



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN ACCOUNTING, FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES



Gender Differences on Perceptions of Employee Quality of Working Life Indicators in Five Star Hotels in Turkey

Derya Kara

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v2-i4/9984>

DOI:10.6007/IJARAFMS /v2-i4/9984

Received: 16 October 2012, **Revised:** 18 November 2012, **Accepted:** 02 December 2012

Published Online: 28 December 2012

In-Text Citation: (Kara, 2012)

To Cite this Article: Kara, D. (2012). Gender Differences on Perceptions of Employee Quality of Working Life Indicators in Five Star Hotels in Turkey. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting Finance and Management Sciences*, 2(4), 158–167.

Copyright: © 2012 The Author(s)

Published by Human Resource Management Academic Research Society (www.hrmars.com)

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Vol. 2, No. 4, 2012, Pg. 158 - 167

<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARAFMS>

JOURNAL HOMEPAGE

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics>



Gender Differences on Perceptions of Employee Quality of Working Life Indicators in Five Star Hotels in Turkey

Derya Kara

Department of Tourism Management Education Commerce and Tourism Education Faculty
Gazi University Ankara, Turkey
Email: deryakara@gazi.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of the study is to examine gender differences on perceptions of employees' quality of working life indicators in five star hotels in Turkey. 443 hotel employees participated in this study. Quality of work life was measured using 7 dimension and 16 items scale. All these dimensions were investigated with respect to gender variable. According these results male employees reported significantly different mean scores in health & safety needs, actualization needs, and knowledge needs in quality of working life indicators. However; economic & family needs, social needs, esteem needs, and aesthetic needs factors were not statistically significant. This finding is also consistent with the results obtained from Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) in which the independent variable was gender and the quality of working life indicators were dependent variables. Finally, MANCOVA analysis was conducted while controlling for such variables as age, marital status, income level, education, and type of department, type of work, length of time in this organization, and length of time in the tourism sector. Specifically, males and females displayed more significant distinctions after controlling for these variables.

Keywords: Gender Differences, Quality of Work Life Indicators, Turkey

Introduction

Quality of work life is the essential concept of favorable situations in a working environment. Legislation enacted in early 20th century to protect employees from job-injury and to eliminate hazardous working conditions, firstly. It was continued following years and finally, in the 1970s the ideal of quality of work life was conceived and from 1980 onwards it was increasingly placed on employee-centered productivity programs. In the mid 1990 till today faced with challenges of economize and corporate restructuring (Pugalendhi et. al, 2010).

In the wake of the most difficult economic times of the century, noted downsizing and restructuring, increased competition, and decreasing demand within tourism organizations has necessitated the focus on employment practices. Employees are the lifeblood of any tourism organization and a motivated, committed, and loyal staff is considered a competitive advantage in

the workplace. Employees, who are provided a high quality of work life, are more productive and effective (Janes and Wisnom, 2011). Therefore, the current study aims to investigate gender differences on perceptions of employee quality of working life in five star hotels in Turkey. To accomplish the study objectives, this paper is organized as follows. A brief review of the literature, a description of the study methodology, respondent profiles and data analysis are presented. Surprisingly, the literature review did not reveal any study of this nature in Turkey. Moreover, the study results can provide useful information to organizations designing gender issue.

Definition of Quality of Work Life (QWL)

Quality of working life has been used in many different ways to refer to a wide variety of phenomena. In general, the term has been used to encompass such factors as providing adequate and fair compensation to employees, guaranteeing a safe and healthful working environment, and providing employees with opportunities to develop and use their unique skills and abilities (Chisholm, 1983). In the original discussions, conferences, and studies, many of us working in this area saw quality of work life as an individual's reaction to work or the personal consequences of the work experience (Nadler and Lawler 3rd, 1983). The quality of working life can be defined as the quality of relationship between the employees and the work environment (Ganguly, 2010). It has been well recognized as a multi-dimensional construct and discussed in the existing literature include job security, better reward systems, higher pay, opportunity for growth, participative groups, and increased organizational productivity, among others (May, 1999). Moreover, Janes and Wisnom (2011) reported that three things are important and have value in the hospitality industry; good wages, job security, and opportunities for advancement. While these are important motivators, they may not work for everyone. Some employees are better motivated by praise, recognition, openness or honesty.

Quality of work life is related with the overall climate of work and the impact on work, people and organization effectiveness (Pugalendhi et. al, 2010). Rose et al (2006) reported that quality of work life consists of opportunities for active involvement in group working arrangements or problem solving that are of mutual benefit to employees or employers, based on labor management cooperation. People also conceive of quality of work life as a set of methods, such as autonomous work groups, job enrichment, and high-involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of workers (Rose et al, 2006). Quality of work life is not a unitary concept and not only include work-based factors, such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay and relationships with work colleagues, but also factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being (Jagannathan and Akhila, 2009). Moreover, Sirgy et. al (2001) supported that quality of work life refers to the impact of the workplace on satisfaction in work life, satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel and Lee, 2001). The employees' satisfaction and reward expectations are influenced by their work environment (employees' jobs, supervisors, and work groups, and the organizational structure and technology) and the extent to which it provides valued rewards (Macy and Mirvis, 1976).

Quality of work life was measured several dimensions by different researchers. Porter (1961) developed his Need Satisfaction Questionnaire and seven needs were originally used and divided into three different need dimensions including survival need (comprised of security and pay needs), social need (comprised of need for interpersonal interactions and friendships and need for membership), and ego need (comprised of need for self-esteem, need for autonomy; and self-actualization needs

(Porter, 1961). The concept 'quality of working life' has been combined from literature findings and includes eight aspects: work motivation, learning opportunities, job satisfaction, work atmosphere, health and safety, participation in decision making, realization of personal/team-level targets, and reward system (Ukko et. al, 2008). Walton (1973) proposed eight major conceptual categories for analyzing quality of working life. These are adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, future opportunity for continual growth and security, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and the total life span and finally social relevance of work life. Connell and Hanif (2009) reported Quality of working life factors as three dimensions job content, working hours and work-life balance, and managerial/supervisory style and strategies. Sirgy et al. (2001) is conceptualized quality of working life domains as satisfaction of health and safety needs, economic and family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetics needs (Sirgy et al., 2001).

The basic objectives of an effective quality of work life program are improved working conditions (mainly from an employee's perspective) and greater organizational effectiveness (mainly from an employer's perspective) (Lau and May, 1998). The important thing to keep in mind is that quality of working life and such individual outcomes as satisfaction and productivity can be addressed by some of the same kinds of actions, but they aren't in a direct cause and effect relationship (Nadler and Lawler 3rd, 1983). QWL is the shared responsibility not only of the management and employees, but also by the society. To improve quality of work life is first to identify and then try to satisfy employees' important needs through their experience in their working environment. Depending upon the situational requirements, management may select the relevant needs of the employee's to improve them with a short term plan (Pugalendhi et al, 2010). Moreover, open communications, mentoring programs, and fostering more amicable relationships among workers improve employees quality of work life are (Wilburn, 2006). Sirgy et al (2001) reported that a happy employee is a productive employee; a happy employee is a dedicated and loyal employee. Quality of work life has so many positive results and they have been supported by a number of previous studies, including reduced absenteeism, lower turnover, and improved job satisfaction. It contributes to a company's ability to recruit quality people and it enhances organizations competitiveness. Common beliefs support the contention that quality of work life will positively nurture a more flexible, loyal, and motivated workforce, which are essential in determining the organizations competitiveness (May et al, 1999). If organizations are concerned about developing their human resources and gaining a competitive advantage in the marketplace, it seems necessary that they attend to one of their most precious assets, namely, their human resources (Chan and Wyatt, 2007).

Gender Differences on Perceptions of Quality of Work Life Indicators in Tourism Sector

Tourism activities which developing countries offer to developed countries cheaper have been developing since 1950s and became the area where woman is most employed. Relying on research results, Oktik (2001) states that, one of every fifteen people in the world works in tourism sector and half of this rate is women. And especially in USA 52% of employers are women in this sector. In contrast, Demir (2011) cites that, it has been seen in the studies done, being subjected to discrimination, women work in low-wage jobs in low working areas where experience and skills are not asked; even though there is a pick in women labor in the past years, women are still employed in low level jobs.

On the other hand, Stewart et al. (2007) reported that there has been an increase in the presence of women in the workplace over the last few decades and this growth pattern is projected

to continue. One feature of the present division of labor of the sexes appears to be basic: women almost universally have the care of the children, especially infants and small children at least up to age 6 or 7. The physical care of small children does not necessarily involve either confinement to a nuclear family home or exclusive pursuit of the domestic chores of food preparation and the making and care of clothes; yet the female work role nearly always involves these services for the children and, with the exception of men who live outside a family-type house-hold, for the male members of the family as well (Agassi, 1975). Moreover, changing gender roles in the last 20 to 25 years have allowed more women to combine domestic responsibilities with paid work outside the home. More families are comprised of dual earners where both partners participate in the labor market and are expected to participate in work in the household. Women traditional caring responsibilities as well as their primary responsibility for housework remain a significant barrier to employment opportunities (Lane, 2008). Doble and Supriya (2010) reported that when work does not permit women to take care of their family, they feel unhappy, disappointed and frustrated. They draw tight boundaries between work and family and they do not like one crossing the other.

Pugalendhi et al. (2010) studied the quality of work life of college teachers under various dimensions. According to their study, there is a significant difference between sex of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. Daskalova (2009) carried out in the framework of the project 'Quality of life in a changing Europe' aimed to review gender differences in quality of work and life. The survey findings showed that men are in more privileged positions at work, while women are more committed to the company. Gender differences are registered concerning most of the study's indicators of work quality, including autonomy, job satisfaction, supervisor support, job security and work-life balance. Another study conducted by Considine and Callus (2002) and they developed the index about the quality of work life of Australian employees. The results of these findings showed that the majority of Australian workers were satisfied with the occupational health and safety standards at work and 76 per cent were satisfied with the way in which people at work got on together.

The general hypothesis of this particular study is that there are differences between female and male employees of the five- star hotel sector with respect to quality of working life indicators (health & safety needs, economic & family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetics needs) and that this hypothesized differences may be moderated both by a group of select demographic variables of age, marital status, income level, education, and a group of job related variables such as typed of department, type of work, length of time in the organization and length of time in the sector.

H1a: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to health & safety needs.*

H1b: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to economic & family needs.*

H1c: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to social needs.*

H1d: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to esteem needs.*

H1e: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to actualization needs.*

H1f: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to knowledge needs.*

H1g: *Male employees have a higher level of perceptions on quality of working life than female employees with respect to aesthetics needs.*

Methods

Data Collection

The study was conducted in a 5 star hotels in Turkey during the months of June 2010 through October 2010. Since 5- star hotels tend to have a larger number of employees, these hotels were selected to populate the sample with “enough” employees. The study used a proportional stratified random sampling based on the number of 5-star hotels and their total number of employees. In total, 1200 employees who works in 5 star hotels from all departments were asked to participate in the survey. And, 443 survey questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 37%. This sampling scheme also met the acceptable level of sample size that was suggested for the study.

The survey consists of two parts. In first par included some statements about demographic features (gender, age, marital status, monthly income level, education level, and education degree) of hotel employees. And second part contains some statements about employee quality of working life. *Quality of Work Life* was measured using a 16 item scale developed by Sirgy et al. (2001) anchored with “I do not agree at all” (1) and “I agree completely” (5). The scale consists of seven dimensions; health & safety needs economic & family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetics needs. The reliability of these 16 items was good with a Cronbach Alpha of .91. Seven composite values of dimensions rather than 16 items were used for analysis.

Results

The majority of the respondents were male (72.9%), 27 – 34 years old (26.2%), single (61.2), and high school (47.9%). The income distribution of respondents showed that 36.1% employees 1501-2500 TL and 28.9% employees 1500 TL and under. The distribution of work departments was rather even; 11.7% Front Office, 14.9% Food and Beverage, 20.8% Housekeeping, 10.2% Accounting, 10.4 % Public relations, 7.7% Sales and Marketing, 13.1% Human Resources and 8.6% other departments. In terms of the employment status, majority of the respondents were full-time employer and mainly department manager (36.8%). In total, 47.9% of the respondents worked in their current jobs 1-5 years and 42.4% worked in the tourism sector for 1-5 years.

Gender Differences on Perceptions of Employee Quality of Working Life

Table 1 reported that t-test result in gender differences on perceptions of employees’ quality of working life. According these results male employees reported significantly different mean scores in “Health & Safety needs ” ($X_{female} = 3,1389$, $X_{male} = 3,3839$, $p < 0.05$) , “Actualization needs” ($X_{female} = 3,2583$, $X_{male} = 3,5944$, $p < 0.05$), and “Knowledge needs” ($X_{female} = 3,3417$, $X_{male} = 3,6331$, $p < 0.05$) in quality of working life indicators. However; “Economic & Family needs”, “Social needs”, “Esteem needs”, and “Aesthetic needs” factors were not statistically significant at the 0.05 probability level. There are no differences between the two groups in regards to the rank importance of quality of working life indicators. Both groups gave equally high scores for “Knowledge needs” indicator. Female employees scored lowest for “Health & Safety needs” and male employees scored lowest for “Economic & Family needs”.

Table 1. Gender Differences on Perceptions of Employee Quality of Working Life

Quality of Working Life Indicators	Female	Male	t-value	Sig.
Health & Safety needs	3,1389(7)	3,3839(6)	2,543	,011
Economic & Family needs	3,2472(6)	3,3127(7)	,691	,490
Social needs	3,2917(4)	3,4056(5)	1,058	,291
Esteem needs	3,3250(3)	3,4474(4)	1.138	,256
Actualization needs	3,2583(5)	3,5944(2)	3,744	,000
Knowledge needs	3,3417(1)	3,6331(1)	2,977	,003
Aesthetic needs	3,3333(2)	3,5263(3)	1,790	,074

Note: Scale ratings: 1= do not agree at all; 2= Agree less; 3= neither agree nor not agree; 4= I agree; 5= I agree completely. The parenthesis beside the mean scores indicated the rank of the main values.

MANOVA (A one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance) was also performed to investigate sex differences in perceptions of quality of working life. Seven delineated factors were used: "Health & Safety needs", "Economic & Family needs", "Social needs", "Esteem needs", "Actualization needs", "Knowledge needs", and "Aesthetic needs" were used as dependent variables. The independent variable was gender. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. There was a statistically significant difference between males and females on the combined effects of seven quality of working life indicators as dependent variables, ($p=,006$; Wilk's Lambda=0.955; partial eta squared=0.007. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, difference to reach statistical significance, using a Benforni adjusted alpha level of 0.012, were Health & Safety needs ($F=6,459$, $p=0.011$, partial eta squared=0.014), Actualization needs ($F=14,021$, $p=0.000$, partial eta squared=0.031, and Knowledge needs ($F=8,864$, $p=0.003$, partial eta squared=0.020). An inspection of the mean scores indicated that males reported slightly higher levels of "Health & Safety needs" ($M=3.3839$, $SD=0,90119$), "Actualization needs" ($M=3.5944$, $SD=0,78291$, and "Knowledge needs" ($M=3.6331$, $SD=0,93296$) than female ($F=3.1389$, $SD=0,90086$), ($F=3,2583$, $SD=0,97658$), ($F=3,3417$, $SD=0,86720$), respectively.

Gender Differences in Perceptions of Quality of Life When Controlling for Other Characteristics

MANCOVA was employed to test gender differences while controlling for other variables, such as age, marital status, income level, and education, type of department, type of work (part-time or full time work), length of time in the organization, and length of time in the tourism sector. In terms of assumptions, the distribution of data variables was checked for outliers first, and then the box plot and normal Q-Q plot of skewness options of selected variables were examined. It is determined that the data met multivariate normality. The findings indicate that gender differences on perceptions of quality of working life (i.e. multivariate main effect) exist after controlling for these covariates (see Table 2). These findings signify male and female respondents, after eliminating the impact of age, marital status, income level, education, type of department, type of work, length of time in the organization, and length of time have significantly different in the tourism sector. The previous *t*-tests indicated that there were significant gender differences in health & safety needs, actualization needs, and knowledge needs.

Table 2. Gender Differences on Quality of Working Life Controlling For Other Variables

Item controlled	Health & Safety		Economic & Family	Social	Esteem
	Actualization	Knowledge	Aesthetic	Needs (F, p)	Needs (F, p)
Needs (F, p)	Needs (F, p)	Needs (F, p)	Needs (F, p)	Needs (F, p)	Needs (F, p)
Age		,250(,617)	1,345(,247)	2,155(,143)	,080(,777)
,014(,905)	,451(,502)	4,903(,027)*			
Marital status		3,288(,070)	2,907(,089)	4,885(,028)*	1,081(,299)
,132(,716)	,122(,727)	,297(,586)			
Income Level (TL)		,515(,473)	,000(,998)	,039(,843)	2,744(,098)
,015(,904)	11,662 (,001)*	9,613(,002)*			
Education		,992(,320)	,029(,865)	,016(,900)	,258(,612)
,7502(,387)	,178 (,141)	,138 (,711)			
Type of Department		,426(,514)	,056(,814)	,044(,833)	,112(,738)
6,131(,014)*	,208(,648)	,411(,522)			
Type of work		7,939(,005)*	5,223(,023)*	18,400(,000)*	6,959(,009)*
1,491(,223)	1,969 (,161)	3,894 (,049)*			
L. of time in this org.		,903(,343)	,566(,452)	,246(,620)	,007(,933)
3,205(,074)	,099(,754)	,014 (,904)			
L. of time in tourism s.		,044(,834)	,215(,643)	,075(,785)	2,652(,104)
4,389(,037)*	,757 (,385)	1,403 (,237)			

Note: Significance levels are indicated in parentheses (* $p < 0.05$); *indicated the significant gender difference based on the previous independent t-test results in Table 1.

The gender differences remained significant when controlling for the covariates but there were also changes after the variables had been controlled respectively. For example, after controlling for the variable ‘type of work’, the mean score of health & safety needs ($X_{male} = 3.385$, $X_{female} = 3.135$, $p < 0.05$), economic & family needs ($X_{male} = 3.314$, $X_{female} = 3.244$, $p < 0.05$), social needs ($X_{male} = 3.408$, $X_{female} = 3.286$, $p < 0.05$), esteem needs ($X_{male} = 3.448$, $X_{female} = 3.322$, $p < 0.05$), and actualization needs ($X_{male} = 3.595$, $X_{female} = 3.257$, $p < 0.05$) showed a significant change between male and female respondents, revealing that men considered ‘health& safety needs”, “economic & family needs”, “social needs”, and “esteem needs”, and ‘actualization needs” factors more important than did women.

After controlling for the variable ‘age”, the mean score of aesthetic needs ($X_{male} = 3.513$, $X_{female} = 3.369$, $p < 0.05$) showed a significant change between male and female respondents, revealing that men considered ‘aesthetic needs” factor more important than did women. When controlling for the variable ‘marital status”, the mean score of social needs ($X_{male} = 3.401$, $X_{female} = 3.304$, $p < 0.05$) showed a significant change between male and female respondents, revealing that men considered ‘social needs” factor more important than did women. After controlling for the variable ‘income level”, the mean score of knowledge needs ($X_{male} = 3.635$, $X_{female} = 3.338$, $p < 0.05$) and aesthetic needs ($X_{male} = 3.528$, $X_{female} = 3.329$, $p < 0.05$) showed a significant change between male and female respondents, revealing that men considered “knowledge needs” and “aesthetic needs” factors more important than did women. For the variable ‘type of department”, the mean score of actualization needs” ($X_{male} = 3.602$, $X_{female} = 3.238$, $p < 0.05$) showed a significant change

between male and female respondents, revealing that men considered “actualization needs” factor more important than did women. When controlling for the variable ‘length of time in tourism sector”, the mean score of actualization needs ($X_{\text{male}} = 3.593$ $X_{\text{female}} = 3.262$, $p < 0.05$) showed a significant change between male and female respondents, revealing that men considered “Actualization needs” factor more important than did women.

Conclusions

The concept of Quality of Work Life measures employee’s experiences within a particular organization and encompasses a wider value set that is specific to individuals. Therefore, measuring issues that are specific or importance to an organization, risks overlooking issues that may be important to individuals working in the organization (Considine and Callus, 2002). This study attempts to find out the gender differences on perceptions of employee quality of working life in five star hotels in Turkey. For this aim, quality of work life was measured using 7 dimension and 16 items scale. The main contribution of this research to the existing knowledge is the identification of gender issue in quality of working life. Moreover, it will provide global and regional implications for the employees who work in hospitality and tourism sector.

Using an independent t- test, significant gender differences were investigated on perceptions of employee quality of working life. The study results suggest that male employees reported significantly different mean scores in health & safety needs, actualization needs, and knowledge needs. H1a, H1e, and H1f supported. However; economic & family needs, social needs, esteem needs, and aesthetic needs dimensions were not statistically significant at the 0.05 probability level. There are no differences between the two groups in regards to the rank importance of quality of working life indicators.

This finding is also consistent with the results obtained from Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) in which the independent variable was gender and the quality of working life indicators. Finally, MANCOVA analysis was conducted while controlling for such variables as age, marital status, income level, education, and type of department, type of work, length of time in this organization, and length of time in the tourism sector. Specifically, males and females displayed more significant distinctions after controlling for these variables (see Table 2).

This study adds to a growing literature examining the gender differences on perceptions of employee quality of working life in five star hotels in Turkey. Research findings should be utilized by the both male and female hotel employees to improve their view of quality of working life. Future research can focus on a wider sample to reach more generalized results.

References

- Agassi, J. B. (1975). The Quality of working life, in L. E. Davis and A. B. Cherns, editors, The Free Press, New York, 1, 280-298.
- Chan, K., and Wyatt, T. (2007). Quality of work life: a study of employees in Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13 (4), pp. 501-517.
- Chisholm, R. (1983). Quality of working life: critical issue for the 80s. *Public Productivity Review*, 7 (1), pp. 10-25.
- Connell, J., and Hannif, Z. (2009). Call centers, quality of work life and HRM practices an in-house/outsourced comparison. *Employee Relations*, 31 (4), pp. 363-381.
- Considine, G., and Callus, R. (2002). The quality of work life of Australian employees – the development of an index. *Working Paper 73. Sydney: ACIRRT, University of Sydney.*

- Daskalova, N. (2009). Gender differences in quality of work and life; Institute for Social and Trade Union Research (ISTUR), Bulgaria, Nov.
- Demir, M. (2011). İş yaşamında ayırmacılık: turizm sektörü örneği. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8 (1), 760-784.
- Doble, N., and Supriya, M. V. (2010). Gender Differences in the Perception of Work-Life Balance. *Management*, 5 (4), pp. 331-342.
- Ganguly, R. M. (2010). Quality of work life and job satisfaction of a group of university employees. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, pp. 209-216.
- Jagannathan, L., and Akhila, P. R. (2009). Predictors of quality of work life of sales force in direct selling organizations, *The IUP Journal of Management Research*, VIII (6): 51-59.
- Janes, P., and Wisnom, M. (2011) Changes in tourism industry quality of work life practices, *Journal of Tourism Insights: 1 (1)*, Article 13:106-113. Available at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/jti/vol1/iss1/13>
- Lane, L. (2008). Perceived work-life conflict among Swedish women in dual-earner families – a preliminary study, Fourth Symposium: Gender and Well-being: the Role of Institutions from Past to Present, 25th -28th June, Madrid-Spain, pp. 1-24.
- Lau, R. S. M., and May, B. E. (1998). A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9 (3), pp. 211-226.
- Macy, B. A., and Mirvis, P. H. (1976). A methodology for assessment of quality of work life and organizational effectiveness in behavioral-economic terms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21 (2), pp. 212-226.
- May, B., Lau, R., and Johnson, S. (1999). A longitudinal study of quality of work life and business performance, *South Dakota Business Review*, 58 (2), pp. 1-7.
- Nadler, D., and Lawler 3rd, E. (1983). Quality of work life: perspectives and directions. *Organizational Dynamics*, 11 (3), p. 20.
- Oktik, N. (2001). Turizm sektorunde calisan kadinlarin toplumsal degisime etkileri. *Mugla Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5 (Bahar), pp. 145-151.
- Porter, L. W. (1961). A study of perceived need Satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45 (1), pp. 1-10.
- Pugalendhi, S. B., Umaselvi, M., and Nakkeeran, S. K. (2010). Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers, MPRA Paper 27868, University Library of Munich, Germany, revised 01 Sep 2010.
- Rose, R. C., Beh, L., Uli, J., and Idris, K. (2006). Quality of work life: implications of career dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (2): 61-67.
- Sirgy, M., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., and Lee, D. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55 (3), pp. 241-302.
- Stewart, S. M., Bing, M. N., Gruys, M. L., and Helford, M. C. (2007). Men, women, and perceptions of work environments, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Business and Public Affairs*, 1(1).
- Ukko, J., Tenhunen, J., Rantanen, H. (2008). The impacts of performance measurement on the quality of working life. *International Journal Business Performance Management*, 10 (1), pp. 86-98.
- Walton, R. E. (1973), Quality of working life: what is it?, *Sloan Management Review*, 15, pp. 11-21.
- Wilburn, R. (2006). Quality of work life, Encyclopedia of Management, 741-744, <http://law-journals-books.vlex.com/vid/quality-of-work-life-51758808>.