan.....	97
3.54 Activities of Human Resource Planning.....	98
3.55 The Factors Affecting the Salary Increment.....	101
3.56 The Factors and Individuals Playing a Role in Managers' Salary Increment.....	102
3.57 The Factors and Individuals Playing a Role in Non-Managers' Salary Increment.....	103
3.58 The Benefits for Managers.....	104
3.59 The Benefits for Non-Managers.....	105

3.60 The Kinds of Monetary Rewards.....	106
3.61 The Kinds of Non-Moneterial Rewards.....	107
3.62 The Methods of Job Evaluation.....	108
3.63 The Activities Performed in Managing Union Relationships.....	110
3.64 The Performers of Employee Health and Safety Issues.....	111
3.65 The Activities of Managing Employee Health and Safety.....	112
4.1 Comparison of Present Study with Arthur Andersen’s Study.....	114
4.2 Recruitment Activities in Different Countries.....	125
4.3 Selection Activities in Different Countries.....	126
4.4 Orientation Activities in Different Countries.....	127
4.5 Training Activities in Different Countries.....	128
4.6 PA Activities in Different Countries.....	129
4.7 Compensation Management Activities in Different Countries.....	131
4.8 Pay for Performance Activities in Different Countries.....	132

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

In the present report, there are mainly four sections. The first section aims to define concept of HRM and explains its main objectives and functions, emergence and historical development of HRM, main HRM practices, HRM practices carried out in Turkey and in different countries. The method of the study is explained in the second section, which involves information on participants, measures, procedures, and data analysis. In the third section, the results of the study are explained in details. In the last section, the findings of the study are discussed further and the HRM practices of Turkey are compared and contrasted with HRM applications in different countries.

1.1 What is Human Resource Management?

The term human resource management (HRM) has relatively adopted in business organizations in place of personnel management. HRM can be defined as “the management of activities under taken to attract, develop, motivate, and maintain a high performing workforce with in the organization” (Harvey & Bowin, 1996, p.6). HRM involves following characteristics. First, it focuses on horizontal authority and reduced hierarchy. The second characteristic is that the role of human resource professionals is to support and facilitate line managers who have the direct responsibility of managing personnel. Thirdly, HRM is proactive and fused with

corporate level planning. The fourth characteristic is that employees are seen as subjects who have potential to develop and grow. The purpose of HRM is to specify employee's potential and develop it in line with the needs of the organization. Finally, HRM holds the view that the management and non-management have a common interest in the success of the organization (Krulis cited in Goss, 1994).

The development of HRM in the 1980s is reflective of an increased realization of the importance of human element in organizations. Goss (1994) stated that the evolution of HRM could be linked to socio-economic factors such as changes in international competition, restructuring of industrial sectors and organizations, and changes in the concept of managerialism. According to Goss (1994), during the 1970s and the early 1980s the US and the UK industries became incompetent at international markets because of increasing domination of Japanese manufacturers. Therefore, Western managers began to analyze the Japanese industry and concluded that Japanese organizations value people as the key asset of business. In short, this conclusion opened the way for the development of HRM.

The second factor that influenced the development of HRM is the restructuring of industries and organizations because of a recession and trade crisis in the UK and the US in the early 1980s. Organizations were becoming less hierarchical, more flexible, and decentralized. Moreover, participation and commitment of employees, greater reliance on self-discipline and development of more effective reward systems were becoming the valued concepts in the restructuring of organizations. In brief, these changes in organizations called for a new perspective on people management, which then led to the emergence of HRM.

The last factor that contributed to the emergence of HRM is the change in the power and confidence of management. As a result of the economic recession in

the 1980s, trade unions lost their power and influence on organizations and this resulted in greater power for managers. Managers had greater confidence, freedom, and willingness to experience new ideas in years of economic boom that followed the recession.

There were other reasons for HRM to develop in the early 1980s. Among them were market changes taking place in line with globalization and effects of enterprise culture (Legge, 1995). Increased globalization and competition were the two trends in the world markets. The intensification of international competition forced companies to analyze their source of competitive advantage. The analysis demonstrated that investment in human and technical capacity was something that was required. As a result, human resource policies started to be integrated with business strategies.

In both the UK and US, the enterprising was emphasized by political entities for economic well being. The concepts of being initiative, energetic, independent, bold, self-reliant, and willingness to take risks were emphasized in enterprise culture. The acquisition and exercise of these qualities were encouraged and led HRM to further develop.

In addition, Beaumont (1993) stated other reasons that pave the way for HRM to emerge. These factors were the relative growth of service sector and white-collar employment, declining levels of workforce unionization, particularly in the US private sector, and limited power of personnel management in terms of increasing the organizational performance. Beaumont (1993) argued that HRM should be viewed as a change or development driven by fundamental environmental changes to which the traditional personnel function could not adequately respond.

According to European perspective, there are two main approaches to HRM. The first one is called 'hard model' that focuses on utilitarian instrumentalism, and the second one is called 'soft model' reflecting a developmental humanism. The hard model of human resource management involves the integration of human resource systems, practices, and policies with the business strategy of the organization. The soft model also values this integration but with an emphasis that involves notions like valuing employees and seeing them as a source of competitive advantage through their commitment, adaptability, and highly qualitative skills or performance (Legge, 1995). To clarify the difference between the two approaches, it can be said that the hard model gives importance to promote the reduction of the costs, including labor, whereas the soft model gives employees the opportunity to participate in the firm's success.

In addition, there are three core characteristics of the most models of HRM developed in Europe. The first one is the close involvement of HRM and corporate strategy. The second one is an emphasis on organizational independence to make decisions about personnel such as an independent remuneration policy and minimal influence from trade unions. The last characteristic is the preference for carefully controlled labour market involving freedom to recruit, absence of restriction on employee contracts, and a substantial degree of training (Brewster & Bourniois cited in Goss, 1994).

1.2 Human Resource Management Today

Poole (1990) stated that today's HRM could be described as broad and strategic, involving all managerial personnel, valuing employees as important assets of organizations, and being proactive in its responsibilities. Moreover, today human resource functions refer to those tasks and duties performed in both large and small

organizations to coordinate human resources (Byars & Rue, 1991). These functions of human resource management activities can be listed as follows:

1. To ensure that the organization apply equal employment opportunities and other government obligations.
2. To conduct job analysis to specify different requirements of jobs in an organization.
3. To identify personnel requirements that led the organization to achieve its objectives.
4. To develop and implement a plan that meet personnel and job requirements.
5. To recruit employees needed by the organization in order to achieve its objectives.
6. To select personnel in order to fill vacant positions within an organization.
7. To provide orientation and training to the employees.
8. To design and implement management and organizational development programs.
9. To design and implement performance appraisal systems to evaluate employee performance.
10. To assist employees in developing career plans.
11. To design and implement compensation systems for employees.
12. To mediate the relationship between organizations and its units.
13. To design systems for discipline and grievance handling.
14. To develop employee communication systems.
15. To develop employee health and safety programs (Byars & Rue, 1991).

The present study aim to cover all of the HRM activities mentioned above.

Some other functions of HRM that mainly improve organizational performance are as follows. First, it is responsible for enhancing competency and adaptability of the workforce by developing advanced recruitment and selection processes, intensive training and development programs. Second, it is stated that “the identification of needs and cultivation of the requisite managerial skills also represent new challenges that HRM function is being called on to fulfil” (Dulebohn, Ferris & Stodd, 1995, p.33). As a result, current emphasis of HRM is to train managers to be effective leaders and good in relational skills. The third responsibility of HRM is to share the HRM activities with senior line management because empowered managers and staff are expected to participate in activities such as recruitment, selection, performance evaluation, and even compensation.

In conclusion, Sisson (1990) stated that there are four features of HRM practice today. To begin with, HRM involves both traditional personnel management activities and activities related to organizational planning. Next, HRM is seen as a partner in organizational change, creator of organizational culture and commitment. Third, HRM is characterized by decentralization of HRM activities from personnel specialists to senior line management. Lastly, current HRM practice focuses on individual employees rather than collective management-trade union relations.

1.3 Objectives of Human Resource Management Functions

The functions of HRM increase organizational effectiveness in several ways. First, HRM implications serve the organization to reach its goals and objectives. In order to reach this objective, HRM both aims to employ skills and abilities of workforce efficiently and provides the organization with well-trained and well-motivated employees. Human resource activities also help to maintain ethical policies and behaviours within the organization.

Next, HRM is responsible for communicating organization's policies to all employees. It aims to increase the employee job satisfaction and self-actualization. These activities also aim to develop and maintain a quality of work life that makes employment in the organization more desirable. Lastly, an important objective of human resource activities is to manage changes and trends occurring in the field of HRM. Consequently, the benefits to employees, groups, organizations, and the public are enhanced.

1.4 Human Resource Management Practices

In this section, the sub-fields of human resource management such as job analysis and design, recruitment, selection, orientation, training, performance appraisal, career planning and development, human resource planning, compensation management, employee health and safety, and union relations would be described in details.

1.4.1 Job Analysis and Design

“Job analysis is a method of for describing jobs and/or the human attributes necessary to perform them” (Spector, 2003, p.54). The results of a job analysis are used to form job description and job specifications. Job description involves knowledge about tasks, duties, and responsibilities of a particular job. Job specifications, on the other hand, are composed of knowledge, skills and abilities that are required to perform the job efficiently (Harvey & Bowin, 1996). Many human resource management activities make use of job analysis. Among them are recruitment, selection and placement, orientation, training, career counselling, performance appraisal, and compensation (Spector, 2003, p.54).

In addition, information obtained from job analysis can be used in designing jobs. Job design is the process of structuring work to achieve the objectives of the

business plan (Byars & Rue, 1991). Job design is basically structuring the work of an organization. It involves continuous process of dividing activities, assigning responsibility to groups or individuals, coordinating performance, and specifying the relationships among newly created jobs. The specific work tasks of an individual or group of individuals, question of how the job is to be performed, who is to perform it and where is to be performed are defined within process of job design. The process of job design can be classified as three parts. First, the individual tasks are specified. Then the method of performing each task is specified. Lastly, individual tasks are combined into specific jobs to be assigned to individuals (Byars & Rue, 1991). Practices of job analysis and design reveal that job is such an important part of any organization's effectiveness that it needs to be clearly understood and designed in a way that allows employee productivity and satisfaction.

1.4.2 Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment is a process of seeking and attracting a pool of people in order to select qualified candidates for vacant positions within the organization (Byars & Rue, 1991). During recruitment process, organizations may use both internal and external sources to fill vacant positions. Internal recruiting is looking for candidates among employees already working in the organization. It involves techniques like job posting. In this method, notices about vacant positions are posted in central locations throughout the organization and employees are given a time to apply these positions. Another method used in internal recruiting is to seek recommendations from present employees regarding friends who might fill vacancies. External recruiting, on the other hand, seeks for candidates from outside the organization. The methods of external recruiting can be listed as follows; media advertisements,

campus recruiting, working with employment agencies or executive search firms, using computer databases (Ivancevich, 1992).

Organizations are better to use realistic job previews in order to improve the effectiveness of recruitment process. Realistic job preview is a way to provide complete information including positive and negative things about the organization to the job applicant (Ivancevich, 1992).

After recruiting qualified applicants, the selection process begins. “Selection is the process of choosing from a pool of applicants the individual or individuals who best fit the selecting criteria for a position” (Harvey & Brown, 1996, p. 120). Generally, in the organizations selection process begins with the completion of the application form by the applicant. The second step is preliminary screening interview in which minimum qualifications of applicants are screened and a brief personal interview is conducted to form general impression of the applicants, and obtain key information about them. The third step is to make employment tests such as cognitive or psychomotor ability tests, knowledge and skill tests, emotional intelligence tests, integrity tests, personality tests, vocational interest tests, and performance simulations. The validity studies of these tests demonstrate that integrity tests have an operational validity of .41 (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993). Moreover, the validity of cognitive ability tests to predict performance is around .51 (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). As a fourth step, employment interviews are conducted. These interviews can be in different formats; structured, unstructured, or semi-structured. In the structured interview, the interviewee received a set of questions that have been prepared in advance by the interviewer and the interviewer leads the course of the interview. However, in unstructured interviews, the candidates control the flow of the conversation. The interviewers do not direct the interviewee; they

repeat the statements made by the candidates to encourage further discussion. Unfortunately, unstructured interviews are subject to the interviewer's interpretations (Harvey & Brown, 1996). The validity of unstructured interview has been shown to be relatively low whereas the validity of structured interview is higher and similar to assessment center validities (Lowry, 1994). There are also other kinds of interviews such as panel, situational and stress interviews. In panel interviews, the applicant is interviewed by a panel or group of individuals. In situational interviews, the applicants solve a particular problem or describe how they would behave in a specific job situation. The validity of situational interviews has been shown to range between .14 and .46 (Cesare, 1996). Lastly, in stress interviews, recruit is subjected to the stresses and strains supposedly encountered in the job situation (Harvey & Brown, 1996).

The next step is to check references or recommendation letters that are submitted by the applicants. As another step, some organizations require applicants take a physical examination tests or drug tests. The final hiring decision is made based on the results of the selection process.

In addition, there are some other tools that used in selection process such as work samples and assessment centers. A work sample is a selection tool that requires the candidates to show how well they perform the tasks involved in a job under standardized conditions. On the other hand, assessment centers measures how well a recruit is able to perform the tasks of a specific job and they include exercises like in-basket exercise, leaderless group exercise, problem solving simulation, and role-play exercise. Additionally, according to Schmitt, Gooding, Noe, and Kirsch (1984), the work samples have true validity of .38 and average validity of assessment centers is around .40 (Howard, 1997).

1.4.3 Orientation and Employee Training

Orientation is a planned introduction of employees to the organization, work unit, their job, and co-workers. It should be conducted in two separate levels; general company orientation and departmental or job orientation. There are many purposes of the orientation process. Among them are reducing the anxiety of new employee, reducing employee turnover, saving time of supervisors or co-workers, developing realistic job expectations, developing positive attitudes toward organization, and improving job satisfaction (Ivancevich, 1992).

In orientation process HR department cooperates with new employee's manager. HR department initiates and coordinates general company orientation and departmental and job orientation, trains line managers in procedures for conducting department and job orientation, conducts general company orientation and follows up the initial orientation with the new employee. The line managers, on the other hand, are responsible for conducting job and departmental orientation.

After a comprehensive orientation, new employees may not be able to perform satisfactorily, so they have to be trained in the duties they are expected to do. Training is a learning process that involves the acquisition of skills, knowledge, concepts or attitudes to increase employee performance (Byars & Rue, 1991). Before training programs are developed, the needs of both employees and organization are assessed in order to determine what objectives should be sought. Prior to needs assessment phase organizational support is provided. Salas and Cannon-Bowers (2001) stated that the need assessment involves the analysis of job and task. The job/task analysis determines the work functions to be performed on the job, the conditions of the job, and knowledge, skill, ability and other requirements (KSAO's) needed to perform those tasks. Moreover, needs assessment phase involves

organizational analysis that determines training climate, identifies goals of the organization, and external and legal constraints (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Need assessment process also includes requirement analysis in which the targeted job is defined, methods of need assessment are chosen, participants are determined, and a protocol is developed.

The methods of training can be classified into two: on-site methods and off-site methods. On-site training involves techniques such as job rotation, vestibule training, on the job training, and apprenticeship training. Off-site training methods are seminars or lectures, programmed instruction, computer-assisted instructions, audiovisual techniques, machine simulators, and behavioural modifications (Riggio, 2003). Additional methods such as management games, case study, role playing, behavioural role modelling, laboratory training, achievement motivation training, and leader match training are particularly used in training managerial and interpersonal skills.

After employees receive training, it should be evaluated. Evaluation of training is composed of comparing the results of training with the objectives of training expected by managers, employees, and trainers. The evaluation of training can be made using four levels of criteria; reaction, learning, behaviour, and results (Kirkpatrick, 1977). Reaction refers to feeling of employees towards training program whether they like it or not. Learning criterion assesses to what extents the trainee has learned the principles, facts, and approaches that are included in the training program. Behaviour criterion evaluates the job behaviour of the trainee. That is, whether the behaviour has changed in the desired direction as a result of the program. Lastly, the results part is related to tangible results that are achieved as a result of the training program, such as reduction in cost or turnover, improvement in

production. Another study conducted by Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver & Shotland (1997) divided the training reactions into affective and utility reactions, and learning into post training measures of learning, retention, and behaviour/skill demonstration.

1.4.4 Performance Appraisal

Performance management is a strategic approach to increasing the effectiveness of organizations by improving the performance of the employees and by developing the capabilities of teams and individual contributors (Baron & Armstrong, 1998).

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) conceptualized job performance as comprising task performance and contextual performance. They suggested that task performance relates to the proficiency, with which employees perform core technical activities that are important for their jobs, whereas contextual performance is defined as extra task proficiency that contributes more to the organizational, social, and psychological environment to help achieving organizational goals. Contextual factors include aspects like persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort, volunteering to carry out duties not formally part of one's job, and endorsing and supporting organizational objectives (Borman & Motowidlo 1993).

Performance appraisal is the process that determines how an employee is performing on the job and communicates that information to the employee back. Performance appraisal systems provide data for other HRM activities such as promotion, layoffs, firing, and merit pay increases. Performance appraisal information can also provide input for training and development needs of employees. Additionally, it provides input for the validation of selection procedures and human resource planning (Riggio, 2003). Finally, Cleveland, Murphy and Williams (1989)

stated that the results of performance appraisal are used to give feedback to employees about their performance and to develop employee's performance.

The performance of the employees is evaluated by their supervisors, peers or outside sources like customers and employees themselves. Muchinsky (1999) stated that there are different methods for performance appraisal. These methods are classified in three groups. The first group is Graphic Rating Scales (GRS), which are the most commonly used techniques of performance appraisal. In GRS, employees are rated on a number of traits or factors. The rater judges how much each factor or trait the employee has. Usually, employees are judged on a 5- or 7- point scale. The number of factors ranges between 5 and 20 (Muchinsky, 1999).

The second group of methods is employee comparison methods that involve rank-order, paired comparisons, and forced distribution. These rating scales are norm referenced; that is, employees are evaluated against each other. With the rank-order method, employees are rated from high to low on a given performance dimension. However, since rank-order data have ordinal scale characteristics, the level of performance is not known exactly. Additionally, in paired comparison method, each employee is compared with every other employee and rater selects which of the two is better on the dimension that is being evaluated. The method is typically used to assess employees on overall ability to perform the job. Lastly, forced distribution method is most useful when the number of employees being evaluated is high. In this method, the raters assign employees to established categories ranging from poor to good on the basis of comparison with all the other employees in the group (Riggio, 2003). However, this method is criticised because it creates artificial distinctions between employees. The third group of performance appraisal methods is named as behavioural checklists and scales. This group is composed of the techniques like

behaviourally anchored rating scales (BARS), behavioural-observation scales (BOS), and mixed standard rating scales (Muchinsky, 1999).

Firstly, BARS is a combination of behavioural incident and rating scale methods. In BARS, employee performance is rated on a scale in which scale points are anchored with actual work behaviours. Raters read a number of behavioural statements and then circle the number that corresponds to the statement that best describes the employee's behaviour. Unfortunately, the development of BARS is time consuming.

Secondly, BOS is developed as an attempt to improve BARS. The assessor rates the employee on the frequency of critical incidents or specific employee behaviours. The rater observes the employee for a certain period of time and evaluates him or her on a critical incident scale recording how often they observed the behaviour (Muchinsky, 1999).

Finally, on mixed standard rating scales, the nature of performance dimension and the levels of performance described by the behavioural examples are disguised. The employee score is calculated after on the basis of rater responses to items forming a specific dimension. Raters respond to behavioural statements that demonstrate high, low, and average performance for each dimension. For each statement, raters evaluate the employee's performance whether it is better than, equal to, or lower than the behaviour reflected in the statement (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

It is agreed that performance evaluation is a two way communication process. That is, it involves an active communication between employees and supervisors about performance. Therefore, feedback interviews that take place after performance appraisals are important parts of the evaluation process. These interviews include

review of the strengths, needed improvements, as well as the overall progress of the employee. The problems that are encountered are discussed and afterwards the employee and the supervisor focus on the ways to improve performance. The issue of how current performance fits with career goals of the employee is also discussed. Finally, specific action plans are prepared for following term (Beardwell & Holden, 2001).

1.4.5 Career Planing and Development

Career planning and development aims to develop employees and to match the employee's knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience with the improvement opportunities that are provided by the organization. Gutteridge (1986) stated that organizations have some important reasons to have career planning and development programs. First career planning is an effective way to deal with problems such as voluntary turnover among managers and low level of productivity.

There are two perspectives of career planning process; organizational centered vs. individual centered career planning. Organizational centered career planning focuses on jobs and constructing career paths that provide logical progression of individuals between jobs (Mathis & Jackson, 1991). Individual centered career planning, on the other hand, focuses directly on employees. Their skills and goals are at the hearth of the analysis.

Sümer (1998) stated that an effective career planning and development system has four parts: human resource planning, individual assessment, matching, and development. It is better to have individuals working for the organization to perform career planning programs rather than individuals outside the firm since the career planning process is closely related to the other HRM functions.

Human resource planning, which is the part of career planning and development systems, aims to predict future personnel needs and to develop human resource strategies in order to fulfil these needs. The goal of the individual assessment part is to evaluate the knowledge, skills, attitudes, expectations, and career interests of the employee who wants to plan his or her career. Matching part of the career planning process compares employees' career plans with the identified future personnel needs of the organization. This part also involves the forming of individual career development strategies. Lastly, the stage of career development involves activities that get employees ready for achieving their career goals. These activities can be listed as follows; job rotation, courses, seminars, workshops, and money or time support for the graduate programs.

1.4.6 Human Resource Planning

“Human resource planning is the system of matching the supply of people, internally (existing employees) and externally (those to be hired and searched for) with over a given time frame” (Watters cited in Byars & Rue, 1991). Human resource planning has two objectives; the optimum utilization of currently employed human resources and providing future HR needs in the areas of skills and numbers (Harvey & Bowin, 1996). Human resource planning is usually performed by both human resource managers and operating managers.

Human resource planning consists of four basic steps. First, effect of general objectives of organization on specific organizational units is determined. Next, skill, expertise, and total number of employees are defined in order to achieve the organization and departmental objectives. In the third step, additional human resource requirements are determined in the light of the organizations current human

resources. The final step involves the development of action plans to meet the anticipated human resource needs.

1.4.7 Compensation Management and Incentives

Compensation management can be defined as the system of rewards, which an employee receives in return for organizational performance (Harvey & Bowin, 1996). While the organizations design their compensation systems, they have some objectives. First, they try to acquire qualified personnel and retain present employees. Next, the organizations aim to ensure internal and external equity of wages that employees earn. The third objective is to reward desired behaviours of employees like good performance and loyalty. The other objective of a rational compensation program is to control costs of obtaining and retaining the organization's workforce. Finally, compensation management programs consider legal constraints and provide compliance with all government regulations related with employee compensation (Mathis & Jackson, 1991).

In compensation management, it is important to determine appropriate pay level for each job. This is acquired through several phases. The first phase is to collect information about jobs by conducting job analysis in order to determine job and position descriptions and job standards. The second phase is the evaluation of jobs in order to obtain internal equity in terms of pay with in the organization.

There are different methods to designate the relative worth of jobs, such as job ranking, job grading, factor comparison, and point system (Hollenbeck & Wright, 1996). The next phase aims to ensure external equity in terms of pay systems by conducting wage and salary surveys. These surveys find out what other employers in the same sector are paying for specific jobs. There are many sources for this survey information in North America. Among these sources are government's department of

labour, employer, and professional associations and surveys conducted by HR departments of the firms (Hollenbeck & Wright, 1996). The last phase is pricing jobs. The job evaluation worth and labour market worth are matched in pricing jobs. In addition to structuring of most efficient compensation program, the organizations should communicate how these programs are formed and obtain employee participation (Hollenbeck & Wright, 1996).

Human resource professionals also design and install incentive pay systems. Incentives are pay systems that reward employees for their efforts beyond normal performance expectations. In order to pay incentives, organizations measure employee performance at three levels; individual level, group level, and organizational level. Individual level incentives are merit pay, skill-based pay, competency-based pay, piece rate pay, standard hour systems, employee suggestion systems and commissions (Heneman & Gresham, 1998). Merit pay is provided to employees for their individual behavioural contributions to organization. In skill-based pay, pay increases are based on skill mastery. It is used by organizations in order to improve organizational learning and promote flexibility. Moreover, competency based pay rewards employee motivation and personality traits. The piece rate plan pay is given for an individual output above a previously defined standard. Specifically, it focuses on productivity enhancement. Additionally, standard hour plans depend on the time for per unit of output and completion of a task in definite time period. If employees complete their task before the designated time ends, they receive a higher hourly wage. In employee suggestion systems, incentives are offered to individuals for their suggestion that leads to cost saving.

In addition to individual level incentives, there are organizational level incentives such as team-based merit pay, group incentives, team recognition, and

sales teams. The team-based merit pay depends on team performance evaluated by team members and supervisor. On the other hand, group incentives rewarded the group performance where it is hard to assess individual contributions of group members. In team recognition, monetary or mostly non-monetary recognition awards are offered for the team developing a more efficient way to produce products or services (Heneman & Gresham, 1998).

Lastly, the organizational level incentives can be listed as follows; gainsharing, profit sharing, stock sharing, and executive pay. Gainsharing emphasizes costsavings, timesavings, and revenue enhancement. Profit sharing is a group incentive pay plan that uses profitability as the standard for organizational level incentives. Additionally, stock sharing is another group incentive-based pay that provides employees with the ability to buy company stock at reduced rate per share. Finally, executive pay is a form of profit and stock sharing that is applied to top level management (Heneman & Gresham, 1998).

In addition, there are other incentives, which are non-monetary such as providing plaquettes, novelty items, certificates, and time-off vacations.

1.4.8 Managing Employee Health and Safety

It is important for organizations to improve occupational safety and health, which in turn, positively affects employee safety and health. Schuler (1995) defined occupational safety and health as the physical and psychological conditions of organization's work force that results from the work environment provided by the organization.

Improvement in occupational safety and health results in many benefits. For instance, it improves productivity due to fewer lost workdays, savings of litigation costs, fewer medical and insurance costs, reduction in insurance premiums, and

better selection ratios because of the enhanced image of the organization (Schuler, 1995).

As a result, the challenge of safety and health management provides human resource professionals with achieving humanitarian goals, while obtaining significant cost reductions for the organizations (Harvey & Bowin, 1996). In order to manage employee health and safety, human resource departments coordinate health and safety programs, develop safety reporting systems, and provide accident investigation expertise and technical expertise on accident research and prevention. Specifically, human resource departments are generally responsible from maintaining government-required health and safety records, coordinating a safety training for new employees, assisting the supervisors in investigating accidents in which an employee was injured, and developing a plant-wide safety communication program and informational materials (Harvey & Bowin, 1996).

1.4.9 Managing Union Relationships

Unions are effective forces that influence organizational practices, legislation, and political thought. In some organizations, human resource departments are not involved in labour relations because operating managers handle these issues. In other organizations, on the other hand, human resource departments are completely in charge of labour relations. Human resource departments that are involved in labour relation process are mainly responsible from dealing with organizing attempts at the company level to monitoring climate for unionization and union relationships, helping in negotiating labour agreements and providing detailed knowledge of labour legislation as may be necessary (Mathis & Jackson, 1991).

Collective bargaining is one of the major processes within labour relations. The process takes place between managers and union representatives to reach an

agreement on employee wages and benefits, work rules, and the resolution of disputes and violation of union contracts (Harvey & Bowin, 1996). For the human resource department knowledge of collective bargaining is important. It is necessary in compensation and benefits because wages and benefits are typically open to negotiation.

Grievance management is another important process of labour relations. The essential responsibilities of human resource department in grievance management are assisting in designing the grievance procedure, monitoring trends in grievance rates for the organization, assisting preparation of grievance cases for arbitration and finally, having responsibility for settling grievances (Mathis & Jackson, 1991).

1.5 Current Human Resource Practices in Turkey

In Turkey, the transition from “personnel management” to “human resource management” started in the late 1980’s. Altın (1997) stated that the changes in Turkey’s economic and social life, education level and demographic composition, quality of workforce, and unionism are among the factors that affected this transition.

Emre (1998) and Üsdiken (1996) stated that human resource management is lately adopted from foreign countries and is still developing mostly by learning from foreign experiences. Moreover, the authors stated that the academic interest in public and business administration is affected the development of human resource management in Turkey. The adoption of HRM from foreign countries and academic interest in the area HRM determined the institutionalization of HRM discipline and its further development in Turkey. In addition, Acuner (2001) stated that the development of human resource management is not an internalized process. It is simply adopted from abroad with the notion that in well-developed countries the practices of human resource management increase the work productivity.

Efforts to improve HRM show variability by geographical region in Turkey. The efforts are more common in Marmara region compared to East and Southeast Anatolian regions due to the fact that the industry and exportation are well developed in that region (Acuner, 2001).

Both organizational culture and practices of HRM are affected by culture of the society in which the organization operates. The Model of Culture Fit explains the way in which socio-cultural surrounding affects internal work culture and HRM practices (Aycan, Kanungo, Mendonca, Yu, Deller, Stahl, & Kurshid, 2000). This model was tested using 1954 employees from work organizations in 10 countries such as Turkey, Germany, Canada, China etc. In this study, Turkey is identified as a paternalistic and a collectivist society in which power distance is high. The findings also revealed that managers who perceived paternalism and high power distance in their socio-cultural environment do not provide job enrichment, empowerment. Therefore, job enrichment, empowered supervision and performance based reward management are not commonly applied in Turkish organizations (Aycan et al., 2000).

Moreover, the organizational culture of the firms in Turkey is shaped by several factors. First, managers believe that employee skills can be improved as a result of training that they received. Therefore, organizations emphasize training and development functions of HRM. However, in Turkey, managers believe that employees are not proactive and do not seek responsibility. In addition, Aycan and Kanungo (2000) stated that the practices of HRM are affected by managers' beliefs and assumptions about the employees. As a result managers should be made conscious about the strategic importance of HRM practices in order to make them support these activities.

Concerning the general structure of HRM, a study was conducted among 258 organizations through out Turkey and the findings stated that in 46.5% of the organizations the managers of human resource department are members of executive committees. The 87.9% of the organizations have a human resource strategy. Among these organizations, 58.6% have a written HR strategy. In 60.6% of the organizations, the manager of human resource department is involved in the process of developing strategy of the organization. 95.5% of the organizations have a structured policy for personnel recruitment and selection, 90.8% for training and development of employees, 95.5% for wage systems, and 49.6% for flexible working hours (Uyargil & Dündar, 2000).

Finally, the organizations generally do not have human resource departments at their plants, branch offices, etc. (Acuner, 2001). Human resource practices at the plants are performed in line with the directions coming from the head quarters.

1.5.1 Job Analysis

The results of a study conducted in 33 public sector and 253 private sector organizations in Turkey revealed that in most of the organizations job analysis is not performed frequently (Öztürk, 1995). In organizations that conduct job analysis, job descriptions are formed as a result of job analysis. However, the organizations do not updating those job descriptions regularly. In both sectors, job descriptions are updated once a year or once every five year. However, it is better to update job descriptions as the quality and property of job changes.

Furthermore, in the year 2000, Turkish Cabinet took a law-equivalent decision that required all government organizations to do organizational and job analyses and to conduct a position norm analysis. Therefore, many public sector organizations provide assistance from industrial and organizational psychologists to

engage in the mentioned processes. For instance, Sümer & Erol (2003) performed a study that aims to conduct position norm analysis in the light of job analysis information in one of the public sector organizations in Turkey.

It can be concluded that law-equivalent decision made by the Cabinet, which requires all government organizations to do organizational and job analyses and to conduct a position norm analysis would improve the practices of job analysis in Turkey.

1.5.2 Recruitment and Selection

The results of a study conducted within 258 organizations by Özçelik (2000) showed that the organizations that do not have human resource department face more difficulties in both selection of employees and providing the continuity of newly selected employees in the organization, as compared to organizations that have human resource department. In addition, the organizations that received support from outside sources like consultant companies for their selection and recruitment process are more likely to recruit employees from foreign countries as compared to ones that do not have such consultancy.

Next, Öztürk (1995) stated that government organizations in Turkey received consultancy from universities. However, private sector provided support from consultant firms in selection process. Moreover, private sector mostly uses media advertising and college recruitment as recruitment methods. Additionally, interviews are mostly used as a selection method both in private and publicly owned organizations. Psychological tests and other techniques are not commonly used. On the other hand, some paper-pencil tests are used in selection process in both sectors (1995). Lastly, Sümer, Çifci, Demirutku, and Sümer (2000) developed a personality

test battery for Turkish Armed Forces to be used in the selection of officers recruited from outside sources.

1.5.3 Training and Development of Employees

Concerning training issue, a study conducted by Cengizhan and Ersun (2000) showed that human resource departments are involved training activities in Turkey. Training units in organizations generally function under the administration of human resource department. Individuals working in training units and senior managers generally prepare the training programs. These programs are developed based on the training needs of employees. Usually, human resource departments conducted need analysis in organizations and need analysis is formed on the basis of both performance appraisal of employees and the information received from interviews conducted with their managers about their performance. Moreover, employees who participate in a training program are selected by department chiefs, managers, and human resource departments. Also, employees are generally asked about their willingness to participate in a training program. Lastly, the results of the study (Cengizhan & Ersun, 2000) presented that both on-site and off-site training methods are used in organizations. The training programs are usually evaluated by questionnaires.

Furthermore, Acuner (2001) stated that training is identified to be the most widely used practice in organizations that operate in Blacksea region of Turkey. The second widely used practice is revealed as job rotation. The third technique is the employee participation in organizational decisions. Training programs are provided to all employees in organizations without regarding their level of position. Job rotation, on the other hand, is performed with personnel who do not have a manager role. Acuner (2001) also showed that the organizations generally have training units

that functioned in accordance with human resource departments in the head offices. They have ready to use training programs that are applied to high level managers and to newly selected employees. As a training method, on the job training is widely used within the organizations. Generally managers decide which training program to be applied without considering the developmental needs or specific demands of personnel.

Moreover, Başboğaoğlu (1999) stated that there is a lack of training specialist in application of training programs, and training programs mostly include theoretical knowledge rather than practical applications. Unfortunately, training evaluation systems are not common in most of the organizations.

On the contrary, Aycan and Balcı (2001) examined the factors that play a role in evaluation process of training programs and they found that individual factors, organizational factors, and the factors related to training programs played a role in the effectiveness of training programs. The effectiveness of training programs are evaluated by three factors; transformation of training programs in job environment, performance improvement, and changes in attitudes towards the job. The findings of the study revealed that in organizations operating in Turkey, pre-knowledge about the topic of training programs, attitudes and expectations of employees towards the training programs, organizational support, source adequacy, the method and time of training programs, the effectiveness of trainer and the factors used to accelerate learning are among the factors that positively effected the transformation of training programs in job environment. Moreover, Aycan and Balcı (2001) found that being job-oriented, tenure, attitudes and expectations of employees towards the training programs, organizational support, and source adequacy are among the factors that positively affected the performance of the employees. Finally, attitudes and

expectations of employees towards the training programs, organizational support, source adequacy, supervisor's support, the effectiveness of trainer and the factors used to accelerate learning are among the factors that have positive effect on attitudes towards the job.

1.5.4 Performance Appraisal

The results of a study, which examined the performance appraisal systems of organizations operating in different parts of Turkey, demonstrated that rank order was the first and forced distribution was the second widely used techniques of performance appraisal (Erdil, 1998). Performance of employees is generally evaluated by their first (22.8%) and second rank superiors (14%) in of the organizations. The employee performance is evaluated twice a year (47.2%) and once a year (37.7%) in most of the organizations. In evaluation of performance; desire for achievement, coordination, communication, customer orientation, and creativity are commonly used as performance criteria. Results of performance appraisal systems are used mostly for rewarding employees. The other areas that use results of performance appraisal systems are determining the weaknesses and strengths of employees, preparation of training programs, and long term career planning for employees. Face to face interviews are conducted with employees after performance evaluation in 76% of the organizations in the sample.

Additionally, Sümer (2000) stated that reward distribution based on needs of employees rather than on performance is more likely to be preferred in Turkey. Also, the high level of power distance between managers and employees in Turkey lead to the distribution of sources of organizations based on political issues rather than on performance. Sümer (2000) also suggested that the training of performance appraiser would improve the performance appraisal systems in Turkish work organizations.

The appraisers should be trained especially in terms of giving feedback to employees about their performance.

1.5.5 Career Planning and Development

Concerning career planning and development activities, the results of a research conducted in Turkey revealed that career planning is not an important aspect of HRM in private organizations (Soysal, 2000). Some of the plausible reasons of this fact can be listed as follows; 1) the organizations involved in the study were family firms, they had a hierarchical structure and less opportunity for employees to promote; 2) the managers did not possess effective leadership skills so they were not able to direct employees for future duty and responsibilities; 3) human resource planning function is not carried out sufficiently neither in private sector nor in state economic enterprises (Öztürk, 1995).

In addition, the findings of a survey conducted by Arthur Andersen Consulting Company in 750 small, medium and large sized Turkish work organizations operating in different sectors such as construction and material, technology, media, textile, finance and metal industries revealed that only 42% of companies had systematic career management systems (Arthur Andersen, 2000). Other findings of the study were; 1) 84.7 % of the companies that had a career management system applied it together with their performance systems, 2) in 31.2 % of organizations with a career management system, HRM departments informed the employees about the required competencies, 3) 72.5 % of the organizations informed their employees about required performance level. This application resulted in accomplishment of coaching function of career development process, 4) employees had been informed about the training that they needed to receive and length of time

that they needed to work in a specific position in 69.8 % and 44.4 % of the organizations, respectively.

1.5.6 Compensation Management

The findings of a survey conducted in 750 small, medium, and large sized Turkish work organizations operating in different sectors such as construction and material, technology, media, textile, finance and metal industries showed that in 94.4 % of the organizations wage increases are dependent on the inflation rate and in 82.6% of the organizations they are dependent on performance ratings (Arthur Andersen, 2000). Moreover, in 57.7 % of the companies, the seniority is another factor that affected the wage increments. In addition, 70.9 % of the organizations make wage increments twice a year and 10.5 % once a year. Also, the increment rates are in 51 % - 75 % range in 65.6 % of the organizations and in 26 %- 50 % range in 22.5 % of the organizations. Moreover, general managers and first rank supervisors determined the wage level of managerial positions with rates of 77.7 % and 50.0 %, respectively. On the other hand, first level supervisors and HR managers played a role with rates of 63.0 % and 49.8 %, respectively. Additionally, job evaluation, which is an important process of compensation management, was performed in 45.6 % of the organizations. The 35.8 % of these organizations used the results of job evaluation in wage determination process.

In terms of incentives and benefits, the survey (Arthur Andersen, 2000) had several results; 1) the most widely applied incentive was food ticket (93.3% and 95.0 % of managerial and non-managerial positions, respectively); 2) the other common incentives for managerial positions were company car assignment (85.7 %), gasoline allowance (77.1 %), and health insurance (71.1 %); 3) the incentives provided for non-managerial positions were health insurance (54.8%), payments in religious

festivals (42.2 %) and fuel allowance (41.2 %); 4) the most widely used incentive pay systems were individual based premiums with a rate of 57.8 %; 5) however, in 16.3% of the organizations there were not any provided incentive system.

1.6 Human Resource Management Practices in Different Countries

A major transformation in form and function of the HRM practices has taken place within the past two decades throughout the world. Intensified foreign competition, rapid technological changes, greater needs for innovation and workers' demands for empowered jobs have led organizations to engage in efficient human resource practices (Kalleberg & Moody, 1994). Organizations try to establish an effective HRM because there is a positive relationship between HRM effectiveness and firm performance (Huselid, 1995). Moreover, the results of a study in 385 small business organizations operating in the USA revealed that HR practices influenced organizational climate, which in turn influenced customer HR practices such as developmental performance appraisal systems and establishing an internal equity of rewards positively affected employee commitment towards the organization (Whitener, 2001). Because of these positive effects of HRM in organizational functioning, organizations started to develop their HRM practices. In the following sections the HRM practices of different countries is briefly reviewed and in Table 1.1 the summary of HRM activities in different countries is presented. However, it should be kept in mind that Table 1.1 does not necessarily represent the whole HRM activities performed in different countries and the findings are not the resulted from cross-cultural comparisons. Results are only reflective of the situations in the sampled organizations in studies conducted in different countries. Yet, this table is expected to help readers understand the nature of HRM activities very roughly in different countries.

Table 1.1 HRM Activities in Different Countries

HRM	Country			
	US	Canada	Japan	Holland
Recruitment method	online recruitment			
Selection Tool	tests walk-in		tests	work samples assessment centers interviews tests
Frequency of PA PA methods	annual		annual	annual BOS BARS 360 degrees feedback ranking methods GRS
Training methods			job rotation on the job training off the job training	on the job training
Benefits, Incentives, Rewards	health insurance pension plans religious festival pay fuel allowance premium			education support education support flexibility/variability of jobs quality circles participative decision making
				education support education support recreational facilities bonus

1.6.1 United States of America

According to the results of a study conducted in 50 major U.S. service and manufacturing companies, the top HRM activities are as follows:

1. Proactive planning to maintain appropriate staffing levels
2. Implementing more effective selection and promotion practices
3. Establishing systematic management development
4. Giving employee training and development a greater priority
5. More involvement in strategic planning and restructuring
6. Reducing human resource bureaucracies and increasing customer service
7. Applying value added performance appraisals and reviews
8. Developing flexible compensation and benefit systems
9. Using pay based performance incentives
10. Effectively monitoring work relations and morale (“Retaining Workers”, 1999).

In addition, Selden, Ingraham, and Jacobson (2001) stated that in terms of selection process, several states in U.S., such as Kansas, have abandoned the use of centralized civil service exams and established skill matching programs that fill positions based on a set of core competencies. Several states have adopted automated application systems that help managers match applicant skills with skills required by jobs. Other innovations in selection process involve use of pass/ fail examinations, walk-in testing applying online and signing bonuses.

The practices of performance appraisal are common in the USA. Selden et al. (2001) stated that thirty-seven states have an annual formal performance appraisal. Eleven states required supervisors to appraise their staff twice a year. In New Jersey’s performance appraisal system, there has to be at least three interactive discussions about employee performance between employees and their supervisors

throughout the year. The first meeting is the initial performance agreement in which the department's work goals and employee work responsibilities are discussed. The expected standards of achievement and employee goals are also identified in the first session. In the second session, the progress of the employee is analyzed and a development plan is made. The third formal meeting takes place at the end of the year. In this meeting, the overall performance of the employee is evaluated.

Moreover, Selden et al. (2001) stated that performance management systems require employees and managers to determine the goals together, establish how employees or teams contribute to the organizational goals, identify strengths and weaknesses of an individual's performance, and recognize high performance in U.S. recently. According to the same study, many states in the U.S. use non-monetary reward systems that include job and time flexibility. However, the use of monetary tools such as individual and group performance bonuses is not common.

1.6.2 Canada

Relatively limited information is available concerning the HRM practices in Canada. However, Ng and Maki (1993) found that small and large organizations in Canada differ in their ranking of the importance of HRM activities. There were three most important activities for smaller firms. The first one was "retaining activities" that included administrating personnel records, payroll processing, health and safety compliance, public relations, and vacation processing. The second one was the "obtaining activities" that was composed of pre-employment testing, recruiting, and hiring. The last one was the "identifying activities" that involved human resource planning and job evaluation.

For larger firms the most important activities were as follows. The first one was the "adjustment activities" that involved promotion, transfer, and the separation

of employees; union management relations; disciplinary issues, and employee assistance plan administration. This is followed by “identifying and developing activities” in which skill training, orientation, and career development were emphasized.

The results of a research conducted by Wager (1998) in 1000 small organizations in Canada revealed that half of the organizations had a formal performance appraisal system and employee pension plan. Almost 30% of employers had a job sharing program and about 27% of organizations conducted employee attitude surveys. Employee assistance programs and presence of a HRM department were less common. Moreover, Wager pointed out that there was a strong relationship between progressive decision making ideology and HRM practices. In other words, firms that valued open communication and employee participation in decision making were more likely to implement HRM practices in Canada.

Finally, a survey conducted in Canada demonstrated that there were differences between most successful and least successful organizations in terms of HRM practices (“Human Resource”, 1994). The first difference was that most successful plants made use of employee work teams more than least successful ones. The second difference was that most successful plants emphasized training issues more than the least successful ones. The successful plants trained their production workers and their supervisory or technical staff. The training programs involved training employees in advanced skills such as problem solving or quality.

1.6.3 Japan

Japan is another country that is active in HRM practices. In terms of selection process, the traditional way of hiring inexperienced graduates from elite universities has been questioned in Japan and organizations have started to hire

white-collars or technical workers without college degrees (Selmer, 2001). Selmer (2001) also presented that sophisticated tests and other screening devices are used in selection of employees. After permanent workers are hired, they received a prolonged orientation program that has been designed to create the culture of loyalty (Kandel, 2001).

Furthermore, as it is the leading economy in its region, the Japanese organizations have increased to spend on training, and other human resource development activities (Zhu, 2004). The employees received extensive training programs. Most companies provided different kinds of trainings such as job rotation, on the job training, and periodic off the job training (Koike, 1997). However, as stated by Zhu (2004), there are differences in terms of training activities among different sectors in Japan. For instance, sectors of financing insurance and real estate have the highest percentage (94%) in implementing training programs. On the contrary, the sectors of communication and transport have the lowest percentage (51%) in providing training programs to their employees.

Additionally, Takeuchi (1990) stated that performance evaluations are done annually or sometimes more frequently in Japan. Performance evaluations do not only depend on performance in terms of output but also on attitudes, ability, growth in skills, and processes for generating output. Both supervisors and human resources department appraise the employees. Human resource department participates in the process in order to increase objectivity and company-wide consistency.

In addition, the organizations in Japan are leaving the traditional salary increment based on seniority and they have started to depend on individual ability and performance in salary increment. Since the early 1990's some companies have developed job ability based systems. These systems focus on goal in evaluation of

employee performance (Selmer, 2001). Moreover, salary administration is basically the function of the human resources department. Salary is paid to “person” so it differs among the employees who do the same work. Furthermore, in large firms employees received profit sharing and bonuses as incentives (Kandel, 2001).

Finally, labor-management relations are very different in Japan. In most industries, employees working for a particular company form unions. The members of unions include production workers, supervisors, foreman, and white collar employees. Unlike American practices, seniority of union members does not play a significant role (Takeuchi, 1990).

1.6.4 European Human Resource Management

Clark and Pugh (1999) examined the HRM functions in 7 European countries (United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Denmark, France, Netherlands, and Sweden). They concluded that HRM was valued as a source of competitive advantage in most of these countries. Also, there was a decentralization of responsibility for HR issues from state to firm level and personnel function to line management. Lastly, there was a strong emphasis on integration of HR strategies with corporate strategies to make them mutually reinforcing.

Pugh and Clark (1999) stated that there was a considerable degree of convergence among four of the seven countries in terms of HRM practices. These countries were France, Netherlands, Sweden, and United Kingdom. There were four factors that affected the similarity of HRM in these countries. The first factor was that these countries accepted the U.S. management philosophies and practices of HRM. Secondly, the governments and employers in these 4 countries faced similar economic problems and development. Consequently, HRM was used as a novel way to gain a competitive advantage in these countries. For instance, in France, HRM

was associated with government's attempts to create a cheaper and flexible work force. While in Sweden it was associated with individualization of employment relationship (Brunstein, 1995). Third factor was the increasing decentralization of industrial relations, institutions, and practices in many of these countries. With decentralization, the locus of collective bargaining shifted from national or multi company level to firm or plant level. In addition, decentralization resulted in a decline in union membership. The final factor was that management sought greater autonomy from the workforce. For example, in Britain, HRM became a powerful managerial rhetoric that reflected current societal values and political priorities (Clark & Pugh, 1999).

Furthermore, concerning selection activity in Holland, it was found that work samples, paper and pencil tests, assessment centers, and interviews are common selection devices (Wiersma, Van den Berg, & Latham, 1995). The other practices that are valued by organizations in Holland are job analysis, career development, developing selection techniques and instruments.

In terms of performance evaluation, managers, and employees engage in two types of appraisal in Holland. One of them is a top-down method in which the employee performance is evaluated by immediate supervisor. The second one is a bilateral evaluation in which employee and supervisor discuss employee performance together. Generally, organizations conduct formal performance appraisals once a year. In addition, Wiersma et al. (1995) stated that BOS are used more than trait scales and BARS in Dutch organizations. Other than these performance appraisal techniques, 360-degree feedback, although not widely used, is conducted by some consulting companies. Moreover, organizations in Holland use intrinsic rewards more than extrinsic ones to motivate their employees.

Providing employees with additional education, increasing task variety and flexibility of jobs, applying participative decision making, and forming quality circles can be given as examples of intrinsic rewards that are used.

1.6.5 Eastern Europe

As Kiriazov, Sullivan and Tu (2000) stated that HR practices in Eastern Europe are relatively immature despite efficient HRM practices in Western Europe. They stated that countries in Eastern Europe focus more on personnel administration than the integration of HR practices with corporate strategy. Specifically, in terms of selection activities, it can be said that only few firms have well developed selection systems. Application forms and informational interviews have started to be applied recently and these interviews measure competence, motivation, and communication skills. However, application forms or interviews still contain personal questions that are considered discriminatory against minorities (Kriazov et al., 2000). In addition, performance appraisal methods are gaining popularity among East European HR professionals. Ranking methods and graphic ratings are applied in some of the organizations. Using performance appraisal to reward employees is becoming more common. However, there is still some resistance to performance based pay, especially among older workers.

According to the Kiriazov et al (2000), in Eastern Europe firms recognize importance of training and development. However, they lack financial resources and expert trainers. The most popular training technique is on the job training. Among the other common techniques are classroom lectures and seminars. As compensation practices analyzed, it is seen that typical East European managerial compensation package consists of base pay, other cash, benefits, and bonuses. Among them base pay has the largest portion with 65%. Organizations also offer social benefits, which

are valued by employees. For example, women have company paid maternity leave with guarantee to return to same position. The tenured employees have unlimited paid sick leave. Moreover, large firms sponsor schools, housing, holiday accommodations, recreational facilities, and cafeterias (Kiriazov et al., 2000). Hence, it seems fair to conclude that HRM is an immature but developing issue in East European countries.

In conclusion, the purpose of the present study was to explore the nature of the HRM practices in a sample of Turkish private sector organizations. Furthermore, after exploring the extent of major HRM functions in the participating organizations, a comparison of the HRM activities in the Turkish and foreign organizations were made based on the available studies on HRM practices in other countries.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Sample

Seven-hundred-fifty organizations operating throughout Turkey in various sectors had been contacted via telephone and e-mail in order to participate in this research. However, the final sample included 200 organizations, with a 27% return rate. The organizations in the sample were the members of both Personnel Managers Association (PERYON) and Quality Association (KALDER) in Turkey. PERYON is an association in Turkey that was established to operate in the field of human resource and personnel management in 1971. It has been working for the development of human resource management throughout Turkey for more than two decades. Secondly, KALDER is an organization that was established in 1991 with a vision of becoming an exemplary organization in the world by the efficient deployment and efficient use of the Total Quality Management throughout Turkey.

In addition, 85% of the participating organizations in the final sample were also among the ones that have been identified as the first 1000 companies of Turkey as classified by the Istanbul Association of Manufacturers in the year 2001. Among the participants there were managers, coordinators or employees working in HRM departments; owner and general managers of these organizations.

2.1.1 Profile of the Organizations

In this section, characteristics of the participating organizations (i.e., sector they operate in, age, and size) are evaluated.

2.1.2 Sector of the Organizations

A frequency analysis was conducted to find out the distribution of the organizations by sector. The results in Table 2.1 revealed that 16 % of the 200 organizations was operating in sector of automotive, 15 % of them was in textile sector. Moreover, the sectors of health and medicine, technology, fast consumer goods, and construction and material represented the 9.5 %, 8.5%, 7.5%, and 7.0% of the organizations, respectively.

Table 2.1 Distribution of the Participating Organizations by Sector

Sector	Frequency	Percentage %
Automotive	32	16
Textile	30	15
Health and Medicine	19	9.5
Durable Consumer Goods	18	9
Technology	17	8.5
Metal	16	8
Fast Consumer Goods	15	7.5
Construction and Material	14	7
Energy	8	4
Insurance	6	3
Service	5	2.5
Communication	4	2
Finance	4	2
Holding Company	4	2
Consultancy	3	1.5
Tourism	3	1.5
Education	1	0.5
Missing	1	0.5
Total	200	100

2.1.3 Age of the Organizations

In order to find out the age profile of the organizations another frequency analysis was conducted. The results in Table 2.2 indicated that 50.5 % and 38% of

the organizations were aged between 0- 25 and 26-50 years, respectively. The 6.5%, 3.5% and 1.5% of the remaining organizations were aged between 51-75, 76-100, 101 and over years old, respectively.

Table 2.2 Age Profile of the Organizations

Age Profile	Frequency	Percentage
0-25 Ages	101	50,5
26-50 Ages	76	38
51-75 Ages	13	6,5
76-100 Ages	7	3,5
101 and Over Ages	3	1,5
Total	200	100

2.1.4 Size of the Organizations

In the identification of the size of the organizations, the standards of KOSGEB (Small and Medium Industry Development Organization) were used (Arthur Andersen, 2000). Based on these standards, the organizations that had 0- 49 employees were identified as small-sized organizations. Those that had 50-199 employees and over 200 employees were classified as medium-sized organizations and large-sized organizations, respectively.

As seen in Table 2.3, 65% (N = 130) of the 200 organizations were large-sized. Twenty-four percent of the organizations employed between 50-199 people, and lastly the percentage of small-sized organizations was 11% (N = 22).

Table 2.3 Size Profile of the Organizations

Size of the Organization	Frequency	Percentage %
0- 49 Employees	22	11
50-199 Employees	48	24
200 and over Employees	130	65
Total	200	100

As it was illustrated at Table 2.3, it can be concluded that most of the organizations in the sample were large-sized (N = 129), the remaining of the organizations were medium- and small sized organizations with frequency of 48 and

22, respectively. Moreover, most of the large-sized organizations were in the sectors of textile (N = 24), automotive (N = 23), construction and material (N = 14), and metal (N = 13). The frequency of the medium-sized organizations analyzed disclosed that more than half of the medium sized organizations belong to sectors such as technology (N = 7), automotive (N = 7), fast consumer goods (N = 6), health and medicine (N = 5), and durable consumer goods (N = 5). Lastly, the small-sized organizations were mostly belong to sectors of technology (N = 4), health and medicine (N = 4), textile (N = 3), automotive (N = 2), metal (N = 2), and durable consumer goods (N = 2).

Table 2.4 The Frequency Distribution of Size of Organizations by Sector

Sector	Small-sized	Medium-sized	Large-sized
Finance	-	1	3
Technology	4	7	6
Fast Consumer Goods	1	6	8
Construction and Material	1	-	13
Health and Medicine	4	5	10
Communication	-	1	3
Automotive	2	7	23
Textile	3	3	24
Metal	2	1	13
Durable Consumer Goods	2	5	11
Holding Company	1	-	3
Consultancy	1	2	-
Energy	-	1	7
Tourism	-	2	1
Insurance	-	5	1
Education	-	-	1
Service	1	2	2
Total	22	48	129

2.2 Measure

Data were collected by using a structured questionnaire which was formed to assess human resource management practices of the organizations operating in Turkey (See Appendix A). The questionnaire was consisted of 83 questions and 12 major sections. The two sections were about profile of the organizations (sector, size,

age, etc.) and HR departments. The remaining 10 sections were about HRM functions such as job analysis and design, recruitment, personnel selection, orientation, training and development, performance management, career planning and development, human resource planning, compensation management and benefits, employee relations, and employee health and safety.

There were 10 open ended questions asking for the name of the organization, age of the organization, size of the organization, and age of the manager of HRM department, etc. and the remaining 73 were in multiple choice format. For instance, the questions like sector of the organization, name of HRM department, title of the person who is responsible for HRM functions at first level etc. were among the multiple choice questions. The participants were able to mark more than one item for 36 of the multiple choice questions, such as functioning areas of HRM department, the areas in which the job analysis results were used, and methods of job analysis.

2.3 Procedure

The questionnaire was placed on the internet site of the Middle East Technical University (METU) Career Planning Center. In order to attract people an e-mail was sent to whole e-mail group members of PERYON by the president of Ankara Office. In this e-mail, the aim and scope of the research had been explained and members were requested to participate in the study by visiting the home page of METU Career Planning Center and clicking on the link of the questionnaire. However, out of approximately 1000 recipients, only 65 participants filled out the questionnaire.

On the next stage, member lists of both PERYON and KALDER were obtained and 300 organizations were reached and asked to participate in the study.

However, only 135 of the organizations among 250 organizations that accepted to participate in the research filled out the questionnaire.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 HRM Departments in Organizations

In the second section of the questionnaire, the structure and general functioning areas of HRM departments and profile of the HRM managers were analysed.

Firstly, a frequency analysis was conducted in order to find out how HRM departments in organizations were named. The findings in the Table 3.1 demonstrate that 119 of the 200 (59.5 %) organizations in the study preferred to use the name of Human Resources Management Department. Additionally, the departments operating in area of HRM were named Personnel and Administrative Department, Personnel Department, or Human Resources and Quality Management Department in 12.0%, 9.0%, and 7.5% of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.1 Name of the Departments Operating in HRM Functions

Name of the HRM Departments	Frequency	Percentage %
HRM Department (İnsan Kaynakları Departmanı)	119	59.5
Personnel and Administrative Department (Personel ve İdari İşler Departmanı)	24	12
Personnel Department (Personel Departmanı)	18	9
Human Resources and Quality Management Department (İnsan Kaynakları ve Kalite Departmanı)	15	7,5
Administrative Department (İdari İşler Departmanı)	5	2.5
HRM and Administrative Department (İnsan Kaynakları ve İdari İşler Departmanı)	5	2.5

Table 3.1 Continued

General Director Office (Genel Müdürlük)	4	2
Industrial Relations and HRM Department (Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Departmanı)	3	1.5
HRM and Training Department (İnsan Kaynakları ve Eğitim Departmanı)	2	1
Finance Department (Finans Departmanı)	2	1
Management, Organizational Development and HRM Department (Yönetim, Organizasyonel Gelişim ve İnsan Kaynakları Departmanı)	2	1
Missing	1	0.5
Total	200	100

Moreover, the descriptive analysis revealed that the minimum number of employees working in HRM departments was 1 and the maximum number was 48 with a mean and standard deviation of 5.98 and 6.81, respectively. The frequency analysis presented in the Table 3.2 illustrates that in 21% of the HRM departments 2 people were employed. In addition, the number of employees working in HRM departments was 3 and 1 in 15.5% and 11.0% of the organizations, respectively. In other words, there were 5 employees or less than 5 employees working in HRM departments in 65.0% of the 200 organizations.

Furthermore, in 20.0% (N = 40) of the organizations, the employee number of HRM departments was between 6 and 10. In medium-sized organizations, most of the organizations (79.2%) had 1-5 employees working in HRM departments and in 12.5% of the organizations the employee number in HRM department was between 6 to 10 individuals. In addition, in 72.7% (N = 16) of the small-sized organizations HRM department was consisted of 1 to 5 individuals and only 14.6% (N = 3) of the small-sized organizations there were 6 to 10 employees working in HRM department.

Table 3.2 Frequency Distribution of Number of Employees in HRM Department

Number of Employees	Frequency	Percentage %
1	22	11
2	42	21
3	31	15.5
4	20	10
5	15	7.5
6	10	5
7	12	6
8	8	4
9	4	2
10	6	3
11	3	1.5
12	5	2.5
13	1	0.5
14	2	1
15	2	1
16	4	2
18	1	0.5
22	1	0.5
23	1	0.5
24	1	0.5
25	2	1
29	1	0.5
31	1	0.5
47	1	0.5
48	1	0.5
Missing	3	1.5
Total	200	100

Also, the descriptive analysis demonstrated that the minimum number of hierarchy levels in HRM departments was 1 and the maximum number was 6 with a mean and a standard deviation of 245 and 1.06, respectively. Moreover, the Table 3.3 demonstrates that in 71 organizations (35.5%) there were 2 hierarchical levels. The number of hierarchy levels in HRM departments were 3 and 1 in 31.5% and 19.0% of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.3 Frequency Distribution of Number of Hierarchy Levels in HRM Department

Number of Levels in the Administrative Hierarchy	Frequency	Percentage %
1	38	19
2	71	35.5
3	63	31.5
4	22	11
5	3	1.5
6	3	1.5
Total	200	100

Another descriptive and frequency analysis was conducted to examine the title of the primary responsible manager of HRM functions. The findings in Table 3.4 demonstrates that in 51.5% of the organizations HRM Managers (N = 103) and in 15.0 % of the organizations HRM Directors (N = 30) were the primary responsible persons of HRM departments.

Table 3.4 Title of Primary Responsible Persons of HRM Functions

Title	Frequency	Percentage %
General Manager Assistant (Genel Müdür Yardımcısı)	27	13.5
HRM Coordinator (İnsan Kaynakları Koordinatörü)	16	8
HRM Director (İnsan Kaynakları Direktörü)	30	15
HRM Manager (İnsan Kaynakları Müdürü)	103	51.5
General Manager (Genel Müdür)	5	2.5
Other Titles	19	9.5
Total	200	100

Moreover, as presented in Table 3.5, in 63.0 % of the organizations HRM managers reported directly to General Managers (N = 126) and in 18.5% of the organizations they reported directly to Assistant General Manager of Finance and Administration (N = 37).

Table 3.5 Executive Managers Reported by HRM Managers

The Individuals to Whom HRM Managers Report	Frequency	Percentage %
General Manager (Genel Müdür)	126	63
Assistant General Manager of Finance and Administration (Finans ve İdari İşlerden Sorumlu Genel Müdür Yardımcısı)	37	18.5
President of Executive Committee (Yönetim Kurulu Başkanı)	12	6
Assistant General Manager HRM and Administration (İnsan Kaynakları ve İdari İşlerden Sorumlu Genel Müdür Yardımcısı)	7	3.5
General Coordinator (Genel Koordinatör)	6	3
Branch/Factory Manager (Fabrika Müdürü)	6	3
HRM Director (İnsan Kaynakları Direktörü)	5	2.5
Coordinator of Administration and Marketing (İdari İşler ve Pazarlama Koordinatörü)	1	0.5
Total	200	100

As the education level of HRM Managers was analyzed, as the findings in the Table 3.6 showed that 63.0% (N =126) of the HRM managers were university graduates and 31.0% (N = 62) of HRM managers had a masters degree.

Table 3.6. Education Level of HRM Managers

Education Level	Frequency	Percentage %
High School	4	2
University Graduate	126	63
Masters Degree	62	31
Doctorate	8	4
Total	200	100

As it was further examined and demonstrated in Table 3.7, the 16.5% (N = 33) of HRM managers had a university degree in management and 13.0% (N = 26) of HRM managers had a masters degree in Management of Business Administration (MBA). Nine and a half percent of HRM managers were graduated from economy department of universities (N = 19).

Table 3.7 Education Fields of HRM Managers

Education Fields	Frequency	Percentage %
University Degree in Management	33	16.5
University Degree in Social Sciences	6	3
University Degree in Economy	19	9.5
University Degree in Administrative and Economic Sciences	6	3
University Degree Industrial Engineering	8	4
University Degree in Other Engineering Departments	6	3
University Degree in Educational Sciences	7	3.5
University Degree in Other Departments	12	6
Masters Degree in MBA	26	13
Masters Degree in Industrial Engineering	9	4.5
Masters Degree in Educational Sciences	3	1.5
Masters Degree in Administrative and Economy Sciences	9	4.5
Masters Degree in Human Resources Management	5	2.5
Masters Degree in Other Departments	10	5
Doctorate Degree in Management	3	1.5
Doctorate Degree in Industrial Engineering	1	0.5
Missing	37	18.5
Total	200	100

The results of the descriptive analysis which was conducted to examine the age profile of HRM managers revealed that the youngest HRM Manager is 24 years old and the oldest one is 67 years old with a mean and standard deviation of 40.4 and 8.9, respectively. The frequency analysis presented in the Table 3.8 demonstrates that the 36.0 % of HRM managers were aged between 36 - 45 years old (N = 72) and 33.5 % of them were between 24 - 35 years old (N = 67).

Table 3.8 Age of HRM Managers

Age of HRM Managers	Frequency	Percentage %
24 - 35 Years Old	67	33.5
36 - 45 Years Old	72	36
46 - 55 Years Old	37	18.5
55 and Over Years Old	15	7.5
Missing	9	4.5
Total	200	100

The results of a further frequency analysis demonstrates that 63.0% (N = 126) of HRM managers were male and 33.5% (N = 67) of HRM Managers were female (See Table 3.9).

Table 3.9 Gender of HRM Managers

Gender of HRM Managers	Frequency	Percentage %
Female	67	33.5
Male	126	63
Missing	7	3.5
Total	200	100

The descriptive analysis of the duration of experience of HRM in managers in the field of human resource management revealed that HRM managers have 1 year of experience in minimum and 39 years of experience at maximum in area of human resource management, with a mean and standard deviation of 9.76 and 7.38 years, respectively.

Moreover, frequency analysis presented in the Table 3.10 demonstrates that 25% of HRM managers are experienced for 6 to 10 years (N = 51) and 17% of them have experience of 1 to 5 years in human resource management field.

Table 3.10 Frequency Distribution of Experience Duration of HRM Managers

Experience of HRM Manager	Frequency	Percentage %
1-5 Years	34	17
6-10 Years	51	25.5
11-15 Years	18	9
16-20 Years	3	1.5
21 Years and Over	11	5.5
Missing	83	41.5
Total	200	100

3.1.1 Functioning Areas of HRM Departments

Lastly, the main functioning areas of HRM departments were analyzed. Results presented in Table 3.11 showed that in 93.5 % of the organization HRM functions included personnel selection and placement, and in 90.5% of the

participating organizations HRM functions included recruitment. However, functions such as social (9.5%) and administrative services (3.5%), and quality (3.5%) were not performed as much as the other HRM functions.

Moreover, 12.5% of the organizations (N = 25) perform 16 of the 19 HRM functions presented in Table 3.11 such as job analysis, job design, recruitment, personnel selection and placement, orientation, training and development, performance management, career planning, HR planning, employee health and safety, compensation and benefits, payroll, employee transportation and food services, matters pertaining to personnel and employee relations. In addition, 2.5% of the organizations (N = 5) perform the functions that were mentioned above except for employee relations.

Table 3.11 HRM Functions

HRM Functions	Frequency	Percentage %
Personnel Selection and Placement	187	93.5
Recruitment	181	90.5
Training and Development	167	83.5
Compensation and Benefits	164	82
Matters Pertaining to Personnel	162	81
Performance Management	161	80.5
Orientation	160	80
Payroll	149	74.5
Employee Health and Safety	147	73.5
Job Analysis	131	65.5
Meal	126	63
Human Resource Planning	117	58.5
Transportation	115	57.5
Career Planing	94	47
Employee Relations	90	45
Job Design	76	38
Social Services	19	9.5
Quality Management	7	3.5
Administrative Services	7	3.5

Furthermore, cross-tab analyses were conducted to present the relation between size of the organizations and the performed HRM activities for exploratory

purposes (See Appendix B). The findings demonstrated that 70.2% (N = 92) and 21.4% (N = 28) of the organizations that perform job analysis were large- and medium-sized organizations, respectively. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .16, $p < .05$). In terms of recruitment activity, the results revealed that 68.5% (N = 124) and 22.1% (N = 40) of the organizations that performed recruitment were large- and medium-sized (Spearman rho = .23, $p < .001$, Chi-square = 10.9, $p < .01$). Moreover, 95.4% (N = 124), 83.3% (N = 40) 77.3% (N = 17) of the large-, medium-, and small-sized organizations in the sample carried out recruitment activities. The 67.4% (N = 126), 22.5% (N = 42) and 10.2% (N = 19) of the organizations that engaged in personnel selection activities were large-, medium- and small-sized organizations (Spearman rho = .19, $p < .01$, Chi-square = 7.19, $p < .05$). In other words, the 86.4% (N = 19) of the small-sized, 87.5% (N = 42) of the medium-sized and 96.9% (N = 126) of the large-sized organizations conducted personnel selection activities. Additionally, 10.8% (N = 18), 21.0% (N = 35), and 68.3% (N = 114) of the 167 organizations that carried out employee training activities were small-, medium-, and large-sized organizations, respectively. In other words, the 81.8% of the small-sized, 72.9% of the medium-sized and 87.7% of the large-sized organizations engaged in employee training activities. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .14, $p > .05$). Considering performance appraisal activity, the results showed that 10.6% (N = 17), 21.1% (N = 34) and 68.3% (N = 110) of the 161 organizations that carried out performance management activities were small-, medium-, and large-sized organizations, respectively. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .13, $p > .05$). Considering career planning activity, the results showed that 7.9% (N

= 10), 22.2% (N = 28) and 69.8% (N = 88) of the 126 organizations that carried out career planning and development activities were small-, medium- and large-sized organizations, respectively (Spearman rho = .14, $p < .05$). Lastly, the results showed that 13.3% (N = 12), 11.1% (N = 10) and 75.6% (N = 68) of the 90 organizations that engaged in managing employee relations activities were small-, medium- and large-sized organizations, respectively (Spearman rho = .16, $p < .05$, Chi-square = 14.94, $p < .001$). In other words, the 54.5% of the small-sized, 20.8% of the medium-sized and 52.3% of the large-sized organizations engaged in managing employee relations.

3.1.1.1 Correlations Among HRM Functions

For exploratory purposes, bivariate correlations were computed to find out the correlations among different HRM functions¹. The results presented in Appendix C showed that HRM departments of the organizations that performed job analysis were likely to perform functions such as job design ($r = .55$, $p < .01$) and performance management ($r = .47$, $p < .01$), human resource planning ($r = .45$, $p < .01$), orientation ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), career planning ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), training and development ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), personnel selection and placement ($r = .24$, $p < .01$), recruitment ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), and compensation management ($r = .18$, $p < .05$). These findings are also in line with the literature since activities of job design, performance appraisal, orientation, career planning, training and development, personnel selection and placement, recruitment and compensation management make use of job analysis results (Mathis & Jackson, 1991).

In addition, correlation analysis revealed that the HRM departments that performed job design were likely to function in HRM practices such as performance

¹ Phi coefficients were also computed instead of each bivariate correlation analysis and the results demonstrated that there were no differences between the two kinds of correlational analysis.

appraisal ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), career planning ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), human resource planning ($r = .51$, $p < .01$). Moreover, HRM departments that perform recruitment processes were more likely to operate in personnel selection ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), and orientation ($r = .28$, $p < .01$).

The correlational analysis also revealed that the HRM function of personnel selection process was significantly and positively correlated with orientation ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), training ($r = .43$, $p < .01$), performance appraisal ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), career planning ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), and compensation management ($r = .30$, $p < .01$).

The organizations that functioned in orientation were likely to operate in training ($r = .73$, $p < .01$), performance appraisal ($r = .54$, $p < .01$), and career planning ($r = .43$, $p < .01$).

The training function of HRM was found to be positively and significantly correlated with performance appraisal ($r = .46$, $p < .01$) and career planning ($r = .39$, $p < .01$). Additionally, the HRM departments that functioned in performance management activities were likely to perform activities of career planning ($r = .51$, $p < .01$), human resource planning ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), and compensation management ($r = .26$, $p < .01$).

It was also found that career planning activities were positively and significantly correlated with human resource planning ($r = .50$, $p < .01$) and compensation management ($r = .34$, $p < .01$).

Moreover, the organizations that operated in compensation management were found likely to perform the activities of both making payroll ($r = .29$, $p < .01$) and personnel matters ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). Also, the activity of making payroll was

positively correlated with personnel matters ($r = .68, p < .01$), employee health and safety activities ($r = .38, p < .01$), transportation ($r = .36, p < .01$), and food services ($r = .31, p < .01$).

In addition, HRM departments that worked in the area of employee health and safety were likely to perform employee relation activities ($r = .25, p < .01$). The HRM departments that were responsible for social services such as arranging social activities or preschool services were likely to work in areas of quality management ($r = .50, p < .01$) and administrative services ($r = .40, p < .05$).

3.2 Job Analysis

In this section, the proportion of the participating organizations conducting job analysis, the areas in which the results of job analysis are used, the performers of job analysis, the methods and, lastly, the frequency of job analysis are presented.

First, as shown in Table 3.12, 65.5% of the surveyed organizations conduct job analysis (N = 131).

Table 3.12 Job Analysis

Job Analysis	Frequency	Percentage %
Not Performed	69	34.5
Performed	131	65.5
Total	200	100

Second, the findings presented in Table 3.13 demonstrates that in 64.3% of the 157 organizations, which performed job analysis, the results of the job analysis were used in the field of selection and placement and compensation management. Moreover, it was found that 61.1% of the organizations use the results of job analysis in training and development. Performance appraisal (55.4%), job design (50.3%), promotion and assignment (48.4%), career planning (47.8%), recruitment

(43.3%), orientation (28.5%) and industrial relations (14.5%) were among the fields in which job analysis results were used. In addition, the results of job analysis were also used in the fields of job evaluation and position planning but with very small percentages (0.06%).

Furthermore, 4.5% (N = 9) of the participating organizations used the results of job analysis in 10 fields such as job design, recruitment, personnel selection and placement, orientation, training and development, career planning, performance appraisal, promotion and appointment, compensation management and employee relations. Moreover, 3% (N = 6) of the organizations used the results of job analysis in all of the fields mentioned above except for employee relations.

3.13 The Fields in which the Results of Job Analysis were Used

The Fields	Frequency	%	Missing	%	Total Frequency	Total Percentage
Job Design	79	50.3	78	49.7	157	100
Recruitment	68	43.3	89	56.7	157	100
Selection and Placement	101	64.3	56	35.7	157	100
Orientation	54	28.5	103	65.6	157	100
Training and Development	96	61.1	61	38.9	157	100
Career Planning	75	47.8	82	52.2	157	100
Performance Appraisal	87	55.4	70	44.6	157	100
Compensation	101	64.3	56	35.7	157	100
Industrial Relations	28	14.5	129	82.2	157	100
Promotion and Appointment	76	48.4	81	51.6	157	100
Job Evaluation	1	0.6	156	99.4	157	100
Position Planning	1	0.6	156	99.4	157	100

In addition, the findings shown in Table 3.14 reveals that in 66.9% of the organizations HRM departments conducted job analysis (N = 105). In 12.1 % of the

organization consultancy firms and individual consultants conducted job analysis (N = 19).

Table 3.14 Frequency Distribution of Job Analysis Performers

JA Performers	Frequency	Percentage %
HRM Department	105	66.9
Consultancy Firms	19	12.1
HRM Department & Consultancy Firms	6	3.8
Consultants out of the Organizations	5	3.2
General Manager	5	3.2
HRM Department & Managers of Relevant Departments	4	2.5
Production Planning Department	4	2.5
Quality Management Department	3	1.9
Organization Planning Department	3	1.9
HRM & Quality Department	1	0.6
Directorship of System Development	1	0.6
Missing	1	0.6
Total	157	100

Next, Table 3.15 presents that employee interview method was used to conduct job analysis in 69.4% of the participating organizations (N =109) and 59.2% of the organizations (N =93) used the method of observation. In addition, in 37.6 % (N = 59), 36.9% (N = 58) and 33.1% (N = 52) of the organizations the methods of job experts, questionnaire, and job analysis form were used, respectively. However, the other methods of manager interview (2.5%) and benchmarking (0.5%) were not used commonly by the participating organizations.

Table 3.15 The Methods of Job Analysis

Methods of Job Analysis	Frequency	Percentage %	Missing	Percentage %	Total Frequency	Total Percentage
Employee Interview	109	69.4	48	30.6	157	100
Observation	93	59.2	64	40.8	157	100
Job Experts	59	37.6	103	98	62.4	100
Questionnaire	58	36.9	99	63.1	157	100
JA Form	52	33.1	105	66.9	157	100

Table 3.15 Continued

Manager						
Interview	4	2.5	153	97.5	157	100
Benchmark	1	0.5	156	99.4	157	100

Furthermore, cross tab analysis was computed between size of organizations and job analysis methods (See Appendix D). The findings revealed that 9.7% (N = 9), 28.0% (N = 26) and 62.4% (N = 58) of the organizations that used observation as a job analysis method were small-, medium-, and large-sized organizations, respectively. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = -.04, $p > .05$). Also, the results showed that generally medium-sized organizations were likely to use observation method with a percentage of 54.2. Considering employee interview method, the findings demonstrated that mostly large-sized organizations used this method with a rate of 64.6% (N = 84). However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .14, $p > .05$). Moreover, the questionnaire method was found to be mostly applied by small-sized organizations with a rate of 36.4% (N = 8). Most of the 65 organizations that applied questionnaire technique were large-sized (66.2%, N = 43). However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .01, $p > .05$). Most of the organizations that used the other methods such as job analysis form and specialist sample were also large-sized organizations with a rate of 74.1% (N = 47) (Spearman rho = .12, $p > .05$) and 71.2% (N = 43) (Spearman rho = .10, $p > .05$), respectively. However, the correlations were not found to be significant.

For exploratory purposes, a bivariate correlation was computed in order to find out the correlations among the fields in which the results of job analysis were used. The results presented in Appendix E showed that the organizations that used

the results of job analysis in recruitment practices were likely to use the same results in areas of personnel selection ($r = .61, p < .01$) and orientation ($r = .56, p < .01$).

Additionally, the organizations that made use of job analysis results in the HRM function of training and development were likely to use the job analysis results in the functions such as career planning ($r = .50, p < .01$), promotion and appointment ($r = .43, p < .01$), and performance appraisal ($r = .40, p < .01$). The correlational analysis also revealed that career planning, in which the results of job analysis were used, was significantly and positively correlated with other areas in which the job analysis results were used such as promotion and appointment ($r = .51, p < .01$) and performance management ($r = .45, p < .01$).

Additionally, the organizations that made use of job analysis results in the HRM function of performance appraisal were likely to use the job analysis results in functions such as promotion and appointment ($r = .47, p < .01$) and compensation management ($r = .40, p < .01$). Lastly, the organizations that made use of job analysis results in the HRM function of compensation management were likely to use the job analysis in the area of promotion and appointment ($r = .50, p < .01$).

Moreover, the frequency analysis revealed that 11.0% ($N = 22$) of the participating organizations were likely to use the combination of observation, employee interview, and questionnaires when they were conducting job analysis. Furthermore, the combination observation and employee interview methods was used by 7.0% ($N = 14$) of the organizations. Lastly, the 6.0% ($N = 12$) of the participating organizations preferred to use the combination of observation, employee interview, and interviews with job expert methods in their job analysis process.

Finally, the frequency of job analysis in the organizations was examined and the results are presented in Table 3.16. In 58 (36.9%), 38 (24.2%), and 24 (15.3%) of the organizations job analysis was conducted once a year, once in every two or three years, once in every four or five years, respectively. However, in 18.4% of the organization job analysis was not conducted systematically (N = 29). Those organizations performed job analysis in unsystematic intervals, in time of a need or after organizational changes.

Table 3.16 Frequency of Job Analysis

Performance Frequency of JA	Frequency	Percentage %
Once a Year	58	36.9
Once in Every 2-3 Years	38	24.2
Once in Every 4-5 Years	24	15.3
In Time of a Need	11	7
Unsystematic Intervals	9	5.7
After Organizational Changes	9	5.7
First Time	4	2.5
Twice a Year	2	1.3
Missing	2	1.3
Total	157	100

3.3 Recruitment

In this section, recruitment process of HRM is evaluated by means of conducting frequency analyses that analyse the methods of recruitment applied in the participating organizations, the effective methods of recruitment, methods of internal recruitment, and the number of the organizations that had structured tools for organizational presentation.

First, it was concluded that the methods that are used for employee recruitment were different than the ones used for manager recruitment. For instance, as shown in Table 3.17 the method of walk-ins was the most frequently used method in employee recruitment with a percentage of 72.5 (N = 145). However,

as it was illustrated in the Table 3.18, the same method was used for managerial positions in 40.0% (N = 80) of the organizations only. The method of employee recommendation was the second most frequently used employee selection technique in organizations (66.0%). On the other hand, this technique was used by 37.5% of the organizations in recruiting managers. Moreover, Table 3.18 presents that the recruitment methods of newspaper, internet and references were used in 63.5%, 61.5%, and 55.5% of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.17 Recruitment Methods for Non-Managerial Positions

Recruitment Methods for Non-Managerial Positions	Frequency	Percentage %
Walk-Ins	145	72.5
Employee Recommendation	132	66
Newspaper	127	63.5
Internet	123	61.5
References	111	55.5
University Career Centers	64	32
Consultancy Firms	55	27.5
Professional Magazines	13	6.5
CV Bank	5	2.5
Internal Recruiting	3	1.5
Employment Agency	2	1

Next, a frequency analysis was performed to find the most frequently used combinations of recruitment methods used for non-managerial positions. The findings demonstrated that 5.0% (N = 10) of the participating organizations used the methods of newspaper adds, consultancy firms and internet together. Next, the combination of newspaper adds, employee recommendation, references and walk-in methods was used by 4.0% (N = 8) of the participating organizations.

As the most frequently used methods of recruitment for managerial positions were analyzed, as seen in the Table 3.18, the most popular method in recruiting managers was newspaper and it was used by 60.0% of the organizations. Also,

52.0% and 50.5% of the organizations used the methods of internet and consultancy firms, respectively. Moreover, the most frequently used combinations of methods used in manager recruitment were examined and the findings demonstrated that 7.0% (N = 14) of the participating organizations used the methods of newspaper adds, internet, universities' career centers, recommendations of employees, references, and walk-ins together. Next, the combination of newspaper adds, employee recommendation, references and walk-ins was used by 6.0% (N = 12) of the participating organizations.

Table 3.18 Recruitment Methods for Managerial Positions

Recruitment Methods of Managerial Positions	Frequency	Percentage %
Newspaper	120	60
Internet	104	52
Consultancy Firms	101	50.5
Walk Ins	80	40
Employee Recommendation	75	37.5
References	66	33
University Career Centers	39	19.5
Professional Magazines	26	13
Internal Recruiting	5	2.5
CV Bank	4	2
Employment Agency	2	1

In the next step, the effectiveness of recruitment methods, used for both managerial and non-managerial positions, were analyzed. The effectiveness of recruitment methods was examined by reaction-based measures. The Table 3.19 shows the recruitment methods that were perceived to be effective for non-managerial positions. It illustrated that CV bank method was evaluated as an effective method by 80.0% (N = 4) of 5 organizations that used the method. The findings also demonstrated that 68.3% (N = 84) of the 123 organizations that use the method of internet evaluated it as an effective one. Moreover, the method of

internal recruiting was evaluated as an effective method by 66.7% (N = 2) of the 3 organizations that use the method. Lastly, the method of newspaper adds was evaluated as an effective way of recruiting non-managerial positions by 60.6% (N = 77) of the 127 organizations that use the method.

Table 3.19 Effective Recruitment Methods for Non-Managerial Positions

Recruitment Methods for Non-Managerial Positions	Number of Organizations Using the Method	Frequency of Organizations Evaluating the Method as Effective	Perceived Effectiveness (%)
CV Bank	5/200	4	80
Internet	123/200	84	68.3
Internal Recruiting	3/200	2	66.7
Newspaper Adds	127/200	77	60.6
Consultancy Firms	55/200	25	45.5
Employee Recommendation	132/200	56	42.4
References	111/200	47	42.3
Walk Ins	145/200	58	40
University Career Centers	64/200	19	29.7
Professional Magazines	13/200	2	15.4

Table 3.20 demonstrates the most effective ways of manager recruitment as perceived by the organizations. Fifty two (51.5%) of the 101 organizations that had consultancy firms to recruit their managerial positions evaluated this method as an effective one. Also, 56 (46.0%) of the 120 organizations that used the method of newspaper adds evaluated it as an effective way to recruit managers. In addition, the method of internet was found to be another effective way to recruit managers by 39.4% of the 104 organizations that used this method (N = 41).

The method of professional magazines was not evaluated as effective as the other methods. Only, 15.4% and 12.8% of the organizations that used this method evaluated it as an effective one for recruiting employees and managers, respectively.

Table 3.20 Effective Recruitment Methods for Managerial Positions

Recruitment Methods of Managerial Positions	Number of Organizations Using the Method	Frequency of Organizations Evaluating the Method as Effective	Perceived Effectiveness (%)
Consultancy Firms	101/200	52	51.5
Newspaper Adds	120/200	56	46
Internet	104/200	41	39.4
CV Bank	4/200	1	25
References	66/200	15	22.7
Employee Recommendation	75/200	15	20
Internal Recruiting	5/200	1	20
Walk Ins	80/200	15	18.8
University Career Centers	39/200	5	12.8
Professional Magazines	26/200	2	07.8

The next step was to specifically examine the method of internal recruitment. It was found that 55.0% (N = 110) of the organizations performed internal recruiting. As demonstrated in Table 3.21, there were 5 different ways to perform internal recruitment. Thirty nine and a half percent (N = 79) and 20.0% (N =40) of the organizations used the methods of organizational intranet and job posting, respectively.

Table 3.21 The Ways of Internal Recruitment

Ways of Internal Recruiting	Frequency	Percentage %
Intranet	79	39.5
Job Posting	40	20
Verbal Communication	15	7.5
Meetings	6	3
Journal of the Organization	3	1.5

Lastly, the participating organizations were examined in order to see if they provide organizational information to their new employees and it was concluded that 68.5% of the organizations apply structured methods such as video presentations,

brochures in order to provide organizational information to their new employees (N = 137).

3.4 Position Norm Analysis

Concerning position norm analysis, the analyses were performed in order to examine the number of organizations that employ position norm analysis, the applicability and length of position planning.

First, it was found that 74.0% of the organizations (N = 148) performed the practices of position norm analysis. However, only 35.5% of the 148 organizations managed to apply the results of position norm analysis and in the remaining 60.0% of the organizations position planning was partly applied.

In addition, the organizations performed position norm analysis for different lengths of duration. For example, 46.5% of the 148 organizations performed their position norm analysis for 1 to 3 years (N = 93). Moreover, the position norm analysis was conducted once a year and once in every 4 or 5 years in 18.0% and 5.5% of the organizations, respectively.

3.5 Personnel Selection

Frequency analyses were performed to examine the number of organizations that owned a structured personnel selection system, the methods of selection used by the organizations and their effectiveness, the methods of selection interview performed by organizations, and the scoring systems of the interviews.

First, the results revealed that a structured personnel selection system was present in 50.8% (N = 95) of the responding organizations that apply personnel selection practices. In 20.3% (N = 38) of the responding organizations a structured selection system partly existed and in 3.2% (N = 6) of them there was not such a

structured system. However, the remaining organizations (25.7%) did not mention the kind of the interviews they performed.

As demonstrated in the Table 3.22 and 3.23, 92.5% of the organizations used the method of interviews for non-managerial positions and 85.0% of the organizations use the same method for managerial positions. Moreover, the method of references were used in 69.0% (N = 138) and 65.0% (N = 130) of the organizations for non-managerial and managerial positions, respectively. The personality tests were the third and biographical data were the fourth most commonly used method to select both managers and non-managers. Forty one point five percentage (N = 83) of the organizations preferred to use that method for non-managerial positions and 37.5% (N = 75) of them for managerial positions. In addition, the results revealed that 39.0% the organizations used the method of biographical data for non-managerial positions and 34.5% of them for managerial positions.

Table 3.22 Methods Used to Select Non-Managers

Methods of Personnel Selection for Non-Managers	Frequency	Percentage %
Interview	185	92.5
References	138	69
Personality Tests	83	41.5
Biographical Data	78	39
Skill Tests	69	34.5
Occupational Tests	63	31.5
Mechanical Tests	53	26.5
IQ Tests	38	19
Assessment Centers	35	17.5
Integrity Tests	17	8.5
Language Tests	8	4
Analytical Thinking Tests	3	1.5
Trial Period	1	0.5
Check up	1	0.5

Table 3.23 Methods Used to Select Managers

Methods of Personnel Selection for Managers	Frequency	Percentage %
Interview	170	85
References	130	65
Personality Tests	75	37.5
Biographical Data	69	34.5
Occupational Tests	34	17
Assessment Centers	32	16
IQ Tests	26	13
Mechanical Tests	16	8
Integrity Tests	11	5.5
Language Tests	10	5
Analytical Thinking Tests	3	1.5
Trial Period	1	0.5
Check up	1	0.5

In addition, it was concluded that 12.5% of the participating organizations (N = 25), the methods of interview and reference were used together. Nine percent of the organizations (N = 18) employed the methods of interview, biographic data, and references together in selecting managers. The combination of interview and reference methods were also found to be among the frequently used combination of methods for selecting employees with a percentage of 9.5 (N = 19) and the combination of interview, biographic data, and references were used together to select employees in 5.5% of the organizations (N = 11).

Additionally, cross tab analyses were computed among size of the organizations and selection methods that are used both for manager and non-manager selection. The findings revealed that most of the organizations (62.9%, N = 107) of that applied interview method in selecting their managerial positions were large-sized organizations but generally the method of interview was used by medium-sized organizations (95.8%, N = 46) (Spearman rho = -.07, $p > .05$, Chi-square = 6.19, $p < .05$) (See Appendix F). Similarly, most of the organizations that used personality

tests in selecting managers were large-sized organizations (58.7%, $N = 44$) but generally personality tests were most frequently used by medium-sized organizations (45.8%, $N = 22$). However, the correlation was not significant (Spearman $\rho = -.10$, $p > .05$). Moreover, the method of reference checking was mostly applied by large-sized organizations (69.2%, $N = 90$). However, the correlation was not significant (Spearman $\rho = .12$, $p > .05$).

In selecting non-managerial positions, most of the organizations that used interview method were large-sized (65.4%, $N = 121$) (See Appendix G). However, the correlation was not significant (Spearman $\rho = .03$, $p > .05$). Similarly, most of the 83 organizations that applied the method of personality tests were large-sized organizations (65.1% $N = 54$), on the other hand, the medium-sized organizations were likely to use the same method more frequently than the other organizations with a percentage of 41.7% ($N = 20$). However, the correlation was not significant (Spearman $\rho = .002$, $p > .05$). Lastly, among the 138 organizations that applied the method of reference checking in selecting non-managers were large-sized organizations with a percentage of 68.8 ($N = 95$) (Spearman $\rho = .13$, $p > .05$).

In the next step, the perceived effectiveness of the selection methods was analyzed in terms of selecting candidates for managerial positions. As it is demonstrated in Table 3.24, the most commonly used methods such as interview, references, personality tests, and biographical data were evaluated by participating organizations as effective ways in selecting managers by 93.5% of the 170, 53.1% of the 130, 50.7% of the 175, and 39.1% of the 69 organizations that used these techniques. Methods that were found to be effective by participating organizations in selecting candidates for non-managerial positions presented in Table 3.25.

Table 3.24 Effective Methods of Selection Used for Managerial Positions

Effective Methods of Personnel Selection Used for Managers	Number of organizations using the method	Frequency of organizations evaluating the method as effective	Perceived effectiveness (%)
Analytical Thinking Tests	3/200	3	100
Interview	170/200	159	93.5
Assessment Centers	32/200	18	56.3
References	130/200	69	53.1
Occupational Tests	34/200	18	52.9
Personality Tests	75/200	38	50.7
Language Tests	10/200	5	50
IQ Tests	26/200	11	42.5
Biographical Data	69/200	27	39.1
Skill Tests	31/200	10	32.3
Mechanical Tests	16/200	5	31.3
Integrity Tests	11/200	3	27.3

As it is seen in Table 3.25, the most commonly used methods such as interview, references, personality tests and biographical data were evaluated as the effective ways in selecting non-managers by 94.6% of the 185, 55.8% of the 138, 57.8% of the 83, and 46.2% of the 78 organizations that used these techniques. The other methods that found to be effective in selecting candidates for non-managerial positions were as follows; analytical thinking tests (100%), assessment centers (62.9%), integrity tests (58.8%), personality tests (57.8%), references (55.8%), mechanical tests (52.8%), skill tests (52.2%).

Table 3.25 Effective Methods of Selection Used for Non-Managerial Positions

Effective Methods of Personnel Selection Used for Non-Managers	Number of organizations using the method	Frequency of organizations that evaluate the method as effective	Perceived effectiveness (%)
Analytical Thinking Tests	3/200	3	100
Interview	185/200	175	94.6
Assessment Centers	35/200	22	62.9
Integrity Tests	17/200	10	58.8
Personality Tests	83/200	48	57.8

Table 3.25 Continued

References	138/200	77	55.8
Mechanical Tests	23/200	28	52.8
Skill Tests	69/200	36	52.2
Biographical Data	78/200	36	46.2
Occupational Tests	63/200	29	46
IQ Tests	38/200	15	39.5
Language Tests	8/200	3	37.5

Next, the kinds of interview techniques used by organizations during selection processes were analyzed. Results shown in Table 3.26 discloses that most frequently used interview format was one interviewer and one interviewee and it was used in 86.0% of the organizations (N = 172). Next, the techniques of panel and group interview were used by 52.0% (N = 104) and 15.0% (N = 30) of the organizations, respectively. The Table 3.26 also illustrated that organizations apply structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews with percentages of 24.0% (N = 48), 15.5% (N = 31) and 14.5% (N = 29), respectively.

The further analyses revealed that 21.5% of the organizations (N = 50) used the interview format of one interviewer and one interviewee, and 18.0% of them (N = 36) applied the formats of both one interviewer and one interviewee and panel interview.

Table 3.26 Techniques of Interviews

Techniques of Interview	Frequency	Percentage %
One Interviewee + One interviewer	172	86
Panel Interview	104	52
Structured Interview	48	24
Unstructured Interview	31	15.5
Group Interview	30	15
Semi-structured Interview	29	14.5
Group of Interviewees and Interviewers	2	1

Furthermore, a cross tab analyses was computed among sector of the organization and interview techniques that are used (See Appendix H). The

findings demonstrated that 63.4% (N = 109) of the 172 organizations that used one to one interview method was large-sized organizations, however, the medium sized organizations were more likely to use the same technique with a percentage of 91.7 (N = 44). However, the correlation was not significant (Spearman rho = -.08, $p > .05$). Sixty two and a half percentage (N = 65) of the 104 organizations that applied the panel interview technique were large-sized. However, the small sized organizations (59.1%, N = 13) applied this technique more frequently than medium- and large-sized ones. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = -.06, $p > .05$). Considering structured interview technique, the cross tab analysis showed that among the 48 organizations that applied this technique, most of them were large-sized organizations (81.3%, N = 39) (Spearman rho = .18, $p < .05$, Chi-square = 7.83, $p < .05$). In addition, 80.6% (N = 25) of the 31 organizations that used unstructured interviews were large-sized organizations. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .14, $p > .05$).

Finally, a frequency analysis was conducted to see whether a scoring system was used during the selection interviews or not. The results showed that in half of the organizations (N = 100), interviewers rated candidates during the interview and in 47.5% (N = 94) of the organizations there wasn't such a grading system.

3.6 Orientation

In this part, frequency analyses were performed in order to examine the nature of the orientation activities performed by the organizations. The result of these analyses demonstrated the number of organizations that applied an orientation program; the performers, the methods and duration of these programs; the positions

that received orientation programs; and lastly, the length of the trial period of newly hired employees. In addition, for exploratory purposes, correlational analyses were performed among the methods of orientation programs and among the positions that orientation programs were applied for.

First, it was concluded that 80.0% (N = 160) of the organizations performed an orientation program for their newly hired employees whereas 17.0% (N = 34) of participating organizations did not have such a program.

Secondly, the results presented in Table 3.27 demonstrates that in 58.0% (N = 116) and 46.5% (N = 93) of the organizations orientation programs were carried out by the HRM departments and first level managers, respectively.

Table 3.27 Performers of Orientation Programs

Performers of Orientation Programs	Frequency	Percentages %
HRM Department	116	58
First Level Managers	93	46.5
Department Managers	12	6
Mentors	10	5
Training Departments	7	3.5
Colleagues	6	3

Furthermore, the techniques of orientation programs were analyzed and it was found that the most frequently used methods were orientations performed by the department managers and trips inside the organizations with a rate of 67.0% (N =134) and 66.5% (N = 133), respectively. Table 3.28 demonstrates that the methods of handling brochures or handbooks, visual techniques (videos, slides etc.), and conferences or group meetings were applied in 56.5%, 33.0%, and 24.0% of the organizations, respectively.

Next, a frequency analysis was performed to find the most frequently used combinations of orientation program techniques used by the participating

organizations. The findings demonstrated that 15.5% (N = 31) of the participating organizations apply the combination of handing brochures or handbooks, trips and orientations performed by department managers. Moreover, the combination of handing brochures or handbooks, visual techniques, trips and orientations performed by department managers was used by 13.5% (N = 27) of the participating organizations.

Table 3.28 Techniques of Orientation Programs

Techniques of Orientation Programs	Frequency	Percentage %
Orientation by Department Managers	134	67
Trips	133	66.5
Brochures/handbooks	113	56.5
Visual Techniques	66	33
Conferences-group Meetings	48	24

The bivariate correlational analysis among the techniques of orientation programs presented in Appendix I reveals that organizations that used the method of brochures and handbooks were likely to use trips ($r = .47$, $p < .01$), orientation programs performed by department managers ($r = .46$, $p < .05$), and visual techniques ($r = .44$, $p < .01$). The method of visual techniques was found to be significantly and positively correlated with the method of trips inside the organizations ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the organizations that used the technique of arranging trips to present their firms were more likely to use the other methods of orientation programs performed by department managers ($r = .61$, $p < .01$).

Furthermore, there were differences among organizations in terms of the length of orientations programs. Table 3.29 demonstrates that in 30.5% (N = 61) of 160 organizations, the length of the orientation programs was 1 day to 1 week. In 15.5% (N = 31) and 14.5% (N = 29) of the organizations, the length of the orientation programs were over 1 month and between 2 weeks to 1 month

respectively. Also, it was found that in 7.0% (N = 14) of the organizations duration of orientation programs depended on the position.

Table 3.29 Length of Orientation Programs

Length of Orientation Program	Frequency	Percentage %
1 day – 1 week	61	30.5
Over 1 Month	31	15.5
2 Weeks – 1 Month	29	14.5
1 Week – 2 Weeks	22	11
Depends on the Position	14	7
Missing	43	21.5
Total	200	100

The results also revealed that orientation programs were applied to different positions with different frequencies and percentages. For instance, organizations mostly applied their orientation programs to non-managerial employees (63.5%) and first level managers (60.5%) positions. Also in 57.0% of the organizations orientation programs were performed for middle level managerial positions.

The bivariate correlational analysis performed in order to see the relations among the positions that orientation programs were applied for, and the results are presented in Appendix J. It was found that organizations that applied orientation programs for first level managers were likely to apply the orientation programs for middle level manager ($r = .62$, $p < .01$), high level managers ($r = .45$, $p < .01$), non-managers ($r = .43$, $p < .01$), blue collar workers ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), management trainees ($r = .47$, $p < .01$). Also, the orientation programs applied for middle level managers were likely to be performed for high level managers ($r = .54$, $p < .01$), non-managers ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), blue collar workers ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), management trainees ($r = .47$, $p < .01$) in organizations. Moreover, organizations that applied orientation programs for high level managers were likely to perform them for management trainees ($r = .31$, $p < .01$). The organizations that applied orientation

programs for non-managers were likely to apply orientation programs for blue-collar workers ($r = .41$, $p < .01$) and management trainees ($r = .49$, $p < .01$). Finally, it was concluded that the orientation programs applied for blue collars were likely to be performed for management trainees.

Finally, trial periods of newly hired employees were analysed and it was concluded that 162 organizations (82.0%) had an application of trial period. Moreover, the organizations used trial periods with differing lengths of duration. For example, as it is demonstrated in Table 3.30, 41.0% of the organizations ($N = 82$) had a trial period of 2 months and 20.5% of them ($N = 41$) had a trial period of 3 months.

Table 3.30 Length of the Trial Period

Length of Trial Period	Frequency	Percentage %
2 Months	82	41
3 Months	41	20.5
1 Month	17	8.5
Depends on the Position	9	4.5
6 Months	8	4
Less than 1 Month	2	1
Missing	41	20.5
Total	200	100

3.7 Training and Development

Training and development process of HRM was evaluated in this section by performing frequency analyses to find the number of organizations that had a training department and to examine the size of the training departments, the kind of training methods, the approaches that were used to determine the needed training programs, the profile of the trainers and the evaluation process of the training programs. Frequency analyses were also conducted to analyse the yearly training hours per employee and the amount of the training budget of the participating

organizations. In addition; again, for exploratory purposes, the correlations between methods of need analyses were examined.

First, the findings in Table 3.31 reveals that 54.5% (N = 109) of the organizations had a training department, the percentage of organizations that did not have a training department was 41 (N = 82). As it was demonstrated in Table 3.32, in 31.0% of the organizations (N = 62) department of training was within the HRM department.

Table 3.31 Training Department

Training Department	Frequency	Percentage %
Does Not Exist	109	54.5
Exists	82	41
Missing	9	4.5
Total	200	100

Table 3.32 Divisions That the Training Departments were Under

Divisions Which Training Departments were Bound to	Frequency	Percentage %
HRM	62	31
General Director's Office	13	6.5
HRM and Quality Department	9	4.5
HRM and Industrial Relations	7	3.5
Personnel Department	6	3
Quality Department	6	3
System Development Department	5	2.5
Personnel and Administration Department	5	2.5
Finance Department	2	1
Logistics Services Department	1	0.5
Missing	84	42
Total	200	100

The size of the training departments showed diversity as it is presented in Table 3.33. It was found that in 20.5% (N = 41) of the organizations, training departments had only one employee. The number of employees working in training departments were 2 in 19.0% (N = 38) of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.33 Frequency Distribution of Number of Employees in Training Department

Number of Employees in Training Department	Frequency	Percentage %
1 Employee	41	20.5
2 Employees	38	19
3 Employees	17	8.5
4 Employees	6	3
5 Employees	7	3.5
6 Employees	4	2
8 Employees	1	0.5
20 Employees	1	0.5
Missing	85	42.5
Total	200	100

As presented in Table 3.34, in terms of training techniques, the most frequently used four methods were on the job training (72.5%), lecture (71.5%), visual techniques (51.5%), such as slides or videos, and computer-based training (47.0%). Moreover, in 24.0%, 21.0%, and 15.0% of the organizations the methods of role-playing, games, and simulators were used, respectively.

Additionally, it was found that 10.5% (N = 21) of the organizations apply both the methods of in-class and on the job training. Furthermore, in 10.0% (N = 20) of the organizations, the methods of in-class training, on the job training and visual techniques were used together.

Table 3.34 Training Techniques Used

Training Techniques Used	Frequency	Percentage %
On The Job Training	145	72.5
Lecture	143	71.5
Visual Techniques	103	51.5
Computer-Based Training	94	47
Role Playing	48	24
Games	42	21
Simulators	30	15
Similar Sector Trips	2	1
Others (Case Study, Psychodrama, etc.)	2	1

Furthermore, a cross tab analysis was computed to see the relation between

the size of the organizations and the applied training methods (See Appendix K). The findings presented that most of the 145 organizations that apply the method of on-the-job training were large-sized organizations (67.6%, $N = 98$). However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman $\rho = .08$, $p > .05$). Similarly, most of the organizations that applied the method of lectures were large-sized organizations (68.5%, $N = 98$). However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman $\rho = .13$, $p > .05$).

On the following step, the planning and application of training activities were examined. As it can be seen in Table 3.35, the frequency analysis disclosed that in 47.5% of the organizations, all of the training activities were planned and performed in the direction of organizational career plans by the departments, HRM departments in 25.0%, training departments in 5.5%, and personnel departments in 4.5% of the organizations.

Also, in 17.5% ($N = 35$) of the organizations, employees received training programs based on the identified needs and with the approval of their managers. Moreover, training activities were planned and carried out by departments in line with job-related departmental needs in 11.5% of the organizations ($N = 23$). The training activities were planned as a result of employee performance meetings and competency analysis in 5.5% of the organizations ($N = 11$). In 4.5% ($N = 9$) of the organizations, managers and employees determined the training the employees would receive and the planning related training activities were performed by the HRM departments. In 3.5% ($N = 7$) of the organizations, HRM department planned the training activities but the application of those activities were performed by the departments themselves.

Table 3.35 The Ways of Determining Training Programs

The ways of Determining Training Programs	Frequency	Percentage %
By HRM in Line with Career Plans	50	25
By Manager Approval	35	17.5
Determined by Departments	23	11.5
By Training Department in Line with Career Plans	11	5.5
By Employee-Manager Meetings	11	5.5
By Personnel Department in Line with Career Plans	9	4.5
In Line with PA Results and Competency Analysis	9	4.5
By Quality Department in Line with Career Plans	7	3.5
By Quality and HRM Department in Line with Career Plans	7	3.5
By Quality and Training Department in Line with Career Plans	7	3.5
Planned by HRM and Performed by Departments	7	3.5
By HRM and Administrative Department in Line with Career Plans	4	2
Missing	20	10
Total	200	100

Additionally, a frequency analysis was performed to find out the methods that were used to determine which training program(s) employees would receive in organizations. As it is presented in Table 3.36, the results demonstrated that in 76.0 % (N = 152) of the organizations managers determined the kind of the training programs that their subordinates would receive. Moreover, in 72% (N = 144) of the organizations, the training programs were determined on the basis of employee demand.

Table 3.36 Methods of Determining Training Programs

Methods of Determining Training Programs	Frequency	Percentage %
Demand of Managers	152	76
Demand of Employees	144	72
PA Results	106	53
Need Analysis by HRM	92	46
Training Based on Appointment	87	43.5
Consultancy Firms	49	24.5
Need Analysis by Consultancy Firms	28	14

On the next step, process of training need analysis was examined in detail. First, a frequency analysis was conducted in order to see the methods that are used in performing need analysis. The results presented in Table 3.37 indicates that performance appraisal results, questionnaires and interviews were used in 60.0% (N = 120), 53.0% (N = 106), and 40.0% (N = 80) of the organizations, respectively.

It was also found that 21.5% (N = 43) of the surveyed organizations used the methods of questionnaires and PA results together. Moreover, the method of PA results was used solely in 15.0% (N = 30) of the organizations.

Table 3.37 Methods of Need Analysis

Methods of Need Analysis	Frequency	Percentage %
PA Results	120	60
Questionnaires	106	53
Interviews	80	40
Assessment Center	19	9.5
Manager Suggestions	8	4

Additionally, the correlations between methods of need analysis were examined by performing a bivariate correlation analysis. The findings demonstrated that the method of questionnaire was significantly and negatively correlated with the method of interviews ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$). In addition, the organizations that used the method of performance appraisal method were not likely to use the method of assessment centers ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$). (See Appendix L).

Furthermore, the profile of the trainers was also analysed. The findings presented in Table 3.38 demonstrates that employees were trained by trainers out of the firm, experienced managers working in the organization, and individual trainers out of the firm in 68.5% (N = 137), 66.5% (N = 133), and 55.0% (N = 110) of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.38 The Profile of the Trainers

Profile of the Trainers	Frequency	Percentage %
Trainers Out of the Firm	137	68.5
Experienced Managers in Organizations	133	66.5
Individual Trainers in Organizations	110	55
Trainers of Consultancy Firms	65	32.5

In addition, the process of training evaluation was examined. As can be seen in Table 3.39, the trainee evaluation was found to be the most frequently used method in evaluating training programs with a rate of 69.0% (N = 138) . The methods of tests applied before and after the training programs and trainer evaluations were used in 41.5% of the organizations (N = 83), each. In 35.0% of the organizations (N = 55), the effectiveness of training programs were evaluated by utility analysis. Furthermore, it was concluded that 6.0% (N = 12) of the organizations used the evaluation methods of trainee evaluation and trainer evaluation together and in 5.5% (N = 11) of the organizations the method of trainee evaluation was used solely. However, 4.5% (N = 9) of the organizations did not assess the effectiveness of their training programs.

Table 3.39 Methods of Training Evaluation

Methods of Training Evaluation	Frequency	Percentage %
Trainee Evaluation (questionnaire)	138	69
Tests Applied Before and After the Training	83	41.5
Trainer Evaluation	83	41.5
Consultancy Firm Evaluations	74	37
Behavioral Change	70	35
Utility Analysis	55	27.5
No Evaluation	9	4.5

The findings of another frequency analysis presented in Table 3.40 discloses that in 60.0% (N = 120) and 59.5% (N = 119) of the organizations non-managers and middle level managers received training programs more frequently than the

incumbents of the other positions, respectively.

Table 3.40 Receivers of Training Programs

Jobs	Frequency	Percentage %
Non-Managers	120	60
Middle Level Managers	119	59.5
First Level Managers	114	57
Blue Collar	98	49
Management Trainee	78	39
High Level Managers	59	29.5

Furthermore, it was found that 74.5% of the organizations (N = 149) had a training budget for performing training practices. However, 21.5% of the organizations did not have a special budget. The results of further analyses presented in Table 3.41 shows that 16.5% of the organizations (N = 33) had a yearly budget of 0-50 billion Turkish Liras (T.L.), 4.5% (N = 9) of them had a yearly budget of 51-100 billion T.L. and only 3.5% of them (N = 7) had a yearly budget of 100 billion T.L. and over.

Table 3.41 Amount of Training Budget

Amount of Training Budget	Frequency	Percentage %
No Amount was Identified	100	50
0- 50 Billions T.L.	33	16.5
51- 100 Billions T.L.	9	4.5
100 Billions and Over T.L.	7	3.5
Missing	51	25.5
Total	200	100

On the last step, the yearly training hours was analysed on the basis of positions. The results showed that in 45.5% (N = 91) of the organizations blue-collar personnel received training for 0-25 hours for a year.

In addition, 36.0% (N = 72) of the organizations provided training programs for white collar employees for a period of 0-25 hours and 23.5% (N = 47) of them for a period of 26-50 hours. In 14.5% (N = 29) of the organizations white-collar

employees receive training for a period of 51 hours and more in a year.

Moreover, 37.5% (N=75) of the organizations provided training programs for managers for a period of 0-25 hours and 18.5% (N=37) of them for a period of 26-50 hours. In 10.0% (N=20) of the organizations managers received training for a period of 51 hours and more in a year.

3.8 Performance Appraisal

Frequency analyses were conducted to find the number of organizations that owned a performance appraisal system and to disclose the methods of performance appraisal. Additionally, the areas in which PA results were used, the frequency and the performers of PA and the areas in which the results of PA were used were also examined via frequency analyses. The frequency analyses were also performed to find the number of surveyed organizations that had a PA form and the content of those forms. In addition, the correlations among methods of performance appraisal, the functions of HRM in which the results of PA were used and variables of performance assessors were analysed by a bivariate correlation for exploratory purposes.

Initially, the results indicated that 80.5% (N = 161) of the organizations had a performance appraisal system. Secondly, the findings of frequency analysis revealed that in 26.0% (N = 52) and 14.0% (N = 28) of the organizations, the methods of rank order and graphic rating scales were used, respectively. The Table 3.42 demonstrates both the other methods used by organizations and their percentages like forced distribution (12.5%), checklists (12.0%), paired comparisons (10.5%), critical incidence technique (9.0%), behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) (7.0%), behaviorally observed rating scales (6.5%) and objective cards (4.5%).

Table 3.42 Methods of Performance Appraisal

Methods of PA	Frequency	Percentage %
Rank Order	52	26
Graphic Rating	28	14
Forced Distribution	25	12.5
Checklist	24	12
Paired Comparison	21	10.5
Critical Incidence	18	9
BARS	14	7
BOS	13	6.5
Objective Cards	9	4.5

Correlations among methods of performance appraisal are presented in Appendix M. Results demonstrates that there was a significant and positive correlation between critical incidence technique and checklists ($r = .37, p < .01$). The organizations that used the method of BARS were likely to use the method of BOS ($r = .25, p < .01$), and checklists ($r = .32, p < .01$).

Additionally, a cross tab analysis was conducted in order to see the relation between size of the organizations and methods of performance management (See Appendix N). The results demonstrated that most of the 52 organizations that used rank order method were large-sized (57.7%, $N = 30$). Whereas, the medium-sized organizations (35.4%, $N = 17$) were likely to use this method more frequently than small- and large-sized organizations. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman $\rho = -.07, p > .05$). Moreover, most of the 28 organizations that applied graphic rating scales were large-sized (67.9%, $N = 19$). The medium-sized organizations (16.7%, $N = 8$) were likely to use this method more frequently than small- and large-sized organizations. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman $\rho = .04, p > .05$). Lastly, most of the 25 organizations that used forced distribution technique were large-sized (64%, $N = 16$). The medium-sized organizations (14.6%, $N = 7$) were likely to apply this method more

frequently than small- and large-sized organizations. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .001, $p > .05$).

Next, the frequency analysis demonstrated that the results of PA were used in many different areas. As seen in Table 3.43, 52.0% (N = 104) and 50.0% (N = 100) of the organizations made use of their PA results in the area of training needs and compensation management and benefits, respectively.

Table 3.43 The Functions for which PA Results were Used

Functions of HRM for which PA Results were Used	Frequency	Percentage %
Training Needs	104	52
Compensation and Benefits	100	50
Career Planning	98	49
Reward Systems	67	33.5

The results of bivariate correlation analysis in Appendix O discloses that the organizations that used their PA results in the area of compensation management were more likely to use those results in career planning ($r = .50$, $p < .01$), training need analysis ($r = .60$, $p < .01$), and reward management ($r = .37$, $p < .01$). Next, the organizations that used their PA results in the area of career planning were more likely to use those results in training need analysis ($r = .52$, $p < .01$) and reward management ($r = .41$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the results of PA that were used in the area of training need analysis were more likely to be used in the area of reward management ($r = .30$, $p < .01$).

Furthermore, a frequency analysis was performed to examine the frequency of performance appraisals conducted for managers in the organizations. The results presented in Table 3.44 shows that in 67 (51.5%) of the 130 organizations that applied performance management system the performance appraisals were conducted once a year.

Table 3.44 The Frequency of Performance Appraisal for Managers

Frequency of PA	Frequency	Percentage %
Once a Year	67	51.5
Two Times a Year	48	36.9
Four Times a Year	4	3.1
Once in Two Years	3	2.3
Based on Projects	2	1.5
Once a Month	2	1.5
Missing	4	3.1
Total	130	100

Another frequency analysis was performed to examine the frequency of performance appraisals conducted for non-managerial positions in the organizations. The findings in Table 3.45 discloses that in 51.5% (N = 67) and 37.7% (N = 49) of the 130 organizations performance appraisals were conducted once and twice a year, respectively.

Table 3.45 The Frequency of Performance Appraisal for Non-Managers

Frequency of PA	Frequency	Percentage %
Once a Year	67	51.5
Two Times a Year	49	37.7
Four Times a Year	5	3.8
Once in Two Years	3	2.3
Once a Month	1	0.8
Missing	5	3.8
Total	130	100

When the frequency of performance appraisals applied for managers and non-managers were compared, the results in Tables 3.44 and 3.45 shows that performance of both managers and non-managers were evaluated once a year and twice a year in most of the organizations. On the other hand, performances of managers were evaluated on the basis of projects in 1.5% of the organizations but for non-managerial positions there was not such a practice.

Next, a frequency analysis was conducted in order to find out the assessors of performance in the work place. As seen in Table 3.46, in 60.5% (N = 121) of the

organizations employee performance was evaluated by the first level supervisors. In 27.5% (N = 55) of the organizations, second level managers were used as raters and in 18.5% (N = 37) and 17.5% (N = 35) of the organizations, employee performance was assessed by employees themselves and their colleagues, respectively. Moreover, the subordinates (8.5%), customers (4.5%), HRM department (1.5%), and executive committee (0.5%) were also among the performance raters. However, only in 0.5% of the organizations 360 feedback system was applied to evaluate the employee performance.

Furthermore, in 7.5% (N = 15) of the organizations employee performance was evaluated by the first level and second level managers together. In 6.5% (N = 13) of the organizations, employee performance was appraised by employee himself/herself, first, and second level managers together.

Table 3.46 Assessors of Performance

Assessors of Performance	Frequency	Percentage %
First Level Supervisor	121	60.5
Second Level Manager	55	27.5
Self	37	18.5
Colleagues	35	17.5
Subordinate	17	8.5
Customer	9	4.5
HRM	3	1.5
360 Feedback	1	0.5
Executive Committee (EC)	1	0.5

Next, a bivariate correlation analysis was performed among variables of performance assessors for exploratory reasons are presented in Appendix P. As can be seen in Appendix P, the organizations that had first level supervisors evaluated employee performance were more likely to have second level managers assess the employee performance ($r = .34$, $p < .01$) and employees evaluate their own performance ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). Similarly, the organizations that had second level

manager evaluate their subordinates were more likely to have employees assess their own performance ($r = .23$, $p < .01$). Moreover, employees who were assessed by their colleagues were more likely to be evaluated by their subordinates ($r = .47$, $p < .01$) and customers ($r = .22$, $p < .01$). Lastly, in organizations where employees evaluated themselves, the method of customer evaluation were more likely to be used ($r = .27$, $p < .01$).

Additionally, another frequency analysis was conducted to examine the way the performance appraisal results were shared by employees. The results presented in Table 3.47 shows that in 33.5% (N = 67) of the organizations employees knew their performance evaluations and they had a feedback interview with their rater(s). However, in 12.0% of the organizations (N = 24) employees did not receive any information about their performance evaluations. In 9.0% (N = 18) of the organizations, the employees knew their PA results and demanded an interview from the supervisor, and in 7.5% (N = 15) of the organizations, employee performance was evaluated in a face to face PA interview.

Table 3.47 Feedback of Performance Appraisal

PA Results	Frequency	Percentage %
Employees Make an Interview with the Rater	67	33.5
Employees Do Not Know the PA Results	24	12
Employees Demand an Interview	18	9
PA Done Face to Face	15	7.5
Written PA Results	3	1.5
Missing	72	36
Total	200	100

Lastly, 57.0% (N = 114) of the organizations had a performance appraisal form, whereas, 43.0% (N = 86) of the organizations did not use a specific rating. When performance appraisal form was analysed, the results presented in Table 3.48 shows that in 19.5% (N = 39) of the organizations, PA form was the same for

all organizational levels, like first level managers and middle level managers the PA form were same for all employees in 17.0% of the participating organizations (N = 34).

Table 3.48 The Content of PA Form

Content of PA Form	Frequency	Percentage %
Same For Hierarchical Levels	39	19.5
Same For All Employees	34	17
Based on Position	20	10
Same For Job Groups	17	8.5
Based on Managerial Positions	9	4.5
Different For Blue and White Collar	7	3.5
Different For Hierarchical Levels and Job Groups	6	3
Missing	68	34
Total	200	100

3.9 Career Planning

Concerning career planning activities, frequency analyses were conducted to find out the number of organizations that had a career management system and to examine the focus of the system, the activities and the content of the career management systems, and the ways that employee KSAOs were evaluated. The frequency analyses were also conducted to analyse the performers of career management. In addition, the correlations among the activities of career development and among the performers of career planning were examined for exploratory purposes.

First, the results of frequency analysis revealed that only 47.0% (N = 94) of the organizations had a career planning system, on the other hand, 51.5% (N = 103) of the organizations did not have such a system. Secondly, the focus of career planning systems was analyzed and the findings revealed that in 31.5% (N = 63) of the organizations the career planning systems were both organization and personnel

focused. In 11.0% (N = 22) and 4.0% (N = 8) of the organizations, career planning systems focused heavily on organization and personnel, respectively. Organization-focused career planning concentrates on jobs and constructing career paths that provide logical progression of individuals between jobs. Individual-centred career planning, on the other hand, focuses directly on employee skills and goals (Mathis & Jackson, 1991).

Thirdly, a frequency analysis was conducted to find out the career development activities. The results presented in Table 3.49 reveals that in 36.0% (N = 72) and 33.5% (N = 67) of the organizations employees received courses in or out of the firm and they participated in different kind of seminars and trainings, respectively. The activity of job rotation was also appeared as another career development activity in 30.0% (N = 60) of the organizations. The other career development activities of work groups, master programs and development centers were used in 18.0% (N = 36), 9.5% (N = 19), and 1.5% (N = 3) of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.49 The Activities of Career Development

Career Development Activities	Frequency	Percentage %
Courses	72	36
Seminars/Trainings	67	33.5
Job Rotation	60	30
Work Groups	36	18
Master Programs	19	9.5
Development Centers	3	1.5

Additionally, a cross tab analysis was computed to see the relationship between size of the organizations and career development activities (See Appendix Q). The activity of courses was applied mostly by large-sized organizations (73.6%, N = 53) among the 72 organizations applying this method. However, the correlation

was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .13, $p > .05$). Moreover, the activity of providing seminars or trainings was applied mostly by large-sized organizations (67.2%, $N = 45$) among the 67 organizations that apply this method. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .03, $p > .05$). In terms of job rotation, the findings demonstrated that among the 60 organizations that applied this method, 75.0% ($N = 45$) of them were large-sized. However, the correlation was not found to be significant (Spearman rho = .13, $p > .05$).

On the next step, bivariate correlations were calculated to examine the relations among the activities of career development. The findings in Appendix R suggested that the organizations that carried out the activity of job rotation were likely to perform the activities of courses ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), seminars or trainings ($r = .48$, $p < .01$), work groups ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), and master programs ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the organizations, in which employees received courses for developing their careers, were likely to perform the activities of seminars or trainings ($r = .59$, $p < .01$), work groups ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and master programs ($r = .36$, $p < .01$). The activities of seminars and trainings were significantly and positively correlated with the other career development activities of work groups ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and master programs ($r = .38$, $p < .01$).

Fourthly, the stages of career planning system were examined in details. The results presented in Table 3.50 suggested that in 28.0% ($N = 56$) of the organization the career planning systems included human resource planning. Human resource planning was performed to predict future personnel needs and to develop human resource strategies in order to fulfil these needs. Moreover, in 25.5% ($N = 51$) of the organizations career planning system was composed of practices that aim to support

employees to reach their career objectives, and career planning system included practices that aimed to match the career interests of employees with alternatives in 25.0% (N = 50) of the organization. The career planning system was composed of practices that aimed to determine the skills, abilities, knowledge, attitudes, and expectations in 22.5% (N = 45) of the organizations. Lastly, in 22.0% (N = 44) of the participating organizations career planning systems included activities such as determining the career interests of employees.

Table 3.50 The Stages of Career Planning System

Stages of Career Planning System	Frequency	Percentage %
HR Planning	56	28
Training Employees	51	25.5
Matching Employee Career Objectives with Organizational Opportunities	50	25
Identifying KSAO's of Employees	45	22.5
Determining Career Interests of Employees	44	22

Additionally, the evaluation criteria of employee knowledge, skills, abilities (KSA's) and career objectives were examined by a frequency analysis. As it can be seen in Table 3.51, the results discloses that in 37.0% (N = 74) of the organizations, employee KSA's and career objectives were evaluated by the statements of supervisors, and in 30.5% (N = 61) of the organizations, performance appraisal results were used when evaluating the KSA's and career aims of employees. However, the methods of individual development plans, simulators, and assessment centers were not used frequently by organizations when evaluating KSAO's and career aims of employees.

Table 3.51 The Evaluation Criteria of Employee KSA's for Career Planning Purposes

Evaluation Criteria of Employee KSAO's for Career Planning Purposes	Frequency	Percentage %
Supervisor Statement	74	37

Table 3.51 Continued

PA Results	61	30.5
Training	53	26.5
Employee Statement	51	25.5
Discipline Records	22	11
Individual Development Plans	2	1
Simulators	1	0.5
Assessment Center	1	0.5

Next, the conductors of career planning systems were examined. It was found that in 33.0% of the organization career management systems were administrated by managers or supervisors. Also, the findings reveals that in 21.5% (N = 66), 9.0% (N = 18) and 4.5% (N = 9) of the organizations career planning systems were carried out by specialists working in the firm, specialists from out of the firm, and the HRM departments, respectively.

Moreover, a bivariate correlation analysis, presented in Appendix S, revealed that the organizations, in which career planning system was carried out by specialist in the firm, were also likely to have managers or supervisors to apply career planning system ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). Next, the career management systems performed by managers or supervisors were likely to be performed by HRM department ($r = .21$, $p < .01$).

Furthermore, the profile of the individuals who carried out the carer management system in organizations was analysed. The results presented in Table 3.52 reveals that in 14.0% (N = 28) of the organizations, the supervisors and managers, who carry out the career management system, had the career consultancy task on their job description, and in 10.5% (N = 21) of the organizations they were trained in terms of career consultancy. However, for 25.0% (N = 50) of the organizations none of the above statements were valid.

Table 3.52 The Profile of the Managers Performing Career Management System

Profile of the Managers Performing Career Management System	Frequency	Percentage %
Job Description of Managers Included the Task of Career Consultancy	28	14
Managers were Trained in Career Consultancy	21	10.5
Neither of Them	50	25
Missing	101	50.5
Total	200	100

3.10 Human Resource Planning

Human resource planning, which is one of the main functions of HRM field was examined in this section. Frequency analyses were performed to find out the number of organizations that applied HR planning and to examine the activities, performers, and frequency of the HR plans. In addition, bivariate correlations among activities of HR plan were examined for exploratory purposes.

Initially, the frequency analysis revealed that HR planning was practiced in 58.5 % (N = 117) of the organizations and in 30% (N = 60) of the organizations HR planning was not practiced. Secondly, a frequency analysis presented in Table 3.53 demonstrates that in 34.0% of the organizations the activity of HR plan was performed for one year or less and HR plan was conducted for 2 years and more than two years in 11.5 % (N = 23) and 10.5% (N = 21) of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.53 The Length of HR Plan

Duration of Human Resource Plan	Frequency	Percentage %
1 Year or Less	68	34
2 Years	23	11.5
2 Years or More	21	10.5
Organizational Change	6	3
Project Based	3	1.5
Missing	79	39.5
Total	200	100

Next, the main practices of the HR planning were analysed. The results presented in Table 3.54 demonstrated that the main parts of a HR plan were determining organizational strategies and objectives, evaluation of existing manpower, and determining the development speed of the organization in 37.5%, 31.5%, 29.0% of the participating organizations, respectively.

In addition, a frequency analysis was conducted to find out the combination of HR activities that was most frequently performed by the organizations. The results demonstrated that all of the HR planning activities mentioned in the questionnaire were used in combination in 3.5% (N = 7) of the participating organizations.

Table 3.54 Activities of Human Resource Planning

Activities of Human Resource Planning	Frequency	Percentage %
Strategies	75	37.5
Manpower Evaluation	63	31.5
Development Speed	58	29
Demand-Supply	48	24
Methods	46	23
Manpower Analysis	44	22
Employee Evaluation	43	21.5
Existing Manpower	38	19
Source Analysis	37	18.5
Equilibrium	36	18

Bivariate correlations among activities of HR planning were also analysed for exploratory purposes. The findings presented in Appendix T reveals that the organizations that engaged in the activity of determining organizational strategies and objectives were likely to engage in determining organizational applications and methods ($r = .51, p < .01$), determining the development speed of the organization ($r = .53, p < .01$), and analyzing the manpower in and out of the organization ($r = .41, p < .01$). Next, the organizations that performed the activity of determining organizational applications and methods were likely to engage in determining the

development speed of the organization ($r = .41, p < .01$) and analyzing the manpower in and out of the organization ($r = .43, p < .01$),

In addition, the activity of determining the development speed of the organization was significantly and positively correlated with other activities such as analyzing the manpower in and out of the organization ($r = .49, p < .01$) and evaluation of existing manpower ($r = .44, p < .01$). The activity of making equilibrium adjustments was significantly and positively correlated with activities of analyzing manpower in and out of the organization ($r = .44, p < .01$), evaluation of existing manpower ($r = .54, p < .01$), and measuring the time and way of providing the required sources ($r = .48, p < .01$).

Moreover, analyzing the manpower in and out of the organization was significantly and positively correlated with evaluation of existing manpower ($r = .52, p < .01$), evaluating employees in order to reach organizational objectives for the time of forecasting ($r = .43, p < .01$), and measuring the time and way of providing the required sources ($r = .56, p < .01$). The organizations that performed the practice of evaluation of existing manpower were likely to perform other HR planning activities, such as evaluating employees in order to reach organizational objectives for the time of forecasting ($r = .68, p < .01$) and measuring the time and way of providing the required sources ($r = .56, p < .01$). Lastly, the activity of evaluating employees in order to reach organizational objectives for the time of forecasting was significantly and positively correlated with measuring the time and way of providing the required sources ($r = .60, p < .01$).

In addition, a frequency analysis was conducted to find out the departments or individuals who performed HR plan in organizations. The findings demonstrated that

in 47.5% (N = 95) of the organizations, human resources were planned by the HRM departments and in 39.0% (N = 78) of the organizations HR plan was conducted by the upper-level management. Also, in 31.0% (N = 62) of the organizations, department managers perform the activities of HR planning.

3.11 Compensation and Benefits

In this section, the compensation management systems of the participating organizations and benefits that were provided by the organizations were examined. Frequency analyses were performed to examine the factors that affected and the managers who played a role in salary increment, the frequency of salary increment, the benefits provided by the organizations and the non-monetary and monetary rewards received by employees. The frequency analyses were also conducted to analyse the payment of overtime work. In addition, the correlations among the factors and individuals that affected salary increment, the benefits provided by organizations, and the kinds of monetary rewards were examined for exploratory purposes.

As can be seen in Table 3.55, inflation, employee performance, organization profit or rate of sales influenced salary increments in 66.5% (N = 133), 62.5% (N = 125) and 44.5% (N = 89) of the organizations, respectively. However, the factors of wage research (1%) and collective bargaining (0.5%) did not affect the salary increment as much as the other factors.

Moreover, inflation and individual performance affected the salary increment together in 7.5% (N = 15) of the surveyed organizations. Additionally, 6.5% (N = 13) of the organizations had inflation, individual performance, and company profitability as the factors that affect the wage increment in combination.

Table 3.55 The Factors Affecting the Salary Increment

Salary Increment	Frequency	Percentage %
Inflation	133	66.5
Performance	125	62.5
Profit	89	44.5
Appointment	72	36
Education Level	55	27.5
Seniority	54	27
Group Performance	39	19.5
Skill	36	18
Relations	28	14
Wage Research	2	1
Collective Bargaining	1	0.5

Bivariate correlation analyses that were conducted for exploratory goals demonstrated that used the factor of inflation in salary increment were likely to use other factors of organization profit or rate of sales ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), employee appointment ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), employee performance ($r = .26$, $p < .01$) (See Appendix U). The factor of individual performance was significantly and positively correlated with other factors of yearly profit of organization or rate of sales ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) and employee appointment ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). The organizations, that took the seniority of employees into consideration in salary increment, were also likely to use the factors of level of employee education ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), employee skill ($r = .27$, $p < .01$), and personal relations within the organization ($r = .21$, $p < .01$) in determining their salary increment level.

Secondly, the factors and individuals that played a role in salary increment of managers were examined in detail by a frequency analysis presented in Table 3.56. It was found that first level managers (49.0%, $N = 98$), PA results (43.5%, $N = 89$), general managers (38.5%, $N = 77$), executive committee (31.5%, $N = 63$), and performance results (31%, $N = 62$) play a role in determining manager's salary increment amounts in organizations. Also, HR Managers, the level of

obtaining individual objectives, and second level managers were used as factors or individuals to increase salary levels of employee in 23.0% (N = 46) and 22.5% (N = 45) of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.56 The Factors and Individuals Playing a Role in Managers' Salary Increment

Factors of Wage Increment	Frequency	Percentage %
First Level Manager	98	49
PA Results	89	43.5
General Manager	77	38.5
Executive Committee	63	31.5
Performance Results	62	31
HR Manager	46	23
Attaining Objectives	45	22.5
Second Level Manager	45	22.5
Collective Bargaining	2	1
Wage Research	2	1
Job Evaluation	1	0.5

Bivariate correlation analyses presented in Appendix V revealed that the organizations in which first level managers played a role in salary increment were likely to have second level managers to play a role in salary increment ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the organizations in which HR managers play a role in salary increment were likely to use attaining individual objectives in salary increment for managers ($r = .27$, $p < .01$). The organizations that had general managers to determine the rate of salary increment of managers were likely to use performance appraisal results ($r = .20$, $p < .01$). The factor of attaining objectives was likely to be used together with performance appraisal results ($r = .36$, $p < .01$) and numerical performance appraisal criteria ($r = .28$, $p < .01$). Lastly, the factor of performance appraisal results was found to be significantly and positively correlated with numerical performance appraisal criteria ($r = .30$, $p < .01$).

Next, the factors and individuals that played a role in salary increment of

non-managers were examined in details by a frequency analysis. The findings presented in Table 3.57 demonstrates that in 62.5% (N = 125) and 36.5% (N = 73) of the organizations first level managers and general managers played a role in determining the amount of salary increment for non-managers, respectively.

Table 3.57 The Factors and Individuals Playing a Role in Non-Managers' Salary Increment

Factors of Wage Increment	Frequency	Percentage %
First Level Manager	125	62.5
General Manager	73	36.5
PA Results	72	36
HR Manager	64	32
Second Level Manager	62	31
Executive Committee	59	29.5
Collective Bargaining	3	1.5
Wage Research	2	1
Job Evaluation	1	0.5

The findings of bivariate correlation analyses presented in Appendix W reveals that the organizations in which first level managers played a role in salary increment were likely to have second level managers to play a role in salary increment of non-managers ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the organizations in which HR managers played a role in salary increment were likely to have general managers to play a role in salary increment for non-managers ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). The factor of attaining individual objectives were likely to be used together with performance appraisal results ($r = .36$, $p < .01$) and numerical performance appraisal criteria ($r = .25$, $p < .01$) in the organizations. Lastly, the factor of performance appraisal results was likely to be used together with numerical performance appraisal criteria ($r = .28$, $p < .01$) in the organizations.

Next, the frequency of salary increment was analysed. The findings demonstrated that in 63.0% (N = 126) of the organizations and 28.5% (N = 57) of

the organizations, the salary increments were done twice and once a year, respectively.

Furthermore, the organizations were analysed in terms of the benefits they provide to their managers. The results presented in Table 3.58 demonstrated that 69.0% (N = 139) of the organizations provided lunch for managers. The 55.5% (N = 111) of the organizations provided company car and 50.5% (N = 101) of them provided gasoline allowance for employees working in managerial positions. In addition to those benefits, managers received health insurance and mobile phone in 45.0% (N = 90) and 43.5% (N = 87) of the organizations respectively.

Table 3.58 The Benefits for Managers

Benefits	Frequency	Percentage %
Food Service	139	69.5
Car	111	55.5
Gasoline	101	50.5
Health Insurance	90	45
Mobile Phone	87	43.5
Travel Allowance	60	30
Festival Premium	59	29.5
New Year Premium	51	25.5
Fuel Allowance	49	24.5
Children Aid	48	24
Life Insurance	44	22
Accident Insurance	43	21.5
Education Aid	38	19
Profit Sharing	36	18
Social Benefits	36	18
Special Retirement	33	16.5
Rent Help	26	13
Club Membership	26	13
Free Apartment	25	12.5
Kinder Garden	18	9
Home Phone	13	6.5
Food Aid	1	0.5

The relationships among the benefits received by managers were analysed by a correlation analysis for exploratory reasons. The results presented in Appendix X

revealed that the existence of the benefit of health insurance was significantly and positively correlated with life ($r = .37, p < .01$) and accident ($r = .26, p < .01$) insurances. The organizations that provided life insurance to their managers were likely to provide benefits of accident insurance ($r = .28, p < .01$) and special retirement programs ($r = .28, p < .01$). The organizations that provided company cars to their managers were likely to provide other benefits of gasoline ($r = .52, p < .01$) and mobile phone ($r = .48, p < .01$). Next, the managers who received new year premium were likely to receive festival premium, too ($r = .25, p < .01$).

The organizations were also analysed in terms of the benefits they provided to their employees. The results shown in Table 3.59 indicated that 74.0% (N = 148) of the organizations provided lunch for non-managers. Forty three percentage (N = 87) of the organizations provided travel allowance and 39.0% (N = 78) of them provided health insurance allowance for employees working in non-managerial positions.

Table 3.59 The Benefits for Non-managers

Benefits for Non-Managers	Frequency	Percentage %
Food Service	148	74
Travel Allowance	87	43.5
Health Insurance	78	39
Festival Premium	73	36.5
Social Benefits	71	35.5
Fuel Allowance	70	35
Children Allowance	62	31
Education Allowance	57	28.5
Accident Insurance	49	24.5
New Year Premium	38	19
Life Insurance	32	16
Gasoline	30	15
Kinder Garden	26	13
Rent Help	25	12.5
Special Retirement	22	11
Club Membership	20	10
Car	19	9.5
Mobile Phone	19	9.5
Profit Sharing	19	9.5

Table 3.59 Continued

Free Apartment	13	6.5
Home Phone	5	2.5
Food Allowance	1	0.5

The relationships among the benefits received by non-managers are presented in Appendix Y. As can be seen, the benefit of health insurance received by non-managers was significantly and positively correlated with life insurance ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and special retirement programs ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). The organizations that provided life insurance to employees were likely to provide accident insurance ($r = .20$, $p < .01$). Organizations that provided company cars were likely to provide gasoline ($r = .20$, $p < .01$) and mobile phone ($r = .42$, $p < .01$).

Moreover, in addition to the incentives the organizations used monetary rewards to motivate their employees. The frequency analysis presented in Table 3.60 revealed that in 41.0% ($N = 82$) of the organizations, individual premiums were used as monetary rewards. On the other hand, in 34.5% ($N = 69$) of the organizations, monetary rewards were not used. Two other kinds of monetary rewards, profit sharing and group premium, were used in 13.0% ($N = 26$) and 12.5% ($N = 25$) of the organizations, respectively.

Table 3.60 The Kinds of Monetary Rewards

Monetary Rewards	Frequency	Percentage %
Individual Premium	82	41
No Monetary Reward	69	34.5
Profit Sharing	26	13
Group Premium	25	12.5
Share	14	7
Individual Premium For Sales Team	5	2.5
Travel	1	0.5

In addition, 51.5% ($N = 103$) of the organizations gave plaques to employees to reward their accomplishments or high performance. As it is presented in Table

3.61, in 42.5% (N = 85) and 34.0% (N = 68) of the organizations employees were rewarded by gifts or success stories posted on boards or published in company magazines.

Table 3.61 The Kinds of Non-Moneterial Rewards

Kinds of Non-Moneterial Rewarding	Frequency	Percentage %
Plaquette	103	51.5
Gifts	85	42.5
Success Stories	68	34
Holiday	27	13.5
Social Activities	1	0.5

Participating organizations were also examined in terms of their pay format for overtime. Findings showed that in 70.5% (N = 141) of the organizations, employees received extra payment for over time work, however, in 25.0% (N = 50) of the organizations employees did not receive any extra payment for over time.

In 50.5% (N = 101) of the organizations, blue collar employees received extra payment for overtime and in 37.5% of the organizations non-managers received extra payment for over time work. Additionally, first level managers and management trainees received extra payment for overtime work in 16.5% (N = 33) and 10.5% (N = 21) of the organizations, respectively.

3.12 Job Evaluation

Considering job evaluation function of HRM, frequency analyses were conducted to find out the number of organizations that engaged in job evaluation and whether the results of job evaluation were used in compensation, and to examine the methods of job evaluation. The frequency analyses were also conducted to analyse whether organizations conducted a study to determine the salary levels of employees in the sector they operated. In addition, the correlations between methods of job evaluation were examined for exploratory purposes.

First, it was found that 45.0% (N = 90) of the organizations used systematic approach to find out the relative worth of jobs in the organization, however 49.0% (N = 98) of the organizations did not use such an approach.

Next, the methods that were used in job evaluation process were examined by a frequency analysis presented in Table 3.62. Results reveals that in 27.0% (N = 54), 23.5% (N = 47), 22.0% (N = 44) and 15.5% (N = 31) of the organizations, the methods of job grading, scoring, job ranking, and factor comparison were used, respectively.

Table 3.62 The Methods of Job Evaluation

Methods of Job Evaluation	Frequency	Percentage %
Job Grading	54	27
Scoring	47	23.5
Job Ranking	44	22
Factor Comparison	31	15.5

Bivariate correlation analyses were performed to find out the relations among the methods of job evaluation. Results presented in Appendix Z suggested that the method of job ranking was significantly and positively correlated with job grading ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the method of job grading was significantly and positively correlated with the method of job scoring ($r = .27$, $p < .01$). Scoring was significantly and positively correlated with factor comparison ($r = .28$, $p < .01$).

Additionally, another frequency analysis was performed to examine whether the results of job evaluation were used in compensation or not. The results disclosed that in 41.0% (N = 82) of the organizations, the results of a study that was carried out to find out the relative worth of jobs within the organization were used as an input in compensation management. On the other hand, the results of job evaluation study were not used in the area of compensation management in 18.5% (N = 37) of the

organizations.

Moreover, it was examined whether the organizations conducted a study to find out the salary levels of employees in the sector they operated. The findings disclosed that only 34.5% (N = 69) of the organizations carried out such a study. However, 61.0% (N = 122) of the organizations did not do a research on salary levels of other organizations operating in same sector.

3.13 Managing Union Relations

In this part of the analyses, the organizations were examined in terms of their practices in union relationship management. The frequency analyses were conducted in order to examine the departments that were responsible for union relation activities and the functions involved in management of union relations.

Firstly, a frequency analysis was performed to find out the number of organizations in which HRM departments were responsible for managing employee relations. The findings demonstrated that in 28.5% (N = 57) of the organizations, HRM departments were responsible for managing union relationships.

As seen in Table 3.63, 33.3% (N = 19) of the HRM departments, that were responsible for managing union relationships, performed the required preparations before the collective bargaining. Moreover, 31.6% (N = 18) of the HRM departments were responsible for performing collective bargaining with unions. Also, the activities of applying the requirements of the collective agreement, managing the relations with unions, and solving employee complaints were carried out by 26.3% (N = 15), 21.1% (N = 12) and 14.0% (N = 8) of the HRM departments respectively.

Furthermore, a frequency analysis was conducted to find out the combinations of union relationship management activities that were most frequently

performed by the organizations. The results demonstrated that 8.0% (N = 16) of the participating organizations performed all of the activities mentioned in the questionnaire such as preparing collective bargaining, managing relations with labor union etc. in a combination.

Table 3.63 The Activities Performed in Managing Union Relationships

Activities of Labor Union Relations	Frequency	Percentage %
Preparing For Collective Bargaining	19	33.3
Making Collective Bargaining	18	31.6
Applying Collective Agreement	15	26.3
Relations with Labor Union	12	21.1
Solving Employee Problems	8	14

3.14 Employee Health and Safety

In the last section, employee health and safety activities performed by organizations were analysed in details. The frequency analyses were conducted to examine the departments that were responsible for managing employee health and safety issues and the activities that were performed by the responsible departments.

The results presented in Table 3.64 suggested that in 25.0% (N = 50) of the organizations, employee health and safety issues were carried out by HRM departments. Additionally, Employee Health and Safety Committees and Administrative Departments were responsible for managing employee health and safety issues in 9.5% (N = 19) and 8.5% (N = 17) of the organizations, respectively. Moreover, Departments of Technical Safety, Personnel and HRM and Administrative were responsible for managing employee health and safety issues in 6% (N = 12) of the organizations. Among the other departments, committees or individuals responsible for managing employee health and safety issues, there were Quality and HRM Departments, Quality Departments, work place physicians, HRM Departments and Employee Health and Safety Committees, Executive Managers,

Personnel and HRM Departments, Personnel and Administrative Departments and Administrative Departments.

Table 3.64 The Performers of Employee Health and Safety Issues

Performers of Health and Safety Activities	Frequency	Percentage %
HRM Department	50	25
Employee Health and Safety Committee	19	9.5
Administrative Department	17	8.5
Technique Safety Department	12	6
HRM and Administrative Department	12	6
Personnel Department	12	6
Quality and HRM Department	11	5.5
Quality Department	10	5
Work place physician	9	4.5
HRM & Employee Health and Safety Committee	9	4.5
Executive Manager	7	3.5
Personnel and HRM Departments	7	3.5
Personnel and Administrative Department	6	3
Administrative Department & doctor	4	2
Missing	15	7.5
Total	200	100

Next, the activities of employee health and safety management were analysed by a frequency analysis. The findings in Table 3.65 demonstrated that 70.0% of the organizations (N = 140) applied legal issues of employee health and safety. Moreover, 67.0% (N = 134) and 65.0% (N = 130) of the organizations performed the practices of analysing job accidents and taking precautions to prevent potential accidents, and coordinating the employee health and safety programs, respectively. In addition, 62.5% (N = 125) of the organizations were responsible for preparing employee health and safety programs. Sixty two percent (N = 124) of the organizations were responsible for training employees in terms of health and safety issues and recording documents related to those issues. Finally, Table 3.66 illustrated that generating statistical reports for job accidents and participating in Employee Health and Safety Committee were among the activities that were performed by

61.0% (N = 122) and 56.0% (N = 113) of the organizations.

Furthermore, a frequency analysis was conducted to identify the combinations of employee health and safety activities that were most frequently performed by the organizations. The results demonstrated that all of the employee health and safety activities mentioned in the questionnaire were used in combination in 28.0% (N = 56) of the participating organizations.

Table 3.65 The Activities of Managing Employee Health and Safety

Activities of Health and Safety	Frequency	Percentage %
Legal Issues	140	70
Job Accidents	134	67
Coordinating	130	65
Preparing	125	62.5
Training Employees	124	62
Records	124	62
Statistics	122	61
Committee	113	56.5

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 HRM Practices in Turkey

The objective of the present study was both to examine the current HRM practices in Turkish private sector organizations and to compare these activities with the HRM practices in other countries based on the available studies conducted in these countries. The HRM practices were examined under 11 sections (i.e., job analysis and design, recruitment, selection, orientation, employee training and development, performance appraisal, career planning and development, human resource planning, compensation management and incentives, employee relations, and managing employee health and safety).

First of all, the results of the present study revealed that most of the organizations prefer to use the name Human Resources Management Department instead of Personnel Department. This finding is in line with the previous research conducted in 307 organizations operating in Turkey in the year 2000 (Arthur Andersen, 2000) (See Table 4.1).

The results of the present study also demonstrated that HRM Managers were the primary responsible persons of HRM departments in more than half of the surveyed organizations. Additionally, HRM managers reported directly to top management, as it was the case in a previous study (Arthur Andersen, 2000) (See

Table 4.1). Furthermore, when the education background of HRM managers was analyzed, it was found that they were educated in different areas such as management, economy, industrial engineering etc. and only 2.5% of them had a masters' degree in HRM.

Moreover, the present study showed that personnel management activities such as making payroll, transportation and food services, etc. were still performed by the HRM departments. So, it can be noted that personnel management activities were still among the functioning area of HRM departments in organizations.

Table 4.1 Comparison of Present Study with Arthur Andersen's Study

	Present Study	Arthur Andersen's Study
HRM		
Name of HRM Departments	HRM Department-İnsan Kaynakları Departmanı	HRM Department-İnsan Kaynakları Departmanı
Individuals to whom HRM Manager Reports	Top Management	Top Management
Selection Tools for Managers	Interview References Personality Tests	Newspaper Consultancy Firms CV Bank
Selection Tools for Non-managers	Interview References Personality Tests	Employee Recommendation CV Bank Newspaper
Interview Techniques	Single Interviewer Panel Interview Structured Interview	Single Interviewer Panel Interview
Methods of Orientation	Orientation by Department Managers Trips Brochures/Handbooks	Information about Different Departments Brochures Video Presentation
Receivers of Orientation Programs	Non-managers First Level Managers	Non-managers First Level Managers

Table 4.1 Continued

Length of Orientation Programs	1 Day to 1 Week	Less Than 1 Day
Methods of Training	On the Job Training In Class Training	On the Job Training In Class Training
Receivers of Training	Non-managers Middle Level Managers	Non-mangers Management Trainees
Ways of Determining Training Programs	Demand of Managers Demand of Employees	Demand of Managers Demand of Employees
Evaluation of Training Programs	Trainee Evaluation Tests Trainer Evaluation	Trainer Evaluation Tests
Methods of Need Analysis	PA Results Questionnaires	Questionnaires Interviews
Content of PA Form	Same for Hierarchical Levels Same for All Employees	Same for Hierarchical Levels Same for All Employees
Sharing PA Results	Feedback Interview	Feedback Interview
Use of PA Results	Determining Training Needs Compensation	Career Planning Compensation Training
Duration of HR Planning	One Year or Less	One to Three Years
Factors that Affect Salary Increment	Inflation Individual Performance	Inflation Individual Performance
Individuals Playing a Role in Salary Increment	First Level Manager General Manager	First Level Manager Second Level Manager
Benefits	Lunch	Lunch Health Insurance
Moneterial Rewarding	Individual Premium	Individual Premium

Furthermore, personnel selection and recruitment were the most frequently applied activities in the surveyed organizations. The most frequently used selection methods were interview and references both for managerial and non-managerial positions. It was also found that the most widespread technique was one-to-one interview, similar to what is reported in a prior study (Arthur Andersen, 2000) (See Table 4.1). In addition, most of the interviews performed by organizations were either structured or semi-structured. As it was stated before, recruitment was the second most frequently performed activity in the surveyed organizations and walk-in was the most widespread method in selecting employees. This finding is not in line with the findings of the previous study by Arthur Andersen (2001) (See Table 4.1). In that study, the method of employee recommendation was identified to be the most frequently used method. However, employee recommendation was the second most frequently used method in the present study. Surprisingly, although the methods of walk-ins and employee recommendation used frequently, they were not evaluated as effective ways to select non-managerial positions.

In terms of manager recruitment, techniques such as newspaper, internet and consultancy firms were used more frequently than the other methods. When these findings were compared with those of Arthur Andersen it was seen that newspaper and consultancy firms were also among the most frequently used methods in the year 2000 (See Table 4.1). However, the method of internet was not used as frequently as found in the present study.

Furthermore, the method of campus recruitment was not found to be a frequently used method in the present study, however, it was found to be the most widely used method especially in private organizations in Turkey (Öztürk, 1995).

The third most frequently carried out HRM function was training and development activity, yet only 41% of the organizations had a training department. When the training function of HRM was further analyzed, it was found that in most of the participating organizations, the training needs were determined by either the immediate managers or employees themselves. Moreover, the organizations that conducted a training need analysis generally used the performance appraisal results of employees and questionnaires. Results of a previous study showed that need analysis was performed by using the results of performance appraisal and the information received by conducting interviews with managers (Cengizhan & Ersun, 2000). When the training methods applied by organizations were analysed, it was found that on the job training was the most frequently used method. This finding was also consistent with the results of Acuner's (2001) study. Additionally, in the present study the methods like computer-based training, role playing, games and simulators were not found to be as widespread as on-the-job or in-class training.

Another important issue in training function was the evaluation of training programs. It was found that in most of the surveyed organizations training programs were evaluated by using reaction criteria. However, the results of a previous study demonstrated that the organizations generally used the method of trainer evaluation (Arthur Andersen, 2000) (See Table 4.1). On the contrary, in both studies, learning criteria was the second most frequently used evaluation criteria. That is, knowledge tests that assess to what extent the trainees have learned the principles, facts, and approaches that are included in the training program, were found to be the second most frequently used criterion in evaluating training effectiveness. The fourth frequently applied activity of HRM was compensation management and benefits. When the factors that affected the salary increment were analysed, it was concluded

that inflation was still the main factor in determining the amount of wage increment in the participating organizations. The second important factor in wage increment was employee performance (i.e., merit) as it was the case in a previous study (Arthur Andersen, 2000) (See Table 4.1). Moreover, the classical factor of employee seniority was not found to be as important as either employee performance or inflation. The present study also revealed that the individual relations had a minor role in wage increments, suggesting that subjective criteria were not that much effective in salary increment. As a result, it seems fair to say that participating organizations tended to use more westernized approaches in compensation management.

The individuals who played a role in wage increments were found to be immediate supervisors as it was reported by the Arthur Andersen study (2001) (See Table 4.1). Arthur Andersen's study also revealed that second-rank managers played a secondary role in wage increment in 36.2% of the surveyed organizations in Turkey. However, in the present study this rate was 22.5%.

In addition to compensation, managing monetary and non-monetary incentives were also important aspects in employee motivation. The findings of the present study revealed that the most frequently used monetary incentive was individual premium and the most frequently used non-monetary incentives were giving plaquettes or gifts to employees. As a result, the number of organizations that provided non-monetary incentives was more than the ones that applied monetary incentive payments.

Performance appraisal or performance management was found to be the fifth frequently applied HRM activity in the surveyed organizations. Coming from a public sector tradition, seniority has played an important role in wage increments and

appointments in Turkey for a long time. However, according to the results of present study, 80.5% of the surveyed organizations evaluated their employees based upon their performance. So, in this respect, Turkish organizations seem to catch up with their western counterparts.

In the Arthur Andersen study (2000), the rate of organizations in Turkey with a structured PA system was reported to be 72%. However, the results of the present study demonstrated that the rate of organizations that had a PA system was 57%. This difference is probably due to sampling differences between the two studies. Yet, the implication is that majority of the Turkish private sector organizations appear to have a systematic approach to performance appraisal. Moreover, in the present study it was found that performance criteria on PA form were the same for all levels in the surveyed organizations, apparently not a very desirable situation. Ideally, performance criteria are expected to be different for different workgroups, positions, and levels of employees.

Next, the present study demonstrated that most of the organizations evaluated employee performance once or twice a year and the employee performance was generally evaluated by the first-rank and second rank supervisors, consistent with the available literature (Erdil, 2000). However, relatively more recent and unconventional approaches to performance management, such as 360 degree feedback that has built on the idea of multiple assessors from all around the employee (from employee manager, subordinate, peer, customer etc.), was not widespread among organizations in Turkey. In addition, the most frequently used two PA methods by the surveyed organizations were rank order approach and graphic rating scales. Concerning feedback to employees about PA results, only in 33.5% of the surveyed organizations performance results were systematically shared

with employees. This finding is not necessarily consistent with the results of other studies. For example, Erdil (2000) and Arthur Andersen (2000) reported that 76% and 43% of the Turkish organizations conduct face to face interviews, respectively.

Employee orientation activity was found to be the sixth frequently applied HRM activity in the surveyed organizations. Majority of the surveyed organizations had an orientation program for their newly hired employees and new employee orientation was performed mostly by HRM departments and/or the new employee's manager. The present study revealed that the most frequently used orientation methods were orientation programs performed by department managers, trips to work sites, and handling brochures/handbooks. The percentage of the surveyed organizations that employed all three of these methods was 15.5% only. Lastly, the present study revealed that the orientation programs were mostly applied to non-managers, consistent with other findings (Arthur Andersen, 2001) (See Table 4.1).

Managing employee health and safety was the seventh most frequently applied HRM practice in the surveyed organizations. However, in most of the organizations the related activities were not carried out by the HRM departments.

Furthermore, one of the most important HRM functions, job analysis, was performed only in 65.5% of the surveyed organizations. This finding is in line with the previous findings (Öztürk, 1995). The present study also revealed that job analysis was conducted mostly by HRM departments of the organizations and it was usually conducted once a year. However, Öztürk's (1995) study revealed that most of the organizations in Turkey performed job analysis once every five year only. The results related to job analysis activities of the two study is different since the type of the organizations participated in these two studies were different. The organizations

in Öztürk's study were small and medium enterprises however present study has examined the private organizations.

The present study demonstrated that the HRM activity of career planning was not performed generally in the participating organizations. The present study also revealed that the most frequently applied stages of career management were human resource planning, employee assessment, matching employee career objectives with organizational opportunities and training employees. As it was stated above, one of the stages of career planning system was identifying employee KSAO's. The present study showed that supervisor evaluations and PA results were the most frequently used methods in evaluation of employee KSAO's. In addition, the present study examined the activities that were included in career management systems and the results revealed that courses, seminars/trainings and rotations were among the most frequently applied activities. On the other hand, the methods of assessment centers or simulators were used only by 0.5% of the organizations.

Human resource planning, a significant component of career planning, was performed by the majority of the surveyed organizations (58.5%). The present study also revealed that in most of the surveyed organizations, the HR plans was performed for one year or less. This finding was not consistent with previous findings since the results of a previous study demonstrated that in most of the organizations (56.7%) HR plans were conducted for 1 to 3 years (Arthur Andersen, 2000).

4.2 Comparison of HRM Practices across Different Countries

Human resource management began to mature in the 1990's throughout the world. HRM became a field with varying applications and practices in different countries, and it is growing and changing more rapidly than imaginable. Once HR departments were considered as mechanical units or administrative necessities that

help the organization to hire, fire, and possibly train employees. However, nowadays HRM departments are expected to add value to the organization since the importance of a highly skilled, motivated, flexible workforce has become certain (Aghazadeh, 2003). Moreover, it has become more and more important for organizations to reach organizational excellence via HRM strategies. Ulrich (1998) has presented four ways for HRM to deliver organizational excellence;

1. Forming a partnership with senior and line managers to move to the marketplace.
2. Becoming an expert in the way that work is organized and executed to deliver efficiency to reduce costs but maintain quality.
3. Working to increase employee contributions, commitment and ability to deliver results.
4. Being an agent of continuous transformation, improving an organization's capacity to change by shaping processes and a culture.

Aghazadeh (2003) stated that there are five essential challenges that need to be faced in today's business environment; globalization, profitability through growth, technology, intellectual capital, and change management. Of course, HR professionals have to face all of these challenges. First, to deal with globalization, HR managers have to ensure that HR policies and practices provide the balance between consistency and coordination versus recognition of cultural and other differences. Secondly, HR professionals have to make employees creative and innovative through continuous learning and development. Additionally, in organizations that grow through mergers or joint ventures, HR managers have to use their skills to combine different work processes and cultures. Thirdly, to deal with improving technology, HR professionals should minimize the resistance of

employees towards new technology by supporting them with the necessary training. Fourthly, in order to capture intellectual capacity, HR managers have to attract, develop, and retain talented individuals. Finally, HR departments must examine and adopt new structures, new working processes, and a new culture of business support in order to deal with challenge of continuous change (Aghazadeh, 2003).

Considering all of the mentioned roles of HR professionals, it can be stated that the role of HRM has become more strategic. Accordingly, the field of strategic human resource management (SHRM) has grown steadily since the mid 1980s (Boxall & Purchase, 2000).

As the sub-fields of HRM were further analyzed, it was seen that the transition from the practice of personnel management to HRM had been accomplished with a more systematic and strategic approach to staffing. As a result, personnel selection and recruitment appeared as the most important areas of HRM. This study presented that the most frequently applied HRM areas in the surveyed organizations in Turkey were personnel selection and recruitment. The HRM functions of personnel selection and recruitment were also among the top HRM activities in the United States ("Retaining Workers", 1999). Proactive planning to maintain appropriate staff and implementing more effective selection activities were important for HRM practitioners in the US.

In terms of recruitment practices, the present study concluded that recruiting via internet was practiced frequently in the surveyed Turkish organizations. The technique of online recruitment was also used in the US companies with different sizes operating in various industries since it is a cost effective and fast way to reach potential candidates. Online job ads also allow the applicants to visit organization's web site so that they receive further information about the company. Gale (1994)

reported that in the US, 96% of job seekers use the internet as their most commonly used search tactic.

Concerning the method of internal recruitment, it was found that more than half of the organizations operating in Turkey employed internal recruiting via organizational intranet and job posting. Table 4.2 presents recruitment activities in four different countries. A word of caution is needed concerning this table and the following tables in which HRM practices across different countries are summarized. These tables bring together results of independent/individual studies conducted in different countries; they do not present summary findings from cross-cultural comparisons. So, it should be kept in mind that, they do not necessarily represent the totality of the HRM activities in those countries. Results are only reflective of the situations in the sampled organizations in studies conducted in different countries. Yet, these tables are expected to help the readers understand the nature of the HRM activities very roughly in different countries.

As presented in Table 4.2, internal recruiting is also popular in companies operating in the US. For instance, many organizations such as IBM recruit their non-entry level jobs via internal recruiting strategies for reasons such as improving employee morale and not dealing with the issues of fairness and openness of hiring processes (Springer & Springer, 1990). Additionally, internal recruitment was also practiced by organizations in Holland in manager recruitment using the method of job posting (Wiersma & Van Den Berg, 1999). In addition, the methods of print advertisements, referral from universities, recruitment consultants and internet were among the techniques that were employed by organizations in Indonesia (Bennington & Habir, 2003).

Table 4.2 Recruitment Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities	Country			
	Turkey	Indonesia	US	Netherlands
Recruitment	Internal		Internal	Internal
	Recruitment	Internet	Recruitment	Recruitment
	Job Posting	Consultants	Internet/On-line	
	Intranet	Printed Adds University Referrals	Recruitment	Job Posting

In terms of selection process, the present study also revealed that the most popular personnel selection methods in the surveyed organizations were interviews, references, tests, and biographical data. Some Eastern European companies also use interviews as the most commonly used methods (Kriazov, Sullivan, & Tu, 2000) in selection process. A survey, in which 900 organizations in the United Kingdom participated, demonstrated that interviews were used to select clerical staff in 70% of the organizations operating in tourism and 91% of the organizations operating in the finance sectors. In addition, the single interviewer method was commonly used to select manual workers and a panel interview technique was generally used for non-manual employees (Scholarios & Lockyer, 1996). On the other hand, the present study revealed that single interviewer method was the most frequently used method for selecting both managers and non-managers in the surveyed organizations.

In Table 4.3, a summary of selection activities across a number of countries/regions of the world is presented. As presented in Table 4.3, the structured interview technique was used commonly in the surveyed organizations in Turkey. Structured interviews with a predetermined set of questions and a rating scale were also quite frequently used in the US (Springer & Springer, 1990). More specifically,

the techniques such as patterned behavior description interviews and situational interviews were used in employee selection by many US companies (Cascio, 1995). Furthermore, in Netherlands assessment centers and work samples were among the most commonly used selection methods (Wiersma & Van den Berg, 1999). The present study demonstrated that assessment center method was not commonly used in employee selection by the surveyed organizations and the method of work samples was not applied by any of the surveyed organizations, despite meta-analytic findings showing that work samples have a true validity of .38 (Schmitt, 1984), and average validity of assessment centers is around .40 (Howard, 1997).

Table 4.3 Selection Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities Selection Tools	Country				
	Turkey	US	Netherlands	England	Eastern Europe
	Single Interviewer	Behavioural Interview	Work Samples	Single Interview	Interview
	Structured Interview	Structured Interview	Assessment Centers	Panel Interview	
	References	Situational Interviews			
	Tests				
	Biographical Data				

After selecting employees, the organizations need to provide orientation programs to them. The results presented in Table 4.4, show that orientation programs were applied generally by the HRM departments in the surveyed organizations and the first-rank managers, as was the case in the US (Barbazette, 2004). The functions of the HRM departments and the first rank supervisors were not the same in orientation programs in the US organizations. The former is responsible of sharing organizational policies, history, and benefits but the latter usually explains safety

rules, reporting requirements, and mainly job tasks (Barbazette, 2004). In addition, the present study demonstrated that trips to the organization and handling brochures were mainly used in orientation programs in the surveyed organizations. The practices in the US organizations are also similar since they generally set up a tour in the organization that ends in employee's work area, and the new employee is paired with a veteran employee (Barbazette, 2004). However, the method of using a veteran employee or a mentor was not common in the surveyed organizations.

Table 4.4 Orientation Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities Performers of Orientation Programs Orientation methods	Country	
	Turkey	US
	HRM Departments First Rank Managers	HRM Departments First Rank Managers
	Trips Brochures	Trips Mentors

Training and development function was also presented as one of the most essential HRM activities practiced in the surveyed organizations. As it is presented in Table 4.5, on the job training and in-class training were among the most popular training techniques in organizations operating in Turkey. Japanese organizations also give priority to training activities. They frequently use the method of on-the-job training and job rotation. In addition, off the job training techniques are also gaining importance among Japanese organizations (Koike, 1997). Rowley, Benson, and Warner (2004) stated that the methods of job rotation and on the job training were also commonly applied in South Korean organizations. Moreover, the trend in the US is to provide in-house training programs that include the usage of software packages (Springer & Springer, 1990). However, the computer-based training

programs were also used by the participating organizations in Turkey, but not very commonly. Although the training and development issue was also important for the organizations in Eastern Europe, they lack the financial resources. Similar to the organizations in Turkey, most of the organizations in Eastern Europe apply the method of on the job training and lectures (Kiriazov et al., 2000).

Table 4.5 Training Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities	Country			
	Turkey	Japan	US	Eastern Europe
Training Methods	On Site Training In-class Training Computer Based Training	On Site Training Job Rotation	In house training Work Place Problems Computer Based Training	On Site Training Lectures

Considering performance appraisal the present study demonstrated that 80.5% of the organizations had a performance management system. Studies indicated that 85% of the organizations in Australia (Nankervis & Leece, 1997), 86% of the organizations in the UK and 90% of the organizations in the US had a systematic performance system (Anderson, 1996). According to Anderson, performance management systems are applied mainly to managers and supervisors in the UK but it has been extended to clerical and manual workers in recent years.

As presented in Table 4.6, employee performance was appraised mainly by the first level supervisors in the surveyed organizations. However, in Japanese organizations, the employee performance is also evaluated by the HRM departments (Takeuchi, 1990). In addition, employees are mostly appraised annually in Japanese (Takeuchi, 1990) and US organizations (Selden, Ingraham, & Jacobson, 2001).

Those findings are in line with the results of the present study since in most of the surveyed organizations performance appraisals are conducted annually.

Furthermore, the present study showed that the most frequently used methods in performance evaluation were rank ordering and graphic rating methods. On the other hand, the behavioral approaches such as BOS or BARS were not commonly practiced in the surveyed organizations. However, as seen in Table 4.5, BARS was a popular method in the US companies (Anderson, 1996) and BOS was preferred to BARS by organizations in Holland (Wiersma et al., 1995).

The appraisal interview is seen as the important aspect of performance appraisal system by most of the organizations in the US (Anderson, 1996). On the other hand, the results of this study showed that only in 33.5% of the organizations performance feedback interview was provided.

Table 4.6 PA Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities	Country			
	Turkey	Japan	US	Netherlands
Evaluators of Performance	First Level Supervisors	HRM Departments		
Frequency of PA	Annual Assessment	Annual Assessment	Annual Assessment	
Methods of PA	Rank Order Graphic Rating		BARS	BOS
Performance Feedback	Yes		Yes	

Compensation management was found to be the other most frequently applied HRM activity in Turkey. As seen in Table 4.7, the pay increases were generally

based on inflation, employee performance, and company profit in the present study. Similarly, pay increases are tied to individual improvement and company performance in the US organizations (“Lessons From 100 Years of Compensation, 2000). On the other hand, since team work is important in the US companies, the pay increases are also based on group performance (“Lessons From 100 Years of Compensation, 2000). Accordingly, the present study revealed that salary increments based on group performance was not common among the surveyed organizations. In addition, as it is presented in Table 4.7, individual performance is also an indicator of salary increment in Korean and Japanese organizations (Rowley et.al., 2004).

Other than salary administration, the benefits are also important in compensation management. The results of the present study revealed that there were differences among managers and non-managers in terms of the benefits they received. The managers generally received food services, company cars, whereas employees received food services as social benefits. On the contrary, as it is presented in Table 4.7, large organizations in Eastern Europe sponsor schools and provide housing, holiday accommodations, recreational facilities, and cafeterias to their employees (Kriazov et al., 2000). However, those kinds of benefits do not seem to be common among organizations operating in Turkey. As the benefit packages provided by the US companies are analyzed, it is seen that health insurance and private pension plans are among the most common benefits provided by the US organizations (Springer & Springer, 1990). However, those benefits were not commonly provided by the participating organizations in Turkey.

Table 4.7 Compensation Management Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities Factors of Pay Increases	Country				
	Turkey	US	Japan	Korea	Eastern Europe
	Individual Performance	Group Performance Company Profit	Individual Performance	Individual Performance	
Benefits	Food Services Company Cars	Paid Leave Time Health Insurance Pension Plans			Sponsoring Schools Housing Holiday Cafeteria Creational Activities

In addition to benefits, the surveyed organizations used monetary and non-monetary rewards to motivate their employees. In terms of monetary rewards, these organizations mostly provided individual premiums. On the other hand, as it is stated by Springer and Springer (1990), the new trend seems to use team or organization wide incentives such as profit sharing and productivity gain sharing in the US organizations. As shown in Table 4.8, the use of profit and gain sharing was not common among the surveyed organizations.

In terms of non-monetary reward systems, the US companies generally use time and job flexibility (Springer & Springer, 1990). In addition, organizations in Holland increase task and job variety, apply participative decision making and form quality circles to intrinsically motivate their employees (Wiersma & Van den Berg, 1999). In the present study it was found that the surveyed organizations in Turkey generally used the methods of giving plaquettes and gifts to the employees.

Table 4.8 Pay for Performance Activities in Different Countries

HRM Activities	Country		
	Turkey	US	Netherlands
Rewarding	Individual Performance Profit Sharing Gain Sharing Plaquette Gifts	Profit Sharing Gain Sharing Time Flexibility Job Flexibility	Task Variety Job Variety Participative Decision Making Quality Circles

Concerning job analysis it was found that 65.5% of the surveyed organizations conduct job analysis as a HRM activity. The results of the job analysis were used in personnel selection and placement activities, compensation management, training and development, performance appraisal, promotion and assignment, career planning, recruitment, orientation in surveyed organizations. This finding is also consistent with findings related to HRM activities in general (e.g., Spector, 2003).

In addition, the present study revealed that the methods of employee interview and observation was the first and second most widely used job analysis data collection techniques in the participating organizations, respectively. In general, off-the self methods of job analysis are not generally used in Turkish organizations. In the US, however, ready- to-use techniques such as position analysis questionnaire were commonly employed (Springer & Springer, 1990).

Furthermore, when human resource planning activity of HRM was analysed it was found that 58.5% of the surveyed organizations planned their human resources. The stages of HR plans conducted by the surveyed organizations were composed mainly of determining organizational strategies and objectives, evaluation of existing manpower, and determining the development speed of the organizations. According

to Jackson and Schuler (1990), the leading organizations in the US plan their human resources in 4 phases; forecasting demand and supply of human resources, establishing human resource objectives, designing and implementing HR programs, and lastly monitoring and evaluating those programs. So, there appear differences between these two countries concerning the steps involved in making HR plans. Human resource planning was also used as a part of career management systems in the 28% of the surveyed organizations in US. However, the practice of career management was not widespread among the surveyed organizations in Turkey.

Lastly, the present study examined the practices of organizations in terms of managing union relations. Managing union relations was not commonly held by the HRM departments in the surveyed organizations. In the US, however, unions have become weaker especially in the private sector. On the contrary, union management relations are still among the most important HRM practices in the state-owned organizations and foreign invested enterprises operating in China (Rowley et al., 2004).

4.3 Conclusion

This study has been concerned with exploring the nature of the current HRM practices in a sample of Turkish private sector organizations and comparing the identified practices with HRM practices carried out in different countries as reported in the relevant literature. As a result of changing business conditions, the organizations in Turkey have lived through a transition from personnel management to HRM since the beginning of the late 1980's. However, HRM is relatively lately adopted in Turkey and is still developing mostly by learning from the experiences of other countries (Emre, 1998).

Concerning the general HRM practices, the results of the present study demonstrated that some of the HR practices such as recruitment, selection, training, performance management, and orientation are more frequently applied than practices of job analysis, human resource planning, career planning and job design in the surveyed organizations. Thus, it can be concluded that HRM practices that aim to attract, select, retain and develop potential workforce are more widespread among the surveyed organizations. It is also the case in most Western organizations. Marriott (2001) argues that the processes of selection, recruitment, and retention (including training and performance management.) are the most pressing challenges facing the US business today.

The results of the present study revealed that HRM applications, which are related to recruitment, selection, orientation, training, and performance, need to be further improved in organizations in Turkey. For instance, concerning recruitment process, it can be stated that the use of internet as a recruitment tool should become widespread among Turkish organizations since it is a cost effective and fast way to reach potential candidates (Gale, 2004). Moreover, the use of internal recruitment should be also become more widespread among organizations operating in Turkey since it aims to improve employee morale and also provides a shield against the charges of unfairness and discrimination.

In terms of selection processes, the present study showed that the application of valid selection tools such as assessment centers, work samples, personality or cognitive ability tests are not widespread among the surveyed organizations. However, those selection tools can be expected to be used more frequently in the future since using only tools and techniques, such as interviews and references, that

are likely to be more subjective and biased would not be effective in maximizing person-job or person-environment fit.

Next, concerning training and development issue the present study revealed that the surveyed organizations generally determine the training needs by relying on the reports of managers or employees. However, a healthier way to identify training needs of employees is to conduct a systematic training need analysis. The training programs applied based on the reported needs/demands of employees or managers are not expected to be as effective as the ones that are applied after a comprehensive need analysis. In conclusion, the activity of need analysis should become widespread among organizations.

The evaluation of training is another important issue in HRM. The surveyed organizations used criteria such as reaction (trainee evaluations) and learning (tests applied before and after the training programs) to evaluate effectiveness of their training programs. However, there are other criteria such as evaluating on the job behavior of trainees (behavior criterion) and reduction in turnover, improvements in production (results criterion). These evaluation techniques should also be employed in order to increase the effectiveness of evaluation process.

Concerning performance appraisal process, the present study found that the performance appraisal methods of BARS and BOS are not commonly used in the surveyed organizations. An examination of the literature revealed that the US (Anderson, 1996) and Netherlands (Wiersma et al., 1995) are among the countries that use methods of BARS or BOS. Although the superiority of these systems over simple graphic rating scales are not clearly shown (Landy & Farr, 1980), organizations may still benefit from such techniques of assessment which involve more clearly defined performance dimensions and scale anchors.

In addition to needed efforts in improving the practices of frequently applied HRM activities, there seems to be a need to focus more on the activities that are not practiced widely in the Turkish organizations, such job analysis, career development, compensation management, and human resource planning. Among these activities, job analysis deserves a special attention since it is the basis of almost all other HRM activities. There is a need to develop job analysis systems/methods, both off-the-self and tailor-made types. When systems of job analysis are developed fully and used systematically and widely, since then the other HRM activities would be performed properly.

4.3.1 Limitations and Suggestions

The present study is expected to contribute to the literature since it provides a basis to compare HRM practices in Turkey against those in other countries. However, there are several limitations/drawbacks of the study that needs to be mentioned. One of these drawbacks is that the number of organizations participated in the research was 200, so the size of the sample was not large enough to be a good representative of the population of interest (i.e., all private sector organizations in Turkey). Yet, it is a consolation that the sample of the present study included organizations from a wide range of sectors.

Secondly, the data were collected via questionnaires answered by HR professionals working in organizations. These individuals may have a tendency to answer the questions in a more positive way. Thus, there is a probability of social desirability problem in the given answers.

Thirdly, most of the organizations in the sample were large- or medium-sized organizations. Thus, the results of the study may not generalize to HRM practices in small-sized organizations in Turkey.

Fourthly, in this study HRM practices in different countries were examined by reviewing the related literature. However, it would be a much better strategy to conduct a cross-cultural comparison study, using the same data collection instrument across different countries and collecting data from organizations that are similar to each other in terms of size, sector, etc.

Lastly, the present study solely focused on the current practices of HRM in the surveyed organizations but it is also important to assess the influences of HRM practices on business performance (Roos, Femström, & Pike, 2004). The issue of effects of HRM on business performance of organizations was beyond the aim of this thesis yet it may be an important point to consider in future research.

REFERENCES

- Acuner, T. (2001). İnsan kaynaklarının yetiştirilmesi, geliştirilmesi ve hizmet sektöründe bir saha araştırması. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 15, 177-190.
- Aghazadeh, S. (2003). The future of human resource management. *Work Study*, 52, 201-207.
- Alliger, G.M., Tannenbaum, S.I., Bennett W., Traver H. & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta- analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 341-358.
- Altın, A. (1997). İşletmelerde insan kaynakları yönetiminin faaliyetleri, işlevleri, önemi ve organizasyondaki yeri. Unpublished master's thesis, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Manisa, Turkey.
- Anderson, G. (1996). Performance appraisal. B. Towers (Ed.). *The handbook of human resource management* (196-223). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Arthur Andersen (2000). 2001'e doğru insan kaynakları araştırması. Sabah Yayıncılık: İstanbul.
- Aycan, Z. & Balcı, H. (2001). Hizmetiçi eğitimin etkililiğini yordayan bireysel ve kurumsal faktörler. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 16, 13-31.
- Aycan, Z. & Kanungo, R.N. (2000). Toplumsal kültürün kurumsal kültür ve insan kaynakları uygulamaları üzerine etkileri. Z. Aycan (Ed.). *Türkiye'de Yönetim, Liderlik ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamaları* (25- 53). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R.N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, J., & Kurshid, A. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A ten-country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49, 192-220.
- Barbazette, J. (2004). Make new employee orientation a success. September, 14, 2004.
- Baron, A. & Armstrong, M. (1998). 'Out of box'. *People Management*, 23, 38-41.

Başboğaoğlu, U. (1999). Gaziantep' deki kamusal ve özel kesim işletmelerinde insan kaynaklarının geliştirilmesi. *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 1, 31-54.

Beardwell, I. & Holden, L. (2001). *Human resource management: A contemporary approach*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.

Beaumont, P.B. (1993). *Human resource management: Key concepts and skills*. London: Sage Publications.

Bennington, L. & Habir, A.D. (2003). Human resource management in Indonesia. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 373-392.

Bormon, W.C. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. N. Schmitt and W. Borman (Ed.). *Personnel selection in organizations* (71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boxall, P. & Purchell, J. (2000). Strategic human resource management: Where have we come from and where should we be going?, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2, 183-203.

Brunstein, I. (1995). *Human Resource Management in Western Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Byars, L.L., & Rue, L.W. (1991). *Human resource management*. USA: Von Hoffman Press.

Cascio, W. F. (1995). Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work? *American Psychologist*, 50, 928-939.

Cengizhan, S., & Ersun, O. (2000). Büyük ölçekli işletmelerde eğitim geliştirme çalışmalarının durum saptaması. M. Ertürk (Ed.). 8. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi: Bildiriler* (731-752). Nevşehir: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Cesare, S.J. (1996). Subjective judgment and the selection interview: A methodological review. *Public Personnel Management*, 25, 291-307.

Clark, T., & Pugh, D. (1999). Similarities and differences in European conceptions of human resource management. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 29, 15-35.

Cleveland, J.N., Murphy, K.R., & Williams, R.E. (1989). Multiple uses of performance appraisal: Prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 130-135.

Dulebohn, J.H., Ferris, G.R., & Stodd, J.T. (1995). The history and evolution of human resource management. G.R. Ferris, S.D. Rosen & D.T. Barnum (Ed.). *Handbook of Human Resource Management* (18-40). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Emre, C. (1998). *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye’de Bilim – Sosyal Bilimler II*. Ankara: TÜBA.

Erdil, O. (1998). İşgörenlerin performans yönetiminde yeni yaklaşımlar ve sanayi işletmelerinde bir uygulama. *6.Ulusal İşletmecilik Kongresi: Bildiriler* (164-180). Antalya: Akdeniz Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Gale, S.F. (2004). Internet recruiting: Better, cheaper, faster. *Workforce Online*, 05, 2003.

Goss, D. (1994). *Principles of HRM*. New York: Rou Hedge.

Gutteridge, T.G. (1986). Organizational development systems: The state of practice. D. Hall (Ed.). *Career development in organizations* (50-94). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harvey, D., & Bowin, R. B. (1996). *Human resource management: An experiential approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Heneman, R.L. & Gresham, M.T. (1998). Performance-based pay plans. J.W. Smither (Ed.). *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (496-536). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hollenbeck, N., & Wright, G. (1996). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage*. United States: Irwin/ McGraw-Hill.

Human resource practices and competitive success (1994, September). *Worklife Report*.

Howard, A. (1997). A reassessment of assessment centers: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 12, 13-53.

Huselid, M. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 171-188.

Ivancevich, J.M. (1992). *HRM foundations of personnel*. USA: Von Hoffman Press, Inc.

Jackson, S.E. & Schuler, R.S. (1990). Human resource planning: Challenges for industrial/organizational psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 45, 223-239.

Kalleberg, A.L., & Moody, J.W. (1994). Human resource management and organizational performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37, 948-962.

Kandel, E. (2001). Flexibility versus commitment in personnel management. *Journal of Japanese and International Economies*, 15, 515-556.

Kiriazov, D., Sullivan, S.E., & Tu, H.S. (2000). Business success in Eastern Europe: Understanding and customizing HRM. *Business Horizons*, 43, 89-100.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1977). Evaluating training programs: Evidence versus proof. *Training and Development Journal*, 31, 9-12

Koike, K. (1997). *Human resource development, Japanese Economy and Labour Series*, No:2, Tokyo: Japan Institute of Labour.

Landy, F.J. & Farr, J.L. (1980). Performance rating, *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 72-107.

Legge, K. (1995). *Human resource management: Rhetorics and realities*. London: Mac-Millan Press Ltd.

Lessons from 100 years of compensation. (2000, March). *HR Spectrum*.

Lowry, P. E. (1994). The structured interview: An alternative to the assessment center? *Public Personnel Management*, 23, 201-216.

Manzolini, L. (1993). Environmental dynamics and the organizational innovation process: Implications for Human resource management in Italy. S. Tyson, P. Lawrence, P. Poirson, L. Manzolini & C.S. Vicente (Ed.). Human resource management in Europe (131-209). England: Clays Ltd.

Marriott, J.W. (2001). "Our competitive strength: human capital", *Executive Speeches*, April, 29, p.18

Mathis, R.L., & Jackson, J.H. (1991). *Personnel/ human resource management*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.

Muchinsky, P.M. (1999). *Psychology applied to work*. United States: Wadsworth.

Murphy, K.R., & Cleveland, J.N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. London: Sage Publications.

Ng, I. & Maki, D. (1993). Human resource management in the Canadian manufacturing sector. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4, 897-916.

Nankervis, A. & Leece, P. (1997). Performance appraisal: two steps forward, one step back. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 35, 80-92.

Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt F.L. (1993). Comprehensive meta analysis of integrity test validation: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 679-703.

Özçelik, A.O. (2000). İşletmelerde insan kaynaklarına ilişkin bazı kriterlere göre işe alma uygulamalarındaki farklılıklarının belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. M. Ertürk (Ed.). 8. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi: Bildiriler* (801-816). Nevşehir: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları

Öztürk, Z. (1995). İşletmelerde personel seçme yöntemleri. *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 2, 41-59.

Poole, M. (1990). Editorial: HRM in an international perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1, 1-15.

Reshef, Y. (1990). Union decline: A view from Canada. *Journal of Labor Research*, 11, 25- 39.

Retaining workers is key to profits. (1999, April). *USA Today Magazine*.

Riggio, E.R.. (2003). *Introduction to industrial/organizational psychology*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey

Rogg, K.L., Schmidt, D.B., Shull, C., & Schmitt, N. (2001). Human resource practices, organizational climate, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 27, 431-449.

Ross, G., Femström, L., & Pike, S. (2004). Human resource management and business performance. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 8, 28-37.

Rowley, C., Benson, J., & Warner, M. (2004). Towards an Asian model of human resource management? A comparative analysis of China, Japan and South Korea. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15, 917-933.

Salas, E. & Cannon-Bowers, J.A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471-499.

Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262-274.

Schmitt N., Gooding R.Z., Noe, R. A., & Kirsch, M. (1984). Meta-analysis of validity studies published between 1964 and 1982 and the investigation of study characteristics. *Personnel Psychology*, 1, 89-92

Scholarios, D. & Lockyer, C. (1996). Human resource management and selection: Beter solutions or new dilemmas. B. Towers (Ed.). *The handbook of human resource management* (173-195). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schuler, R.S. (1995). *Managing human resources*. St Paul: West Publishing Company.

Selden, S.C., Ingraham, P.W., & Jacobson, W. (2001). Human resource practices in state government: Findings from a national survey. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 598-607.

Selmer, J. (2001). Human Resource Management in Japan: Adjustment or transformation? *International Journal of Manpower*, 22, 235-243.

Sisson, K. (1990). Introducing the human resource management journal. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 1, 1-11.

Soysal, A. (2000). Örgütlerde kariyer planlama sürecinin işleminde motivasyon faktörünün etkisi: Kahramanmaraş özel işletmelerinde yapılan bir uygulama. M. Ertürk (Ed.). 8. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi: Bildiriler* (787-800). Nevşehir: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Spector, P.E. (2003). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*. John Wiley & Sons: New York.

Springer, B. & Springer S. (1990). Human resource management in the U.S.- Celebration of its centenary. R. Pieper (Ed.). *Human resource management: An international comparison* (41-57). New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Strauss, G. (1996). Human relations in the USA. Towers B. (Ed.). *The handbook of human resource management* (26-49). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sümer, H.C. (1998). İnsan kaynakları yönetimi etkinliği olarak örgütsel kariyer planlama ve geliştirme. *Türk Psikoloji Bülteni*, 9, 62-65.

Sümer, H.C., Çifci, O.S., Demiroğlu, K., & Sümer, N. (2000). Subay kişilik özelliklerinin ölçülmesi ve yapı geçerliliği çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15, 15-36.

Sümer, H.C. (2000). Performans değerlendirmesine tarihsel bir bakış ve kültürel bir yaklaşım. Z. Aycan (Ed.). *Türkiye’de Yönetim, Liderlik ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamaları* (57-90). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Takeuchi, N. (1990). Comparative competitive aspects of Japanese use of human resource vis-a-vis United States and Canada. *United States Law Journal*, 16, 46-62.

Ulrich, D. (1998). “A new mandate or human resources”. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 124-134.

Üsdiken, B. (1996). Importing theories of management and organization. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 26, 33-46.

Uyargil, C., & DüNDAR, G. (2000). İşletmelerde insan kaynakları fonksiyonunun stratejik niteliğinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. M. Ertürk (Ed.). 8. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi: Bildiriler* (675- 688). Nevşehir: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Wager, T.H. (1998).Determinants of human resource management practices in small firms: Some evidence from Atlantic Canada. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 36, 15- 31.

Whitener, E.M. (1997). The impact of human resource activities on employee trust. *Human Resource Management Review*, 7, 389-404.

Wiersma, U.J., Van den Berg, P.T., & Latham, G.P. (1995). Dutch reactions to behavioral observation, behavioral expectation, and trait scales. *Group and Organization Management*, 20, 297-309.

Wiersma, U.J. & Van den Berg, P.T. (1999). Influences and trends in human resource practices in the Netherlands. *Employee Relations*, 21, 187-202.

Zhu, Y. (2004). Responding to the challenges of globalization: Human resource development in Japan. *Journal of World Business*, 39, 337-348

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ANKET

FİRMA BİLGİLERİ

1. Çalışmakta olduğunuz firmanın adı nedir?

(.....)

2. Firmanız hangi sektörde yer almaktadır?

- ☐ Finans
- ☐ Teknoloji
- ☐ Hızlı Tüketim Malları
- ☐ İnşaat ve Malzeme
- ☐ Sağlık ve İlaç
- ☐ Medya
- ☐ Otomotiv
- ☐ Tekstil
- ☐ Metal
- ☐ Dayanıklı Tüketim Malları
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

3. Firmanız kaç yıllık bir kuruluştur? (.....)

4. Firmanız bünyesinde toplam kaç kişi çalışmaktadır? (.....)

İNSAN KAYNAKLARI YÖNETİMİ DEPARTMANI

5. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimine ilişkin faaliyetleri yürüten bölümünüzün adı nedir?

- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı
- ☐ Personel Departmanı
- ☐ Personel ve İdari İşler Departmanı
- ☐ İdari İşler Departmanı
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

Not: Aşağıdaki sorularda bu bölümden İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı olarak bahsedilecektir.

6. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı aşağıdaki alanların hangilerinden sorumludur? **Sorumlu olunan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İş analizi
- ☐ İş tasarımı
- ☐ Başvuru sağlama
- ☐ İşe alma ve yerleştirme
- ☐ İşe alıştırma (oryantasyon)
- ☐ Eğitim ve geliştirme
- ☐ Performans değerlendirme
- ☐ Kariyer planlama
- ☐ İnsangücü planlaması
- ☐ Ücretlendirme ve ek kazançlar
- ☐ Bordro
- ☐ Servis
- ☐ Yemek
- ☐ Personel ve özlük işlemleri
- ☐ İş güvenliği ve sağlık
- ☐ Endüstriyel ilişkiler
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

7. İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanında çalışan sayısı kaçtır? **(İdari İşler'in bu departmana dahil olması durumunda lütfen sadece İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi ile ilgili olarak çalışan personel sayısını belirtiniz)**

8. İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi hiyerarşisinde kaç düzey vardır?(Örn; müdür, müdür yardımcısı, vb.) (.....)

9. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetiminden birinci derecede sorumlu olan kişinin unvanı nedir?

- ☐ Genel Müdür Yardımcısı
- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Koordinatörü
- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Direktörü
- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Müdürü
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

10. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanında en üst düzeyde olan kişinin eğitim durumu nedir?

- ☐ Lise
 - ☐ Lisans
 - ☐ Yüksek lisans
 - ☐ Doktora
- Bölüm: (.....)
Alan: (.....)
Alan: (.....)

11. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanında en üst düzeyde olan kişinin yaşı kaçtır?

- ☐ 25-30
- ☐ 31-39

- ☐ 40- 49
- ☐ 50-59
- ☐ 60- 69
- ☐ 70 yaş ve üstü

12. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanında en üst düzeyde olan kişinin cinsiyeti nedir?

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

13. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanında en üst düzeyde olan kişinin İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi alanındaki deneyim süresi nedir?

(.....)

14. İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanında en üst düzeyde olan kişi kime bağlı olarak çalışmaktadır?

- ☐ Genel Müdür
- ☐ Mali ve İdari İşlerden Sorumlu Genel Müdür Yardımcısı
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

İŞ ANALİZİ ve İŞ TASARIMI

15. Firmanızda iş analizi yapılıyor mu?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

16. Firmanızda yapılan iş analizi kim/kimler tarafından yürütülüyor?

- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı
- ☐ Danışmanlık şirketleri
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

17. Firmanızda iş analizi hangi sıklıkta yapılmaktadır?

- ☐ Her yıl
- ☐ 2-3 yılda bir
- ☐ 4-5 yılda bir
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

18. Firmanızda uygulanan iş analizi sonuçları aşağıdaki alanlardan hangisi/hangilerinde kullanılıyor? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İş tasarımı
- ☐ Başvuru sağlama
- ☐ İşe alma ve yerleştirme
- ☐ İşe alıştırma (Oryantasyon)
- ☐ Eğitim ve geliştirme
- ☐ Kariyer planlaması
- ☐ Performans değerlendirme/ yönetimi
- ☐ Ücretlendirme
- ☐ Endüstriyel ilişkiler
- ☐ Terfi ve atamalar

☐ Diğer (.....)

19. İş analizi yaparken kullandığınız bilgi toplama yöntemleri nelerdir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Gözlem
☐ Çalışanlarla görüşme
☐ Anketler
☐ Konuyla ilgili uzman grupları
☐ Standart iş analizi formu
☐ Diğer (.....)

BAŞVURU SAĞLAMA

20. Firmanızda aşağıdaki başvuru sağlama yöntemlerinden hangisi/ hangileri kullanılmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
<input type="radio"/> Gazete ilanları	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Danışmanlık firmaları	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> İnternet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Profesyonel dergiler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Üniversitelerin kariyer merkezleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Çalışanların tavsiyesi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Tanıdık vasıtasıyla	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Kendiliğinden Başvuru	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Diğer	(.....)	(.....)

21. Firmanızda kullanılan yöntemlerden en etkili olduğunu/olduklarını düşündüklerinizi işaretleyiniz. **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
<input type="radio"/> Gazete ilanları	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Danışmanlık firmaları	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> İnternet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Profesyonel dergiler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Üniversitelerin kariyer merkezleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Çalışanların tavsiyesi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Tanıdık vasıtasıyla	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Kendiliğinden Başvuru	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Diğer	(.....)	(.....)

22. Boşalan pozisyonları firmanızda çalışan mevcut personele bildiriyor musunuz?

- ☐ Evet
☐ Hayır

23. Boşalan pozisyonları hangi yöntemle/ yöntemlerle çalışanlarınıza bildirirsiniz? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İş yerindeki panolara ilan asma
☐ Organizasyon içi internet ağı

- ☐ Firma dergisi
☐ Diğer (.....)

24. Yapılandırılmış bir “Firma Tanıtım Paketi” (sunum, video kaseti, broşür, vs) var mı?

- ☐ Evet
☐ Hayır

ELEMAN SEÇME

25. Firmanızda kadro planlaması yapılıyor mu?

- ☐ Evet
☐ Hayır

26. Yapılıyorsa bu plan uygulanabiliyor mu?

- ☐ Uygulanıyor
☐ Kısmen Uygulanıyor
☐ Uygulanamıyor

27. Bu plan ne uzunlukta bir süreyi kapsamaktadır?

- ☐ 1 yıldan az
☐ 1-3 yıl
☐ 4-5 yıl
☐ 5 yıldan fazla

28. Firmanızda yapılandırılmış bir eleman seçme sistemi (başvuru yapan kişilerin/adayların hangi aşamalardan hangi sırada geçeceklerinin önceden belirlendiği bir süreç) var mı?

- ☐ Evet
☐ Kısmen
☐ Hayır

29. Aşağıdaki personel seçimi metodlarından hangisi/ hangileri firmanızda uygulanmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
<input type="radio"/> Mülakat	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Yetenek testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Zeka testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Mekanik beceri testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Kişilik ve ilgi envanterleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Mesleki testler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Değerlendirme merkezi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Biyografik bilgiler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Referanslar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Dürüstlük testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Diğer (.....)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

30. Firmanızda kullanılan yöntemlerden en etkili olduğunu/olduklarını düşündüklerinizi işaretleyiniz. **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
<input type="radio"/> Mülakat	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Yetenek testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Zeka testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Mekanik beceri testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Kişilik ve ilgi envanterleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Mesleki testler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Değerlendirme merkezi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Biyografik bilgiler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Referanslar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Dürüstlük testleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Diğer (.....)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31. Aşağıdaki görüşme (mülakat) tekniklerinden hangisini/ hangilerini kullanıyorsunuz? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Birebir görüşme (bir görüşmeci, bir aday)
- ☐ Panel görüşme (bir aday, birkaç görüşmeci)
- ☐ Grup görüşme (bir görüşmeci, birkaç aday)
- ☐ Yapılandırılmış görüşme
- ☐ Yapılandırılmamış görüşme
- ☐ Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

31.b Mülakat sırasında bir puanlama yapılıyor mu?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

ORYANTASYON

32. Firmanızda, işe yeni başlayanlar için standart bir işe alıştırma (oryantasyon) programı var mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

33. İşe alıştırma programının süresi nedir? (.....)

34. İşe alıştırma programı aşağıdaki yöntemlerden hangisini/ hangilerini içermektedir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Firmayı tanıtan yayınlar (broşür, elkitabı vb.)
- ☐ Konferanslar, açık oturumlar, grup toplantıları
- ☐ Görsel teknikler (video, slayt vb.)
- ☐ Firma içi geziler
- ☐ İlk amir, uzmanlar veya kıdemli bir işgören tarafından yürütülen işe alıştırma
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

35. İşe alıştırma programı aşağıdaki kademelerden hangisine/ hangilerine uygulanmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İlk kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Orta kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Üst kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Yönetici olmayan personel
- ☐ Mavi yakalı
- ☐ Yönetici adayları
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

36. Firmanızda deneme süresi uygulaması var mı? Varsa bu süre ne kadardır yazınız.

- ☐ Evet (.....)
- ☐ Hayır

37. Firmanızda, işe alıştırma programının yürütülmesinden kim/kimler sorumludur?

Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.

- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Bölümü
- ☐ Yeni iş görenleri doğrudan yönetecek amirlere
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

EĞİTİM VE GELİŞTİRME

38. Firmanızda bir eğitim departmanı var mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

39. Eğitim departmanı hangi bölüme bağlıdır ve departmanda kaç kişi çalışmaktadır?

(.....)

40. Firmanızdaki eğitim faaliyetleriyle ilgili olarak;

- ☐ Tüm eğitim faaliyetleri işletme içi kariyer planları doğrultusunda aynı departman tarafından planlanmakta ve yürütülmektedir. Lütfen departmanın adını belirtiniz (.....)
- ☐ İşle ilgili ihtiyaçlar doğrultusunda departmanlar tarafından bağımsız olarak planlanmakta ve yürütülmektedir
- ☐ Çalışanlar, ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda yöneticilerinin onayı ile eğitim almaktadırlar.
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

41. Firmanızda aşağıdaki eğitim metodlarından hangisi/ hangileri kullanılmaktadır?

Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.

- ☐ Sınıf içi eğitimler
- ☐ İşbaşı eğitimler
- ☐ Bilgisayar destekli programlar
- ☐ Sesli- görüntülü eğitimler (video, slayt vb.)
- ☐ Simülatörler
- ☐ Rol oynama
- ☐ Oyunlar

☐ Diğer (.....)

42. Firmanızda en çok hangi kademe çalışanlara eğitim verilmektedir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İlk kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Orta kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Üst kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Yönetici olmayan personel
- ☐ Mavi yakalı personel
- ☐ Yönetici adayları
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

43. Çalışanlara verilecek eğitim programları belirlenirken aşağıdaki yöntemlerden hangisini/hangilerini kullanıyorsunuz? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Personel tarafından iletilen talepler
- ☐ Yöneticilerin astları için belirlediği eğitimler
- ☐ Unvanlar bazında alınması gereken eğitimler (Terfi öncesi ve sonrasında)
- ☐ Performans Değerlendirme sonuçlarına göre belirlenen eğitimler
- ☐ Danışmanlık şirketleri tarafından sunulan eğitimlerden seçerek
- ☐ İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı tarafından yapılan ihtiyaç analizi sonuçlarını dikkate alarak
- ☐ Danışmanlık şirketlerine yaptırılan ihtiyaç analizi sonuçlarını dikkate alarak
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

44. Firmanızda eğitim ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesinde aşağıdaki yöntemlerden hangisi/ hangileri kullanılmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Anketler
- ☐ Yüz yüze derinlemesine görüşme
- ☐ Performans değerlendirme sonuçları
- ☐ Değerlendirme merkezi
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

45. Firmanızda sunulan eğitimleri kim/kimler veriyor? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Firmanızda çalışan profesyonel eğitimciler
- ☐ Firma içinde konusunda uzman olan yöneticiler
- ☐ Firma dışından gelen eğitimciler
- ☐ Eğitim danışmanlığı şirketleri eğitimcileri
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

46. Firmanızda verilen eğitimler değerlendirilirken aşağıdaki yöntemlerden hangisi/hangileri kullanılmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Eğitim öncesi ve sonrası uygulanan testler
- ☐ Eğitim sonunda uygulanan katılımcı değerlendirmeleri
- ☐ Eğitimci görüşleri özeti
- ☐ Eğitim danışmanlığını veren firma tarafından hazırlanan değerlendirmeler
- ☐ Performans değerlendirmeleri ile davranış değişikliğinin ölçümü

- ☐ Eğitimin iş sonuçlarına etkisinin veya yatırımın geri dönüş oranının ölçümü
- ☐ Değerlendirme yapılmıyor
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

47. Kişi başına düşen yıllık eğitim saati nedir?

- ☐ Mavi yakalı personel (.....)
- ☐ Beyaz yakalı personel (.....)
- ☐ Yöneticiler (.....)

48. Firmanızda, eğitim faaliyetleri için ayrı bir bütçe var mı?

- ☐ Evet. 2002 yılı eğitim harcamalarınız (yaklaşık olarak)TL
- ☐ Hayır

PERFORMANS DEĞERLENDİRME

49. Firmanızda uygulanan sistematik bir performans değerlendirme sistemi var mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

Firmanızda performans değerlendirme sisteminiz varsa;

50. Standart bir performans değerlendirme formunuz var mı? (elektronik ya da yazılı)

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

51. Bu formdaki değerlendirme kriterleri ;

- ☐ Tüm çalışanlar için aynıdır
- ☐ Organizasyon seviyeleri için aynıdır (ilk kademe yöneticiler, orta kademe yöneticiler)
- ☐ İş grupları için aynıdır
- ☐ Her pozisyon için **ayrıdır**
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

52. Firmanızda uygulanan performans değerlendirme sonuçları hangi alanlarda kullanılmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Ücret ve ek kazançların belirlenmesinde
- ☐ Kariyer planlamasında (terfi, yatay hareketler vb.)
- ☐ Eğitim ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesinde
- ☐ Ödül ve takdir sistemlerinde
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

53. Firmanızda performans değerlendirme hangi sıklıkta yapılmaktadır?

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
3 ay	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6 ay	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1 yıl	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2 yıl	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proje bazında	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diğer(.....)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

54. Firmanızda uygulanan performans değerlendirme sistemi kapsamında değerlendirilen kişileri kim/ kimler değerlendirir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İlk amiri değerlendirir.
- ☐ İkinci amiri değerlendirir.
- ☐ Çalışma arkadaşları değerlendirir.
- ☐ Kişi kendini değerlendirir.
- ☐ Astı değerlendirir.
- ☐ Dış müşteri değerlendirir.
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

55. Aşağıdaki performans değerlendirme ölçümlerinden hangisi/hangileri firmanızda kullanılıyor? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ **Sıralama yöntemi** (çalışanları en yüksek performansa sahip olandan en düşük performansa sahip olana doğru sıralamak)
- ☐ **İkili karşılaştırmalar** (çalışanları ikişer ikişer birbiriyle kıyaslayarak sıralamak)
- ☐ **Zorunlu normal dağılım sıralaması** (çalışanları normal dağılım eğrisine göre gruplara ayırarak sıralamak)
- ☐ **Grafik değerlendirme ölçekleri** (çalışanları performans boyutlarının çeşitli basamaklarla gösterildiği bir ölçek üzerinde değerlendirmek)
- ☐ **Kritik olaylar tekniği** (çalışanın iş yapılırken gösterilen en etkili yada en zayıf davranış örnekleri üzerinden değerlendirilmesi)
- ☐ **Davranış odaklı değerlendirme ölçekleri- BARS** (çalışanları performans boyutlarının davranış cinsinden ifade edildiği bir ölçek üzerinde değerlendirmek)
- ☐ **Davranış gözlemlene ölçekleri- BOS** (çalışanları performans boyutlarının davranış cinsinden tanımlandığı bir ölçek üzerinde davranış gösterme sıklığı açısından değerlendirmek)
- ☐ **Kontrol listesi yöntemi** (Yapılan işle ilgili davranışların yer aldığı bir listenin her bir davranışın söz konusu çalışan tarafından yapılıp yapılmadığını düşünerek işaretlenmesi)
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

56. Firmanızda uygulanan performans değerlendirme sonuçlarını;

- ☐ Değerlendirilen kişi görmez
- ☐ Değerlendirilen kişi görür ve değerlendirenden görüşme talep edilir
- ☐ Değerlendirilen kişi görür ve değerlendiren kişi ile görüşmesi zorunludur
- ☐ Performans değerlendirme karşılıklı yapılır

- ☐ Değerlendiren kişi yazılı olarak değerlendirilen kişiye iletir
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

KARİYER PLANLAMA/ GELİŞTİRME

57. Firmanızda uygulanan bir kariyer planlama ve geliştirme sistemi var mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

58. Firmamızda uygulanan kariyer planlama ve geliştirme sistemi,

- ☐ Organizasyon odaklıdır
- ☐ Personel odaklıdır
- ☐ Hem organizasyon hem personel odaklıdır

59. Firmanızdaki uygulanan kariyer planlama ve geliştirme sistemi aşağıdaki aşamalardan hangisini/ hangilerini içermektedir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İnsan kaynakları planlaması
- ☐ Çalışanların kariyer ilgilerinin saptanması
- ☐ Çalışanların bilgi, beceri, yetenek, tutum ve beklentilerinin saptanması
- ☐ Çalışanların kariyer hedefleri ile organizasyonun sunabileceği olanakların eşleştirilmesi
- ☐ Çalışanların kariyer hedeflerine ulaşmalarına destek olmak için geliştirilmeleri (eğitim verilmesi vb.)

60. Firmanızda kariyer planlama ve geliştirme faaliyetini kim/kimler yürütmektedir?

Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.

- ☐ Kurum içi uzmanlar
- ☐ Kurum dışı uzmanlar
- ☐ Amirler/ yöneticiler
- ☐ Diğer(.....)

61. Çalışanların kariyer hedefleri, bilgi, beceri ve yetenekleri değerlendirilirken;

Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz

- ☐ Çalışanların kendi ifadelerinden yararlanılır
- ☐ Amirlerin ifadelerinden yararlanılır
- ☐ Çalışanların geçmiş dönem performans değerlendirme sonuçlarından yararlanılır
- ☐ Çalışanların geçmiş dönemde aldığı eğitimlerden yararlanılır
- ☐ Çalışanların disiplin bilgilerinden yararlanılır
- ☐ Gerçek ya da bilgisayar simülasyonlarından yararlanılır
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

62. Firmanızda kariyer danışmanlığını üstlenen amirler ya da yöneticiler;

- ☐ Kariyer danışmanlığı üzerine eğitim almışlardır
- ☐ Kariyer danışmanlığı görevleri iş tanımında yer almaktadır
- ☐ Hiç biri

63. Firmanızda, aşağıdaki kariyer geliştirme aktivitelerinden hangisi/hangileri

uygulanmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İş rotasyonu
- ☐ Kurum içi ve dışı kurslar
- ☐ Seminerler/ eğitimler
- ☐ Çalışma grupları
- ☐ Yurt içi ya da dışı yüksek lisans programlarına destek verilmesi
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

İNSANGÜCÜ PLANLAMASI

64. Firmanızda insan gücü planlaması yapılıyor mu?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

65. Firmanızda yapılan insangücü planlaması aşağıdaki aktivitelerden hangisini/hangilerini içerir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Örgütün strateji ve hedeflerinin belirlenmesi
- ☐ Örgütün uygulama ve yöntemlerinin belirlenmesi
- ☐ Örgütün büyüme hızının saptanması
- ☐ İç ve dış insangücü analizlerinin yapılması
- ☐ Arz ve talebe ilişkin tahminlerin yapılması
- ☐ Denge ayarlarının yapılması (Piyasa çalışmaları, eldekileri koruma ya da sayıyı azaltma vb. kararlar)
- ☐ Varolan insan kaynaklarının değerlendirilmesi
- ☐ Tahminde bulunulan zaman dilimi içinde halen varolan insan kaynaklarının ne kadarının işyerinde çalışmaya devam edeceği
- ☐ Tahminde bulunulan zaman diliminde örgütün amaçlarına ulaşabilmesi için çalışanların değerlendirilmesi/ tahmin edilmesi
- ☐ Gerekli kaynakların nasıl ve ne zaman sağlanabileceği konusundaki ölçümlerin yapılması
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

66. Firmanızda yapılan insangücü planlamasında kim/kimler görev almaktadır?

Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.

- ☐ İnsan kaynakları departmanı
- ☐ Diğer departman yöneticileri
- ☐ Üst düzey yöneticiler
- ☐ İnsangücü planlama uzmanı
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

67. Firmanızda insan gücü planlaması ne uzunlukta bir süre için yapılıyor?

- ☐ 1 yıl ya da daha az
- ☐ 2 yıl
- ☐ 2 yıldan fazla
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

ÜCRET ve EK KAZANÇLAR

68. Firmanızda ücret artışlarını aşağıdaki faktörlerden hangisi/hangileri etkilemektedir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Enflasyon
- ☐ Bireysel performans
- ☐ Grup performansı
- ☐ Firma karlılığı/ satışlar
- ☐ Firmada çalışılan süre
- ☐ Öğrenim durumu
- ☐ Terfi
- ☐ Yetenek
- ☐ Kişisel ilişkiler
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

69. Firmanızda çalışanlara yılda kaç kez zam yapılmaktadır?

- ☐ 1 kez
- ☐ 2 kez
- ☐ 3 kez
- ☐ 4 kez
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

70. Firmanızdaki ücret artışlarında rol oynayan faktörler/kişiler nelerdir/ kimlerdir? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
Çalışanın birinci amiri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Çalışanın ikinci amiri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
İnsan kaynakları yöneticisi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Genel Müdür	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yönetim Kurulu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hedeflere ulaşma derecesi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Performans değerlendirme sonuçları	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sayısal olarak belirlenen performans kriterleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diğer (.....)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

71. Firmanızda iş değerlendirme çalışması (ücretlendirmeye esas olacak şekilde işlerin sistematik bir şekilde sıralanması) uygulandı mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

72. İş değerlendirme çalışması yapıldıysa sonuçları ücretlendirmede kullanılıyor mu?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

73. İş değerieme çalışmasında aşağıdaki yöntemlerden hangisi/hangileri kullanıldı?

Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.

- ☐ İş sıralama
- ☐ İş dereceleme
- ☐ Puanlama
- ☐ Faktör karşılaştırma
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

74. Firmanızın ait olduğu sektördeki çalışanların genel olarak nasıl ücretlendirildiğini saptamak üzere bir çalışma yapıldı mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

75. Firmanızda fazla mesai ücreti uygulaması var mı?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

76. Fazla mesai ücreti uygulaması aşağıdaki seviyelerden hangisine/hangilerine uygulanmaktadır? Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.

- ☐ İlk kademe yöneticiler
- ☐ Yönetici olmayan personel
- ☐ Mavi yakalı
- ☐ Yönetici adayları
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

77. Aşağıdaki ek kazançlardan hangileri firmanızda uygulanmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

	Yöneticiler için	Yönetici olmayanlar için
Yemek/yemek fişi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sağlık sigortası	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hayat sigortası	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kaza sigortası	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Özel emeklilik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Araba	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yol parası	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benzin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cep telefonu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ev telefonu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lojman	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ev kirası yardımı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kreş	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Klüp/dernek üyeliği	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yılbaşı ikramiyesi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bayram harçlığı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kar payı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Çocuk yardımı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tahsil yardımı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Yakacak yardımı ☐ ☐
Şarta bağlı sosyal yardımlar ☐ ☐
Diğer (.....)

78. Firmanızda aşağıdaki nakdi teşvik edici yöntemlerden hangisi/hangileri kullanılıyor? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Bireysel prim
- ☐ Grup primi
- ☐ Hisse senedi
- ☐ Kardan pay verme
- ☐ Teşvik edici bir yöntem kullanılmamaktadır.
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

79. Firmanızda aşağıdaki aynı teşvik yöntemlerinden hangisi/hangileri kullanılmaktadır? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Plaket vermek
- ☐ Fazladan tatil imkanları sağlamak
- ☐ Hediyeler vermek
- ☐ Firma dergisinde ya da iş yerindeki panolarda çalışanların başarı öykülerine yer vermek
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

SENDİKAL İLİŞKİLER

80. Firmanızda İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı sendikal ilişkilerin yürütülmesinden sorumlu mu?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

81. Evetse, İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Departmanı aşağıdaki faaliyetlerin hangisinden/ hangilerinden sorumludur? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ Toplu İş Sözleşmesi hazırlık çalışmalarının yapılması
- ☐ Sendikalarla Toplu İş Sözleşmesinin yapılması
- ☐ Sendikaya bağlı çalışanların şikayet ve uyuşmazlıklarının çözülmesi
- ☐ Sendika (merkez ya da şube) temsilcileri ile ilişkilerin düzenlenmesi
- ☐ Toplu İş Sözleşmesinin uygulanması
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

İŞÇİ SAĞLIĞI VE GÜVENLİĞİ

82. Firmanızda çalışanların sağlığını korumak ve güvenliğini sağlamaktan hangi departman sorumludur? (.....)

83. Söz konusu departman aşağıdaki çalışan sağlığı ve güvenliği faaliyetlerinin hangisinden/ hangilerinden sorumludur? **Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz.**

- ☐ İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği programlarını koordine etmek
- ☐ İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği programları hazırlamak
- ☐ Çalışanları İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği konularında eğitmek
- ☐ İş kazalarını analiz etmek ve gerekli önlemleri almak

- ☐ İş kazalarına ilişkin istatistikler tutmak
- ☐ İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliğine ilişkin yasal mevzuata uymak
- ☐ İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği Kurulunda görev almak
- ☐ Çalışan sağlığı ve güvenliği ile ilgili kayıtları tutmak
- ☐ Diğer (.....)

APPENDIX B

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY HRM FUNCTION)

			Job Analysis		
			Not performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	11	11	22
		% within size	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within job analysis	15.9%	8.4%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	20	28	48
		% within size	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
		% within job analysis	29.0%	21.4%	24.0%
	Large	Count	38	92	130
		% within size	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
		% within job analysis	55.1%	70.2%	65.0%
Total	Count		69	131	200
	% within size		34.5%	65.5%	100.0%
	% within job analysis		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .16, $p < .05$, Chi-Square= 5.02, $p > .05$

			Recruitment		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	5	17	22
		% within size	22.7%	77.3%	100.0%
		% within recruitment	26.3%	9.4%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	8	40	48
		% within size	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
		% within recruitment	42.1%	22.1%	24.0%
	Large	Count	6	124	130
		% within size	4.6%	95.4%	100.0%
		% within recruitment	31.6%	68.5%	65.0%
Total	Count		19	181	200
	% within size		9.5%	90.5%	100.0%
	% within recruitment		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .23, $p < .001$, Chi-Square= 10.9 $p < .01$

			Personnel Selection		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	3	19	22
		% within size	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
		% within personnel selection	23.1%	10.2%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	6	42	48
		% within size	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
		% within personnel selection	46.2%	22.5%	24.0%
	Large	Count	4	126	130
		% within size	3.1%	96.9%	100.0%
		% within personnel selection	30.8%	67.4%	65.0%
Total	Count		13	187	200
	% within size		6.5%	93.5%	100.0%
	% within personnel selection		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .19, $p < .01$, Chi-Square= 7.19, $p < .05$

			Training		
			Not performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	4	18	22
		% within size	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
		% within training	12.1%	10.8%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	13	35	48
		% within size	27.1%	72.9%	100.0%
		% within training	39.4%	21.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	16	114	130
		% within size	12.3%	87.7%	100.0%
		% within training	48.5%	68.3%	65.0%
Total	Count		33	167	200
	% within size		16.5%	83.5%	100.0%
	% within training		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .14, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 5.61, $p > .05$

			Performance Management		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	5	17	22
		% within size	22.7%	77.3%	100.0%
		% within performance	12.8%	10.6%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	14	34	48
		% within size	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
		% within performance	35.9%	21.1%	24.0%
	Large	Count	20	110	130
		% within size	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
		% within performance	51.3%	68.3%	65.0%
Total	Count		39	161	200
	% within size		19.5%	80.5%	100.0%
	% within performance		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .13, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 4.41, $p > .05$

			Career Planning		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	12	10	22
		% within size	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within career planning	16.2%	7.9%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	20	28	48
		% within size	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
		% within career planning	27.0%	22.2%	24.0%
	Large	Count	42	88	130
		% within size	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%
		% within career planning	56.8%	69.8%	65.0%
Total	Count		74	126	200
	% within size		37.0%	63.0%	100.0%
	% within career planning		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .14, $p < .05$, Chi-Square= 4.58, $p > .05$

			Employee Relations		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	10	12	22
		% within size	45,5%	54,5%	100,0%
		% within employee relations	9,1%	13,3%	11,0%
	Medium	Count	38	10	48
		% within size	79,2%	20,8%	100,0%
		% within employee relations	34,5%	11,1%	24,0%
	Large	Count	62	68	130
		% within size	47,7%	52,3%	100,0%
		% within employee relations	56,4%	75,6%	65,0%
Total	Count		110	90	200
	% within size		55,0%	45,0%	100,0%
	% within employee relations		100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Spearman rho= .16, $p < .05$, Chi-Square= 14.94, $p < .001$

APPENDIX C

CORRELATIONS AMONG HRM FUNCTIONS

	Job Analysis	Job Design	Recruitment	Personnel Selection	Orientation	Training	Performance	Career Planning	HR Planning	Compensation	Payroll	Transportation	Lunch	Personnel	Health Safety	Employee Relations	Social Services	Quality Management
Job Design	.55**																	
Recruitment	.23**	.15*																
Personnel Selection	.24**	.12	.40**															
Orientation	.40**	.26**	.28**	.33**														
Training	.36**	.21**	.18*	.43**	.72**													
Performance	.47**	.31**	.23**	.38**	.54**	.46**												
Career Planning	.40**	.32**	.14*	.30**	.43**	.38**	.51**											
HR Planning	.45**	.51**	.16*	.16*	.29**	.24**	.38**	.50**										
Compensation	.18*	.21**	.16*	.30**	.15*	.07	.26**	.34**	.29**									
Payroll	-.09	.08	.16*	.03	.12	.05	.06	.07	.11	.29**								
Transportation	.08	.24**	.20**	.06	.18*	.16*	.14	.10	.11	.12	.36**							
Lunch	-.01	.13	.07	.01	.09	.08	.04	-.03	-.05	.18*	.31**	.81**						
Personnel	.02	.12	.19**	.13	.14	.03	.15*	.10	.08	.34**	.68**	.43**	.37**					
Health_Safety	.09	.24**	.15*	-.02	.23**	.19*	.05	.06	.19**	.10	.38**	.40**	.41**	.37**				
Employee Relations	.21**	.29**	.26**	.08	.20**	.10	.24**	.24**	.36**	.27**	.18**	.31**	.17*	.23**	.25**			
Social Services	.02	.06	.10	.02	.05	.10	.07	-.14*	-.09	-.07	.07	.18*	.18*	.11	.16*	.08		
Quality Management	.14	.13	.06	.05	.01	.08	.09	-.02	.10	.09	.05	.11	.09	.02	.05	.16*	.50**	
Administrative Services	.02	.08	-.03	-.06	.01	.01	.03	-.02	-.01	-.05	.11	.11	.15*	.09	.11	.05	.40**	-.04

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX D

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY JOB ANALYSIS METHODS)

			Observation		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	13	9	22
		% within size	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within observation	12.1%	9.7%	11.0%
		% of Total	6.5%	4.5%	11.0%
		Count	22	26	48
	Medium	% within size	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
		% within observation	20.6%	28.0%	24.0%
		% of Total	11.0%	13.0%	24.0%
		Count	72	58	130
		% within size	55.4%	44.6%	100.0%
	Large	% within observation	67.3%	62.4%	65.0%
		% of Total	36.0%	29.0%	65.0%
		Count	107	93	200
		% within size	53.5%	46.5%	100.0%
		% within observation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	53.5%	46.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= -.04, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 1.60, $p > .05$

			Employee Interview		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	12	10	22
		% within size	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within employee interview	15.0%	8.3%	11.0%
		% of Total	6.0%	5.0%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	22	26	48
		% within size	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
		% within employee interview	27.5%	21.7%	24.0%
		% of Total	11.0%	13.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	46	84	130
		% within size	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within employee interview	57.5%	70.0%	65.0%
		% of Total	23.0%	42.0%	65.0%
Total	Count		80	120	200
	% within size		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within employee interview		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		40.0%	60.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .14, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 3.77, $p > .05$

			Questionnaire		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	14	8	22
		% within size	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
		% within questionnaire	10.4%	12.3%	11.0%
		% of Total	7.0%	4.0%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	34	14	48
		% within size	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
		% within questionnaire	25.2%	21.5%	24.0%
		% of Total	17.0%	7.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	87	43	130
		% within size	66.9%	33.1%	100.0%
		% within questionnaire	64.4%	66.2%	65.0%
		% of Total	43.5%	21.5%	65.0%
Total	Count		135	65	200
	% within size		67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
	% within questionnaire		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		67.5%	32.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .01, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= .41, $p > .05$

Specialist Sample

SIZE			Not	Performed	Total
			Performed		
SIZE	Small	Count	17	5	22
		% within size	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%
		% within Specialist sample	12.7%	7.6%	11.0%
		% of Total	8.5%	2.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	34	14	48
		% within size	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
		% within Specialist sample	25.4%	21.2%	24.0%
		% of Total	17.0%	7.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	83	47	130
		% within size	63.8%	36.2%	100.0%
		% within Specialist sample	61.9%	71.2%	65.0%
		% of Total	41.5%	23.5%	65.0%
Total		Count	134	66	200
		% within size	67.0%	33.0%	100.0%
		% within Specialist sample	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	67.0%	33.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .10, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 1.95, $p > .05$

JA Form					
SIZE			Not	Performed	Total
			Performed		
SIZE	Small	Count	17	5	22
		% within size	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%
		% within JA form	12.0%	8.6%	11.0%
		% of Total	8.5%	2.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	38	10	48
		% within size	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
		% within JA form	26.8%	17.2%	24.0%
		% of Total	19.0%	5.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	87	43	130
		% within size	66.9%	33.1%	100.0%
		% within JA form	61.3%	74.1%	65.0%
		% of Total	43.5%	21.5%	65.0%
Total		Count	142	58	200
		% within size	71.0%	29.0%	100.0%
		% within JA form	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	71.0%	29.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .12, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 3.03, $p > .05$

APPENDIX E

CORRELATIONS AMONG HRM FUNCTIONS IN WHICH RESULTS OF JOB ANALYSIS WERE USED

	Job Design	Recruitment	Selection	Orientation	Training	Career Planning	Performance	Compensation	Industrial Relations	Promotion	Job Evaluation	Position Analysis
Recruitment	.37**											
Selection	.45**	.60**										
Orientation	.29**	.56**	.42**									
Training	.49**	.47**	.61**	.48**								
Career Planning	.45**	.38**	.39**	.30**	.50**							
Performance	.34**	.37**	.38**	.40**	.49**	.45**						
Compensation	.47**	.46**	.52**	.24**	.47**	.31**	.45**					
Industrial Relations	.38**	.23**	.11	.18*	.25**	.25**	.29**	.20**				
Promotion	.41**	.36**	.37**	.28**	.43**	.51**	.47**	.50**	.24**			
Job Evaluation	-.05	.10	.07	-.04	-.07	.09	-.06	.07	-.03	-.06		
Position Norm Analysis	.09	-.05	-.07	-.04	-.07	-.05	-.06	.07	-.03	-.06	-.01	
Process Improvement	-.08	.14*	.10	.17*	.10	.13*	.11	-.10	-.04	-.08	-.01	-.01

*P< .05, **P<.01

APPENDIX F

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY METHODS USED TO SELECT MANAGERS)

			Interview		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE					
	Small	Count	5	17	22
		% within size	22.7%	77.3%	100.0%
		% within interview	16.7%	10.0%	11.0%
		% of Total	2.5%	8.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	2	46	48
		% within size	4.2%	95.8%	100.0%
		% within interview	6.7%	27.1%	24.0%
		% of Total	1.0%	23.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	23	107	130
		% within size	17.7%	82.3%	100.0%
		% within interview	76.7%	62.9%	65.0%
		% of Total	11.5%	53.5%	65.0%
Total		Count	30	170	200
		% within size	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%
		% within interview	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= -.07, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 6.19, $p < .05$

			Personality Tests		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	13	9	22
		% within size	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within personality tests	10.4%	12.0%	11.0%
		% of Total	6.5%	4.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	26	22	48
		% within size	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
		% within personality tests	20.8%	29.3%	24.0%
		% of Total	13.0%	11.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	86	44	130
		% within size	66.2%	33.8%	100.0%
		% within personality tests	68.8%	58.7%	65.0%
		% of Total	43.0%	22.0%	65.0%
Total		Count	125	75	200
		% within size	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
		% within personality and interest inventories	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= -.10, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 2.27, $p > .05$

			References		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	9	13	22
		% within size	40.9%	59.1%	100.0%
		% within references	12.9%	10.0%	11.0%
		% of Total	4.5%	6.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	21	27	48
		% within size	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%
		% within references	30.0%	20.8%	24.0%
		% of Total	10.5%	13.5%	24.0%
	Large	Count	40	90	130
		% within size	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
		% within references	57.1%	69.2%	65.0%
		% of Total	20.0%	45.0%	65.0%
Total		Count	70	130	200
		% within size	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
		% within references	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .12, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 2.98, $p > .05$

APPENDIX G

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY METHODS USED TO SELECT NON MANAGERS)

			Interview		
			Not performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	2	20	22
		% within size	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
		% within interview	13.3%	10.8%	11.0%
		% of Total	1.0%	10.0%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	4	44	48
		% within size	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
		% within interview	26.7%	23.8%	24.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	22.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	9	121	130
		% within size	6.9%	93.1%	100.0%
		% within interview	60.0%	65.4%	65.0%
		% of Total	4.5%	60.5%	65.0%
Total			Count	15	185
			% within size	7.5%	92.5%
			% within interview	100.0%	100.0%
			% of Total	7.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .03, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= .19, $p > .05$

			Personality Tests		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	13	9	22
		% within size	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within personality tests	11.1%	10.8%	11.0%
		% of Total	6.5%	4.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	28	20	48
		% within size	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
		% within personality tests	23.9%	24.1%	24.0%
		% of Total	14.0%	10.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	76	54	130
		% within size	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
		% within personality tests	65.0%	65.1%	65.0%
		% of Total	38.0%	27.0%	65.0%
Total			Count	117	83
			% within size	58.5%	41.5%
			% within personality tests	100.0%	100.0%
			% of Total	58.5%	41.5%

Spearman rho= .002, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= .004, $p > .05$

			References		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	10	12	22
		% within size	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
		% within references	16.1%	8.7%	11.0%
		% of Total	5.0%	6.0%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	17	31	48
		% within size	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within references	27.4%	22.5%	24.0%
		% of Total	8.5%	15.5%	24.0%
	Large	Count	35	95	130
		% within size	26.9%	73.1%	100.0%
		% within references	56.5%	68.8%	65.0%
		% of Total	17.5%	47.5%	65.0%
Total			Count	62	138
			% within size	31.0%	69.0%
			% within references	100.0%	100.0%
			% of Total	31.0%	69.0%

Spearman rho= .13, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 3.60, $p > .05$

APPENDIX H

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY KINDS OF INTERVIEWS)

			One to One Interview		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	3	19	22
		% within size	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
		% within one to one interview	10.7%	11.0%	11.0%
		% of Total	1.5%	9.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	4	44	48
		% within size	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
		% within one to one interview	14.3%	25.6%	24.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	22.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	21	109	130
		% within size	16.2%	83.8%	100.0%
		% within one to one interview	75.0%	63.4%	65.0%
		% of Total	10.5%	54.5%	65.0%
Total	Count		28	172	200
	% within size		14.0%	86.0%	100.0%
	% within one to one interview		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		14.0%	86.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= -.08, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 1.78, $p > .05$

		Panel Interview		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	9	13	22
	% within size	40.9%	59.1%	100.0%
	% within panel interview	9.4%	12.5%	11.0%
	% of Total	4.5%	6.5%	11.0%
Medium	Count	22	26	48
	% within size	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
	% within panel interview	22.9%	25.0%	24.0%
	% of Total	11.0%	13.0%	24.0%
Large	Count	65	65	130
	% within size	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within panel interview	67.7%	62.5%	65.0%
	% of Total	32.5%	32.5%	65.0%
Total	Count	96	104	200
	% within size	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	% within panel interview	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= -.06, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= .74, $p > .05$

			Structured Interview		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
			Performed		
SIZE Small	Count		18	4	22
	% within size		81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
	% within structured interview		11.8%	8.3%	11.0%
	% of Total		9.0%	2.0%	11.0%
Medium	Count		43	5	48
	% within size		89.6%	10.4%	100.0%
	% within structured interview		28.3%	10.4%	24.0%
	% of Total		21.5%	2.5%	24.0%
Large	Count		91	39	130
	% within size		70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	% within structured interview		59.9%	81.3%	65.0%
	% of Total		45.5%	19.5%	65.0%
Total	Count		152	48	200
	% within size		76.0%	24.0%	100.0%
	% within structured interview		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		76.0%	24.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .18, $p < .05$, Chi-Square= 7.83, $p < .05$

		Unstructured Interview		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	20	2	22
	% within size	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
	% within unstructured interview	11.8%	6.5%	11.0%
	% of Total	10.0%	1.0%	11.0%
Medium	Count	44	4	48
	% within size	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	% within unstructured interview	26.0%	12.9%	24.0%
	% of Total	22.0%	2.0%	24.0%
Large	Count	105	25	130
	% within size	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
	% within unstructured interview	62.1%	80.6%	65.0%
	% of Total	52.5%	12.5%	65.0%
Total	Count	169	31	200
	% within size	84.5%	15.5%	100.0%
	% within unstructured interview	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	84.5%	15.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .14, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 3.95, $p > .05$

APPENDIX I

CORRELATIONS AMONG METHODS OF ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

	Brochures/ Handbooks	Conferences/ Group Meetings	Visual Techniques	Trips
Conferences/Group Meetings	.23**			
Visual Techniques	.44**	.28**		
Trips	.47	.20	.34	
Orientation by Managers	.46	.15	.24	.61

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX J

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE POSITIONS THAT ORIENTATION PROGRAMS WERE APPLIED FOR

	First Level Managers	Middle Level Managers	High Level Managers	Non- managers	Blue Collar	MT
Middle Level Managers	.62**					
High Level Managers	.45**	.54**				
Non- managers	.43	.37	.24			
Blue Collar	.38**	.36**	.30**	.41**		
MT	.46**	.47**	.31**	.49**	.49**	
MT Interns	.01	.11	.07	.09	.05	.13

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX K

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY TRAINING METHODS)

		Lecture		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	10	12	22
	% within size	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	% within lecture	17.5%	8.4%	11.0%
	% of Total	5.0%	6.0%	11.0%
Medium	Count	15	33	48
	% within size	31.3%	68.8%	100.0%
	% within lecture	26.3%	23.1%	24.0%
	% of Total	7.5%	16.5%	24.0%
Large	Count	32	98	130
	% within size	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%
	% within lecture	56.1%	68.5%	65.0%
	% of Total	16.0%	49.0%	65.0%
Total	Count	57	143	200
	% within size	28.5%	71.5%	100.0%
	% within lecture	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	28.5%	71.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .13, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 4.24, $p > .05$

		On the Job Training		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	7	15	22
	% within size	31.8%	68.2%	100.0%
	% within on the job training	12.7%	10.3%	11.0%
	% of Total	3.5%	7.5%	11.0%
Medium	Count	16	32	48
	% within size	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within on the job training	29.1%	22.1%	24.0%
	% of Total	8.0%	16.0%	24.0%
Large	Count	32	98	130
	% within size	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%
	% within on the job training	58.2%	67.6%	65.0%
	% of Total	16.0%	49.0%	65.0%
Total	Count	55	145	200
	% within size	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%
	% within on the job training	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%
Spearman rho= .08, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 1.57, $p > .05$				

APPENDIX L

CORRELATIONS AMONG METHODS OF NEED ANALYSIS

	Questionnaires	Interview	PA Results	AC
Interview	-.28**			
PA Results	.05	-.15*		
AC	-.07	.05	-.22**	
Manager Suggestions	-.09	-.06	-.15*	-.066

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX M

CORRELATIONS AMONG METHODS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

	Rank Order	Paired Comparison	Forced Distribution	GRS	Critical Incidence	BARS	BOS	Checklist
Paired Comparison	.17*							
Forced Distribution	.09	.07						
Graphic Rating	-.01	.14*	.07					
Critical Incidence	.05	.01	.09	.08				
BARS	-.03	.03	.01	.17*	.12			
BOS	-.02	.04	.08	.13	.13	.25**		
Checklist	-.01	.07	.09	.12	.37**	.32**	.15*	
Objective Cards	-.13	-.07	-.01	-.09	.10	-.06	.14	-.01

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX N

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL METHODS)

			Rank Order		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	17	5	22
		% within size	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%
		% within rank order	11.5%	9.6%	11.0%
		% of Total	8.5%	2.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	31	17	48
		% within size	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
		% within rank order	20.9%	32.7%	24.0%
		% of Total	15.5%	8.5%	24.0%
	Large	Count	100	30	130
		% within size	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
		% within rank order	67.6%	57.7%	65.0%
		% of Total	50.0%	15.0%	65.0%
Total	Count		148	52	200
	% within size		74.0%	26.0%	100.0%
	% within rank order		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		74.0%	26.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= -.07, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 2.91, $p > .05$

			Forced Distribution		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	20	2	22
		% within size	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within forced distribution	11.4%	8.0%	11.0%
		% of Total	10.0%	1.0%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	41	7	48
		% within size	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%
		% within forced distribution	23.4%	28.0%	24.0%
		% of Total	20.5%	3.5%	24.0%
	Large	Count	114	16	130
		% within size	87.7%	12.3%	100.0%
		% within forced distribution	65.1%	64.0%	65.0%
		% of Total	57.0%	8.0%	65.0%
Total	Count		175	25	200
	% within size		87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	% within forced distribution		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		87.5%	12.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .001, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= .43, $p > .05$

			Graphic Rating		
			Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE	Small	Count	21	1	22
		% within size	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%
		% within graphic rating	12.2%	3.6%	11.0%
		% of Total	10.5%	.5%	11.0%
	Medium	Count	40	8	48
		% within size	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within graphic rating	23.3%	28.6%	24.0%
		% of Total	20.0%	4.0%	24.0%
	Large	Count	111	19	130
		% within size	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%
		% within graphic rating	64.5%	67.9%	65.0%
		% of Total	55.5%	9.5%	65.0%
Total		Count	172	28	200
		% within size	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
		% within graphic rating	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .04, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 1.96, $p > .05$

APPENDIX O

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE FUNCTIONS IN WHICH PERFORMANCE RESULTS WERE USED

	Compensation and Benefits	Career Planning	Training Needs
Career Planning	.50**		
Training Needs	.60**	.52**	
Reward Management	.37**	.41**	.30**

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX P

CORRELATIONS AMONG ASSESSORS OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

	First Level Supervisor	Second Level Manager	Colleagues	Self	Sub- Ordinate	Customer	HRM	360 Feedback
Second Level Manager	.34**							
Colleagues	.16*	.13						
Self	.33**	.26**	.15*					
Sub-Ordinate	.06	.09	.47**	.18*				
Customer	.13	.03	.22**	.27**	.02			
HRM	.10	.11	-.06	.15*	-.04	-.03		
360 Feedback	.06	.12	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.01	
Executive Committee	.06	.12	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.01	-.01

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX Q

CROSSTAB ANALYSIS (ORGANIZATION SIZE BY CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES)

		Job Rotation		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	17	5	22
	% within size	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%
	% within job rotation	12.1%	8.3%	11.0%
	% of Total	8.5%	2.5%	11.0%
Medium	Count	38	10	48
	% within size	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
	% within job rotation	27.1%	16.7%	24.0%
	% of Total	19.0%	5.0%	24.0%
Large	Count	85	45	130
	% within size	65.4%	34.6%	100.0%
	% within job rotation	60.7%	75.0%	65.0%
	% of Total	42.5%	22.5%	65.0%
Total	Count	140	60	200
	% within size	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	% within job rotation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .13, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 3.79, $p > .05$

		Courses		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	16	6	22
	% within size	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
	% within courses	12.5%	8.3%	11.0%
	% of Total	8.0%	3.0%	11.0%
Medium	Count	35	13	48
	% within size	72.9%	27.1%	100.0%
	% within courses	27.3%	18.1%	24.0%
	% of Total	17.5%	6.5%	24.0%
Large	Count	77	53	130
	% within size	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
	% within courses	60.2%	73.6%	65.0%
	% of Total	38.5%	26.5%	65.0%
Total	Count	128	72	200
	% within size	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%
	% within courses	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .13, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= 3.67, $p > .05$

		Seminars/Trainings		
		Not Performed	Performed	Total
SIZE Small	Count	15	7	22
	% within size	68.2%	31.8%	100.0%
	% within seminars/trainings	11.3%	10.4%	11.0%
	% of Total	7.5%	3.5%	11.0%
Medium	Count	33	15	48
	% within size	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
	% within seminars/trainings	24.8%	22.4%	24.0%
	% of Total	16.5%	7.5%	24.0%
Large	Count	85	45	130
	% within size	65.4%	34.6%	100.0%
	% within seminars/trainings	63.9%	67.2%	65.0%
	% of Total	42.5%	22.5%	65.0%
Total	Count	133	67	200
	% within size	66.5%	33.5%	100.0%
	% within seminars/trainings	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	66.5%	33.5%	100.0%

Spearman rho= .03, $p > .05$, Chi-Square= .21, $p > .05$

APPENDIX R

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE ACTIVITIES OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT

	Job Rotation	Courses	Seminars/ Trainings	Work Groups	Master Programs
Courses	.37**				
Seminars/ Trainings	.48**	.59**			
Work Groups	.37**	.38**	.33**		
Master Programs	.38**	.36**	.38**	.11	
Development Centers	.10	-.01	.09	-.06	.10

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX S

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CAREER PLANNING

	Specialist In the Firm	Specialist Outside the Firm	Managers/ Supervisors
Specialist Outside the Firm	.01		
Managers/Supervisors	.25**	-.07	
HRM Department	.004	.10	.21**

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX T

CORRELATIONS AMONG HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING

	Strategies	Methods	Development	Manpower	Demand-	Supply	Equilibrium	Manpower	Existing	Employee
			Speed	Analysis				Evaluation	Manpower	Evaluation
Methods	.51**									
Development										
Speed	.53**	.41**								
Manpower										
Analysis	.41**	.43**	.49**							
Demand-										
Supply	.29**	.30**	.36**	.35**						
Equilibrium	.23**	.24**	.25**	.22**	.35**					
Manpower										
Evaluation	.39**	.32**	.44**	.37**	.35**	.44**				
Existing										
Manpower	.23**	.25**	.20**	.24**	.27**	.54**	.52**			
Employee										
Evaluation	.32**	.41**	.20**	.31**	.19**	.36**	.43**	.68**		
Source										
Analysis	.24**	.35**	.29**	.31**	.21**	.48**	.56**	.56**	.60**	

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX U

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE FACTORS THAT AFFECT SALARY INCREMENT

	Inflation	Performance	Group Performance	Profit	Experience	Education	Appointment	Skill	Relations	Wage Research
Performance	.26**									
Group Performance	.08	.20**								
Profit	.32**	.30**	.17*							
Experience	.12	.10	.10	.09						
Education	.13	.15*	.18*	.10	.38**					
Appointment	.29**	.34**	.21**	.21**	.13	.26**				
Ability	.11	.09	.23**	.10	.27**	.27**	.11			
Relations	-.05	-.04	.17*	.07	.21**	.20**	-.002	.15*		
Wage Research	-.04	.08	.05	-.09	.05	.05	.03	-.05	-.04	
Collective Bargaining	-.10	-.09	-.03	-.06	-.04	-.04	-.05	-.03	-.03	-.01

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX V

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE FACTORS AND INDIVIDUALS PLAYING A ROLE IN MANAGERS' SALARY INCREMENT

	First Level Manager	Second Level Manager	HR Manager	General Manager	EC	Attaining Objectives	PA Results	Numerical PA Criteria	Collective Bargaining	Wage Research
Second Level Manager	.21**									
HR Manager	.06	.08								
General Manager	.05	-.08	.18*							
EC	-.06	-.06	-.09	.19**						
Attaining Objectives	.12	.05	.27**	.14*	-.004					
PA Results	.12	.08	.17*	.20**	.03	.36**				
Numerical PA Criteria	.05	-.003	.10	.11	.14*	.28**	.30**			
Collective Bargaining	-.10	-.05	-.05	.02	.15*	-.05	.15*	.11		
Wage Research	-.10	-.05	-.05	-.08	-.07	.07	.15*	-.04	-.01	
Job Evaluation	.07	.13	.13	.09	-.05	.04	.12	-.03	-.01	-.01

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX W

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE FACTORS AND INDIVIDUALS

PLAYING A ROLE IN NON-MANAGERS' SALARY INCREMENT

	First Level Manager	Second Level Manager	HR Manager	General Manager	EC	Attaining Objectives	PA Results	Numerical PA Criteria	Collective Bargaining	Wage Research
Second Level Manager	.21**									
HR Manager	.13	.17*								
General Manager	.16*	.08	.21**							
EC	-.02	-.03	-.02	.17*						
Attaining Objectives	.12	.08	.12	.04	.02					
PA Results	.15*	.06	.16*	.04	.06	.36**				
Numerical PA Criteria	.04	.11	.10	-.004	.12	.25**	.28**			
Collective Bargaining	-.16*	-.08	-.08	-.01	.01	-.07	.08	.08		
Wage Research	-.13	-.07	-.07	-.08	-.07	.06	.13	-.04	-.01	
Job Evaluation	.05	.11	.10	.09	-.05	-.04	.09	-.03	-.01	-.01

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX X

CORRELATIONS AMONG MANAGERS' BENEFITS

	Food Service	Health Insurance	Life Insurance	Accident Insurance	Special Retirement	Car Allowance	Travel Allowance	Gasoline	Mobile Phone	Home Phone	Free Apartment	Rent Help	Kinder Garden	Club Membership	New Year Premium	Festival Premium	Profit Sharing	Children Allowance	Education Allowance	Fuel Allowance	Social Benefits
Health Insurance	.27**																				
Life Insurance	.17*	.37**																			
Accident Insurance	.16*	.26**	.28**																		
Special Retirement	.09	.19**	.28**	.16*																	
Car	.28**	.18**	.11	.17*	.02																
Travel Allowance	.29**	.11	-.04	-.08	.06	.10															
Gasoline	.28**	.17*	.09	.23**	.01	.52**	.23**														
Mobile Phone	.30**	.30**	.17*	.28**	.18*	.48**	.06	.30**													
Home Phone	.09	-.03	-.04	-.09	.10	.07	.004	.06	.01												
Free Apartment	.12	.08	.02	.06	.24**	.06	-.08	.04	.13	.27**											
Rent Help	.16*	-.02	.19**	.23**	.15*	.08	-.03	.17*	.05	.14*	.08										
Kinder Garden	.17*	.07	.17*	-.12	.10	-.07	-.05	-.04	.01	.27**	.25**	.09									
Club Membership	.13	.13	.15*	.09	.15*	.05	.07	-.03	.20**	.26**	.03	.07	.35**								
New Year Premium	.26**	.07	-.06	.001	.08	.15*	.12	.12	.09	.08	.13	.22**	.18*	.08							
Festival Premium	.24**	.12	.03	.25**	.04	.18*	.22**	.25**	.14*	.09	-.01	.17*	.06	.01	.25**						
Profit Sharing	.08	.15*	.10	.04	.18*	.11	.03	-.01	.14*	.09	.14	-.07	.13	.17*	.11	.10					
Children Allowance	.27**	.15*	-.07	.16*	.003	.24**	.12	.18*	.15*	.14*	-.07	.03	.03	.17*	.24**	.59**	.13				
Education Allowance	.24**	.07	-.01	.15*	-.01	.36**	.07	.28**	.17*	-.02	-.07	.04	-.02	.04	.19**	.36**	0.01	.56**			
Fuel Allowance	.25**	.09	.06	.18*	-.03	.23**	.03	.19**	.04	.04	-.004	.19**	-.02	-.01	.17*	.52**	.04	.55**	.46**		
Social Benefits	.23**	.13	.04	.07	-.03	.1	.03	.13	.09	-.02	.10	-.02	.13	-.07	.26**	.27**	.19**	.35**	.30**	.43**	
Food Allowance	-.11	-.06	-.04	.14	-.03	.06	-.05	.07	.08	-.02	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.04	.11	-.03	-.04	.15*	-.04	-.03

*p<.05, *p<.01

APPENDIX Y

CORRELATIONS AMONG NON-MANAGERS' BENEFITS

	Food Service	Health Insurance	Life Insurance	Accident Insurance	Special Retirement	Car	Travel	Gas	Mobile Phone	Home Phone	Free Flat	Rent Help	Kinder Garden	Club Member	New Year Premium	Festival Premium	Profit	Children Allowance	Education Allowance	Social Benefits
Health Insurance	.22**																			
Life Insurance	.17*	.38**																		
Accident Insurance	.15*	.19**	.20**																	
Special Retirement	.14	.21	.06	.10																
Car	.08	-.01	.09	-.03	-.6															
Travel	.24**	.10	-.08	-.10	-.02	.09														
Gas	.12	.09	.20**	.15*	.17*	.20**	-.001													
Mobile Phone	.19	.06	.04	.01	-.004	.42**	.13	.20**												
Home Phone	.02	.003	.10	.13	.15*	-.05	-.08	-.07	-.05											
Free Flat	.16*	-.002	.05	.13	.04	.12	-.03	.002	-.02	.09										
Rent Help	.05	.04	-.04	.17*	.01	-.07	.09	.18*	-.12	-.06	.02									
Kinder Garden	.09	.06	.07	.06	.05	.07	.14*	-.04	-.02	.13	.08	-.06								
Club Member	.16*	.11	.26**	.16*	.04	.001	-.06	.14*	.01	.37**	.11	-.03	.22**							
New Year Premium	.17*	-.05	-.04	.17*	-.13	.23**	.06	.08	.15*	.004	.03	.13	.08	.05						
Festival Premium	.24**	.10	-.08	.03	-.07	.04	.26**	-.12	.07	-.05	.01	.12	.17*	.02	.16*					
Profit	.15*	.02	.04	.09	-.06	-.05	.06	-.04	.01	.28**	.05	.14*	.08	.18*	.02	.04				
Children Allowance	.27**	.02	-.06	.10	.04	-.03	.15*	-.04	-.03	.03	.13	.17*	.06	.03	.09	.48**	.04			
Education Allowance	.27**	.04	.15*	.10	-.04	.02	-.02	-.14*	-.09	.11	.10	.03	.12	.08	.26**	.42**	.02	.46**		
Fuel	.32**	-.03	-.03	.09	-.02	.01	.16*	-.19**	-.09	.08	.15*	.10	.12	-.03	.15*	.53**	.12	.60**	.54**	
Social Benefits	.27**	.05	.13	.18*	.04	.12	.13	.10	.01	.08	.06	.23**	.18*	.10	.15*	.39**	.08	.32**	.36**	.29**
Food Allowance	-.12	-.06	-.03	.2	-.02	-.02	-.06	-.03	-.02	-.01	-.01	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.03	.09	-.02	-.05	-.04	-.05

*p< .05, **p< .01

APPENDIX Z

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE METHODS OF JOB EVALUATION

	Job Ranking	Job Grading	Scoring
Job Grading	.33**		
Scoring	.16*	.27**	
Factor Comparison	.17*	.11	.28**

*p< .05, **p< .01