

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10436280>

Accepted: 01.11.2023

## Examination Of Talent Management And Employee Performance Levels Of Public Servants

**Kerem SINDIR**

Uzman, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, İşletme Yönetimi  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6512-3041>

**Serdal GÜNDÜZ**

Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, İşletme Yönetimi  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8980-7956>

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the talent management and employee performance levels of public servants. The population of the study consists of public servants aged between 18 and 65 in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). A total of 301 individuals were included in the study using the random sampling method. The data collection tools used in the study include a Personal Information Form, Talent Management Scale, and Employee Performance Scale. The analysis of the study was conducted using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 26.0 software. In this study, it was found that there is a positive and statistically significant correlation between participants' overall scores on the Talent Management Scale and sub-scores of management style, career development, competency, as well as the overall scores on the Employee Performance Scale and sub-scores of organizational culture, motivation, rewards and performance, and job execution. Furthermore, the study revealed that the overall scores on the Talent Management Scale statistically significantly and positively predicted the scores on the Employee Performance Scale.

**Keywords:** Talent, talent management, performance, employee performance, public servant.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary world, globalization has led to significant changes in the business environment. Organizations need to sustain their operations and differentiate themselves from competitors in the areas where they provide services. In this context, it is evident that organizations need to efficiently utilize and manage their human resources. Modern work life has shifted competition from production-focused goals to differentiation in accordance with the new world order. Accordingly, the new competitive arena for organizations is to attract the most talented employees. The knowledge individuals possess is a crucial talent; integrating individuals with high education levels and extensive knowledge into businesses, ensuring their loyalty, and retaining them has become increasingly challenging. Organizations need to develop strategies in their relevant departments to employ knowledgeable and talented individuals in the required units and positions. In other words, organizations should classify individuals based on their talents and knowledge and subsequently manage them based on their qualifications and

characteristics. Especially in recent years, the concepts of talent and talent management have emerged in the business world. Talent refers to the intellectual and physical capacities individuals use to exhibit specific cognitive skills such as understanding, analyzing, solving problems, and reaching conclusions (Ceylan, 2007). Talent management represents a comprehensive and integrated process developed to create successful organizations. In other words, talent management is an approach that encompasses organizational activities such as planning, recruitment, training, discovering talents, and retaining existing talents within the organization, requiring communication and collaboration among organizational leaders (Çelik, 2011).

To keep up with the increasing competition in globalization, organizations need to be "successful." In successful organizations, human and talent factors take precedence. In other words, organizations need goal-oriented employees with knowledge and skills that align with the requirements of the era. From this perspective, the most valuable asset for organizations is "talented" employees. Therefore, to retain talented employees and gain competitive advantage, organizations need to employ skilled workers and follow policies that enhance career development opportunities, in-service training, and organizational commitment levels (Fukofuka, 2014). This phenomenon is related to talent management. Organizations' performance increases to the same extent as they correctly structure talent management policies, allowing them to achieve organizational goals and gain a more advantageous position compared to their competitors.

The concepts of talent management and performance intersect in revealing the latent power of talented employees. It is evident that achieving the corporate objectives of businesses, a crucial element in reaching organizational goals, will be possible through effective talent management practices in employee performance (Gharib, Kahwaji, and Elrasheed, 2017). Relevant studies report that effective talent management and performance management positively impact important dynamics within the organization, such as employee motivation, performance, productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. In this context, this study evaluates the impact of talent management practices in public institutions in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) on employee performance. The study also examines talent management practices and employee performance within the framework of individuals' sociodemographic characteristics.

## 2. LITERATURE

### 2.1 *Concept of Talent*

Talent is defined as the entirety of a person's intellectual abilities, such as understanding specific relationships, analyzing, solving problems, and achieving results, as well as physical qualities that enable them to master certain skills. In this context, talent represents the mental and physical capacities individuals utilize in exhibiting their behaviors (Ceylan, 2007). From the perspective of the working environment, talent is a dynamic structure that allows the capacities of individuals to be revealed and developed to serve the visions and missions of organizations in continuously changing organizational conditions and in the conditions required by the global labor market (Turan, 2015). The driving force behind the increasingly important human resources process is the talents carried by employees. Since talented employees are valuable, creative forces that create and produce value, and are challenging to find, organizations need to attract, retain, and bind them to the organization (Çeliktenten et al., 2019).

### 2.2 *Concept of Talent Management*

The increasing importance of globalization, knowledge, and technology has propelled organizations into a highly competitive environment. This situation has compelled organizations to make decisions that align with changing human needs and competition.

Competition also revolves around attracting, developing, and retaining talented and high-potential employees. Talent management has emerged as a product of this competition (Boz, 2019). Talent management is a comprehensive and integrated process developed to create excellent organizations (Çelik, 2011).

Talent management is an approach that encompasses organizational activities such as planning, recruitment, training and development, discovering talents, and retaining existing talents within the organization, requiring communication and collaboration among organizational leaders. Talent management is a set of strategies that attract, develop, and retain individuals with the necessary skills and abilities to meet the current and future needs of the organization, maximizing their benefits from existing resources (Bayraktar and Alayoğlu, 2018). Talent management is a phenomenon created by managers aiming to appoint the right employee to the right position at the right time. The concept can also be defined as the entirety of activities that contribute to the success of the organization by identifying, training, developing, and nurturing talented personnel towards the goals of the organization (Demirkasımoğlu and Taşkın, 2014). The characteristics of talent management that contribute to the success of organizations and provide an advantage against competitors can be listed as follows (Gündüzalp and Özan, 2018):

- Effective talent management enhances the productivity of human resources, contributing to an increase in gains related to productivity.
- Organizational strategies related to talent management are developed by top management.
- Strategies developed for talent management are in harmony with the overall strategies of the organization. Additionally, these strategies bring out the competencies and skills of the leaders.
- Successful talent management analysis is necessary for effective performance evaluation and reward processes.
- Practices such as talent development programs, coaching, and mentoring are based on theory and practice.
- An organization's ability to gain an advantage over its competitors is possible by creating more economic value than them. In addition to gaining a competitive advantage, sustaining and growing it is crucial. One of the determining factors for sustainability and growth is the human resources. Human resources are unique, non-imitable, and non-replicable, making them a decisive factor (Alayoğlu, 2010).

Talent management is a part of human resources management and aims to employ, develop, manage performance, and retain a unique and non-imitable workforce. Additionally, it motivates employees on the path to success (Öztrak and Bayram, 2020). Talent is at the core of significant activities such as having innovative ideas, creating value by utilizing these ideas, launching new products by producing them, creating differentiation in products/services, increasing productivity to reduce costs and enhance profitability, and strengthening teamwork. Organizations with employees focused on self-improvement and job development differentiate themselves in the market by producing unique goods/services compared to their competitors. Effective talent management is identified as the underlying factor for this success (Johnson and Christensen, 2019). On the other hand, talent management prevents resource waste by ensuring the appointment of talented individuals to key positions within the organization.

### *2.3 Concept of Employee Performance*

The concept of performance is defined as the degree to which the work performed reaches the goals and serves as a measure of success. However, the use of the word "performance" in different contexts can lead to various definitions. The contribution of human resources is significant for organizations to be sustainable in their field of operation. In this context, organizations need high-performing employees to gain a competitive advantage over their internal and external competitors (Uzuntarla, Ceyhan, and Fırat, 2017).

Employee performance is defined as the success of an employee in completing assigned tasks within a specific time period and the results achieved. Employee performance also reflects the level of completion of the designated job by the employee (Tunçer, 2013). The concept is also defined as the extent to which an individual reaches the goals and standards related to the work they perform. Employee performance describes the employee's accomplishment of the assigned task, tailored to their abilities and characteristics, in line with the desired criteria. Looking at this definition, we can say that the higher the employee's performance, the higher their contribution to the workplace (Demir and Yılmaz, 2010).

According to İpek (2019), performance has six characteristics, which are listed below:

- Performance is a highly disciplined phenomenon.
- In performance evaluation, it cannot be separated from bias.
- The indicators and levels of performance are variable.
- An individual's opinion should not be considered regarding performance.
- Models that measure performance levels have complex structures and involve bias.
- A mixed model should be developed for performance dimensions.

### 2.3.1 Dimensions of Employee Performance

**Task Performance:** Task performance refers to the performance demonstrated by employees when fulfilling the tasks, duties, and responsibilities assigned to them in their job descriptions. In other words, it describes the degree of success in basic tasks and responsibilities related to the job. According to Koscianska (2013), task performance includes fundamental production and maintenance activities such as producing goods, making sales, keeping inventory records, and delivering services to customers. Task performance is related to fulfilling the technical functions of the organization, involving the application of technical processes or the maintenance and service of technical requirements. The importance of professional competence, appropriate work environment, clear job description, and ethical characteristics is significant in achieving high task performance (Özdevecioğlu and Kanıgür, 2019).

**Contextual Performance:** Contextual performance includes employee behaviors developed within the framework of an ethical understanding that supports and defends the organization. Contextual performance is defined as voluntary behaviors of employees such as assisting other employees in their work, exerting extra effort to achieve the organization's goals and objectives, and adhering to the rules and procedures set by the organization in the social environment (Koscianska, 2013). Contextual performance involves employees voluntarily exhibiting certain behaviors that are beyond their assigned tasks. It indirectly contributes to the improvement of organizational performance through social and psychological behaviors. It is based on positive and helpful human behaviors, indirectly contributing to the execution of technical activities. Behaviors influencing contextual performance also serve the organizational cultural climate (Akça and Yurtçu, 2017).

### 2.3.2 Types of Performance

**Individual Performance:** Individual performance refers to the contribution of an individual's tasks to the organization's goals and objectives within a specified time frame set by the organization (Karakaya, 2020). It is a qualitative and quantitative indicator of how close an individual has come to the goals unrecognized by the organization while performing their duties, encompassing factors such as the employee's abilities, skills, experience, effort, and communication style. Individual performance cannot be separated from organizational performance. Employee performance affects organizational efficiency, success level, and competitiveness. Therefore, to increase organizational performance, individual performance must be enhanced (Lewis and Heckman, 2006).

**Team Performance:** A team is a group of individuals with different expertise who come together to perform a task. A team is formed by bringing together two or more people who are related and work together to achieve predefined goals (Mostafa, Gaber, and Labib, 2019). In

organizations, team and performance are two related concepts. In situations that require versatile skills, decision-making, and experience, team performance surpasses individual performance. When measuring team performance, measuring the individual performance of team members undermines team spirit and hinders the desire of members to work as a team. Therefore, when measuring team performance, measuring both the team members and organizational performance separately will overcome the mentioned drawbacks (Naik, 2012). **Organizational Performance:** Organizational performance is a process that assesses the extent to which an organization can effectively and efficiently use its resources to achieve its objectives. It involves not only implementing innovations but also focusing on understanding customer desires and expectations and how well the organization measures up to them (Eren and Kaplan, 2014). Organizational performance provides information about the source of organizational problems and the underlying reasons for successes and failures. The goals of organizational performance are to find answers to the objectives that organizations need to achieve for their sustainability and the processes that need to be followed to reach these goals. These objectives include increasing effectiveness, improving efficiency, enhancing customer satisfaction, growing, and achieving good profitability. A high-performing organization is one that successfully attains all these objectives (Tansley, 2011).

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research Design

In this study, a relational survey model and a descriptive research design, specifically a cross-sectional research pattern, were employed. Cross-sectional research involves observational surveys aimed at collecting data from a specific group of people (sample group) or the entire population at risk of a health/disease problem in society at a specific time (Çaparlar and Dönmez, 2016).

#### 3.2 Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of public employees working in public institutions in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). A total of 301 individuals were included in the study using the random sampling method. The random sampling method ensures that all combinations of the sample group selected from the population are done in accordance with the principle of randomness, ensuring equal chances of selection (Büyüköztürk, 2016). Inclusion criteria for individuals in the study were working in public institutions at the time of the study, voluntary participation, and complete response to the study questionnaire. Individuals who did not meet these criteria were excluded from the study. Ethical approval (Ethics Approval No: 2023/1015) was obtained from the Cyprus Health and Social Sciences University Ethics Committee before data collection commenced on May 15, 2023.

#### 3.3 Data Collection Tools

Before data collection began, the researcher informed the participants about the purpose, scope, and confidentiality limits of the study. Information about the scales used in the research is provided below.

##### 3.3.1 Personal Information Form

The Personal Information Form, prepared by the researcher, consists of a total of 5 questions aiming to determine participants' gender, age, education level, title, and professional seniority.

##### 3.3.2 Talent Management Scale

The Talent Management Scale was developed by Uludağ (2016). The scale consists of a total of 18 items and three sub-dimensions, namely management, career development, and competence. Participants expressed their answers on a 5-point Likert scale. In this context, it was expressed as 1="Strongly Disagree," 2="Disagree," 3="Undecided," 4="Agree," 5="Strongly Agree". The Talent Scale has three sub-dimensions: Management (5 items), Career

Development (11 items), and Competence (2 items). The Cronbach's Alpha value for the Talent Management Scale was found to be 0.940.

### 3.3.3 Employee Performance Scale

The Employee Performance Scale was developed by Nur (2014). The scale consists of a total of 12 items and three sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions of the scale are expressed as motivation, organizational culture, and job performance. Participants expressed their answers on a 5-point Likert scale. In this context, it was expressed as 1="Strongly Disagree," 2="Disagree," 3="Undecided," 4="Agree," 5="Strongly Agree." The Cronbach's Alpha value for the Employee Performance Scale was found to be 0.879. The Employee Performance Scale consists of three sub-dimensions: Motivation (7 items), Organizational Culture (3 items), and Job Performance (2 items).

### 3.4 Data Analysis

The data collected from public employees participating in the study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0 program. The distribution of socio-demographic characteristics of the public employees included in the study is presented through frequency distribution tables, and descriptive statistics are provided for the scores of the Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale.

**Table 1.** Normality Test for Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale Scores of Public Employees

| <b>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</b>            |                  |           |          |                 |                 |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                      | <b>Statistic</b> | <b>Sd</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>Skewness</b> | <b>Kurtosis</b> |
| Management Style                     | 0,122            | 301       | 0,000    | 0,470           | -0,446          |
| Career Development                   | 0,083            | 301       | 0,000    | 0,290           | -0,337          |
| Competence                           | 0,210            | 301       | 0,000    | -0,739          | 0,045           |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>       | 0,066            | 301       | 0,003    | 0,296           | -0,388          |
| Organizational Culture               | 0,120            | 301       | 0,000    | -0,493          | 0,108           |
| Motivation, Rewards, and Performance | 0,098            | 301       | 0,000    | 0,163           | -0,644          |
| Job Performance                      | 0,181            | 301       | 0,000    | -0,403          | 0,309           |
| Employee Performance Scale           | 0,068            | 301       | 0,002    | -0,001          | -0,158          |

In Table 1, the results of the normality test for the Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale scores of public employees are presented. According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results, the data set does not follow a normal distribution. However, due to the skewness and kurtosis values being within the  $\pm 1.5$  range, it is considered to be approximately normally distributed. Parametric hypothesis tests were used to compare the Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale scores of public employees based on their socio-demographic characteristics. Independent sample t-tests were used when the independent variable had two groups, and ANOVA was used when there were more than two groups. In cases where ANOVA indicated a significant difference, Tukey's test was applied for post-hoc analysis. The relationships between the Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale scores were examined using Pearson correlation analysis. The predictive ability of Talent Management Scale score.

#### 4. FINDINGS

**Table 2:** Distribution of Public Employees According to Socio-demographic Characteristics

|  | Number(n) | Percentage(%) |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| <b>Age Group</b>                           |           |               |
| 35 and under                               | 109       | 36,21         |
| 36-45 years                                | 110       | 36,54         |
| 46 and above                               | 82        | 27,24         |
| <b>Gender</b>                              |           |               |
| Female                                     | 150       | 49,83         |
| Male                                       | 51        | 50,17         |
| <b>Marital Status</b>                      |           |               |
| Single                                     | 82        | 27,24         |
| Married                                    | 219       | 72,76         |
| <b>Education Level</b>                     |           |               |
| High School                                | 48        | 15,95         |
| Bachelor's                                 | 169       | 56,15         |
| Postgraduate                               | 84        | 27,91         |
| <b>Title</b>                               |           |               |
| Worker                                     | 40        | 13,29         |
| Clerk                                      | 221       | 73,42         |
| Manager                                    | 40        | 13,29         |
| <b>Years of Service in the Institution</b> |           |               |
| 5 years and under                          | 57        | 18,94         |
| 6-10 years                                 | 106       | 35,22         |
| 11-15 years                                | 43        | 14,29         |
| 16 years and above                         | 95        | 31,56         |

Upon examination of Table 2, it is observed that among the public employees participating in the research, 36.21% are aged 35 and below, 36.54% are in the age group of 36-45, 27.24% are aged 46 and above, 49.83% are female, 50.17% are male, 27.24% are single, 72.76% are married, 15.95% have a high school education, 56.15% have a bachelor's degree, 27.91% have a postgraduate degree, 13.29% have the job title of worker, 73.42% have the job title of clerk, 13.29% have the job title of manager, 18.94% have worked in the institution for 5 years and under, 35.22% have worked in the institution for 6-10 years, 14.29% have worked in the institution for 11-15 years, 31.56% have worked in the institution for 16 years and above.

**Table 3:** Scores of Public Employees on Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale

|                                     | n   | Mean | SD   | Min  | Max  |
|-------------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
| Management Style                    | 301 | 2,70 | 0,87 | 1,00 | 4,80 |
| Career Development                  | 301 | 2,50 | 0,80 | 1,00 | 4,82 |
| Competence                          | 301 | 3,63 | 1,02 | 1,00 | 5,00 |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>      | 301 | 2,69 | 0,76 | 1,00 | 4,83 |
| Organizational Culture              | 301 | 3,18 | 0,83 | 1,00 | 5,00 |
| Motivation, Reward, and Performance | 301 | 2,62 | 0,87 | 1,00 | 5,00 |
| Job Performance                     | 301 | 3,25 | 0,86 | 1,00 | 5,00 |
| <b>Employee Performance Scale</b>   | 301 | 2,87 | 0,73 | 1,00 | 4,83 |

When examining Table 3, it was determined that public employees included in the research received an average of  $2.70 \pm 0.87$  points for the Management Style, a minimum of 1, and a maximum of 4.80 points. For the Career Development, a sub-dimension of the Talent Management Scale, they received an average of  $2.50 \pm 0.80$  points, with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 4.82 points. For the Competence, another sub-dimension of the Talent Management Scale, the average score was  $3.63 \pm 1.02$ , with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5. The overall Talent Management Scale had an average score of  $2.69 \pm 0.76$ , with a minimum

of 1 and a maximum of 4.83. Regarding the Employee Performance Scale, public employee participants received an average of  $3.18 \pm 0.83$  points for the Organizational Culture, with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5 points. For the Motivation, Reward, and Performance sub-dimension, they received an average of  $2.62 \pm 0.87$  points, with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5 points. For the Job Performance sub-dimension, the average score was  $3.25 \pm 0.86$ , with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5 points. The overall Employee Performance Scale had an average score of  $3.25 \pm 0.86$ , with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5 points.

**Table 4.** Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale Scores According to Age Group of Public Employees

|                                      | Age Group    | N   | Mean | SD   | Min  | Max  | F     | P      | Difference |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----|------|------|------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| Management Style                     | 35 and below | 109 | 2,86 | 0,88 | 1,20 | 4,60 | 3,462 | 0,033* | 1-3        |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 2,65 | 0,85 | 1,00 | 4,80 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 2,55 | 0,84 | 1,00 | 4,60 |       |        |            |
| Career Development                   | 35 and below | 109 | 2,61 | 0,86 | 1,00 | 4,55 | 2,786 | 0,063  |            |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 2,52 | 0,77 | 1,00 | 4,82 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 2,34 | 0,74 | 1,00 | 4,00 |       |        |            |
| Competence                           | 35 and below | 109 | 3,61 | 0,98 | 1,00 | 5,00 | 1,017 | 0,363  |            |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 3,55 | 1,08 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 3,76 | 0,98 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>       | 35 and below | 109 | 2,80 | 0,79 | 1,33 | 4,56 | 2,570 | 0,078  |            |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 2,67 | 0,77 | 1,00 | 4,83 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 2,55 | 0,71 | 1,22 | 4,06 |       |        |            |
| Organizational Culture               | 35 and below | 109 | 3,28 | 0,75 | 1,33 | 4,67 | 3,972 | 0,020* | 1-3        |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 3,25 | 0,81 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 2,96 | 0,93 | 1,00 | 4,67 |       |        |            |
| Motivation, Rewards, and Performance | 35 and below | 109 | 2,76 | 0,91 | 1,00 | 4,29 | 3,048 | 0,049- | 1-3        |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 2,62 | 0,84 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 2,44 | 0,83 | 1,00 | 4,00 |       |        |            |
| Job Performance                      | 35 and below | 109 | 3,34 | 0,86 | 1,00 | 5,00 | 2,027 | 0,134  |            |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 3,12 | 0,92 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 3,30 | 0,76 | 1,50 | 4,50 |       |        |            |
| <b>Employee Performance Scale</b>    | 35 and below | 109 | 2,98 | 0,73 | 1,25 | 4,33 | 3,188 | 0,043* |            |
|                                      | 36-45        | 110 | 2,86 | 0,71 | 1,00 | 4,83 |       |        |            |
|                                      | 46 and above | 82  | 2,72 | 0,74 | 1,08 | 4,08 |       |        |            |

\* $p < 0.05$  (F: ANOVA)

Examining Table 4, it is observed that there is a statistically significant difference in the scores of the Talent Management Scale, the sub-dimension of Management Style, among the age groups of the public employees included in the research ( $p < 0.05$ ). Participants in the age group of 35 and below have statistically significantly higher scores in Management Style compared to participants in the age group of 46 and above. There is no statistically significant difference in the scores of Career Development and Competence, sub-dimensions of the Talent Management Scale, and the overall Talent Management Scale scores among the age groups of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ). Regardless of their age groups, participants' scores in Career Development and Competence sub-dimensions and the overall Talent Management Scale scores are similar.



There is a statistically significant difference in the scores of the sub-dimension Organizational Culture of the Employee Performance Scale among the age groups of public employees participating in the research ( $p < 0.05$ ). Participants in the age group of 35 and below have statistically significantly higher Employee Performance scores compared to participants in the age group of 46 and above. Participants in the age group of 36-45 also have statistically significantly higher Employee Performance scores compared to participants in the age group of 46 and above. There is a statistically significant difference in the scores of Motivation, Reward, and Performance, sub-dimensions of the Employee Performance Scale, and the overall Employee Performance Scale scores among the age groups of the participants ( $p < 0.05$ ). Participants in the age group of 35 and below have statistically significantly higher scores in Motivation, Reward, and Performance, as well as the overall Employee Performance Scale scores, compared to participants in the age group of 46 and above. There is no statistically significant difference in the scores of the sub-dimension Job Done, of the Employee Performance Scale ( $p > 0.05$ ). Regardless of their age groups, participants' scores in the Job Done sub-dimension are similar.

**Table 5.** Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale Scores According to the Gender of Public Employees

|                                     | Gender | N   | Mean | SD   | T      | P       |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|------|------|--------|---------|
| Management Style                    | Female | 150 | 2,54 | 0,82 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 2,85 | 0,88 | -3,202 | -0,002* |
| Career Development                  | Female | 150 | 2,35 | 0,73 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 2,66 | 0,84 | -3,394 | -0,001* |
| Competence                          | Female | 150 | 3,61 | 0,90 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 3,66 | 1,12 | -0,417 | -0,677  |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>      | Female | 150 | 2,55 | 0,70 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 2,82 | 0,80 | -3,153 | -0,002* |
| Organizational Culture              | Female | 150 | 3,12 | 0,81 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 3,25 | 0,86 | -1,372 | -0,171  |
| Motivation, Reward, and Performance | Female | 150 | 2,45 | 0,85 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 2,80 | 0,86 | -3,574 | -0,000* |
| Job Done                            | Female | 150 | 3,17 | 0,85 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 3,32 | 0,86 | -1,562 | -0,119  |
| <b>Employee Performance Scale</b>   | Female | 150 | 2,73 | 0,69 |        |         |
|                                     | Male   | 151 | 3,00 | 0,75 | -3,199 | -0,002* |

\* $p < 0.05$  (t: Independent samples t-test)

Upon examining Table 5, statistically significant differences were found in the scores of public employees participating in the research based on their genders for the Talent Management Scale sub-dimensions of Management Style, Career Development, and the overall Talent Management Scale ( $p < 0.05$ ). Male public employees' scores in Management Style, Career Development, and the overall Talent Management Scale were statistically significantly higher than those of female public employees. There is no statistically significant difference in the scores for the Talent Management Scale sub-dimension of Competence based on employees' genders ( $p > 0.05$ ). Although the scores for Competence were calculated higher for male employees than for female employees, the difference in scores is not statistically significant. Statistically significant differences were observed in the scores for the Employee Performance Scale sub-dimension of Motivation, Reward, and Performance, as well as the overall Employee Performance Scale, based on employees' genders ( $p < 0.05$ ). The scores for Motivation, Reward, and Performance, as well as the overall Employee Performance Scale, were statistically significantly higher for male public employees compared to female public employees. There is no statistically significant difference in the scores for the Employee Performance Scale sub-

dimensions of Organizational Culture and Job Done based on employees' genders ( $p > 0.05$ ). Although the average scores for male public employees in these sub-dimensions were higher than those of female public employees, the identified score differences are not statistically significant.

**Table 6.** Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale Scores of Public Employees According to Education Level

|                                     | Education Level | N   | Mean | SD   | Min  | Max  | F     | P     |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Management Style                    | High School     | 48  | 2,74 | 0,87 | 1,60 | 4,80 | 0,477 | 0,621 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 2,72 | 0,84 | 1,00 | 4,80 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 2,62 | 0,92 | 1,20 | 4,60 |       |       |
| Career Development                  | High School     | 48  | 2,62 | 0,83 | 1,18 | 4,55 | 2,561 | 0,079 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 2,55 | 0,78 | 1,00 | 4,82 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 2,34 | 0,81 | 1,00 | 3,91 |       |       |
| Competence                          | High School     | 48  | 3,60 | 0,86 | 1,50 | 5,00 | 1,171 | 0,312 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 3,57 | 1,12 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 3,77 | 0,86 | 2,00 | 5,00 |       |       |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>      | High School     | 48  | 2,76 | 0,75 | 1,44 | 4,56 | 0,976 | 0,378 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 2,71 | 0,76 | 1,00 | 4,83 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 2,59 | 0,77 | 1,22 | 4,17 |       |       |
| Organizational Culture              | High School     | 48  | 3,23 | 0,92 | 1,00 | 4,67 | 1,019 | 0,362 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 3,22 | 0,84 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 3,07 | 0,78 | 1,00 | 4,33 |       |       |
| Motivation, Reward, and Performance | High School     | 48  | 2,54 | 0,92 | 1,00 | 4,00 | 0,481 | 0,619 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 2,66 | 0,89 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 2,59 | 0,81 | 1,00 | 4,29 |       |       |
| Job Done                            | High School     | 48  | 3,14 | 0,84 | 1,00 | 5,00 | 1,804 | 0,166 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 3,21 | 0,87 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 3,39 | 0,84 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |       |
| <b>Employee Performance Scale</b>   | High School     | 48  | 2,81 | 0,75 | 1,67 | 4,08 | 0,311 | 0,733 |
|                                     | University      | 169 | 2,89 | 0,74 | 1,00 | 4,83 |       |       |
|                                     | Graduate        | 84  | 2,84 | 0,70 | 1,08 | 4,33 |       |       |

\* $p < 0.05$  (F: ANOVA)

Upon examining Table 6, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference in Talent Management Scale sub-dimensions, including Management Style, Career Development, and Competence, as well as the overall score of the Talent Management Scale, based on the educational level of public employees ( $p > 0.05$ ). Although public employees with a high school diploma have higher scores in Management Style and Career Development, as well as in the overall Talent Management Scale, compared to university and graduate degree holders, and graduate degree holders have higher Competence scores than those with a high school or bachelor's degree, these differences in scores based on participants' educational levels are not statistically significant.

There is no statistically significant difference in the Employee Performance Scale sub-dimensions, including Organizational Culture, Motivation, Reward, and Performance, Job Done, as well as the overall score of the Employee Performance Scale, based on the educational level of participants ( $p > 0.05$ ). Regardless of their educational background, public employees' scores in Organizational Culture, Motivation, Reward, and Performance, Job Done, and the overall Employee Performance Scale are similar.

**Table 7.** Scores of Public Employees on the Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale According to Job Title

|                                     | Title         | n   | Mean | SD   | Min  | Max  | F      | P      | Difference |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|------------|
| Management Style                    | Worker        | 40  | 3,30 | 0,97 | 1,80 | 4,80 | 22,138 | 0,000* | 1-2        |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 2,51 | 0,76 | 1,00 | 4,80 |        |        | 2-3        |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 3,13 | 0,93 | 1,20 | 4,60 |        |        |            |
| Career Development                  | Worker        | 40  | 3,02 | 0,89 | 1,55 | 4,82 | 17,998 | 0,000* | 1-2        |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 2,35 | 0,73 | 1,00 | 4,55 |        |        | 2-3        |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 2,85 | 0,81 | 1,00 | 4,55 |        |        |            |
| Competence                          | Worker        | 40  | 3,56 | 1,18 | 1,00 | 5,00 | 9,411  | 0,000* | 1-3        |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 3,53 | 1,01 | 1,00 | 5,00 |        |        | 2-3        |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 4,26 | 0,58 | 2,50 | 5,00 |        |        |            |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>      | Worker        | 40  | 3,15 | 0,89 | 1,67 | 4,83 | 19,875 | 0,000* | 1-2        |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 2,53 | 0,68 | 1,00 | 4,56 |        |        | 2-3        |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 3,08 | 0,74 | 1,44 | 4,56 |        |        |            |
| Organizational Culture              | Worker        | 40  | 3,24 | 0,88 | 1,67 | 5,00 | 1,520  | 0,220  |            |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 3,14 | 0,82 | 1,00 | 5,00 |        |        |            |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 3,38 | 0,83 | 1,00 | 5,00 |        |        |            |
| Motivation, Reward, and Performance | Worker        | 40  | 3,00 | 0,99 | 1,29 | 5,00 | 13,201 | 0,000* | 1-2        |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 2,47 | 0,80 | 1,00 | 4,43 |        |        | 2-3        |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 3,07 | 0,87 | 1,00 | 4,57 |        |        |            |
| Job Done                            | Worker        | 40  | 3,40 | 0,86 | 1,00 | 4,50 | 2,980  | 0,052  |            |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 3,18 | 0,85 | 1,50 | 5,00 |        |        |            |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 3,49 | 0,89 | 1,58 | 5,00 |        |        |            |
| <b>Employee Performance Scale</b>   | Worker        | 40  | 3,13 | 0,83 | 1,00 | 4,83 | 10,272 | 0,000* | 1-2        |
|                                     | Civil Servant | 221 | 2,76 | 0,67 | 1,80 | 4,25 |        |        | 2-3        |
|                                     | Manager       | 40  | 3,22 | 0,74 | 1,58 | 4,50 |        |        |            |

\*p < 0.05 (F: ANOVA)1,

Upon examining Table 7, it was determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the Talent Management Scale sub-dimensions, including Management Style, Career Development, Competence scores, and the overall Talent Management Scale scores, based on the job titles of the public employees included in the research ( $p < 0.05$ ). Employees with the job title "Worker" obtained statistically significantly higher scores in Management Style, Career Development, and the overall Talent Management Scale compared to employees with the title "Civil Servant." Similarly, employees with the title "Manager" scored significantly higher in Management Style, Career Development, and the overall Talent Management Scale compared to "Civil Servant" employees. When examining Competence scores, it is observed that participants with the job title "Manager" obtained statistically significantly higher scores compared to those with the titles "Worker" and "Civil Servant."

In terms of the Employee Performance Scale sub-dimensions, there is no statistically significant difference in scores for Organizational Culture and Job Done based on job titles ( $p > 0.05$ ). Regardless of job titles, the scores for Organizational Culture and Job Done are similar. However, a statistically significant difference was found in.

**Table 8.** Talent Management Scale and Employee Performance Scale Scores According to the Years of Service of Public Employees

|                                    | Years of Service | N   | Mean | SD   | Min  | Max  | F     | P      | Difference |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| Management Style                   | 0-5              | 57  | 3,04 | 0,84 | 1,60 | 4,80 | 3,950 | 0,009* | 1-2        |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 3,04 | 0,79 | 1,00 | 4,40 |       |        | 1-3        |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 2,58 | 0,97 | 1,00 | 4,40 |       |        | 1-4        |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 2,71 | 0,88 | 1,00 | 4,80 |       |        |            |
| Career Development                 | 0-5              | 57  | 2,61 | 0,86 | 1,36 | 4,82 | 5,266 | 0,001* | 1-2        |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 2,86 | 0,75 | 1,00 | 4,55 |       |        | 1-3        |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 2,38 | 0,66 | 1,27 | 3,73 |       |        | 1-4        |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 2,51 | 0,83 | 1,00 | 4,55 |       |        |            |
| Competence                         | 0-5              | 57  | 2,42 | 1,02 | 2,00 | 5,00 | 2,477 | 0,061  |            |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 3,78 | 0,95 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 3,45 | 1,02 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 3,88 | 1,06 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
| <b>Talent Management Scale</b>     | 0-5              | 57  | 3,63 | 0,79 | 1,61 | 4,83 | 4,935 | 0,002* | 1-2        |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 3,01 | 0,69 | 1,00 | 4,56 |       |        | 1-3        |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 2,57 | 0,73 | 1,39 | 3,89 |       |        | 1-4        |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 2,71 | 0,79 | 1,39 | 4,56 |       |        |            |
| Organizational Culture             | 0-5              | 57  | 2,61 | 0,75 | 1,67 | 5,00 | 1,328 | 0,265  |            |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 3,32 | 0,87 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 3,10 | 0,75 | 1,33 | 4,67 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 3,31 | 0,88 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
| Motivation, Reward and Performance | 0-5              | 57  | 2,94 | 0,83 | 1,57 | 5,00 | 3,500 | 0,016* | 1-2        |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 2,51 | 0,89 | 1,00 | 4,57 |       |        | 1-3        |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 2,64 | 0,75 | 1,29 | 3,86 |       |        | 1-4        |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 2,55 | 0,89 | 1,00 | 4,42 |       |        |            |
| Job Done                           | 0-5              | 57  | 3,41 | 0,78 | 1,50 | 5,00 | 1,265 | 0,286  |            |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 3,16 | 0,91 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 3,33 | 0,78 | 1,50 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 3,22 | 0,88 | 1,00 | 5,00 |       |        |            |
| <b>Employee Performance Scale</b>  | 0-5              | 57  | 3,12 | 0,65 | 2,08 | 4,83 | 3,319 | 0,020* | 1-2        |
|                                    | 6-10             | 106 | 2,76 | 0,76 | 1,00 | 4,50 |       |        | 1-4        |
|                                    | 11-15            | 43  | 2,92 | 0,64 | 1,58 | 3,92 |       |        |            |
|                                    | 16 and above     | 95  | 2,81 | 0,75 | 1,08 | 4,25 |       |        |            |

Upon examining Table 8, it is observed that there is a statistically significant difference in the Talent Management Scale sub-dimensions, including Management Style, Career Development, and overall Talent Management Scale scores, based on the years of service of public employees ( $p < 0.05$ ). Participants with 5 years or less of service in the organization scored significantly higher in Management Style, Career Development, and overall Talent Management Scale compared to those with 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years and above of service. There is no statistically significant difference in Competence scores among participants based on their years of service ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that Competence scores are similar regardless of the duration of service.

For the Employee Performance Scale sub-dimension, Motivation, Rewards, and Performance scores, and overall Employee Performance Scale scores show a statistically significant difference based on the years of service ( $p < 0.05$ ). Participants with 5 years or less of service scored significantly higher in Motivation, Rewards, and Performance, and overall Employee

Performance compared to those with 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years and above of service. However, there is no statistically significant difference in scores for Organizational Culture and Job Done among participants based on their years of service ( $p>0.05$ ), indicating that scores for Organizational Culture and Job Done are similar, regardless of the duration of service.

**Table 9.** Correlations between Talent Management Scale Scores and Employee Performance Scale Scores of Public Employ

|                                     |   |   | Management Style | Career Development | Competence | Talent Management Scale | Organizational Culture | Motivation, Reward, and Performance | Job Execution | Employee Performance Scale |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Management Style                    | R | 1 | 0,829            | 0,511              | 0,915      | 0,491                   | 0,734                  | 0,467                               | 0,745         |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           | 0,000*             | 0,000*     | 0,000*                  | 0,000*                 | 0,000*                              | 0,000*        |                            |
| Career Development                  | R | 1 | 0,464            | 0,963              | 0,539      | 0,790                   | 0,498                  | 0,804                               |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           | 0,000*             | 0,000*     | 0,000*                  | 0,000*                 | 0,000*                              |               |                            |
| Competence                          | R | 1 | 0,613            | 0,278              | 0,328      | 0,318                   | 0,371                  |                                     |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           | 0,000*             | 0,000*     | 0,000*                  | 0,000*                 |                                     |               |                            |
| Talent Management Scale             | R | 1 | 0,546            | 0,787              | 0,514      | 0,806                   |                        |                                     |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           | 0,000*             | 0,000*     | 0,000*                  |                        |                                     |               |                            |
| Organizational Culture              | R | 1 | 0,572            | 0,371              | 0,758      |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           | 0,000*             | 0,000*     |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
| Motivation, Reward, and Performance | R | 1 | 0,448            | 0,949              |            |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           | 0,000*             |            |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
| Job Execution                       | R | 1 | 0,615            |                    |            |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   | 0,000*           |                    |            |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
| Employee Performance Scale          | R | 1 |                  |                    |            |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |
|                                     | P |   |                  |                    |            |                         |                        |                                     |               |                            |

\* $p<0.05$  (r: Pearson test)

When examining Table 9, it is observed that there is a positive, strong, and statistically significant correlation ( $p<0.05$ ) between the Talent Management Scale scores and its sub-dimensions, including Management Style, Career Development, Competence, and the overall scores of the Employee Performance Scale, as well as its sub-dimensions such as Organizational Culture, Motivation, Reward, and Performance, and Job Execution. Therefore, the increase in Talent Management Scale scores and its sub-dimensions, including Management Style, Career Development, and Competence, is associated with a positive increase in the Employee Performance Scale scores and its sub-dimensions, including Organizational Culture, Motivation, Reward, and Performance, and Job Execution for public employees.

**Table 10.** Prediction of Employee Performance Scale Scores by Talent Management Scale Scores for Public Employees

|                         | Standardize |      | Beta  | T      | P      | F       | R <sup>2</sup> |
|-------------------------|-------------|------|-------|--------|--------|---------|----------------|
|                         | B           | S.H. |       |        |        |         |                |
| (Fixed)                 | 0,80        | 0,09 |       | 8,754  | 0,000* | 554,626 | 0,650          |
| Talent Management Scale | 0,77        | 0,03 | 0,81  | 23,551 | 0,000* | 0,000*  | 0,649          |
| (Fixed)                 | 1,01        | 0,10 |       | 10,182 | 0,000* |         |                |
| Management Style        | 0,22        | 0,05 | 0,27  | 4,327  | 0,000* | 199,130 | 0,668          |
| Career Development      | 0,55        | 0,05 | 0,60  | 10,059 | 0,000* | 0,000*  | 0,665          |
| Competence              | -0,03       | 0,03 | -0,05 | -1,185 | 0,237  |         |                |

\*p&lt;0.05

In Table 10, the prediction of the Employee Performance Scale scores based on the scores obtained from the Talent Management Scale by participating public employees was examined. The model explained that 64.9% of the variance. It was determined that the scores obtained by public employees from the Talent Management Scale significantly and positively predicted the scores of the Employee Performance Scale ( $\beta=0.81$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). Thus, an increase in the scores obtained by public employees from the Talent Management Scale would lead to an increase in the scores of the Employee Performance Scale.

In the regression model that examined the prediction of the Employee Performance Scale scores based on the scores obtained from the Management Style, Career Development, and Competence sub-dimensions of the Talent Management Scale by public employees, the explained variance was found to be 66.5%. Upon examining the model, it was observed that the scores obtained by public employees from the Management Style ( $\beta=0.27$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) and Career Development ( $\beta=0.60$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) sub-dimensions of the Talent Management Scale positively and significantly predicted the scores of the Employee Performance Scale. However, the scores obtained by public employees from the Competence sub-dimension of the Talent Management Scale did not significantly predict the scores of the Employee Performance Scale ( $\beta=-0.05$ ;  $p>0.05$ ). According to these results, an increase in the scores obtained from the Management Style and Career Development sub-dimensions of the Talent Management Scale would result in an increase in the scores of the Employee Performance Scale.

## 5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, the impact of talent management practices on the employee performance of public personnel in Northern Cyprus was examined. When the research findings were examined, it was observed that the scores individuals obtained from the Talent Management Scale general and the sub-dimensions of management style and career development differed according to gender; male participants scored higher. In the study, it was also observed that the competence sub-dimension scores did not differ according to gender. This finding is consistent with the literature, as supported by the studies conducted by Güner (2016), İpek (2019), and Megri (2014).

In the study, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in the scores individuals obtained from the Management Style sub-dimension of the Talent Management Scale based on their ages; individuals aged 35 and under had higher scores in the management style sub-dimension compared to those aged 46 and above. However, there was no significant difference in the scores of individuals in career development and competence and the general scores obtained from the Talent Management Scale. The study found a statistically significant difference in the scores of public employees in the age groups for the sub-dimension of

organizational culture in the Employee Performance Scale; individuals aged 35 and under had higher scores compared to those aged 46 and above. The study also found a significant difference in the scores of individuals in the motivation, reward, and performance sub-dimensions and the general scores of the Employee Performance Scale; individuals aged 35 and under had higher scores in motivation, reward, and performance sub-dimensions, and in the general scores of the Employee Performance Scale compared to those aged 46 and above. In addition, no significant difference was found between the scores of job performance sub-dimensions and age groups. While there are studies in the literature that support the findings of this study (Yahya, Othman, & Shamsuri, 2012; Davis, 2015), there are also studies that reach different results from the findings of this study (Güler & Taşlıyan, 2021; İpek, 2019). It is thought that this difference may be due to the diversity of the sample groups.

In this study, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the general scores of the Talent Management Scale, as well as the sub-dimension scores of management style, career development, and competence, and the general scores of the Employee Performance Scale, and the sub-dimension scores of organizational culture, motivation, reward, and performance, and job performance based on the participants' education levels. When examining the literature, there are studies reporting different results. Tarakçı (2016) reported a significant difference between the education level and talent management. However, Karcıoğlu and Atasever (2019) reached results supporting the findings of this study, stating that there was no significant relationship between education level and talent management. Additionally, while İpek (2019) reported that employee performance did not differ based on education level, Güler and Taşlıyan (2021) revealed a positive and significant relationship between education level and employee performance, contrary to the findings of this study. The obtained different results are thought to be related to geographical variation.

Examining the findings of this research, it was observed that public employees with the title of "worker" had higher general scores on the Talent Management Scale, as well as higher scores on the management style and career development sub-dimensions, compared to public employees with the title of "officer." Moreover, participants with the managerial title had higher competence sub-dimension scores than those with the titles of "worker" and "officer." The obtained findings are consistent with the results of similar studies (Musette, 2016; Stahl et al., 2012).

In the study, it was found that there was a difference in the general scores of the Employee Performance Scale, as well as the scores of the motivation, reward, and performance sub-dimensions based on job titles. Workers had higher scores than officers, and managers had higher scores than officers. Additionally, no significant difference was found in the sub-dimension scores of organizational culture and job performance based on job titles. When examining the relevant literature, it was observed that the findings of this study are supported by similar results (Born & Heers, 2019; Yousuf & Siddiqui, 2019; Patil & Bhakkad, 2014).

In the study, it was found that there is a difference in the general scores of the Talent Management Scale based on the working period of public employees. Participants with 5 years or less of experience in the institution had higher scores compared to those with 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years and above of experience. This finding is consistent with the literature (Morgan & Jardin, 2010; Tarakçı, 2016; Jerome, 2013). Additionally, in this study, a significant difference was observed in the general scores of the Employee Performance Scale and the sub-dimension scores of motivation, reward, and performance based on the working period of public employees. Participants with 5 years or less of experience in the institution had higher scores compared to those with 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years and above of experience. Furthermore, no difference was found in the sub-dimension scores of organizational culture and job performance based on the working period. Similar results have been observed in studies

related to this topic (Gallardo-Gallardo, 2015; Dhanabhakym & Kokilambal, 2014; İpek, 2019).

The study revealed a positive and significant correlation between the general scores of the Talent Management Scale and the sub-dimension scores of management style, career development, competence, as well as the general scores of the Employee Performance Scale and the sub-dimension scores of organizational culture, motivation, reward, and performance, and job performance among public employees. In this context, this finding aligns directly with the results of studies conducted by Turner, Webster, and Morris (2013), Bozboğa (2019), and Çayan (2011). Finally, in the study, it was determined that the general scores obtained from the Talent Management Scale significantly and positively predicted the scores of the Employee Performance Scale. This finding is in line with the literature (Boselie & Thunnissen, 2017; Bozboğa, 2019; Aarnio & Kimber, 2016; Çayan, 2011).

In light of the findings obtained in the study, considering the positive relationship between talent management practices and employee performance, it is evident that businesses need to develop effective and functional talent management strategies in their relevant units. Establishing a talent pool system to nurture leaders and managers in businesses will provide employees with the opportunity to acquire professional knowledge related to their talents and work more efficiently in their fields. Moreover, it is believed that managers providing feedback on employee performance, expressing appreciation when high levels of performance are demonstrated, developing policies that make employees feel more valued, determining promotion criteria based on talent and performance, and effectively rewarding high-performing employees would be beneficial.

The study has some limitations. The talent management and employee performance levels of public employees were assessed with a limited sample group, which is considered a significant limitation of the research. Additionally, another limitation is that the findings in the research were determined with a survey form consisting of three sections. It is assumed that individuals who voluntarily participated in the research answered the survey questions sincerely and genuinely.

## REFERENCES

- Aarnio, A., Kimber, E. (2016). Talent Management & Strategy: Identifying Patterns through a Multiple Case Study.
- Akca, A. G. D. M., Yurtçu, A. G. D. B. G. (2019). The effect of working environment characteristics on physicians' task and contextual performance. *International Journal of Academic Value Studies (Javstudies)*, 3(15), 197-207.
- Alayoğlu, N. (2010). A new era in human resource management: Talent management. *Journal of Commerce and Tourism Education Faculty*, 1, 68-97.
- Bayraktar, Ü., Alayoğlu, N. (2018). A talent model proposal for today's organizations: The acquisition system. *Journal of Public Administration*, 51(3), 89-119.
- Boselie, P., Thunnissen, M. (2017). Talent management in the public sector. In *The Oxford Handbook of Talent Management*.
- Boz (2019). Talent Management in Turkey: An analysis based on academic articles published in the 2008-2018 period. *Eurasian International Research Journal*, 7(20), 289-327.
- Bozboğa, Z. (2019). The relationship between assertiveness levels and problem-solving skills of midwives working in the city center of Sivas. (Master's Thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Institute of Health Sciences, Sivas.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). *Experimental designs: Pre-test post-test control group design and data analysis*. Pegem Academy Publishing.
- Ceylan, N. (2007). Talent management in human resource management and an application. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.



- Chen and Lian. (2015). Generational differences in work values in China. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 43(4), 567-578.
- Coetzee, M., & Gunz, H. (2012). Careers and retention of staff in the 21st century world of work: Introduction to the special edition. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 1-4.
- Çaparlar, C. Ö., Dönmez, A. (2016). What is scientific research, how is it done. *Turk J Anaesthesiol Reanim*, 44(4), 212-218.
- Çayan, D. (2011). The effects of talent management on the performance of employees and an application in the health sector in Niğde. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Niğde University, Institute of Social Sciences, Niğde.
- Çelik, M. (2011) Talent management approach and an application. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Istanbul Commerce University, Institute of Science, Istanbul.
- Çelikten, M., Gılıç, F. Çelikten, Y., Yıldırım, A. (2019). The decision-making process in organizational management, an endless debate. *Mersin University Journal of Education Faculty*, 15(2), 581-592.
- Davis, P. J. (2015). Implementing an employee career development strategy: How to build commitment and retain employees. *Human Resource Management*, 23(4), 28-32.
- Demir, C., Yılmaz, M.K. (2010) The strategic planning process and its importance for organizations. *Dokuz Eylül University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 25(1), 69-88.
- Demirkasimoğlu, N., Taşkın, P. (2014). The relationship between talent management and organizational effectiveness: An example from private educational institutions. *Journal of Education and Training Research*, 4(4), 268-285.
- Dhanabhakya, M., Kokilambal, K. (2014). A study on existing talent management practice and its benefits across industries. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 2(7), 23-36.
- Eren, M. Ş., Kaplan, M. (2014). The effects of corporate competencies on organizational performance: A study on manufacturing companies. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 40, 175-192.
- Fukofuka, S. (2014). Factors that predict employee retention in profit and not-for-profit organizations. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(4), 1-8.
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Nijs, S., Dries, N., Gallo, P. (2015). Towards an understanding of talent management as a phenomenon-driven field using bibliometric and content analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(3), 264-279.
- Gharib, M. N., Kahwaji, A. T., Elrasheed, M. O. (2017). Factors affecting staff retention strategies used in private Syrian companies during the crisis. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2), 202-206.
- Güler, B., Taşlıyan, M. (2022). The mediating role of dedication to work in the effect of psychological climate on employee performance. *Alanya Academic Perspective*, 6(1), 1605-1628.
- Gündüzalp, S., Özan, M.B. (2018). From talent wars to talent management. *Journal of Anatolian Education Research*, 2, 14-46.
- Güner, M. B. (2016). The effect of employees' perception of talent management on job motivation. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Doğu University, Istanbul.
- İpek, K. R. O. M. (2019). Art/gender: Art history and feminist criticism. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 8(29), 125-137.
- Jerome, N. (2013). Application of Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory; impacts and implications on organizational culture, human resource and employee's performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(3), 39-45.

- Johnson, R. B., Christensen, L. (2019). Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches: *SAGE Publications, Incorporated*.
- Karakaya, H. B. (2020). Inflation targeting regime and its application in selected OECD member countries. *JOEEP: Journal of Emerging Economies and Policy*, 5(1), 23-33.
- Koscianska, A. (2013). Talent Management in Ireland: An exploratory study into how companies in Ireland manage talent in their organizations. Dublin Business School.
- Lewis, R. E., Heckman, R. J. (2006). Talent management: A critical review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 139-154.
- Megri, Z. (2014). The impact of talent management system on the enterprise performance: a study on a sample of workers in national company of juice and canned-food unit MANAA (Batna). *Arab Economic and Business Journal*, 9(2), 156-165.
- Morgan, H., Jardin, D. (2010). *Integrated talent management. Old Practitioner*, 42(4), 24
- Mostafa, M. M. S., Gaber, H. R., & Labib, A. A. (2019). Explaining The Effect of Organizations' Practices on Employee's Engagement in Egypt.
- Musette, M. S. (2016). Brain drain from the Southern Mediterranean. *IEMed Mediterranean Yearbook*. Barcelona: European Institute of the Mediterranean.
- Naik, M. S. A. (2012). Impact of Talent Management on The Performance of an Organization with Special Reference to ABG, Pipapav, Bharati Shipbuilding Industries. A Report.
- Özdevecioğlu, M., Kanğür, S. (2009). The effects of employees' perception of relationship and task-oriented leadership on their performance. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University Journal of Social and Economic Research*, 11(16), 53-82.
- Öztırak, M., Bayram, V. (2022). Examination of the relationship between favoritism perceptions of healthcare workers and organizational silence behaviors: A comparative study on public and private hospitals. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, 10(3), 956-976.
- Patil, D. B., Bhakkad, D. D. (2014). Redefining management practices and marketing in the modern age: Athrav Publications.
- Stahl, G., Björkman, I., Farndale, E., Morris, S. S., Paauwe, J., Stiles, P., Wright, P. (2012). Six principles of effective global talent management. *Sloan Management Review*, 53(2), 25-42.
- Tansley, C. (2011). What do we mean by the term “talent” in talent management? *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 43(5), 266-274.
- Tarakcı, H. (2016). The impact of talent management on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to leave. (Master's Thesis). Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale.
- Tunçer, P., (2012) Career management in the changing understanding of human resources management. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of Education Faculty*, 31(1), 203-233.
- Turan, N. (2015). Talent, skill, competence, sufficiency in working life. Ankara: Nobel Academic Publishing, 1st Edition.
- Turhan, M., Köprülü, O., Helvacı, İ. (2018). The relationship between organizational trust and individual job performance. *Journal of Politics, Economics and Management Research*, 6(5), 47-55.
- Turner, L.M., Webster, S.G., Morris, S. (2013). Roles of crustacean hyperglycaemic hormone in ionic and metabolic homeostasis in the Christmas Island blue crab, *Discoplax celeste*. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 216(7), 1191-1201.
- Uludağ, G. (2019). An empirical study on the impact of leader-member interaction on talent management. *Çukurova University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 28(2), 338-353.
- Uzuntarla, Y., Ceyhan, S., Fırat, İ. (2017). Examination of employee performance: A case study in the healthcare sector. *Gulhane Medical Journal*, 59(1), 16-20.

- Yahya, A. Z., Othman, M. S., & Shamsuri, A. L. S. (2012). The impact of training on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) performance. *Journal of Professional Management*, 2(1), 15-25.
- Yousuf, S., Siddiqui, D. A. (2019). Factors Influencing Employee Retention: A Karachi-based comparative study on IT and banking industry. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(1), 42-62.