

e-ISSN:2587-2168

International Journal of
Disciplines Economics &
Administrative Sciences
Studies (IDEASTUDIES
Journal)

Vol: 8 Issue: 38
Year: 2022
pp 117-132

Article ID
57680

Arrival
09 November 2021
Published
28 February 2022

Doi Number
10.26728/ideas.57680

How to Cite This Article
Kavak, H. (2022). "Evaluating
The Level Of Fear Culture
Perceived By Employees And
Its Management In Terms Of
Various Variables: The Case
Of Adiyaman City",
International Journal of
Disciplines Economics &
Administrative Sciences
Studies, (e-ISSN:2587-2168),
Vol:8, Issue:38; pp:117-132



International Journal of Disciplines
Economics & Administrative
Sciences Studies is licensed under
a Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial 4.0 International
License.

Evaluating The Level Of Fear Culture Perceived By Employees And Its Management In Terms Of Various Variables: The Case Of Adiyaman City

Dr. Habib KAVAK 

Ministry of Education, Kahta Salkambagi Primary School, Adiyaman, Turkey

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the level of fear, fear culture and management perceived by the employees in the enterprises they work in, in terms of various variables -age, gender, marital status, working time, educational status, type of company. The research was carried out with 386 employees in Adiyaman Organized Industry. Data; The question/information form about the existence and management of fear culture was collected using the fear culture scale consisting of 14 questions. In accordance with the purpose of the research, descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test from parametric tests and analysis of variance were used. As a result of the analysis, it has been determined that although the culture of fear is not at a very evident level in the enterprises, it exists and that the employees can easily manage their fears. It is estimated that this result will be a vital benefit for the successful existence of the enterprise to be able to predict the causes, source and possible consequences of the fear culture in the enterprises.

Keywords: Fear, Culture, Fear Culture, Management of Fear

1. INTRODUCTION

Fear is an emotion caused by one's own thoughts. If there is "danger" in their thoughts, people react with fear. Therefore, different people who are faced with a similar situation may react differently as a result of their different thoughts. However, people who are afraid generally cannot understand that this emotion is caused by their own thoughts, cannot reach an effective solution, remain in despair, and as a result, they may carry their fears to a crisis that cannot be overcome. But when those who question their fear-inducing thoughts and do not run away from their fears and who try to face them overcome these feelings, they both gain important gains and increase their self-confidence and sense of competence.

Man is a part of the society and culture in which he lives. Therefore, wherever a person goes, in which organizations he works, he takes his own culture and values with him. Humans need to communicate with others in order to survive. As there are certain facts (beliefs, values, symbols, etc.) that make up the culture formed as a result of a need, each business has its own cultural structure dynamics and their functioning.

It has values, norms and beliefs in businesses with basic purposes such as benefiting from social services in businesses. It provides integration with the business related to the integrated design in the business. Integration is unlikely to happen. Besides, it causes delicacy and unhappiness. In general, in order for our businesses to survive, grow and develop in our businesses where globalization is spreading rapidly and competition has become more intense, defending the whole and its employees should have a management style from the style of dominating fear. It is said that there is success in jobs where scary people do not dominate and employees and managers can work in harmony.

In this study, it is aimed to investigate the level of perceived fear culture in enterprises according to the age, gender, type of company they work for, working time, education level and marital status variables and to what extent they can manage their perceived fears.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

According to the Turkish Language Association, fear; when expressed in a dictionary meaning, a definition emerges as “anxiety, sadness, possibility of evil, danger in the face of a danger or danger thought” (www.tdk.gov.tr, 16,11,2014).

Fear is an ideal tool of domination to be able to manipulate others. He argues that the attitude of fear is to save the individual from the dangerous environment he is in and to provide him with the opportunity to reach a shelter. According to Mannoni, it is necessary to mention the important disorder seen in behavior after the fear response. Under the influence of excitement, the individual is often forced to abruptly give up his work and react quickly, without having time to adjust himself and regulate his movements. The more compelling the threat, the more likely it is that maladaptive and unnecessary gestures or, conversely, a detention that risks not being pragmatic at all will occur. This irregularity in movements often accompanies a decrease in intellectual abilities and attention to reality (Mannoni, 1992: 13-14).

When fear prevails in the minds, the problems and obligations in the world are exaggerated and possible solutions begin to be ignored. Fear and panic have a self-justifying quality. For example, a person who is concerned about food is more likely to assume that he or she is ill.

Opinion leaders mostly stated that fear is necessary for people to behave in the right way. Even those who do not tolerate such oppressive structures have chosen to establish control over people when they cannot cope with the problems of the masses. The history of humanity is full of examples of the oppressed majority under the pressure of power. The most visible reason underlying people's being forced to live a life in the center of fear is to ensure the survival of large structures. Resisting these structures may mean threatening the power of global actors. Today's world is going through a period in which gaining from wars and peace is placed above everything else, and the motor power of this process is the 'culture of fear'. The only weapon of both hot wars and cold wars is fear. Because as long as the person is afraid, dark corners remain in his mind that will never be questioned, and these dark corners are in all the attitudes and purposes of the person in question, starting from the closest relationships; becomes determinant in its values, principles and actions (Altan, 2014:5).

The culture of fear is a culture that sometimes cannot be said to exist openly in organizations, but it maintains its existence in a secret way. The culture of fear is a philosophy of life. In this culture, there are the oppressors and the oppressed. It is a culture where people and rules are not taken into account unless there is a force to be feared and coercive. If there is fear in the environment, the source of this fear is respected. If there is no fear in the environment, people have no value as human beings, there is no obligation to obey the rules. The essence, dignity and uniqueness of the human being are not considered important; power is important (Cüceloğlu, 2002: 196).

The culture of fear manifests itself in the organization with managerial practices. The basis of a management approach based on a culture of fear is the perspective of people, and this situation differentiates the management approach based on a culture of fear from others. When expressed more clearly, the way the manager perceives human nature and the management style he uses in this direction will affect the management style. With its basic assumptions about human nature, the culture of fear places an organization's management model in a paternalistic framework. Accordingly, there is a situation in which only one person has a say in the organization or one person has control over the decisions in the organization (Aykaç, 1999: 51).

In an organization dominated by fear culture, the concept of organizational justice is also controversial, and since employees attribute the functionality of the justice distributing mechanism to one person, that is, to the authority, their belief that justice can take place is also very low. Because in the culture of fear, justice has the feature of being distributed according to some subjective principles such as proximity to authority rather than ethical standards. For this reason, it is possible for people to perceive organizational justice as a situation of inequality (www.sabem.saglik.gov.tr, cited in Kaşmer, 2009).

One of the most disturbing consequences of the culture of fear is that human relations are framed as risk. People are now approaching their relationships with a more intense risk sensitivity (Furedi, 2014:17).

Asunakutlu said, “The culture of fear manifests itself in the organization through managerial practices. The basis of a management approach based on a culture of fear is the perspective of people, and this situation

differentiates the management approach based on a culture of fear from others. When expressed more clearly, the way the manager perceives human nature and the management style he uses in this direction will affect the management style” (Asunakutlu,2009:30).

Cüceloğlu argued that different forms of communication used between individuals in the formation of fear culture would create different environments and created a communication matrix related to this. This communication matrix consists of two dimensions, the environment dimension and the individual dimension. In the individual dimension, the state of the person's self is indicated. In this dimension, positive self-consciousness (+) and negative self-consciousness (-) are shown (Cüceloğlu, 2002: 145).

Table 1: Communication matrix of Cüceloğlu

Environment-Individual Interaction		ENVIRONMENT (As the rule maker) Top	
		Negative (-)	Positive (+)
INDIVIDUAL (Supervisor's Contact)	Negative (-)	(1) FEAR (-) (-)	(2) FRUSTRATION (-) (+)
	Positive (+)	(3) ANGER (+) (-)	(4) PEACE (+) (+)

Source: Cüceloğlu, D. (2002), Communication Equipment, 2nd Edition, Remzi Bookstore, Istanbul.

In section (1) of the matrix, the relationship is defined as "fear" since both the subordinate (who is the addressee of the supervisor) and the supervisor (representing the environment, the one who sets the rules) both adopt the culture of fear. The manager does not value the employees, and the employees already feel worthless. Therefore, the behavior of the manager is considered normal and there is no discomfort. In section (2), while the subordinate has adopted the culture of fear, the superior has a culture of values and acts accordingly. The result is "Disappointment" for both. Evaluating the behavior of his subordinate within the framework of the fear culture he adopted, he judged his helplessness, was surprised and did not find it worthy of respect. The chief is also disappointed, he behaved normally to his subordinate and received a response as not being counted (www.caginpolisi.com.tr, 07,11,2014). In section (3), the subordinate has adopted the culture of values and has appropriate expectations, while the superior (supervisor) has adopted the culture of fear and his behaviors are in this direction. What emerges in this case is "Anger". The subordinate knows that he has a value, since he has self-confidence, his expectation is in this direction. It is impossible for this situation to continue for a long time. In section (4), "Peace" emerges because it adopts both subordinate and superior values culture and behaves accordingly. The employee believes that he or she exists, is natural, valuable, strong and reliable, worthy of love. At the same time, he sees his manager as valuable as himself. Both parties are naturally respectful and helpful to each other without any coercion. Since both parties evaluate their obligations and limits as healthy, there is no problem.

As it is seen, the situation that creates fear in the communication matrix revealed by Cüceloğlu is that both the employees see themselves as worthless and the managers perceive the employees as worthless. However, the important issue here is that the employees do not respect their managers who treat them as valuable, and they need a constant authority. This is a paradox in human life (Kaşmer, 2009:34). If there is a mismatch between the manager and the environment according to the leadership model of the fiefs, the manager or the environment should be changed. However, as it is known, it is easier to change the manager. In fact, businesses generally follow this policy.

2.1. Dominant Features Of Fear Culture

The characteristics of businesses in which the culture of fear is dominant can be listed as follows; (Kaşmer, 2009:42).

- ✓ Employees in businesses where the culture of fear is dominant are seen as people who work under the authority. It is thought that people do not like to work, therefore, in order to achieve organizational goals, employees should be forced, supervised, managed and intimidated with punishment to show sufficient effort.
- ✓ In workplaces where there is a culture of fear, the manager is someone who gets what he says, is strict, and has rules. He usually holds all the power and does not like to share that power.
- ✓ In order to be a good employee in companies with a culture of fear, it is necessary not to rebel, to work hard and to be loyal to the orders of the manager.
- ✓ In businesses where there is a culture of fear, employees avoid work when the manager is not present. In environments where the manager is present, they do everything they can to get the manager's attention. They can also compete with others for this.

- ✓ Employees do their jobs because they are afraid of being punished and to be rewarded. Otherwise, there is no satisfaction due to the performance of the work.
- ✓ Duties are determined in line with the needs and decisions of the authority. There is no system for determining tasks.
- ✓ Generally, employees are not asked for their opinions, they are only expected to do the specified work.
- ✓ The problems that arise are solved by the manager with authority. Employees are not involved in the process of resolving the problem.
- ✓ Decisions to be taken on every issue are determined by the manager who has a high degree of power and authority in the organization. The manager usually makes these decisions in line with his own thoughts, without considering the values of other employees.
- ✓ It is not possible for the employees to be included in the decision-making process.
- ✓ There is extrinsic motivation rather than intrinsic motivation in enterprises where the culture of fear is dominant.
- ✓ Apart from these features, according to Güler, the main features of the culture of fear in social life can be expressed as follows (Guler, 2001: 194);
- ✓ The network of relations in the culture of fear is based on the “you-me” relationship. No crumbs of value can be found in the name of friendship, love, devotion and self-sacrifice.
- ✓ Instead of joint decisions, who says it is important in determining a common attitude. Everything that a person says due to his position has the quality of law.
- ✓ Hierarchical “position awareness” is superior in psycho-social relations. In this sense, the bottom-up movement has stagnated. The voice of the majority is either not heard or ignored.
- ✓ The culture of fear, which is dominated by arbitrariness, inconsistency and an understanding devoid of personal integrity, restricts human rights.
- ✓ If there is interest in the culture of fear, communication is established, and beyond that the benefit of communicating is incredible.
- ✓ In the culture of fear, family interaction is also based on fear. The agreeable personality is considered henpecked or servile.
- ✓ Living by rote is in effect in the culture of fear. A person's wishes, aspirations, feelings are not important. What matters is what others say. This attitude prevents the development of responsibility and conscience.
- ✓ It is important to memorize what the authority says in the culture of fear. The person in authority should not smile, be sullen and serious.

When these characteristics are examined, it is seen that people are divided into two in businesses as in society: people with authority and people who obey authority. People with authority want to use their power in all areas of their lives, and they use this power at every opportunity. They want to establish authority in their environment and businesses. People who obey the authority, on the other hand, feel obliged to follow the instructions of the authority and are constantly under the influence of the authority. In businesses where such a relationship is dominant, obedience is considered a basic duty for employees who have adopted the power of authority, and thus, relationships based on interest rather than relationships based on sincerity prevail in such businesses.

2.2. A Social Pressure Machine: A Culture Of Fear

The existence of the human being, who has to exist by communicating with his peers, is shaped by the conditions of the culture he was born into. However, the forms of relationships and roles in the culture in which they take place are subject to control in a socio-cultural framework. The mentioned control includes the norms and values system developed by social codes and establishing an indirect dominance over the subject, and in this respect, it creates a structural and dynamic oppressive system. Many social system mechanisms have been compared with the researches in the field of humanities and it has been observed that communication is controlled by social pressure elements as a result of the nature-culture opposition. In today's global world, it is seen that abstract and environmental-based emotions such as fear, anxiety and worry dominate in interpersonal communication. Altan states that this is not surprising given that symbolic consumption is lived without limits. One of the situations that invalidate the old rules of interaction is the changes in male-female relationships. The natural behavior patterns in these relationships fail to adapt to the codes of the changing culture. A sincere look, a sign of love is no longer enough for people to establish intimacy; on the contrary, mimics or gestures related to establishing closeness can be perceived as harassment (Altan, 2013:1). This uncertainty results in conflict and alienation. Thus, modern man becomes ruled by fear. In order to understand the situation of today's people, who are dominated by the culture of fear, what fear is should be discussed.

2.3. Thought Dimension of Fear Culture

Most people are afraid and they have innumerable fears. Fear of the dark, fear of death, fear of life... these fears are mostly fears of one's existence. In addition to these, people have some social and social fears indirectly related to their existence. From the point of view of society, they are afraid of not being successful, not being able to realize, not having the opportunity, losing what they have. The reason for fears may be an event experienced in the past and recorded in the brain, observed situations, information and beliefs received from others. However, whatever the cause of the fear is, it is the knowledge of the person that confronts the phenomenon of fear. Fear is the movement of knowledge in the context of the past, and this knowledge is time and experiences. So fear is also part of thought. Thought and time are movements of knowledge. Therefore, fear is a movement of time, experience and thought, and this knowledge prevents people from seeing something new and clean (Özkan, 2010: 7-9).

2.4. The Basics of Employee Behaviors in a Culture of Fear

Human behavior is shaped by the characteristics of the society in which they live. The individual adopts the culture of the society, customs and traditions, value judgments, and regulates his behavior according to the culture of the society he socially interacts with and adopts. In this process, society has set certain limits and set criteria for individuals in many areas about what they should do, what they should not do, or how and when they will do them. People who know the demands of the society and act accordingly are accepted by the society. In the society they live in, people become members of various groups at every stage of their lives and always want to be a member of a group. The reason people want to be a member of a group is because their needs will be better met in any way. However, one does not want to be just a member of a group, one also desires to be a true part of the group. In order to belong to the group, the group must accept the person and the person must accept the other members of the group (Aytaç, 2000: 13-16).

The person tries to fulfill all the expectations of the group in order to be included in the group. If the group embraces being led by fear, the newcomer to the group can be expected to adopt the fear as well. Even if the employee cannot internalize this situation, he or she may show the same behaviors just because others behave like that. In this case, the main stimulus is the group. However, if the group does not want to be ruled by fear, other people who want to be included in the group will also react negatively to the fear. The reactions shown will cease to be individual and will become the reaction of all organizational employees. In order for fear to succeed in the organization, the expectations of the society and the group must be taken into account, and the culture, values, customs and traditions of this group must allow the culture of fear. Otherwise, the society's negative attitudes towards the culture of fear, but the dominance of the culture of fear in the organization may cause the organization to encounter negativities. The basis of employee behavior in the culture of fear has been examined in terms of social environment and group relations. Employees shape their behaviors within the framework of these two variables. As a result of the behaviors performed, the employees encounter different reactions. It is not possible for the employees not to be affected by these reactions. The effect that will occur on the employees will indirectly affect the organizational climate, job satisfaction and organizational productivity. Therefore, it is an important issue that needs to be revealed how the culture of fear can affect the employees (Kaşmer, 2009:66).

2.5. The Effects of Fear Culture on Employees

It is a known fact that fear has many effects on employees, especially its psychological effects. The effects of fear on employees are (www.mba.co.za):

- ✓ Fear discourages people from telling the truth and reporting bad news for the manager. Therefore, the existing problems in the organization are hidden, only the things that may please the authority are expressed. This means that organizations act without knowing what is really happening,
- ✓ Encourages people to look after only themselves and their interests,
- ✓ It drives good people away from the organization, so under competitive conditions, the organization loses its chance to excel in jobs that require talent,
- ✓ It demoralizes people and causes them to be shy. Therefore, knowledge and effort for the benefit of the organization is reduced and
- ✓ It causes people to perceive themselves, others and everything about the organization badly. In addition to these effects, other possible effects on employees are listed below.
- ✓ Employees' commitment to the organization may decrease,
- ✓ Employees may not see themselves as members of the organization,

- ✓ It can increase the burnout levels of the employees, especially emotional burnout may occur,
- ✓ Employees' desire to go to work may decrease,
- ✓ Employees' life satisfaction may decrease.

As it is seen, the fear that occurs in the employee negatively affects the emotional aspect of the employee and decreases his creativity ability. The employee cannot express himself as he is. Since the fear of the employees is in line with the employer's request, although it may seem to have a positive effect on the employee from the outside, this may have a negative effect on the employees. The employee acts only according to the employer, which may cause selfishness among the workers rather than a cooperative environment among the employees in the enterprise.

The culture of fear that is desired to be created in the enterprise may result in the alienation of the employees from the enterprise, and thus the employee may not see himself as a part of the enterprise.

2.6. Responses of Employees in a Culture of Fear

Compliance Behavior

Managers keep behaviors under control with the power of reward or punishment they use on employees. By working harder, employees will either avoid punishments or achieve the rewards promised by the manager. Therefore, instead of resisting these applied forces, employees show compliance behavior by thinking of the benefits they will gain (Kırel, 1998: 50).

Sherif, Asch, and Milgram studies have been conducted on social influence and conformity behavior. In these studies, they focused on the formation of a group norm, the individual's compliance with an existing group norm, and where this conformity behavior can lead. In the light of these research findings, it has been seen that not only the power used by the manager, but also various environmental factors affect the behavior of conforming to the group (the size of the group, position, glory, fame, reward, punishment, etc.) (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1992: 80).

Do not Engage in Conflict

Employees may have negative feelings towards their managers as a result of the culture of fear they are exposed to in the workplace. In the face of any negative treatment, they may argue with the manager and show resistance to defend themselves. Other employees who witness this are also disturbed by the situation, and this may cause a negative atmosphere in the business. As a result of this situation, mobbing events may also occur.

Being Indecisive

The negativities experienced in the workplace can be indecisive about whether the employees should change their minds or pass over the negativities experienced.

Acting Impartially

The employee thinks that being a party may cause harm and may choose impartiality. Employees do not reveal their negative feelings towards their managers in the face of the negativities they experience and continue their work routinely as if nothing had happened. Thus, they do not get into tension in the workplace. In addition, since they do not belong to any group that reacts against it, they avoid a bad sanction.

Fear of Organizational Change

Environmental changes occur rapidly as a part of life. Although there are situations where the change is perceived positively by the employees, an environment of fear may occur with organizational change for many reasons. Because change is inherently unpredictable, signals of confusion begin to appear as soon as change is proposed in organizations. Therefore, employees have learned to show negative tension expressions such as fear and failure in times of change (Mealiea, 1978: 211).

Machiavelli (2008) argues that there is nothing more difficult, less successful and dangerous to implement than creating a new order. Because all those who benefit from the old order are the enemies of those who want change. Those who will benefit from the new order also provide only passive support for change. The reason why this support is passive is partly due to the fear of the hostility of those who support the old order, partly to the distrust of people against new and untested things (cited in Kasmer, 2009:44).

Employees generally resist change in the face of the following situations (Mealiea, 1978: 216):

- ✓ In cases related to situations that the employee is not accustomed to;

- ✓ In cases where the results do not directly benefit the employees;
- ✓ In cases where it is difficult for the employees to get used to the change and it is not desired.

Individual Resistance Responses to Change

Individual reactions to change can be explained as follows (www.dersimizkimya.com, 10,01,2015):

- ✓ **Selective Attention and Remembering:** Instead of resisting change, the individual approves the change if he understands the truth and sees the individual and organizational benefits of change. When any useful information that will positively affect human tendencies towards change is neglected, the effect of information that will negatively affect change begins.
- ✓ **Habits:** Employees continue their habits as long as they cannot perceive that the change has occurred. In cases where the meaning of change is to give up habits, employees react to this situation.
- ✓ **Dependency:** It is known that some employees are dependent on other employees. They direct their reactions in line with the reactions of the people they are dependent on to change. However, when their dependents accept change, they also accept change.
- ✓ **Fear of Uncertainty:** When employees are not informed about the situations that will arise after the change, the uncertainty of the situation will lead them to resist this change. The new environment to be created, the position and value of the employee in this environment will cause anxiety in the employee. Employees in the new situation may fear that their skills are not as valuable as they used to be, or that they may not be able to keep up with the skills required in the new situation.
- ✓ **Economic Reasons:** Individuals resist change with the thought that it will directly or indirectly reduce their income. Change can threaten their duties, economic interests, security, or create work routines.
- ✓ **Security and Withdrawal:** Some employees may prioritize their safety. Therefore, the uncertainty of the new situation may create insecurity in them. In this case, employees may give up on changing, thinking that the past is safer and that this situation causes them to be more happy.

Fear of Taking Risks

Risk taking is the activities that enable the organization to gain competitive advantages in the market and to grow. What makes risk taking so difficult is the possibility of losing, and unfortunately, many people focus on what they can lose rather than what they can gain. Therefore, the biggest obstacle for employees to take risks is fear (Sisson, 1985: 39).

Fear of Making Mistakes

Fear of failure has become a very important emotion in the work environment since it makes one feel discouraged. This situation may sometimes lead to the dismissal of employees. Employees with this fear prefer status change and/or maintain their low organizational profile. It is true that no human being wants to make mistakes, but some have an extreme fear of mistakes that immobilizes them, restricting their ability to act. Such people can be perfectionists who internalize their mistakes and think that the source of it is themselves. Therefore, they can punish themselves ruthlessly and limit themselves in various risk-taking (Sisson, 1985: 40). Such people avoid opportunities and continue to do what they feel is doing well.

Fear of Being Fired

It is the biggest type of fear that causes the employee to feel uneasy all the time in the working environment. Worrying about being fired makes him obedient to his managers and co-workers, who does not go beyond the set rules, and cannot bring a new awareness to the institution he works for.

Fear of Success

The principle of success organizes human relations according to the success and skill of individual people. The polarity of being able-not-able turns into a primary judgment scheme in almost all problems related to living, and life itself resembles a race of self-assertion situations that lead to fear. The moment it is necessary to demonstrate a success, there is also the danger of failure; A person is either too unsympathetic or too weak or too sensitive or too cowardly. The principle of success will inevitably lead to the fear of not being able to tackle a task, and the more ingrained this principle is in all our activities and relationships, the more inseparable the fear of failure will be in our entire life (Duhm, 1996: 78).

Fear of What Others Think

Sometimes people who seemingly do everything right suffer from fear of what others might think. So because such people focus on what others think, they do things that they are sure others will approve of. As a result, the opinions of others are very important and they constantly monitor what people are thinking and doing. Employees are very careful when talking to others and care too much about what they want to hear and suggest solutions that can be seen as obvious. The results are as follows, solutions prevent creativity and thinking about what others think ends with others thinking about themselves (Sisson, 1985: 40).

Group Decisions

A key point about fear is that it is a dynamic situation where group decisions reveal their own styles of reluctance and fear. Many people participate in conservatively oriented group decisions and are not compelled by arguments or doubts that occur within the group. Courage and initiative are associated with individuals rather than groups (Appelbaum, 1998: 121).

In particular, the fear of contradicting group decisions is a fundamental factor that drives people in many social situations. Being perceived as different from others can result in being excluded from the group. Strong pressures can be applied to the individual in order to be the sole power in many groups. Someone who does not conform to group pressure runs the risk of encountering serious problems. The person who opposes the group is pressured to change, if he maintains the opposite attitude, communication with him is cut off and the group ignores him. The group can also impose direct sanctions on the individual who opposes it (Kaşmer, 2009:49).

Fear of Uncertainty

The employee with this fear prefers to remain comfortable and stable in his current job. These employees avoid extra responsibilities or promotions and prefer to focus on tasks with tangible results while rejecting things that could change their current position. One's fears are not as big a mistake as not being sure of the results. Uncertainty creates fear and anxiety. Because this offers a reduced possibility of control (Sisson, 1985: 40).

All these types of fears we have mentioned will cause employees to stay within a certain narrow limit where they cannot be active in the workplace. The employee will not see himself as valuable and a part of the business, he will think that other employees feel like him, and perhaps he will inhibit the formation of the business culture, which is vital for the success of the business. Although it is not clearly felt at first, over time, an internalized feeling of anxiety and fear will occur against all elements in the enterprise, and this feeling will reach a dimension that can be seen in the actions of the employee after a while. Thus, employee-based fear culture will be a natural part of the business.

3. METHOD

3.1. Research Approach

In this study, which was carried out to examine the differences in the level of fear culture perceived by the employees working in the enterprises in the Organized Industry of Adıyaman province and the level of managing their fears according to various variables, the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research approaches, was used. It is suggested that this quantitative research approach should be preferred in scientific studies carried out for purposes such as the strength of relations between variables and revealing differences (Graziano & Raulin, 2012).

3.2. Universe and Sample

The universe of the research consists of 850 employees working in enterprises located in Adıyaman Organized Industry. Within the scope of the research, it was aimed to reach 500 employees, but only 430 people could be reached. By using simple random sampling method and face-to-face survey technique, 386 information/question forms obtained between February and June 2014 were evaluated and the data collection process of the research was terminated.

3.3. Data Collection Tool

As a measurement tool in the research, socio-demographic variables prepared by the researcher to obtain information about the participants were included. The questionnaire used in the research was prepared by using the questionnaires used by Kasmer in his master's thesis study "Analysis of the Effects of Fear Culture on Management, Employees and Business" at Muğla University in 2009. Within the scope of the research, first a pilot application was made and necessary changes were made in the questionnaire in the light of the data obtained from this application. Then, the opinion of an expert with knowledge in the field of statistics was taken. In the questionnaire, 13 questions were asked to determine the culture and level of fear, and 1 (17.) error

control question was asked to determine that the participants read and answered. In addition, there are 6 demographic questions in the questionnaire. The scale was prepared as a 5-point Likert (1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Undecided, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree).

3.4. Data Analysis

Within the scope of the research, descriptive analysis of the socio-demographic information of the participants and their responses to the scale expressions were included after the extreme values of the data were selected and made suitable for analysis. Before proceeding to the stage of performing analyzes for the main purpose of the study, the reliability of the data, the normality of the data distributions and the extent of the parametric conditions were evaluated. When the distribution of the expressions related to the scale is examined; It is seen that the internal consistency coefficient is 852 high reliability (Nunnally, 1978: 245) and above, and the skewness and kurtosis values are in the range of ± 1 . Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) state that kurtosis and skewness among the central tendency criteria can satisfy the normality condition for scale values in the range of ± 1.5 . Büyükoztürk et al. (2014) states that in order to determine to what extent a measurement tool meets the parametric conditions, it is necessary to meet the conditions such as normal distribution, random selection of the participants from the universe, homogeneity of variance, and sufficient number of participants. Based on the listed criteria, the t-test and analysis of variance, which are among the parametric tests, were performed between socio-demographic variables and the opposition scale, since the data provided parametric conditions.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Descriptive Findings

Descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic data of 350 participants included in the scope of the research are included in Table 1. When the percentage frequency values are examined, it can be argued that the values show homogeneity. According to this, it is seen that the majority of those participating in the study are male, married, higher education graduate teachers with a working period of 15 years or more in the sector and a union membership.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for socio-demographic variables

Demographic features		F	Rate (%)
Gender	Male	239	61,9
	Female	147	38,1
Age	18-21	69	17,9
	22-25	80	20,7
	26-31	123	31,9
	32 and plus	114	29,5
Educational Status	Primary school	65	16,8
	Middle School	130	33,7
	High school	119	30,8
	Undergraduate	67	17,4
	Post graduate	5	1,3
Marital Status	Married	192	49,7
	Single	194	50,3
Working Time	0-2 years	134	34,7
	3-5 years	105	27,2
	6-10 years	75	19,4
	11-15 years	39	10,1
	16 years and plus	33	8,5
Company Type	Anonim	119	30,8
	Limited	267	69,2

Descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic data of a total of 386 participants included in the study are given in Table 1. Considering these characteristics, 61.9% (239) of the respondents are male and 38.1% (147) are females. Ages of the participants 17.9% (69) between the ages of 18-21, 20.7% (80) between the ages of 22-25, 31.9% (123) between the ages of 26-31, 29%, 5 (114) of them are in the age range of 31 years and above.

As seen in Table 4, the educational status of the employees participating in the research is 16.8% (65) primary school graduate, 33.7% (130) secondary school graduate, 30.8% (119) high school graduate, 17% ,4' (67) are undergraduate graduates, 1,3% (5) of them are graduate graduates.

As can be seen in Table 3, the marital status distributions of the participants in the study are 49.7% (192) married and 50.3% (194) singles.

Considering the working hours (table 4) of the employees participating in the research, 34.7% (134) 0-2 years, 27.2% (105) 3-5 years, 19.4% (75) 6-10 years, 10.1% (39) 11-15 years, 8.5% (16 years and above).

In addition, in the same table, it is seen that 30.8% (119) of the employees work in anonymous companies and 69.2% in limited liability companies.

When we look at the data, our participant profile is mostly observed as 26-31 years old, secondary school graduate, single, 0-2 years working time and male.

4.2. Factor Analysis of Variables

Factor analysis can be defined as a multivariate statistics that aims to find a small number of conceptually significant new variables (factors, dimensions) by bringing together a large number of interrelated variables. Rennie (1997) explains factor analysis as an analytical technique with a computational logic that aims to reach a small number of explanatory factors (comprehension) that explains the maximum variance and is based on the relationships between the observed variables.

Table 2. Factor Analysis

Questions	Employee's Fear of Manager	Employee's fear of making mistakes	Managing the Employee's Fears
S9	0,770		
S10	0,772		
S11	0,770		
S12	0,789		
S13	0,796		
S20	0,623		
S14		0,760	
S15		0,801	
S16		0,798	
S17		It is an error checking question.	
S18			0,860
S19			0,860

Factor analysis is used to provide clues about the structure of the relationship between variables that are thought to be related to each other. The basic logic in factor analysis can also be expressed as the idea that a complex phenomenon can be explained with the help of fewer factors. Hair et al. (1998) suggested to consider $-/+ 0.3$ little (minimal), $-/+ 0.4$ very important and $-/+ 5$ as meaningful in practical terms when evaluating factor loads (Altunışık et al., 2010:261- 281). All the questions seen in the table can be considered as meaningful from a practical point of view. Because all of our factors have values above 0.623. During the pilot study, the questions that did not find the factor load sufficient were removed from the questionnaire.

4.3. Research Findings of the Employee's Manager-Related Fear

Table 3: Research Findings of the Employee's Fear of Managers

Employee's Fear of Manager	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency Analysis							
				Frequency(S)				Percentage(%)			
				--	-	+	++	--	-	+	++
Employees at our workplace fear managers.	386	2,38	1,16	120	98	71	97	31,1	28,4	18,4	25,4
Your manager is aware of the fears I have.	386	2,51	1,08	84	117	91	94	21,8	30,3	23,6	24,4
My manager at work uses my fears to manage me.	386	2,42	1,14	114	86	96	90	29,5	22,3	24,9	23,3
Employees in our workplace are constantly intimidated by punishment for making enough effort.	386	2,61	1,14	89	88	92	117	23,1	22,8	23,8	30,3
Employees work harder because they fear punishment.	386	2,57	1,05	74	113	105	94	19,1	29,3	27,2	24,3
After executives leave their jobs, they lose their old reputation in the company.	386	2,81	1,13	71	76	94	145	18,2	19,7	24,4	37,5
Total average	386	2,55	1,11	92	96,3	91,5	106,1	23,55	25,46	23,71	27,36
								49,0		51,0	

In table 3, it has been tried to determine the level of agreement of the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman with the statements given about the level of fear they feel towards the managers. When the table is examined, in order to learn the fear that the employees feel towards the managers; It has been questioned whether the employees are afraid of the managers, whether the managers are aware of the fears of the employees, whether the managers manage their employees by scaring them, whether the managers threaten their employees with

punishment and make them work more, whether the managers are respected by their former employees after they leave their jobs.

According to the data we have obtained, the fear perceptions of the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman against their managers are as follows:

- ✓ 59.5%(31.1+28.4) that employees are not afraid of their managers.
- ✓ 52.1% of managers are not aware of their employees' fears
- ✓ 51.8% that managers do not manage their employees by fear

He confirmed that since the employees are not afraid of their managers, the managers are not aware of the fears of the employees. Because no fear situation could be detected in the middle. In addition, when the table is examined;

- ✓ 54.1, where managers intimidate their employees with fines.
- ✓ 51.5%, where managers work more for fear of punishing their employees.
- ✓ It was determined by 61.9% that the executives did not see their former dignity by their former employees after leaving the job.

Looking at the table, it has been determined that employees are generally afraid of managers, but this rate is not very clear (51%). In addition, it has been determined that managers use some fear methods in order to increase the performance of their employees. These methods are; dismissal, wage cut, mobbing, severance suspension and investigation.

4.4. Employee's fear of making mistakes Research Results

Table 4: Employee's Fear Of Making A Mistake

Employee Fear of Making Mistakes	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency Analysis							
				Frequency(S)				Percentage(%)			
				-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+
Employees in our workplace are afraid of making mistakes, even small ones.	386	2,75	1,04	64	85	130	107	16,6	22,8	33,7	27,7
Even small mistakes are billed to employees at our workplace.	386	2,58	1,13	89	95	91	111	23,1	24,6	23,6	28,6
When we make mistakes, some opportunities are taken away from us..	386	2,61	1,02	71	95	134	86	18,4	24,6	34,7	22,3
I am allowed to take small risks in my organization.	386	2,27	0,961	102	117	129	38	26,4	30,3	33,4	9,8
Total average	386	2,55	1,03	81,5	98	121	85,5	21,1	25,5	31,3	22,1
								46,6		53,4	

In Table 4, the statements about the level of fear of the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman province due to making mistakes are examined. When Table 8 is examined, in order to learn the fear of the employees of the enterprise against the anxiety of making a mistake; It has been questioned whether the employees are afraid of making small mistakes at work, whether the mistakes made by the employees are billed to the employees, whether the opportunities are taken as a result of the mistakes made by the employees at the workplace, and whether the employees are allowed to take small risks in the business.

As a result of the data we have obtained (as seen in table 8), the employees in the enterprise in Adıyaman;

- ✓ 61.4% fear of making mistakes, even small ones, at work.
- ✓ 52.4% of the employees are billed for the mistakes they make in the workplace.
- ✓ Opportunities are taken away from employees as a result of mistakes they make at work 57%
- ✓ It has been determined by 56.7% that employees are not allowed to take small risks in the workplace.

It has been determined that the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman are generally afraid of making mistakes in the enterprises they work with at a rate of 53.4%.

Clearly expressing the perception that it is natural for employees to make mistakes and that there will be no sanction for employees as a result of their mistakes will help employees not be afraid of making mistakes in the workplace.

4.5. Findings of Managing Fears of Employees

Table 5: Employees' Ability To Manage Their Fears

Managing the Employee's Fears	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency Analysis	
				Frequency(S)	Percentage(%)

				--	-	+	++	--	-	+	++
I am aware of my fears.	386	2,76	1,06	70	66	135	115	18,1	17,1	35,0	29,8
I manage my fears.	386	2,89	0,99	47	72	145	122	12,2	18,7	37,6	31,6
Total average	386	2,82	1,02	58,5	69	140	118,5	15,1	17,9	36,3	30,7
								33,0		67,0	

In Table 5, it has been tried to determine the level of agreement of the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman with the statements about the ability to manage their fears. When Table 9 is examined, in order to determine whether the employees of the enterprise can manage their fears; It was questioned whether the employees are aware of their fears and whether they have the ability to manage their fears.

As a result of the data obtained, the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman;

- ✓ 64.8% that they are aware of their fears
- ✓ It was determined that 69.2% of the employees were able to manage their fears.

It has been determined that 67% of the employees in the enterprises located in Adıyaman are generally aware of and manage their fears.

4.6. Findings Regarding the Analysis of Differences

Table 6: Relationship Between Marital Status and Fear Culture

	Group	N	Ortalama	Standard deviation	T	df	p
Employee's fear of manager	Married	192	2,55	,84			
	Single	194	2,54	,84			
Employee's fear of making mistakes	Married	192	2,64	,85			
	Single	194	2,62	,82			
Ability to manage employee's fears	Married	192	2,85	,86			
	Single	194	2,79	,90			

According to the data we obtained as a result of the questionnaire we applied to the employees in the enterprises in Adıyaman Organized Industry, although the difference is not very obvious, the married employees;

- ✓ They are more afraid, albeit a little ($2.55 > 2.54$), than single workers,
- ✓ They are more afraid of making mistakes ($2.64 > 2.62$) compared to single employees,
- ✓ It was determined that they were able to manage their fears more ($2.85 > 2.79$) than single employees.

However, when Table 6 is examined, it has been found that this small difference (see mean and P value) between married and single people is not statistically significant. In other words, it can be said that the employee's being married or single does not affect the level of fear much.

4.7. Gender-Fear Culture Relation

Table:7 Relationship Between Gender and Fear Culture

	Group	N	Ortalama	Standard deviation	T	df	p
Employee's fear of manager	Male	239	2,55	,84			
	Female	147	2,53	,84			
Employee's fear of making mistakes	Male	239	2,66	,86			
	Female	147	2,59	,80			
Ability to manage employee's fears	Male	239	2,84	,85			
	Female	147	2,79	,93			

When table 7 is evaluated in the light of the data obtained from the employees of the enterprise;

- ✓ They are more afraid of their managers compared to women ($2.55 > 2.53$),
- ✓ They are more afraid of making mistakes compared to women ($2.66 > 2.59$),
- ✓ It was determined that they were better at managing their fears compared to women ($2.84 > 2.79$).

When Table 11 is examined, it is seen that the difference between men and women (look p mean value) is not statistically significant. It can be stated that the employee's being male or female does not significantly affect the level of fear in the workplace.

4.8. Company Type - Fear Culture Relationship

Table:8 Relationship between Company Type and Culture of Fear

	Group	N	Ortalama	Standard deviation	T	df	p
Employee's fear of manager	Anonim	119	2,37	,73			
	Limited	267	2,62	,88			
Employee's fear of making	Anonim	119	2,53	,77			

mistakes	Limited	267	2,68	,86	-1,636	384	,128
Ability to manage employee's fears	Anonim	119	2,78	,78	,583		
	Limited	267	2,84	,92	,623	384	,025

Based on the data obtained as a result of the questionnaire applied to the employees of the enterprise, compared to the employees in the joint stock companies of the employees in the limited companies;

- ✓ They are more afraid of their managers ($2.62 > 2.37$),
- ✓ They are more afraid of making mistakes ($2.68 > 2.78$) but,
- ✓ It was concluded that they were better at managing their fears ($2.84 > 2.78$).

When the sig. values in the table are investigated, a semantic difference is observed among employees in limited and joint stock companies on the basis of fear of their managers ($.000 < .005$) and being able to manage their fears ($.025 > .005$), while there is a semantic difference in terms of fear of making mistakes ($.128 > .005$). not observed. The lack of institutionalization and norms in the workplaces and the greater uncertainty can be shown as the reason for the high culture of fear in limited companies.

4.9. Relationship between Working Time and Culture of Fear

Table:9 Relationship between Woking Time and Culture of Fear

	Woking Time	N	Ortalama	Standard deviation	T	df	p
Employee's fear of manager	0-2 years	134	2,75	,96	3,39	,110	134
	3-5 years	105	2,40	,77			105
	6-10 years	75	2,42	,67			75
	11-15 years	39	2,51	,74			39
	16 years and plus	33	2,46	,86			33
		386	2,54	,84			386
Employee's fear of making mistakes	0-2 years	134	2,73	,95	1,10	,354	134
	3-5 years	105	2,64	,70			105
	6-10 years	75	2,53	,82			75
	11-15 years	39	2,47	,82			39
	16 years and plus	33	2,61	,79			33
		386	2,63	,84			386
Ability to manage employee's fears	0-2 years	134	2,92	1,01	1,46	,211	134
	3-5 years	105	2,83	,80			105
	6-10 years	75	2,80	,78			75
	11-15 years	39	2,53	,81			39
	16 years and plus	33	2,77	,85			33
		386	2,82	,88			386

One-way Anowa test was applied to test the effect of different working hours of the employee on the fear culture. When the data obtained as a result of this test applied are examined;

- ✓ Considering the averages of the group with 0-2 years of working experience compared to the groups with different working periods, it was determined that the group with 0-2 years of working experience was more afraid of their managers ($2.75 > 2.51-2.46-2.42-2.40$). Although the sig. value is higher than .005, the high difference between the means allowed us to express such a result.
- ✓ When the average of the group with 0-2 years of work is examined, it is seen that it is higher than the averages of the other groups ($2.73 > 2.64-2.53-2.61-2.47$) and they are more afraid of making mistakes.
- ✓ It was found that the group with a working period of 0-2 years was better in managing their fears compared to the other groups ($2.92 > 2.83-2.80-2.77-2.77$).

It was determined that the group with the least work experience (0-2 years) among the employees who were applied the questionnaire were more afraid than the other groups. Among the reasons for this; Having less experience, not knowing their workplaces well enough, not knowing their managers fully, etc. is acceptable. On the other hand, one of the reasons why employees with 0-2 work ornaments are the most successful group in managing their fears can be expressed as their courageous behavior at a young age, single and high education level.

It was found that as the seniority increased, the level of fear of the managers, the level of fear of making mistakes decreased, and the level of managing their fears increased. The reason for this can be interpreted as the fact that he has gained a lot of experience in his work over time and his self-confidence has increased.

4.10. Age and Fear Culture Relationships

Table10: Age and Fear Culture Relationship

	Age	N	Ortalama	Standard deviation	T	df	p
Employee's fear of manager	18-21	69	2,33	,85	2,52	,057	69
	22-25	80	2,50	,83			80
	26-31	123	2,58	,85			123
	32 and plus	114	2,67	,80			114
		386	2,54	,84			386
Employee's fear of making mistakes	0-2 years	69	2,45	,88	2,21	,086	69
	21	80	2,55	,79			80
	22-25	123	2,67	,82			123
	26-31	114	2,76	,85			114
	32 and plus	386	2,63	,84			386
Ability to manage employee's fears	21	69	2,59	,99	3,04	,029	69
	22-25	80	2,75	,92			80
	26-31	123	2,97	,84			123
	32 and plus	114	2,84	,80			114
		386	2,82	,88			386

When the effect of different age ranges of business employees on fear culture is examined;

- ✓ Considering the average of the age group of 32 and over compared to the other groups, it has been determined that this age group is more afraid of their managers ($2.67 > 2.58-2.50-2.33$).
- ✓ Based on the averages of the age group of 32 and over compared to other age groups, it has been determined that this age group is more afraid of making mistakes than other age groups ($2.76 > 2.67-2.55-2.45$).
- ✓ It has been determined that the 26-31 age group is more successful in managing their fears compared to the other groups ($2.97 > 2.84-2.75-2.59$) with an average.

4.11. The Relationship between Education Level and Fear Culture

Table: 11 Relationship between Education Level and Fear Culture

	Educational Status	N	Ortalama	Standard deviation	T	df	p
Employee's fear of manager	Primary school	65	2,76	,94	1,59	,176	65
	Middle School	130	2,54	,89			130
	High school	119	2,46	,74			119
	Undergraduate	67	2,48	,78			67
	Post graduate	5	2,83	,97			5
	386	2,54	,84	386			
Employee's fear of making mistakes	Primary school	65	2,87	,86	2,84	,024	65
	Middle School	130	2,66	,88			130
	High school	119	2,52	,79			119
	Undergraduate	67	2,51	,79			67
	Post graduate	5	3,20	,44			5
	386	2,63	,84	386			
Ability to manage employee's fears	Primary school	65	3,00	,93	1,01	,399	65
	Middle School	130	2,78	,87			130
	High school	119	2,76	,88			119
	Undergraduate	67	2,85	,86			67
	Post graduate	5	2,60	,96			5
	386	2,82	,88	386			

When the effect of different education levels of business employees on fear culture is examined;

- ✓ It has been determined that postgraduate graduates are more afraid of their managers than graduates of other education levels ($2.83 > 2.76-2.54-2.48-2.46$).
- ✓ It was found that the fear of making mistakes of the graduates of the graduates was higher than the graduates of other education levels ($3.20 > 2.87-2.66-2.52-2.51$).
- ✓ It has been determined that primary school graduates are more successful in managing their fears compared to other education graduates ($3.00 > 2.85-2.78-2.76-2.60$).

Looking at the table above, it has been determined that primary school graduates are less afraid of making mistakes than graduate students. This is because; The fact that the primary school graduate has been involved in the business since childhood and has a lot of work experience ensures that he is not afraid of making mistakes, while the fact that the graduate employee starts working at the age of 25-30 and has little work experience can be considered as the reason for this fear.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Fear is a phenomenon that people try to reconcile, which does not actually pose a permanent threat to their own security, but requires defense against themselves in thought. When this phenomenon leaves the individual dimension and generalizes in people, that is, when it dominates the society, it is no longer a feeling that people can manage and becomes a force that determines the life limits of the society and that a group applies to manipulate other groups.

In order to achieve targeted levels of results from employees in companies, managers need to resort to a covert method. This latent power is the culture of fear. The culture of fear shows its presence in businesses by the way it is managed. A management approach dominated by a culture of fear is far from a management approach that puts people at the center. In the culture of fear, the priority is the interests of the business. The wishes and interests of the employees come after the interests of the enterprise. In this respect, a management approach based on a culture of fear is different from the others. In this study, we can define the culture of fear as a process for the existence and management of fear in the workplace.

In the study, the application was made by going to different enterprises operating in Adiyaman Organized Industry. In the survey application, the employees of the enterprise were determined as the target and the comments obtained from these people were used in this study. In the questionnaire form, expressions were used to determine the existence of a culture of fear in the enterprise and to determine how the employees think in the face of the fear they experience in the enterprises. Looking at the data obtained, it has been determined that there is a culture of fear in the enterprises in the statistical sense.

According to the data obtained, most of the participants (61.9%) are male employees. According to the data, the age variable is mostly seen in the 26-31 age group (31.9%). It is observed that the education level of the employees is mostly (33.7%) secondary school graduates. When the marital status of the employees is examined, it is seen that the single group (50.3%) constitutes the segment, although there is not much difference. When the levels of feeling fear are examined, it is seen that women are the ones who feel their fear at the highest level according to their gender and marital status, secondary school graduates are the most frightened group according to their education level, and high school graduates are the least afraid, and the most frightened group has the least experience in terms of working hours. It has been determined that the group with 2 years of work experience is the group with the least fear, the group with 11-15 years of experience, the groups that feel the highest level of fear according to the age of the employees are 18-21 and 26-31, and those who feel their fear at the lowest level are the 32 and over group. has been done.

As a result of the analyzes made, it is seen that the employees are afraid of their managers, that the employees are not comfortable due to the culture of fear found in the workplace, that they are afraid of making mistakes because they think that a negative result will be blamed on them and they are afraid of being punished. However, despite all this, it has been found that they know what the source of their fear is and they can easily manage their fears.

It is thought that it would be beneficial to consider the following in order for the employees in the business to gain the ability to fight their fears and to feel more comfortable, peaceful and valuable in the workplace.

- ✓ Managers should make their employees feel that they are more sincere and well-intentioned in the manager-employee relationship so that their employees can be more comfortable at work, and they should also avoid the tendency to punish their employees as much as possible.
- ✓ It would be more appropriate for managers to reward their employees with attractive things that may interest them rather than punish them. In other words, it would be better to reward the good employee instead of punishing the weak employee.
- ✓ It may be preferable for the newly hired employees to do orientation work by the authorities who have experience about the business in order to get to know the business and its environment first, so that the employees can get to know the business and get used to it in a short time.
- ✓ Strengthening the communication between employees and managers by organizing social activities outside of working hours, away from the working environment, by the business management can be a factor that increases the success of the business.
- ✓ The organization and unionization of the employees at the workplace will contribute to the prevention of rights violations. It will make them behave more courageously and comfortably.
- ✓ Since the culture of fear develops depending on the behavior of the managers, it is important for the managers to foresee the consequences of their behavior towards their employees.

- ✓ In order for managers to provide an effective management, it is important to foresee and determine how the employees will react to the management style to be used.

REFERENCES

- Adams, B. D., Thomson, M. H., vd., (2004), Organizational trust in the Canadian Forces. Defence Research and Development, Canada.
- Altan, Z. (2009), Kişilerarası İletişimde Bir Sosyal Baskı Düzenegi: Korku Kültürü, İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi, Malatya.
- Asunakutlu, T., “Örgütsel Güvenin Oluşturulmasına İlişkin Unsurlar Ve Bir Değerlendirme”. Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2002, 1, (9), ss. 1- 13.
- Aykaç, B. (1999). İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Ve İnsan Kaynaklarının Stratejik Planlaması, Ankara, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Cüceloğlu, D. (2002), İletişim Donanımları, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Duhm, D. (1996), Kapitalizmde Korku, (Şölçün, S.çev.), Ankara: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Frank, F. (2014), Korku kültürü, (Yıldırım, B. çev), İstanbul: Ayrıntı yayınları.
- Güler, A. (2008), Türk Toplumunda Korku Kültürü, Bolu: Punto Tasarım.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1992). İnsan ve İnsanlar, 8. Basım, Evrim Basım Yayım Dağıtım, İstanbul.
- Kamer, M., (2001) Örgütsel güven, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkileri (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul (Türkiye).
- Kırel, Ç. (1998), Örgütlerde Güç Kullanımı, Çalışanların Algıladıkları Güç ve Tepkileri Üzerinde Bir Uygulama, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1031.
- http://www.dersimizkimya.com/egitim_makal_pdf/nedendegisim.pdf (10/01/2015).
- <http://www.mba.co.za/article.aspx?rootid=6&subdirectoryid=1204>(17/01/2015)
- Mannoni, P. (1992), (çev: Işın Gürbüz), Korku, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mealiea, L. W. (1978). Learned Behaviour: The Key to Understanding and Preventing Employee Resistance to Change, Group and Organization Studies,
- Özkan, R. (2010), Türk eğitim sisteminde himayeci değerler: İlköğretim ders kitapları örneği, Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 7,1.
- Sisson, S. (1985). Managerial Risk Taking, Training and Development Journal, January Press.