

# Cilt:17 -Sayı:3 -Temmuz 2015

	MAKALE ADI	SAYFA
1	SCHAUFELİ VE BAKKER TARAFINDAN GELİŞTİRİLMİŞ OLAN İŞE ANGAJE OLMA ÖLÇEĞININ TÜRKÇE'DE GÜVENİLİRLİK VE GEÇERLİLİĞININ ANALİZİ PROF.DR. ENVER ÖZKALP-PROF.DR. BİLÇİN MEYDAN DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0285.x	4-19
2	ARAŞTIRMALARDA İSTATİSTİK VE ETİK PROF. DR. NURAN BAYRAM DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0286.x	20-29
3	LABOUR LAW AWARENESS OF EMPLOYEES: A COMPARISON FROM GERMANY AND TURKEY PROF. DR. ÖMER SADULLAH-ASSOC.PROF.DR. FULYA AYDINLI KULAK-MELTEM SERMET DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0287.x	30-48
4	SKILLED WORKFORCE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR THE TURKISH TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRY, CASE OF DENİZLİ ASSOC.PROF.DR.SEMA PALAMUTCU, NEDİM DOĞAN DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0288.X	49-60
5	DEĞİŞEN İŞ ORTAMINDA BİREYE AİT DİNAMİKLER: ÖZ-DENETİM'İN ROLÜ YARD. DOÇ. DR. ESRA ATİLLA BAL DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0289.X	61-71
6	ULUSLARARASI TİCARETİN ADALETİNİ SORGULAMAK: ADİL TİCARET SİSTEMİ, ÇALIŞMA KOŞULLARINA ETKİSİ VE FINDIK İŞÇİLERİ İÇİN "ADALET" ARAYIŞI YARD.DOÇ.DR.ASLI ŞEN TAŞBAŞI DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0290.X	72-92
7	KİŞİLİĞE YÖNELİK YILDIRMA (MOBBING) DAVRANIŞLARI VE FİZYOLOJİK ETKİLER ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİDE PSİKOLOJİK ETKİLERİN ARACILİK ROLÜ YARD. DOÇ. DR. HAKAN SEZEREL, YARD. DOÇ. DR. SEDAT BOSTAN, YARD. DOÇ. DR. TARHAN OKAN DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0291.X	93-118
8	ETİKSEL DAVRANIŞLAR VE ETİKSEL İKLİMİN MOBBİNG ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ: BİR ALAN ARAŞTIRMASI -DR. FİKRET SÖZBİLİR DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0292.X	119-140
9	MAVİ YAKALI ÇALIŞANLAR: NEDEN AKADEMİK ÇALIŞMALAR İÇİN CAZİP BİR ÖRNEKLEM DEĞİL? PROF. DR. SERKAN BAYRAKTAROĞLU, DOÇ. DR. YASEMİN ÖZDEMİR, ARŞ. GÖR. MUSTAFA ARAS, ARŞ. GÖR. SAMET ÖZDEMİR DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0293.X	141-157
10	KARMA ÇALIŞMA ÖLÇEĞİNİN TÜRKÇE FORMUNUN GEÇERLİK VE GÜVENİRLİĞİ DOÇ.DR.AHMET AKIN , ARŞ.GÖR.MEHMET BAŞÖREN DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0294.X	161-167
11	GENDER DIFFERENCES IN WORK EXPERIENCES AND WORK AND LEARNING OUTCOMES AMONG EMPLOYEES IN THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR IN TURKEY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY PROF.DR.RONALD BURKE, PROF.DR.MUSTAFA KOYUNCU, JACOB WOLPIN, ASST.PROF.DR.FÜSUN TEKİN ACAR, KADİFE KOYUNCU DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0295.x	168-183





İş,Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, yılda dört kez yayınlanan hakemli, bilimsel elektronik dergidir. Çalışma hayatına ilişkin makalelere yer verilen derginin temel amacı, belirlenen alanda akademik gelişime ve paylaşıma katkıda bulunmaktadır. İş, Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 'Türkçe' ve 'İngilizce' olarak iki dilde makale yayınlanmaktadır.

Is,Guc The Jorunal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is peer-reviewed, quarterly and electronic open sources journal. IsGuc covers all aspects of working life and aims sharing new developments in industrial relations and human resources also adding values on related disciplines. Is,Guc The Jorunal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is published Turkish or English language.

# Editörler Kurulu / Editorial Board

Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University) K.Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University) Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

# Editör / Editor in Chief

Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

# Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board

Doç.Dr.Erdem Cam (ÇASGEM)
Yrd.Doç.Dr.Zerrin Fırat (Uludağ University)
Prof.Dr.Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)
Prof.Dr.Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)
Yrd.Doç.Dr.Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)
Prof.Dr.Abdulkadir Şenkal (Kocaeli University)
Doç.Dr.Gözde Yılmaz (Marmara University)
Yrd.Doç.Dr.Dr.Memet Zencirkıran (Uludağ University)

## Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu / International Advisory Board

Prof.Dr.Ronald Burke (York University-Kanada)

Assoc.Prof.Dr.Glenn Dawes (James Cook University-Avustralya)

Prof.Dr.Jan Dul (Erasmus University-Hollanda)

Prof.Dr.Alev Efendioğlu (University of San Francisco-ABD)

Prof.Dr.Adrian Furnham (University College London-İngiltere)

Prof.Dr.Alan Geare (University of Otago- Yeni Zellanda)

Prof.Dr. Ricky Griffin (TAMU-Texas A&M University-ABD)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Diana Lipinskiene (Kaunos University-Litvanya)

Prof.Dr.George Manning (Northern Kentucky University-ABD)

Prof. Dr. William (L.) Murray (University of San Francisco-ABD)

Prof.Dr.Mustafa Özbilgin (Bruner University-UK)

Assoc. Prof. Owen Stanley (James Cook University-Avustralya)

Prof.Dr.Işık Urla Zeytinoğlu (McMaster University-Kanada)



# Ulusal Danışma Kurulu / National Advisory Board

Prof.Dr.Yusuf Alper (Uludağ University)

Prof.Dr.Serpil Aytaç (Uludağ University)

Prof.Dr.Veysel Bozkurt (İstanbul University)

Prof.Dr.Toker Dereli (Işık University)

Prof.Dr.Nihat Erdoğmuş (İstanbul Şehir University)

Prof.Dr.Ahmet Makal (Ankara University)

Prof.Dr.Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)

Prof.Dr.Nadir Suğur (Anadolu University)

Prof.Dr.Nursel Telman (Maltepe University)

Prof.Dr.Cavide Uyargil (İstanbul University)

Prof.Dr.Engin Yıldırım (Anayasa Mahkemesi)

Doç.Dr.Arzu Wasti (Sabancı University)

# Tarandığı Indeksler/ Indexes

















Dergide yayınlanan yazılardaki görüşler ve bu konudaki sorumluluk yazarlarına aittir. Yayınlanan eserlerde yer alan tüm içerik kaynak gösterilmeden kullanılamaz.

All the opinions written in articles are under responsibilities of the outhors. The published contents in the articles cannot be used without being cited

"İşGüç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi - © 2000- 2015

"Is,Guc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources - c 2000- 2015



# GENDER DIFFERENCES IN WORK EXPERIENCES AND WORK AND LEARNING OUTCOMES AMONG EMPLOYEES IN THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR IN TURKEY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY<sup>1</sup>

RONALD J. BURKE YORK UNIVERSITY

MUSTAFA KOYUNCU
ONSEKIZ MART UNIVERSITY

JACOB WOLPIN
INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT

FUSUN TEKIN ACAR ERCIYES UNIVERSITY

KADIFE KOYUNCU
ONSEKIZ MART UNIVERSITY

#### **ABSTRACT**

This study examined gender differences in work experiences and work outcomes among 215 male and 46 female employees working in the textile and furniture sectors in Turkey. Data were collected from 261 employees, a 65 percent response rate, using anonymously completed questionnaires. Respondents were mostly male, worked full-time, had relatively short job and firm tenures, generally held jobs involving some supervisory responsibilities, and worked 41 to 50 hours per week in fairly large firms. All measures used here had been used and validated previously by other researchers. Work experiences included perceptions of supervisor empowering behaviors; outcomes included job

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by York University, Onsekiz Mart University and Erciyes University. We thank the management of the organizations cooperating by taking part in our research, and our respondents for their participation.

satisfaction, affective commitment, work engagement, engaging in voice behaviors, and intent to quit. Learning related outcomes included learning opportunities and self-rated employability. There were small differences in departments in which men and women worked with a slightly higher percentage of men in production and a slightly lower percentage of men in accounting, human resource management and marketing. Consistent with earlier work, significant gender differences were found on several personal demographic and work situation characteristics. Women were younger, less likely to be married, were more highly educated, were at lower organizational levels, had less job and organizational tenure. Males and females had similar perceptions of their supervisor's empowering behaviors, their own levels of psychological empowerment, similar learning opportunities and levels of self-rated employability and on most work outcomes (e.g, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intent to quit).

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This study examined potential gender differences in work experiences, important work outcomes typical of organizational research (e.g., job satisfaction, work engagement), as well as workplace learning-related opportunities and potential benefits of these to levels of worker employability. In addition, the study was undertaken in Turkey to address the relative lack of research undertaken there on women in management and the professions. The Turkish society and culture may also pose additional challenges to women in the workplace.

#### **Supervisor Empowering Behaviors And Psychological Empowerment**

Organizational cultures that empower employees are more likely to realize higher levels of employee and organizational performance (Bowen & Lawler, 1995, 1992; Menon, 2011; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997, Zemke & Schaaf, 1989). Empowered employees have a more proactive view of their jobs bringing more energy, dedication and risk taking to their work.

Empowerment exists at two levels, macro or organizational and micro or individual (Spreitzer, 1997; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). Macro factors exist at the organization level and include organizational structure and hierarchy, policies, practices, and leader behaviors. Micro level empowerment considers individual perceptions and feelings of empowerment.

#### **Work Outcome Benefits Of Empowerment**

Empowered employees have been found to report more positive work outcomes. These would include higher levels of job satisfaction, work engagement, organizational commitment and lower levels of quit intentions (Seibert, Wang & Courtright, 2011), which in turn get translated into higher levels of organizational success (Zemke & Schaaf, 1989; Lawler, 1992; Lawler, Mohrman & Ledford, 1995).

#### Workplace learning

Organizations that learn are likely to have competitive advantages given the increasing number of challenges they face in the form of heightened competition, the faster pace of change, increasing use of new technologies and processes, and the need for higher levels of innovation, among others(Salas & Von

Glinow, 2008).. Organizations however do not learn; individuals in organizations are the agents of all learning that takes place within organizations.

Organizations that exhibit high levels of individual learning have learning cultures, such cultures supporting learning at individual, team and organizational levels. Marsick and Watkins (2003) suggest seven dimensions of a learning culture, developed measures of these, and using a number of samples, showed a link between more supportive learning cultures and organizational performance.

Individual learning in the workplace takes place formally through training initiatives dictated by the organization as well as informally through one's work experiences. Some writers have concluded that informal learning is more useful to individuals and their organizations than formal organization-sponsored learning events. We have come to better understand barriers, facilitators, and outcomes of informal workplace learning (Crouse, Doyle & Young, 2011; Lohman, 2009, 2006, 2005, 2000) and thus how to enhance it.

#### **Employability**

Another important outcome for both individuals and organizations from workplace learning is the concept of employability. Rothwell and Arnold (2007, p.75) define employability as "the individual ability to keep the job one has and of getting the job one desires". Individuals, through informal learning, acquire skills, behaviors, attitudes, values, relationships, information, and knowledge which helps them perform their present jobs at a high level and makes it more likely to advance their careers inside or outside their present organization. Employability has been found to predict objective early career success and the number of promotions for late career employees (vander Heijden, DeLange, Dermerouti & van der Heijde, 2009). Interestingly, individuals having higher levels of self-rated employability were more rather than less likely to remain with their employers (DeCuyper & deWitte, 2011) appreciating what their employers did to contribute to their employability.

#### Women in management and the professions in Turkey

There are reasons for both optimism and pessimism as far as women's job prospects and career advancement in Turkey are concerned. Turkey has a significant number of women working as physicians, dentists, pharmacists, lawyers, and professors, but few of these women are at senior levels in these occupational groups. Women also have a presence in the public sector. (Kabasakal, Aycan, Karakas & Maden, 2011; Kabasakal, Aycan & Karakas, 2004; Boydak & Akpinar, 2002)

In addition, studies of gender differences in several occupations showed that although women and men differed considerably on personal demographic and work situation characteristics (e.g, women were younger, less likely to be married or have children, had lower salaries, were at lower organizational levels) gender differences on work outcomes such as job satisfaction, work engagement, intent to quit were few and small (Burke, Koyuncu & Fiksenbaum, 2009; Burke, Koyuncu, Singh, Alayoglu & Koyuncu, 2011; Koyuncu, Burke & Fiksenbaum, 2006).

There are some reasons for pessimism as well. The Republic of Turkey was created in 11923 with Mustafa Kemal Ataturk as president. He appeared to have very progressive attitudes towards the role of women, very much ahead of his time. However the current President of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Speaking in Istanbul at a meeting of an association advocating women's rights, said that gender equality

goes against nature, pregnant women should not be in the same situation as working men, a woman breast feeding a child is not equal to a man, that Islam worships women ad mothers and that working women should instead stay at home with their children, and attacked feminists for not accepting the concept of motherhood. Women and men cannot be equal as they have different natures and bodies. Turkey is a secular Islamic country but Erdogan is trying to move the country in a more Islamic direction.

Here is some research evidence. Aycan (2004) found that Turkish men held stereotypes views of the managerial job and women in management. Guney, Gohar, Lilic and Akinci (2006), in a study of male and female teachers in Turkey and Pakistan reported that both men and women in Turkey had negative attitudes towards women managers, more so than did Pakistani male and female teachers. Besler and Oruc (2010) examined the portrayal of men and women in the media finding support for the "think manager, think male" viewpoint. Sanal (2008) noted the following factors as barriers to women's advancement: gender role stereotypes, conflict of work with roles of wife and other, men's negative attitudes to women in management (e.g., women less competent) and the "old boys" network. Women are always paid less than men holding the same jobs (Kabasakal, Aycan, Karakas & Maden, 2011). Ozbilgin and his colleagues (Ozbilgin 2000; Ozbilgin & Healy, 2004; Ozbilgin & Woodward, 2004a, Ozbilgin & Woodward, 2004b; Woodward & Ozbilgin, 1999) have highlighted the special challenges face in the financial, banking and university sectors in turkey.

Though women are entering educational offerings at all levels, more men than women receive the highest levels of education and men more than women tend to focus on the technological areas (Kabasakal, Aycan, Karakas & Maden, 2011).

Few private sector organizations make efforts to support the career advancement of their qualified female employees and though legislation supporting gender equality exists it is not clear the extent to which it is monitored or sanctions applied to organizations that fail to comply with it (Burke & Koyuncu, 2013).

Finally, a United Nations Development Programme (2008) report comparing the percentages of women among managers, legislators and union officials in 13 countries indicated that Turkey placed last having only 7% of these positions occupied by women as opposed to 52% in the United States, 37% in Germany and 36% in Canada.

#### The present study

In this study, we consider the relationship of employee perceptions of supervisor/leader empowerment behaviors, levels of felt psychological empowerment, important work outcomes (job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, work engagement, engaging in voice behavior, intent to quit), and opportunities for learning and employability. Although the wider Turkish society and culture poses significant challenges to women in the workforce, women and men have been shown to have similar work experiences and outcomes.

We examine the following general hypotheses based on previous research findings.

- 1. Female employees with be significantly different from male employees on personal demographic and work situation characteristics.
- 2. Female and male employees will report similarly positive work experiences and work outcomes.
- 3. Female and male employees will report similar learning opportunities and self-rated employability.

#### Method

#### **Procedure**

The Employment Agency of the Kayseri Region of Turkey was approached in 2014 and indicated there were 58 furniture and 37 textile manufacturing organizations in their region. Fifty organizations, 30 from the furniture sector and 20 from the textile sector, were randomly selected to participate in the research. A total of 400 questionnaires were sent to these 50 organizations. Data were collected over a five month period, September 2014 to January 2015). Two hundred and sixty one individuals completed the survey, a 65% response rate.

#### Respondents

Table 1 presents the personal demographic and work characteristics of our sample (n=261). Most were male (82%), worked full time (96%), were between 31 and 40 years of age (43%), were married (71%), had children (87%), had high school educations (38%), worked in their present jobs between 1 and 5 years (44%), worked for their present organization between 1 and 5 years (40%), held non-management positions (35%), earned between \$5000-\$10,000 US (50%), worked between 41 and 50 hours per week (82%), worked in a variety of departments but mostly in production (63%),worked mostly in the furniture sector (66%), and in organizations having 250 or more employees (44%). <sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This sample has also been incorporated in an unpublished manuscript. Supervisory empowerment behaviors, psychological empowerment, learning opportunities, and self-rated employability among employees in two manufacturing sectors in Turkey. York University.

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Male	Gender	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Mork Status						
Work Status         41 – 50         49         19.1           Full time         251         96.2         51 or more         8         3.1           Part time         10         3.8         Parental Status         Children         171         87.7           Single         76         29.3         No children         24         12.3           Married         183         70.7         Hours worked           39 or less         6         2.3           Education         20         40 to 50         212         82.5           High school         99         37.9         50 or more         39         15.2           Bachelors         91         34.9         Supervisory duties           Master/PhD         13         5.0         Supervisory duties           Ves         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         Supervisory duties           Supervisor         87         33.3         Organizational tenure           Middle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103	Female	46	17.6			
Full time						
Part time         10         3.8         Parental Status           Marital Status         Children         171         87.7           Single         76         29.3         No children         24         12.3           Married         183         70.7         Hours worked           Education         183         70.7         Hours worked           Elementary         58         22.2         40 to 50         212         82.5           High school         99         37.9         50 or more         39         15.2           Bachelors         91         34.9         Supervisory duties           Master/PhD         13         5.0         Supervisory duties           Ves         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         Supervisor duties           Supervisor         87         33.3         Organizational tenure           Middle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         16         5.4         6 to 10 years         74         28.7 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Marital Status   Children   171   87.7	Full time			51 or more	8	3.1
Marital Status   Children   171   87.7     Single   76   29.3   No children   24   12.3     Married   183   70.7     Hours worked   39 or less   6   2.3     Elementary   58   22.2   40 to 50   212   82.5     High school   99   37.9   50 or more   39   15.2     Bachelors   91   34.9     Master/PhD   13   5.0   Supervisory duties     Yes   184   70.5     Yes   184	Part time	10	3.8			
Single   76   29.3   No children   24   12.3     Married   183   70.7     Education   28   22.2   40 to 50   212   82.5     High school   99   37.9   50 or more   39   15.2     Bachelors   91   34.9     Master/PhD   13   5.0   Supervisory duties     No   27   29.5     Non-supervisory   91   34.9     Supervisor   87   33.3     Supervisor   87   33.3     Crganizational levule   69   26.4   5 years or less   103   39.9     Senior management   69   26.4   5 years or less   103   39.9     Senior management   16   5.4   6 to 10 years   74   28.7     11 to 20   67   26.0     12 to more   14   5.4     5000 or less   34   13.0     5001 to 10,000   130   49.8   Organizational size     10,001 to 20,000   28   10.7   50 to 249   104   39.8     30,001 or more   13   5.0   250 or more   115   44.1     Job Tenure     Less than 1 year   55   21.3   Textile   90   34.3     1 - 50 years   25   24.0     11 - 20 years   25   24.0     11 - 20 years   25   24.0     12   HR   8   3.1     R&D   2   8     R&D   2   8     R&D   2   8     R&D   2   8     R&B   3.1     12   13   12     HR   8   8   3.1     12   13   12     HR   8   8   3.1     12   13   12     14   15.8     15   16   16   16     10   10   10     10   10   16   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16     10   16   16				Parental Status		
Married   183   70.7     Hours worked   39 or less   6   2.3	Marital Status			Children		
Education         Hours worked           Elementary         58         22.2         40 to 50         212         82.5           High school         99         37.9         50 or more         39         15.2           Bachelors         91         34.9         Yes         184         70.5           Master/PhD         13         5.0         Supervisory duties         Yes         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         Widdle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         16         5.4         6 to 10 years         74         28.7           Income (US\$)         21 or more         14         5.4           5001 to 10,000         130         49.8         Organizational size           10,001 to 20,000         56         21.5         49 or less         42         16.1           20,001 to 30,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8	Single			No children	24	12.3
Education         39 or less         6         2.3           Elementary         58         22.2         40 to 50         212         82.5           High school         99         37.9         50 or more         39         15.2           Bachelors         91         34.9         Supervisory duties         Yes         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         Supervisor         87         33.3         Organizational tenure         Middle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         16         5.4         6 to 10 years         74         28.7           11 to 20         67         26.0         21 or more         14         5.4           5000 to 10,000         130         49.8         Organizational size         10,001 to 20,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8           30,001 or more         13         5.0         250 or more         115         44.1           Job Tenure         55         21.3         Textile         90	Married	183	70.7			
Elementary				Hours worked		
High school         99         37.9         50 or more         39         15.2           Bachelors         91         34.9         Supervisory duties           Master/PhD         13         5.0         Supervisory duties         Yes         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         Supervisor with supervisor         87         33.3         Organizational tenure           Middle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         16         5.4         6 to 10 years         74         28.7           Income (US\$)         20         67         26.0         26.0         21.0         67         26.0           Income (US\$)         34         13.0         21 or more         14         5.4           5001 to 10,000         130         49.8         Organizational size         10.00 to 20,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8           20,001 to 30,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8           30,001 or more	<u>Education</u>			39 or less	6	2.3
High school         99         37.9         50 or more         39         15.2           Bachelors         91         34.9         Supervisory duties           Master/PhD         13         5.0         Supervisory duties         Yes         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         Supervisor with supervisor         87         33.3         Organizational tenure           Middle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         16         5.4         6 to 10 years         74         28.7           Income (US\$)         20         67         26.0         26.0         21.0         67         26.0           Income (US\$)         34         13.0         21 or more         14         5.4           5001 to 10,000         130         49.8         Organizational size         10.00 to 20,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8           20,001 to 30,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8           30,001 or more		58	22.2	40 to 50	212	82.5
Bachelors   91   34.9     34.9		99			39	15.2
Master/PhD         13         5.0 Yes         Supervisory duties Yes         184         70.5           Organizational level         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         34.3						
Organizational level Non-supervisory         91 91 91 34.9         34.9           Supervisor         87 33.3         33.3         Organizational tenure Widdle management         16 92.6.4         5 years or less         103 9.9         39.9           Senior management         16 16 5.4         5.4         6 to 10 years         74 28.7         28.7           Income (US\$)         21 or more         14 5.4         5.4           5001 to 10,000         130 10,001 to 20,000         49.8         Organizational size 21 or more         42 16.1           20,001 to 30,000         28 10.7         10.7         50 to 249 50 or more         104 39.8           30,001 or more         13 5.0         250 or more         115 44.1           10b Tenure Less than 1 year         55 21.3         Textile         90 34.3           1 − 5 years         114 44.2         Furniture         171 65.5           6 − 10 years         25 9.7         Department Marketing         27 10.4           21 years or more         2 8 9.7         Production Marketing         27 10.4           40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 4				Supervisory duties		
Organizational level Non-supervisory         No         27         29.5           Non-supervisory         91         34.9         33.3         Organizational tenure           Middle management         69         26.4         5 years or less         103         39.9           Senior management         16         5.4         6 to 10 years         74         28.7           Income (US\$)         21 or more         14         5.4           5000 or less         34         13.0         34.8         3.0 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>184</td> <td>70.5</td>					184	70.5
Non-supervisory   91   34.9   Supervisor   87   33.3   Organizational tenure   Sector   Less than 1 year   55   21.3   Textile   90   34.3   1.2   Sector   1.2	Organizational level					
Supervisor   87   33.3   Organizational tenure		91	34.9			
Middle management       69       26.4       5 years or less       103       39.9         Senior management       16       5.4       6 to 10 years       74       28.7         Income (US\$)       21 or more       14       5.4         5000 or less       34       13.0       13.0       13.0       14       5.4         5001 to 10,000       130       49.8       Organizational size       10,001 to 20,000       26       21.5       49 or less       42       16.1         20,001 to 30,000       28       10.7       50 to 249       104       39.8         30,001 or more       13       5.0       250 or more       115       44.1         Sector         Less than 1 year       55       21.3       Textile       90       34.3         1 – 5 years       114       44.2       Furniture       171       65.5         6 – 10 years       52       24.0       10.0 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Organizational tenure</td> <td></td> <td></td>				Organizational tenure		
Senior management					103	39.9
11 to 20   67   26.0     1						
Name of the Income (US\$)   21 or more   14   5.4	Comor managomorit	10	0.1			
5000 or less         34         13.0           5001 to 10,000         130         49.8         Organizational size           10,001 to 20,000         56         21.5         49 or less         42         16.1           20,001 to 30,000         28         10.7         50 to 249         104         39.8           30,001 or more         13         5.0         250 or more         115         44.1           Job Tenure         Sector           Less than 1 year         55         21.3         Textile         90         34.3           1 - 5 years         114         44.2         Furniture         171         65.5           6 - 10 years         52         24.0         11 - 20 years         25         9.7         Department           21 years or more         2         .8         Production         163         62.9           Marketing         27         10.4           Accounting         41         15.8           Finance         3         1.2           HR         8         3.1           HR         8         3.1           R&D         2         .8	Income (LIS\$)					
5001 to 10,000         130         49.8 bfs         Organizational size           10,001 to 20,000         56         21.5 bfs         49 or less         42 bfs         16.1 bfs           20,001 to 30,000         28 bfs         10.7 bfs         50 to 249 bfs         104 bfs         39.8 bfs           30,001 or more         13 bfs         5.0 bfs         250 or more         115 bfs         44.1 bfs           Job Tenure Less than 1 year         55 bfs         21.3 bfs         Textile         90 bfs         34.3 bfs           1 - 5 years         114 bfs         44.2 bfs         Furniture         171 bfs         65.5 bfs           6 - 10 years         52 bfs         24.0 bfs         24.0 bfs         24.0 bfs         24.0 bfs         24.0 bfs         24.0 bfs         24.0 bfs         25.0 bfs         27.0 bfs		34	13.0	21 of more	17	0.4
10,001 to 20,000       56       21.5       49 or less       42       16.1         20,001 to 30,000       28       10.7       50 to 249       104       39.8         30,001 or more       13       5.0       250 or more       115       44.1         Job Tenure       Sector         Less than 1 year       55       21.3       Textile       90       34.3         1 - 5 years       114       44.2       Furniture       171       65.5         6 - 10 years       52       24.0       24.0       11 - 20 years       25       9.7       Department         21 years or more       2       .8       Production       163       62.9         Marketing       27       10.4         Accounting       41       15.8         Finance       3       1.2         HR       8       3.1         R&D       2       .8				Organizational size		
20,001 to 30,000       28       10.7       50 to 249       104       39.8         30,001 or more       13       5.0       250 or more       115       44.1         Job Tenure       Sector         Less than 1 year       55       21.3       Textile       90       34.3         1 – 5 years       114       44.2       Furniture       171       65.5         6 – 10 years       52       24.0       24.0       24.0       24.0       24.0       24.0       24.0       25.0       24.0       27.0       24.0       26.0       26.0       27.0       26.0       27.0					12	16.1
30,001 or more   13   5.0   250 or more   115   44.1     Job Tenure						
Sector   S						
Less than 1 year       55       21.3       Textile       90       34.3         1 - 5 years       114       44.2       Furniture       171       65.5         6 - 10 years       52       24.0       11 - 20 years       25       9.7       Department         21 years or more       2       .8       Production       163       62.9         Marketing       27       10.4         Accounting       41       15.8         Finance       3       1.2         HR       8       3.1         R&D       2       .8	30,00 FOLUNCIE	13	3.0	230 Of Thore	113	44.1
1 - 5 years     114     44.2     Furniture     171     65.5       6 - 10 years     52     24.0       11 - 20 years     25     9.7     Department       21 years or more     2     .8     Production     163     62.9       Marketing     27     10.4       Accounting     41     15.8       Finance     3     1.2       HR     8     3.1       R&D     2     .8	Job Tenure			<u>Sector</u>		
1 - 5 years     114     44.2     Furniture     171     65.5       6 - 10 years     52     24.0       11 - 20 years     25     9.7     Department       21 years or more     2     .8     Production     163     62.9       Marketing     27     10.4       Accounting     41     15.8       Finance     3     1.2       HR     8     3.1       R&D     2     .8	Less than 1 year	55	21.3	Textile	90	34.3
6 - 10 years     52     24.0       11 - 20 years     25     9.7     Department       21 years or more     2     .8     Production     163     62.9       Marketing     27     10.4       Accounting     41     15.8       Finance     3     1.2       HR     8     3.1       R&D     2     .8		114	44.2	Furniture	171	65.5
11 – 20 years 25 9.7 <u>Department</u> 21 years or more 2 .8 Production 163 62.9  Marketing 27 10.4  Accounting 41 15.8  Finance 3 1.2  HR 8 3.1  R&D 2 .8		52	24.0			
21 years or more 2 .8 Production 163 62.9  Marketing 27 10.4  Accounting 41 15.8  Finance 3 1.2  HR 8 3.1  R&D 2 .8				Department		
Marketing 27 10.4 Accounting 41 15.8 Finance 3 1.2 HR 8 3.1 R&D 2 .8					163	62.9
Accounting 41 15.8 Finance 3 1.2 HR 8 3.1 R&D 2 .8	•					
Finance 3 1.2 HR 8 3.1 R&D 2 .8						
HR 8 3.1 R&D 2 .8						
R&D 2 .8						

#### Measures

All measures used in the research were translated from English to Turkish and back by members of the research team fluent in both languages using the back translation method.

#### Personal and work situation demographics

Personal and work setting characteristics were assessed by a number of single items. The former included: gender, age, current work status, current marital and parental status, and level of education. The latter included hours worked per week, organizational level, job tenure, organizational tenure, and whether respondent had supervisory duties. These items served as control variables in some of our analyses.

#### **Supervisory empowerment behaviors**

Arnold, Arad, Rhoades and Drasgow (2000) developed and validated a measure of empowering leader behaviors. They ended up with five factors: Coaching, Informing, Leading by example, Participative Decision Making, and Showing concern/Interacting with their team. In the present research, each of these five dimensions was measured by five items. Respondents indicated how frequently their supervisor exhibited each behavior on a five point Likert Scale (1=Never, 3=Sometimes, 5=Always).

Leading by example ( $\alpha$  =.89) An item was "Leads by example."

<u>Participative decision making</u> ( $\alpha$  =. 94) One item was "Encourages work group members to express their ideas/suggestions".

<u>Coaching</u> ( $\alpha$ =.93) An item was "Suggests ways to improve my work group's performance."

Informing ( $\alpha = 31$ ) One item was "Explains h9ow my work group fits into the company."

Showing concern/Interacting with the team ( $\alpha$  =91) An item was "Shows concern for work group members well-being."

As these five dimensions were positively and highly correlated, a composite measure of total leader empowering behaviors was created.

#### **Psychological empowerment**

Psychological or personal feelings empowerment was measured by a twelve item scale developed and validated by Spreitzer (1996, 1995). This measure tapped four dimensions, each addressed by three items. Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a seven-point Likert scale (1=Very strongly disagree; 4=Neutral, 7=Very strongly agree).

Meaning ( $\alpha$ =.92) "The work I do is meaningful to me."

Competence ( $\alpha$ =.85) "I am confident about my ability to do my job."

<u>Self-determination</u> ( $\alpha$ =.85) "I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job." Impact ( $\alpha$ =91.) "My impact on what happens in my department is large".

And as these four dimensions were positively and significantly correlated, a composite measure of psychological empowerment was created.

#### Work and well-being outcomes

Eight work and well-being outcomes were included.

<u>Job satisfaction</u> was assessed by a seven item scale ( $\alpha$ =83) developed and validated by Taylor and Bowers (1972). Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five-point Likert scale (1-Very dissatisfied, 3=Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 5=Very satisfied. One item was "all in all, how satisfied are you with the persons in your work group?"

Affective commitment was measured by a six item scale ( $\alpha$ =.93) developed and validated by Meyer and Allen (1997). Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five-point Likert Scale (1=Strongly disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree; 5= Strongly agree). One item was "I am proud to tell others I work at my hotel".

#### Work engagement

Three aspects of work engagement were assessed using measures created by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002). Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 5= strongly agree)

<u>Dedication</u> was measured by five items ( $\alpha$ =.87). One item was "I am proud of the work I do."

<u>Vigor</u> was assessed by six items ( $\alpha$ =.87) An item was "At my work I feel bursting with energy."

Absorption was measured by six items ( $\alpha$ =.77). One item was "I am immersed in my work."

#### **Employee Voice**

Employee voice behaviors were measured by a six item scale ( $\alpha$ =.93) developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). Respondents reported how often they engaged in voice behaviors in their workplaces by indicating the frequency of each item on a five point Likert scale (1=Never, 3=sometime, and 5=Very frequently). One item was "I speak up in my workplace with ideas for new projects or changes in the way we do things."

Intent to quit was measured by two items ( $\alpha$ =.91) used by Burke (1991). Respondents indicated "yes or no" for both items. One item was "Are you currently looking for a different job in a different organization?"

Employee health complaints was assessed by a 19 item scale ( $\alpha$  =90) developed and validated by Quinn and Shepard (1974.) Respondents indicated how often they experienced each complaint on a four-point Likert scale (1=Never, 4=often).

#### **Learning- related outcomes**

### **Workplace learning potential**

Workplace learning potential was assess by a twelve item scale developed and validated by Nikolova, Van Ruysseveldt, de Witte and Syroit (2014). It included four potential sources, each measured by three items. Respondents indicated how applicable each item was to their current work situation on a five point Likert scale (1=Not applicable at all; 5=Completely applicable). Learning potential sources included: Learning through reflection ( $\alpha$ -.88) 'In my work I am given the opportunity to contemplate about different work methods; Learning through experimentation ( $\alpha$ =.79) "In my job I can try different work methods even if that does not deliver any useful result,"; Learning from colleagues ( $\alpha$ =.85) "My colleagues tell me if I make mistakes in my work"; and Learning from supervisors ( $\alpha$ =.88) "My supervisor helps me see my mistakes as a learning experience."

#### **Self-perceived employability**

Self-perceived f employability was measured by nine items ( $\alpha$ =.83) developed and validated by Wittekind, Raeder and Grote (2010). Respondents indicated their agreement with each—item as they saw themselves at work in a five-point Likert scale (1-strongly agree, 3+Neither agree nor disagree; 5=Strongly agree). One item was "If my organization offered me a possibility to obtain more work experiences, I would take it."

#### **Results**

#### Personal and work situation characteristics

Table 2 shows the comparisons of males and females on personal and demographic characteristics. The following comments are offered in summary. Significant gender differences were present on eight of the twelve measures. Females were younger, less likely to be married, were more highly educated, had less organizational and job tenures, were at lower organizational levels, and were less likely to have supervisory duties. In addition, females tended to be in part-time positions, and a smaller percentage of females worked in production with more tending to be employed in accounting, marketing and human resources

TABLE 2

GENDER DIFFERENCES ON PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHIC AND WORK SITUATION
CHARACTERISTICS

	<u>Males</u>			<u>Females</u>			
5	<u>X</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>P</u>
Personal demographics Age	2.9	.80	212	2.6	1.05	45	.05
Marital status	1.8	.42	214	1.4	49	45	.001
Parental status	1.1	.32	213	1.2	.38	24	NS
Level of education	2.2	.86	215	2.5	.84	46	.05
Work status	1.0	.16	215	1.1	.28	46	.10
Work situation characteristics							
Job tenure	2.3	.94	212	2.0	.78	46	.05
Organizational tenure	2.1	.94	212	1.5	.78	46	.001
Organizational level	2.1	.90	215	1.8	.95	46	.05
Organization size	2.3	.72	215	2.0	.73	46	.05
Hours worked	2.2	.42	213	2.0	.26	44	.10
Income	2.5	.98	215	2.4	1.15	46	NS
Supervisory duties	1.3	.44	215	1.5	.50	46	.01

#### Work experiences, work and learning-related outcomes

Table 3 shows the comparisons of males and females on their work experiences, work outcomes, and learning-related outcomes. The following comments are offered in summary. First, males and females reported similar perceptions of their supervisors level of empowering behaviors. Second males reported higher levels on one of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment, Impact. Which was then reflected in males having a higher total psychological empowerment score. Third, males and females reported similar levels of job satisfaction, the work engagement factor of Absorption, organizational commitment, quit intentions and psychological well-being. Females indicated significantly lower levels of vigor and dedication, two work engagement dimensions, and engaging in voice behaviors than did their male counterparts. Fourth, males and females reported similar levels of learning opportunities and self-assessed levels of employability.

TABLE 3
GENDER DIFFERENCES ON WORK AND LEARNING – RELATED OUTCOMES

		<u>Males</u>		<u>Fe</u>	<u>emales</u>		
	<u>X</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Leader empowering behaviors</u>							
Example	19.2	4.58	215	19.2	3.28	46	Ns
Participation decisions	18.8	5.43	215	19.5	4.43	46	NS
Informing	18.8	5.09	215	19.2	4.37	46	NS
Coaching	18.5	5.27	215	19.3	4.70	46	NS
Showing concern	18.4	5.37	215	19.5	4.77	46	NS
Total empowering behaviors	93.6	23.62	215	96.6	19.43	46	NS
Psychological Empowerment							
Meaning	13.4	2.35	215	12.9	2.92	46	NS
Competence	13.0	2.31	215	12.5	2.52	46	NS
Self-determination	11.7	2.70	215	11.3	2.57	46	NS
Impact	11.8	3.13	215	10.2	3.17	46	.01
Total Empowerment	49.9	8.59	215	46.9	7.89	46	.05
Work Outcomes							
Job satisfaction	25.4	5.08	215	26.4	5.25	46	NS
Vigor	23.1	5.21	215	21.1	5.34	46	.05
Dedication	20.1	4.34	215	18.2	5.13	46	.01
Absorption	21.1	4.79	215	20.1	4.98	46	NS
Organizational commitment	24.3	6.01	215	24.1	5.45	46	NS
Voice behaviors	23.5	5.78	215	21.2	5.58	46	.05
Intent to quit	3.5	.86	215	3.6	.75	46	NS
Health complaints	34.7	10.87	215	35.0	10.36	46	NS
<u>Learning-related outcomes</u>							
Reflection	10.710	3.40	215	10.4	3.73	46	NS
Experimentation	.9	3.32	215	9.9	3.27	46	.10
Co-workers	11.6	3.30	215	11.3	3.87	46	NS
Supervisors	11.1	3.58	215	10.9	3.95	46	NS
Self-related Employability	27.8	5.64	215	27.7	4.68	46	NS

#### **Additional observations**

It is possible that females lower levels of work engagement on vigor and dedication, and their engaging in less voice behaviors, reflected the facts that they had less organizational and job tenures and were in jobs at lower organizational levels. Not surprisingly, individuals at higher organizational levels reported both more supervisory/leader empowerment behaviors and higher levels of their own psychological empowerment. It is possible to instill characteristics of the experiences of these higher level respondents (more influence, more discretion) into lower level jobs as well- one approach to increasing levels of empowerment.

#### Discussion

We found considerable support for our three hypotheses (see Tables 2 and 3), consistent with some previous gender research conclusions in studies of other occupations in Turkey. There were considerable gender differences on personal demographic and work situation characteristics but relatively few differences on perceptions of leadership behaviors, a range of work outcomes, and indicators of workplace learning opportunities associated with the concept of employability. Thus it may be possible for women to transcend obvious societal and cultural biases and obstacles in achieving work experiences and work outcomes similar to their male colleagues.

The few significant gender differences likely reflected the fact that men were at higher organizational levels and had longer organizational tenures. And although the differences were not statistically significant, a slightly higher percentage of men were working in production and a slightly lower percentage of men were working in marketing, accounting and human resources.

#### **Practical implications**

The absence of gender differences on important perceptions of work experiences, work outcomes, and learning-related opportunities and benefits, while not suggesting that women and men have identical work experiences, clearly supports the conclusion that women in the present study, and in others, have satisfying work experiences and responses. The responsibility then in workplaces is to continue to support the future career possibilities of their qualified male and female employees similarly (Hewlett & Rashid, 201`1). This would involve equal access to both formal and informal learning and training opportunities, as well as considering women for advancement on the same basis as their male colleagues (Burke, Koyuncu & Fiksenbaum, 2007a, 2007b, 2006)...

#### Limitations of the research

The present research has limitations which should be noted to better assess the results. First, all data were collected using self-report questionnaires with the possibility of response set tendencies and common method biases. Second, although the sample was relatively large, all respondents came from firms in the same industrial region of Turkey thus the extent to which our findings would apply to firms in other regions is indeterminate. Third, the females sample however was relatively small. Finally, the majority of our respondents had some level of supervisory responsibility and were generally satisfied with their work situations making it unclear the extent to which our findings would be replicated in a sample of non-supervisory employees.

#### **Future research directions**

It would be important to undertake a similar study focusing on women and men without supervisory responsibilities to assess the generalizability of the present findings. In addition, including measures that more directly address bias and discrimination would supplement what this and other earlier studies have shown. Finally, continuing this line of work hut examining gender in other occupations would be informative.

An important question that remains unexplored is the apparent gap or disconnect between the experiences of women working in the occupations under study and the wider societal context which embodies elements of bias and obstacles for women in the workplace.

#### REFERENCES

- Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000) The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 249-269.
- Aycan, Z. (2004) Key success factors for women in management in Turkey. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53, 453-477.
- Besler, S., & Oruc, I. (2010) Women managers in the print media in Turkey. Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences, 10, 17-38.
- Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1995) Empowering service workers. Sloan Management Review, 36, 73-84.
- Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1992) The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how and when. Sloan Management Review, 33, 31-40.
- Boydak, O.M., & Akpinar, B. (2002) The success of women administrators in school administration. Firat University Journal of Social Science, 12, 219-234.
- Burke, R. J. (1991) Early work experiences of female and male managers and professionals: Reasons for optimism? Canadian Journal of Administrative sciences, 8, 224-230.
- Burke, R. J, & Koyuncu, M. (2013) Women in management in Turkey: Opportunities and challenges. In M. Paludi (ed.) Women and management: global issues and promising solutions. Santa Barbara. CA: Praeger. pp. 239-263.
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2009) Gender differences in work experiences, satisfactions and well-being among physicians in Turkey. Gender in Management: An International Journal, 24, 70-91.
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M. & Fiksenbaum, L. (2007a) Career priority patterns among managerial and professional women in Turkey: Benefits of putting career first? Women in Management Review, 322, 405-417.
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2007b) Workaholism types, work outcomes and psychological well-being among managerial women in banking in 'Turkey.
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., & Fiksenbaum, L (2006) Organizational practices supporting women's career advancement and their satisfaction and well-being in Turkey. Women in Management Review, 21, 610-624.
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., Singh, P., Alayoglu, N., & Koyuncu, KI (2011) Gender differences in work experiences and work outcomes among Turkish managers and professionals: Continuing signs of progress?

- Crouse, P. Doyle, W., & Young, J. D. (2011) Workplace learning strategies, barriers, facilitators and outcomes: A qualitative study among human resource management professionals. Human Resource Development International, 14, 39-55.
- DeCuyper, N. & DeWitte, H. (2011) The management paradox: Self-rated employability and organizational commitment and performance. Personnel Review, 40, 152-172.
- Dewettnick, I. & van Ameijde, M. (2011) Linking leadership empowerment behavior to employee attitudes and behavioral intentions. Personnel Review, 40, 284-305.
- Guney, S., Gohar, R., Lailic, A. S., & Akinci, M. M. (2006) Attitudes toward women managers in Turkey and Pakistan. Journal of International Women's studies, 8, 194-211.
- Hewlett, S. A. & Rashid, R. (2011) Wining the war for talent in emerging markets: Why women are the solution. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kabasakal, H., Aycan, Z. & Karakas, F. (2004) Women in management in Turkey. In M. J. Davidson & R. J. Burke (eds) Women in management worldwide: Facts, figures and analysis. Aldershot: Gower, pp. 223-253.
- Kabasakal, H., Aycan, Z., Karakas, F. & Maden, C. (2011) Women in management in Turkey. In M. J. Davidson & R. J. Burke (eds.) Women in management worldwide: Progress and prospects. Aldershot: Gower. pp. 317-330
- Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J. & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006) Work experiences and satisfaction of male and female professors in Turkey: signs of progress? Equal Opportunities International, 25, 38-47.
- Lawler, E. E. (1992) The ultimate advantage: Creating the high involvement organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford, G. F. (1995) Creating high performance organizations: Practices and results of employee involvement and total quality management in Fortune 1000 companies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lohman, M. C. (2009) A survey of factors influencing the engagement of information technology professionals in informal learning activities. Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal, 25, 43-53.
- Lohman, M. C. (2006) Factors influencing teachers' engagement in informal learning activities. Journal of Workplace Learning, 18, 1141-1156.
- Lohman, M. C. (2005) A survey of factors influencing the engagement of two professional groups in informal workplace learning activities. Human Resources Development Quarterly, 16, 501-527.
- Lohman, M. C. (2000) Environmental inhibitors to informal learning in the workplace: A case study of public school teachers. Adult Education Quarterly, 50, 83-1201.
- Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2003) Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 5, 132-151.

- İş,Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi/Is,Guc The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources, Temmuz/July 2015, Cilt/Vol: 17, Sayı/Num: 3, Sayfa/Page: 168-183 ISSN: 2148-9874, DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2015.0295.x
- Menon, S. T. (2001) Employee empowerment: An integrative psychological approach. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50, 153-180.
- Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1997) Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and applications. Thousand Oaks, CA>: Sage Publications.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, AM., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002) The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analysis approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71-92.
- Nikolova, I., Van Ruysseveldt, J., De Witte, H., & Syrioit, J. (2014) 'Work-based learning: Development and validation of a scale measuring the learning potential of the workplace (LPW). Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84, 1-10.
- Ozbilgin, M. F. (2000) The way forward for equal opportunities by sex in employment in turkey and Britain. Management International Review, 7, 55-65.
- Ozbilgin, M. f., & Healy, G. (2004) The gendered nature of career development of university professors: The case of turkey. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64, 358-371.
- Ozbilgin, M., & Woodward, D. (2004a) Banking and gender: /Sex equality in the financial services in Britain and Turkey. London: L. B. Tauris.
- Ozbilgin, M. F. & Woodward, D. (2004b)"Belonging" and "otherness": Sex equality in banking in turkey and Britain. Gender, Work and Organization, 11, 668-688.
- Quinn, R. P., & Shepard, LL. J. (1974) The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Quinn, R. P., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1997) The road to empowerment: seven questions every leader should consider. Organizational Dynamics, 26, 37-49.
- Rothwell, A., & Arnold, J. (2007) Self-perceived employability: Development and validation of a scale. Personnel Review, 37, 23-41.
- Salas, S. & Von Glinow, M. A. (2008) Fostering organizational learning: Creating and maintaining a learning culture. In R. J. Burke & C. L. Cooper (eds) Building more effective organizations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 207-227.
- Sanal, M. (2008) Factors preventing women's advancement in management in Turkey, Education, 128,380-391.
- Schaufeli W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002) The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analysis approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71-92.
- Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011) Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations. A meta-analytic review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 96, 981-1003.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1997) toward a common ground in defining empowerment. Research in Organizational /Change and Development, 10, 31-62.

- Spreitzer, G. M. (1996) Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 483-504.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995) Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 1442-1465.
- Taylor, J. C., & Bowers, D. (1972) Survey of organizations: A machine-scored standardized questionnaire instrument Ann Arbor, MI.: Institute for social Research.
- United Nations Development Programme (2008) Human development report 2007-2008l New York: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998) Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 108-119.
- Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M>, de Lange, A. H., Demerouti, E. & van der Heijde, C. M. (2009) Age effects on the employability-career success relationship. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 156-164.
- Wittekind, A. Raeder, S., & Grote, G. A. (2010) A longitudinal study of determinants of perceived employability. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31, 566-586.
- Woodward, D., & Ozbilgin, M. F. (1999) Sex equality in the financial services sector in Turkey and the UK. Women in Management Review, 14, 325-332.
- Zemke, R., & Schaaf, D. (1989) The service edge: 101 companies that profit from customer care. New York: New American Library.