Analysis Of The Hotel Personnel's Conceptions Of Organizational Justice, Organizational Silence, Mobbing, Organizational Commitment In Terms Of Demographic Variables

Şevket Yirik, Yusuf Yilmaz, Osman Nuri Demirel,Yıldırım Yilmaz,

Abdullah Akgün, Hasan Kinay

Akdeniz University, Turkey

Abstract

This study analyses the conceptions of organizational justice, organizational silence, mobbing, organizational commitment in terms of demographic variables in hotel management. Field work is carried out in the 5-star hotels that are active during 12 months in the Manavgat region of Antalya (Turkey). The study is supported by 229 hotel personnel and all responded. The study reveals that factors such as gender, age, educational level, professional rank and position have considerable effects on the conceptions of institutional devotion, mobbing, institutional repose and institutional justice.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Organizational Silence, Mobbing, Organizational Commitment

1.THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1.Organizational Justice

Originally, the conception of organizational justice is based on "Equity Theory" of Adams in 1965 (Baş and Şentürk, 2011: 33). Organizational justice is whether there is equity or not comparing what the employees bring in the company according to the contributions the employees made to the company (time, work, earnings). Organizational Justice is examined under three headings; distributive justice, procedural justice and personal interaction justice. (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001: 279; St-Pierre and Holmes, 2010: 1171).

1.2. Organizational Silence

Organizational Silence was proposed by Hirschman in 1970; however, it was first used as a definition by Morrison and Milliken in 2000 (Erenler, 2010). Organizational silence can be seen when the employees do not express their views and concerns about the company (Morrison and Milliken, 2000).

The employee silence, on the other hand, can be defined as not revealing one's feelings, not sharing with others and concealing the problems by remaining silent and keeping on working as if nothing happened. There may be many reasons why the employee prefers to remain silent. These can be stated as the behavioural habits, consciousness and decision mechanisms (Blackman and Sadler-Smith, 2009: 571-572). The institutional reasons of the organizational silence are as follows:

- Organizational Reasons

- Injustice Culture
- Silence Climate
- Organizational Culture
- Managerial Reasons
- Negative Feedback Fears of Managers
- Prejudices towards Work and Worker
- Character of the Manager
- Homogeneity of the Management Team
- Individual Reasons
- Lack of Confidence
- Considering Talking Risky
- Fear of Isolation
- Past Experiences
- Fear for Damaging the Relations
- Character and Personality
- National and Cultural reasons
- Cultural Structure and Norms
- Power Distance

1.3. Mobbing

Latin origin word, mobbing means "psychological violence, disturbance and harassment". The term mobbing was first suggested by Lorenz in 1960, a scientist who was observing animal behaviours (Davenport et. al., 2003: 3). In the beginning of 1980s, Leymann determined that these kind of outrageous and negative behaviours were taking place in workplaces. Although Leyman met this behaviour style in 1980s, the studies indicate that this behaviour goes far beyond (Leymann, 1996: 166). In 1983, in Norway, the mobbing that 3 teenagers were subject to ended with the suicides of these three teenagers. Hereupon, a broadened investigation was carried out by the Ministry of Education and violence and situations of the victims were revealed. Programs in the USA, England and Germany, in the 1990s, started to be applied for protecting the kids and the youth (Olweus, 1993). However, the first study in Turkey about mobbing was conducted in 2003 (Yavuz, 2007: 7).

World Health Organization (WHO) defines mobbing as, attitudes and behaviours that damage physical, psychological and moral development of the individuals or groups by using power against them (Akgeyik vd., 2009: 98). The disturbing behaviours of mobbing that even ends in the resignation of the employees have risen a lot recently.

1.4. Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment can be said to exist when the employees are willing to stay in the organization and adopt the beliefs of the company as their own and dedicate their work in accordance with company's interests (Becker, 1960: 32).

The factors effecting the organizational commitment are studied under four subtitles; factors concerning work and duty, working place and working conditions, organizational structure and demographic factors (Topaloğlu et. al., 2008: 953).

Approaches of organizational commitment can be gathered under three titles; attitudinal commitment, behavioural commitment and normative commitment (Kitapçı, 2006:75).

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. The Aim of the Study

This study aims to introduce whether the perceptions of organizational justice, organizational silence, mobbing and organizational commitment of the hotel employees differ in terms of demographic variables or not. In this respect, the differences in the perceptions of organizational justice, organizational silence, mobbing and organizational commitment of the hotel employees were examined regarding their age, gender, educational background and work experience.

2.2. Sampling

The universe of the study is the 5 star hotel employees in the city of Antalya. Due to the time and financial difficulties experienced in reaching the universe, random sampling was used. In this context, the sampling of this study is 229 employees of a 5 star hotel in Antalya. The questionnaire was distributed to 229 people and all was responded. No invalid questionnaire was determined while analyzing the data.

2.3. Data Collection

Questionnaires were used as a means of data collection. Questionnaire was composed of 5 main parts. In the first part, Personal Information Form; in the second part, Organizational Commitment Scale; in the third part Mobbing Scale; in the fourth part Organizational Silence Scale; in the fifth part Organizational Justice Scale was used.

2.3.1. Personal Information Form

Questions like gender, age, educational background, work experience, salary, position and weekly working hours were in the form in order to determine the demographics of the hotel employees.

2.3.2. Organizational Commitment Scale

The Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) was used. The scale had 19 items and prepared in accordance with 5 points Likert Scale (1= Absolutely disagree, 5= Absolutely agree). Since the 3rd, 4th, 6th and 13 the items of the scale include negative statements, they were coded with reverse coding method. Thus, it was stated that the higher the score from the scale is, the more the commitment of the employee has. The

reliability of the scale was high in many studies in which it was used. For this study, the reliability of the scale was determined as 0, 744 and was highly reliable.

2.3.3. Mobbing (Psychological Violence) Scale

The appropriate questions for this study about mobbing were chosen from the LIPT (Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror) , the questionnaire version of which was developed by Klaus Niedl and were selected from the Negative Action Questionnaire (NAQ) , the questions of which were developed by Stale Einarsen, Björn Inge Raknes, Stig Berge Matthiesen and Odd (Mercan, 2007: 120). The Mobbing Scale including 14 items was examined in accordance with 5 points Likert Scale (1= Absolutely disagree, 5= Absolutely agree). With a minimum score of 5 and maximum score of 70, the mobbing (being subject to psychological violence) was said to be increasing when the total score rises. In these studies, the reliability of the scale (α) was observed to be considerably high and the reliability and validity were proved. For this study, the reliability of the scale was observed as 0, 959 and was found to be highly reliable.

2.3.4. Organizational Silence Scale

The question form designed by Çakıcı ve Çakıcı (2007) was used for preparing the questions about organizational silence. The scale consisted of 28 questions and was examined in accordance with 5 points Likert type. (1= Absolutely disagree, 5=Absolutely agree). The most appropriate 13 out of 28 questions were chosen for the study. The minimum score was 5 and the maximum score was 65 and it was stated that the higher the total point was, the more the organizational silence becomes. Many studies that this scale was used indicated that this scale was a considerably reliable one. As for this study, the reliability of the scale was determined as 0,951 and was rather high.

2.3.5. Organizational Justice Scale

While preparing the questions about Organizational Justice, 20 item- Organizational Justice Scale of Niehoff and Moorman (1993) was used (Yıldırım, 2002). The scale was evaluated in accordance with 5 points Likert type. (1= Absolutely disagree, 5=Absolutely agree). With the evaluation of each response for each statement, the score of organizational justice was found. The minimum score was 5 and the maximum score was 100 and it was stated that the higher the total point was, the more effective the organizational justice applications are. Many studies in which this scale was used indicated that this scale was a considerably reliable one. As for this study, the reliability of the scale was determined as 0,956 and was indicated to be considerably high.

3. Data Analysis

In this study, Independent Samples T Test and ANOVA were used in accordance with the aim of the study. Data analysis was made using SPSS 17.0 package program. .05 and .01 significance levels are used in the study.

4. Findings

4.1. Demographics

Demographic profiles of the respondents can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographics

Variables		n	%
Gender	Female	117	51,1
	Male	112	48,9
	Total	229	100,0
Age	25-30	32	14,0
	31-36	95	41,5
	37-42	38	16,6
	43 and over	64	27,9
	Total	229	100,0
Education	Primary School	31	13,5
	High School	51	22,3
	Vocational School	26	11,4
	Undergraduate	75	32,8
	Graduate	46	20,0
	Total	229	100,0
Work Experience	2-6 years	41	17,9
	7-11 years	117	51,1
	12-16 years	71	31,0
	Total	229	100,0
Salary	1500 TL and less	67	29,2
	1501-2000 TL	21	9,2
	2001-2500 TL	29	12,7

	2501-3000 TL	20	8,7
	3001-3500 TL	47	20,5
	3501 and more	45	19,7
	Total	229	100,0
Position	Worker	68	29,7
	Assistant	22	9,6
	Expert	14	6,1
	Middle Level Manager	47	20,5
	Senior Manager	78	34,1
	Total	229	100,0
Weekly Working Hour	41-60 hour	80	34,9
	61-80 hour	145	63,3
	81 hour and more	4	1,8
	Total	229	100,0

As it is seen in Table 1 the ratio of female and male is nearly the same. The dominant age group is between 31 and 36 (41.5 %). Above half of the respondents are graduated from the university (52.8%). Most of them have been working for less than 12 years (69%). Majority of them are in the group of 7 and 11 years as working experience (51%).

Workers (29.7%) and senior managers (34.1%) are two dominant groups and the salaries are less than 1.500 TL. (29.2%) and more than 3.000 TL.(40.2%). People are working mostly between 61-80 hours in a week (63.3%).

4.2. Reliability Analysis

Reliability is determined with Cronbach's Alpha. The reliability results can be seen at Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability Analysis Results

	N	**Cronbach's Alpha**

Organisational Commitment	18	0,744
Mobbing	14	0,959
Organisational Silence	13	0,951
Organisational Justice	10	0,956

It seems that reliability of all the scales is high.

4.3. Normality Tests

The normality tests are done in this part of the study. To test the normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test was applied using the total points of the scales. This normality tests were done to determine which tests were appropriate to examine the hypotheses tests.

Table 3. Results of Normality Tests

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	**p**
Organisational Commitment	3,610	0,000
Mobbing	4,116	0,000
Organisational Silence	2,405	0,000
Organisational Justice	4,000	0,000

According to the Table 3, total scores of the scales do not seem to fit the normal distribution ($p<0,05$). This result leads the researchers to use non-parametric methods to test the hypotheses.

4.4. Findings According to Gender Differences

Table 4 shows the Mann Whitney U test results of gender differences in organisational commitment, mobbing, organisational silence, and organisational justice.

Table 4. Findings According to Gender Differences- Mann Whitney U Test Results

Scale	**Group**	**N**	**Mean Rank**	**U**	**P**
Organisational Commitment	Female	117	135,53	4150,000	0,000**
	Male	112	93,55		
Mobbing	Female	117	84,35	2966,000	0,000**
	Male	112	147,02		
Organisational Silence	Female	117	92,71	3944,000	0,000**
	Male	112	138,29		
Organisational Justice	Female	117	135,71	4129,000	0,000**

	Male	112	93,37		

**p<0,01

It is seen from the Table 4 that hotel employees' perception on organisational commitment, mobbing, organisational silence, and organisational justice differs at 0.01 significant level between females and males. According to the mean ranks, perception of female employees on organisational commitment and organisational justice are higher than male employees whereas for the mobbing and organizational silence, perception of male employees is higher than females.

4.5. Findings According to Age Differences

To test the differences occur for organisational commitment, mobbing, organisational silence and organisational justice according to the age, Kruskal Wallis H test was applied. The results are indicated at Table 5.

Table 5. Findings According to Age Differences- Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

Scale	**Group**	**N**	**Mean Rank**	χ^2	**P**
Organisational Commitment	25–30	32	106,03	8,177	0,042*
	31–36	95	129,22		
	37–42	38	111,03		
	43 years and over	64	100,73		
Mobbing	25–30	32	142,66	58,456	0,000**
	31–36	95	102,95		
	37–42	38	58,12		
	43 years and over	64	152,83		
Organisational Silence	25–30	32	133,47	47,078	0,000**
	31–36	95	96,41		
	37–42	38	77,16		
	43 years and over	64	155,83		
Organisational Justice	25–30	32	90,00	62,641	0,000**
	31–36	95	138,93		
	37–42	38	154,11		

	43 years and over	64	68,77		

**p<0,01
*p<0,05

According to the age of the hotel employees there are significant differences for all scales. The significance level is 0.05 for the organisational commitment whereas 0.001 for other scales.

4.6. Findings According to Differences in Education Level

Table 6 shows the Kruskal Wallis H test results of education differences in organisational commitment, mobbing, organisational silence, and organisational justice.

Table 6. Findings According to Education Differences- Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

Scale	**Group**	**N**	**Mean Rank**	χ^2	**P**
Organisational Commitment	Primary School	31	16,00	103,004	0,000**
	High School	51	101,88		
	Vocational School	26	161,88		
	Undergraduate	75	146,81		
	Graduate	46	117,89		
Mobbing	Primary School	31	183,03	89,458	0,000**
	High School	51	154,55		
	Vocational School	26	125,58		
	Undergraduate	75	76,84		
	Graduate	46	81,54		
Organisational Silence	Primary School	31	198,52	89,958	0,000**
	High School	51	140,59		
	Vocational School	26	123,04		
	Undergraduate	75	78,84		
	Graduate	46	84,76		
Organisational Justice	Primary School	31	46,16	80,135	0,000**
	High School	51	92,43		

	Vocational School	26	83,27		
	Undergraduate	75	143,52		
	Graduate	46	157,85		

**p<0,01

According to the education level of the hotel employees there are differences for all scales at 0.01 significance level. It seems that perception of mobbing and organisational silence increase as the level of education decreases. On the other hand, the organisational justice perception increases as the level of education increases.

4.7. Findings According to Differences in Work Experience

Table 7 shows the Kruskal Wallis H test results of differences of work experience of employees for organisational commitment, mobbing, organisational silence, and organisational justice

Table 7. Findings According to Work Experience- Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

Scale	**Group**	**N**	**Mean Rank**	χ^2	**P**
Organizational Commitment	2–6 years	41	55,29	42,881	0,000**
	7–11 years	117	123,05		
	12–16 years	71	136,21		
Mobbing	2–6 years	41	151,68	31,221	0,000**
	7–11 years	117	92,21		
	12–16 years	71	131,38		
Organizational Silence	2–6 years	41	165,59	36,444	0,000**
	7–11 years	117	94,00		
	12–16 years	71	120,39		
Organizational Justice	2–6 years	41	88,29	27,834	0,000**
	7–11 years	117	137,29		
	12–16 years	71	93,68		

**p<0,01

According to the work experience of the hotel employees the difference at the significance level is 0.01 for the organisational commitment, mobbing, organizational silence and organizational justice.

4.8. Findings According to Differences in Positions

Table 8 shows the Kruskal Wallis H test results of differences in position for organisational commitment, mobbing, organisational silence, and organisational justice.

Table 8. Findings According to Position- Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

Scale	**Group**	**N**	**Mean Rank**	χ^2	**P**
Organizational Commitment	Assistant	22	109,68	159,880	0,000**
	Middle Level Manager	47	179,47		
	Senior Manager	78	125,58		
	Expert	14	206,50		
	Worker	68	41,19		
Mobbing	Assistant	22	160,32	152,276	0,000**
	Middle Level Manager	47	67,55		
	Senior Manager	78	77,91		
	Expert	14	58,50		
	Worker	68	187,31		
Organizational Silence	Assistant	22	131,86	170,593	0,000**
	Middle Level Manager	47	81,72		
	Senior Manager	78	80,37		
	Expert	14	7,50		
	Worker	68	194,40		
Organizational Justice	Assistant	22	84,50	142,661	0,000**
	Middle Level Manager	47	114,40		
	Senior Manager	78	166,08		
	Expert	14	198,50		
	Worker	68	49,50		

**p<0,01

According to the work positions of the hotel employees, the difference at the significance level is 0.01 for the organisational commitment, mobbing, organizational silence and organizational justice.

5. DISCUSSION

In this study, it was determined that the woman employees' perception of organizational commitment and organizational justice is higher than that of the men whereas the men employees' perception of organizational silence is higher than that of the women.

As for the age, while the organizational commitment of 31-36 age groups is the highest, the employees' commitment at the age of 43 and over is the lowest. The age group 43 and over was subject to mobbing at the highest level and 25-30 ages followed that and 37-42 age group were subject to the mobbing the least. Moreover, while organizational silence of the 43 and over age group is the highest, the organizational silence of 37-42 is the lowest. The organizational justice perception of the age group 37-42 was determined to be the highest.

The organizational commitment of the employees who are graduates of primary school is the lowest and vocational school graduates' perception is the highest. The primary school graduates were observed to be subject to mobbing more often than the others. Generally, it can be stated that the higher the graduate degree is, the lower the employees are subject to mobbing. It was also observed that the organizational silence of primary school graduates is higher than that of the others. As the education level increases, the perception of organizational silence decreases. Besides, as the education level increases, the perception of organizational justice increases in parallel.

In general, it was determined that as the working year increases, the organizational commitment increases, too. While the mobbing rate is the highest among the employees having a work experience of 2-6 years; it is the lowest among 7-11 years. The organizational silence of the employees who worked for 2-6 years is the highest and 7-11 years is the lowest. The organizational justice perception of the employees with 2-6 years of working experience is the lowest and 7-11 years of working experience is the highest.

As for the positions, the workers organizational commitment is the lowest and that of the experts is the highest. The mobbing rate among the workers is the highest whereas it the lowest among the experts. The organizational silence of the workers is the highest and that of the experts is the lowest. The perception of organizational justice of the experts is the highest while that of the workers is the lowest.

REFERENCES

Akgeyik, T., Güngör, M., Usen, Ş. & Omay U. (2009). İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz Olgusu: Niteliği, Yaygınlığı ve Mücadele Stratejisi. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi, 56, 91-150.

Baş, G. & Şentürk, C. (2011). İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Adalet, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık ve Örgütsel Güven Algıları. Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 17(1), 29-62.

Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the Consept of Commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66(1), 32-40.

Blackman, D. & Sadler-Smith, E. (2009). The Silent and the Silenced in Organizational Knowing and Learning. Management Learning, 40(5), 569-585.

Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta Analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86(2), 278-321.

Çakıcı, A. & Çakıcı, C. (2007). İş gören Sessizliği: Konuşmak Mı Zor, Sessiz Kalmak Mı Zor?, 15. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Sakarya, 389-400.

Davenport, N., Swartz, R.D. & Eliot, G.P. (2003). Mobbing: İşyerinde Duygusal Taciz, (Çev.: Osman Cem Önertoy), Sistem Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Erenler, E. (2010). Çalışanlarda Sessizlik Davranışının Bazı Kişisel Ve Örgütsel Özelliklerle İlişkisi: Turizm Sektöründe Bir Alan Araştırması. Yayınlanmış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Kitapçı, H. (2006). "TKY'de Karar Almaya Katılımın ve Örgütsel Bağlılığın Kişisel Performansa Etkisi", Bilig, 39, 73-86.

Leymann, H. (1996). The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work. Europen Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5, 165-184.

Mercan, N. (2007). Örgütlerde Mobbing'in Örgüt İklimiyle İlişkisine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kütahya.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. Human Resources Management Review, 1, 61-89.

Morrison, E. W. & Milliken, F.J. (2000). Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. The Academy Of Management Review, 25(4), 706-725.

Niehoff, B.P.I. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justiee as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 36(3), 527-556.

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at School What We Know and What We Can Do, Oxfort, Blackwell.

St-Pierre, I. & Holmes, D. (2010). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Workplace Aggression. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 66(5), 1169-1182.

Topaloğlu, M., Koç, H. & Yavuz, E. (2008). Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığının Bazı Temel Faktörler Açısından Analizi, Kamu-İş, 9(4), 949-967.

Yavuz, H. (2007). Çalışanlarda Mobbing (Psikolojik Şiddet) Algısını Etkileyen Faktörler: SDÜ Tıp Fakültesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.

Yıldırım, F. (2002). Çalışma Yaşamında Örgüte Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Adalet İlişkisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.