



Gender Diversity in the Hospitality Industry: An Empirical Study in Turkey

Musa Pinar¹
Valparaiso University
musa.pinar@valpo.edu

Michael K. McCuddy
Valparaiso University

Ibrahim Birkan
Atilim University

Metin Kozak
Mugla University

INTRODUCTION

Gender diversity and the status of women in the hospitality industry has been a concern among both management practitioners and academicians. In recent years, there has been remarkable progress with respect to women closing the gender gap in managerial positions in the hospitality industry. Yet there still seems to be what might be called “patterns of employment ghettos,” wherein certain departments are predominantly filled by men and others are predominantly staffed by women. This suggests that gender diversity may be lacking in the hospitality industry.

This study aims to investigate gender diversity in the hospitality industry in Turkey by pursuing two major research objectives, both of which address the extent to which a *gender effect* exists within the hospitality industry. First, the study explores the potential relationships between employees’ gender and four other demographic variables, including employees’ job position in the hospitality industry, the department in which they are employed, and their education level and age. In pursuing this research objective, the study will ascertain whether any gender disparities occur in the context of these other demographic characteristics. Second, the study examines employees’ beliefs regarding both the recruitment of men and women and the earning potential of men and women within the hospitality industry. The second aspect of this study will reveal whether recruitment efforts and the salary offered are influenced by gender, as well as by the demographic characteristics identified above. We believe that the results of this study will provide meaningful insights into gender diversity in the Turkish hospitality industry.

GENDER IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

A considerable body of research exists concerning gender diversity in businesses, including the hospitality industry. For example, several studies demonstrate a disparate distribution of income between male and female employees in the hospitality industry, with females earning less than their male counterparts (Biswas and Cassell, 1996; Purcell 1996; Sparrowe and Iverson, 1999). Gender-based

¹ Contact author: College of Business Administration, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, IN 46383, Phone: (219) 464-5401; e-mail: musa.pinar@valpo.edu



income disparity has been confirmed as a form of sex discrimination within the hospitality industry (e.g., Sparrowe and Iverson, 1999; Thrane, 2007). Still other research has documented gender differences in promotions to managerial positions (Manwa and Black, 2002; Thrane, 2007), wherein men are over-represented in preferred positions that pay better. Part of the reason for this disparity may be that female employees may interrupt their working lives due to preferences for marriage and caring for children.

Of course, gender might not be the sole cause of disparities in the distribution of income and managerial employment in the hospitality industry. Other variables might interact with gender to produce these disparities. For example, Adib and Guerrier (2003) explored the ways in which gender interacts with such variables as race, ethnicity, and the class background of chefs and their employees in the context of how they position themselves within organizational power arrangements. Adib and Guerrier (2003) reported that the lack of power resulting from employees' immigrant status was the most significant reason behind male chefs' harassment of female employees working in the same department. In addition to discrimination, Kattara (2005) identified other characteristics such as age, work experience, and work-family conflict as influential factors that prevented female employees from reaching the top managerial positions within the Egyptian hotel industry.

In developing countries, including Turkey, females usually are quite powerless to compete with their male counterparts due to several visible or invisible barriers and challenges (e.g., forgoing marriage, motherhood, discrimination, stereotyping, etc.). This problem becomes magnified when the operational aspects of hospitality management require long working hours and high degrees of mobility. As a result, women, lacking the experience that is essential for a higher position, often are denied opportunities; in contrast, the business environment of the hospitality industry supports males' advancement in their professional careers.

The Turkish hospitality industry has also been dominated by the problem of seasonality, which particularly deters women from continuing their professional careers in this field. Perhaps most importantly, some women believe that the hospitality industry can interfere with their private lives and their social lives. Thus, hospitality businesses provide fewer opportunities for promotion that are sufficient to meet the expectations of women. The widely shared perspective within Turkey is that women often view the public sector as an alternative employment solution given its flexibility with regard to managing domestic household duties. Contrary to the situation in some Western countries such as the United Kingdom (Purcell, 1996), these factors have led the Turkish hospitality industry to become male-dominated. Despite this, and from an optimistic point of view, over the last few years there has been a growing number of women who are undertaking tourism programs at the university level and seeking positions in the Turkish hospitality industry.² Still, gender disparity seems to remain in the Turkish hospitality industry, which in turn brings to the forefront important questions regarding recruitment and compensation decisions, and the factors that could influence those decisions.

² Two of the co-authors teach in tourism programs in Turkey. Based on their personal observations, there were only one or two female students in classes about 20-25 years ago but now almost 30-35% of the students are female. Moreover, some schools might be more female-dominant.



Gender Effect on Recruitment

Studies have investigated the impact of gender in employment interviews, with the goal of separating the effects of applicant sex and recruiter sex on recruiters' evaluations of the applicants. In a laboratory setting, Gallois *et al.* (1992) found that personnel managers regarded same-sex applicants as more similar to themselves than opposite-sex applicants; however, sex similarity was not a factor in ratings of likeability or suitability for the job. Graves and Powell (1988) found no significant effects of applicant sex on interview outcomes; but they did find that perceived similarity and interpersonal attraction were important factors in the recruiters' decision-making processes. In a different study, Graves and Powell (1995) showed that perceived gender similarity and interpersonal attraction mediated the effect of sex similarity on female recruiters' assessments of applicants' qualifications. However, an unexpected finding of their study was that female recruiters saw male applicants as more similar to themselves and more qualified than female applicants. In a more recent study, Hardin *et al.* (2002) found that similarity of recruiter and applicant gender did not have any significant effect on the recruiting outcomes.

As more women have entered the sales arena, several studies began exploring the effect of buyer-seller gender similarity on sales performance. Conventional wisdom concerning buyer-seller similarity is that exchange relationships are easier to develop with similar others (Churchill *et al.*, 1997). Crosby *et al.* (1990) point out that similarity between salespersons and customers — as measured by such characteristics as sex, appearance, lifestyle, and status — is positively related to quality of the sales relationship and sales performance. Similarly, Smith (1998) reports that same-gender and same-life-stage buyer-seller relationships are associated with greater relationship investment, more open communication, and greater trust and satisfaction within relationships. While an earlier study by Churchill *et al.* (1975) found a statistically significant relationship between visible similarity (*i.e.*, gender, age, race, education, and nationality) and salesperson performance, more recent similarity research (Crosby *et al.*, 1990; Weitz, 1981) suggests that this relationship is weak at best. On the other hand, Dwyer *et al.* (1998) show that female salespeople are just as effective as male salespeople and that gender similarity is not a significant factor in sales performance.

Gender Effect on Earning Potential

Despite continued efforts during the last few decades, wage disparities on the basis of gender still persist in the United State (Gibelman, 2002). Since 1975, when the Equal Pay Act came into effect, the full-time pay gap has closed considerably for women, from 29.5% of men's hourly pay to 20.2% in 1996 and from 20.7% in 1997 to 17.2% in 2006 (Anonymous, 2006). A study by Gibelman (2002) revealed substantial salary discrepancies on the basis of gender throughout the service professions. She states that in the year 2000 women earned 24% less than men, which was a reduction from a 37% earnings gap that existed in 1979. While the reasons for this pay gap are complex and interconnected, the keys factors



include: (a) human capital differences, (b) part-time work by many women, (c) travel patterns, (d) occupational segregation, and (e) workplace segregation (Anonymous, 2006).

The gender pay gap among United States salespeople has narrowed, but it is still very wide. Schellhardt (1994) states that in 1992 men in sales earned, on average, \$31,346 while women were paid \$17,924. As the number of saleswomen earning more than \$50,000 jumped sevenfold to 141,000 in 1992, men in that elite group numbered 801,000 (Schellhardt, 1994). In a survey conducted by *Sales and Marketing Management*, 75% of the responding 157 female sales executives said women who were promoted to senior sales management positions were paid less than men in those same positions (Marchetti, 1996). Longwell (2004) claims that, in sales, women substantially narrowed the pay gap with men, but men still earn more (\$74,000) than women (\$64,150). A gender pay gap also seems to be common in other countries. For example, a study by Menguc (1998) found that average daily earnings were US dollars (US\$) 1.50 for men and US\$0.50 for women in Turkey. He argues that while the Turkish male/female earnings gap has been declining in recent years, it still remains quite substantial.

As implied by the findings of Hardin *et al.* (2002), men might be earning more than women in their jobs because they are offered higher starting salaries. Also, a study by Joy (2000) found that men earned more than women in their first jobs within the majority of majors and occupations (including the sales field). Since many women start with a lower salary, it would be difficult for them to catch up with men's earnings later in their careers. This could provide one possible explanation of the gender pay gap. Moreover, applicants' perceptions of gender effects on expected earning potential could influence their decisions when making career choices. For example, if a male or female applicant perceives that he/she will be earning less than the other gender in a given field, he/she may not pursue a career in that field. Therefore, it is important to examine applicants' perceptions of the gender effect on their expected and potential earnings from their future jobs and careers.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study has two primary research objectives regarding the phenomenon of gender diversity in the hospitality industry in Turkey. The first objective is to examine the potential relationships between gender and several demographic factors, including employees' job position in the Turkish hospitality industry, the department in which they are employed, and their education level and age. This research objective establishes the context for four specific research questions, which are:

RQ1a: How, if at all, are employees' gender and job position related?

RQ1b: How, if at all, are employees' gender and department of employment related?

RQ1c: How, if at all, are employees' gender and education level related?

RQ1d: How, if at all, are employees' gender and age related?

In answering these four questions, the comparisons will demonstrate the presence (or absence) of a *gender effect* — or gender diversity with respect to relevant demographic characteristics.



The second research objective focuses on examining the perceptions of Turkish hospitality industry employees with respect to a *gender effect* in the recruitment of men and women as well as in their respective earning potential. This research objective also leads to the following specific research questions:

RQ2a: Does employee gender influence recruiting effort and earning potential?

RQ2b: What is the relative impact of employees' gender, job position, department, education, and age on recruiting effort?

RQ2c: What is the relative impact of employees' gender, job position, department, education, and age on earning potential?

The answers to these three research questions will reveal whether recruitment efforts and the salary offered are influenced by gender, or any of the other demographic characteristics of interest.

METHODOLOGY

To generate data for addressing the research objectives, a survey instrument was developed and administered to personnel at hotels and resorts in Turkey. This survey was designed to cover more than one phenomenon, and this paper utilizes only the demographic data from the survey and responses to two questions regarding beliefs about being recruited for a job and the salary likely to be offered within the hospitality industry. The survey's demographic questions focused on the respondents' gender, age, highest education level attained, job position held, and department in which they are employed. These demographic characteristics are used in addressing Research Questions 1a through 1d; they are also used in answering Research Questions 2b and 2c but in conjunction with the respondents' replies to two other survey questions about the impact of gender on recruiting and earning potential of male and female personnel. Also, the responses to the recruiting and earning potential questions, without inclusion of the demographic questions, are used in exploring Research Question 2a.

For the two survey questions, the respondents were asked whether male or female recruiters are more likely to offer them the job and if hired, whether male or female recruiters would be more likely to offer them a higher starting salary. These questions were measured on a semantic differential scale with values ranging from -5 to +5, where a score of "-5 = definitely males," a score of "0 = equally likely," and a score of "+5 = definitely females." On the actual instrument, the negative and positive signs were omitted in order to eliminate any potential confusion and/or response bias in association with negative numbers. The research instrument was developed by drawing on prior gender research (Pinar, Nisolle, and McCuddy 2007a, 2007b). After the instrument was developed, it was pre-tested with respondents who are similar to the target population. This process further improved the wording and meaning of the survey questions. As stated before, the survey instrument included more questions to address some other research objectives/issues that are not mentioned here.



The entire questionnaire, which was originally developed in English, was translated into Turkish and later back-translated into English to avoid translation errors (Ball *et al.* 2002), and to make sure that the intended meaning of the questions was maintained. The Turkish version of the survey was further pre-tested in two stages. In the first stage, the survey instrument was given to three experts who were managers at a major international chain hotel in Ankara, Turkey. In the second stage, the survey instrument was pre-tested with a sample of 20 hotel personnel at different ranks in Ankara, Turkey. These respondents were deliberately selected from different ranks of the hotel personnel in order to get feedback to determine whether the survey questions were understood as they were intended. These pretests of the English and Turkish versions of the questionnaire provided useful input for improving the survey questions and for establishing the face validity of the constructs (Churchill 1979; Churchill and Iacobucci 2005; Narver and Slater 1990).

The above described survey instrument was administered to hotel personnel in Turkey. For this study, two groups of hotels were selected. The first group of hotels is located in the resort town of Marmaris, one of the major tourist destinations located on the Southwest coast of Turkey. From this town, 30 hotels were selected as sample organizations. Of these, 24 hotels agreed to cooperate in undertaking the survey in their facilities. In terms of the standard hotel classification system, these hotels can be characterized as follows: five-star hotels (6 hotels), four-star hotels (16 hotels), and three-star hotels (2 hotels). The questionnaires were distributed with the assistance of two interviewers who requested each human resource manager to encourage the participation of their employees in the survey. Questionnaires were collected at the end of the day in which they were distributed. During the data collection process, particular attention was paid to increasing the proportion of respondents representing various occupations (e.g., front office, housekeeping, food and beverage, accounting, etc.) out of the total population. The data collection period lasted approximately two weeks in June 2007. Out of 1,802 employees affiliated with the sample hotel businesses, 620 usable questionnaire forms were received, representing a response rate of 34%.

The second sample group represents major international chain hotels, which are located primarily in the two large Turkish cities of Istanbul and Ankara. Since these chain hotels have become a part of the hotel industry in Turkey, they should also be included to fully portray the Turkish hotel industry in the study. In Istanbul and Ankara, there are a total of 21 major chain hotels and ten of these chain hotels were randomly selected. The managers of the hotels were contacted and the purpose of the research was explained to them in order to get their cooperation and support for the study. Of the ten hotels contacted, four hotel managers agreed to administer the survey to their personnel. The survey instruments were sent to the hotel managers who were asked to randomly distribute the surveys to about 25-30 personnel at different ranks or positions in the hotels. Out of 68 completed surveys from 4 hotels, only 62 were useable. The samples from the two groups of hotels provided a total of 682 completed surveys that were used for analysis.



Respondent Profiles

Selected demographic profiles of the respondents show that 65% are men and 35% are women. The distribution of the respondents' educational levels indicates that 20.6% have a high school diploma, 46.5% have a two-year college education, 17.2% have a college degree, and 15.7% have a graduate degree (masters, Ph.D., or post-Ph.D.). The fact that a large percentage of the sample has a two-year college education probably reflects the existence of two-year college programs in Turkey that are geared toward educating students for employment in the tourism and hospitality industries. Concerning the age of the respondents, 45.9% are 18-25 years old, 37.9% are between 26-35 years old, and 16.2% are 36 years old or older. The data for the job position of the respondents show that 11.0% of the hotel personnel are upper managers, 28.9% are middle managers, and 60.1% are contact personnel. Of those respondents who identified the department in which they are employed, 47.8% worked in food and beverage, 36.2% in the rooms (or services) department (*i.e.*, housekeeping, front desk, or technical services), 8.4% in accounting or purchasing, and 7.6% in marketing and public relations. In addition, 8.9% of the respondents did not identify the department in which they worked. The respondents have been working an average of 7.9 years in the hotel industry and 3.5 years in their current organization.

RESULTS

The results of the study are reported in two parts. First, we present the results that pertain to the first research objective and which answer Research Questions 1a through 1d. Since the data for answering these questions are nominal (or categorical) in form, they are analyzed using the Chi-square test. The results of the Chi-square analysis will demonstrate the presence (or absence) of any gender disparity in relation to four other demographic characteristics. Second, we present findings that address the second research objective and offer answers to research questions 2a through 2c. One-sample and two-sample *t*-tests are used to analyze the data for Research Question 2a, whereas Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) is used to analyze data pertaining to Research Questions 2b and 2c.

Gender Distribution by Demographic Characteristics

The gender profile in Table 1 shows that about two-thirds of the respondents are men and approximately one-third of them are women. This suggests that the Turkish hospitality industry is relatively male-dominated, which in turn could point to a gender effect that favors men. But if there is a gender effect, does it occur in conjunction with or independent of other relevant demographic characteristics? This is the focus of Research Questions 1a through 1d.

Gender by Job Positions: RQ1a poses the question: How, if at all, are employees' gender and job position related? The results of the cross-tabulation and Chi-square test for gender by job position are presented in Table 2. Since the Chi-Square test is not significant ($p > .05$), there is no relationship between gender effect and job position. Specifically, the results show that 62.8% of the contact persons are men and 37.2% are women. 68.5% of middle managers are men and 31.5% are women, and 66.7%



of upper managers are men and 33.3% are women. Given that the distribution of gender for each job position is very similar to the general distribution of men and women employees, a managerial action of increasing the absolute number of women employees rather than the increasing the proportion of women employees may be the only way to increase the number of women in different job positions, especially in middle- and upper-level management positions.

Gender by Departments: RQ1b asks: How, if at all, are employees' gender and department of employment related? Table 3 presents the cross-tabulated distribution of gender by departments. The significance of the Chi-square test ($p < .01$) indicates an existence of a gender effect relative to the departments. The distribution of gender by departments shows that 74.1% of food and beverage department are men and 25.9% are women, 53.3% of the rooms department are men and 46.7% are women, 59.6% of accounting and purchasing department are men and 40.4% are women, and 68.1% of marketing and PR department are men and 31.9% are women. These results indicate that in the Turkish hospitality industry substantially more men than women work in the food and beverage department and in the marketing and PR department, but that the gender differential is not as great in the rooms department and accounting and purchasing department. This indicates a stronger tendency toward a gender effect in certain departments.

Table 2: Cross Tabulation of Gender Effect by Job Position			
Job Position	Male	Female	Total
Contact persons	257 (58.1%) (62.8%)	152 (63.6%) (37.2%)	409 (60.1%) (100.0%)
Middle manager	135 (30.5) (68.5%)	62 (25.9%) (31.5%)	197 (28.9%) (100.0%)
Upper manager	50 (11.3%) (66.7)	25 (10.3%) (33.3%)	75 (11.0%) (100.0%)
Total	442 (100.0%) (64.9%)	239 (100.0%) (35.1%)	681 (100.0%) (100.0%)
Chi-square (2, 681) = 2.006, p > .05			
Note: The % in the upper set of parentheses refers to the column %; the % in the lower set of parentheses refers to the row %.			



Table 3: Cross Tabulation of Gender Effect by Department			
Department	Male	Female	Total
Food and Beverage	220 (54.6%) (74.1%)	77 (35.3%) (25.9%)	297 (47.8%) (100.0%)
Rooms	120 (29.8%) (53.3%)	105 (48.2%) (46.7%)	225 (36.2%) (100.0%)
Accounting and Purchasing	32 (7.7%) (59.6%)	21 (9.6%) (40.4%)	52 (8.4%) (100.0%)
Marketing and PR	32 (7.9%) (68.1%)	15 (6.9%) (31.9%)	47 (7.6%) (100.0%)
Total	403 (100.0%) (64.9%)	218 (100.0%) (35.1%)	621 (100.0%) (100.0%)
Chi-square (3, 621) = 25.03, p < .01			
Note: The % in the upper set of parentheses refers to the column %; the % in the lower set of parentheses refers to the row %.			

Gender by Education: RQ1c raises the question: How, if at all, are employees' gender and education level related? The distribution of cross-tabulated results for gender by education is presented in Table 4. Since the Chi-square test is statistically significant ($p < .05$), there is a relationship between gender and education level. This cross-tabulation indicates that 72.9% of the hospitality industry's high school graduates are men and 27.1% are women, 66.2% of two-year college graduates are men and 33.8% are women, 55.6% of the college graduates are men and 44.4% are women, and 61.7% of the personnel with a graduate degrees are men and 38.3% are women. Significantly more high school educated men than women work in the Turkish hotel industry. College educated men and women are employed in the hospitality industry in fairly equal proportions. Men and women with two-year college degrees or with graduate degrees appear in the hospitality industry in proportions equivalent to the overall gender distribution in the industry. Collectively, these results provide evidence of a gender effect across education levels.

Table 4: Cross Tabulation of Gender Effect by Education			
Education	Male	Female	Total



High School	102 (23.0%) (72.9%)	38 (16.0%) (27.1%)	140 (20.6%) (100.0%)
Two-year College	210 (47.4%) (66.2%)	107 (45.0%) (33.8%)	317 (46.5%) (100.0%)
College	65 (14.7%) (55.6%)	52 (21.8%) (44.4%)	117 (17.2%) (100.0%)
Graduate	66 (14.9%) (61.7%)	41 (17.2%) (38.3%)	107 (15.7%) (100.0%)
Total	443 (100.0%) (65.1%)	238 (100.0%) (34.9%)	681 (100.0%) (1000.0%)
Chi-square (3, 681) = 9.12, p < .05			
Note: The % in the upper set of parentheses refers to the column %; the % in the lower set of parentheses refers to the row %.			

Gender by Age: RQ1d asks: How, if at all, are employees' gender and age related? As shown in Table 5, the Chi-square test for gender by age is not statistically significant ($p > .05$), thereby indicating the absence of a gender effect with respect to the employees' age. The distribution for the age groups shows that 64.5% of the 18-25 age group are men and 35.5% are women, 62.9% of the 26-35 age group are men and 37.1% are women, and 72.5% of the 36 and above age group are men and 27.5% are women. Even though there are more men than women in the 36 and above age group, the overall results indicate that there is no gender effect relative to employees' age. The distribution of men and women for the 18-25 and 26-35 age groups is very similar to the overall gender distribution. An increasing number of young females attending tourism programs over the last decade and their subsequent employment within the hospitality industry after graduation could be affecting the distribution of gender relative to age.

Age	Male	Female	Total
18 - 25	200 (45.5%) (64.5%)	110 (46.8%) (35.5%)	310 (45.9%) (100.0%)
26-35	161 (36.6%) (62.9%)	95 (40.4%) (37.1%)	256 (37.9%) (100.0%)



36 & above	79 (18.0%) (72.5%)	30 (12.8%) (27.5%)	109 (16.1%) (100.0%)
Total	440 (100.0%) (65.2%)	235 (100.0%) (34.8%)	675 (100.0%) (100.0%)
Chi-square (2, 675) = 3.209, p > .05			
Note: The % in the upper set of parentheses refers to the column %; the % in the lower set of parentheses refers to the row %.			

Gender Effect on Recruiting Effort and Earning Potential

RQ2a asks: Does employee gender influence recruiting effort and earning potential? The analyses that are relevant to answering this question are presented in Table 6. Two different analyses are used in this table: one based on a one-sample *t*-test and the other based on a two-sample *t*-test. The one-sample *t*-test is used to ascertain whether or not a *gender bias*, which is one form of gender effect, exists. The two-sample *t*-test determines if a *gender difference*, which is a second type of gender effect, is present in the sample data.

Table 6: Employees' Perceptions of Two Types of Gender Effect on Recruiting Effort and Earning Potential in Turkish Hospitality Industry							
	Gender Bias						Gender Difference
	One-sample <i>t</i>-test: all respondents (n=682) Test mean = 0		One-sample <i>t</i>-test: male respondents (n=443) Test mean = 0		One-sample <i>t</i>-test: female respondents (n=239) Test mean = 0		Two-sample <i>t</i>-test: male vs. female respondents
	Mean	<i>p</i> -sign.	Mean	<i>p</i> -sign.	Mean	<i>p</i> -sign.	<i>p</i> -sign.
Recruiting Effort	-1.05	0.000	-1.51	0.000	-0.20	0.293	0.000
Earning Potential	-0.38	0.000	-0.66	0.000	0.15	0.370	0.000

In the one-sample *t*-test the mean test value is equal to zero (0), or equivalently it represents the midpoint of the response scale where there is an equal likelihood of the decision favoring either men or women. Since the scale used in the study ranged from “-5 = definitely males” to “+5 = definitely females”



with “0 = equally likely,” the sign of the arithmetic mean shows the direction of any *gender bias*. A negative sign for the mean indicates a decision orientation toward men, whereas a positive sign identifies a decision orientation tilted toward women. The two-sample *t*-test involves a comparison of means for male respondents versus female respondents, and it reflects testing of the statistical hypothesis that the mean values for male and female personnel are equal versus the hypothesis that they are not equal. The *t*-significance (or *p*-value) indicates whether or not men and women differ significantly in their responses; a significant difference would signify the existence of a *gender difference* with respect to recruiting or earning potential.

Table 6 provides the results of both the one-sample and two-sample *t*-tests. The one-sample results for all respondents indicate that hotel personnel in general perceive that male recruiters are more likely to offer them a job (Mean = -1.05, $p < .001$) and to offer them a higher salary (Mean = -0.38, $p < .001$). The negative sign of the mean reveals the presence of a *gender bias*. When the sample is broken down into subsamples of male respondents and female respondents, a *gender bias* exists in the male subsample but not in the female subsample. Specifically, male employees believe that male recruiters are more likely than female recruiters to make a job offer (Mean = -1.51, $p < .001$) and to offer a higher salary (Mean = -0.66, $p < .001$), whereas female employees believe male and female recruiters do not differ in terms of the likelihood of making a job offer (Mean = -0.20, $p > .05$) or offering a higher starting salary (Mean = 0.15, $p > .05$). The two-sample *t*-test results reveal a *gender difference* between men and women, as evidenced by the fact that male employees are significantly more likely than female employees to perceive that male recruiters will be more likely to offer them a job (Mean for male employees = -1.51, Mean for female employees = -0.20, $p < .001$) and a higher salary (Mean for male employees = -0.66, Mean for female employees = 0.15, $p < .001$).

Impact of Demographic Factors on Recruiting Effort and Earning Potential

The relative impacts of employee’s demographic characteristics on their perceptions of recruiters’ recruiting effort and the salary offered to recruits (earning potential) are addressed in RQ2b and RQ2c. RQ2b asks: What is the relative impact of employees’ gender, job position, department, education, and age on recruiting effort? RQ2c is: What is the relative impact of employees’ gender, job position, department, education, and age on earning potential?

To answer these two research questions, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was performed for each question (the results are not presented in tables). In each ANCOVA gender was the independent variable, and job position, department, education, and age were covariates. Recruiting effort was the dependent variable in one ANCOVA and earning potential was the dependent variable in other.

With respect to recruiting effort the department in which the hotel employees work is a significant covariate for their perceptions regarding whether male or female recruiters are the most likely to offer a job ($p < .01$). Although personnel in all departments believe that male recruiters are more likely to offer them a job, this belief is significantly stronger among members of the food and beverage department than



it is for personnel in all other departments. Job position, education, and age are not significant covariates ($p > .05$) with respect to recruiting effort. For the earning potential analysis, position, education, department, and age are non-significant covariates ($p > .05$); therefore, these factors do not have any impact on whether male or female recruiters offer the highest starting salary. This result, in conjunction with that for recruiting effort, suggests that regardless of the department in which hotel personnel work, they believe that there would be no difference in the salary offered by male or female recruiters.

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

This study focused on two research objectives containing a total of seven derivative research questions that pertain to the presence or absence of the *gender effect* within the Turkish hospitality industry. The results of this study have provided some revealing answers to the seven research questions.

Research questions 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d address the *gender effect*, as a general phenomenon, in relation to relevant demographic characteristics. Or more precisely, “how, if at all, is gender related to Turkish hospitality employees’ job position, department of employment, education level, and age?” Answering this question can provide insight regarding meaningful differences in the proportions of men and women occurring in each of the response categories of the selected demographic characteristics. A definitive differential between men and women in a given response category that departs significantly from the overall proportion of men and women relative to the specific demographic characteristic provides evidence of a *gender effect* — and the absence thereof indicates the lack of a *gender effect*. No significant difference exists with respect to job position or age, which relates to RQ1a and RQ1d, respectively. However, significant differences do exist with respect to department and education level, which pertain to RQ1b and RQ1c, respectively. Thus, a *gender effect* exists in relation to department and education level, but not job position and age.

Research Question 2a explores the potential existence of a *gender bias* and a *gender difference*, each of which is a different type of *gender effect*. A gender bias is revealed in the one-sample *t*-test results for the total sample of hotel employees and the male subsample, with the former being influenced substantially by the latter, wherein twice as many men as women are in the overall sample. Male respondents believe that male recruiters would be more likely than female recruiters to offer them a job and a higher salary, whereas female respondents do not perceive any differences between male and female recruiters with respect to recruiting effort and earning potential. These findings somewhat contradict the gender pay gap literature (*i.e.*, Gibelman, 2002; Hardin *et al.*, 2001; Joy, 2000; Longwell, 2004; Marchetti, 1996; Menguc, 1998; Roberts, 2002), which shows that men are offered the highest salary regardless of the recruit’s gender. Our results are consistent with the gender pay gap observation for male recruits but not for female recruits.

Research question 2a also addresses the presence (or absence) of a *gender difference*. The two-sample comparison of male versus female respondents reveals that both male and female personnel



believe that male recruiters are more likely to offer them a job (Mean = -1.51 for men and Mean = -0.21 for women), but that this belief is much stronger for the male employees. These findings demonstrate the existence of a *gender difference* for recruiting effort that is consistent with the findings of prior studies (Gallois *et al.*, 1992; Graves and Powell, 1988; Hardin *et al.*, 2002). Concerning the salary offered, male personnel feel that male recruiters would offer them the highest starting salary (Mean = -0.66), whereas female personnel perceive that female recruiters would offer them the highest starting salary (Mean = 0.15). Thus, each gender perceives that a same-gendered recruiter will offer them the highest starting salary. The results for earning potential are consistent with predictions derived from the Similarity-Attraction Paradigm (Byrne, 1971; Byrne and Neuman, 1992; Graves and Powell, 1995); Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel and Turner, 1986); and Self-Categorization Theory (Turner, 1982, 1985), which suggest that applicants would be offered a higher salary by recruiters of the same gender than by recruiters of the opposite gender.

Research Questions 2b and 2c focus on the relative impact of the various demographic variables, including gender, on hotel employees' beliefs regarding recruiting effort and earning potential. The ANCOVA results reveal a *gender effect* for both recruiting effort and earning potential, but that the recruiting effort variable is also influenced by the department in which the employees work. Apparently, the cultural milieu of the food and beverage department heightens and reinforces the *gender effect* more than it does in any of the other departments. We may speculate that working in this department requires more physical energy, which could be a factor that motivates males more than females.

Our results and conclusions must be put in the context of the potential limitations of the study and directions for future research. This study did not examine gender diversity by hotel classifications (*i.e.*, five-star hotels, four-star hotels, three-star hotels, and international chain hotels). Would the same or similar results be realized in different types of hotel classifications? Future research could address gender diversity by hotel classifications. A second potential limitation concerns the geographic location of the study. Would the same or similar results be found in other nations, both developed and developing? A third limitation is central to a much larger dominance of the summer-oriented seasonal beach resort hotel businesses; thus, future research should attempt to widen its scope to other forms of hotels such more hotels in large cities and ones catering to business travelers. Finally, are there other demographic characteristics that should be explored in relation to the *gender effect*? Extending the research to address these limitations would be a useful addition to our knowledge about the *gender effect*, and its subsidiary components — *gender bias* and *gender difference*.



REFERENCES

- Adib, A. and Guerrier, Y. (2003), The Interlocking of Gender with Nationality, Race, Ethnicity and Class: The Narratives of Women in Hotel Work, *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 413-432.
- Anonymous (2006), *What Is the Pay Gap and Why Does it Exist, Women & Equality Unit*, http://www.womenandequalityunit.gov.uk/pay/pay_facts.htm, [Accessed 12.26.2006].
- Ball, D.A., McCulloch, Jr., W.H., Frantz, P.L., Geringer, J.M., and Minor, M.S. (2002), *International Business: The Challenge of Global Competition* (8th ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Biswas, R. and Cassell, C. (1996), Strategic HRM and the Gendered Division of Labour in the Hotel Industry: A Case Study, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 19-34.
- Byrne, D. (1971), *The Attraction Paradigm*, New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D., and Neuman, J.H. (1992), "The Implications of Attraction Research for Organizational Issues," (in K. Kelley—Ed., *Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial and Organizational Psychology*), New York: Elsevier, pp. 29-70.
- Churchill, Jr., G.A. (1979), A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 16, pp. 64-73.
- Churchill, G.A., Collins, R.H., and Strang, W.A. (1975), Should Retail Salespersons be Similar to Their Customers?, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 51, Fall, pp. 29-42.
- Churchill, G.A. Jr., Ford, N.M., and Walker, O.C. Jr. (1997), *Sales Force Management*, 5th ed., Chicago: Irwin.
- Churchill, Jr., G.A. and Iacobucci, D. (2005), *Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations* (9th ed.), Cincinnati, OH: Thomson/South-Western.
- Crosby, L.A., Evans, K.R., and Cowles, D. (1990), Relationship Quality in Services Selling: An Interpersonal Influence Perspective, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, July, pp. 68-81.
- Dwyer, S., Orlando, R., and Shepherd, C.D. (1998), An Exploratory Study of Gender and Age Matching in the Salesperson-Prospective Customer Dyad: Testing Similarity-Performance Predictions, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, Vol. 4, Fall, pp. 55-69.
- Gallois, C., Callan, V.J., and Palmer, J.M. (1992), The Influence of Applicant Communication Style and Interviewer Characteristics on Hiring Decisions, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 22, pp. 1041-1060.
- Gibelman, M. (2002), Progress or Complacency? Pay Equity for Women Circa 2001, *Affilia*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 279-298.
- Graves, L.M., and Powell, G.N. (1988), An Investigation of Sex Discrimination in Recruiters' Evaluations of Actual Applicants, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73, pp. 20-29.
- Graves, L.M., and Powell, G.N. (1995), The Effect of Sex Similarity on Recruiters' Evaluations of Actual Applicants: A Test of the Similarity Attraction Paradigm, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, Spring, pp. 85-98.



- Hardin, R.J., Reding, K.F., and Stocks, M.H. (2002), The Effect of Gender on the Recruitment of Entry-Level Accountants, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 251-266.
- Joy, L. (2000), Do Colleges Shortchange Women? Gender Difference in the Transition from College to Work, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, No. 2, pp. 471-475.
- Kattara, H. (2005), Career Challenges for Female Managers in Egyptian Hotels, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 238-251.
- Longwell, J. (2004), Gentlemen First, *CRN. Jerincho*, Issue 1102, p. 26.
- Manwa, H. and Black, N. (2002), Influence of Organizational Culture on Female and Male Upward Mobility into Middle and Senior Managerial Positions, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 357-373.
- Marchetti, M. (1996), Attention All Women: Get Greedy, *Sales and Marketing Management*, Vol. 148, No. 10, p. 54.
- Menguc, B. (1998), The Earning Gap Between Male and Female Sales Managers, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 27, No. 5, pp. 385-400.
- Narver, J., and Slater, S. F. (1990), The Effects of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, pp. 20-35.
- Pinar, M., Nisolle, J.E. and McCuddy, M.K. (2007a) Examining the Gender Effect on Recruitment and Earning Potential for Salespeople in a Developing Country: A Study of Tajik Students' Perceptions, paper presented at International Conference on Business, Management, and Economics (ICBME), Turkey.
- Pinar, M., Nisolle, J.E. and McCuddy, M.K. (2007b), Investigating the Impact of Gender on Managing a Sales Force in a Developing Country: An Exploratory Study in Tajikistan, *The Business Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 209-215.
- Purcell, K. (1996), The Relationship between Career and Job Opportunities: Women's Employment in the Hospitality Industry as a Microcosm of Women's Employment, *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 17-24.
- Roberts, C. (2002), Where Are the Female Hotel Executives?, *Lodging Hospitality*, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp. 33-34.
- Schellhardt, T.D. (1994), The Selling Game — A Special Report on People and Their Jobs in Offices, Fields and Factories, *The Wall Street Journal*, Eastern Edition, March 29, p. A1.
- Smith, J.B. (1998), Buyer-Seller Relationships: Similarity, Relationship Management, and Quality, *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 15, January, pp. 3-21.
- Sparrowe, R. T. and Iverson, K. M. (1999), Cracks in the Glass Ceiling? An Empirical Study of Gender Differences in Income in the Hospitality Industry, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 4-20.
- Tajfel, H. (1982), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, New York: Cambridge University Press.



- Tajfel, H., and Turner, J.C. (1986), "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior," (in: S. Worchel and W.G. Austin—Eds., *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*), Chicago: Nelson-Hall, pp. 7-24.
- Thrane, C. (2007), Earnings Differentiation in the Tourism Industry: Gender, Human Capital and Socio-demographic Effects, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 29, pp. 514-524.
- Turner, J.C. (1982), Toward a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group, *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 12, pp. 15-40.
- Turner, J.C. (1985), Social Categorization and the Self-Concept: A Social-Cognitive Theory of Group Behavior, *Advances in Group Processes: Theory and Research*, Vol. 2, pp. 77-121.
- Weitz, B.A. (1981), Effectiveness in Sales Interactions: A Contingency Framework, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 45, Winter, pp. 85-103.