

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335920314>

Remaining Silent or Not: Is Power Distance a Barrier for Academicians?

Chapter · January 2014

CITATIONS

0

1 author:



Refika Bakoglu

Marmara University

87 PUBLICATIONS 46 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Leadership through Expressive Arts/ Dışavurumcu Sanatlarla Liderlik [View project](#)



STRATEGIC PARADOX, STRATEGIC THOUGHT SCHOOLS/ STRATEJİK PARADOKSLAR VE STRATEJİK YÖNETİM OKULLARI [View project](#)

HUMANIZATION OF WORK AND MODERN TENDENCIES IN MANAGEMENT



redakcja
Felicjan Bylok
Leszek Cichobłaziński

CZĘSTOCHOWA 2010

CZĘSTOCHOWA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

MONOGRAPH

**HUMANIZATION OF WORK
AND MODERN
TENDENCIES IN MANAGEMENT**

Edited by F. Bylok, L. Cichobłaziński

Częstochowa 2010

REVIEWERS:

PROFESSOR JANUSZ SZTUMSKI

EDITORS:

FELICJAN BYŁOK

LESZEK CICHOBŁAZIŃSKI

COVER:

DOROTA BORATYŃSKA

ISBN 978 – 83 – 61118 – 57 - 2

ISSN 1428 - 1600

© Copyright by Wydawnictwa Politechniki Częstochowskiej

Wydawnictwo Wydziału Zarządzania Politechniki Częstochowskiej,
42-200 Częstochowa, ul. Armii Krajowej 19B
Nakład: 100 egz. + 5 egz.

REMAINING SILENT OR NOT: IS POWER DISTANCE A BARRIER FOR ACADEMICIANS?

Summary: Power distance is considered to be the extent to which individuals at lower level of a cultural hierarchy accept their lack of autonomy and authority versus power shared throughout a hierarchy. However, few studies intend to investigate whether silence at work occurs as an effect of power distance. Power distance in Turkey is considered to be at high level, and recent research in a university shows that as many as 70% of the academicians preferred to remain silent at work. This finding is somehow paradoxical as a pluralistic organization; the university is expected to be an organization, which values and allows for the expression of multiple opinions. In this study, we aim to explore the relationship between power distance and silence at work within the framework of university organizations. The research was conducted in two large sized state universities located in Istanbul.

Key Words: Power Distance, Silence at Work, Academician, State University

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Concept of Power Distance

In recent years, scholars have become increasingly critical of silence at work. However, our knowledge of what serves as basis for silence is still limited. This paper extends silence at work established in management literature in order to link it with power distance, a dimension of culture, often taken into account by management theorists.

Power distance is a term first used by Mulder (Bruins, 1993) and measures the interpersonal power or influence between A and B as perceived by the least powerful of the two. Mulder defines "power" as "the potential to determine or direct the behavior of others more so than the other way round to a certain extent (Hofstede 1984:71). As Hofstede defines power distance as "the extent to which the less powerful of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede, 1997:28), it is, in fact, a question of whether subordinates acknowledge the power of others in terms of their positions in the hierarchy. Inequality in organizations is also considered to have an essential basis for culture by Hofstede, whereas unequal distribution of power over members is addressed as the essence of organization (Hofstede, 1984: p.69). Consultative and democratic power relations are expected in societies with low power distance, whereas people feel equal to one another regardless of their formal positions. However, inequality is considered to be the correct order of things in the world with everyone having his/her own rightful place in high power distance cultures. In consequence, superiors distinguish from subordinates. In contrary, individuals in low power distance cultures tend to feel that inequalities should be minimized, all members of society are interdependent, superiors and subordinates are not basically different, thus every individual should have equal rights (Wheeler, 2002).

1.2 Power Distance in Organizations

Power distance may be defined as the degree of acceptance of unequal distribution of power that exists as a continuum in organizations (Tan and Chong, 2003). However, the structure of the organization, as well as its environment and the nature of interpersonal relationships are also essential in order to analyze the power distance through an organizational framework.

Organizations with high power distance (Khatr, 2009) tend to have tall organization hierarchies and greater differentiation in salaries, perks and status symbols (Merritt and Helmreich 1996). The sense of division of labor “may become” a platform for the unequal distribution of power, which is widely discussed today in the management literature. Some characteristics of organizations with high power distance reveal certain outcomes, e.g. subordinates are expected to obey and receive instructions (Bochner and Heskett, 1994), superiors initiate most contacts with subordinates and relations between them tend to be distant (Offermann and Hellman 1997), and subordinates may accept autocratic or paternalistic relations as demonstrations of leadership (Fedor and Weather, 1995; Stephens and Greer 1995). Since today’s knowledge workers, i.e. those who use brainpower to do their jobs, tend to implement their individual opinions and strategies, the nature of consensus becomes arguable in terms of power distance. In other words, it becomes a question of how individuals articulate what the power distance is, and that they should feel themselves free to the maximum extent possible in order to create knowledge, thus accomplish their tasks. Organizations with low power distance tend to have flatter organization structures. In fact, status differentiation and special privileges may not be desirable in such organizations (Earley, 1999). Decision-making is more decentralized; there is high level of participation in decision-making. Therefore, they need to speak up to tell how they see the truth, for instance during the meetings, instead of remaining silent and just confirm the ongoing discussions. This consultative style provides for less formal relations and practices in the organization, and subordinates generally prefer such arrangements (Bochner and Hesketh, 1994). Considerably, power distances of organizations have characteristics that can be found in both high and low power distance organizations (Hofstede, 1997). For example, the marketing and sales department of a telecommunications company may have a low power distance culture while its accounting department considers high power distance relationships with strict rules and regulations.

1.3 Power Distance and Organizational Silence

Employee silence can be referred to as the withholding of ideas, suggestions, or concerns about people, products or processes that are communicated verbally to an individual inside the organization with the perceived authority to act (Kish-Gephart et al., 2009). Silence at work becomes a collective behavior when most employees in an organization tend to remain silent concerning organizational issues. Morrison and Milliken (2000) states that organizational silence refers to as the collective-level phenomenon of doing or saying very little in response to significant problems or issues facing an organization or industry. There exists an emerging body of research in the literature concerning when and why employees choose to remain silent or to speak up about essential organizational issues. Evidence suggests that the decisions made by individuals to speak up can be influenced either by individual-level factors, e.g. personality (Premeaux and Bedeian, 2003; Leet et al., 2000) and motives (Dyne et al., 2003) or by organizational-level factors e.g. organizational and management support (Edmondson, 2003; Piderit and Ashford, 2003), the perceived risk of speaking up (Milliken et al., 2003), organizational norms (Bowen and Blackmon, 2003), and institutional norms (Creed, 2003). However, remaining silent can also be an employee’s strategy to influence the decisions made by managers or an employee chooses certain topics about which to speak up while keeping silent about others (Milliken et al., 2003). Departing from the above given individual-level approach, in our study, it is a question of seeing silence either necessary or an obstacle in order to get along with colleagues and other individuals inside the organization.

2. RESEARCH

2.1. Context and Methodology of the Research

Our purpose is to determine whether power distance has effect on organizational silence issues at the Business Administration departments of two old and large sized universities in Istanbul. The respondents are selected from Business Administration faculty members of Marmara University and Istanbul University. Both universities are considered to be old and large sized, located in Istanbul, serve as state universities, and offer bachelor, master's and doctoral degree programs in the business field. In order to conduct the research, a survey instrument was provided to all the faculty members.

Table 1: Sample size and response rate of the research

	<i>Marmara University</i>	<i>Istanbul University</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>School of Business Adm. And Economics, Dept. of Business Administration</i>	<i>School of Business Administration</i>	
<i>Population size</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>213</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Response rate</i>	<i>54.3%</i>	<i>24.8%</i>	<i>38.97%</i>

In order to conduct the research, two measurement tools; developed by Çakıcı (2008) and, Varoğlu et al. (2000) were used. The former concerning the organizational silence issues was developed particularly to be conducted at Mersin University, whereas the latter concerning power distance is borrowed from Hofstede (1984). The tool of Varoğlu et al. had 10 items. Both tools are designed on a Likert-type of scale of 5 through 1 with 28 and 11 items respectively, and all tools were revised and minor changes were made in order to adapt the items to be asked to the academicians.

The reliability of the survey instrument is calculated separately for each measurement tool, approving that each of these tools is considerably reliable. The Cronbach alpha value for the issues of organizational silence and power distance are calculated as 92.45% and 84.89% respectively.

2.2. Findings and Evaluations

Following the factor analyses (Table 2), arithmetic mean values and standard deviations are calculated prior to the correlation analysis between organizational silence issues and power distance, which is used to determine the relationship between the two concepts of our research.

Arithmetic mean value for the power distance construct is calculated as 3,03 with a standard deviation of 0.605.

As seen in Table 2, the factor analyses yield eight factors for the first dimension of our research; namely the issues of organizational silence. The factors are named and explained as given below:

- *Macro-level issues:* Such problems related to issues as infrastructure, the structure of education, governmental policy of education, certain legal mechanisms, and several others, which cannot be solved individually.
- *Issues related to practices at the micro-level:* These issues are the ones that have direct impact on the individual. Examples can be given as rules and procedures that do not serve objectives, environmental responsibility, and waste at workplace.

Table 2: Factor Analyses Results for Issues of Organizational Silence

Items	Factor Load.	Mean	Std Deviation	Name of the Factor
SK22	0,8405	2,530	1,0410	Macro-level issues (fac_sk1)
SK25	0,7535	2,530	1,0110	
SK23	0,7515	2,152	1,0705	
SK24	0,6879	2,455	1,0696	
SK14	0,7966	2,621	1,0780	Issues related to practices at the micro-level (fac_sk2)
SK20	0,6492	2,364	0,9866	
SK18	0,6032	2,258	1,1137	
SK15	0,5839	2,818	1,0511	
SK13	0,5377	2,364	0,9549	
SK21	0,8503	2,833	1,1036	Managerial performance (fac_sk3)
SK19	0,7356	2,500	1,0414	
SK16	0,5482	2,970	1,1228	
SK7	0,4611	2,485	1,2557	
SK5	0,4462	2,682	1,0101	Managerial insufficiency and ethical disorder (fac_sk4)
SK3	0,7796	2,182	1,2014	
SK12	0,6208	3,091	1,1466	
SK11	0,6103	2,091	1,0774	
SK6	0,5416	2,348	1,1568	Indirect issues and interpersonal conflicts (fac_sk5)
SK10	0,7766	2,955	1,2207	
SK27	0,7067	3,348	1,1434	
SK26	0,6133	3,030	1,0809	Operations and process improvement (fac_sk6)
SK2	0,7835	2,924	1,0857	
SK4	0,7731	2,576	1,0963	Personal development and career (fac_sk7)
SK8	0,7680	2,273	1,0458	
SK17	0,7311	2,530	1,0844	Colleague insufficiency and priority of self-interests (fac_sk8)
SK1	0,7627	3,667	1,1140	
SK9	0,5261	2,879	0,9847	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.

- *Managerial performance*: Inaccurate attitudes and behaviors as well as low performance of managers, decisions and policies that do not comply with expectations at the workplace are major examples to this factor.
- *Managerial insufficiency and ethical disorder*: Harassment, mistreatment, professional misconduct, violence, insufficient talent and knowledge of managers are such examples to this factor.
- *Indirect issues and interpersonal conflicts*: These are usually conflicts happen to exist between individuals as an outcome of low performance of one of the colleagues and usually due to reasons that do not directly affect the other.
- *Operations and process improvement*: This factor involves two items related to the improvement of operational activities.
- *Personal development and career*: This factor also involves two items related to the title.
- *Colleague insufficiency and priority of self-interest*: This factor contains the approach of the individual by taking his/her self-interest into consideration.

Table 3: Correlations between Power Distance and Issues of Organizational Silence

Issues	Power Distance	
	r	σ
1. fac_sk1	0.2394	0.0548
2. fac_sk2	-0.0638	0.6138
3. fac_sk3	-0.4251**	0.0004
4. fac_sk4	0.1996	0.1109
5. fac_sk5	0.1235	0.3269
6. fac_sk6	0.0852	0.4998
7. fac_sk7	0.0430	0.7336
8. fac_sk8	0.2629*	0.0345

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 exhibits a low level of positive relationship between “colleague insufficiency and priority of self-interests” and power distance, and this relationship is significant at the 5% level. This shows us that respondents have a low level of tendency to remain silent and rarely prefer not to tell the truth to their superiors, once they perceive that their colleagues have insufficient knowledge, experience or talent, and when they need to consider their self-interests before the interests of their organizations. The table also indicates a second correlation, which shows a moderate level of negative relationship between “managerial performance” and power distance, and this relationship is significant at the 1% level. In other words, when level of power distance increases, there is a decrease in the respondents’ willingness of speaking up about the managerial performance.

3. Conclusion

As power distance has been scholarly taken into consideration over the past decade, researchers used this dimension of culture to explain its effects on several management topics. In our research, we aimed to determine whether power distance had relationship with issues of organizational silence. Findings reveal that respondents coming from the business school/department of the two state universities slightly have the intention to remain silent and to prefer not to tell the truth once they encounter such situations as the insufficiency of their colleagues. This is occasional in the academic world that academicians may prefer to wait and see the personal improvements for a while rather than taking quick reactions. In addition to that, the moderate level of relationship between the managerial performance and power distance reveals that when not satisfied with the managerial performance of their superiors, particularly those who take the administrative posts, academicians may feel uncomfortable to speak up. Further investigation is needed to uncover the causes of such behaviors including samples from other universities. The future study with an extensive framework may also enlighten whether Hofstede’s power distance score of 66% for Turkey in 1984 is consistent with the conditions in the Turkish state universities.

References

1. Bochner, S. and Heskett, B. *Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, and Job-Related Attitudes in a Culturally Diverse Work Group*, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, (1994),vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 233–257.

2. Bowen, F and Blackman, K, *Spirals of Silence: The Dynamic Effects of Diversity on Organizational Voice*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no. 6, September, pp. 1393-1417.
3. Bruins, J, J and Wilke, H, A, M. *Upward Power Tendencies in a Hierarchy: Power Distance Theory versus Bureaucratic Rule*, European Journal of Social Psychology, (1993), vol. 23, pp. 239-254.
4. Creed, W., E., D. *Voice Lessons: Tempered Radicalism and The Use of Voice and Silence*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no.6, September, pp.1503-1536.
5. Duffy, A.J., *Successful Women of the Americas: The Same or Different*, Management Research News, (2006), vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 552-572.
6. Dyne, L, V, Ang, S, and Botero, I, C. *Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no. 6, September, pp.1359-1392.
7. Earley, C. *Playing Follow the Leader: Status- Determining Traits in Relation to Collective Efficacy Across Cultures*, Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, (1999), vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 192–212.
8. Edmondson, A., C. *Speaking Up in The Operating Room: How Team leaders Promote Learning in Interdisciplinary Action Teams*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no.6, September, pp.1419-1452.
9. Fedor, K and Werther, W. *Making Sense of Cultural Factors in International Alliances*, Organizational Dynamics, (1995), Spring, pp. 33-48.
10. Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences- International Differences in Work Related Values*, Sage Publ., USA, (1984).
11. Hofstede, G. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw-Hill, London, (1997).
12. Khatri, N. *Consequences of Power Distance Orientation in Organizations*, The Journal of Business Perspective, (2009), vol. 13, no. 1, January-March, pp. 1-9.
13. Kish-Gephart, J.J., Detert, J. R., Trevin, L.K. and Edmondson, A.C., *Silenced by Fear: The Nature, Sources, and Consequences of Fear at Work*, Research in Organizational Behavior, (2009) vol. 29, pp.163-193.
14. Lee, C., Pillutla, M., Law, K.S. *Power Distance, Gender and Organizational Justice*, The Journal of Management, (2000), vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 685-704.
15. Merritt, A. and Helmreich, R. *Human Factors on the Flight Deck: The Influence of National Culture*, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, (1996), vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 5-24.
16. Milliken, F.J., Morrison, E.W. and Hewlin, P. F., *An Exploratory Study of Employee Silence: Issues that Employees don't Communicate Upward and Why*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no. 6, September, pp. 1453-1476.
17. Morrison, E.W. and Milliken, F.J. *Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World*, Academy of Management, (2000), vol. 25, no. 4, pp.706-725.
18. Moulettes, A. *The Absence of Women's Voices in Hofstede's Cultural Consequences*, Women in Management Review, (2007), vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 443-455.
19. Offermann, L. and Hellmann, P. *Culture's Consequences for Leadership Behavior: National Values in Action*, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, (1997), vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 342-351.
20. Paulus, T, M., Bichelmeyer, B, Malopinsky, L, Pereira, M, Raslog, P, *Power Distance and Group Dynamics of an International Project Team: A Case Study*, Teaching in Higher Education, (2005), vol. 10, no. 1, January, pp.43-55.
21. Piderit, S., K. and Ashford, S., J. *Breaking the Silence: Tactical Choices Women Managers Make in Speaking up about Gender-Equity Issues*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no.6, September, pp. 1477-1502.

22. Premeaux, F.S. and Bedeian, A.G. *Breaking the Silence: The Moderating Effects of Self-Monitoring in Predicting Speaking up in the Workplace*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1537-1561.
23. Stephens, G. and Greer, C. (1995), "Doing Business in Mexico: Understanding Cultural Differences", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer, pp. 39-55.
24. Paulus, T. M., Bichelmeyer, B, Malopinsky, L, Pereira, M, Raslog, P, *Power Distance and Group Dynamics of an International Project Team: A Case Study*, Teaching in Higher Education, (2005), vol. 10, no. 1, January, pp.43-55.
25. Piderit, S, K and Ashford, S, J, *Breaking the Silence: Tactical Choices Women Managers Make in Speaking up about Gender-Equity Issues*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no.6, September, pp. 1477-1502.
26. Premeaux, F, S and Bedeian, A, G, *Breaking the Silence: The Moderating Effects of Self-Monitoring in Predicting Speaking up in the Workplace*, Journal of Management Studies, (2003), vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1537-1561.
27. Stephens, G. and Greer, C, *Doing Business in Mexico: Understanding Cultural Differences*, *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer, (1995), pp. 39-55.
28. Tan, W and Chong, E, *Power Distance in Singapore Construction Organizations: Implications for Project Managers*, International Journal of Project Management, (2003), vol.21, Issue, no. 7, October, pp. 529-536.
29. Triandis, H C and Suh, E, M, *Cultural Influences on Personality*, Annual Review of Psychology, (2002) vol. 53, pp.133-160.
30. Xu Huang, V, Evert Van De and Vegt, Gerben Van Der, *Breaking the Silence Culture: Stimulation of Participation and Employee Opinion Withholding Cross-Nationality*, Management and Organization Review, (2005), vol.1, no.3, pp.459-482.
31. Varoğlu, K, A, Basım, N, Ercil, Y, *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemine Farklı Bir Bakış: Analitik Düşünce-Bütünleşik Düşünce Modelleri ile Belirsizlikten Kaçınma ve Güç Mesafesi Araştırması*, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 8. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Bildiriler, Nevşehir, (2000), pp. 421-444.
32. Vega, G and Comer, D, R, *Sticks and Stones May Break Your Bones, But Words Can Break Your Spirit: Bullying in the Workplace*, Journal of Business Ethics, (2005), vol.58: 101-109.
33. Wheeler, K, G, *Cultural Values in Relation to Equity Sensitivity Within and Across Cultures*, Journal of Managerial Psychology, (2002), vol. 17, no.

Lemi Tufan Taşpolat
Rıfat Yılmaz
Hasan Yamık
Mesut Kaplan

ENTERPRISE QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN THE EMPLOYEES ON MOTIVATION EFFECTS

Abstract: Aim of this study is to examine the effects of Total Quality Management System on employee motivation. This study was implemented in the Bilecik 1st Organized Industrial Zones. In this study two separate companies were selected as a model in the sector. One of the Companies is Evren Metal A.Ş. which produces metal profile. Other company is Metko Kimya Sanayii which produces chemical resin. In both companies employee motivation was examined before and after implementation of Quality Management System. Examining the motivation, organizational and individual data have been undertaken. Data were assessed using demographic characteristics. Data Survey Method was used for research. As a result, Total quality Management System positively affects employee motivation has been concluded by analyzing the quality management system in both company.

Key words: Employee motyvaton, quality managemetrn

INTRODUCTION

As an important element of global competition has come to the fore 21 century, the indispensable institutions of society are companies in the world. Businesses offering goods and services required for the factors can be described as the most indispensable "human" is. The purpose of the enterprise as well as human labor as a tool has been integrated with other production factors. That's why I love working with employees and the business environment by working toward it more productive to focus on managers is one of the most important human issues. Expected of employees in the best way to get him motivated to (motivate) are required. Motivation towards business objectives Builder workers, convincing, and all actions and efforts are made to encourage quality. Motivation is in the process of economic, socio-psychological and organizational-administrative tools are effective in many. Other hand, satisfied and loyal customer base, the only way to create a happy and those who see the job through the organization's principles are adopted. Thus, organizational change and modernization of the moves with the change in the machinery and equipment, those who work in the best way of evaluating a competence, responsibility, work needs to be in a position-sensitive people. From this perspective, we recently enterprises started to be applied and modern management model as one we face the Quality Management System human factors based on the employees of mutual trust, two-way communication, allowing decisions democratically taken as a system of motivation in the process is effective. As a result, the key to the future success of business culture on the business ones. More importantly, the renovation work requires a very high cost on labor and capital is an element of the most important ones. Those who work for the success of the operation depends on motivated. Depending on factors used in the motivation, the motivation is made between good and evil. Ill-motivated people only improve the efficiency there may, but well-motivated human productivity and peace together, will increase. For this reason, in working life of people expected yield to obtain a peaceful environment to ensure the employees according to their needs should be identified and the best way to be met should be run. In this way, provided with highly motivated, effective,