How Aware are we of our Rights in Work Life? A Quantitative Comparative Study Between Tourism Industry Female Employees of Turkey and Italy

Demet Tuzunkan
Woosong College, Daejeon, South Korea

Abstract: The aim of the study is determining the level of compliance with decent work principles among tourism industry workers. Tourism industry has a complex structure with its working conditions as well as its employees with different demographic characteristics. In this research, employees' awareness of their rights are resolved through survey questions. These survey questions have been prepared through the Wage Indicator Foundation. The questions in the questionnaire have been prepared in accordance with decent work indicators. Through these questions 9 out of 10 indicators are assessed. Only the employment opportunities indicator has been excluded from the survey due to its concept. The questionnaire was applied to female city hotel workers in Bologna and Istanbul and the results were evaluated comparatively based on Italian and Turkish female employees' points of view on the available legal structure. Statistical analysis conducted for each indicator and hypothesis were interpreted with the homogeneity of variance test (Levene's test) t-test.

Key words: Labor rights, decent work, work life, demographic, industry

INTRODUCTION

All women and men have the right to live and work under respectable and equal conditions. Alongside this, the benefits of minorities like youth, children, the disabled, elderly, pregnant, etc., who must be protected as per social politics, must not be disregarded. International Labour Organization (ILO) has underlined in its acceptance of decent work in 1999 that all women and men in the world must work under conditions that observe human dignity and has further solidified it with the final shaping of its measurement criteria in 2008.

All over the world, people live and work under the protection of the constitutions and various laws of the countries of which they are citizens. However, conditions where laws are disregarded, misunderstood or distorted may arise especially in the work life from time to time. One way of preventing these is to inform individuals of their present rights. This study has been conducted on this trajectory. Hotel employees as workers of a labour-intensive industry have been asked how aware they are of their legal rights via the conducted survey. These questions have been grouped under nine of the ten substantive indicators of decent work. Thus, a comparison of awareness of criterion-specific labour rights has been made between female hotel employees in Turkey and Italy in this study. Turkey and Italy have been chosen since they are close rivals in terms of tourist attraction among Mediterranean countries and exhibit similarities in terms of population. The conclusion of the study reveals that Italy scores higher points in the comparison than Turkey.

The concept of decent work: Since, ILO's foundation in 1919, the organization's core philosophy has been to improve the work and life standards in all countries around the world. Upon entering the 21st century, decent work has become ILO's main target. decent work has been brought up initially in a report presented by Juan Somavia, Director-General of ILO at the time at the 87th conference in 1999. Decency of work depends on rights such as good salary, social security and representation rights (Auer, 2006). October 7th has been announced as world decent work day (Oz, 2008).

Decent work may mean different things for different people. For children, decent work constitutes not working or working without hindering the child's education for employed adults it means decent salary and overpay when there is overwork for unemployed individuals it means finding a job fast enough. For unemployed, young adult women, decent work means having the same rights as the opposite sex (Bescond, 2003).

Decent work must be assessed based on the country. Global conclusions may be made by considering different countries' decent work data individually. Similarly, each country's own work laws and legislations hold significance on a national level in terms of decent work. If global employment and decent work conditions are desired, then national level developments should be

the starting point. This way, each country's individually structured workforce will be influenced by developments simultaneously. Especially in developing countries, priority must be given to the decrement and even annihilation of informal economies (ILO, 2007).

In his 2006 study, Tipple lists the components of decent work as they were relayed at the 87th ILO conference as follows (Tipple, 2006):

- There should be sufficient work for all to have full access to income-earning opportunities
- It generates an adequate income
- Workers' rights are protected in it
- It is productive, not just existing as 'work for work's sake'
- It provides adequate social protection

Decent work includes a conceptual framework that references people's work and employment rights, workers' health and social security conditions and their representative rights via unions and other means. At the 87th ILO Conference in 1999 where decent work was coined for the first time, the fact that all people have decent work as part of their human rights, regardless of whether they are unionized or not, young or old was emphasized. For a work to be decent work it must be free of forced labour and child labour the employee must receive the deserved salary for the performed labour and the basic rights and principles regarding work must be fulfilled in a tripartite agreement between the government, employee and employer. In ILO's definition of decent work the following sentence stands out.

"The first important feature in the new ILO vision is the articulation of its goal the promotion of opportunities for women and men to obtain decent and productive work, in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity." As can be understood from the definition of this goal, the field of execution for decent work is not limited to employees in the formal economy but is inclusive of any disadvantaged groups lacking regular salary. All women and men must have equal opportunity.

Conclusively, decent work is the set of standards that must exist in the work life where everyone is included, employment opportunities are created fairly, all employees have rights and are included in a social security system. Decent work is measured via 10 indicators. These indicators are explained below.

Employment opportunities: The employment opportunities indicator puts forth the size of supply and demand in the workforce. The indicator includes the employment ages 15-64 to overall population ratio, unemployment rate, youth unemployment rate and informal employment rate (ILO, 2012).

Adequate earnings and productive work: Adequate Earnings and Productive Work indicator comprises data regarding employee wages in accordance with human dignity. Minimum wages, overtime pay and nighttime wages are included within this indicator (ILO, 2012).

Decent working time: Employment within decent working Time that is observant of human dignity, employment without exceeding 48 h per week, lawful execution of overtime work are included under this indicator. Apart from these, employee rights regarding paid annual leave and vacation time earned for work conducted on religious and other holiday times are also examined under decent working time (ILO, 2012).

Combining work, family and personal life: Combining work, family and personal life indicator covers maternity and parental leaves and pay to which women and men have rights (ILO, 2012).

Work that should be abolished: According to decent work, Work That Should Be Abolished includes child labour and forced labour. This indicator studies the rights of children under 15, between 15-17, people working in adverse conditions and people coerced into work (ILO, 2012).

Stability and security of work: Stability and Security of Work indicator comprises protective measures towards the possibility of rapid dismissal and dismissal of employees without severance pay. This indicator emphasizes the rights of workers in precarious employment such as casual and short term workers. It also states obligations for contractual agreements and the standards to go by in case of contract termination (ILO, 2012).

Equal opportunity and treatment in employment: Among the basic principles of decent work is that every woman and man are employed under equal work conditions. This indicator measures whether wage-related and positional discriminations are being made based on color, race, religion, disability, sex, etc (ILO, 2012).

Safe work environment: Workplace health and occupational safety are among the basic principles of decent work. Stated under this indicator are employee rights regarding work accidents and occupational diseases, preventive measures within the responsibility of

the employer prior to the occurrence of work accidents and occupational diseases and labour inspections at the workplace (ILO, 2012).

Social security: Measured under this indicator are employee rights in old age, cases of disability and death as part of long term security care (ILO, 2012).

Social dialogue, workers' and employers' representation: The last indicator of decent work, social dialogue studies the rights of workers regarding trade unions and collective bargaining (ILO, 2012).

Aim of the study: The aim of this study is to determine the extent to which decent work principles are followed in the tourism industry an industry that displays a complex structure both in terms of work conditions and employee demographics. According to The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) 2014 data, Italy ranks 5th and Turkey ranks 6th among countries visited by highest number of tourists (UNWTO, 2015). The conclusion of the study displays whether tourism industry employees in Italy which constitutes Turkey's closest rival in tourism work under Decent Work conditions or not. The study provides opportunity for comparison of the two countries in this aspect.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Employees' awareness of their rights as per labour law and the rate at which they practice these rights are determined by way of survey questions. The survey questions have been administered with the Wage Indicator Foundation's 2012 study, designed to provide decent work measurements through the eyes of female employees. The questions in the survey have been designed in accordance with decent work indicators and provide measurements for 9 indicators. These indicators are work that should be abolished adequate earnings and productive work decent working time stability and security of work combining work, family and personal life equal opportunity and treatment in employment safe work environment social security and social dialogue. According to maternity and fertility questions the survey was applied directly to female workers. Demographic questions were not asked.

The survey results have been assessed as a comparative study among city hotel female employees of Istanbul and Bologna. The universe of the study has been determined as female employees from all city hotels in Turkey and Italy and the samples have been determined as female employees of four-star hotels in Istanbul and Bologna.

There are sections of questions for each indicator. The number of four-star hotels that comprise the sample are 104 hotels in Istanbul and 25 hotels in Bologna. The survey omits demographic questions and concentrates directly on whether labour laws within content of each indicator are applied or not. Out of the 104 hotels in Istanbul, 96 have been reached and surveys collected from a total of 204 employees. In Bologna, 21 out of 25 hotels have been reached and a total of 80 surveys collected from employees. In the survey, 9 indicators have been answered with a total of 40 yes/no questions. Only employment opportunities indicator has been omitted from the survey. Essential statistic analyses have been conducted for each indicator and variance homogeneity test (Levene's Test) and t-test have been conducted and interpreted in accordance with the proposed hypothesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings of study: As can be observed from Table 1 work that should be abolished indicator displays a positive quality for both countries. In both countries, the "yes" reply to all three questions regarding the indicator are close to 100%. Only 1 person out of the 204 employees who took the survey in Turkey has stated that children under 15 work at their workplace.

- H_0: In terms of decent work's work that should be abolished indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 2)

According to Table 3 the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for work that should be abolished criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are the same (p = 0.210>0.05). Therefore, t-test for two

Table 1: Ratio of "yes" replies to work that should be abolished indicator

Work that should be abolished questions	Turkey (Yes) (%)	Italy (Yes) (%)
In my workplace, it is forbidden to employ children under 15	99.51	100
I have the right to terminate employment after serving notice	100	100
My employer keeps my workplace free of forced or bonded labour	100	100
General ratio	0.9984	100

Table 2: Essential statistics for work that should be abolished indicator

Question	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SEM	SD
Work that should be abolished	Italy	80	1.0000	0.00000	0.00000
	Turkey	204	0.9984	0.02334	0.00163

Table 3: Hypothesis test results for work that should be abolished indicatorr

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Work that should be abolished									
Equal variances assumed	1.581	0.210	0.626	282.000	0.532	00163	0.00261	-0.0351	0.00678
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.000	203.000	0.319	00163	0.00163	-0.0159	0.00486

Table 4: Ratio of "yes" replies to adequate earnings and productive work indicator

Adequate earnings and productive work questions	Turkey (yes) (%)	Italy (yes) (%)
I earn at least the minimum wage announced by the government (TR)/I earn at least the minimum wage determined by collective bargaining (IT)	100.00	100.0
I get my pay on a regular basis (daily, weekly, fortnightly, monthly)	100.00	100.0
Whenever I work overtime, I always get compensation	3.92	36.25
Whenever I work at night, I get higher compensation for night work	10.29	36.25
General ratio	53.55	6.13

Table 5: Essential statistics for adequate earnings and productive work indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Adequate earnings and productive work	Italya	80	0.6813	0.24188	0.02074
	Turkiye	204	0.5355	0.10655	0.00746

independent samples has been applied for the values in the first line (Equal variances assumed). As the t statistic value quoted in the equal variances assumed line is 0.626 and Sig. 0.532>0.05, in terms of work conditions under decent work's work that should be abolished indicator, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically insignificant. Hypothesis H_0 cannot be denied.

According to Table 4 the ratio of employees in Turkey who have replied "yes" to especially the "whenever I work overtime, I always get compensation" statement under the adequate earnings and productive work indicator is only 3.92%. Out of a total of 204 participants, only 8 receive overtime compensation. 196 participants do not. Moreover, only 21 participants out of 204 have stated that they receive higher compensation for night work and the ratio of participants who have replied "yes" to this has remained only at 10.29%. Both questions reveal a low ratio of "yes" replies for Italy as well. Only 36.25% of 80 participants receive overtime and night work compensation. However, it is also observed that the wages received are not lower than the minimum wages announced by the government or through collective bargaining and that all participants receive their payments regularly. For this indicator, the general ratio for Turkey is 53.55% and for Italy 68.13%.

- H_1: In terms of decent work's adequate earnings and productive work indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 5)

First, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for adequate earnings and productive work criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same (p = 0.0<0.05). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (equal variances not assumed). As the t statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 5.194 and Sig. 0.000<0.05 in terms of work conditions under decent work's adequate earnings and productive work criterion, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically significant. H_1 hypothesis cannot be accepted (Table 6).

As can be seen from Table 7 employees in Turkey have not replied with a high ratio of positivity to any of the questions other than a weekly rest period of at least 24 h. It appears especially unlikely for employees to receive compensatory vacation time upon having to work on a public holiday or weekly rest day. Only 2 out of a total of 204 participants have replied "yes" to this question. Furthermore, they also lack paid national or religious holidays. Only 3 participants have positive responses to this question and the general ratio is merely about 10.47%. This indicator measures at a general 25.98% "yes" ratio for Turkey and states that hotel employees in Turkey do not work under decent work conditions in terms of decent working time. On the other hand, the same criterion measures at 56.25% in Italy and paints a more positive profile than Turkey. Remarkably only 19.12% or in other words just 1/5 (one fifth of) employees in Turkey have responded "yes" to working a maximum of 45 h a week as stated in labour laws or collective bargains whereas 100% employees in Italy have responded positively to the same question. In terms of abiding labour law, Italy is in good state with an average of 77.92% "yes" replies under this indicator. Turkey's average ratio is 25.98% (Table 8).

Table 6: Hypothesis test results for adequate earnings and productive work indicator

Variables	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Adequate earnings and productive work									
Equal variances assumed	248.249	0.000	7.048	282.000	0.000	0.14571	0.02067	0.10501	0.18641
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	5.194	91.276	0.000	0.14571	0.02805	0.08999	0.20143

Table 7: Ratio of "yes" replies to decent working time indicator

Decent working time indicator questions	Turkey (yes) (%)	Italy (yes) (%)
I work for a maximum of 45 h a week	19.12	100.00
I receive at least 14 days of paid annual leave (TR)/I receive at least 4 weeks of paid annual leave (IT)	23.94	98.75
I receive paid public (national and religious) holidays	1.47	56.25
I get a weekly rest period of at least 24 h in a week	97.55	100.00
Whenever I work on a public holiday or weekly rest day, I get compensatory vacation day	0.98	56.25
Whenever I work on a weekly rest day or public holiday, I get due compensation for it	13.78	56.25
General ratio	25.98	77.92

Table 8: Essential statistics for decent working time indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Decent working time	Italy	80	0.7792	0.25266	0.02825
	Turkey	204	0.2598	0.15532	0.01087

- H_2: in terms of decent work's decent working time indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey

First, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for decent working Time criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same ($p = 0.0 < 0.05$). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (equal variances not assumed). As the t statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 17.158 and Sig. $0.000 < 0.05$ in terms of work conditions under decent work's decent working time criterion the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically significant. H_2 hypothesis cannot be accepted (Table 9).

As can be seen at Table 10 Turkey and Italy present similar conditions in terms if stability and security of work. Nearly everyone is provided with a contract and this contract is prepared as a permanent employment contract. Furthermore, employees in neither country experience problems in terms of severance pay and payment in lieu of notice. The average for Turkey measures at 98.33% and

for Italy 99.50%' dir. This shows that decent work's stability and security of work indicator rates close to perfect in both countries.

- H_3: in terms of decent work's stability and security of work indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 11)

Initially, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for stability and security of work criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same ($p = 0.001 < 0.05$). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (equal variances not assumed). As the t -statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 1.843 and Sig. $0.067 > 0.05$ in terms of work conditions under decent work's stability and security of work indicator, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically insignificant. H_3 hypothesis cannot be denied (Table 12).

According to Table 13 the ratio of positive replies to questions regarding rights of employees in cases of birth, pregnancy and maternity, cases that are especially important for women employees is close to excellent in both countries. In both countries, women employees work as the law requires.

- H_4: in terms of decent work's combining work, family and personal life indicator there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 14)

Initially, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for combining work, family and personal life criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are the same ($p = 0.210 > 0.05$). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the first

Table 9: Hypothesis test results for decent working time indicator

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Decent time working									
Equal variances assumed	134.199	0.000	20.970	282.000	0.000	0.51936	0.02477	0.47061	0.56811
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	17.158	103.267	0.000	0.51936	0.03027	0.45933	0.57939

Table 10: Ratio of "yes" replies to stability and security of work indicator

Stability and security of work questions	Turkey Yes (%)	Italy Yes (%)
I was provided a written statement of particulars at the start of my employment	98.04	100.00
My employer does not hire workers on fixed term contracts	99.51	98.75
My probation period has been clearly stated on my contract	94.12	98.75
My employer gives due notice before terminating my employment contract (or pays in lieu of notice)	100.00	100.00
My employer pays severance pay in terms of termination of employment	100.00	100.00
General ratio	98.33	99.50

Table 11: Essential statistics for stability and security of work indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Stability and	Italy	80	0.9950	0.04472	0.00500
Security of work	Turkey	204	0.9833	0.05541	0.00388

Table 12: Hypothesis test results for stability and security of work

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Stabilty securty of work									
Equal variances assumed	11.887	0.01	1680	282	0.094	0.1167	0.0694	-0.0020	0.2533
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.843	177.698 0.67	0.1167	0.0063	0.0082	-0.2416	

Table 13: Ratio of "yes" replies to combining work, family and personal life indicator

Combining work, family and personal life questions	Turkey yes (%)	Italy yes (%)
During pregnancy, I am exempted from nightshifts (night work) and hazardous work	100.00	100
My maternity leave lasts at least 14 weeks	100.00	100
During my maternity leave, I get at least 2/3rd of my former salary	99.51	100
I am protected from dismissal during the period of pregnancy	100.00	100
I have the right to get same/similar job when I return from maternity leave	100.00	100
My employer allows nursing breaks, during working hours	100.00	100
General ratio	99.92	100

Table 14: Essential statistics for combining work, family and personal life indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Combining work,	Italy	80	1.0000	0.00000	0.00000
family and personal life	Turkey	204	0.9992	0.01167	0.00082

- H_5: in terms of decent work's equal opportunity and treatment in employment indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 17)

Initially, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for equal opportunity and treatment in employment criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are the same (p = 0.074>0.05). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the first line (equal variances assumed). As the t-statistic value quoted in the equal variances assumed line is 0.887 and Sig. 0.376>0.05, in terms of work conditions under equal opportunity and treatment in employment indicator, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically insignificant. H_5 hypothesis cannot be denied (Table 18).

line (equal variances assumed). As the t-statistic value quoted in the equal variances assumed line is 0.626 and Sig. 0.532>0.05 in terms of work conditions under decent work's combining work, family and personal life indicator, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically insignificant. H_4 hypothesis cannot be denied (Table 15).

As can be observed from Table 16 discriminatory actions are not encountered in either country. The results are close to perfect. Indicator of decent work is harmonious with the current laws:

Table 15: Hypothesis test results for combining work, family and personal life indicator

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Combining work, family and personal life									
Equal variances assumed	1.58	0.210	0.626	282.000	0.532	0.00082	0.00131	-0.00175	0.00339
Equal variances not assumed			1.000	203.000	0.319	0.00082	0.00082	-0.00079	0.00243

Table 16: Ratio of "yes" replies to equal opportunity and treatment in employment indicator

Equal opportunity and treatment in employment questions	Turkey yes (%)	Italy yes (%)
My employer ensures equal pay for equal/similar work (work of equal value) without any discrimination	99.02	100
My workplace is free of occupational, promotional, financial discrimination on the basis of matters quoted below Sex Race Colour Religion Political opinion Nationality Age Disability Trade union membership or Related activities	100	100
General ratio	99.51	100

Table 17: Essential statistics for equal opportunity and treatment in employment indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Equal opportunity and treatmentItaly in employmentitaly	Italy	80	1.0000	0.00000	0.00000
	Turkey	204	0.9951	0.04939	0.00346

According to Table 19 employers in Turkey and Italy rank excellent in providing hotel employees with safe work environment, inspections, taking preventive measures against potential work accidents and occupational diseases and informing employees. However, inadequacies in labour inspections are clearly visible in the survey results. Only 35 employees out of 204 in Turkey and 31 out of 80 in Italy claim that their workplaces are inspected. However, overall responses to the indicator show positive inclination.

- H_6: in terms of decent work's Safe Work Environment indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 20)

First, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for safe work environment criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same ($p = 0.0 < 0.05$). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (equal variances not assumed). As the t-statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 3.765 and Sig. $0.000 < 0.05$ in terms of work conditions under decent work's safe work environment criterion the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically significant. H_6 hypothesis cannot be accepted (Table 21).

According to Table 22 social security indicators in Turkey and Italy fall within the criterion set by decent work. As can be observed, long term security is satisfactory for hotel workers of both countries. The individuals are aware of their rights. The overall ratios for both countries indicate a near-excellent level.

- H_7: in terms of decent work's social security indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 23)

First, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for social security criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same ($p = 0.0 < 0.05$). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (equal variances not assumed). As the t statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 3.868 and Sig. $0.000 < 0.05$, in terms of work conditions under decent work's social security criterion, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically significant. H_7 hypothesis cannot be accepted (Table 24).

As can be observed from Table 25 the most significant difference between Turkey and Italy's decent work indicators lies within the social dialogue indicator. whereas almost all employees in Italy are represented by a labour union or covered by a collective bargain, only 3 out of 204 employees in Turkey have given feedback of the existence of unions at their workplace. Employees

Table 18: Hypothesis test results for equal opportunity and treatment in employment indicator

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Equal opportunity and treatment in employment									
Equal variances assumed	3.209	0.074	0.887	282.000	0.376	0.00490	0.00553	-0.00598	0.01578
Equal variances not assumed			1.418	203.000	0.158	0.00490	0.00346	-0.00192	0.01172

Table 19: Ratio of "yes" replies to safe work environment indicator

Safe work environment questions	Italy Yes (%)	Turkey Yes (%)
My employer makes sure my workplace is safe and healthy	100	100
My employer provides protective equipment and clothing free of cost	100	100
My employer provides adequate health and safety training and ensures that workers know the health hazards and the emergency exits in case of an accident	100	100
My workplace is visited by a labour inspector at least once a year	17.16	38.75
I am provided sick pay leave	99.51	100
I get adequate compensation in the case of an occupational accident/work injury or occupational disease	99.51	100
My employment is secure during the first 6 months of my illness	99.51	100
General ratio	87.96	91.25

Table 20: Essential statistics for safe work environment indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Safe work	Italy	80	0.9125	0.07004	0.00783
environment	Turkey	204	0.8796	0.05581	0.00391

Table 21: Hypothesis test results for safe work environment indicator levene's test for equality of variances

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Safe work environment									
Equal variances assumed	38.390	0.000	4.153	282.000	0.000	0.03295	0.00793	0.01733	0.04856
Equal variances not assumed			3.765	120.338	0.000	0.03295	0.00875	0.01562	0.05027

Table 22: Ratio of "yes" replies to social security indicator

Social security questions	Turkey yes (%)	Italy yes (%)
I am entitled to a pension when I turn 60 as a man or 58 as a woman (TR)/I am entitled to a pension when I turn 66 (IT)	100	100
I get unemployment benefit in case I lose my job	93.14	100
If I die as an employee, my lawful next of kin receive benefits	100	100
General ratio	97.71	100

Table 23: Essential statistics for social security indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Social security	Italy	80	1.0000	0.00000	0.00000
	Turkey	204	0.9771	0.08448	0.00591

Initially, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for social dialogue criterion and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same (p = 0.0<0.05). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (Equal variances not assumed). As the t statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 46.083 and Sig. 0.000<0.05 in terms of work conditions under decent work's social dialogue criterion, the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically significant. H_8 hypothesis cannot be accepted (Table 27).

As can be seen from Table 28 out of the 9 decent work indicators measured in this survey there are significant differences observed between Turkey and Italy especially in 3 indicators. These are adequate earnings and productive work, decent working time and social dialogue. For these 3 indicators the hypotheses that "there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey in terms of decent work's related indicator" have not been accepted. In the general

show signals that employers may be disapproving of joining a union and/or related activities. General ratio for Turkey is a mere 9.93% whereas for Italy, it is a positive 95%.

- H_8: in terms of decent work's social dialogue indicator, there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 26)

Table 24: Hypothesis test results for social security indicator

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Social security									
Equal variances assumed	27.286	0.000	2.419	282.000	0.016	0.02288	0.00946	0.00426	0.04149
Equal variances not assumed			3.868	203.000	0.000	0.02288	0.00591	0.01121	0.03454

Table 25: Ratio of "yes" replies to social dialogue indicator

Social dialogue questions	Turkey yes (%)	Italy yes (%)
I have a labour union at my workplace	1.47	98.75
I have the right to join a union at my workplace	19.12	100
My employer allows collective bargaining at my workplace	3.43	100
My colleagues and I can defend our social and economic interests through "strike" without fear of discrimination	15.69	81.25
General ratio	9.93	95

Table 26: Essential statistics for social dialogue indicator

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Social dialogue	Italy	80	0.9500	0.10821	0.01210
	Turkey	204	0.0993	0.19917	0.01394

Table 27: Hypothesis test results for social dialogue indicator

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Social dialogue									
Equal variances assumed	18.886	0.000	36.145	282.000	0.000	0.85074	0.02354	0.80440	0.89707
Equal variances not assumed			46.083	253.928	0.000	0.85074	0.01846	0.81438	0.88709

Table 28: Ratio and score of "yes" replies to all indicators of decent work

All indicators	Turkey ratio of "yes" (%)	Italy ratio of "yes" (%)
Work that should be abolished	99.84	100
Adequate earnings and productive work	53.55	68.13
Decent working time	25.98	77.92
Stability and security of work	98.33	99.50
Combining work family and personal life	99.92	100
Equal opportunity and treatment in employment	99.51	100
Safe work environment	87.96	91.25
Social security	97.71	100
Social dialogue	9.93	100
General ratio	74.75	94.4

Table 29: Essential statistics for all indicators of decent work

Indicators	Parameter 1	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Total of all	Italy	80	0.9141	0.05481	0.00613
indicators	Turkey	204	0.7271	0.04297	0.00301

Table 30: Hypothesis test results for all indicators of decent workr

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
Variables	F-value	Sig.	t-values	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	SE difference	Lower	Upper
Total of all indicators									
Equal variances assumed	17.829	0.000	30.425	282.000	0.000	0.18698	0.00615	0.17488	0.19908
Equal variances not assumed			27.391	118.977	0.000	0.18698	0.00683	0.17346	0.20050

ratios, Turkey has received a score of 74.75 whereas Italy has received 94.4. There is a score difference of 17.6 between the two countries.

- H_9: in terms of decent work's indicators as a whole there are no differences in the work conditions of the employees in Italy and Turkey (Table 29)

Initially, the homogeneity of the variances for the two groups (Italy, Turkey) has been studied. The variance value regarding points of employees in Italy for all criteria and the variance value of employees in Turkey are not the same ($p = 0.0<0.05$). Therefore, t-test for two independent samples has been applied for the values in the second line (Equal variances not assumed). As the t-statistic value quoted in the equal variances not assumed line is 27.391 and Sig. $0.000<0.05$ in terms of work conditions under decent work's indicators as a whole the difference between employees in Italy and Turkey is statistically significant. H_9 hypothesis cannot be accepted.

CONCLUSION

Decent Work, a framework of standards where all women and men work under equal and fair conditions, employment opportunities created, employee rights provided, social security and dialogue principles realized, is measured via 10 indicators. These indicators are employment opportunities; work that should be abolished; adequate earnings and productive work; decent working time; stability and security of work; combining work, family and personal life; equal opportunity and treatment in employment; safe work environment; social security and social dialogue, employers' and workers' representation.

In this study, a survey comprising of 40 questions and 9 indicators has been presented to four-star hotel employees in Bologna and Istanbul in order to determine whether female personnel at Italian and Turkish hotels are employed under conditions that are compliant with decent work criteria. According to survey results, the difference between Turkey and Italy has been evident in decent working time; adequate earnings and productive work and social dialogue indicators. Italy ranks better in comparison to Turkey in terms of these indicators. Survey results reveal that Turkey scores 17.6 points behind Italy in the overall average of all indicators.

Score differences are present in especially 3 main criteria. These criteria are related to wages, work hours and labour unions. Female employees in Turkey are far behind their Italian colleagues in receiving pay for nighttime and overtime work. Similarly, though female employees in Italy use more paid holiday leave their colleagues in Turkey are not compensated with paid leave for times they work on public holidays or weekly rest days. Necessary legal regulations regarding wages, vacations and constant inspection are essential. Another way of protecting employee rights is through joining unions. However, as can be detected from the results, even though legal rights to joining unions are present in Turkey, the practice is nearly nonexistent among the country's hotel employees, whereas all rights of workers in Italy are determined by unions. Regarding this, it is necessary for unions to work more actively, present themselves and organize incentive activities and events. Fixing wage and working time related inadequacies in Turkey appears possible through effective and productive unionizing as well.

REFERENCES

Auer, P., 2006. Protected mobility for employment and decent work: Labour market security in a globalized world. J. Ind. Relat., 48: 21-40.
Bescond, D., A. Chataignier and F. Mehran, 2003. Seven indicators to measure decent work: An international comparison. Int. Labour Rev., 142: 179-212.
ILO, 2007. Toolkit for Mainstreaming Employment and decent work. International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland, ISBN:978-92-2-121540-0,.
ILO., 2012. decent work Indicators Concepts and Definitions. International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland, ISBN:9789221280187, Pages: 257.
Luangsa, A.N., 2016. Guideline in developing a tourism route: A case study of Tambon Bang Nok Khwaek, Samutsongkharm Province. Int. J. Hum. Arts Soc. Sci., 2: 101-104.
Oz, F., 2008. decent work and wage indicator. Hans-Bockler-Foundation, Institute of Economic and Social Research, UK.
Tipple, G., 2006. Employment and work conditions in home-based enterprises in four developing countries: Do they constitutedecent work'?. Work Employment Soc., 20: 167-179.
UNWTO, 2015. Tourism highlights 2015. World Tourism Organization UNWTO, Moscow, Russia. http://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284416899.