

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

## Effects of Corporate-Managerial Behaviours on Employee Motivation and Organizational Commitment: A Study on Barter Firm

**Selma Yazkan**

Student, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Management,  
Istanbul Aydın University, Turkey

**Salih Güney**

Professor, Department of Management, Istanbul Aydın University, Turkey

### **Abstract:**

*The main goals of the firms are to gain revenue, keep their activities continued, and grow, respectively. To realize their goals, the firms are supervised within the scope of the legal regulations by the owners and/or professional managers. The managerial styles and techniques suitable for the firm's goals have significant impacts on its corporate's successes such as its sustainability, growth, employee motivation, and strengthening organizational commitment. The types of corporate-managerial behaviors have important effects on employee motivation and organizational commitment. Depending on this fact, challenging managerial styles in the firms would obviously trigger the performance of employee- and corporate's performance. In this study, we aimed to examine the effects of corporate-managerial behaviors on employee motivation and organization commitment in a barter firm empirically. Because, it is believed that increased employee motivation and organizational commitment by the corporate-management significantly add value to the corporate's productivity and performance in both short and long terms. Based on these facts, this study would make a significant contribution the academic literature. Overall, the first part of this study introduces a solid theoretical knowledge on the management, managerial concept and its definition, and managerial styles. The second part, however, presents motivation, its definition and importance as well as motivation processes and some basic motivation-related concepts. In the third part, organizational commitment, its definition, importance, its difference than occupational commitment, and basic dimensions of organizational commitment, and factors affecting organizational commitment. After that, the fourth section basically describes the theories related to the organizational commitment. The fifth unit of this study explains the positive and negative results of organizational commitment. The next coming chapter, sixth section, presented the material and methods, including the results from a survey/poll conducted in a barter firm. Finally, the last part of the study explained how important the corporate-managerial behaviours in a barter firm affected employee motivation and organizational commitments by using the findings obtained from the survey, as well as conclusions and recommendations in itself.*

**Keywords:** Management, managerial styles, motivation, organizational commitment

### **1. Introduction**

Management; it is the smallest organized unit that emerges with human beings living together. It has been accepted as a branch of science in the modern era and it has been expressed as a set of principles aimed at implementing some activities with a certain systematic in order to realize common goals and objectives. For this reason, there has been a need for a person, or a manager, to direct all these resources and facilities within a certain period of time. Effective management requires people who are able to use human resources and other means of production in line with organizational goals and objectives effectively. From this perspective, the manager is the most important element in the success and continuity of an organization, who is expected to have different skills, and has problem solving abilities in extraordinary times as well as in ordinary times. One of the most important factors that affect the organizational performance and the organizational and job satisfaction of the employees is the management style that the manager or executive group exhibits while directing and managing subordinates. In this study, it is aimed to investigate the effects of management styles in a barter company on organizational commitment and motivation of employees.

### **2. Literature Review**

#### *2.1. Management Concept and Its Definition*

Management is a concept that emerged when mankind began to live together as the smallest organized unit and is accepted as a science in the modern age. Management is the whole of the actions involving the efficient, effective and correct use of the tools and resources that an organization can use to achieve its targets (Güney, 2007a: 33). In this

context, the concept of management is a set of principles aimed at implementing certain activities in a systematic way in order to realize common goals and objectives.

### *2.2. The Concept of Manager and Its Definition*

The concept and definition of management is the art of effectively and efficiently using an organization's material and human resources to achieve its goals. For this reason, there was a need for the person who would direct all these resources within a certain period of time and the manager factor has come into existence. The manager is the person who works in order to realize the highest possible production by evaluating the available resources in the most effective and efficient manner, fulfilling the rules in the process of realizing its target, determining and following, instructing and giving instructions. (Özgür, 2011: 217).

### *2.3. Manager Styles*

Some scientists have divided managers into three groups: transformative, bureaucratic and hierarchical. In the developed Western countries, while executives exhibit transformative management, they tend to exhibit a more bureaucratic and hierarchical style in Asian countries. The cultural structure and traditions of the societies in which organizations are involved have an important role in determining the management styles. In general, executive styles are classified under the titles of democratic, authoritarian, liberating, charismatic, transformative, interactionist and visionary. (Lok ve Crawford, 2003: 323).

### *2.4. The Concept of Motivation and Its Definition*

The management style adopted by an organization and the managers conducting the management process and their styles are among the most important factors in achieving the objectives of the organization. On the other hand, other factors that are as important as these two concepts are the employees and their morale. In this respect, motivation (encouragement) is an important phenomenon that directs communication and relations with employees. Motivation is the willingness and behavior of a person with respect to the performance of a task. (Güney, 2015b: 253).

### *2.5. The Importance of Motivation*

Motivation is gaining more and more importance in terms of achieving organizational goals. On the basis of this development is the fact that motivating employees for the success and continuity of the organization is felt as a necessity and it is understood that it is one of the important factors. It is seen that motivation leads to effective communication within the organization, directing relations at every level, reducing the environment of unrest and tension, and also providing benefits for employees, managers and businesses such as increase in performance and productivity. A study conducted in the United States (USA) has shown that motivation is extremely important in increasing productivity of 97% of employees and 92% of their commitment to business (Barlı ve Özen, 2008: 439). Motivation is essential not only for employees to be successful and peaceful, but also for managers to be efficient and high-performing. Satisfaction of two basic elements such as employee and manager for the success of the business is a proof of the double-sided effect of motivation. This situation is also important in terms of showing that the manager and employee are affected by each other (Alsat, 2016: 8). For businesses, motivation is important in terms of guiding and mobilizing employees towards their goals. Otherwise, it will not be possible to achieve the desired results (Mercanlıoğlu, 2012: 47-48). The main elements of the motivation process are success, recognition, duty, responsibility, promotion and development opportunities (Alayoğlu ve Doğan, 2015: 4). To better understand the concept of motivation, it is necessary to understand the main terms commonly used in this field such as need, impulse, motivation, achievement, attachment, competition and power. Among the techniques effective in increasing employee motivation are intimidation, punishment and reward, competition and rivalry, recognition of privileges and identification with profession and institution. (Güney, 2015b: 257).

### *2.6. Factors Motivating the Employees and Manager Behaviors*

Many different tools are used in organizations to motivate employees. The main ones are psycho-social tools, administrative and organizational tools and economic tools (Ünsar vd., 2010: 249-251). There is no single, best and most acceptable motivation factor known. Managers need to develop and use the ways that will positively affect the employee by taking into consideration the management style of the enterprise, environmental factors and cultural value judgments as well as the personality of the employee (Güney, 2015b: 282).

### *2.7. The Concept and Definition of Organizational Commitment*

Organizational commitment is a type of relationship that will benefit the individual and the organization to which the person is involved. In this relationship, the employee accepts the aims and objectives of the organization he / she is affiliated with and adopts them as his / her own, acts in favor of the organization and according to its interests and strives to maintain his / her belonging. Therefore, organizational commitment represents the strong link between the organization and the employee. Organizational commitment manifests a tendency to take part in a coherent line of activity and is the power to identify one with the organization. (Sürücü ve Maşlakçı, 2018: 49-51).

### *2.8. The Importance of the Organizational Commitment*

Organizational commitment is important for employees, managers and businesses themselves. For this reason, organizational commitment (Organizational loyalty) is an essential requirement for every type of organization. This, in turn, concludes that no matter how high quality they have, people who are not motivated enough and who have poor

organizational commitment will create big problems in achieving their goals and objectives. (Güney, 2017c: 328). A study conducted in 36 companies and approximately 8,000 units of these companies has shown that employees with high organizational commitment caused a loss of \$ 63 per incident, while those with poor organizational commitment corresponded to \$ 392. In a study conducted by Caterpillar, a world-famous heavy machinery and vehicle company, it has been shown that the increase in organizational commitment corresponds to a decrease of 80% in customer complaints and 34% increase in customer satisfaction. (Erdem, 2015: 79). The management and executives of the organizations with high organizational commitment, developing and executing effective and correct human resources policies take into consideration this skilled workforce in their decisions. (Akar ve Yıldırım, 2008: 98). Thanks to this powerful psychological bond, organizations inevitably facing contemporary managerial problems should provide solutions by reducing costs and staff turnover, taking measures to ensure a peaceful work environment, implementing effective human resources policies, ensuring that employees feel safe and improving their performance by taking all kinds of measures (Kesoğlu ve Bayraktar, 2017: 2-6).

### 2.9. Organizational and Professional Commitment and Basic Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a kind of shared commitment that employees feel about the goals and objectives of the organization. The same expectations apply for professional engagement, and people connected to the profession are expected to be good employees in the business. Professional commitment can be expressed as the time and effort that people use to develop themselves technically so that they can demonstrate their profession at the highest level. Professional commitment is the measure of how much the individual sees his / her expertise above the organization and maintains it. The concept of organizational commitment, which shows the degree of psychological commitment of the employee to the organization, is expressed in three main dimensions as the main adaptation dimension, identification dimension and internalization dimension. (Güney, 2007a: 238).

### 2.10. Factors Affecting Organizational Commitment

Factors that determine and influence employee engagement in an organization can be specified as individual (age, gender, marital status, length of service, level of education, wage, perceived competence), work-related (content of work, skill diversity, autonomy), roles to be performed (role ambiguity, role conflict), organizational (control, promotion opportunities, communication style, trust, organizational structure, management style). In addition, some factors that increase the organizational commitment for an employee are healthy communication, vision, teamwork, struggle, getting paid, auditing, valuation, technology, development and organizational culture Yüceler, 2009: 450. Organizational commitment is an area on which business discipline puts most emphasis and models are developed. Numerous researchers have put forward detailed theories that differ from each other time to time. Among these approaches are Etzioni's Organizational Commitment Approach, Allen and Meyer's Organizational Commitment Approach, O'Reilly and Chatman's Organizational Commitment Approach, Kanter's Organizational Commitment Approach, Wiener's Organizational Commitment Approach, Staw and Salancik's Organizational Commitment Approach and Penley and Gould's Organizational Commitment Approach (Gül, 2002: 40).

### 2.11. Positive and Negative Results of Organizational Commitment

For an organization, positive and negative consequences of organizational commitment can emerge. Organizational commitment can have positive or negative consequences for the future of the organization. For example, contrary to most people's expectations, high levels of organizational commitment can sometimes have negative consequences. In order to ensure a positive result of organizational commitment, it is a rule that the aims and targets of the organization are adopted by the employees. (Uğraşoğlu ve Çağanağa, 2017: 17).

We can list the positive results of the employee's organizational commitment as follows: (Balay, 2000: 59-65; Doğan ve Kılıç, 2007: 37-61):

- The employee is more productive and open to development.
- Willingness to quit, job turnover decreases and job satisfaction rises.
- A fair and effective reward system operates. This system turns the reward of the employee in favor of the organization.
- Increases competition among employees.
- Organizational expectations are easily adopted by the employee.

The negative consequences of organizational commitment can be listed as follows: (Balay, 2000: 59-65; Doğan ve Kılıç, 2007: 37-61):

- Employee performance and productivity are adversely affected.
- Objections and complaints of employees lead to reputation loss for the organization.
- Poor organizational commitment restricts employees' self-development and tendency to be dynamic.
- Causes bureaucratic resistance to change.
- It causes tension in the social and family relations of the employee.

### 3. Research

#### 3.1. Purpose of the Research

The aim of this study is to investigate the effects of management styles on the motivation of employees and organizational commitment in the barter sector. For this reason, a questionnaire was applied to 107 people working in different positions in a barter company located in Istanbul.

#### 3.2. The Universe and Sample of Research

A total of 107 questionnaires have been conducted among the employees of the over 100 barter companies operating in Turkey who work in firms resident in Istanbul.

#### 3.3. Data Collection Method

In the study; questions have been asked to the participants using the scales prepared for "Leadership Factors Scale", "Motivation Factors Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Factors Scale" and the data for the analysis of the study has been obtained.

#### 3.4. Hypotheses

A total of 10 hypotheses of the study are presented below:

##### 3.4.1. Hypothesis 1

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Economic Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".
- H1: There is a statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Economic Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".

##### 3.4.2. Hypothesis 2

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Economic Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".
- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Economic Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".

##### 3.4.3. Hypothesis 3

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psychosocial Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".
- H1: There is a statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psycho-social Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".

##### 3.4.4. Hypothesis 4

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psychosocial Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psychosocial Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".

##### 3.4.5. Hypothesis 5

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".

##### 3.4.6. Hypothesis 6

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".

##### 3.4.7. Hypothesis 7

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psycho-social Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psycho-social Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".

### 3.4.8. Hypothesis 8

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psycho-social Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Psycho-social Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".

### 3.4.9. Hypothesis 9

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Demographic Factors".

### 3.4.10. Hypothesis 10

- H0: There is no statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".
- H0: There is statistically significant relationship between "Executive Styles", "Organizational and Managerial Motivators" and "Emotional Factors".

### 3.5. Analysis of Data

In SPSS statistics program, the data obtained from the study and the relationships between the determined variables were compared, hypothesis tests and other analyzes were conducted and the report of the study was prepared. Finally, in the light of the data obtained, all the information obtained by scientific method is presented as conclusions and recommendations.

### 3.6. Findings

In the study, reliability analysis of the scales of the questionnaires directed to the participants has been performed. The 5-point Likert scale, in which the participants gave a question about any subject, was subjected to reliability analysis and Cronbach Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) values have been found. Since Factor 4 (Organizational Commitment General) and Factor 6 (Executive Style General), which are included in the reliability table, formed by separating the questions that are the subject of the research into factors is less than 0.50, which is the reliability value, has low and medium reliability in terms of reliability. Therefore, there is no need to make any data changes in the study. The questions of the survey are reliable.

	Cronbach's Alpha	N
Economic satisfaction subscale	0,804	8
Psychological satisfaction subscale	0,508	7
Organizational management satisfaction subscale	0,795	6
Organizational commitment general	0,008	5
Satisfaction general	0,722	3
Executive style general	0,445	3

Table 1

The gender distribution of the participants was 75 (70.1%) female and 32 (29.9%) male

Gender	N	%	Valid %	% Total
Female	75	70,1	70,1	70,1
Male	32	29,9	29,9	100,0
Total	107	100,0	100,0	

Table 2

Age distribution of participants: 45 of them (42.1%) were in the 20-29 age range, 41 of them (38.3%) were in the 30-39 age range, 17 of them (15%) were in the 40-49 age range and 4 of them (3.7%) were 50 years or older.

Age Range	N	%	Valid %	% Total
20-29	45	42,1	42,1	42,1
30-39	41	38,3	38,3	80,4
40-49	17	15,9	15,9	96,3
50+	4	3,7	3,7	100,0
Total	107	100,0	100,0	

Table 3

According to the distribution of tasks; 13 (12.1%) of the participants were mid-level managers, 81 (75.7%) were office clerks, 8 of them (7.5%) were interns and 5 of them (4.7%) were employed as attendants (servants). A total of 94 (87.9%) of the participants were managers and office clerks.

Duty	N	%	Valid %	% Total
Mid-level Managers	13	12,1	12,1	12,1
Office Clerk	81	75,7	75,7	87,9
Interns	8	7,5	7,5	95,3
Attendants	5	4,7	4,7	100,0
Total	107	100,0	100,0	

Table 4

According to the status of the participants' service period in the institution, 86 (80.4%) of the participants were 1-8 years, 19 of them (17.8%) were 8-16 years, while 2 of them (1.9%) were in service for 17-25 years.

Service time	N	%	Valid %	% Total
1-8 Years	86	80,4	80,4	80,4
8-16 Years	19	17,8	17,8	98,1
17-25 Years	2	1,9	1,9	100,0
Total	107	100,0	100,0	

Table 5

According to the educational background of the participants, it has been found that 1 (0.9%) of the participants had primary, 15 (14.0%) had high school, 83 (77.6%) had university and 8 (7.5%) had postgraduate degrees.

Education Level	N	%	Valid %	% Total
Primary School	1	,9	,9	,9
High-school	15	14,0	14,0	15,0
University	83	77,6	77,6	92,5
Postgraduate	8	7,5	7,5	100,0
Total	107	100,0	100,0	

Table 6

In the Sphericity (Bartlett) table, Sigma value was found to be 0.000. For this reason, Ho was rejected and factor analysis was performed. When the table is analyzed, it is observed that Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value is close to 1 (0.631). Therefore, it was determined that one variable had an effect on other variables. Since Bartlett's Test Table Sigma value (0.000) is less than  $\alpha = 0.05$ , it was decided to perform factor analysis.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Value		0,631
Bartlett's Test Statistics	Ki-square value	2636,222
	df	990
	Sigma value	0,000

Table 7

According to the results of the KMO Bartlett test, there was a relationship between the variables and factor analysis was applied. In the study, rotated factor analysis was performed to determine how many factors would be and the factors were limited to 6.

Question	General basic values			TotalSquaresextraction			Rotated Factor Analysis (Total Management of Squares)
	Eigenvalues	Explanation percentages	Cumulative	Eigenvalues	Explanationpercentages	Cumulative explanation Percentages	Eigenvalues
1	8,093	17,985	17,985	8,093	17,985	17,985	5,190
2	4,829	10,731	28,715	4,829	10,731	28,715	4,856
3	3,151	7,002	35,718	3,151	7,002	35,718	3,048
4	2,331	5,179	40,897	2,331	5,179	40,897	3,511
5	2,000	4,446	45,343	2,000	4,446	45,343	4,159
6	1,938	4,307	49,650	1,938	4,307	49,650	4,904
7	1,772	3,938	53,589				
8	1,613	3,585	57,174				
9	1,593	3,539	60,713				
10	1,441	3,202	63,915				
11	1,338	2,973	66,888				
12	1,161	2,580	69,468				
13	,995	2,210	71,678				
14	,929	2,064	73,743				
15	,918	2,041	75,783				
16	,876	1,947	77,730				
17	,820	1,822	79,552				
18	,776	1,723	81,276				
19	,706	1,570	82,845				
20	,668	1,485	84,330				
21	,654	1,453	85,783				
22	,588	1,308	87,091				
23	,531	1,181	88,271				
24	,504	1,120	89,391				
25	,467	1,039	90,430				
26	,456	1,014	91,444				
27	,390	,867	92,311				
28	,360	,799	93,110				
29	,353	,784	93,895				
30	,312	,694	94,589				
31	,280	,623	95,212				
32	,264	,586	95,798				
33	,249	,553	96,351				
34	,226	,503	96,854				
35	,209	,464	97,318				
36	,192	,427	97,745				
37	,175	,390	98,135				
38	,173	,385	98,521				
39	,152	,337	98,858				
40	,133	,296	99,154				
41	,102	,227	99,381				
42	,090	,199	99,580				
43	,069	,154	99,734				
44	,062	,139	99,873				
45	,057	,127	100,000				

Table 8

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. When Components Are Correlated, Sums of Squared Loadings Cannot Be Added to Obtain a Total Variance

Factor analysis was limited to 6 factors. For this purpose, fixed number of factors method was used from the Extraction tab. In factor analysis, the loads were taken as 1,938 according to 6 factors. The distribution of the factor analysis questions are presented below:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Training opportunities enhance the expertise of employees.	,637					
Pay rise motivates the employees.	,618					
Participation in profit increases employee productivity.	,593					
Premium wage increase increases employee productivity.	,566					
Respect for private life increases employee motivation	,565					
Flexible working conditions increase employee's peace of mind.	,518					
Demographic elements increase employee productivity.		,790				
Continuance commitment increases the motivation of employees.		,782				
Entrepreneurial management increases employee participation in innovation.		,656				
Demographic differences may adversely affect organizational commitment.		,594				
Value / normative commitment improves employee success.		,550	-,523			
Emotional commitment improves employee productivity.		,536				
Professional elements ensure the career development of employees.		,520				
Authoritarian manager-style practices adversely affect employee productivity			-,583			
Authorization causes employees to make mistakes by using initiative.				,719		
Involvement of employees in decisions causes delays in business.				,709		
Charismatic executive style improves organizational commitment and motivation of employees.				,524		
Criminal system reduces employee motivation.					-,587	
Opportunities for promotion increase employee motivation.					-,562	
Participation in decisions increases employee benefit to the business.					-,509	
Facilitator-style management practices increase employee organizational commitment						-,748
Instructional manager style practices are effective in increasing the career of employees.						-,687
Visionary manager-style applications increase managers' productivity.						-,680
Interactive manager-style applications increase employee productivity.						-,639
Empowering manager style practices positively affect employee motivation.						-,616
Ethical executive style practices lead to the establishment of organizational justice.						-,545
Converter manager style applications are important in bringing innovations to managers.						-,534

Table 9

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  
a. 6 components extracted

Rotated Factor Analysis Question Distribution is presented below:

In the rotated factor analysis, the factors that the questions were taken are as above. The table below shows the distribution of the questions in the factor and rotated factor analysis;



Factor	Unrotated Factor Analysis	Rotated Factor Analysis
F1 (Economic satisfaction subscale)	Education opportunities. Pay rise... Joining the profit. Respect for the private life... Flexible working...	Continued commitment. Demographic elements. Entrepreneur manager. Demographic differences. Value / normative. Organizational support. Professional elements. Emotional commitment.
F2 (Psychological satisfaction subscale)	Demographic elements. Entrepreneurial management. Demographic differences. Value / normative. Emotional commitment. Professional elements.	Training opportunities. Premium wage increase. Wage increase. Flexible working. Delegation. Joining the profit. Economic rewards.
F3 (Organizational management satisfaction subscale)	Authoritarian manager.	Instructional manager. Facilitator manager. Interactive Manager. Visionary Manager. Ethical Manager. Empowering Manager.
F4 (Organizational commitment general)	Authorization. Employee participation in the decision. Charismatic Manager.	Promotion opportunities. Wage increase. Participation in decisions. Penal system. Authorization.
F5 (Satisfaction general)	Penal system. Promotion. Participation in decisions.	Private life. Value and status. Democratic manager.
F6 (Executive style general)	Facilitator. Instructional. Visionary. Interactionist. Reinforcing. Ethical manager. Transformational manager.	Charismatic manager. Transformational manager. Employee participation in decisions.

Table 10

M Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk were used to determine parametric or non-parametric tests for the analysis of hypotheses for demographic variables and H1 hypothesis was accepted in all groups since the "Sig". values reached as a result of the "Kolmogorov-Smirnov" test were lower than 0,05. When all groups are considered, with 95% confidence, it is concluded that the data is not normally distributed. In this case, it was considered appropriate to perform non-parametric tests on the grounds that the normality test could not be achieved.

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Organizational management satisfaction subscale	,223	107	,000	,838	107	,000
Economic satisfaction subscale	,109	107	,003	,963	107	,005
Psychological satisfaction subscale	,117	107	,001	,955	107	,001
Organizational commitment general	,133	107	,000	,964	107	,006
Satisfaction general	,149	107	,000	,907	107	,000
Executive style general	,151	107	,000	,918	107	,000

Table 11

When an evaluation with respect to the relevance is made between demographic elements and factor 1 (Economic Satisfaction); there was no significant difference between factor 1 and age (sig: 0.365); there was no significant difference

between factor 1 and task (sig: 0.61); there was no significant difference between factor 1 and the duration of service in the institution (sig: 0.568); There was no significant difference between factor 1 and educational status (sig: 0.71)..

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	9,183	12	,765	1,105	,365
	Within Groups	65,078	94	,692		
	Total	74,262	106			
Position	Between Groups	7,581	12	,632	1,789	,061
	Within Groups	33,186	94	,353		
	Total	40,766	106			
Period of Service in the Institution	Between Groups	2,232	12	,186	,882	,568
	Within Groups	19,824	94	,211		
	Total	22,056	106			
Education Status	Between Groups	4,763	12	,397	1,737	,071
	Within Groups	21,480	94	,229		
	Total	26,243	106			

Table 12

When an evaluation with respect to the relevance is made between demographic elements and factor 2; there was no significant difference between factor 2 and age (sig: 0,601); there was no significant difference between factor 2 and task (sig: 0.753); there was no significant difference between factor 2 and the duration of service in the institution (sig: 0.730); there was no significant difference between factor 2 and educational status (sig: 0.692)..

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	9,976	16	,624	,873	,601
	Within Groups	64,286	90	,714		
	Total	74,262	106			
Position	Between Groups	4,703	16	,294	,733	,753
	Within Groups	36,064	90	,401		
	Total	40,766	106			
Period of Service in the Institution	Between Groups	2,611	16	,163	,755	,730
	Within Groups	19,446	90	,216		
	Total	22,056	106			
Education Status	Between Groups	3,236	16	,202	,791	,692
	Within Groups	23,007	90	,256		
	Total	26,243	106			

Table 13

When an evaluation with respect to the relevance is made between demographic elements and factor 3; there was no significant difference between factor3 and age (sig: 0.706); there was no significant difference between factor 3 and task (sig: 0.757); there was no significant difference between factor 3 and the duration of service provided in the institution (sig: 0.297); There was no significant difference between factor 3 and educational status (sig: 0.510).

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	9,976	16	,624	,873	,601
	Within Groups	64,286	90	,714		
	Total	74,262	106			
Position	Between Groups	4,703	16	,294	,733	,753
	Within Groups	36,064	90	,401		
	Total	40,766	106			
Period of Service in the Institution	Between Groups	2,611	16	,163	,755	,730
	Within Groups	19,446	90	,216		
	Total	22,056	106			
Education Status	Between Groups	3,236	16	,202	,791	,692
	Within Groups	23,007	90	,256		
	Total	26,243	106			

Table 14

When an evaluation with respect to the relevance is made between demographic elements and factor 4; there was no significant difference between factor 4 and age (sig: 0.768); there was no significant difference between factor 4 and task (sig: 0.169); there was no significant difference between factor 4 and the duration of service in the institution (sig:

0.988); There was a significant difference between factor 4 and educational status (sig: 0.10). Post-Hoc test is required to measure the difference between learning status and factor 4. However, since a group has at least two events, this test cannot be performed in the SPSS package program.

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Age	Between Groups	4,106	9	,456	,631	,768
	Within Groups	70,156	97	,723		
	Total	74,262	106			
Position	Between Groups	4,899	9	,544	1,472	,169
	Within Groups	35,867	97	,370		
	Total	40,766	106			
Period of Service in the Institution	Between Groups	,478	9	,053	,239	,988
	Within Groups	21,578	97	,222		
	Total	22,056	106			
Education Status	Between Groups	5,086	9	,565	2,591	,010
	Within Groups	21,157	97	,218		
	Total	26,243	106			

Table 15

When an evaluation with respect to the relevance is made between demographic elements and factor 5; there was no significant difference between factor 5 and age (sig: 0.960); there was no significant difference between factor 5 and task (sig: 0.964); there was no significant difference between factor 5 and the duration of service in the institution (sig: 0.650); there was no significant difference between factor 5 and education (sig: 0.845).

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Age	Between Groups	1,847	8	,231	,312	,960
	Within Groups	72,415	98	,739		
	Total	74,262	106			
Position	Between Groups	,971	8	,121	,299	,965
	Within Groups	39,795	98	,406		
	Total	40,766	106			
Period of Service in the Institution	Between Groups	1,268	8	,158	,747	,650
	Within Groups	20,788	98	,212		
	Total	22,056	106			
Education Status	Between Groups	1,053	8	,132	,512	,845
	Within Groups	25,190	98	,257		
	Total	26,243	106			

Table 16

When an evaluation with respect to the relevance is made between demographic elements and factor 6; there was no significant difference between factor 6 and age (sig: 0.140); there was no significant difference between factor 6 and task (sig: 873); there was no significant difference between factor 6 and the duration of service in the institution (sig: 0.528); There was no significant difference between factor 6 and educational status (sig: 0.596).

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Age	Between Groups	15,165	16	,948	1,443	,140
	Within Groups	59,097	90	,657		
	Total	74,262	106			
Position	Between Groups	12,660	16	,791	2,534	,873
	Within Groups	28,107	90	,312		
	Total	40,766	106			
Period of Service in the Institution	Between Groups	3,158	16	,197	,940	,528
	Within Groups	18,898	90	,210		
	Total	22,056	106			
Education Status	Between Groups	3,543	16	,221	,878	,596
	Within Groups	22,700	90	,252		
	Total	26,243	106			

Table 17

Correlation Values for Regression Preliminary Analysis are given below.

		<b>Authoritarian manager-style practices adversely affect employee productivity</b>	<b>F1</b>	<b>F2</b>	<b>F4</b>	<b>F5</b>	<b>F6</b>
Authoritarian manager-style practices adversely affect employee productivity	Pearson Correlation	1	-,026	,122	,064	-,139	,107
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,793	,211	,513	,153	,271
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107
F1	Pearson Correlation	-,026	1	,102	,223*	,147	,010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,793		,295	,021	,130	,915
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107
F2	Pearson Correlation	,122	,102	1	,158	,134	,234*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,211	,295		,104	,167	,015
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107
F4	Pearson Correlation	,064	,223*	,158	1	,146	,176
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,513	,021	,104		,134	,070
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107
F5	Pearson Correlation	-,139	,147	,134	,146	1	,322*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,153	,130	,167	,134		,001
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107
F6	Pearson Correlation	,107	,010	,234*	,176	,322**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,271	,915	,015	,070	,001	
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107

Table 18

It was not analyzed since sig. value was 0,171 as a result of the Regression Analysis for Factor 1.

<b>Model</b>		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
1	Regression	2,257	5	,451	1,586	,171 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	28,742	101	,285		
	Total	30,999	106			

Table 19

It was not analyzed since sig. value was 0,096 as a result of the Regression Analysis for Factor 2.

<b>Model</b>		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
1	Regression	4,484	5	,897	1,929	,096 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	46,950	101	,465		
	Total	51,434	106			

Table 20

It was not analyzed since sig. value was 0,269 as a result of the Regression Analysis for Factor 3.

<b>Model</b>		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
1	Regression	7,019	5	1,404	1,303	,269 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	108,831	101	1,078		
	Total	115,850	106			

Table 21

It was not analyzed since sig. value was 0,068 as a result of the Regression Analysis for Factor 4.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3,629	5	,726	2,131	,068b
	Residual	34,396	101	,341		
	Total	38,025	106			

Table 22

It was analyzed since sig. value was 0,003 as a result of the Regression Analysis for Factor 5. Correlation has been established as Factor 5(1,487) = + F6 (0,450) + F1 (0,170) + F4 (0, 86).

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10,325	5	2,065	3,902	,003b
	Residual	53,455	101	,529		
	Total	63,780	106			

Table 23

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,487	,824		1,805	,074
	F6	,450	,136	,315	3,312	,001
	F3	-,135	,068	-,181	-1,966	,052
	F1	,170	,135	,118	1,262	,210
	F2	,067	,106	,060	,633	,528
	F4	,086	,124	,066	,692	,490

Table 24

It was analyzed since sig. value was 0,002 as a result of the Regression Analysis for Factor 6. Correlation has been established as Factor 6 (1,487) = + F3 (0,063) + F2 (0,130) + F5(0,217).

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5,347	5	1,069	4,186	,002b
	Residual	25,804	101	,255		
	Total	31,152	106			

Table 25

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,618	,520		5,036	,000
	F3	,063	,048	,121	1,308	,194
	F1	-,075	,094	-,075	-,795	,429
	F2	,130	,073	,167	1,794	,076
	F4	,102	,086	,113	1,196	,235
	F5	,217	,066	,311	3,312	,001

Table 26

#### 4. Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, 107 people employed in a barter company have been surveyed. The management style scale of the questionnaire was used to measure the motivation perceptions, degrees and organizational commitment levels of barter company employees. Based on these findings, it has been investigated whether there is a significant relationship between executive style and motivation and organizational commitment levels.

The demographic part of the study has provided important information in terms of interpreting the scale applications. According to demographic findings, 70.1% of the participants were female and 29.9% were male. When the age distribution of the participants is examined, it is seen that 42.1% are between 20-29 years and 38.3% are between 30-39 years. In this context, 80.4% of the people participating in the implementation or of the barter company personnel are between 20-39 years of age; or in other words, young people. When the distribution of duties of the employees is examined, it has been determined that 87.9% are mid-level managers and office clerks. According to the distribution of service periods in the institution, it has been found that the majority (80.4%) are distributed between 1-8 years and 17% 8

to 8-16 years. Finally, it has been observed that 91% of the participants in the barter company were high school and university educated people. As a result, it has been determined that the barter company, where the application was made, is composed of women, young, well-educated and senior people. In this study, the importance of factors such as gender, age, educational background and service period have been mentioned among the main factors affecting organizational commitment. In the literature, it has been emphasized that advanced age increases organizational commitment and commitment for younger ages is weak. Although there is no clear relationship between gender and organizational commitment, some studies suggest that organizational commitment is higher in women than in men. There are studies showing that organizational commitment increases as service life increases. Finally, it has been shown that education level, which is one of the factors that deeply affect organizational commitment, decreases as the level of education increases. From this point of view, higher organizational commitment among women in terms of demographic characteristics was observed for the employees of the barter firms surveyed; in terms of education level, it was found that they have a positive similarity with service period. From this point of view, it has been observed that the management styles should be taken according to the demographic characteristics of the firm and the results of the current research in the literature, and if necessary attention is paid to this detail, it will have direct or indirect impacts on the employees' motivation, when considering the characteristics of the job and the level of education, attitudes such as engaging employees in the internal decision-making processes will have serious effects on the success of the firm.

In this study, statistical analysis of hypothesis related to demographic variables has been performed. The results obtained from the Anova analyzes applied to the hypotheses are listed as follows:

There was no significant relationship between age, duty, institutional service period and education level and economic satisfaction, psychological satisfaction, organizational management, satisfaction and manager style. On the other hand, there was no significant relationship between age, duty and duration of institutional service and organizational commitment. However, a significant relationship has been determined between educational status and organizational commitment. According to the results of the Anova analysis, it was concluded that only the educational level affected the organizational commitment, but the age, duty, service period and level of education did not affect the economic satisfaction, psychological satisfaction, organizational management and satisfaction and the manager style. The level of education is one of the most important determinants of organizational commitment. Research has shown that the higher the education level, the more opportunities for alternative jobs increase, which in turn, reduces organizational commitment for the employee. The fact that the expectations of highly educated employees cannot be fully met by the company may also have an effect. In other words, attention should be paid to the fact that individuals with high levels of education have more professional commitment than organizational commitment. In this respect, our findings have led to a similar conclusion with the literature.

Regression analysis of six factors (Economic satisfaction, Psychological satisfaction, Organizational management, Organizational commitment, Satisfaction and Manager Style) was performed. According to the results of the regression analysis, which aims to develop predictions based on the existence of possible relationships among the factors and from these relationships, there is a significant correlation between general satisfaction and executive style, psychological satisfaction and organizational commitment. It was determined that organizational commitment was the most important factor determining the general satisfaction level of the participants in the barter company, followed by executive style and economic satisfaction dimension. Other regression analysis has shown that there is a relationship between executive style and organizational management, psychological satisfaction and general satisfaction. The sub-dimension in which the executive style is most effective is general satisfaction, followed by psychological satisfaction and organizational management. These relationships, which affect each other, reveal that the management style in the barter firm affects general satisfaction, psychological satisfaction and organizational commitment in some way.

As a result, it has been understood that the management style affects the motivation and organizational commitment in the employees of the firm, organizational commitment weakens as the level of education increases, demographic factors such as age, service period, and task do not determine the satisfaction dimensions or their effects are very low.

## 5. References

- i. Akar, C., Yıldırım, Y. T. (2008). Yöneticilerin örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatmini ve rol stres kaynakları arasındaki ilişkiler: yapısal denklem modeliyle beyaz et sektöründe bir alan uygulaması. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10 (2). 97-113.
- ii. Alayoğlu, N., Doğan, E. A. (2015). Örgüt Kültürünün Çalışan Motivasyonuna Etkileri: Belediyecilik Sektöründe Bir Uygulama. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi WPS NO/05/2015-08*, Erişim: <http://www.ticaret.edu.tr/uploads/dosyalar/921/WPS%20NO%2005%202015-08.pdf>.
- iii. Alsat, O. Ç. (2016). Çalışan Motivasyonunu Etkileyen Faktörlerin İş Tatminine Etkisinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Uygulama. (Yayımlanmış Doktora Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Üretim Yönetimi ve Pazarlama Bilim Dalı, Konya.
- iv. Balay, R. (2000). Özel ve Resmi Liselerde Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığı (Ankara İli Örneği). Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, Ankara.
- v. Barlı, Ö., Özen, Ü. (2008). Maddi Değer Taşımayan Motivasyonel Araçlar Bağlamında Kamu ve Özel Sektör Karşılaştırması. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (2): 437-455.
- vi. Doğan, S. ve Kılıç, S. (2007). Örgütsel bağlılığın sağlanmasında personel güçlendirmenin yeri ve önemi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29 (Temmuz-Aralık): 37-61.
- vii. Erdem, İ. Örgütsel Davranış. 14. Basımdan Çeviri, Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara, 2015.

- viii. Gül, H. (2002). Örgütsel bağlılık yaklaşımlarının mukayesesi ve değerlendirilmesi. *Ege Academic Review*, 2, (1): 37-56.
- ix. Güney, S. (2007a). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*. 2. baskı, Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara.
- x. Güney, S. (2015b). *Liderlik*. 2. Basım, Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara.
- xi. Güney, S. (2017c). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon El Kitabı*. 2. Basım, Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara.
- xii. Kesdoğan, N., Bayraktar, O. (2017). Örgütsel bağlılık ve işveren markası arasındaki ilişki ve bir araştırma. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Dış Ticaret Enstitüsü Working Paper Series WPS NO/ 120/ 2017-06, İstanbul.
- xiii. Lok, P., Crawford, J. (2003). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23 (4), 321-338.
- xiv. Mercanloğlu, Ç. (2012). Örgütlerde Performans Yönetimi İle İşgörenlerin Motivasyonu Arasındaki İlişki. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4 (1): 41-52.
- xv. Özgür, B. (2011). Yönetim Tarzları ve Etkileri. *Maliye Dergisi*, 161: 215-230.
- xvi. Sürücü, L., Maşlakçı, A. (2018). Örgütsel bağlılık üzerine kavramsal inceleme. *IJMA*, 2 (3): 49-65.
- xvii. Uğraşoğlu, İ. K. ve Çağanağa, Ç. K. "Öğretmenlerin örgüte bağlılık düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi", *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education*, Cilt: 6, sayı: 4, 2017.
- xviii. Ünsar, A. S., İnan, A., Yürük, P. (2010). Çalışma Hayatında Motivasyon ve Kişiyi Motive Eden Faktörler: Bir Alan Araştırması. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (1): 248-262.
- xix. Yüceler, A. (2009). Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgüt İklimi İlişkisi: Teorik ve Uygulamalı Bir Çalışma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 22: 445-458.