

Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance and Satisfaction: Evidence from Northern Cyprus Universities

Ergün Özgür
Business Administration Department
Cyprus International University, TRNC.
Email: ergunozgur1@gmail.com

Fares Mujahed
Business Administration Department
Cyprus International University, TRNC.
Email: fmujahed@hotmail.com

Ahmad Abu Alrub
Department of Accounting and Finance
Cyprus International University, TRNC.
Email: aalrub@ciu.edu.tr

Abstract

Understanding the needs, wants, and desires of university students in multi-cultural educational system is a critical issue for any university administration. The development of an efficient system of delivering a culturally sensitive curriculum requires the development of skills to understand how to satisfy students under the care of the university. Part of this understanding is to take into account the cultural differences between students. This research seeks to examine how Hofstede's cultural dimensions namely power distance and uncertainty avoidance can be related to students' satisfaction. This was examined by applying factor analysis and ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Overall, the finding of the research will be used to determine how the students, professors and university management can coexist for a better education in North Cyprus. The research used a questionnaire as the main tool for gathering data. A sample of 637 students from the eight universities in North Cyprus was selected using the random sample procedure. While research findings indicated no relationship between high power distance and the satisfaction levels of university students, they indicated positive and significant relationship (robust relationship) between high uncertainty avoidance and the satisfaction levels of university students.

Keywords: Culture, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, satisfaction.

1. Introduction

There are eight universities in North Cyprus. They are Cyprus International University, Near East University, Eastern Mediterranean University, Girne American University, European University of Lefke, University of Mediterranean Karpasis, Istanbul Technical University, and Middle East Technical University. Six of them are local universities and two are the branches of the Middle Technical University in Ankara and Istanbul Technical University in Istanbul. Cyprus International University reported that the number of students in 2006 was 3545 and it rose to 7948 in 2014. As one can see, there is a growing number of students. They are from Turkey, Turkish Republic Northern Cyprus (TRNC), African, East Asian and Middle Eastern countries. Considering the number of all these students, Cyprus becomes a hub for the students from many different nationalities and cultures.

Despite all these figures and numbers, universities in North Cyprus are confronted with challenges such as bridging the cultural gap between the different nationalities. One of these pressing issues is students' satisfaction. Anderson and Zemke (1998) argue that it is very important for organizations to satisfy their customers. Satisfied customers will increase the organization's profit margin whilst dissatisfied customers

will weaken their growth. In contrast to the easily quantifiable improvements that are currently taking place in universities, little attention is given to the less quantifiable aspect of culture and its diversity. For instance, Eastern Mediterranean University (2012) has recognized in its strategic plan for 2012-2015 that one of the challenges is that comprehensive and effective policies should be formulated in coordination with all stakeholders. In the same plan, it is emphasized that one of the actions to be taken is the improvement and development of the campus infrastructure in line with the developments in educational technologies. The challenge of meeting the cross-cultural variations among students is receiving less attention, one can guess. However, it is recognized that education abroad offers an individual the opportunity to expand his/her experience and to connect with other international community. Builtjens and Noorderhaven (1996) hinted that leaders and managers at both the international and cross-cultural levels take decisions which consider their countries' norms and values. This fact leads to the necessity of training employees of multi-national organizations to be more culturally sensitive to the differences across cultures. As we are living in a globalized world, studying culture and its influences on education is a necessity.

This paper seeks to place culture into the debate of students' satisfaction, and calls for the universities to consider the cultures of students and adapt accordingly. This is to avoid potential decrease in numbers in the future or resistance by those who are not satisfied. McColl-Kennedy and Schneider (2000) point out that customers are important for any organization like other assets. Thus organizations have to monitor and manage customer satisfaction in an effective way so as to prosper and be more competitive with their rivals. This assertion holds also true for students as they are the customers of the universities. The paper also searches to determine how power distance and uncertainty avoidance can be taken into consideration by the universities in North Cyprus as cultural dimensions influencing their students' satisfaction. The paper also presupposes that knowledge of culture and its influence can be useful in Northern Cyprus universities. This is of course going beyond the design of both materials and platforms because they are not considering the impact of culture on students' satisfaction in the learning environment.

The research is conducted on both undergraduates and postgraduates students in order to investigate the power distance and uncertainty avoidance cultural dimensions on students' satisfaction. It is assumed that students studying in North Cyprus have variances in their satisfaction due to these two cultural dimensions. Accordingly, the students' perspectives are explored to learn the differences among students in terms of their satisfaction level. The present research argues that there is noticeably insufficient amount of research investigating the relationship between Hofstede dimensions, namely power distance and uncertainty avoidance and university students' satisfaction especially when students are coming from different nations. Overall, the findings of the research will be used to determine how the students, professors and university management can coexist for better future education in North Cyprus.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Erez and Christopher (1993, p.43) states that "societies shape their collectives and aggregates according to the rules implied by culture." However, there are different definitions of culture. Schein (2004, p.17) defines culture as "a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems." Hofstede (1980, p.13) defines culture as "the collective programming of the mind." Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) states that culture includes manners of thinking and behavior inherited and transmitted from one generation to another. These manners are elaborated through direct reciprocal action between, family members, friends, groups, work colleagues and community. In contrast to what has been introduced by Hofstede (1980) in terms of defining culture, Kuper (1999, p.299) describes culture as an issue of ideas and values with a combined shaping of mind. Interestingly, some other scholars go beyond that like Geertz (1993) who demonstrates that culture from a historical point of view is transmitted with different patterns of meanings characterized by symbols through which people communicate, maintain, and grow their knowledge, attitudes and perceptions toward life.

All these definitions and most probably others, despite some of the differences between them, show that human activity is influenced by culture. Monaghan and Just (2000) inform us that culture has a direct influence on human activity. Others have emphasized the deep roots of culture and its influences on values and beliefs, whether these beliefs and values are rational or not.

In offering education, it is important to strengthen the ties between different nations and to consider the variances between cultures so as to make the students more satisfied. Parrish and Linder-VanBerschot (2010) assume that different levels of culture exist within many structures including workplaces, family and community. This existence takes place not only at the regional level but also at the national and even international levels. This requires that teachers have to recognize the implications and consequences of culture on the teaching and learning environment. Nisbett (2003) reveals that teachers must be knowledgeable of their learners' culture to be able to interpret and analyze how those cultures demonstrate and manifest themselves in learning processes.

Hofstede (1980, 2001) and Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) developed a framework for describing cultural differences based on five value dimensions. These dimensions are high power distance versus low power distance, high uncertainty avoidance versus low uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity and long-term orientation versus short-term orientation. The development of these dimensions was done by a staff survey at IBM Corporation. Hofstede has lately added the sixth dimension which is indulgence versus restraint. According to the Hofstede (2015), indulgence "stands for a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun. Restraint stands for a society that suppresses gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms."

According to Hofstede (2015), power distance dimension "expresses the degree to which the less powerful members of a society accept and expect that power is distributed unequally." Thus, in a society with high power distance, superiors are inaccessible by those inferior in positions while in a society with a low power distance, superiors are accessible and there is a feeling of equal distribution of power. Huq, Tyler and Schulhofer (2011) pointed out that individuals of various ethnicities recognize ways of interaction differently. What might be fair and acceptable in one ethnic group might not be fair and acceptable in another one in the lights of the expectancy of behaviors of an authoritative agency. This leads us to the notion that culture and ethnic groups might be perceived to conciliate outcomes of attitudes and individuals in societal reciprocity.

According to Hofstede (2015), uncertainty avoidance dimension "expresses the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity." Individuals who live in a low uncertainty avoidance culture usually tend to prefer not to be bound by regulations and rules, so they prefer to be free. The opposite is true for people who live in a high uncertainty avoidance culture. The choices are not many for individuals. They either want to stay away from these situations by imposing firm behavioral norms and asserting values and beliefs in complete factuality or else they accept the new situations by changing the ruling regulations into flexible ones. Stress and anxiety are the main distinguishing characteristics of strong uncertainty avoidance cultures. Another characteristic is the urge to have written laws, regulations and rules. On the contrary, people in a weak uncertainty avoidance culture try to take risk and tolerate different situations of uncertainty. Moreover, there is a higher degree of acceptance to change, a higher degree of tolerance for differences in opinions and a greater preparation for exposure to danger.

2.2 Related Researches

2.2.1 Cultural Dimensions and Satisfaction

A number of studies used Hofstede's (1980) power distance dimension as a tool to examine the practices of business. Some of them aimed to examine the relationship between power distance and satisfaction. Cropanzano et al. (1997) observed that equality and power distance go in sharp contrast with each other. Interestingly and figuratively, he noted that the organization and its atmosphere will be poisoned if there is

injustice. Injustice inside organizations reduces the level of energy and increases the level of laziness. It means that the less the power distance the more the satisfaction is. Fock et al. (2013) studied the effects of power distance on some kinds of empowerment. They conducted their study on a number of employees from China and Canada. One of their findings indicated that the effect of the leadership empowerment on satisfaction was found to be more influential on low power distance (Canada) culture compared to high power distance (China) culture. Rafiei and Pourreza (2013) investigated the impact of power distance on the relationship between participation and a number of variables. Findings showed that there is a relationship between the level of power distance and job satisfaction.

Other studies aimed to examine the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and satisfaction. Häkkinen and Järvelä (2006) emphasized the significance of creating reciprocal understanding or common goals and values. It can be said that studies support an argument that a learner's uncertainty avoidance may have an influence on his learning experience but it does not give information about how this may affect his satisfaction. Karahanna et al. (2013) studied the impact of uncertainty avoidance on consumer perceptions and attitudes of e-loyalty. Results showed that uncertainty avoidance has an impact on information quality in relation to usefulness and e-loyalty. It is implied in this study that the more e-loyalty, the more satisfaction is. Reimann et al. (2008) indicated that customers vary in their level of satisfaction when there is a problem or defect in the service provided to them, especially when their expectations are not met. Customers who are from cultures with high level of uncertainty avoidance were less satisfied than customers who are from cultures with low uncertainty avoidance.

2.2.2 Cultural Dimensions and Other Related Issues

Many studies have aimed to examine or to expand upon Hofstede's (1980) principal findings. Cronjé (2010) concluded that three variables affect the cultures' roles when there is a conflict. These variables are communicative uncertainty reduction, shared meanings construction, and the appropriate usage of technology. Purohit and Simmers (2006) researched Hofstede's power distance dimension. They found that people from US, Nigeria, and India show different behavior patterns in terms of solving their administrative conflicts.

Rodrigues (2005), and Sulkowski and Deakin (2010) found that culture has a direct influence on learner's perceptions, expectations and preferences. This has been found to be related and reflected in whether they have a preference to be either active or passive, have more or less responsibility for learning, and prefer interaction with peers or teachers. Psychologists from several societies and organizations used power distance dimension of Hofstede. They clearly concluded that power distance measurements of individuals are so crucial to anticipate and understand people's societal behaviors. Among them are Tyler, Lind and Huo (2000) who proposed that measurement of respondents about conflict reconciliation procedures responses would interpret behavior. The same proposition is suggested by Farh et al. (2007) regarding workplace discerned institutional support. They recommended that investigators have to assess and analyze values of culture at the personal level. They have particularly placed a great importance to power distance. Zhang (2013) explored Chinese students' attitudes of power distance and its influence on their communication with teachers and peers in an online learning setting. It is found that teachers were seen by students as major sources of knowledge, having high power and possessing authority. Moreover, Chinese students who face some difficulties in learning were not feeling easy to communicate with teachers. Instead they preferred to ask assistance from peers who share similar linguistic and cultural background. Rahmat and Fayazi (2006) showed that power distance in institutions has a negative relationship with institutional loyalty and performance.

Sulimma (2009) mentioned that students who are high in UA prefer well-structured learning, show interest to get the right answers, expect that the teacher has the correct answers, and refer results to circumstances rather than confessing self-control for their learning. Deepwell and Malik (2008) postulated that students who are high in UA may have a tendency to take online learning because it depends on the learners being self-directed to finish assignments and to become more involved with various discussions and collaborations with peers, to have an access to library resources, research and development and to work on materials given by the tutors.

Mansoor and Tayib (2010) demonstrated that institutional culture has strong powerful influence on job satisfaction. Chang and Lee (2007) speculated that culture affects employees' job satisfaction. They also emphasized that a suitable culture in organizations increases job satisfaction of employees. Hence there is a strong positive correlation between culture and job satisfaction. Amos and Weathington (2008) emphasized that an appropriate organizational culture has a positive impact on employees, gives them satisfaction and increases their commitment to the organization.

Andreassi et al. (2012) examined the factors affecting job satisfaction across four-regional cultures. One of the findings of their study showed that differences do exist in relation to significance of job attributes on job satisfaction. Sabri et al. (2011) studied the effect of organizational culture on job satisfaction level of instructors working at institutes and universities in Lahore, Pakistan. Findings showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction. Ndubisi et al. (2012) researched culture's role in the association of quality of relationship with loyalty of customers. The results revealed that uncertainty avoidance has a significant association with loyalty. Broadly speaking, this shows that culture explains customer's loyalty. Richard et al. (2002) reported that processes that foster justice in organizations are crucial. They also emphasized that the way organizations deal with employees has an influence on attitudes, perceptions, feeling, beliefs, and behaviors. Kuh et al. (2005) explained that students' persistence, engagement and participation in learning will increase when resources and values of the institution enrich the students' educational experience.

2.3 Research Hypotheses

The research focuses on how students' power distance and uncertainty avoidance affect their satisfaction. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H1: There is a positive and significant relationship between high power distance and the satisfaction levels of university students.

H2: There is a positive and significant relationship between high uncertainty avoidance and the satisfaction levels of university students.

H3: Nationality, level of education and gender have a positive effect on the relationship between power distance and uncertainty avoidance and the satisfaction levels of university student.

3. Methodology

The study adopted a quantitative methodology. The paper used a sample in order to understand the students' satisfaction along Hofstede's cultural dimensions namely power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Because of using the random sample procedure, the data were transformed to standardized variables (Z-score) so as to overcome any problems in the estimated standard deviation. The following Z-score equation was used to provide an assessment of how off-target a process is operating:

$$Zscore_{e_i} = \frac{X_i + \mu_i}{\sigma}$$

Where; X_i is the standard score, μ_i is the mean of the population, and σ is the standard deviation of the population. Then, OLS robust model was applied to investigate the relationship between the exogenous variables and students' satisfaction. The formula was expressed as follows:

$$S_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PD_i + \beta_2 UV_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n=3} \beta_i(N_i, LE_i, G_i) + \epsilon_i$$

Where; S_i : represents students' satisfaction, PD_i : represents power distance, UV_i : represents uncertainty avoidance, (N_i, LE_i, G_i) : represents nationality, level of education, and Gender, and ϵ_i : error term.

The researchers utilized both primary and secondary data. The primary data were collected from students of the eight universities in North Cyprus. The secondary data were obtained from books, journals and the

Internet. A random sample of 750 students from North Cyprus universities was selected. A total of 637 students provided responses. The response rate was 85%.

Students responded to a paper questionnaire that assessed power distance, uncertainty avoidance and students' satisfaction. Thus, the instrument of the research was composed of three scales. The first one was power distance scale of Hofstede (1980) which was composed of three items. The second scale was uncertainty avoidance scale of Hofstede (1980) which was composed of four items. The third scale is satisfaction scale of SurveyMonkey (2015) which is composed of fifteen items. These items were measured on a 5 point Likert scale. The reliability of the questionnaire was measured by Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Another tool used for the analysis was Factor analysis in order to describe the correlated variables and variability among observation.

4. Results

4.1 Demographic Statistics

The data showed that 62% of the respondents were males, while 38% of them were females. It also showed that 59.5% of the respondents were undergraduates, while 40.5% of them were postgraduates. While the data showed that most of the respondents were from Nigeria with a percentage of 18.45%, and Turkey with a percentage of 14.9%, they showed that least of them were from India with a percentage of 0.9% and Lebanon 1.3%. Table 1 shows the frequency and percentages of the demographic variables.

Table 1. Sample Distribution of Demographic Variables

Variables		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	395	62%
	Female	242	38%
	Total	637	100%
Educational Level	Undergraduate	379	59.5%
	Postgraduate	258	40.5%
	Total	637	100%
Nationality	Nigeria	117	18.45%
	Turkey	95	14.9%
	Iraq	51	8.0%
	Syria	48	7.5%
	Libya	47	7.4%
	North Cyprus	45	7.1%
	Russia	39	6.1%
	Turkmenistan	31	4.9%
	Zambia	30	4.7%
	Palestine	24	3.8%
	Rwanda	23	3.6%
	Jordan	20	3.1%
	Iran	19	3.0%
	Egypt	14	2.2%
	Somalia	10	1.6%
	Ghana	10	1.6%
	Lebanon	8	1.3%
India	6	0.9%	
Total	637	100%	

4.2. Factor Analysis - Measure of Sampling Adequacy

Bartlett's test has been employed for the power distance group of questions. It is found that the approx. Chi-Square is 40.482, the degree of freedom is 3.00, and significance is 0.000. Findings show that the value of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) is 0.569. This result shows that the data were adequate for factor analysis. Bartlett's test has also been used for the uncertainty avoidance group of questions. It is found that the approx. Chi-Square is 125.087, degree of freedom is 6.00, and significance is 0.000. Results show that the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) is 0.643. This result also shows that the data were adequate for factor analysis (Hutcheson and Sofroniou, 1999).

Bartlett's test has finally been employed for the satisfaction group of questions. It is found that the approx. Chi-Square is 750.493, degree of freedom is 120.00, and significance is 0.000. Findings show that the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) is 0.772. This finding shows that the data were adequate for factor analysis. 15 factors have been extracted. Out of them 2 items have been excluded due to the value of factor loading which was less than 0.5.

According to factor Analysis table, all the variables are well fitted in factor solution. This is because most of the factors have loading value more than 0.50 except 2 items in the group questions of satisfaction. The result of factor analysis gives evidence to the proper use of the instrument which measures the variables of power distance and uncertainty avoidance and allows to proceed for data collection. The reliabilities of the scales were tested by performing the Cronbach's Alpha reliability statistics. Results were more than 75% (power distance: 0.771, Uncertainty avoidance: 0.818 and satisfaction: 0.763) which indicate the high reliability of the present measure of the scales. Factor analysis table shows that the determinant is more than 0.00001. This indicates the absence of multicollinearity. Table 2 shows the factor analysis results. (See appendix 1).

4.3 Testing of Hypotheses

The multiple regression analyses were performed on the mean scores data collected from the respondents. In model 1, the R Square value is 0.825 which means that dimensions of power distance and uncertainty avoidance account for 82.5% of the variation in students' satisfaction. The adjusted R square value is 0.825 which is the same as R Square, which means that this model is acceptable (See Table 3).

Table 3. Model Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses.

Independent variables	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3				Model 4				
	β		Collinearity Diagnostics		β		Collinearity Diagnostics		β		Collinearity Diagnostics		β		Collinearity Diagnostics		
	Tolerance	VIF	Tolerance	VIF	Tolerance	VIF	Tolerance	VIF	Tolerance	VIF	Tolerance	VIF	Tolerance	VIF			
Constant	0.002 (0.007)	---	---	---	0.007 (0.012)	---	---	---	-0.010 (0.020)	---	---	---	---	-0.031 (0.029)	---	---	
Power Distance	-0.017 (0.011)	0.996	1.004	1.004	-0.017 (0.011)	0.992	1.008	1.008	-0.017 (0.011)	0.992	1.008	1.008	0.991	-0.017 (0.011)	0.991	1.009	
Uncertainty Avoidance	0.982 (0.018)***	0.996	1.004	1.004	0.982 (0.018)***	0.993	1.007	1.007	0.980 (0.018)***	0.981	1.020	1.020	0.980	0.979 (0.018)***	0.980	1.021	
Nationality					-0.001 (0.002)	0.994	1.006	1.006	-0.001 (0.002)	0.991	1.009	1.009	0.991	-0.001 (0.002)	0.991	1.009	
Level of Education									0.010 (0.001)	0.985	1.015	1.015	0.984	0.011 (0.001)	0.984	1.017	
Gender														-0.030 (0.015)**	0.997	1.003	
No of respondents	637				637				637					637			
R square	0.825				0.825				0.826					0.827			
Adjusted R square	0.825				0.824				0.825					0.825			
F-test	1494.344***				995.176***				598.444***					601.096***			
Durbin-Watson	1.902				1.911				1.912					1.908			

** and *** denote significant level at P < 0.05 and P < 0.01 respectively. Based on Standard errors are in parentheses. Note: Durbin-Watson of residuals test indicates that the residual does not display any serial correlation.

The value of F-test is 1494.344. This means that it is highly significant ($p \leq 0.0001$). The coefficient value for the power distance variable is -0.017 which is not significant. Therefore, the variable of high power distance does not affect the students' satisfaction. On the contrary, the coefficient value for uncertainty avoidance variable is 0.982 which is significant. Thus, the variable of high uncertainty avoidance is positively and significantly related to students' satisfaction.

In terms of collinearity diagnostics, the value of tolerance in model 1 is 0.996 for both power distance and uncertainty avoidance. This result confirms the absence of perfect multi-collinearity since it is more than 0.02. Both variables also share the variance inflation factor (VIF) value which is 1.004. This value is less than 5.00. Hence, it shows that there is no multicollinearity between the independent variables (power distance and uncertainty avoidance). Each one of them has a distinct relationship with the dependent variable (students' satisfaction). The value of Durbin-Watson test in all models indicates "white noise residual", which means that there is no autocorrelation.

The Robust Model takes into consideration to analyze the impacts of the demographic variables namely country, gender and educational level on the variables of power distance and uncertainty avoidance with their relationship with the variable of students' satisfaction. Results show almost the consistency of the R Square in all models: 0.825 for Model 2, 0.826 for Model 3, and 0.827 for Model 4. Considering the hypotheses of the research, this is an indication that the sample has approximately the same cultural characteristics in terms of power distance and uncertainty avoidance.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Most of the students in North Cyprus are from Turkey, African Countries, Arab countries and Asian countries. Regarding power distance and uncertainty avoidance, almost all of these countries score high on power distance and uncertainty avoidance dimension of Hofstede 1980. It can be implied that variations do not exist on the studied sample.

Findings of this research showed that there is no statistically significant relationship between high power distance and students' satisfaction ($p < 0.05$). This result is consistent with the results of other researchers conducted over the previous years (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Fock et al., 2013; Rafiei and Pourreza, 2013). The findings of these researches confirmed that low power distance in organizations is linked to higher degree of satisfaction. It can be stated that students' satisfaction is not strengthened by the increase or decrease of power distance. It seems that students consider other factors as influential of their levels of satisfaction. One of these factors could be the quality of the teaching staff. It is assumed that the teaching staff play a crucial role in the level of students' satisfaction. Other factors may be library resources, IT assistance, psychological comfort, rewards of study, support services, and general life satisfaction. In investigating the relationship between high power distance dimension, students' satisfaction and students' demographic factors and variables, the results showed no statistically significant relationship. The reason for this may be attributed to the great number of students who come from high power distance countries to study in North Cyprus universities and the lack of students who come from low power distance countries. Therefore, H1 is not supported.

The results of the research indicated that there is a statistically significant relationship between high uncertainty avoidance and students' satisfaction ($p < 0.05$). This result is almost consistent with the results of other researchers conducted during the previous years (Häkkinen and Järvelä, 2006; Karahanna et al., 2013; Reimann et al., 2008). The result means that students who have high uncertainty avoidance levels in North Cyprus universities are more satisfied. This result suggests that university students in North Cyprus have availability of clear procedures, policies and regulatory framework that guide their academic life in North Cyprus. It can also be implied that students do not consider academic life in North Cyprus as vague, and that most of their expectations are met. In other words, students do not find it difficult to adapt to the existing culture. In investigating the relationship between high uncertainty avoidance dimension, students' satisfaction and students' demographic factors and variables, the results showed no statistically significant

relationship. The reason for this may also be attributed to the great number of students who come from high uncertainty avoidance countries to study in North Cyprus universities. Therefore, H2 is supported.

However, management and lecturers of North Cyprus universities need to be very formal when dealing with their students. They have to clearly formulate laws, rules, procedures, and policies. It is advisable that those universities leave nothing unclear or unexplained. This is important because not doing so would result in a serious challenge to the students' levels of satisfaction. It can also be said that failure by universities' managements in North Cyprus to consider cultural differences of students especially uncertainty avoidance dimension leads to decreased levels of satisfaction.

As the demographic variables of nationality, level of education and gender have no positive effect on the relationship between power distance and uncertainty avoidance and the satisfaction levels of university student, it is concluded that H3 is not supported.

To conclude, the findings of the study showed some differences between students from different cultures in terms of their level of satisfaction towards the universities in North Cyprus. These differences regarding cultural values may have various implications to universities' administrations. Raising the level of understanding of these cultural variations especially power distance and uncertainty avoidance dimensions would contribute to develop more effective learning/teaching strategies, and would improve the abilities of universities to satisfy students who come from multi-cultural communities. Therefore, the researchers recommend that decision makers in North Cyprus universities should take into consideration the cultural dimensions in order to raise the level of students' satisfaction of their universities.

This research added evidence to the existing literature, and contributed to current understanding of power distance and uncertainty avoidance and their relation to satisfaction. Future studies could focus on other aspects of cultural influence on students' satisfaction. For instance, researches can focus on addressing the complex issue of students' satisfaction from all its perspectives. Other researches can also replicate this study in different countries, together with studying all Hofstede cultural dimensions and their impact on satisfaction.

References

- Amos, E.A. and Weathington, B.L. (2008). An Analysis of the Relation between Employee Organization Value Congruence and Employee Attitudes. *The Journal of Psychology*, 142 (6), 615-631.
- Anderson, K. and Zemke, R. (1998). *Delivering Knock Your Socks off Service*, NY: Amacon.
- Andreassi, J. K.; Lawter, L.; Brockerhoff, M.; and Rutigliano, P. (2012). Job Satisfaction Determinants: A Study Across 48 Nations. *WCOB Faculty Publications*, 220, 192-215.
- Builtjens, P.M. and Noorderhaven, N.G. (1996). *The Influence of National Culture on Strategic Decision-making: A Case Study of the Philippines*, Tilburg University and Institute for Research and Intercultural Cooperation.
- Chang, S. and Lee, M. S. (2007). A Study on the Relationship among Leadership, Organizational Culture, the Operation of Learning Organization and Employees Job Satisfaction. *Learning Organization*, 14 (2), 155-185
- CIU (2015). Cyprus International University. <http://www.ciu.edu.tr/en/hakkimizda/bunlari-biliyormuydunuz/> (Retrieved on: 01.05. 2015)
- Cronjé, J. (2010). Using Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions to Interpret Cross-cultural Blended Teaching and Learning. *Elsevier Journal: Computers and Education*, 56 (2011), 596-603.

Cropanzano, R.; Howes, J. C.; Grandey, A. A.; and Toth, P. (1997). The Relationship of Organizational Politics and Support to Work Behaviors, Attitudes and Stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18 (2), 159-180.

Deepwell, F. and Malik, S. (2008). On Campus, But out of Class: An Investigation into Students' Experiences of Learning Technologies in their Self-directed Study. *Research in Learning Technology*, [online] Available at: <http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/rlt/article/view/10881>

EMU (2015). Eastern Mediterranean University. http://ww1.emu.edu.tr/emu_v1/media/assets/files/emu-new-strategic-plan.pdf (Retrieved on: 25.04.2015)

Erez, M. and P. Christopher E. (1993). *Culture, Self-Identity, and Work*. Oxford University Press, Inc. New York.

Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., and Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level Cultural Values as Moderators of Perceived Organizational Support–Employee Outcome Relationships in China: Comparing the Effects of Power Distance and Traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (3), 715-729.

Fock, H., Hui, M., Au, K., and Bond, M. (2013). Moderation Effects of Power Distance on the Relationship Between Types of Empowerment and Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44 (2), 281-298.

Geertz, C. (1993). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London, UK: Fontana Press.

Häkkinen, P. and Järvelä, S. (2006). Sharing and Constructing Perspectives in Web-based Conferencing. *Computers and Education*, 47 (4), 433–447.

Hofstede, G. and Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Attitudes*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (2015). Dimensions of National Culture. <http://www.geerthofstede.com/dimensions-of-national-cultures> (Retrieved on: 27.4.2015)

Huq., A. Z., Tyler, T. R., and Schulhofer, S. J. (2011). Why Does the Public Cooperate with Law Enforcement? The Influence of the Purposes and Targets of Policing. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 17, 419-450.

Hutcheson, G. D., and Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The Multivariate Social Scientist: an introduction to generalized linear models*. Sage Publications.

Karahanna, E., Williams, K., Polites, G., Liu, B. and Seligman, L. (2013). Uncertainty Avoidance and Consumer Perceptions of Global e-Commerce Sites: A Multi-Level Model. *Drake Management Review*, 3 (1), 12-47.

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H. and Whitt, E. (2005). *Student Success in College. Creating Conditions that Matter*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Kuper, A. (1999). *Culture: The Anthropologists' Account*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Mansoor, M. and Tayib, M. (2010). An Empirical Examination of Organizational Culture, Job Stress, Job Satisfaction within the Indirect Tax Administration in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1 (1), 81-95.

McColl-Kennedy, J.R. and Schneider, U. (2000). Measuring Customer Satisfaction: Why, What and How? *Total Quality Management*, 11 (7), 883-896.

Monaghan, J. and Just, P. (2000). *Social and Cultural Anthropology: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ndubisi, N., Malhotra, N., Ulas, D. and Ndubisi, G. (2012). Examining Uncertainty Avoidance, Relationship Quality, and Customer Loyalty in Two Cultures. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 24 (5), 320-337.

Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently and Why*. New York: Free Press.

Orlando, R. (2002). Procedural Voice and Distributive Justice. *Journal of Business Research*, 55 (9), 725-735.

Parrish, P. and Linder-VanBerschoot J.A. (2010). Cultural Dimensions of Learning: Addressing the Challenges of Multicultural Instruction. *International Review of Research in Open and distance Learning*: ISSN:1492-3831 V(11) N(2) (http://books.google.com.mt/books?id=BkmU-FaKed8C&dq=inauthor:%22Helene+Andrawiss%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=No-OUIcPMpPE4gT_gYGwBw&ved=0CCwQ6AEwAA)

Purohit, Y. S. and Simmers, C. A. (2006). Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance: Cross-national Examination of Their Impact on Conflict Management Modes. *Journal of International Business Research*, 5 (1), 1-19.

Rafiei, S. and Pourreza, A. (2013). The Moderating Role of Power Distance on the Relationship between Employee Participation and Outcome Variables. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 1 (1), 79-83.

Rahmat S. H. and Fayazi, M. (2006). Relationship between Power Perception, Commitment and Employee Performance. *Journal of Humanity and Social Sciences*, 8 (29), 73-96.

Reimann, M., Lünemann, U.F. and Chase, R.B. (2008). Uncertainty Avoidance as a Moderator of the Relationship between Perceived Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Service Research*, 11 (1), 63-73.

Richard, O. C., Taylor, E. C., Barnett, T., and Nesbit, M. F. A. (2002). Procedural Voice and Distributive Justice: Their Influence on Mentoring Career Help and Other Outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 55 (9), 725-735.

Rodrigues, C. A. (2005). Culture as a Determinant of the Importance Level Business Students Place on Ten Teaching/Learning Techniques: a Survey of University Students. *The Journal of Management Development*, 24 (7/8), 608-621.

Sabri, P. and Ilyas, M. and Amjad, Z. (2011). Organizational Culture and Its Impact on the Job Satisfaction of the University Teachers of Lahore. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (24), 121-128.

Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 3rd Edition. Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. San Francisco.

Sulimma, M. (2009). Relations between Epistemological Beliefs and Culture Classifications. *Multicultural Education and Technology Journal*, 3 (1), 74-89.

Sulkowski, N. and Deakin, M. K. (2010). Implications of Internationalisation on Learning and Teaching - Listening to the Winds of Change? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 9 (1), 110-116.

SurveyMonkey Inc. (2015). www.surveymonkey.com. Palo Alto, California, USA. Available at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/university-student-satisfaction-survey-template>. Retrieved on: 15.03.2015.

Tyler, T. R., Lind, E. A., and Huo, Y. J. (2000). Cultural Values and Authority Relations: The Psychology of Conflict Resolution across Cultures. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 6 (4), 1138-1163.

Zhang, Y. (2013). Power Distance in Online Learning: Experience of Chinese Learners in U.S. Higher Education. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 14 (4), 238-254.

Appendix 1

Table 2. Factor and Reliability Analyses.

Variables	Items	Factor Loading	Reliability Cronbach's Alpha	Determinant	KMO	Bartlett's Test		
						Approx Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Power Distance	I prefer dialogues to top-down teaching.	0.675	0.771	0.938	0.569	40.482	3	0.000
	Classroom power is to be shared between teachers and students.	0.663						
	I take responsibility for my own learning.	0.639						
Uncertainty Avoidance	I build my learning on previous experiences.	0.671	0.818	0.821	0.643	125.087	6	0.000
	Homework should follow strict instructions.	0.640						
	I prefer YES or NO answers.	0.635						
	I prefer structured learning	0.564						
Satisfaction	How easy is it to register for courses at this university?	0.860	0.763	0.301	0.772	750.493	120	0.000
	How crowded are the dormitory facilities at this university?	0.776						
	How happy are you with the choice of university-sponsored extracurricular activities at this university?	0.756						
	How fair are the administrative procedures at this university?	0.745						
	How well do the professors teach at this university?	0.719						
	How helpful is the staff at the on-campus health center?	0.670						
	How helpful is your academic advisor?	0.638						
How healthy is the food served at this university?	0.633							

How safe do you feel on campus?	0.632					
How well-maintained are the facilities at this university?	0.596					
How effective is the teaching outside your major at this university?	0.552					
How useful are the services provided by the on-campus career center?	0.513					
How easy is it to obtain the resources you need from the university library system?	0.508					
How likely are you to continue attending this university next year? *	0.448					
How likely are you to recommend this university to others? *	0.363					

* Denotes that the item is excluded, value of factor loading <0.5.