

The Universal Value Concept Applied in Bank Management: Study Case on Turkish Banking in Marmara Region

Cemal IYEM

Sakarya University, Sakarya, TURKEY

Key words: *Bank managers on public and private sector, values and attitudes, value comprehensions of public and private bank sector managers*

Abstract: Values and attitudes are the most active components which hold members of a society together as well as shaping people's opinions. Values are a cognitive structure representing ideals that refer more to a desire of access than to easiness of access. In this context, the culture which the individual lives in is a primary factor in shaping value comprehension. Thus, national culture and value models have been developed. The universal value scale of Schwartz was used as it has been used commonly in the literature. The basic aim of this survey is to determine differences and similarity value comprehensions of public and private bank sector managers. In this way, it is thought that public and private bank sector managers are different and this difference affects their decisions and management policy. It seemed to be a very rigid thinking among experts concerning public sector management legislation.

On this account, this study determines the basic values and attitudes, on the one hand, and the differences and similarity value comprehension among different sector managers, on the other hand. We suppose that there are differences between public and private bank sector managers.

Introduction

Management values have interested employers and researchers for many years. A Value is very difficult to define because it means so many different things to different people. However, these different factors to explain for achieving values mean that it depends on many factors to explain the values. Each individual or culture has certain underlying values that contribute to their value systems. Values are subjective and may vary across people and cultures (<http://en.wikipedia.org>, 2008). Inheriting their concern from philosophy most early social scientists spoke of "values" in a way that conformed to the term's Latin etymology (value to be worth) (Case 1939). Thus in *The Wealth of Nations* (1863, orig 1776) economist Adam Smith wrote of labour as the ultimate and real standard by which value could be determined. Using a similar formulation, Marx (1968, orig 1848)

developed his labour theory of value and in a neglected American classic, *Principles of Social Science* H. C. Corey (1858: 158) defined values as “the measure of the resistance to be overcome in obtaining those commodities or things required for our purpose” (The social of values James L. Spotes).

The first was Clyde Kluckhohn’s (1951: 395) systematic definition “A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action.”

Furthermore, we will use the individualism – collectivism terminology and type A, type B, type AB, transactional and transformational behaviour terminology in this study to discuss the values of the private and public bank sector managers.

Individualism - Collectivism

This continuum has been identified as a means to differentiate Western cultures from Eastern cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis et al., 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988; Yang & Bond, 1990). Individualism can be defined as an individual's self-orientation that emphasizes self-sufficiency and control with value being given to self-accomplishments; whereas collectivism can be defined as the subordination of personal goals to the goal of the (work) group with an emphasis on sharing and group harmony (Morris, Davis & Allen, 1994). Ensuing research has supported Hofstede's (1980) original findings that Eastern cultures score high on collectivism, while individualism epitomizes Western cultural values, especially for the U.S. (Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung & Terpstra, 1992; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Triandis et al., 1972; Tung, 1981).

Thus, this study presents evidence about contrasts between public and private bank sector manager’s values. Our hypotheses are based on the “Turkish public and private bank sector managers” continuum that was previously described. We hypothesize that there are more differences between public and private bank sector managers’ values.

Research Design

This study is an effort to answer to the questions, “What is a Turkish public and private bank sector manager’s values?” and “Are there any differences between public and private bank sector Turkish management values?” Thus, we decided to contact total of 212 public and private bank sector managers because bank sector plays leading roles in Turkish management life. Subjects were given a Turkish language version of “Schwartz Value Survey” instrument administered by a Turkish researcher. They were told there were no right or wrong answers, and that it was only their opinion that mattered.

Method

Questionnaires were used to collect data. This study is based on a survey conducted with 212 Turkish managers in public and private bank sectors. We received a total of 212 questionnaires from 120 private and 92 public bank sector managers. The managers were asked to react “What values are important to managers as guiding principles in their life and what values are less important to them?”

Measurement

An important part of the design of this study was to identify measures that would allow us to contrast between Turkish public and private bank sector managers. The Schwartz Value Survey was selected as research measurement.

The Schwartz Value Survey consists of 10 universal sub dimensions, as described in Table 1. While all 10 of these sub dimensions of work motivation are found in every

culture, the level of importance of each varies from one culture to the next (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990).

The ten value types are listed in Table 1 and each defined in terms of its central goal:

Table 1:

Power	Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.
Achievement	Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
Hedonism	Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
Stimulation	Excitement, novelty and challenge in life.
Self-direction	Independent thought and action; choosing, creating, exploring.
Universalism	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.
Benevolence	Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.
Tradition	Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide.
Conformity	Restraint of actions, inclinations and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.
Security	Safety, harmony and stability of society of relationships and of self.

Furthermore, Fifty-six values are included in the core survey, 52 to represent the ten postulated value types and 4 to capture a possible spirituality type. The values are presented in two lists, the first 30 phrased as terminal values (nouns), and the remaining 26 as instrumental values (adjectives), each followed by a short explanatory phrase. Values from the different motivational types are intermixed throughout the survey. Respondents rate each value on a 9-point importance scale "As a guiding principle in my life," from 7 (of supreme importance) to 6 (very important), to 3 (important), to 0 (not important), to -1 (opposed to my values). Prior to rating the values on each list, respondents choose and rate their most and least important values, thereby anchoring their use of response scale.

Findings

The sample consisted of 67,4 % male public bank sector managers and 32,6 % female public bank sector managers. Furthermore, 56,7 % male private sector managers and 43,3 % female private sector managers. Of all public bank sector managers, 17,4 % have 1 to 5 years, 22,8 % have 6 to 10 years, 42,4 % have 11 to 20 years and 17,4 % have more than 21 years of work experience. Of all private sector managers, 32,5 % have 1 to 5 years, 37,5 % have 6 to 10 years, 22,5 % have 11 to 20 years and 7,5 % have more than 21 years of work experience. A high school degree only is held by 5,8 % of the private bank sector managers whereas a high school degree is 12% of the public bank sector managers. Moreover, of the private sector managers, 73,3 % hold a university degree, 19,2 % master degree and 1,7% Ph.D. degree. Findings of the study show that Turkish public bank sector managers to be mostly autocratic, paternalistic and transactional leaders, strictly obeying rules and their dependence on the organization is a result of importance they give to the use of skills, physical conditions, training, advancement, recognition and earnings. (Arbak et al, 1995: 88). Furthermore, Turkish public bank sector managers are influenced by deep-rooted historical traditions and exhibit

the respective behaviour. Many of these are inherited from the Ottoman Empire. Typical characteristics of the Ottoman administrative culture are old, conservative, authoritarian with controlled decision making, strict obedience to the rules, dependence on superiors, limited creativeness, little freedom of action (initiative), introvert and high resistance to change and to change and to uncertainly. Some studies describe that Turkish managers show mostly type A and type AB behaviour. Type A personality is characterized by feeling a chronic sense of struggle to achieve more and more in less and less time, which results in high standards of productivity (Friedman & Rosenman 1974). Type B is exactly opposite of type A, the person never suffers from a sense of time urgency (Robbins, 1971). Type AB is a mixture of type A and type B.

In addition, type AB people are managers that mostly show typical autocratic behaviour. Findings of the study show that especially, Turkish public bank sector managers show mostly type AB. Moreover, we can see from this study that Turkish public bank sector managers are more collectivist than private bank sector managers. The Turkish private bank sector however is quite young. Turkey has been moving toward becoming a democratic country for 100 years. This movement has opened the doors to many new people to move into leadership position. The private sector in Turkey started to boom in 1960s. Before 1960s, the business climate in Turkey is moving away from traditional industries and manufacturing and toward moving some industry off shore. There is also a slow but significant trend away from an over-dependence on family business toward larger organization structures. Typical characteristics of private sector managers, especially after 1980 when opened private bank in Turkey, include young, dynamic, hedonist, transformational (one who provides individualized, consideration and intellectual stimulation and who possesses charisma), paternalistic, open to change, individual.

REFERENCES

- ARBAK, Yasemin; ALDEMİR, Ceyhan; ÖZMEN Ömür Timurcanday; KATRİNLİ, Alev Ergenç; İSHAKOĞLU, Gülem Atabay, KESKEN, Jülide; "Perceptual Study of Turkish Managers and Organization Characteristics"; SACKMANN, Sonja A.; **Cultural Complexity in Organization**; Sage Publications; 1997
- BATTEN, Joe D., **Tough-Minded Leadership**, New York: American Management Association, 1989.
- FRIEDMAN, M. and Rosenman, R.H. (1974) **Type A Behaviour and Your Heart**. Knopf, New York
- HOFSTEDE, G. 1980. **Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values**. Newbury Park,CA: Sage.
- HOFSTEDE, G. & Bond, M.H. 1984. Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 15: 417-433.
- HOFSTEDE, G. & Bond, M.H. 1988. The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth, **Organizational Dynamics**, 16(4): 4-21.
- HUGHES O. E., **Public Management & Administration: An Introduction**, London: the MacMillan,1994.
- KABASAKAL, H. and BODUR, M., "**Leadership and Culture in Turkey: A Multi-Faceted Phenomena**", <http://mgmt3.ucalgary.ca/web/globe-nsf/index>,1998.
- KASHIMA Yoshihisa – KASHIMA Emiko S.; "Culture, Connectionism and the Self", ADANOPOULOS John; "The Emergence of Cultural Patterns of Interpersonal Behavior". **Social Psychology and Cultural Context**, Edt. John Adamopoulos – Yoshihisa Kashima, Sage Publications 1999.
- KROBER A.L.,- KLUCKHOHN Clyde, **Culture A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions**, Vintage Boks, 1963.
- KUŞDİL Ersin M., ABACI Nurcan, "Yeni Yüzyılda Genç Anlayışı"; **Bilimin Işığında Aydınlanma Semineri**; Uludağ Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü; Kültür Sanat Kurulu Yayınları; No.4; Bursa 2003.
- RALSTON David – HOLT David H. – TERPSTRA Robert H. - CHENG Yu Kai, "The Impact of National Culture and Economic Ideology on Managerial Work Values: A Study of The United States, Russia, Japan and China", **Journal of International Business Studies**, Vol.28, Issue 1, 1997.
- ROBBINS B. Naomi **The Annals of Probability**, Vol. 4, No. 6 (Dec., 1976), pp. 1027-1029
- SCHWARTZ, S., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 53, 550–562.
- SCHWARTZ, S., & Bilsky,W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 58, 878–891.