

Determining the Differences between Managers' Conceptions of Discipline

Dr. Didem Pasaoglu

Assistant Professor

Anadolu University

Faculty of Business Administration

Department of Management and Organization

TR-26460-Eskişehir

Turkey

Abstract

Discipline is the power or measures package that head to decrease the disorders in the organizational life and stick to agreement between the organizational and individual goal. In this study, a research is made to determine the efficiency of discipline in organizations. The research is made with 130 employees working in Turkish owned firms and foreign owned in order to determine how managers' effect disciplines perception and its implementation. As a result of this research, it has been observed that, in comparison with foreign owned firm managers, Turkish owned firm managers apply more discipline approaches (corrective and punitive), are less successful in discipline implementation and also a higher indiscipline rate is seen in organizations they manage. Besides, there is a perception that Turkish owned firm managers do not behave fair while trying to discipline. Employees that work under their supervision are not satisfied with discipline efforts.

Key Words: Discipline, preventive discipline, corrective discipline, constructive discipline and progressive discipline

Introduction

In the recent world characterized with high population, behaviour of people such as, respect the rights of others or fulfill personal responsibilities have started to require lower and upper limits. According to Foucault (1977), "Discipline implies order and regularity. Discipline refers to regular behaviour and working effort of a subject". The concept of discipline is an inevitable for the interaction of human and for enabling people sustains their lives with as less troubles as possible. The increased importance of this concept indicates the vitality in implementation process of a discipline system. Discipline is a style of living which ensures harmony in work places. Perceptions of people are different and therefore, it is necessary to create coordination between people. In order to ensure order in the business, rules required for proper operation of the system (order) should not be left to the discretion of individuals.

Controlling the behaviors of the employees, bringing them to the desired standards, influencing and directing them positively are all dealt with within the scope of discipline. The lower the discipline maintained within an organization is, the lower the efficiency and productivity of the same organization is. Indiscipline is like a virus. As soon as it is infected, it may spread throughout the organization. That is why numerous policies have been developed to discipline the individuals within the organizations. These policies may vary according to the characteristics of the organizations. Conceptions of discipline, which vary according to the genders, personality structures, ages, educational backgrounds, socio-economical conditions of the individuals, as well as to the statuses and roles thereof within the society, may also be in question.

Literature Review

Atiomo (2000) defines discipline "as the training of the mind and character to produce self control and habit of obedience". In its general sense, discipline refers to punishment of some sort for wrong doing and can be a useful tool for behavior modification, for reorientation and for educational purposes (Udom, 1998). Staff discipline has many definitions. Some focus on fostering productivity, others on ensuring compliance with policies or controlling behavior (Franklin and Pagan, 2011).

Belohlav (1985) emphasized that making and keeping people productive is the function of the disciplinary process. Werther and Davis (1993) defined discipline as “management action to encourage compliance with organizational standards”. Robbins (1994) argued that the term refers to “actions taken by a manager to enforce the organization’s standards and regulations”. Greer and Labig (1987) suggested that “discipline is an important, albeit distasteful function in almost every manager’s job as he or she attempts to control undesired behaviour in the work place”. Discipline is a measure aimed at producing self control and habit of obedience. Robins (1996) notes that at some time, every manager has to deal with an staff who drinks on the job, is insubordinate, steals company property, arrives consistently late for work, or engages in similar problem behaviours; that managers will normally respond with disciplinary action such as oral reprimands, written warnings, and temporary suspensions. Every other organization manager has to take some disciplinary measures against some staff who exhibit undesirable behaviour.

In literature, there are four types of discipline models which are preventive discipline, corrective discipline, constructive discipline and progressive discipline (Beyer and Trice, 1984). But, two discipline models-progressive discipline or positive discipline - are followed by most large organizations (Guffey and Helms, 2001).

The traditional approach to discipline is based upon the theory that various standards of conduct and productivity can be achieved and maintained through a system of ever-increasing degrees of punishment. Arbitrator Harry J. Dworkin in *Babcock & Wilcox Co.* described this approach to discipline in a case involving a discharge for excessive absenteeism (Gilliom,1992). As for any discipline system to have credibility, the standards of conduct or performance must be clearly established so that all staffs are, at least theoretically, aware of the employer’s expectations. In a progressive discipline system, discipline is used to achieve employer expectations by compelling compliance with company rules through punishment or the threat of punishment. This traditional approach has developed into a fairly set formula (Shaw and Bransford, 1995). This formula frequently consists of the following four steps. First step, a staff who has committed an infraction is verbally warned and told that if the same infraction occurs again within some specified period the degree of disciplinary action will be increased.

The second one is, if the staffs again commit the same or a similar violation within the specified period, the staff will be given a written warning which will be placed in his or her personnel file. The staff will be told that if his or her conduct is repeated within a specified period the staff will be disciplined again but more severely. The third step is, if the staffs again transgress in the same manner and within the specified period, he or she will be suspended from employment for a period of time without pay and will be given a final warning. This warning will clearly specify discharge as the result of another such infraction within a stated time. The final step is, if the staff again violates the same rule within the specified time, the staff will be discharged. However, to really work this traditional approach must contain two additional and essential elements. Without them an arbitrator may still find the discipline to have been unfair. Those elements are the following: the system must provide due process to the staff, and all staffs must be treated the same or advanced through the steps of the system in the same fashion without discrimination.

Importance and Application of Discipline within the Organization Life

Importance of discipline within the organization life may be reviewed from two points of view. First of these two is the individual importance thereof. Discipline in view of the individuals is one of the *sin qua non* of the personal development. It maintains the efficiency and productivity of the individuals' works. It avoids the conflicts between the individuals within an organization. Overcoming the bad habits and bringing in good habits instead is possible by means of discipline. In case individuals within the enterprises could not have been caused to work according to certain disciplinary rules, certain differences of performance could have emerged between the employees. In this view, disciplinary rules force the individuals live under certain standards.

Secondary importance is the organizational dimension. Organizational life goes along with stress, acts of aggression, violence, and tensions. Both individual and group conflicts within an organization cause loss of efficiency and productivity.

The most important way to restore peace within an organization as a whole is discipline. Successful achievement of the organizational objectives is possible by way of maintaining not only the interpersonal harmony, but also the harmony between the persons and the machines. Differences between the personality traits of the individuals serving within an organization, as well as the differences between the qualities of the works being done therein altogether form a domain of problem for the managers of the same organization.

Differences between the personality traits of the individuals will bring along the deviances from the established procedures and rules of the organization. From another point of view, individual differences may, for sure, escalate the novelties and creativity within an organization. Deviations from the rules, on the other hand, will disrupt the activities within the same organization. Irregular acts will increase in an undisciplined organization, and such increasing number of irregular acts will negatively affect the operations of the same organization. Flawless operation of a system as a whole depends to the flawless operation of each and every element of the same system. Failures in some of the units will hamper the operations of a system as a whole. Thus, flawless operation of each and every unit within a system, and consequently the flawless operation of the system as a whole may be possible by means of disciplinary rules or policies.

That is why the managers of an organization should bring about disciplinary rules or policies, and should bring them into force. If not brought into force, bringing about rules and policies will not make any sense. If not brought into force, bringing about rules and policies will not make any sense.

If not brought into force, bringing about rules and policies will not make any sense.

- Undisciplined domains should be ascertained, the points where the employees may make mistake should be detected, and the personnel should be rendered permanent training on the respective issues.
- Employees should be avoided from making mistakes by way of consistently laying down respective and clear instructions and rules.
- Negative intensifiers are intended for avoiding the recurrence of irregular acts. The same is true for the punishments. However, punishments may fall away from being deterrent. Punishments should bear the quality of being negative intensifiers in general. If not, such punishments will not avoid the recurrence of such irregularities (Baysal & Tekarslan, 1996). Punishment should be imposed when negative or irregular acts are recurred.
- In case an employee acts irregularly, necessary action should be taken, otherwise indiscipline will spread.
- Employees' acts should be canalized towards positive direction by means of incentives.
- Having the principles of behavioral conditioning applied, employees should be conditioned at certain issues, and respective irregular acts should thereby be avoided.
- It should be taken into consideration that, the established rules, and the desired behaviors as well should be of operable quality (Eren, 1998). In case the rules, having been established so as to maintain discipline, are of inoperable quality, there is a mistake being made right from the start.
- It should be avoided to lay down exemptions within the disciplinary rules (Eren, 1998). Each exemption to be laid down will make it difficult to implement the respective disciplinary rules.

A Research for Sorting out the Differences between the Senses of Discipline of the Managers in Turkish-Owned Firms and Those of the Managers in Foreign-Owned Firms

1. Purpose of the Research, and Hypotheses

Main purpose of this research is to sort out the perceptive and practical differences in terms of discipline between the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms. In order to achieve this main purpose, the scale included in the literature, having been established by Özdevecioğlu & Kaya, has been made use of. The purpose is to find out whether there is any difference, or resemblance in terms of the sense of discipline. By means of the findings to be attained here from, managers in both Turkish- and foreign-owned firms may adopt certain policies suitable for themselves. The hypotheses to be tested in the research are as follows:

1. There is a meaningful difference in the levels of perception of the harshness of discipline between the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms.
2. There is a meaningful relationship between the undisciplined acts of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in both Turkish-, and foreign-owned firms, and the managers of Turkish- and foreign-owned firms.
3. The degrees of satisfaction of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those in foreign-owned firms show meaningful differences in terms of the perception of discipline of the personnel who work under their supervision.
4. There is a meaningful difference in the personnel's (in Turkish-owned firms, and in foreign-owned firms) perception in view of implementation of disciplinary rules by their managers equally to everyone (in the respective firms).

2. Sampling and Collection of Data

Due to the scarcity of the number of foreign-owned firms, the research is concentrated on certain firms. A foreign-owned firm had been chosen for the purpose of comparison with the Turkish-owned firm, which was operating in the same or similar field of business of, and the research was conducted accordingly. It was thereby taken into consideration for causing the sampling with regard to the managers of Turkish and foreign-owned firms to bear similar features. Sampling was made statistically in accordance with the "purposeful sampling" (Kurtuluş, 1998) method. Out of the universe, foreign-owned firm was chosen at first, and Turkish-owned firms from the same sector were chosen thereafter. A non-random type of sampling was thereby adopted. It is known that, it is impossible to make any generalization by means of a non-random type of sampling. However, the fact that the universe of the research was unknown had caused the adoption of this sort of a method in this research. Respective generalizations may be made by making use of the results of the further researches to be made. This should by any means be taken into consideration that, the results of this research are not suitable for making any generalization.

In the researches to determine the universe, it was impossible to put forth an accurate number of foreign-owned firms due to lack of accurate information. However, the research could have been conducted together with the personnel who were working in all the chosen firms and units. In case the universe could have been known, it would be possible to make the sampling out of such a universe; but the universe is unknown at all.

Data were collected by means of a questionnaire form. The questionnaire form is divided into two sections. The first section is comprised of the questions intended for sorting out the undisciplined acts. 15 expressions had been developed for sorting out the undisciplined acts. In the scale, 1 means to reveal that the undisciplined act in question is committed at all times, while 5 means to reveal that the same is never committed. Respective analyses were made over average values.

The second section is comprised of the questions (expressions) intended for measuring the respective personnel's perception with regard to the undisciplined acts. In this section, the expression being measured via 5-point likert scale in between the options of 1, I totally disagree, and 5, I totally agree. Total number of the expressions in the section is 9. Respective analyses were made over average values.

3. Data Analysis

The data were entered into SPSS (statistical package for social sciences), and respective analyses were made in this program. Techniques, which are intended for testing the hypotheses, were made use of in the analyses. One-way variance analysis was made in order to determine the meaningful differences between the averages, while t-test was made with the intent of determining the relationship in between. Parametric test statistics was applied in testing the hypotheses. It is known that, it is not applicable to make parametric analyses in the studies on the sampling, which has been chosen via non-random method (Kurtuluş, 1998öz). However, parametric tests were preferred on the basis of the rule that, when the number of samples exceeds 30, the averages show normal distribution (Kurtuluş, 1998). Other conditions for the performance of parametric tests were also fulfilled.

4. Reliability Analysis

In the analysis, having been made for determining the reliability of the questions in the questionnaire form applied in the research, Cronbach Alfa values were calculated as follows:

Violations of discipline and undisciplined acts	0.820
Personnel's perceptions with regard to the undisciplined acts	0.845

"Item analysis" was made for the validation test. There was no question cancelled at the end of the analysis. All the questions asked in the questionnaire form were included in the analyses.

5. Findings and Assessment

5.1. Findings with Regard to the Types of Undisciplined Acts occurring in the Enterprises or Units which operate under the Supervision of the Managers in Turkish-, and Foreign-owned Firms

The approaches with regard to discipline of the managers from the enterprises and units, in which the research was being conducted, were further ascertained. The table below reveals which disciplinary approach is applied the most by the managers of Turkish-, and foreign-owned firms. In terms of punitive disciplinary actions, 1 reveals that the respective disciplinary action is taken at all times, while 5 reveal that the same is never taken.

Table 1: Averages of the Disciplinary Approaches of the Managers of Turkish-, and Foreign-owned Firms towards Punishing

Firms	Average	Standard Deviation
Foreign-owned firm managers	5.22	0.6264
Turkish-owned firm managers	4.92	0.7515

As being seen in Table 1, managers of Turkish-owned firms tend to adopt punitive approaches by a higher ratio. Such an approach includes punishments such as discharge from job, imposing monetary fine, assignment to passive duties, imposing emotional punishments, dismissal from office. This is a result, which shows parallelism with the outcome that, indiscipline occurs by higher ratios under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned Firms. Out of the t-test, the t value was found as 3.076 at the significance degree of $p < 0.01$. The difference between the averages is found to be meaningful. This is not an accidentally attained result.

The averages of both Turkish-, and foreign-owned firms' managers' resort to such approaches, including mutual friendly conversation, lecturing, issuing written warning, denunciation, which are cited within the literature under corrective disciplinary actions, are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Averages of the Corrective Disciplinary Approaches of the Managers of Turkish-, and Foreign-owned Firms

Firms	Average	Standard Deviation
Foreign-owned firm managers	4.30	0.9442
Turkish-owned firm managers	2.96	0.8601

Average of the foreign-owned firms' managers' corrective disciplinary actions is also higher. It is also seen that, the managers of the foreign-owned firms also resort to corrective disciplinary approaches by a higher ratio. Out of the t-test, the t value was found as 4.759 at the significance degree of $p < 0.01$. This value points out that the differences in between are meaningful.

It is not a coincidence that, both punitive, and corrective disciplinary approaches are adopted by a higher ratio by the female managers. That is so because the higher the number of the female managers in the foreign-owned firms is, the higher the ratio of indiscipline in the enterprises or units being under the monitor of these managers is (Table 2). In order to eliminate this situation, female managers resort to disciplinary approaches more frequently.

5.2. Test of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: *There is a meaningful difference in the levels of perception of the harshness of discipline between the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms.*

There is a question in the questionnaire form, which has been asked in order to test this hypothesis. As being the first question, the personnel were asked to tell the level of discipline in their enterprise.

According to the answers, having been responded in compliance with the 5-point likert scale, 1 describes quite high level of discipline, while 5 describes quite low level of discipline. In order to test the hypothesis, it should at first be sought whether the difference between the levels of perception of the harshness of the discipline of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms, is meaningful, or not. The findings, having been attained for this purpose, are shown in the table below:

Table 3: t-Test with Regard to the Differences between the Levels of Perception of the Employees, working under the Supervision of the Managers of Turkish- and Foreign-owned Firms, in Terms of the Harshness of Discipline

Firms	t-value	df	Degree of Significance
	-3.029	130	0.009

$p < 0.01$

t-value was found as -3.029 at the significance degree of $p < 0.01$. That is to say, the perceptions regarding the harshness in the sense of discipline show a meaningful difference as per the firms. The hypothesis has been accepted thanks to this result.

Hypothesis 2: There is a meaningful relationship between the undisciplined acts of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-, and foreign-owned firms, and the managers of the respective firms.

15 types of undisciplined acts were listed in the questionnaire form, in order to sort out the undisciplined acts of the personnel, and the personnel were required to tick the frequency of occurrence of such behaviors in their enterprises. In the options varying within the time range from at all times to never, 1 expresses that the undisciplined act in question occurs at all times, while 5 expresses that the same act never occurs. The average values of the responses to this question, and the standard deviations thereof are shown as a whole on the table below.

Taking the average values into consideration (Table 4), the level of indiscipline of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms seems to be lower (average of 3.97). There is a meaningful relationship between the undisciplined acts of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms, and the managers of Turkish-, and foreign-owned firms. The level of indiscipline in the firms under the supervision of the managers is higher (3.55).

Table 4: Influential Factors of the Undisciplined Acts of the Personnel

	Expression	Average	Standard Deviation
1	Discharge from job due to indiscipline	3.87	0.37
2	Being exposed to violence, or being imposed with a physical punishment	4.88	0.47
3	Paying monetary fine against the committed mistakes	3.79	0.80
4	Being reprimanded, being yelled at	4.05	0.95
5	Being assigned to passive duties	4.02	0.88
6	Being asked to resign	4.16	1.12
7	To be pensioned forcefully	4.45	1.02
8	To be warned verbally in harsh words	2.30	1.29
9	To be given written warning	3.62	1.41
11	To be temporarily removed from office	4.65	0.62
12	To be punished with written reprimand or warning	3.55	1.38
13	To be deprived from certain awards	3.49	1.33
14	To cause the irregular act repeated until it becomes regular	3.79	1.36
15	To be left out of the group on certain occasions, and not to be participated in certain applications	4.04	1.27

Table5: Levels of Indiscipline of the Personnel, working under the Supervision of the Managers of Turkish- and Foreign-owned Firms

Firms	Average	Standard Deviation
Manager of Turkish-owned Firm	4,00	0.70
Manager of Foreign-owned Firm	3,60	0.69

The result of the Pearson correlation analysis, which was intended for determining whether there was any meaningful relationship between the ratios of indiscipline in the enterprises under the supervision of the managers of Turkish- and foreign-owned firms, and conducted by making use of dummy variable (that is to say in which the managers of Turkish-owned firms were given the value of 1, and those of the foreign-owned firms were given the value of 0) was shown in Table

Table 6: The Correlation Analysis intended for determining the Relationship between the Managers of Turkish- and Foreign-owned Firms

The firm to which the manager is associated	Undisciplined Acts (R)
	-0.360***

***p<0.01

The correlation coefficient in the correlation analysis has been found as 0.360 at the significance level of $p < 0.01$ this result points at the presence of a reverse relationship of medium intensity. In other words, there is higher ratio of occurrence of undisciplined acts in the workplaces under the supervision of the managers of the foreign-owned firms. Second hypothesis has thereby been accepted, too. This accepted hypothesis reveals that, undisciplined acts occur more in the workplaces under the supervision of the managers of the foreign-owned firms.

Hypothesis 3: The degrees of satisfaction of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those in foreign-owned firms, show meaningful differences in terms of the perception of discipline of the said personnel.

There are 9 expressions available in the questionnaire form for testing the hypothesis. The average values of the responses given to these expressions are shown as a whole on the table below. For the aforementioned expressions, the 5-point likert scale was applied in between the options of 1, I totally disagree, and 5, I totally agree.

Table 7: Influential Factors on the Personnel's Satisfaction regarding their Sense of Discipline

No	Expression	Average	Standard Deviation
1	The punishments being imposed in our enterprise do not act effectively	2.58	0.89
2	There is no effective sense of discipline in effect in our enterprise	2.38	0.48
3	The undisciplined acts being committed in our enterprise do not get the punishment they deserve	2.72	0.87
No	Expression	Average	Standard Deviation
4	There is no clear-cut disciplinary rules in effect in our enterprise	2.52	1.00
5	Punishment and awarding are both imposed equally to everyone	3.20	0.87
6	I am by no means satisfied with the sense of discipline in effect in our enterprise	2.53	0.56
7	Certain rules are not imposed to certain persons	3.38	0.66
8	Those who are to maintain discipline themselves commit undisciplined acts	2.60	0.79
9	There are differences between the imposition of the disciplinary rules to the men and imposition of the same to the women	2.70	0.65

Having the averages compared with respect to the managers of Turkish- and foreign-owned firms, it is seen that the employees, working under the supervision of the managers of the foreign-owned firms, are dissatisfied more in terms of their sense of discipline

Table 8: Levels of Satisfaction of the Employees, working under the Supervision of the Managers of Turkish- and Foreign-owned Firms in Terms of Their Sense of Discipline

Firm	Average	Standard Deviation
Managers of Turkish-owned Firms	2.76	0.89
Managers of Foreign-owned Firms	3.00	0.69

t-test was applied in order to test the hypothesis. The results form are shown in Table 8.

Table 9: t-Test with Regard to the Differences between the Levels of Satisfaction of the Employees, working under the Supervision of the Managers of Turkish- and Foreign-owned Firms in Terms of Their Sense of Discipline

Firm	t-value	df	Degree of Significance
	-2.900	130	0.007

$p < 0.01$

Out of the t-test, the t-value was found as -2.900 at the significance level of $p < 0.01$. This result points out that the differences in between are meaningful. Third hypothesis has been accepted, too.

Hypothesis 4: There is a meaningful difference in the personnel's (in Turkish-owned firms, and in foreign-owned firms) perception in view of equal implementation of disciplinary rules by their managers (in the respective firms) to everyone.

In order to test the hypothesis, personnel’s attitudes, regarding whether everyone was imposed with punishments or disincentives equally against undisciplined acts, were asked in one of the questions of the questionnaire form. 5-point likert scale was applied again as the scale thereof. In the scale, 1 expresses that I totally disagree, and 5 expresses that I totally agree.

T-test was made in order to test whether there was any meaningful difference between the personnel’s perception regarding the imposition of the disciplinary rules by the managers of Turkish- and foreign-owned firms equally to everyone. The attained results are shown on the Table below:

Table10: t-Test regarding the Personnel’s Differences of Perception in view of the Imposition of the Disciplinary Rules by the Managers of Turkish- and Foreign-owned Firms equally to everyone

Firm	t-value	df	Degree of Significance
	-2.600	129	0.013

p<0.05

Out of the t–test made in order to determine whether the differences were meaningful as per the firms, the t-value was found as -2.600 at the significance level of p<0.05 According to this result, it is understood that, there is a perception regarding the fact that, the managers of Turkish- foreign-owned firms were not imposing the disciplinary punishments they resorted equally to everyone. Fourth hypothesis has thereby been accepted, too.

Result and Assessment

Disciplined work system is an issue which should be dealt with for the enterprises at both organizational and individual levels. In this study, the relationships between discipline and Turkish- and foreign-owned firms are dealt with. It is analyzed herein whether the employees create any difference in the perception and implementation of discipline of the managers of Turkish- and foreign-owned firms. Having the universe of the research chosen via non-random method herein has avoided the generalization of the results. This should be taken into consideration both by the readers and by the researchers as well.

The first result to be derived from this study is that, the managers of foreign-owned firms are unsuccessful in maintaining the discipline. Managers of foreign-owned firms have proved to be unsuccessful in maintaining the discipline. Out of the respective correlation analysis, a correlation of medium intensity has been detected in between the managers of Turkish- and foreign-owned firms, and indiscipline (R = -0.360).

This result shows that, undisciplined acts are more common among the employees who work under the supervision of the managers of the foreign-owned firms. This is, on the other hand, a result which fits with the theory of individual-centered socialization.

The second result to be derived from this research is that, the managers of the foreign-owned firms tend to resort to both punitive and corrective approaches more than those of Turkish-owned managers in maintaining the discipline. The most significant reason of this is the indiscipline being seen in their organizations. Managers of the foreign-owned firms tend to resort to both two methods in eliminating such undisciplined acts. The reason why the managers of the of Turkish-owned firms resort to the methods of maintaining discipline less is the lower ratio of indiscipline.

Third result to be derived is that, there is a difference in the levels of perception of the harshness of discipline between the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms, and those who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms. The personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms perceive their enterprises as more disciplined.

Fourth result to be derived is that, the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in foreign-owned firms tend to be less satisfied with the sense of discipline in their organizations in comparison to the satisfaction of the personnel who work under the supervision of the managers in Turkish-owned firms with regard to the sense of discipline in their organizations. Its reason is quite apparent; managers of the foreign-owned firms tend to resort to various methods (either punitive or corrective) for maintaining the discipline. Both two methods for maintaining discipline seem to be irritating the employees.

Fifth and last result to be derived is that, the managers in Turkish-owned firms do not impose the disciplinary rules equally to everyone. This is also a result that is worthy of attention. That is to say, the managers in Turkish-owned firms do not impose the disciplinary policies, or rules equally to everyone.

They tend to treat certain persons within the organization preferentially. The persons who are being treated preferentially may be set forth in other researches. However, it is suggested that, they tend to exempt the persons (both male, and female) who are older than themselves from being imposed to certain rules. All these are the results having been derived from the research conducted in the two companies. It would be wrong to make inferences binding all firms.

References

- Atiomo, A.C. (2000). *Practical Human Resources Management*. Malthouse Press, Lagos.
- Atwater, L.E., Carey J.A. & Waldman D.A. Gender and discipline in the workplace: Wait until your father gets home. *Journal of Management*, 27, 537-561.
- Baysal, A.C. & Tekarslan, E. (1996). *İşletmeciler İçin Davranış Bilimleri*, İstanbul: Avciol Basım-Yayın.
- Bellizzi, J. A., & Hasty, R. (2000). The effects of hiring decisions on the level of discipline used in response to poor performance. *Management Decision*, 38(3), 154-159.
- Belohlav, J. A. (1985). *The art of disciplining your staffs: A manager's guide*. Englewood, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Beyer, J. M. & Trice, H. M. (1984). A field study of the use and perceived effects of discipline in controlling work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(4). 743-764.
- Billikopf, G.E. (2003). *Discipline, Labor Management in Agriculture: Cultivating Personnel Productivity*. University of California.
- Cole, G.A. (1996). *Management Theory and Practice* (5th ed). Letts Educational, London.
- David L. (1995). Discipline and Decisions: A Study of Arbitration Cases Dealing With Staff Discourtesy, *Labor Law Journal*, 46(2), 79-87.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social Role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eren, Erol. (1998). *Yönetim Psikolojisi*, İstanbul.
- Fenley, A. (1998). Models, styles and metaphors: understanding the management of discipline. *Employee Relations*, 20(4), 349-364.
- Gilliom, J. (1992). Rights and Discipline: Competing Modes of Social Control in the Fight Over Staff Drug Testing. *Polity*, 24(4), 591-614.
- Greer, C. R. & Labig, C. E. (1987). Staff reactions to disciplinary actions. *Human Relations*, 40(8), 507-524.
- Hodges, A.C.(1990), The Interplay of Civil Service Law and Collective Bargaining Law in Public Sector Staff Discipline Cases. *Boston College Law Review*, 32(1), 95-172.
- Hook, C.M., Rollinson, D. J., Foot, M. & Handley, J. (1996). Supervisor and manager styles in handling discipline and grievance: Part one - comparing styles in handling discipline and grievance. *Personnel Review*, 25(3), 18-29.
- Huberman, J. (1964). Discipline without punishment. *Harvard Business Review*, 42(3), 25-42.
- Jones, D. (1983). Power structures and perceptions of power holders in same-sex groups of young children. *Women and Politics*, 3, 147- 164.
- Klaas, B.S. & Wheeler, H.N.(1990). Managerial Decision Making about Staff Discipline: Policy Capturing Approach. *Personnel Psychology* .43 (2), 116-133.
- Knight, T.R. (1984). The Impact of Arbitration on the Administration of Disciplinary Policies. *The Arbitration Journal*. 39(1), 43-56.
- Kunda, Z. & Sinclair, L. (1999). Motivated reasoning with stereotypes: activation, application and inhibition *Psychological Inquiry*, 10,12- 22.
- McPherson, D.S. (1987). The Evolving Concept of Just Cause: Carrol R. Daugherty and the Requirements of Disciplinary Due Process. *Labor Law Journal*, .38(7), 387-403.
- Morrison, A. & Von Glinow, M. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist*, 45, 200-208.
- Özdevecioğlu, M. & Y. Kaya (2005). Cinsiyete Dayalı Dılarak Yöneticilerin Disiplin Anlayışları Arasındaki Farklılıkları Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34(1), 41-67.
- Pullhamus, A.R. (1989). Performance Appraisal - Why and How You Should Implement a Due Process Approach to Discipline, *Supervision*, .3-5.
- Raper, J.L. & Myaya, S.N. (1983). Staff Discipline: A Changing Pradigm. *The Health Care Supervisor*, 12(2), 67-77.
- Redeker, J.R. (1983). *Discipline: Policies and Procedures*, The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C.
- Rieple, A. ve Vyakarnam, S. (1996). The case for managerial ruthlessness. *British Journal of Management*, 7(1), 17-33.
- Robbins, S. P. (1994). *Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robisch, T. G. (1996). The reluctance of federal managers to utilize formal procedures for poorly performing staffs. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 16(2), 73-85.
- Shaw, G.J. & Bransford, W.L. (1995). Poor Performers: How much Due Process? *The Public Manager*, 17-19.
- Tannen, D. (1995). The power of talk: Who gets heard and why? *Harvard Business Review*, September, 73(5), 138-148.
- Wagner, D. G. & Berger, J. (1997). Gender and interpersonal task behaviors: Status expectation counts *Sociological Perspectives*, 40, 1-32.
- Werther, W. B. & Davis, K. (1993). *Human resources and personnel management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Yohay, S.C. (1996). Should Past Discipline Be Required to Show Staff Misconduct. *Occupational Hazards*, 58(3), 13-20.