

The Effect Of Human Resources Management Models On Employees' Perception Of Their Managers' Humor Styles

Nilüfer Rüzgar

Bursa Technical University, Turkey

Beliz Ülgen

Istanbul Commerce University, Turkey

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i12/3618 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i12/3618>

Abstract

Effective management of human, which is the most important resource of organizations, leads to increasing overall performance of the organization and thus gaining competitive advantage. In addition to this, watching employees' desires and needs in order not to unstabilize their work-life balance, which increases their job satisfaction, is one of the most crucial topic that needs to be paid attention by organizations so as to be powerful and eternal. Furthermore, adopting and using humor styles in organizations and perceptions of employees, has recently drew attention and been researched in literature. In this research, the effect of perceptions of employees about Human Resources Models on their perceptions of their managers' humor styles, is researched. In the frame of the research, local and foreign organizations, performing in production and service sector in Bursa, Turkey are researched as population.

Keywords: Hard Human Resources Model, Soft Human Resources Model, Affiliative Humor, Self-Enhancing Humor, Agressive Humor, Self-Defeating Humor

Introduction

Organizations, have to put effort into developing themselves and adapting the constant changing environmental conditions in order to live. The decisions, which are made as a result of analysing and evaluating both the interior and the exterior environment of the organization, provides advantage and power for the competition in the sector. Managing an organization so as to increase organizational effectiveness; leads to consolidation of the organization. In other words, the succesful attempts in the process of strategic management accrue, with managing human resources in a strategic way (Uyargil, 1997).

The humor styles that are adopted and displayed in the organization, constitutes great importance in terms of increasing the job satisfaction of human resources and managing them in the way that helps to reach the organizational goals.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of employees' perceptions about the HR models that are applied and its effect on their perception about managers' humor styles. In the scope of the research, the service sector organizations (hotels) and production sector organizations (textile, food, automotive) in Bursa are taken as main population. As for the measurement, HR Models Scale, which is developed as 38 items by Kidombo, K'Obonyo and Gakuu (2012), by founding on and adapting the study of Kane, Crawford and Grant (1999) in order to determine the barriers in front of the HRM effectiveness, is used as the first measure. The second scale is Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ), which is developed by Martin and Puhlik-Doris (1999) as 60 items and revised as 32 items by Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray and Weir (2003). The reason for having service sector and production sector as separate; is the fact that service cannot be dimensioned, defined and measured physically because of its being dynamic. On the other hand in production sector, the physical definitions and dimensions of the products can be identified. Furthermore, service consists activities that are led by human behaviour. Human resources activities, in organizations that are active in production sector; are implemented by private departments such as public relations. The employees and the customers do not have the chance of coming face to face until the offering of the production. In service sector on the other hand, the employees and the customers are face to face all the time. In this sense, human resources implementations, human resources models, perceived humor styles and the level of job satisfaction differ.

1. Human Resources Models

Human Resources Management (HRM), is an area that is developed under the effect of functional paradigm in America; although its philosophical basis go back to industrial relations system in Europe (Dulebohn, Ferris, Gerald and Stodd, 1995 cited in Tayeb, 2005; Orhan, 2010). These two regions, which are effective on developing this human resources area; differ in terms of cultural dynamics and legal procedures (Claus, 2003). This situation has caused two different approaches and thus, two different models have emerged (Drucker, 1996).

1.1. Hard Human Resources Model

The Hard HR model, which is proposed by Fombrun, Tichy and Devanna (1984) in Michigan University, is also known as "Michigan School Model". In emergence of this model, Alfred Chandler's structural equality strategy has been an inspiration. The main emphasis of the model, is to treat employees as means of reaching the organizational goals.

The hard model, which reflects the American tradition, stresses the intense strategic management pressure on human resources. The harmony between HRM implementations and organizational strategy, constitutes great importance. The employees are considered as sources and a part of competitive advantage (Fombrun, Tichy and Devanna, 1984; Brewster, 1995; Drucker, 1996; Claus, 2003; Fenton-O'Creevy, Gooderham and Nordhaug, 2005). The model which is also named as "Pragmatic Instrumentalism" (Legge, 1995), supports unifying the HRM policies and systems with organizational strategies (Gill, 1999).

1.1.1. The Advantages of Hard Human Resources Model

The primary advantage of the model is its market performance and commitment to the organizational growth. Furthermore, the employees are evaluated as the other sources of the

organization, which leads minimizing the costs in the sense that human resource is tried to be gained in the most economical and the cheapest way (Ivo, 2006).

Another advantage of the model is its cost effectiveness and the ability of managers making fast decisions. In addition, changing employees by outsourcing, leads to construct more effective strategies in the time of crisis. Because instead of training the current employees, outsourcing is applied and without wasting time the crisis is tried to be defeated.

The organizations that apply this model, give importance to the employee training and development; in order to integrate the business strategy with the organization (Morris, Wilkinson and Munday, 2000). Hard HR model, supports that the needs of the organization are the most important needs and the increasing productivity is the pushing force for the management to develop HRM (Kidombo, 2004).

1.1.2. The Disadvantages of Hard Human Resources Model

The model, is criticised for its being in a rational and mechanical organizational decision-making shape, although in reality the decision-making process is more complicated (Price, 2004). The model is also criticised as being “unitarist”; in the sense that it ignores employee relationships while focusing on managerial activities (Boxall, 1993). This is why the model approaches HR as “hard” and does not see human resources different from the other sources of the organization (Price, 2004). The employees are evaluated as sources that should be exploited (Guest, 1989; Legge, 1995). Because of this fact; the employees are controlled in a very hard system.

When control and pressure is high, the commitment and the trust of the employees to the organization stay low (Noon, 1992), which leads low performance especially in jobs that require creativeness.

1.2. *Soft Human Resources Model*

The soft HR model, which is proposed by Beer, Spector, Lawrence, Mills and Walton (1985) in Harvard University, is also known as “Harvard School Model”. The model reflects European tradition and its basis go back to human relations model, which emphasises communication, motivation and leadership (Henderson, 2011). In the model, employees are treated as the most valuable assets of the organization (Beer, Spector, Lawrence, Mills ve Walton, 1985; Brewster, 1995; Drucker, 1996; Tayeb, 2005). The model is also named as “Developmental Humanism”, because of the fact that it focuses on “human” aspect of human resources management (Legge, 1995). According to the model, human resources are more valuable and more costly than the other sources. The model believes that just a single employee can create difference in the organization and just a single employee can provide competitive advantage with creativity, commitment and competence. Therefore, it supports that HR policies (careful selection, paying attention, development, appropriate awards) should be integrated with the organization (Brewster, 1995; Gill, 1999).

1.2.1. The Advantages of Soft Human Resources Model

Soft HR model, evaluates the employees as the most important asset of the organization. Thus, it tries to serve the needs of the employees in order to provide commitment and trust (Storey 1992; Armstrong 2007). Employee empowerment is also of great importance in this model. In addition to this, providing employees with participating the decision-making process, is another important advantage of this model.

In other words soft HR model, tries to form a labor power with high motivation, high trust and high commitment (Gennard ve Judge 2005 cited in Mohamed, 2007).

Beer et al. (1985), defines the model as “pluralist” and “analytic”; which means considering the organization’s and employees’ needs as seperate.

1.2.2. The Disadvantages of Soft Human Resources Model

Soft HR model is criticised because of the fact that it does not focus on management, which causes costs to rise and profits to fall. In addition, the model is more complicated than the hard model in the sense that it considers multiple shareholders and multi-dimensioned performance evaluation (Brewster and Boselie, 2013 cited in Kidombo, 2004)

Soft HR model, cannot be appropriate for some organizations, because of the fact that the employees may not be ready for this model. On the other hand, the model needs a great understanding and application capability. In this sense, activities may not be run as desired. (Kidombo, 2004).

Table 1. The Content of HRM: The Hard Model and The Soft Model)

Hard HR Model	Soft HR Model
Employees are treated as a source of the organization	Employees are treated as the most important asset and the most important competitive advantage of the organization
HRM focus is on defining the labor needs and making the recruitment according to those needs	HRM focus is on giving importance the needs of the employees (roles, rewards, means of motivation)
Turnover rates are high	Turnover rates are low and there is long-term laborpower planning
There is minimum and vertical communication flow	There is a regular, powerful and horizontal communication flow
There is adequate payment for recruitment and withholding (minimum salary)	The payment structure is based on performance and competition (profit sharing, share allocation)
There is minimum empowerment and delegation of authority	There is a high level of empowerment and delegation of authority
Reward system is based on judging the employees (good employee-bad employee)	The reward system is based on the development of the employees
The organizational structure is complicated	The organizational structure is flat
It is appropriate for autocratic leadership	It is appropriate for democratic leadership

Source: ‘Hard’ HR model ‘Soft’ HR model Fombrun et al., (1984); Schuler (1992); Huselid (1995) Beer et al., (1985) ; Guest (1989), cited in <https://www.slideshare.net/IGilmore/hard-versus-softhrm> (2014)

2. Humor Styles

Humor, can be used as an individual expression style in social environment. It can be both positive and negative (Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larse, Gray and Weir, 2003). In the model that is developed by Martin et al., humor can be both positive and negative and it can be used for affecting the individual himself/herself and the other people. In this sense, 4 humor styles are defined (Reisoğlu, 2014). The positive styles are “Affiliative” and “Self Enhancing” humor. The negative styles are “Agressive” and “Self Defeating” humor (Tümekaya, 2006; Çeçen, 2007; Kazarian, Martin and Shahe, 2004).

2.1. Affiliative Humor

Affiliative humor, is a humor style that is developed by the individual considering and respecting both himself/herself and the other people. It is defined as the most social humor style. It means, using of humor for entertaining both himself/herself and the others in daily life (Martin et al., 2003). This humor style provides people with integration with each other, easing the climate and creating a positive environment (Li-Hsing, Ya-Ping, Hung-Chen and Hsueh-Chih, 2012). Organizations, in which this humor style is used, the working environment becomes positive and constructive. This situation also leads to high levels of job satisfaction and productivity (Özer, 2014).

2.2. Self-Enhancing Humor

Self enhancing humor, is a humor style that helps decreasing negative feelings by considering the needs of both himself/herself and the others. This humor style provides the individual with a more humorous perspective and keep this perspective even in negative situations. It also helps coping with negative and undesired situations (Martin and Kuiper, 1999). It is considered as being in a negative relationship with negative emotions such as sadness and worry; in a positive relationship with positive emotions such as openness to experience, self-respect and psychological well-being (Martin et al., 2003 cited in Reisoğlu, 2014).

2.3. Agressive Humor

Agressive humor, is a style that doesn't fit with social norms, in the sense that it is used for satisfying the individual needs without considering others. The aim of the individuals who adopt and use this style of humor is teasing, bullying, insulting and criticising others (Martin et al., 2003). Agressive humor can be used as an invisible weapon in social environment. For example, in a situation of discussion, individuals can use aggressive humor in order to insult and underestimate the rivals. It is considered as being in a positive relationship with nevrozizm, anger, hostility and aggression; in a negative relationship with mildness and liability (Martin et al., 2003 cited in Reisoğlu, 2014).

2.4. Self-Defeating Humor

As for *self-defeating humor*, it is a style that is used for enjoying others without self respect (Martin et al., 2003). The individual who uses this humor style constantly insults and humiliates himself/herself in order to entertain the others and building powerful relationships with them. In addition to this, an individual who adopts this humor style, can use it so as to escape from solving problems or hiding the reasons that create negative emotions (Martin et al., 2003).

There are some opinions on using humor styles in organizations (Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran, 2012; Ünal, 2014). Some researchers state that in organizations which adopt

positive humor styles; employees feel happier, healthier, more creative and less stressful. Thus, the social interaction between the managers and the employees enhances and creative thought and problem solving capabilities increase (Morreall, 2009). In addition Avolio (1999), states that humor is a very important trait that should be adopted by managers. Especially positive humor styles that are used by managers, helps employees feel positive about their job and work environment. These humor styles also increase the employees' job satisfaction (Ünal, 2014).

3. The Positive and Negative Effects of Using Humor Styles in Organizations on Organizational Components

Humor in organizations, especially for the managers, is seen necessary and inevitable for effective management. Managers have to make decisions, solve the problems and satisfy the needs of the members of the organization constantly. This causes a stressful environment. In order to cope with this stressful situations, humor constitutes great importance. In this sense humor, plays a vital role as one of the most powerful means for the managers (Özdemir, 2002; Yılmaz, 2011).

3.1. Group Cohesion

Romero and Cruthirds (2006) developed a theoretical model that reflects the effects of using humor in organizations. In the model, the factors that enhances group cohesion are defined in two groups as exterior (threats, rivals) and interior (new members).

A member, who perceives an exterior rivalry as a threat, can make jokes about the rivals by using aggressive humor (Henman, 2001 cited in Romero and Cruthirds, 2006). When a new member joins to the organization, older members can use mild aggressive humor, which helps the newcomer adopt the organizational norms and feel relieved in the group (Martineau, 1972).

Especially affiliative humor, reveals the positive emotions and helps enhancing the group cohesion (Murstein and Brust, 1985 cited in Romero and Cruthirds, 2006). It helps group members to trust each other (Terrion and Ashford, 2002 cited in Romero and Cruthirds, 2006). In addition to this, it helps group members to adopt the concept of "group" (Romero and Cruthirds, 2006).

3.2. Communication

Communication plays a vital role in organizations in terms of sharing and distributing knowledge. In some situations, especially mild self-defeating humor, reduces the level of stress and provides the manager integrate with the employees. When it is used by organization members, they focus on similarities and share the humor. It can also be used in political arena (Chang and Grunner, 1981). For example Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton are known for their preference of using mild self-defeating humor in order to make the society feel that they are one of them (Romero and Cruthirds, 2006).

Using humor in organizations, increases the desire of members to listen to their co-workers and managers. It also brings ease to learning and teaching and bounds the employees to each other. Furthermore, it defeats the conflicts and increases the feeling of trust (Tarvin, n.d.).

3.3. Stress Level

There are some strong evidences about humor in the sense of it reduces non-functional stress (Yovetich, Dale and Hudak, 1990). When a joke is made on a situation that creates stress, the individual feels superior to the situation.

Affiliative humor, creates an integrating climate and helps the members to share the stress. It creates the perception of “we live this stressful situation together and we cope with it” (Martineau, 1972 cited in Romero and Cruthirds, 2006).

Self-enhancing humor, helps to reduce the stress level as well. In a study it has been found out that employees who have a high sense of self-enhancing humor, feel less stress in the organization and their self-perception level is higher (Martin et al., 2003).

3.4. Creativity

Humor relieves individuals and make them accept the faults of others or new ideas more easily. Thus, risk taking, which is the base of creative thinking, becomes easier (Morreall, 2009). Without sharp criticism, employees can think in a more creative way and they can take the risk of applying new ideas. It also creates a joyfull environment in which new ideas can arouse more easily and clearly (Ziv, 1984). In an organizational environment in which there is a humorous climate, employees are more tend to find creative problem solving ways (Daubman et al., 1987 cited in Romero and Cruthirds, 2006).

Affiliative and self-enhancing humor styles are seen as the most appropriate styles for increasing creativeness. Both styles lead employees to think creatively (Romero and Cruthirds, 2006).

3.5. Organizational Culture

Humor, is accepted as one of the most important components of organization and organizational culture (Clouse and Spurgeon, 1995). Using humor in organization, creates a positive environment in which the ideas and knowledge are shared freely (Romero and Cruthirds, 2006). In addition to this, using humor in the organization is also seen as in a close relationship with performance (Caudron, 1992).

Humor, is not only a component of organizational culture; it is also a distinctive aspect which makes organisational culture unique. Affiliative and self-enhancing humor styles, enhances the interpersonal relationships and helps to cope with problems. Thus, employees display positive behaviour that will enhance the organization.

3.6. Social Distance

According to Romero and Cruthirds (2006), Self-enhancing humor style is used widely by employees who want to prove that they are in fact similar to their superiors/managers. As Cooper (2005) states, humor in the organization can unify the employees when it is used as an integration strategy. In an environment in which there are managers, using self-defeating humor style is not preferred in the sense that it can lead to a negative impression (Romero and Cruthirds, 2006). As for the managers, using affiliative or self-defeating humor style can help removing the barriers between the manager and the subordinates (Smith and Powell, 1988).

4. Methodology and Analysis

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of hard and soft human resources models on the perception about employees' about their managers' humor styles. In the scope of the research, the service sector organizations (hotels) and production sector organizations (textile, food, automotive) in Bursa, Turkey are taken as main population. The survey forms are delivered and collected via hardcopy forms and e-mail questionnaire. The data are analysed by SPSS 20.0 statistical package programme.

The survey forms constitutes two measures and demographical questions. The first measure is HR Models Measure, which is developed as 38 items by Kidombo, K'Obonyo and Gakuu (2012), by founding on and adapting the study of Kane, Crawford and Grant (1999) which aimed at determining the barriers in front of the HRM effectiveness. The second measurement is Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ), which is developed by Martin and Puhlik-Doris (1999) as 60 items and revised as 32 items by Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray and Weir (2003).

4.1. Significance of the Study

In national and international literature, studies on the hard and soft HR models and their effect on perceived humor styles are really scarce. Furthermore, studies that compare service and production sector and the effects of human resources models' effects on employees' perception about their managers' humor styles, cannot be found in national and international literature. In this sense, this study constitutes originality and acts as a reference for future research.

4.2. Hypotheses

The main hypothesis of this research is "The perceptions of employees' about applied Soft HR Model and Hard HR Model in their organizations, affect their perception about the humor styles of their managers". The sub-hypotheses are structured as to test the relations of the population, which is the employees of production sector and service sector, in the sense of measurement dimensions. First four hypotheses are related to production sector; and the last four hypotheses are related to service sector. According to the literature review, sub-hypotheses are conducted as follows:

H₁: In production sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about affiliative humor styles of their managers': H₁: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₂: In production sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about self-enhancing humor styles of their managers': H₂: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₃: In production sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about self-defeating humor styles of their managers': H₃: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₄: In production sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about aggressive humor styles of their managers': H₄: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₅: In service sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about affiliative humor styles of their managers': H₅: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₆: In service sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about self-enhancing humor styles of their managers': H₆: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₇: In service sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about self-defeating humor styles of their managers': H₇: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H₈: In service sector, Hard HR model and Soft HR model have statistically significant effect on employees' perception about aggressive humor styles of their managers': H₈: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

4.3. Analysis and Findings

In the context of scale reliability level; it is acceptable when Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is between .61 and .80 (İslamoğlu & Alnıaçık, 2014; cited in Tuğsal, 2017:56). In the study, Cronbach's Alpha value of Human Resources Management Models Scale is calculated as .812; therefore, scale reliability level is acceptable. In the same way, Cronbach's Alpha value of Humor Scale is calculated as .699 and humor scale reliability level is acceptable, too.

4.3.1. Findings About Production Sector

The first regression model of the research is exploring the effect of *hard and soft HR models on affiliative humor style* in **production sector**.

Table 2. Model Summary of Hard and Soft HRM Models on Affiliative Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,074	,006	-,003	,74045

In the first model of the research, independent variables hard HR and soft HR models predict 0.6% of affiliative humor style. However, it is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 3. ANOVA Statistics of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Affiliative Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,737	2	,368	,672	,512
	Residual	132,132	241	,548		
	Total	132,868	243			

Neither of the independent variables predict the dependent variable (affiliative humor style) statistically significant. So, H₁: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$ is rejected.

The second regression model of the research is exploring the effect of *hard HR and soft HR models on self-enhancing humor style*.

Table 4. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Enhancing Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,146	,021	,013	,52577

In the second model of the research, independent variables hard HR and soft HR models predict 2.1% of self-enhancing humor style. On the contrary, it is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 5. ANOVA Statistics of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Enhancing Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1,456	2	,728	2,634	,074
	Residual	66,621	241	,276		
	Total	68,077	243			

None of the independent variables (soft HR and hard HR models) predict the dependent variable (self-enhancing humor style) statistically significant. According to the second model, $H_2: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is rejected.

The third regression model of the study is researching the effect of hard and soft HR models on self-defeating humor style.

Table 6. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Defeating Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,329	,109	,101	,70206

In the third model of the research, independent variables hard and soft HR models can predict 10.9% of self-defeating humor style. Moreover, unlike the previous hypotheses the third one is statistically significant ($p < .001$). So, $H_3: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is accepted.

Table 7. ANOVA Statistics of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Defeating Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14,457	2	7,229	14,666	,000
	Residual	118,785	241	,493		
	Total	133,243	243			

Table 8. Coefficients of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Defeating Humor Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,369	,248		13,608	,000
	Soft	-,476	,089	-,408	-5,372	,000
	Hard	,192	,072	,202	2,664	,008

According to the B values in the coefficients table, there is a positive relation between dependent variable and independent variables if the sign is positive. On the contrary, there is a negative relation between dependent variable and independent variables if the sign is negative (Field, 2013; cited in Tuğsal, 2017:69).

In the direction of statistical calculations, the regression equation of the model adopted in the first process is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Self-Defeating Humor Style} = 3.369 + [(-.408 \times \text{Soft HRM}) + (.202 \times \text{Hard HRM})]$$

As the findings are evaluated, the factors which have statistically significant effects on the self-defeating humor style can be interpreted as follows:

- **Soft HR models** have statistically significant effect on **Self-Defeating Humor Style** of managers ($p < .001$). So; **if soft HR model increases 1 unit, Self-Defeating Humor Style decreases .408 unit.**
- Similarly; **Hard HR models** affect **Self-Defeating Humor Style** of managers ($p < .01$). Therefore; **if hard HR model increases 1 unit, Self-Defeating Humor Style increases .202 unit.**

The last regression model of the research for **production sector** is exploring the effect of hard and soft HR models on aggressive humor style.

Table 9. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Agressive Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,036	,001	-,007	,67289

In this model of the research, independent variables hard HR and soft HR models can predict 3.6% of aggressive humor style. However, it is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 10. ANOVA Statistics of Hard and Soft HR Models on Agressive Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,737	2	,368	,672	,512
	Residual	132,132	241	,548		
	Total	132,868	243			

Neither hard nor soft HR models (independent variables) can predict the dependent variable (agressive humor style) statistically significant. So, $H_4: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is rejected.

4.3.2. Findings About Service Sector

The first regression model of the research about **service sector** is exploring the effect of *hard HRM and soft HRM models on affiliative humor style*.

Table 11. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Affiliative Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,150	,023	,010	,62430

In this model of the research, independent variables hard HR and soft HR models can predict 2,3% of affiliative humor style. However, it is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 12. ANOVA Statistics of Hard and Soft HR Models on Agressive Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1,390	2	,695	1,784	,171
	Residual	60,021	154	,390		
	Total	61,411	156			

Neither hard nor soft HR models (independent variables) can predict the dependent variable (affiliative humor style) statistically significant. So, $H_5: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is rejected.

The second regression model of the research about service sector is exploring the effect of hard HRM and soft HRM models on self-enhancing humor style.

Table 13. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Enhancing Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,066	,004	-,001	,56742

In this model, independent variables hard HR and soft HR models can predict 0,4% of self-enhancing humor style. However, it is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 14. ANOVA Statistics of Hard and Soft HRM Models on Self-Enhancing Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,566	2	,283	,879	,416
	Residual	128,141	398	,322		
	Total	128,707	400			

Not only hard HR but also soft HR models (independent variables) can not predict the dependent variable (self-enhancing humor style) statistically significant. So, $H_6: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is rejected.

The third regression model of the study is researching the effect of hard and soft HR models on self-defeating humor style in service sector.

Table 15. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Defeating Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,250	,062	,050	,75975

In the third model of the research, independent variables hard HR and soft HR models can predict 6.2% of self-defeating humor style. Moreover, unlike the previous hypotheses the third one is statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Table 16. ANOVA Statistics of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Defeating Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5,920	2	2,960	5,128	,007
	Residual	88,892	154	,577		
	Total	94,812	156			

Table 17. Coefficients of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Self-Defeating Humor Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,707	,409		9,068	,000
	Soft	-,337	,126	-,246	-2,677	,008
	Hard	-,008	,112	-,006	-,069	,945

According to the B values in the coefficients table, there is a positive relation between dependent variable and independent variables if the sign is positive. On the contrary, there is a negative relation between dependent variable and independent variables if the sign is negative (Field, 2013; cited in Tuğsal, 2017:69).

In the direction of statistical calculations, the regression equation of the model adopted in the first process is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Self-Defeating Humor Style} = 3.707 + [(-.246 \times \text{Soft HRM})]$$

As the findings are evaluated, the factor which has statistically significant effects on the self-defeating humor style can be interpreted as follows:

- **Soft HR models** have statistically significant effect on **Self-Defeating Humor Style** of managers ($p < .01$). So; **if soft HR model increases 1 unit, Self-Defeating Humor Style decreases .246 unit.**
- **Hard HR models don't affect Self-Defeating Humor Style of managers ($p > .05$).**

Since hard HR models don't have statistically significant effect, $H_7: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is partially accepted. The last regression model of the **service sector** in the research is investigating the effect of hard HR and soft HR models on aggressive humor style.

Table 18. Model Summary of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Agressive Humor Style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,273	,075	,063	,83522

In the last model of the research, independent variables hard HRM and soft HRM models can predict 7.5% of aggressive humor style. Moreover, the last hypothesis is statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Table 19. ANOVA Statistics of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Aggressive Humor Style

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8,678	2	4,339	6,220	,003
	Residual	107,430	154	,698		
	Total	116,108	156			

Table 20. Coefficients of Hard HR and Soft HR Models on Aggressive Humor Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,644	,449		8,109	,000
	Soft	-,473	,138	-,312	-3,416	,001
	Hard	,131	,123	,098	1,068	,287

In accordance with the statistical calculations, the regression equation of the model adopted in the first process is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Aggressive Humor Style} = 3.644 + [(-.312 \times \text{Soft HRM})]$$

As the findings are evaluated, the factor which has statistically significant effects on the aggressive humor style can be interpreted as follows:

- **Soft HR models** have statistically significant effect on **Aggressive Humor Style** of managers ($p < .01$). So; **if soft HR model increases 1 unit, Aggressive Humor Style decreases .312 unit.**
- **Hard HR models** don't have statistically significant effect on **Aggressive Humor Style** of managers ($p > .05$).

Since hard HR models don't have statistically significant effect, $H_8: \mu_1 > \mu_2$ is partially accepted.

5. Conclusion

Organizations had better implement Soft HR models and policies in order to make employees satisfied. Therefore; job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment might increase. As it is verified by the analysis, either in production or service sector, when Soft HR model is implemented, the use of self-defeating humor decreases. Therefore it can be concluded that, while it is expected in organizations that implement Soft HR model, the use of self-enhancing and affiliative humor to increase, it is expected in organizations that implement Hard HR model, the use of self-enhancing and affiliative humor to decrease and the use of self-defeating and aggressive humor to increase.

In the research, it is found that in service sector, the use of hard HR models don't have statistically significant effect on the perceptions of employees about self-defeating humor styles of their managers. In this sense, it can be concluded that in service sector organizations that implement Soft HR model, the use of self-defeating humor increases. As a deduction, it can be said that in service sector the managers try to remove the barriers between them and their inferiors by making jokes about themselves and try to be friendly.

In addition to this, in production sector the use of self-defeating humor is verified as statistically meaningful. The reason of this, again, can be explained as managers' effort to be on good terms and in a warm relationship, in order to make employees work effectively.

On the other hand, it is verified that in service sector Hard HR does not have a statistically meaningful effect while it has a statistically meaningful effect in production sector. The reason for this difference can be interpreted as, the fact that employees' being face to face with customers in service sector, necessitates a warm relationship between the managers and the employees in order to satisfy the employees in terms of their jobs and thus providing the best service for the customers. In production sector, the employees do not have to come face to face with the customers. The management needs them to work efficiently and therefore implements a strict HR model, which is Hard model.

In the research, it is also found that in service sector, hard HR models don't have statistically significant effect on the perception of employees about aggressive humor styles of their managers. In this sense, it can be concluded that in service sector organizations that implement Soft HR model, the use of aggressive humor increases. As a deduction, it can be said that in service sector although the managers try to remove the barriers between them and their inferiors, they may not be able to balance the dosage of the jokes. This is to say that, they may try to make the new employees adapt the organization's rules, as Romero and Cruthirds (2006) mentioned, but while doing this they may exceed the dosage of the jokes and perceived as aggressive by the employees.

Furthermore, it should also be mentioned that, affiliative humor and self-enhancing humor styles do not have statistically meaningful effects in both sectors. Therefore, it can be concluded that both production and service sectors, the use of positive humor styles is not comprehended enough by the managers and the employees. The reason of this may be the fear of not being able to balance the relationships in organizations, which may cause inefficiency in productivity.

For further studies, it should be noted that, although the previous studies lead the researchers in terms of positive and negative effects of using humor styles in organizations, the current researches are not adequate. Therefore, there is a need of deep theoretical researches in order to guide the empirical researches in the future. Although the theoretical framework that is suggested by Romero and Cruthirds (2006) helps in selecting and evaluating the humor style that is to be used in organizations, it does not serve the effects of dynamic nature of humor and its use in different organizational levels. There is also a need of developing new scales in order to define the use of humor styles individually, in teams and its organizational outcomes.

In addition to this, there is a striking inadequacy of scales in terms of measuring Hard and Soft Human Resources Models. As most of the researchers mention, the current scales in HR

literature are not adequate (Kane, Crawford ve Grant, 1999; Wright, Gardner, Moynihan ve Park, 2001; Edgar; 2003; Radcliffe, 2005; Truss, Gratton, Hope-Hailey, McGovern ve Stiles, 1997; Demo, Neiva, Nunes ve Rozzett, 2012; Edgar ve Geare, 2005). Moreover, there is not a current scale that is used frequently to measure Hard and Soft HR models. As it is applied in this research, most of the researchers base their measures on the article of Kane, Crawford and Grant (1999), titled "Barriers to Effective HRM", which aims at developing a strong scale in terms of measuring Hard and Soft HR models.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2007). *Armstrong's handbook of hrm practice*. (1st edition published in 1977 as a *Handbook of personnel management practice*). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Avolio, B. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P.R., Quinn Mills, D., & Walton, R.E. (1985). *Human resource management: A general manager's perspective. Text and cases*. New York: The Free Press.
- Boxall, P. F. (1993). The significance of human resource management: A reconsideration of the evidence. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(3), 645–55.
- Brewster, C. (1995). Towards a European model of human resource management. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1st quarter, 1-21.
- Brewster, C., & Boselie, P. (2013). [At the crossroads at midnight: Strategic human resource management now](#). *John H. Dunning Centre for International Business, Discussion Paper*, 2013-010, June 2013. Reading.
- Caudron, S. (1992). Humor is healthy in the workplace. *Personnel Journal*, 71(6), 63–67.
- Chang, M. J., & Grunner, C. R. (1981). Audience reaction to self-disparaging humor. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46(4), 419 – 426;
- Claus, L. (2003). Similarities and differences in human resource management in the European Union. [Thunderbird International Business Review](#), 6, 729–755.
- Clouse, R. W., & Spurgeon, K. L. (1995). Corporate analysis of humor psychology. *A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior*, 32(3– 4), 1–24.
- Cooper, C. D. (2005). Just joking around? Employee humor expression as an ingratiation behavior. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 765-776.
- Çeçen, A. R. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsiyet ve yaşam doyumu düzeylerine göre sosyal ve duygusal yalnızlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. [Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi](#), 3(2), 180-190.
- Demo, G., Neiva, E., Nunes, I. ve Rozzett, K. (2012). Human resources management policies and practices scale (HRMPPS): Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. *BAR, Rio de Janeiro*, 9(4), art. 2, 395-420.
- Drucker, P. (1996). *The executive in action: Managing for results, innovation & entrepreneurship, the effective executive*. New York: Harper Business.
- Dulebohn, J., Ferris, H., Gerald R., & Stodd, J. T. (1995). The history and evolution of human resource management. In G. Ferris, R. Rosen, S. D. Barnum, (Eds.), *Handbook of human resource management*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, (pp. 18-40).

- Edgar, F. (2003). Employee-centred human resource management practices. *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations*, 28(3), 230-240.
- Edgar, F. ve Geare, A. (2005). HRM practice and employee attitudes: different measures – different results. *Personnel Review*, 34(5), 334-549
- Fenton-O'Creevy, M., Gooderham, P. N., & Nordhaug, O. (2005). [Diffusion of HRM to Europe and the role of US MNCS: Introduction to the special issue](#). *Management Revue*, 1(1), 5-10.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* 4th Ed. Sage Publications. [Electronic Version]. London.
- Fombrun, C. J., Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1984). *Strategic human resource management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gill, C. (1999). Use of hard and soft models of hrm to illustrate the gap between rhetoric and reality in workforce. *Working Paper*, 1-15, RMIT Business, November.
- Guest, D. (1989). Personnel and human resource management: Can you tell the difference? *Personnel Management*, 48-51
- Ivo, A. M. (2006). Best perspectives to human resource management. *African Centre For Community And Development* (www.africancentredorcommunity.com).
- Henderson, I. (2011). *Human resource management for MBA students*. (2nd ed.). Wimbledon, United Kingdom: CIPD.
- Henman, L. D. (2001). Humour as a coping mechanism: Lessons from POWs. *Humor*, 14(1), 83-94
- Huselid, M., Jackson, S., & Schuler, R. (1997). Technical and strategic human resource management effectiveness as determinants of firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 171-188.
- Daubman, K. A. ve Nowicki, G. P. Isen, A. M. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(6), 1122-1131.
- İslamoğlu, A. H., ve Alniaçık, Ü. (2014). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Ivo, A. M. (2006). Best perspectives to human resource management. *African Centre For Community And Development* (www.africancentredorcommunity.com).
- Kane, B., Crawford, J. ve Grant, D. (1999). Barriers to effective HRM. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(8), 494-515.
- Kazarian, R., Martin, A., & Shahe, S. (2004). Humour styles, personality, and well-being among Lebanese university students. *European Journal Of Personality*, 18, 209-219.
- Kidombo, H. J. (2004). Human resource management orientation and strategic responses to environmental change, *PHD Independent Study Paper*.
- Kidombo, H. J., K'Obonyo, P., ve Gakuu, C. M. (2012). Human resource strategic orientation and organizational commitment in Kenya manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Arts And Commerce*, 1(7).
- Legge, K. (1995). *HRM: Rhetorics and realities*. Basingstoke, England: Macmillan Business.
- Li-Hsing, H., Ya-Ping W., Hung-Chen H., & Hsueh-Chih C. (2012). Humor cuts both ways: Moderating effect of humor styles in the organizations. *International Journal of Advancements In Computing Technology*, 4(23).

- Martin, R.A., & Kuiper, N.A. (1999). Daily occurrence of laughter: Relationships with age, gender, and type a personality. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 12, 355-384.
- Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the humor styles questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), 48-75.
- Martineau, W. H. (1972). *A model of the social functions of humor*. In J. Goldstein, & P. McGhee, (Eds.). *The psychology of humor* (101–125). New York: Academic Press.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J., Glew, D. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2012). A meta analysis of positive humor in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(2), 155 – 190.
- Mohamed, R. (2007). *An international comparative study of the effects of 'best practice' human resource management on worker outcomes in local government organisations: A case between England and Malaysia*, Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, United Kingdom.
- Morreal, J. (2009). *Comic Relief: A comprehensive philosophy of humor*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Morris J., Wilkinson, B., & Munday, M. (2000). Farewell to HRM? Personnel practices in Japanese manufacturing plants in the UK. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(6), 1047-1060.
- Murstein, B. I. ve Brust, R. G. (1985). Humor and interpersonal attraction. *PubMed*, 49(6).
- Noon, M. (1992). HRM: *A map, model or theory?* In P. Blyton and P. Turnbull, (Eds.). *Reassessing human resource management* (16-32). London: Sage.
- Orhan, K. (2010). Amerika Birleşik Devletlerinde ve Avrupa'da insan kaynakları yönetimi yaklaşımlarının bir karşılaştırılması: Avrupalı insan kaynakları yaklaşımı mümkün müdür? *Ege Akademik Bakış / Ege Academic Review*, 10(1), 271-301.
- Özdemir, A. (2002). Okul yöneticiliğinde mizahi yaklaşım. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(3), 49-61.
- Özer, G. (2014). *Orta öğretim kurum yöneticilerinin mizah tarzlarının incelenmesi (Kayseri ili örneği)*. Yüksek lisans tezi, T.C. Erciyes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Price, A. (2004). *Human resource management in a business context*. (2nd ed.). London: Thomson Learning.
- Reisoğlu, S. (2014). *Öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluşlarını yordamada beş faktör kişilik özellikleri, mizah tarzları ve duygusal zekânın rolü*. Doktora tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Romero, E. J., & Cruthirds, K. W. (2006). The use of humor in the workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(2), 58-69.
- Schuler R. S. (1992). *Working through diversity: Human resources management*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Smith, C. M., & Powell, L. (1988). The use of disparaging humor by group leaders. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 53(spring), 279 –292.
- Storey, J. (1992). *Developments in the management of human resources: An analytical review*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell.

- Tarvin, A. (n.d.). *Using humor at work is as easy as pie*. Retrieved July 7, 2017, from <http://www.humorthatworks.com/how-to/using-humor-at-work-is-as-easy-as-pie/>
- Tayeb, M. (2005). *International human resource management: A multinational company perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Terrion, J. L. & Ashforth, B. E. (2002). From 'I' to 'we': The role of putdown humor and identity in the development of a temporary group. *Human Relations*, 55, 55–88.
- Truss, C., Gratton, L., Hope-Hailey, V., ve McGovern, P. (1997). Soft and hard models of human resource management: A reappraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(1), 53.
- Tuğsal, T. (2017). İş-Yaşam Dengesi, Sosyal Destek ve Sosyo-Demografik Faktörlerin Tükenmişlik Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Doctoral Dissertation*. İstanbul.
- Tümkiye, S. (2006). Öğretim elemanlarının mizah tarzları ve mizahı yordayıcı değişkenler. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, 23, 200-208.
- Uyargil, C. (1997). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. İstanbul: Dönence Basım ve Yayım.
- Ünal, Z. M. (2014). Influence of leaders' humor styles on the employees' job related affective well-being. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 4(1), 201–211.
- Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M., Moynihan, L. M., Park, H. J., Gerhart, P. ve Delery, J. E. (2001). Measurement Error in research on human resources and firm performance: Additional data and suggestions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 54.
- Yılmaz, K. (2011). An analysis of humor styles of school administrators. *Inonu University Journal of The Faculty of Education*, 12(1), 27-44.
- Yovetich, N. A., Dale, A., & Hudak, M. A. (1990). Benefits of humor in reduction of threat-induced anxiety. *Psychological Reports*, 66(1), 51–58.
- Ziv, A. (1984). *Personality and sense of humor*. New York: Springer.
- <https://www.slideshare.net/IGilmore/hard-versus-soft-hum> (2014)

Corresponding Author

Nilüfer Rüzgar, Bursa Technical University, Turkey, niluferruzgar@hotmail.com, Bursa Technical University 16330 Yıldırım/Bursa Turkey