

A Research to Identify the Problem Areas Caused by Organizational and Managerial Values

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan KARA

Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Kütahya Sosyal Bilimler Yüksekokulu, KÜTAHYA

ABSTRACT

In this study, on the basis of G. Hofstede and G. England's research on organizational and managerial values, it is aimed to determine which problems arise from organizational and managerial values in the organization. Research data needed to achieve the objective come from 166 administrators with academic and administrative authority at faculties, colleges and vocational schools of a public university. In the light of the data, the logistic regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between values and the problems caused by values. According to the results obtained by modeling, which organizational and managerial values cause which problem areas is discussed.

Key Words: *G. Hofstede's organizations values, G. England's management values, manager, organization.*

JEL Classification: *M0, M1, M14*

Örgütsel ve Yönetmel Deęerlerin Neden Olduęu Sorun Alanlarının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Arařtırma

ÖZET

Bu arařtırmada G. Hofstede ve G. England'ın örgütsel ve yönetmel deęerler konusundaki arařtırmaları temel alınarak, örgütsel ve yönetmel deęerlerinin örgütte hangi sorunların kaynaęını oluřturduęu saptanmaya çalıřılmıřtır. Arařtırma amacına ulařmak için gereksinim duyulan veriler, bir kamu üniversitesinin merkez ve ilçelerinde bulunan fakülte, yüksekokul, meslek yüksekokullarındaki akademik ve idari birimlerde görev yapan 166 yöneticiden elde edilmiřtir. Elde edilen veriler ışığında deęerler ve deęerlerin neden olduęu sorunlar arasındaki iliřkinin modellenip sayısal olarak ortaya konulmasında lojistik regresyon analizinden yararlanılmıřtır. Modelleme ile elde edilen sonuçlara göre hangi örgütsel ve yönetmel deęerlerin hangi sorun alanlarına neden olduęu tartıřılmıřtır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *G. Hofstede'nin örgütsel deęerleri, G. England'ın yönetmel deęerleri, yönetici, organizasyon.*

JEL Sınıflaması: *M0, M1, M14*

INTRODUCTION

Organizations implement different plans to extend their life curves and to achieve their objectives. The most crucial responsibility in identifying the first step in this process and sustaining the planned mobility is on the administrators. Administrators who determine organizational objectives can have similar or different values from employees, because they grow up in different social culture. This difference has a potential power to pose a conflict in determining the objectives and in the organizational and managerial practices. Values express what are favoured, expected to be achieved and important within a given culture. Therefore, if the differentiation arising from cultural structures not generalized

within organizational culture, it can be a source of unrest among employees, yet what is expected within the organization is a high level of contribution to organizational goals by the harmonization of cultures of employees.

The managerial and organizational problems that arise from executive values should be determined effectively. In this context, the managerial and organizational problems arise from executive values in achieving and sustaining the integrity of the aims of organizations should be evaluated as a problem.

I- INFORMATION ON ORGANIZATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL VALUES IN THE RESEARCH

Executives are not independent of the culture of the society and organizations they grow up in. Culture of societies and organizations affect culture of managers just as culture of managers affect the culture of societies and organizations. Executives are under the influence of certain cultural forces in their decisions made for the actions of the organization. The major of these forces affecting them directly or indirectly is the values regarded as a part of culture.

It is not possible to examine human values alone by abstracting them from society. Being social is one of the basic features of human beings. Besides personal values, there are also the values of society and culture they live in (Aşkun, 1978:266). Community rules and values hold an important place in terms of warnings. Community values are examples of social norms (Sheriff, 1985:95). Depending on the culture of Turkish society, the values of managers tend to progress under the influence of the general characteristics of culture. Professionalism provides executives with common sense, with which they have to fulfill the responsibilities arising from the culture of society as a command, in which values have an important role.

Values consist of the evaluation of some goods and living beings as "positive-negative" through the common thoughts of society or community groups. The concept of value is addressed in different ways in philosophy and sociology. Philosophy is engaged in the characteristics of values, their structure and their criticism. Sociology, on the other hand, deals with the disclosure of values, ways of existence, their types, various systems made up of values, value conflicts in specific situations and their interaction with social phenomenon, the organization and processes (Güney, 2002:39).

Value has been defined in various ways in the history of science. A common definition of value seems difficult in the abundance of these definitions (Özlem, 2002:282). Assuming the thinkers define values as products of different cultures, it is not surprising that they have their own values. It is then natural that different definitions have appeared to describe the concept of value, some of which will be explained below.

The dictionary meaning of value is defined as an attitude that, in ethics and value philosophy, appears after fact conscious and that is determined by ascribing certain characteristics to the fact and the subject in relation who has particular feelings, wishes, interests, aims, needs and actions (Cevizci, 2000:221). Definitions of the meaning of value other than dictionary definitions are as

follows: shared ideas or in criteria indicating which social behavior is good, correct and desirable (Tokat, 1996:81), the ethical ideals and a concept explaining what is good in general in dealing with other people according to these ideals (Gordon, 1960:15; Skula, 1973:5), the common phenomena in social life (Allport, 1968), a concept that shows how to carry out the works in an organization (Trevino and Nelson, 1995:244). In the light of the definitions of the value above, it can be defined more broadly as the generalized base, ethics, the doctrine of faith or the criteria which are approved by the majority to maintain the integrity and functioning and existence of a society expressing the thoughts, common purpose and interests of the majority or group (Güney, 2002:40). Values are shaped by the cultural structure of society and are evident in the organizational and managerial areas. Organizational and administrative actions are influenced by values formalize because they guide the direction of the organizational and administrative actions.

A. Organizational Values

Various studies have dealt with what organizational values are. One of these studies is G. Hofstede's "Cultural Analysis". G. Hofstede, focusing on management and organizational fields, studied the individual values in these fields (Geyikdağı, 1995:90). In G. Hofstede's classification, while determining the differences between cultures, four dimensions were determined for values: avoidance from uncertainty, power distance, masculinity-femininity, individuality and collective behavior.

Value of avoidance from uncertainty is about level of unease because of insufficient or unclear information, complexity and rapid and unforeseeable changes (Varoğlu et. al, 2000:425). Value of avoidance from uncertainty indicates the degree of organization members' eliminating uncertainty of unforeseeable events through rules and bureaucratic practices (Alpay et. al, 2002:76). It is a cultural assumption about to what extent various acting styles and ideas are tolerated socially and culturally (Bozkurt and Turgut, 1999:61). It also indicates the degree of considering the unknown and unstructured situations as a threat and keeping to traditions and customs (Danışman, 2000:342). In other words, it refers to the level of acceptance or rejection of uncertain situations of social systems (Şişman, 2002:128-134).

Power distance value is an idea determining the size of the national culture, adopted by between lower and upper groups and supported by their social circles. Power distance also reflects the degree of independence a manager gives to his subordinates in the decision making process and this dimension is recognized as the degree of authority (Tüz, 2004:4-5). Power distance value is concerned with equal or unequal distribution of power in organizations (Varoğlu et. al, 2000:427). Power distance, shows the difference in power between offices and people. It is related to the order of steps and the degree of power people have to obey (Schermerhorn et. al, 2000:46). G. Hofstede defines power distance as the unjust distribution of power in society groups and organizations (Wall et. al, 2001:129-130). On the basis of this value lies the idea that using the power

satisfies the user. Using the power creates addiction. Therefore, every individual desires to have the power (Tüz, 2004:2-3).

The value of individualism and collective behavior expresses weak or strong ties between individuals in society and is related to how an individual expresses him/herself. Individuality focuses on the degree of both a community's supporting individual or collaborative success and relations between people. Individualism is explained with concepts such as distance, independence from the band, freedom, autonomy. Socialism is characterized by concepts such as dependency on group, trust and intra-group harmony (Tüz, 2004:13). It is a tendency of a cultural value to emphasize individual and group requests (Schermerhon et. al, 2000:46).

Masculinity and femininity value indicates how the roles played men and women in society are determined by gender. There is a similar trend between both traditional and modern societies in the distribution of gender roles. Men should deal with economic actions while the women deal with children and house chores. These role models are structured according to biological gender roles. This dimension of culture expresses the roles imposed by the society on men and women, the basic beliefs of the society about different genders and different values of different genders (Tüz, 2004:13-19). Masculinity values are a degree of to what extent such rigid values as achievement, competition and rule are dominant whereas feminine values are a degree of to what extent such softer values as serve, taking care of the weak and solidarity are dominant (Marie et.al, 1998:268). In the societies where masculinity values are dominant, women should do their own jobs and comply with the traditional male domination. Among the values of femininity are sensitivity, concern, kindness, compassion, willingness to please others and generosity (Wilson, 1999:109).

B. Managerial Values

There may be different items that always affect managers' attitudes and values (Fincham and Rhodes, 1999:63). It is not possible to study these items only in historical, organizational and technological aspects. It should be known that managers act to be successful and what the values that have an active role in the formation and development of modern society are (Mc Clelland, 1961:46-47).

Administrators shouldn't only be seen physically strong and with capability of supernormal action. Who managers administer today and how stand out more (Bennis and Nanus, 1985:4). Managers do not just have subordinates; they also have superiors who can influence managers' managing styles (Boone and Kurtz, 1987:407). Without considering the ethical values of society, an administrator may give decisions without thinking about their impact on the behavior of other people (Hellriegel et. al, 1992:66-67). Values, by being restructured in organizations according to the characteristics of organizations, can return to the other value resources of community as managerial values and affect them. On the other hand, those who founded the organization and the shareholders are among the major elements in the creation of value in the organization. Even if the status of the shareholders within the organization is

formed by official contracts, it is not entirely separate from the actions of management (Kanter et. al, 1992:214). Despite difference, managers are responsible for the whole organization. An organization's success depends on the success of managers. For successful management of the organization, positive contribution expected from the various differences should be reflected to the organization's operational behavior (Matteson and Ivancevich, 1999:139). The managerial value fields expressing actions and behaviors involve methods of decision, communication, supervision, employee evaluation, time schedule and evaluation, rewarding, motivation and so on (Austin, 1990:355).

Various values of the organization play a role in motivating the expected behaviors (Baron and Greenberg, 1990:77). Management relies on the power. The power is considered to be the manager's superior skills in managing a group of people because it is the manager's affecting others for his/her own purposes rather than doing action (Michael and Jones, 1973:294). A manager possessing the power must have a mental ability in all the acts of the organization containing the values (Certo, 1992:416). Administrators, before developing values for their organizations, should review their organizations and be able to receive positive responses from the organizational structure (Wild et. al, 2003:314).

G. England developed a model for the relationship between managers' behavior and values. This model was used to develop a measurement approach for personal value systems which were designed in the light of managers' characteristics and values, and which revealed behavioral relation of values. Each term in personal value scale represents four different values. These are self-seeking (utilitarian, pragmatic) value, moral (ethical, customary) value, emotional value and complex value (Silah, 2000:494).

Not to disrespect self-seeking people, they are called pragmatic, utilitarian. In other words, s/he is a person who exhibits self-seeking approach. To be self-seeking, pragmatism is not a prerequisite; pragmatism has its own system of values (www.sozluk.sourtimes.org/show, 19.12.2006). Self-seeking, in this regard, is based on "selfishness" and "I am everything and everything is for me." (Hançerlioğlu, 1970:224).

The administrator puts more emphasis on ethical values than success and emotions. He assures that important things do not contradict moral values. It is important for him to do the selection of subordinates customarily. The purpose of such an administrator is to comply with moralism values and to implement them. For the sake of sticking to moral values, success and feelings are sacrificed (Silah, 2000:494-508).

Feelings are dominant in the behavior and decisions of managers that have emotional values. Emotional manager decides and acts upon his feelings. The administrator reflects such emotions as acceptance, being touched and satisfied in the face of goodness and beauty. His feelings are as important for him as being right or practical. He also acts upon his senses in the selection of subordinates (Silah, 2000:494-508).

Except for the value trends above, executives with a pattern of values which is a mix of those above can be defined as managers with tendency of mixed value. They not only interact with their environment and take personal or organizational decisions self-seekingly, ethically and emotionally but also partly reflect emotional value tendency in their personality. Each of these values may influence the formation of the integrity of the manager's personality. However, the severity and impact level of each of these values are different from one another (Silah, 2000:494-508).

II. RESEARCH PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION

A. Aim of the Research

The purpose of this study is to determine problem areas caused by organizational and managerial values.

B. Importance of the Research

Despite a lot of work on values, it is observed that there is no study on which organizational and managerial problems arise from the values put forward in the literature. It is hoped that this study will make some contribution by determining the problem areas caused by values both theoretically and in terms of the model applied.

C. Limitations of the Research

The values of a society are the basic element of the change in the organization. Irresponsibility, ignorance, resistance to change and submission, along with the cultural structure features based on education, are the basic method shortcomings applied to change and prevent change. The formation of community values and their ability to change mentioned above are beyond the scope of this study. Determining what the values are may constitute the subject of another study; the limit of the research is not to involve all the values.

On the other hand, the reluctance of managers in the public universities in the research papers to answer the survey and the challenges brought by the research in terms of time and cost in face to face meeting with responders are the other limits. Problem areas composed of values are limited to the values of the subjects at the time are the other criteria for limitation. It should also be noted that because of the changeable nature of values, another research in another time zone might yield different results. On the other hand, the validity of the results is as much as the validity of the scale, which constitutes another limitation.

D. Literature Survey

The literature was reviewed to find out what organizational and managerial problems are that constitute the source of values that compose the purpose of our study. As a result of the review, problem areas were identified. These problems were gathered in 36 areas.

E. Preparation of Poll Questions

The survey questions were based on the theoretical knowledge about values. 221 questions were obtained at the first stage. Eliminating duplicates and insignificant ones, a 44-item questionnaire was obtained.

F. Pilot Experiment

A pilot experiment was conducted on the 56 managers serving in various academic and administrative units in the public universities within the scope of research before the implementation of the poll. Rectifying the subtle items, the 44-item survey questions were redesigned.

G. Survey Reliability

The research questionnaire was composed of 44 questions with 5-point Likert scale. The reliability statistic was calculated as $\alpha = 0.778$ in the SPSS environment, which is very close to the value considered to be highly reliable (Özdamar, 2004).

III. MODEL COMPATIBILITY

The purpose of most of the scientific research in the field of social sciences is to determine the relationships between the variables. In this study, it is aimed to model and study numerically the relationship between the values of the administrators and the problems created by the administrator values. Logistic regression analysis was used to analyze the survey results.

As is known, regression analysis is a statistical technique that allows revealing the relationship between a dependent (explained) variable and an independent (explanatory) variable. On the other hand, it is also known that when the dependent variable has categorical values (no natural numerical values) the linear regression model is not feasible. In such cases, logistic regression analysis is used. Indeed, the logistic regression analysis is a method utilized to determine the relationship between the explanatory and described variables when the dependent (response) variable is observed as a categorical variable in bilateral or multiple categories.

Another fundamental difference between linear regression and logistic regression models is the implementation of normal distribution assumptions. While normal distribution assumption should be provided in linear regression, the validity of this assumption is not in question in logistic regression. In addition, logistic regression can be applied on models in which besides the dependent variables, the independent variables are composed of qualitative variables that don't have numerical values (Durucasu, 2005). For these reasons, our research used logistic regression analysis order to model the problems caused by the values of managers.

The model compliance tables given in the following chapters have been obtained directly from the outputs of SPSS software. The level of significance p value of significance is less than (or equal) to $\alpha = 0.05$, which shows that the model is compatible. This is shown under the tables as "Significance p-value $< \alpha = 0.05$, so the model is significant." In the following chapters, while creating parameter estimation tables, only the explanatory variables with significant effect are kept and the others are not included. In order for an explanatory variable to have a significant effect, significance level of the values on the column of p significance should be less than (or equal to) $\alpha = 0.05$. This is shown under the

parameter estimation tables as " $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant." Application of the questionnaire was conducted on the subjects after having the necessary consent from faculty, college, vocational school and department administrators in a public university.

IV. SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

The scope of the research was composed of administrators working in faculties, colleges, vocational schools of a public university. The research aimed to reach the entire population, so sampling was not taken. 166 questionnaires were evaluated which were obtained from the managers of 24 different departments.

V. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The 44-item questionnaire conducted to determine the problems caused by organizational and managerial values were evaluated in SPSS environment. Compatibility of each problem was analyzed with an individual regression model. The relationship between values and the problems compatible with the model is determined through parameter estimates.

The regression models showing whether the values are compatible with the problems caused by organizational and managerial values of 166 administrators in various academic and administrative units of a public university; namely, *not being able to take risks, prescriptivism, loss of respect, loss of organization's vision, absolute obedience, teamwork denial, not valuing subordinates, centralization, unhealthy decision-making, selfishness, resistance to new ideas, persecution, gender discrimination, conflict, lack of communication, intolerance, giving no importance to ethics and emotions, self-sordidness, excessive materiality, excessive authority, egocentrism, saving the day, indecisiveness, administrative space, single-man policy, unprincipledness, insecurity, inconsistent behavior, non-democratic behavior, abuse, non-formal relationships, disobedience, injustice*, and the parameter estimates showing the relationship between values and problems are presented in detailed tables.

Organizational values- *uncertainty value, power value, the value of individuality-joint behavior, masculinity-femininity value*- and managerial values- *self-seeking value, morals value, sentimentality value, mixed-value*- are the sources of each problem. They are explained the parameter estimates. The level of how organizational and managerial give rise to problems is explained in the tables in the following sections.

The results of the SPSS environment (including statements of a and b) are in 62 different tables. However, since attempting to explain all the results in tables will increase the volume of writing, the problem areas caused by organizational and managerial values are sampled in several tables. The remaining problem areas are explained briefly.

Table-1- Model Harmonization and Parameter Estimation of Problem of not Taking Risk

i-**Dependent Variable:** not Taking Risk, Restlessness ii-**Independent Variables:** Values

Table-1a- Model Harmonization of Problem of not Taking Risk

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	441,303			
End	360,606	80,697	31	0,000

Significance p-value $< \alpha = 0.05$, so the model is significant.

Table-1b- Parameter Estimation of Problem of not Taking Risk

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	Df	Sig.
[Self-Seeking=Most of the Time]	1,023	0,527	3,764	1	0,052
[Sentimentality = Most of the Time]	-1,366	0,584	5,474	1	0,019

$P < \alpha = 0.05$ sig.

Analyzing the parameter estimates in Table-1b, it is seen that the problems of not taking risk and restlessness arise from the values of self-seeking source and sentimentality. As uncertainties increase in managers' decisions and actions due to self-seeking and sentimentality, they abstain from taking risks and tend to avoid from risky actions that will hinder them in the future.

Table-2- Model Consistency of Prescriptivism Problem and Parameter Estimation

i-**Dependent Variable:** Prescriptivism ii-**Independent Variables:** Values

Table-2a- Model Consistency of Prescriptivism Problem

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	329,014			
End	255,494	73,520	31	0,000

Significance p-value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$ so the model is significant.

Table-2b- Parameter Estimation of Prescriptivism Problem

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	Df	Sig.
[Uncertainty=Never]	-25,102	1,818	190,735	1	0,000
[Uncertainty=Rarely]	-22,727	1,561	211,840	1	0,000
[Uncertainty=From Time to Time]	-23,237	1,544	226,443	1	0,000
[Self-seeking=Never]	-7,624	2,289	11,088	1	0,001
[Self-seeking=From Time to Time]	-2,915	1,089	7,171	1	0,007
[Self-seeking =Most of the Time]	-2,389	0,673	12,619	1	0,000

[Morals= Never]	-3,903	1,144	11,641	1	0,001
[Morals = From Time to Time]	-1,395	0,544	6,585	1	0,010
[Sentimentality= Most of the Time]	-1,498	0,654	5,242	1	0,022
[Mixed = Never]	-19,449	1,187	268,626	1	0,000
[Mixed=Rarely]	-19,941	1,130	311,627	1	0,000
[Mixed = From Time to Time]	-20,722	1,147	326,540	1	0,000

$P < \alpha = 0.05$ sig.

Environments within and outside the organization leads to the problems of **uncertainty**, **self-seeking**, **moralism**, **sentimentality**, **mixed values**, and **prescriptivism** when the organization's future and the result of changes and decisions can not be seen.

Table-3- Model Consistency of Absolute Obedience Problem

i-**Dependent Variable:** Absolute Obedience ii-**Dependent Variable:** Values

Table-3a- Model Consistency of Absolute Obedience Problem

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	398,011			
End	368,614	29,397	31	0,549

The model is not significant because p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the problem of **absolute obedience**. None of the 166 administrators answering the questionnaire consider absolute obedience as a problem. In other words, the values investigated by the survey in the organization do not create the problem of **absolute obedience**.

Table-4- Model Consistency of Resistance to New Ideas Problem

i-**Dependent Variable:** New Ideas Obscurity ii-**Independent Variables:** Values

Table-4a- Model Consistency of Resistance to New Ideas Problem

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	418,026			
End	387,312	30,714	31	0,481

The model is not significant because p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the problem of **resistance to new ideas**. None of the 166 administrators answering the questionnaire consider **resistance to new ideas** as a problem. In other words, the values investigated by the survey in the organization do not create the problem

of **resistance to new ideas**. The goals and policies of organizations are extremely important in being open to new ideas. Therefore, the fact that the problem of being resistant to new ideas does not exist is extremely significant because the population of the research is a university.

As noted above, because of excess of the tables for values and the problems caused by values produced by the SPSS program, the results are given in the text form below.

1-i-Dependent Variable: Loss of Respect; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Loss of Respect Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) It depends on the alignment of organizational and individual objectives for the organization to reach its goal. His/her subordinates will not respect an administrator ignores common compliance and decides and acts upon self-seeking values. The source of the **loss of respect** problem is the value of **self-seeking**.

2-i-Dependent Variable: Organization's Vision Weakness **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Organization's Vision Weakness Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) Values of **self-seeking** and **sentimentality** cause managers to be interested in their own benefits and to act away from the goals of the organization. Such a manager will not be able to determine a vision for the organization. In addition, when managers cannot determine uncertainties efficiently, under the influence of **self-seeking** and **sentimentality** values, they will lead to the emergence of vision weakness problem in decisions and actions that determine the organization's future.

3-i-Dependent Variable: Team Work Disclaimer; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Team Work Disclaimer Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) The parameter estimates show that values of **self-seeking** and **sentimentality** cause **team work disclaimer** problem. Managers can determine how their teams are formed, their characteristics, objectives and common tasks unilaterally. Tasks should be carried out collectively by the whole team, which is one of the basic characteristics of team work. Managers affect or even prevent establishment and co-working of teams under the influence of their values.

4-i-Dependent Variable: Not Valuing the Subordinates; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Not Valuing the Subordinates Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) The fact that the executives are forced to make decisions fast and accurately to adapt to the conditions inside and outside their organization accelerates the individual decision-making process. Administrators, instead of benefiting from the expertise of his subordinates, rely on their own knowledge and skills while making decisions. When executives

make decisions without trusting their subordinates' knowledge, experience and expertise, problems of **uncertainty** within the organization, **sentimentality**, **mixed values** and not valuing their subordinates may occur.

5-i-Dependent Variable: Problem of Centralization; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Centralization Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) When executives believe that they should make the final decision, even though the decision was thought and developed previously at sub-stages, they may give rise to **centralization** problem due to **individuality-joint behavior**, **moralism**, **sentimentality** and **mixed values** values.

6-i-Dependent Variable: Unhealthy Decision-making; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Unhealthy Decision-making Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) The success of an administrator is measured by his/her true and accurate decisions for the organization. However, every manager can be under the influence of his/her own values. When decision making for the future of the organization isn't carried out upon consensus and objectively, **moralism** and **sentimentality** values may cause **unhealthy decision-making** problem.

7-i-Dependent Variable: Selfishness; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values . Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Selfishness Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) Executives may consider the success they have achieved over time equal to the success of the organization and may think that without them their organizations would fail and they are the indispensable man. Because of managers who tend believe that their value is the only true value and try to spread it within the organization, **uncertainty value** may create the problem of **selfishness**.

8-i-Dependent Variable: Persecution; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values . Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Persecution Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) **Persecution** problem may arise when administrators implement the decisions they believe to be correct and use their power on their subordinates to promote their own values within the organization. In the circumstances with increased uncertainties, **uncertainty**, **power distance**, **sentimentality**, and **mixed values** can create **persecution problem** within the organization.

9-i-Dependent Variable: Gender Discrimination; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Gender

Discrimination Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) It is very natural when executives act under the influence of gender roles incurred to them because they are a part of the cultural construction they have grown up in. When one of **masculinity-femininity** values dominates, the opinions of subordinates for their gender will change. A **gender discrimination problem** may arise within the organization when managers tend to protect one gender against the other, load more work to one gender and try to solve problems according to gender characteristics. Parameter estimations show that **uncertainty, individualism-joint behavior, self-seeking, sentimentality** and **mixed values** lead to **gender discrimination problem**.

10-i-Dependent Variable: Conflict; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Conflict Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) The fact that managers have different values can be seen as the source of the **problem of conflict** within the organization all the time. When the managers of different cultures and values come together or encounter their subordinates, a conflict may arise between them in necessary decisions or actions for the organization. On the other hand, the parameter estimates show that **uncertainty, sentimentality** and **mixed values** lead to the problem of a conflict in the organizational environment.

11-i-Dependent Variable: Lack of Communication; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Lack of Communication Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) When managers and subordinates have different cultures and values, it becomes difficult to adopt a common communication network and a common language. Not using a common language and communication network will hinder not only carrying out the daily actions, but also determining a common organizational behavior and policy. Parameter estimations show that **uncertainty, sentimentality** and **mixed values** lead to **lack of communication problem** in the organizational environment.

12-i-Dependent Variable: Intolerance; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Intolerance Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) Parameter estimations show that **uncertainty, force, moralism, sentimentality**, and **mixed values** lead to **intolerance problem**. In cases when conditions inside and outside the organization are uncertain, managers may be affected by uncertainties and cause **intolerance problem** towards subordinates and one another in their relationships, behaviors and actions when different cultures and values do not meet at a common point.

13-i-Dependent Variable: Giving No Importance to Ethics and Senses; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p

value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Giving No Importance to Ethics and Senses Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) Executives may not give any importance to their subordinates' values, beliefs, attitudes, feelings and ethical values while carrying out their decisions and actions. **Self-seeking value** cause managers not to pay attention to the value of their subordinates and organization for their own interests, while for moralism causes ignoring other individuals' ethics and emotions. Parameter estimates show that **self-seeking** and **moralism values** lead to the problem of **ignoring feelings**.

14-i-Dependent Variable: Giving No Importance to Human Relations; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is more than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the problem of **giving no importance to human relations**. This problem is not seen as a problem among 166 managers of the organization on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the problem of **giving no importance to human relations**.

15-i-Dependent Variable: Self-sordidness; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the problem of **self-sordidness**. **Self-sordidness problem** is not seen as a problem among 166 managers of the organization on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the problem of **self-sordidness**.

16-i-Dependent Variable: Excess Materiality; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the problem of **excess materiality**. **Excess materiality problem** is not seen as a problem among 166 managers of the organization on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the problem of **excess materiality**. The fact that the problem area in the previous issue "self-sordidness" doesn't exist in the organization organization confirms the fact that the problem of **excessive materiality** doesn't exist in the organization.

17-i-Dependent Variable: Discrimination; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Discrimination Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) When administrators choose to work with such subordinates with similar values, not to involve all the subordinates during decision making and to ignore some subordinates while forming a common organization culture and making decisions to embark on similar actions, this can create **discrimination problem**. If the ignored subordinates have common values,

they will come together, which will spread the problem the **discrimination problem** within the organization. Parameter estimates show that **self-seeking, moralism, sentimentality** and **mixed values** lead to **discrimination problem**.

18-i-Dependent Variable: Resistance to Change; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Resistance to Change Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) Assuming that executives are products of different cultures, a manager under the influence of moralist cultural values will not be apt to change. A traditionalist manager will cause the problem of **resistance to change** because he tends protect his values, which will also prevent a change in direct proportion to the culture and values within the organization. If that administrator's **moralist values** cannot adapt to changes occurring in the society, the problem of **resistance to change** will spread within the organization. The parameter estimates show that **uncertainty, power distance, moralism** and **mixed values** lead to the problem of **resistance to change**.

19-i-Dependent Variable: Excessive Authority; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Excessive Authority Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) When administrators tell their subordinates to implement their decisions which they have made under the influence of **self-seeking, moralism** and **mixed values**, this non-constructive approach towards subordinates may lead to the problem of **excessive authority** within the organization. Such a practice also leads to an autocratic form of administration because it prevents subordinates from joining decision-making. Failure to achieve the transfer of authority to the others can be evaluated as a result of **excessive authority** problem.

20-i-Dependent Variable: Centrism; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Centrism Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) The parameter estimations show that **uncertainty, sentimentality** and **mixed values** lead to **centrism problem**. **Centrism problem** arises when executives, under the influence of **uncertainty, sentimentality** and **mixed values**, rely on their own common sense without consulting their subordinates and considering the cases that will affect functioning of their organization, want to be informed or to have an effect in all decisions. When **centrism problem** settles within the organization, subordinates lose their ability to take the initiative.

21-i-Dependent Variable: Saving the Day Approach; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. When **uncertainty avoidance value** of managers is high, they will be unable to take decisions concerning the future

and will only act to save the day. The **saving the day problem** will spread within the organization because managers who cannot make critical decisions will cause the problems to get worse. The parameter estimates show that **uncertainty, moralism** and **sentimentality values** lead to the **saving the day problem**.

22-i-Dependent Variable: Instability; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the problem of **instability**. A manager's most prominent feature is his/her precise and correct decisions regarding the organization. Instability problem is not considered as a problem among the 166 managers on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the problem of **instability**.

23-i-Dependent Variable: Space Management; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Space Management Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) There may be decisions a manager wants to make but s/he can't. However, the most important feature of an executive is his/her decisions taken and put into practice. Giving priority to his/her own interest, not being able to make a decision or stepping back from a decision will fail his/her method. Such a failure might lead to **space management problem**. In addition, **space management problem** will also cause confusion within the organization when an administrator makes a decision without taking the organization's objectives and policies, skills and characteristics of subordinates and the environmental changes into account because this will exacerbate the failure. Parameter prediction show that **self-seeking, sentimentality** and **mixed values** lead to **space management problem**.

24-i-Dependent Variable: Single-man; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the **single-man problem**. Single-man problem is not considered as a problem among the 166 managers on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the **single-man problem**.

25-i-Dependent Variable: Normlessness; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the **normlessness problem**. Normlessness problem is not considered as a problem among the 166 managers on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the **normlessness problem**.

26-i-Dependent Variable: Insecurity; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and

managerial values can explain the **insecurity problem**. Insecurity problem is not considered as a problem among the 166 managers on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the **insecurity problem**.

27-i-Dependent Variable: Inconsistency in Behaviors; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Inconsistency in Behaviors Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) An administrator's decisions should be consistent for all similar cases. In other words, managers should be able to demonstrate similar behaviors in similar situations. Parameter estimations show that **power distance**, **masculinity-femininity** and **mixed values** lead to the problem of **inconsistency in behaviors**.

28-i-Dependent Variable: Non-Democratic Behaviors; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is not significant. Accordingly, none of the **organizational** and **managerial values** can explain the **non-democratic behaviors problem**. Non-Democratic Behaviors problem is not considered as a problem among the 166 managers on whom the survey was conducted. In other words, the **values** surveyed in the organization do not create the **non-democratic behaviors problem**.

29-i-Dependent Variable: Abuse; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Abuse Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) **Abuse problem** might occur in complying with the organization's policies and implementing the tasks in line with commitment to organizational targets and goals among subordinates when managers always treat subordinates in good faith and communicate with subordinates under the influence of certain values. The parameter estimates show that **individualism-joint behavior**, **masculinity-femininity**, **moralism** and **mixed values** lead to **abuse problem** within the organization.

30-i-Dependent Variable: Non-Formal Relations; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Non-Formal Relations Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) It is expected that managers meet with subordinates in social life outside the organization. However, this association is caused by specific issues and it will affect the organization's formal structure when it is carried into the organization. Therefore, it can be said that some values lead to **non-formal relations problem** within the organization. The parameter estimations show that **power distance**, **individualism-joint behavior**, **masculinity-femininity**, **self-seeking** and **mixed values** lead to the problem of **non-formal relations**.

31-i-Dependent Variable: Disobedience; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$,

the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Disobedience Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) The fact that managers have friendly relations with subordinates shows that the manager values human relations. An administrator's belief that such an act should be carried out is by the effect of some values. However, this can also be perceived differently by subordinates, which can raise the problem of **disobedience** against the administration. The values responsible for such a case are shown in the parameter estimates as **individuality-joint behavior, masculinity-femininity, moralism, sentimentality, and mixed values.**

32-i-Dependent Variable: Injustice; **ii-Independent Variables:** Values. Because Model Consistency significance p value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the model is significant. (Parameter Estimation of Injustice Problem, $P < \alpha = 0.05$ significant.) Executives should take the wishes and recommendations of their subordinates into consideration in the daily and future decisions of their organizations. But these proposals and wishes should not be for the fulfillment of a one-sided goal. When the suggestions and requests do not involve all the organization or there are some requests or suggestions of subordinates that haven't been fulfilled because they haven't been reported to the management, **injustice problem** might occur in the organization. Administrators might be under the influence of some values while fulfilling the suggestions and requests. The parameter estimations show that **uncertainty, sentimentality and mixed values** lead to **injustice problem.**

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Uncertainty avoidance value is about the level of uneasiness of the organization about the environments the organization comes into when information is insufficient or not clear, complexity occurs and the changes occur fast and unpredictably. A sense of insecurity and threat in the face of uncertainties will require acting under the rules and will turn the rules into obligation. Saying "hopefully" due to moralist values in the society shows that as uncertainties increases, individuals don't possess power in the face of events. In addition, the implementation of lifelong employment can be seen as a natural result of uncertainty avoidance. This value appeared high in the research, which caused selfishness to stand out in the organization. On the other hand, the value of uncertainty avoidance, together with moralism values, brings prescriptivism and commitment to the rules problems into the organization. Employees who see uncertainty as a threat choose to act in accordance with the rules without using any initiatives and leaving everything to their seniors.

The value of uncertainty avoidance, together with power distance value, constituted the source of persecution problem within the organization. Power distance is an idea that is accepted between subordinates and seniors, is supported in their social circles and determines the extent of the national culture. Power distance is related to the degree of independence granted by a manager to his/her subordinates in decision-making process. If such a power isn't composed of the

functional structure of management, but arises from the personality of a group of manager, it means that the growth and development of the organization is carried out through a personalized management model. Such a personalized interaction of management and organizational environment causes instability. People or members of the organization constantly live in restlessness and insecurity in organizational environments whose interaction develops along the line of instability.

The problem of resistance to change within an organization develops because of uncertainty, the power, moralism and mixed values. In this case, people with dependent personality characteristics stand out with low self-esteem, low self-power and authoritarianism; moreover, people with these characteristics become dependent on the existing situation, shutting themselves off any change that will disrupt their balance.

Uncertainty, moralism and sentimentality values cause the “save the day” concept to be dominant in the organization, which supports the problems mentioned above. Not only will sense of insecurity occur in the face of uncertainty, but individuals will also be seeking for continuity in working conditions in this culture where change isn’t welcome. Besides, the lack of habit of making plans will be a natural result of uncertainty. Lack of habit of making plans is an educational problem.

Individuality, moralism and the emotional values cause the problems of centralization and unhealthy decision-making. Business consciousness of managers and other employees in the middle and bottom steps of the organization the management of organizations will weaken when the authority and responsibilities of an organization is not well-spread to the base because everything is decided at the top. Besides, the lagged decisions retard the problem-solving in the relationship between the management and organization or make the problems that should be resolved in a certain time unsolvable.

Self-seeking (utilitarian, pragmatic), sentimentality and moralism values cause the problems of discrimination, not giving importance to ethics and emotions, management space and unrest. Administrators can cause the problem of discrimination when they joint work with subordinates with common values to make a joint resolution to take similar actions and to create a common organizational culture; when their decisions don’t involve all the subordinates and when they ignore the other employees. The most important feature of a manager is to take appropriate decisions and to be able to implement them. However, his/her self-seeking decisions and hesitation the decisions will make her fail, which will cause space management.

Uncertainty and sentimental values cause centrism, conflict, lack of communication, injustice and giving no importance to subordinates problems. These findings seem to support the above-described findings regarding values and problems. Lack of effective communication system prevents encouraging individuals to specific purposes and objectives of management and adopting

them. Thus, people are dissolved from the administration and everyone can act his own way.

Self-seeking (utilitarianism, pragmatic) value, in other words, giving the interests of those in management higher priority and perception of this by other employees in this way leads to a loss of respect for the top.

Uncertainty, power distance, moralism and sentimentality values cause the cause of the problem of intolerance. In other words, in circumstances of uncertainty inside and outside the organization, personalization of power, moralist and emotional behavioral patterns cause managers to be intolerant towards employees, their errors and their environment. Decisions and actions of individuals with different values will be different.

Uncertainty, individualism-joint behavior, self-seeking and sentimentality values is the source of the problem of gender discrimination. Individualism and collective behaviour mean the ties between individuals in society being weak or strong. Individuality focuses on the degree of the society's supporting relationships between people and individual or collaborative success. Behavior of individualist societies may be amicable. However, there is no tendency for people outside the family. Turkish society is the product of a culture that values social behaviour which lies in the origin of citizenship and nepotism. Masculinity and femininity values refers to the roles imposed on different genders in the society and shows how gender determines the roles played by men and women in the society. It is natural that executives act under the effect of gender roles incurred to them because they are a part of the cultural community they have grown up in. When one of the masculinity-femininity values becomes dominant, this will change subordinates' perspective towards their own gender. The problem of gender discrimination may arise when managers with masculine values become more protective for women, load more jobs on men and solve problems according to gender characteristics.

Power distance and masculinity-femininity values are the causes of the imprecision in behaviors. An administrator should be able to perform similar behaviors in similar situations. When an administrator can not use the value of power distance effectively and use masculinity-femininity value in its relations with subordinates one-sidedly, this may lead to the problem of inconsistency in organizational behavior.

The model was not significant for problem areas like insecurity, unprincipledness, single-man, indecisiveness, excessive materiality, absolute obedience, resistance to new ideas, non-democratic behavior, not giving importance to human relations and self-sordidness because p value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$; therefore, they could be explained by none of the organizational and managerial values. However, this situation may have arisen from the characteristics of the organization in the research and may be a source of the problem in other organizations.

REFERENCES

- ALLPORT, G.W. (1968), The Handbook of Social Psychology, 2. Ed., V.:1, Addison-Wesley, London, England.
- ALPAY, G., DEVELİOĞLU, K., EVCİMEN, İ. (2002), "İşletmelerin Sosyal Sorumlulukları: Belirleyici Etken Olarak Kurumsal Değerler", 10. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, 23-25 Mayıs, Antalya, pp.73-84.
- AŞKUN, İ.C. (1978), İşgören, Cem Ofset, Aralık, Eskişehir.
- AUSTIN, J.E. (1990), Managing in Developing Countries, Strategic Analysis and Operating Techniques, The Free Press, New York, USA.
- BARON, R.A., GREENBERG, J. (1990), Behavior in Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work, 4. Ed., Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston, USA.
- BENNIS, W., NANUS, B. (1985), Leaders, The Strategies For Taking Charge, Harper-Row Pub., New York, USA.
- BOONE, L.E., KURTZ, D.L. (1987), Management, 3. Ed., Random House Pub., New York, USA.
- BOZKURT, T., TURGUT, T. (1999), "Çalışanların Toplam Kalite Yönetim Uygulamaları İle İlgili İş Tatminleri ve Kültürel Saygınlıkları Arasındaki İlişkiler", Öneri, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, S.:12, C.:2, Y.:5, Haziran, İstanbul, pp.60-71.
- CERTO, S.C. (1992), Modern Management, Quality, Ethics and Global Environment, Mc Graw Hill Comp., New York, USA.
- CEVİZCİ, A. (2000), Felsefe Sözlüğü, 4. Baskı, Paradigma Yayınları, Eylül, İstanbul.
- DANIŞMAN, A. (2000), "Kültürel Ortamın Araştırma Sonuçlarına Etkisi: Kuzey Amerika'da Geliştirilip Türkiye'de Tekrarlanan Bazı Araştırmalar Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", 8. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, 25-27 Mayıs, Nevşehir.
- DURUCASU, H. (2005), Yaz Okulu Öğrencilerinin Beklentileri, Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No.: 1612, İİBF Yayınları No.:188, Eskişehir.
- FINCHAM, R., RHODES, R.P. (1999), Principles of Organizational Behaviour, 1. Ed., Oxford University Press Inc., New York, USA.
- GEYİKDAĞI, N.V. (1995), "What Makes an Effective European Manager?", Management International Review, V.:35, New York, USA, pp.89-91.
- GORDON, L. (1960), Survey of Interpersonal Values, Science Research Associates, Chicago, USA.
- GÜNEY, S. (2002), Davranış Bilimleri, 2. Baskı, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- HANÇERLİOĞLU, O. (1970), Felsefe Sözlüğü, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- HELLRIEGEL, D., SLOCOM, J.W., WOODMAN, R.W. (1992), Organizational Behavior, 7. Ed., West Pub., Minneapolis, USA.
- KANTER, R.M., STEIN, B.A., JICK, T.D. (1992), The Challenge of Organizational Change, How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It, The Free Press, New York, USA.
- MARIE, A., BARRY, F., GOLD, A. (1998), International Organizational Behavior, Prentice Hall Inc., New Jersey, USA.
- MATTESON, M.T., IVANCEVICH, J.M. (1999), Management and Organizational Behavior Classics, 7. Ed., Irwin Mc Graw Hill Comp., Boston, USA.
- MC CLELLAND, D.C. (1961), The Achieving Society, The Free Press, New York, USA.
- MICHAEL, S.R., JONES, H.R. (1973), Organizational Management, Mc Graw Hill Comp., New York, USA.
- ÖZDAMAR, K. (2004), Paket Programlar İle İstatistiksel Veri Analizi, Kaan Kitabevi, Eskişehir, p.663.
- ÖZLEM, D. (2002), "Değerler Sorununda Nesnelcilik, Mutlakçılık ve Öznelcilik, Rölativizm Tartışması Üzerine", Bilgi ve Değer Sempozyumu, Vadi Yayınları, Ankara, pp.282-301.
- SCHERMERHORN, J.R., HUND, J.G., OSBORN, R.N. (2000), Organizational Behavior, John-Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, USA.
- ŞERİF, M. (1985), Sosyal Kuralların Psikolojisi, (Çev.: SANDIKÇIOĞLU), Akan Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- SİLAH, M. (2000), Sosyal Psikoloji (Davranış Bilimi), Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.
- ŞİŞMAN, M. (2002), Örgütler ve Kültürler, Pegem Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- SKULA, F. A. (1973), "The Values and Values System of Governmental Executives", Public Personnel Management, January-February, pp.5-22.

- TOKAT, B. (1996), Örgütlerde Değişim ve Değişimin Yönetimi, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Yayın No.:6, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Yayın No.:6, Myra Yayıncılık, Kütahya.
- TREVINO, L.K., NELSON, K.A. (1995), Managing Business Ethics, Straigh Talk About How To Do It Right, Mc Millan Pub. Comp., New York, USA.
- TÜZ, M. (2004), İşletmelerde Yönetim Modelleri, Avrupa, Amerika, Japonya, Türkiye Uygulamalı, Aktüel Matbaacılık, İstanbul.
- VAROĞLU, A.K., BASIM, N., ERCİL, Y. (2000), “Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemine Farklı Bir Bakış; Analitik Düşünce-Bütünleşik Düşünce Modellemeleri İle Belirsizlikten Kaçınma ve Güç Mesafesi Araştırması”, 8. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 25-27, Mayıs, Nevşehir, pp.421-444.
- WALLS, S., RESS, B., BLACK, G. (2001), Introduction to International Business, Prentica Hall, Great Britain.
- WILD, J.J., WILD, K.L., HAN, J.C.Y. (2003), International Business, 2. Ed., Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Inc., New Jersey, USA.
- WILSON, F.M. (1999), Organizational Behaviour: A Critical Introduction, Oxford University Press, New York, USA.
- www.sozluk.sourtimes.org/show, (19.12.2006).