

*An Investigation Of The Managerial And Cultural Values Adopted By The Managers In Universities

Nuray YILDIRIM

Faculty of Education, Afyon Kocatepe University
nrytas@hotmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the managerial and cultural values adopted by managers working in universities and whether these values differ according to gender, age, professional experience, managerial experience, and their faculties. This study was conducted as a survey. The participants of this study were composed of 100 deans, vice deans, and heads of departments in Afyon Kocatepe University. Study data were collected using the Managerial and Cultural Values Adopted by the Managers Scale developed by Turan, Durceylan and Şişman (2005). This study showed that university managers adopted feminine values more commonly, were closer to a collectivist value dimension, the power distance was higher, and ambiguity avoidance was lower.

Keywords: *Manager, University, Values.*

Introduction

Value is described as an abstract measurement that promotes knowledge, the usefulness of something, or its price (Turkish Language Association). Value is described as a tendency to prefer a certain situation to another. Values are understandings that source and judge behaviors (Erdem, 2003). Values refer to concepts which are given importance, preferred and wanted to be achieved and realized in a society (Turan, Durceylan, and Şişman, 2005). Each society has different values based on its culture. In this respect, value is one of the basic elements that shape people's behaviors. Humans are an entity that produce value and regulates and interprets their own world according to these values (Şişman, 1995). Therefore, based on the individuals' protection or ignorance of values in a society, they are either lost or transferred to the next generations. The persistence and permanence of values for years depends on their internalization and general acceptance (Akbaba-Altun, 2003).

Individuals in a society adjust their behaviors and expectations according to values. At the same time, values provide a legal identity to an organization's purpose, duties, authorities, and responsibilities (Sağnak, 2005). Although the people who form an organization have similar values to the culture they live in, their values differ. People with differing values have to balance their values and the organization's values to be able to achieve the purposes of the organization and make themselves happy. From the perspective of managers, recognition of other values and norms existing in the organization may provide them with multiple benefits. When those values are known, the members' behaviors can be predicted and precautions can be taken to correct those behaviors when necessary (Şişman, 2002).

This study used the "Managerial and Cultural Values Adopted by Managers Scale" developed by Turan et al. (2005) based on Hofstede's four value dimensions. Hofstede's model's dimensions on cultural values are as follows (Turan et al., 2005):

1. Femininity-masculinity dimension: Refers to the roles attributed to females and males. In societies where feminine values are dominant, there are sincere and warm relationships. Conversely, in societies where masculine values are considered as dominant, values like competition, success, and ambition are more commonly observed.
2. Individualist-collectivist dimension: This dimension shows whether people in society prefer to act as individuals or members of society. In individual-centered societies, the individual tends to consider himself and his benefits before the organization. However, for people with collectivist values, the organization's benefits are more important than their own.
3. Power distance dimension: This dimension refers to the level of acceptance or refusal of the differences or inequalities in a social system by the members. A great distance from power will make employees more dependent on their supervisors in organizations. In societies with lower power distance, the inequality between managers and employees is minimized.
4. Ambiguity avoidance dimension: This dimension refers to what extent the members of a society or culture avoid ambiguity. In organizations where the avoidance of ambiguity is strong, individuals are rule-centered. In societies where avoidance of ambiguity is weak, the rules may be stretched and there is no need for over prescriptivism.

According to Turkish Higher Education Law No. 2547, a university is a higher education institution with scientific autonomy and public legal entity in which higher levels of education, scientific research, publication, and consultancy activities are conducted. Universities are composed of faculties, colleges, and similar institutions and

departments. Higher education institutions have the function of producing solutions for the problems of the society and humanity besides the function of increasing human capital, scientific research, scientific accumulation protection, dissemination and development (Güçlüoğlu, 1996). Since universities are value-based organizations, the values adopted by managers are also important in these institutions and will contribute to the literature. In this respect, the purpose of this study was to investigate the managerial and cultural values adopted by the managers in universities. In line with this purpose, the sub-purposes of the study are as follows.

To investigate whether the managerial and cultural values adopted by the managers in universities:

1. differ according to gender.
2. differ according to age.
3. differ according to professional experience.
4. differ according to managerial experience.
5. differ according to faculties.

Methodology

This was a survey study. A survey study reveals the beliefs, views, characteristics, and past or current behaviors of the participants (Neuman, 2007). The participants of this study were composed of 100 deans, vice deans, and heads of departments in Afyon Kocatepe University. Table 1 gives background information of the participants including their gender, age, professional experience, managerial experience, and their faculty.

Table 1. The distribution of participants' demographics

| Options | | Total |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Gender | Female | 14 |
| | Male | 86 |
| | Total | 100 |
| Age | 31-35 | 10 |
| | 36-40 | 24 |
| | 41-45 | 20 |
| | 46-50 | 27 |
| | 51 or more | 19 |
| | Total | 100 |
| Professional Experience | 1-5 years | 4 |
| | 6-10 years | 11 |
| | 11-15 years | 20 |
| | 16-20 years | 16 |
| | 21-25 years | 29 |
| | 26 years or more | 20 |
| Total | 100 | |
| Managerial Experience | 1-5 years | 45 |
| | 6-10 years | 29 |
| | 11-15 years | 13 |
| | 16-20 years | 10 |
| | 21 years or more | 3 |
| Total | 100 | |
| Faculty | Education | 12 |
| | Science and Literature | 22 |
| | Engineering | 14 |
| | Veterinary Medicine | 15 |
| | Economics and Managerial Sciences | 13 |
| | Tourism | 3 |
| | Technology | 7 |
| | Fine Arts | 6 |
| | Islamic Studies | 8 |
| | Total | 100 |

Data Collection Tool

Study data were collected using the Managerial and Cultural Values Adopted by the Managers Scale that was developed by Turan et al. (2005). The scale was composed of 30 items and used a 5-point Likert type scale. The scale had a four-dimensional structure of "Values shared by managers on femininity-masculinity dimension",

“Values shared by managers on individualism-collectivism dimension”, “Values shared by managers on power distance dimension”, “Values shared by managers on ambiguity avoidance dimension”. The Cronbach’s Alpha internal consistency of the scale was calculated to determine the reliability of the scale, and it was found as 0.80.

The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted for the scale in order to ensure the construct validity of the scale. CFA is a method used to determine an existing theory (Matsunaga, 2010). At the end of the CFA, the scale was found to have a four-factor structure as in its original form and the following results were obtained $\chi^2 = 752.52$; $df= 399$; $\chi^2 /df= 1.8886$; RMSEA=.095. Point one zero (.10) or a lower result is sufficient for fit in the results obtained from RMSEA. A χ^2 /df ratio between 2 and 5 references a good fit and lower than this refers to a perfect fit (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 2001). When the goodness of fit values of the scale were investigated, the scale was found as acceptable. Additionally, at the end of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach’s Alpha value was found as 0.70.

The one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was performed to investigate the distribution of data in the study and the coefficient of skewness was calculated. As seen in Table 2, an analysis of the skewness coefficients showed that the factors have a normal distribution although the data appears to not be normally distributed in each factor according to the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test data. If the skewness coefficient is between the $-1 < SC < 1$ limit, it can be interpreted that data does not show any important deviation from a normal distribution (Büyükoztürk, 2007; p. 40).

Table 2. The results of the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and skewness coefficients

| Factors | <i>n</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>S.C.</i> |
|----------------------------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Femininity-Masculinity | 100 | .000 | .852 |
| Individualism-Collectivism | 100 | .033 | .418 |
| Power distance | 100 | .002 | -.445 |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | 100 | .004 | .198 |

Findings

Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviation values of factors regarding managerial and cultural values adopted by managers in universities.

Table 3. N, X and SD Values of managerial and cultural values adopted by managers in universities

| Factors | N | Minimum | Maximum | X | sd |
|----------------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|-----|
| Femininity-Masculinity | 100 | 1.13 | 3.75 | 2.22 | .49 |
| Individualism-Collectivism | 100 | 2.22 | 4 | 2.89 | .34 |
| Power distance | 100 | 1.71 | 4.43 | 3.36 | .53 |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | 100 | 2 | 4 | 2.86 | .40 |

According to Table 3, the mean score in femininity-masculinity values of 2.22 revealed that the managers in universities mostly agree on feminine value statements. Therefore, university managers adopted feminine values more. The 2.89 mean score in individualist-collectivist value dimension illustrates that university managers are slightly closer to the collectivist value dimension. The 3.36 mean score in power distance value expression reveals that the university managers agree on high power distance value statements. The 2.86 mean score in ambiguity avoidance value statements shows that the university managers tend to use weak ambiguity avoidance value statements.

Table 4 presents the results of an unpaired t-Test implemented to determine whether the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers differed according to gender.

Table 4. t-Test according to the gender variable

| Dimensions | Gender | N | X | S | SD | t | p |
|----------------------------|--------|----|------|------|----|-------|------|
| Femininity-Masculinity | Female | 14 | 2.07 | .301 | 98 | 1.212 | .228 |
| | Male | 86 | 2.24 | .518 | | | |
| Individualism-Collectivism | Female | 14 | 2.92 | .327 | 98 | .322 | .748 |
| | Male | 86 | 2.89 | .344 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------|----|------|------|----|-------|------|
| Power Distance | Female | 14 | 3.29 | .593 | 98 | .564 | .574 |
| | Male | 86 | 3.37 | .521 | | | |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | Female | 14 | 3.01 | .431 | 98 | 1.557 | .123 |
| | Male | 86 | 2.83 | .393 | | | |

When the data in Table 4 was investigated it was observed that the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers revealed no statistically significant difference in all dimensions according to genders ($t_{(98)}=1.212$; $t_{(98)}=.322$; $t_{(98)}=.564$; $t_{(98)}=1.557$, $p>.05$). Thus, the female and male university managers adopted similar managerial and cultural values in all dimensions.

Table 5 presents the results of a One-Way ANOVA Test implemented to determine whether the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers differed according to age.

Table 5. ANOVA Test results according to the age variable

| Dimensions | Age | N | X | S | F | p |
|----------------------------|------------|----|------|------|-------|------|
| Femininity-Masculinity | 31-35 | 10 | 2.42 | .627 | 2.016 | .098 |
| | 36-40 | 24 | 2.03 | .355 | | |
| | 41-45 | 20 | 2.16 | .534 | | |
| | 46-50 | 27 | 2.24 | .471 | | |
| | 51 or more | 19 | 2.38 | .516 | | |
| Individualism-Collectivism | 31-35 | 10 | 2.86 | .314 | .212 | .931 |
| | 36-40 | 24 | 2.92 | .346 | | |
| | 41-45 | 20 | 2.93 | .392 | | |
| | 46-50 | 27 | 2.90 | .330 | | |
| | 51 or more | 19 | 2.84 | .330 | | |
| Power distance | 31-35 | 10 | 3.67 | .350 | 1.613 | .177 |
| | 36-40 | 24 | 3.47 | .574 | | |
| | 41-45 | 20 | 3.26 | .566 | | |
| | 46-50 | 27 | 3.27 | .394 | | |
| | 51 or more | 19 | 3.28 | .633 | | |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | 31-35 | 10 | 3.03 | .489 | .559 | .693 |
| | 36-40 | 24 | 2.85 | .364 | | |
| | 41-45 | 20 | 2.82 | .410 | | |
| | 46-50 | 27 | 2.86 | .366 | | |
| | 51 or more | 19 | 2.82 | .451 | | |

When the data in Table 5 was investigated it showed that the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers did not reveal any statistically significant difference in any of the scale dimensions ($F_{(4,95)}=2.016$; $F_{(4,95)}=.212$; $F_{(4,95)}=1.613$; $F_{(4,95)}=.559$, $p>.05$). Consequently, the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers were similar in different age groups in all dimensions.

Table 6 presents the results of the One-Way ANOVA carried out to determine whether the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers revealed any statistically significant difference according to professional experience.

Table 6. ANOVA Test results according to the professional experience variable

| Dimensions | Professional Experience | N | X | S | F | p |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----|------|------|-------|----------------------------|
| Femininity-Masculinity | 1-5 years | 4 | 1.97 | .312 | 1.090 | .371 |
| | 6-10 years | 11 | 2.31 | .571 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 20 | 2.07 | .404 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 16 | 2.14 | .591 | | |
| | 21-25 years | 29 | 2.34 | .452 | | |
| | 26 years or more | 20 | 2.27 | .531 | | |
| Individualism-Collectivism | 1-5 years | 4 | 2.50 | .192 | 2.587 | .031 (1-5/16-20) |
| | 6-10 years | 11 | 2.92 | .311 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 20 | 2.89 | .248 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 16 | 3.10 | .468 | | |
| | 21-25 years | 29 | 2.84 | .248 | | |
| | 26 years or more | 20 | 2.87 | .385 | | |
| Power distance | 1-5 years | 4 | 3.39 | .741 | .627 | .680 |
| | 6-10 years | 11 | 3.44 | .721 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 20 | 3.49 | .438 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 16 | 3.38 | .445 | | |
| | 21-25 years | 29 | 3.33 | .508 | | |
| | 26 years or more | 20 | 3.21 | .570 | | |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | 1-5 years | 4 | 2.79 | .370 | .921 | .471 |
| | 6-10 years | 11 | 3.01 | .456 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 20 | 2.86 | .398 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 16 | 2.83 | .422 | | |
| | 21-25 years | 29 | 2.91 | .402 | | |
| | 26 years or more | 20 | 2.72 | .360 | | |

The data in Table 6 showed that there was a significant difference in the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers regarding individualism-collectivism dimension according to professional experience variable ($F_{(5,94)} = 2.587, p < .05$). The mean score of the answers given by university managers participants with 16-20 years of experience ($X=3.10$) revealed the highest mean score, and it was followed by participants with 6-10 years of experience ($X=2.92$), 11-15 years of experience ($X=2.89$), 26 years or more experience ($X=2.87$), and 1-5 years of experience ($X=2.50$). A statistically significant difference between the participants with 1-5 years of experience and 6-20 years of experience exists when the differences are investigated.

Evaluating the data in Table 6 showed no statistically significant difference in any of the dimensions except for professional experience dimension ($F_{(5,94)} = 1.090; F_{(5,94)} = .627; F_{(5,94)} = .921, p > .05$). The managerial and cultural values adopted by the participants are similar to each other for all dimensions except for individualism-collectivism dimension. Table 7 presented a One-Way ANOVA Test used to determine whether the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers revealed any difference in managerial experience.

Table 7. ANOVA test results according to managerial experience variable

| Dimensions | Managerial Experience | N | X | S | F | p |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----|------|------|------|------|
| Femininity-Masculinity | 1-5 years | 45 | 2.23 | .565 | .959 | .434 |
| | 6-10 years | 29 | 2.12 | .408 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 13 | 2.29 | .416 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 10 | 2.44 | .534 | | |
| | 21 years or more | 3 | 2.00 | .000 | | |
| Individualism-Collectivism | 1-5 years | 45 | 2.89 | .374 | .731 | .573 |
| | 6-10 years | 29 | 2.94 | .327 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 13 | 2.94 | .300 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 10 | 2.78 | .287 | | |
| | 21 years or more | 3 | 2.70 | .257 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|----|------|------|-------|------|
| Power distance | 1-5 years | 45 | 3.49 | .476 | 1.846 | .127 |
| | 6-10 years | 29 | 3.25 | .566 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 13 | 3.24 | .575 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 10 | 3.37 | .491 | | |
| | 21 years or more | 3 | 2.90 | .577 | | |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | 1-5 years | 45 | 2.92 | .395 | .730 | .573 |
| | 6-10 years | 29 | 2.76 | .390 | | |
| | 11-15 years | 13 | 2.86 | .359 | | |
| | 16-20 years | 10 | 2.87 | .537 | | |
| | 21 years or more | 3 | 2.83 | .289 | | |

Table 7 illustrated no statistically significant difference according to the managerial experience variable in any of the dimensions ($F_{(4,95)} = .959$; $F_{(4,95)} = .731$; $F_{(4,95)} = 1.846$; $F_{(4,95)} = .730$, $p > .05$). University managers with different managerial experience adopted similar managerial and cultural values.

Table 8 shows the results of One-Way ANOVA Test which was carried out to determine whether there was any significant difference in the cultural and managerial values adopted by university managers according to the faculties.

Table 8. ANOVA test results according to the faculty variable

| Dimensions | Faculty | N | X | S | F | p |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|------|------|-------|---|
| Femininity- Masculinity | Education | 12 | 2.18 | .618 | .723 | .671 |
| | Science and Literature | 22 | 2.14 | .516 | | |
| | Engineering | 14 | 2.40 | .433 | | |
| | Veterinary Medicine | 15 | 2.17 | .497 | | |
| | Economics and Managerial Sciences | 13 | 2.12 | .222 | | |
| | Tourism | 3 | 2.37 | .545 | | |
| | Technology | 7 | 2.34 | .443 | | |
| | Fine Arts | 6 | 2.02 | .215 | | |
| | Islamic Studies | 8 | 2.41 | .807 | | |
| Individualism- Collectivism | Education | 12 | 2.85 | .403 | .815 | .591 |
| | Science and Literature | 22 | 3.00 | .450 | | |
| | Engineering | 14 | 2.90 | .252 | | |
| | Veterinary Medicine | 15 | 2.81 | .329 | | |
| | Economics and Managerial Sciences | 13 | 2.96 | .274 | | |
| | Tourism | 3 | 2.70 | .170 | | |
| | Technology | 7 | 2.79 | .290 | | |
| | Fine Arts | 6 | 2.98 | .237 | | |
| | Islamic Studies | 8 | 2.79 | .281 | | |
| Power Distance | Education | 12 | 3.40 | .541 | .524 | .016 ISF- SLF,Tou r,Vet.EA F,FAF |
| | Science and Literature | 22 | 3.35 | .458 | | |
| | Engineering | 14 | 3.42 | .378 | | |
| | Veterinary Medicine | 15 | 3.21 | .497 | | |
| | Economics and Managerial Sciences | 13 | 3.11 | .529 | | |
| | Tourism | 3 | 3.24 | .359 | | |
| | Technology | 7 | 3.65 | .487 | | |
| | Fine Arts | 6 | 3.05 | .933 | | |
| | Islamic Studies | 8 | 3.93 | .241 | | |
| Ambiguity Avoidance | Education | 12 | 2.87 | .370 | 2.057 | .048(SL F-Tech) |
| | Science and Literature | 22 | 2.64 | .314 | | |
| | Engineering | 14 | 2.89 | .311 | | |
| | Veterinary Medicine | 15 | 2.98 | .422 | | |
| | Economics and Managerial Sciences | 13 | 2.90 | .337 | | |
| | Technology | 7 | 3.19 | .531 | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|------|------|
| Fine Arts | 6 | 2.94 | .310 |
| Islamic Studies | 8 | 2.67 | .454 |

The data in Table 8 exhibits a statistically significant difference between the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers and their faculties ($F_{(8-91)} = 2.524$, $p < .05$). The university managers' answers regarding power distance dimension indicated that those in Islamic Studies Faculty had the highest mean score ($X=3.93$) followed by the members of Technology ($X=3.65$), Engineering ($X=3.42$), Education ($X=3.40$), Science and Literature ($X=3.35$), Tourism ($X=3.24$), Veterinary Medicine ($X=3.21$), Economics and Managerial Sciences ($X=3.11$), and Fine Arts ($X=3.05$) faculties. Interpreting the power distance dimension shows a statistically significant relationship between university managers who are members of Islamic Studies Faculty, and Science and Literature, Tourism, Veterinary Medicine, Economics and Managerial Sciences and Fine Arts Faculty members.

When the data in Table 8 was investigated, the ambiguity avoidance dimension of the managerial and cultural values adopted by university members revealed statistically significant differences according to their faculties ($F_{(8-91)} = 2.057$, $p < .05$). When the mean score of the university managers' answers was examined, the Faculty of Technology was found to have the highest mean score ($X=3.19$) followed by Tourism ($X=3.00$), Veterinary Medicine ($X=2.98$), Fine Arts ($X=2.94$), Economics and Managerial Sciences ($X=2.90$), Engineering ($X=2.89$), Education ($X=2.87$), Islamic Studies ($X=2.67$), and Science and Literature ($X=2.64$). A statistically significant difference between the university managers who are members of Science and Literature Faculty and the participants who are members of Faculty of Technology was emphasized.

The data in Table 8 reveals no statistically significant difference in femininity-masculinity and individualism-collectivism dimensions according to their faculties ($F_{(8-91)} = .723$; $F_{(8-91)} = .815$; $p > .05$). The managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers in different faculties were similar in femininity-masculinity and individualism-collectivism dimensions.

Conclusions, Discussion, And Implications

In this study, the mean scores and standard deviation values toward the data obtained were investigated first. The findings concluded that managers adopted feminine values more. The results of the study by Turan et al. (2008) was consistent with the results of this study since they also found that university managers adopt feminine values. Additionally, it was observed that university managers were closer to the collectivist dimension. Turan et al.'s (2005) study revealed that the managers were closer to the collectivist values, which is also consistent with the findings of the present study. Additionally, it is found that university managers had a high distance of power. Similarly, Turan et al. (2005) found in their study that in general, the managers agreed on statements with high power distance. Additionally, the results of this study revealed that the university managers tended to use statements in which ambiguity avoidance is weaker. The results of the study by Turan et al. (2005) indicated that not all managers were rule-centered, and thought that ambiguous situations increased the danger and risk possibility in their institutions.

Secondly, this study investigated whether the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers revealed any statistically significant difference according to gender, age, professional experience, managerial experience, and their faculties. The findings concluded that university managers with different genders adopted similar managerial and cultural values in all dimensions. According to the findings of Turan et al.'s (2005) study, there was no statistically significant difference between the managers' preference of feminine or masculine values. In addition, their study's views regarding power distance, and views on ambiguity avoidance and gender variable were found to be partially consistent with this study.

Further, the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers in different age groups revealed similar results in all dimensions. The study by Turan et al. (2005) revealed partially consistent results with this study as they found a statistically significant difference between the university managers' preference of feminine or masculine values and views on the ambiguity avoidance and age variable.

When the individualist-collectivist dimension of managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers was investigated according to professional experience, it was found that university managers with 1-5 years of experience adopted more collectivist values compared to the university managers with 16-20 years of experience. Along with this, the managerial and cultural values adopted by managers with different levels of experience revealed similar results in femininity-masculinity, power distance, and ambiguity avoidance dimensions.

An investigation of the change in the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers according to experience showed that the university managers with different lengths of experience revealed similar results in all dimensions of managerial and cultural values. The results of Turan et al.'s (2005) study showing that managers with different managerial experience had similar managerial and cultural values were consistent with the results of this study.

When the power distance dimension of managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers was investigated according to their faculty, it disclosed that the university managers who are members of the Islamic Studies Faculty revealed values of higher power distance compared to members of Science and Literature, Tourism, Veterinary Medicine, Economics and Managerial Sciences and Fine Arts Faculties. University managers in Islamic Studies Faculty think that the managers are privileged, their decisions are right and hierarchical structure is important compared to managers in Science and Literature, Tourism, Veterinary Medicine, Economical and Managerial Sciences, and Fine Arts faculties.

When the change in the ambiguity avoidance dimension of managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers according to their faculties is considered, it highlighted that the ambiguity avoidance is higher in university managers who are members of the Technology Faculty compared to the university managers in Science and Literature faculty. Science and Literature Faculty members thought that rules should be more flexible compared to the university managers in Technology Faculty. In addition to this, it was seen that the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers were similar in femininity-masculinity dimension and individualism-collectivism dimension. In line with the results of this study, the findings of Turan et al.'s (2005) study showed that there was no statistically significant difference in university managers' adopting individualism-collectivism values and their fields, however, their finding regarding the statistically significant difference between the preference of femininity and masculinity values by managers contradicts with the results of this study.

This study aimed to determine the managerial and cultural values adopted by university managers and was designed as a survey study. However, the author recommends that qualitative studies involving long-term observation and interviews should be designed to obtain in-depth information due to the limitations of quantitative studies. Additionally, the university staff's perception of the university managers' value judgment may be investigated as a follow-up study. The managerial and cultural values of the managers in different education levels may be investigated rather than limiting the study to university managers.

References

- Akbaba-Altun, S. (2003). Eğitim yönetimi ve değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (1), 7-18.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı: İstatistik, Araştırma Deseni, Spss Uygulamaları ve Yorum*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Erdem, A.R. (2003). Üniversite kültüründe önemli bir unsur: Değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (4), 55-72.
- Güçlüoğlu, K. (1996). *Üniversitelerin temel sorunları: Çağdaş eğitim- çağdaş üniversite, üniversitelerimizin gelişmişlik durumu*. Ankara: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Cumhurbaşkanlığı Yayınları.
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8.51*. Mooresville: Scientific Software.
- Matsunaga, M. (2010). *How to factor-analyze your data right: Do's, Don'ts, and how-to's. International Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(1), 97-110.
- Neuman, W.L. (2007). *Toplumsal araştırma yöntemleri nitel ve nicel yaklaşımlar, cilt II*, (Çev: S. Özge). İstanbul: Yayın Odası.
- Sağnak, M. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında görevli yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel değerlere ilişkin algıları: *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30 (1), 50-57.
- Şişman, M. (1995). Örgüt kavramının kültürel açıdan çözümlenmesi ve eğitim örgütleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, Eğitim Yönetimi*, 1 (1), 79-94.
- Şişman, M. (2002). *Örgütler ve Kültürler*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Turan, S., Durceylan, B., Şişman, M. (2005). Üniversite yöneticilerinin benimsedikleri idari ve kültürel değerler. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13, 181-202.
- Turkish Language Association (2018). Türkçe sözlük. (http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&arama=gts&guid=TDK.GTS.5b7b24acb947b2.59826211, 20 Ağustos 2018'de erişildi).
- Yükseköğretim Kanunu (6 Kasım 1981). Resmi Gazete, 17506.

Acknowledgements

This research has been financially supported by the Afyon Kocatepe University, Turkey.