

The Dynamics of Demographic Characteristics: An Exploratory Study

Dr. Andleeb Akhtar¹, Dr. Sadaf Ahsan², Dr. Sameena Humayun Khan³, Ms. Anbreen Bibi⁴, Ms. Saira Bano⁵

¹Lecturer, Department of Psychology, The University of Haripur, Haripur, Pakistan
Email: andleebmalik81@yahoo.com

²Associate Professor, Psychology Department, FUSST, Foundation University Islamabad, Pakistan

³Lecturer, Department of Psychology, The University of Haripur, Haripur, Pakistan

⁴Lecturer, Department of Economics, The University of Haripur, Haripur, Pakistan

⁵Lecturer, Department of Psychology, The University of Haripur, Haripur, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The current research studied the relationship between demographic variables and organizational processes and their impact on organizational processes and outcomes. The mean differences were also studied. Demographic variables: gender, age, designation, education, salary, job experience, management level, functional department and organizational size significantly impacted organizational process and outcomes (ie. national culture, organizational culture, emotional intelligence and perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship behavior, quality of work life, organizational performance). Gender differences were significant on perceived organizational support. Job experiences were significant in all years and across organizational processes and outcomes.

Keywords: gender, age, designation, education, salary, job experience, management level, functional department, organizational size, national culture, organizational culture, emotional intelligence and perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship behavior, quality of work life and organizational performance

INTRODUCTION

Today's competitive environment is challenging, helping organizations to enhance their performance and success by implementing new approaches (Salajegheh et al. 2015; Taslimi, 2015). They need to have a clear understanding of demographic characteristics of employees and the influence of demographic variables to organizational processes and outcomes. Employees are seen as most important asset. Their work is affected by a number of organizational and subjective factors (Robbins & Judge, 2013). The demographic factors influence organizational behaviors, processes and outcomes. Demographic characteristics are also called biographical characteristics. These variables impart potential contributions of a diverse workforce leading to

enhanced job performance. These demographic characteristics are a source of skills, abilities and talent for organizations. These individual differences may also lead to miscommunication, misunderstanding, and conflict in work life. Today the statistics of demographic variables of workforce have changed as they were before three decades. Age and gender is no more a hurdle now. Women and individuals of 55 years age and above are a large part of workforce. Their experience benefits in improving quality, employee productivity by improving customer service and work-life conflicts (DiNatale & Boraas, 2002).

Similarly gender differences affect job performance, problem-solving, ability, analytical skills, competitive drive, motivation,

sociability, or learning ability (Weiss et al. 2003; Jorm et al. 2004). Researches have shown significant minor gender differences where women are more agreeable and conforming to authority as compared to men. Men are aggressive, competitive, have more success expectations of success. However, no significant gender differences were found in job productivity between them (Black & Holden, 1998). But significant higher rates of absenteeism and turn over found among women due to family responsibilities (Tait et al. 1989). There is a role reversal between women and men for job and family responsibilities (Halrynjo, 2009; Jayson, 2009) but mothers were rated especially low in competence (Heilman & Okimoto, 2008). Gender emerged as a significant predictor of quality of worklife and is strongly associated. Also, gender moderated the relationship between masculinity and quality of worklife (Ganesh & Paramasivam, 2014). Previous researches showed non significant gender differences in emotional intelligence (Meshkat & Nejati, 2017). The researchers report significant gender difference in organizational citizenship behavior. Women are seen to display less organizational citizenship behaviors as compared to men (Punia & Shyam, 2017). Female employees experienced better quality of worklife than male employees (Tabassum et al. 2012). However this relationship was non-significant also (Wright, 2002; Bhuvaneswari, 2012; Ahmad, 2017). Many organizations found older workers as a huge pool of potential of experience, judgment, work ethics, more specialized to certain types of work, show high commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, more work satisfied, have better relationships with co-workers (Ng & Feldman, 2010) and have higher wage rates, longer paid vacations, and more attractive pension benefits. They are also perceived as having low flexibility, less adaptable, less open to change, fewer job opportunities, resistant to new technology, low job turnover, less absenteeism (Ng & Feldman, 2009). The store staffed with employees of age

over-50 was found significantly more productive than others (Labich, 1993). Researchers found that age and job task performance are unrelated (Ng & Feldman, 2010). The age and job satisfaction showed a U-shaped relationship. Job satisfaction increases with age among professionals, but it decreases during middle age and then increases in the later years among nonprofessionals (Kacmar & Ferris, 1989; Hochwarter et al. 2001). Age and quality of work life are significantly and positively correlated (Ahmad, 2017; Wright, 2002). With age increases job experience (Robbins & Judge, 2013) that ultimately benefits the organizational performance. As job experience increases with age, emotional intelligence, quality of worklife and seniority increases with age and a deep concern develops due to which skills develop (Ahmad, 2017; Bharti et al. 2010; Chen et al. 2016). Job experience increases job satisfaction and employee productivity, reduces absenteeism and turn over also. Past literature suggests that emotional intelligence may increase with age and lead to higher levels of subjective well being in older adults (Chen et al. 2016). Lowering age combating by organizations indirectly enhances organizational performance (Kunze et al. 2011). Higher educational levels give orientation of the better environment and enhance our social skills. Higher levels of education enhance organizational effectiveness (Nazarian & Atkinson, 2012) and enhance quality of work life (Ahmad, 2017; Wright, 2002). Learning and education teach individuals to be better equipped with knowledge and deal issues of daily life with logic and reasoning. Organizational processes and behaviors are affected by higher education (Schieman & Glavin, 2011), higher management levels (Dasgupta, 2015; DiRenzo et al. 2011; Langley, 2000; Nazarian & Atkinson, 2012) and higher wages (Ahmad, 2017; Schmidt & Dantas, 2012; Okpara, 2005; Wright, 2002). Similarly departmental differences affect organizational processes (Dalton et al. 1980; Gray et al., 2003)

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the demographic variables and organizational factors, processes and behaviors with the main research question of the study determined as follows: Do demographic factors create differences with respect to the organizational processes and individual factors? Do organizational behaviors differ due to gender, age, education, salary, job experience, management levels, functional departments and organizational size? Do they carry an impact? The reassessment of national culture produced different results (Jordan et al. 2017; Lee et al. 2013; Taras et al. 2010) which suggested the reassessments of affects of national and organizational culture at different levels (DeZilva, 2014; Downey et al. 2011; Santos & Goncalves, 2014; Taras et al. 2010). Thus the objectives of study included: to reassess and directly measure the dimensions of national culture on Pakistani sample; to study the relationship among national culture, organizational culture, emotional intelligence and perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship behavior, quality of work life, organizational performance and demographic variables; to find out mean differences of demographic variables (gender, age, education, job experience, management levels, organizational size and salary) and their impact on national culture (NC), organizational culture (OC), emotional intelligence (EI), perceived organizational support (POS), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), quality of work life (QWL) and organizational performance (OP). The term demographic refers to traits of population (age, gender, salary, education, job experience, organizational size). The demographic variables of the sample were analyzed in detail. Large sample size and different cross-sections of industrial population was obtained. The age of participants was divided into three groups as: 20-30 years age group (young adults), 31-45 years age group (middle adulthood) and 46-65 years (middle late adulthood) age group (Erikson, 1950; Robbins & Judge, 2013). The

educational levels of the participants were categorized into Intermediate (12 years of formal education), BA/BSc (14 years of formal education), MA, MSc (16 years of formal education) and Post-graduation/MS/PhD (Schieman & Glavin, 2011). The job experience was taken as reported and later on divided into many groups :1 year, 2 to 3 years, 4 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years and 21 above years (Schmidt et al. 1986; Vineberg & Taylor, 1972). The management level of the participants was taken as lower management, middle management, senior management and others (Dasgupta, 2015; Langley, 2000). The salary of the participants was categorized as less than 20000/- PKR, 21000/- to 50000/- PKR, 51000/- to 100000/- PKR and more than 100000/- PKR (Darin-Mattsson, et al. 2017). The functional area or the functional department of the participants included HRM, sales/marketing, general admin or management, production or engineering, finance or accounting, research and development. The organizational size was categorized as small, medium and large as reported by the participants. However organizations with 100 employees are considered small, 101- 499 as medium and above 500 is large in manufacturing sector (Atkins & Lowe, 1996; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1999; Dalton et al. 1980; Gray, 2003). Designations were taken as reported by the participants. Current research focused the industrial employees that was an important contribution. The research on such sample is highly recommended by experts in this field. Various researches outlined to study the demographic differences but not relating it to the effect of demographic factors. The demographic variables were studied in a comprehensive way along with organizational factors and processes.

Methods & Instruments. A quantitative cross-sectional survey research design was chosen to study the relationship among the study variables. The analyses included Pearson's correlation, mean-group comparisons (t-test

and ANOVA) and multiple regressions. Demographic information included gender, age, designation, education, salary, job experience, management level, functional department and organizational size. Each demographic variable was grouped into different categories. Organizational factors, processes and behaviors were measured in terms of national culture, organizational culture, emotional intelligence, perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship behaviors, quality of worklife and OP in the current research. National culture was measured by Values Survey Module (Hofstede, 1994) which comprises of five dimensions. i- Individualism versus Collectivism. ii- Power Distance. .iii- Uncertainty Avoidance.iv- Masculinity versus Femininity.v- Long-Term versus Short-Term Orientation. OC was measured through Denison Organizational Culture Survey (Denison, 2000). Emotional intelligence (EI) was measured by Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Concise) developed by Palmer et al. (2009). Perceived organizational support was measured by Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Organizational citizenship behaviors were measured by scale of organizational citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff et al. 1990). QWL was measured by Quality of Work Life Scale (Swamy et al. 2015). Organizational performance was measured by Scale of Organizational Performance, developed by Kuo (2011). Higher scores on scales indicated higher values. A sample of 994 industrial employees was taken from different industries/organizations at Industrial State Hattar, Wah, Taxila, Rawalpindi and Islamaabad, Pakistan by using purposive sampling technique. The inclusion criteria of research maintained that participants must be industrial employees with at least 12 years of formal education, aged 20 years and above with at least one year of the job experience. Data was collected from participants at their offices or work places after taking permission from their organizations.

Results and Discussion:

Reassessment and direct measurement of indices of national culture was done. The indices of national culture were calculated by formula for current study as under:

Individualism vs collectivism: IDV = 50.2

Power distance: PDI = 14.45

Uncertainty avoidance: UAI = 73.05

Masculinity vs femininity: MAS= 87.5

Time orientation: LTO= 36.8

The reassessment of national culture of Pakistan done on industrial employees revealed that work values showed collectivism, low power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, highly masculine and short term orientation. Within national culture model of Pakistani culture, a transition and shift in values is visible. Hofstede's data (Hofstede, 2021) is still on their website and it's about five decades old, based on IBM subsidiaries. The data was from Karachi, southern region of Pakistan. The data of current research is from Hattar, Haripur, Taxila, Wah, Rawalpindi and Islamabad, the northern region of Pakistan. The sample of present research was of industrial employees. Over years, researches have confirmed Hofstede's dimensions (Jamal, 1998; Khilji, 2004; Rehman, 2010) but these are only relative positions of the country to the other countries. Due to historical affects and societies' basic problems and striving of solutions to such problems, the cultural values change slowly (Hofstede, 2011). Technological shifts have changed societies and cultures a lot. Theses shifts have brought changes in entire world. The thinking styles not only have changed the life styles but contributed to lesser sensitivity to traditional and cultural values. Technological advancements have pushed the world towards globalization. The changes have been felt across the globe. The technology and social media have slowly moved thoughts and people towards materialism (Robbins & Judge, 2013). This change supported and pushed cultures towards individualism and short term orientation among people. The change in value

of power distance is also visible. Social media have inversely highlighted the unbalanced and biased use of power towards nepotism that has favorably shifted low acceptance of power distance. But high uncertainty avoidance still binds to the economic conditions of the developing country. The confirmation to rules and regulations is highly appreciated and accepted. The compliance to formal rules and regulations reduces ambiguity and insecurity. This has led to enhanced uncertainty avoidance. However masculinity in the culture has enhanced. It is also because of patriarchal Pakistani society that has favored masculinity. Further evaluation of Pakistan's national culture as explained by Hofstede (2011) is discussed here. Being collectivist society, it bears joint and extended families and demands too much responsibility, belongingness and loyalty in all family matters including financial matters. Respect and harmony is maintained. People survive in groups and groups as in-group or out-group. Personal opinions are suppressed and group decision by some elder is favored. Obedience, conformity and team work is endorsed. Skills and tasks are more important to perform. Relationships have more importance than tasks and duties. Generally, business deal is dependent on personal relationships and friendships in Pakistan. A lot of inter-personal discussion is done before the final business deals. The decision is highly centralized by eldest of the concern and politely endorsed (Khilji, 2004; Anjum et al. 2013). A mix of characteristics of low power distance and high power distance is evident in Pakistan's national culture. Power used is legitimate and also subject to get good. Parents teach children with low obedience and treat children equally. Older people influence has reduced than before. Education has student-centered approach now. Hierarchy in organizations lies close to political influence that has endorsed inequality of roles and uneven salary distribution. Subordinates are consulted and supervised too. Political structure is democratic with frequent corruption

scandals that are covered up too and are also used to end political careers. Religious beliefs more importantly affect commitments, business and lifestyle in a hierarchy of priests. The calculated index of high uncertainty avoidance has cultivated a continuous threat needed to be combat in society. This resulted in increased stress, anxiety, emotive, neuroticism that ultimately lowers subjective well-being. There is low tolerance for innovative ideas and creativity. Novelty is usually not accepted. A strong need for clearness and structure is always there. Supervisors must have all the solutions. Jobs are carried on even if jobs are not liked. Conformity to rules is an obligation through emotional needs. Citizens are understood incompetent towards authorities and hold strong beliefs in grand theories and ultimate truths rather than philosophy, science, and religion. Being highly masculine society, she has utmost social role and emotional role differences between male and females. Men are expected more to be assertive, strong, ambitious and fight back than women. Work has much importance over family and moralistic attitudes are much more expected. Fathers handle matters inside and outside of family. Mothers deal with training, education and feelings of progeny. Religion strongly invests supreme Sovereignty. The time orientation index showed short term orientation. People live with orientation of imperative life events already occurred or going to happen now. Personal stability and consistency about traditions, morality, character, virtues, altruism, attitudes and behaviors is expected. Traditions, norms, values, religious and family rituals are carried on to next generations and guided by elders. Patriotism is the key feature of one's pride. People sustain and maintain their traditional social gatherings and spend huge amounts even if they have to lend money. Locus of control is usually attributed to luck and fortune. The economic growth is a gradual process in developing countries (Hofstede, 2011).

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics, Alpha Coefficient and Pearson's Correlation of Study Variables (N=994)

Sno	Variable	M	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	COLL	11.31	.72	-																		
2	PD	11.41	.59	.52**	-																	
3	UA	10.87	.59	.05	.20**	-																
4	MAS	10.97	.50	.42**	.42**	.24**	-															
5	TO	11.52	.76	.52**	.45**	.07*	.33**	-														
6	OC	204.06	.93	-.05	-.25**	-.43**	-.37**	-.04	-													
7	EI	100.16	.86	.17**	.03	-.23**	-.00	.14**	.47**	-												
8	OCB	74.28	.89	.00	-.14**	-.37**	-.28**	-.09**	.39**	.39	-											
9	POS	26.21	.60	.09**	-.07**	-.26**	-.23**	-.14**	.51**	.43**	.37**	-										
10	OP	20.40	.81	-.02	-.14**	-.41**	-.39**	-.10**	.69**	.37**	.61**	.42**	-									
11	QWL	149.96	.95	-.06	-.24**	-.42**	-.37**	-.04	.84**	.50**	.68**	.51**	.00**	-								
12	Age	25.17		-.23**	-.14**	.04	-.05	-.03	-.03	-.03	.02	-.11**	.04	-.02	-							
13	Dsg			.12**	.13**	.03	.08	.03	-.02	.06	-.05	-.00	.06	.01	-.11**	-						
14	Edu	2.07		.01	-.06	-.07*	-.09**	.04	.20**	.06	.21**	.13**	.14**	.18**	.00	.01	-					
15	JE	8.07		-.17**	-.14**	-.11**	-.13**	-.10	.18**	.02	.23**	.00	.21**	.20**	.52**	.12**	.07*	-				
16	ML	1.92		-.07*	.04	-.02	.08**	.02	-.17**	.00	-.17**	-.13**	-.13**	-.15**	.15**	.20**	-.07*	.03	-			
17	Salary	1.83		-.15**	-.05	-.02	-.05	-.05	-.01	.00	.07*	-.05	.03	.00	.34**	.20**	.06*	.44**	.38**	-		
18	FA	3.38		-.03	-.03	-.10**	-.12**	-.02	.11**	.07*	.16**	.03	.14**	.09**	-.16**	.07	.11**	.12**	.11**	.38**	-	
19	OS	1.88		-.16**	-.03	-.06	-.17**	-.00	.16**	.06	.21**	.12**	.16**	.13**	.13**	.12**	.12**	.31**	-.12**	.38**	.16**	-

Note. COLL=collectivism; PDI=Power Distance; UAI=uncertainty avoidance; MAS=Masculinity; TO=Time Orientation; OC= Organizational Culture; Inv= Involvement; Cons=Consistency; Adap= Adaptability; Msn= Mission; EI=Emotional Intelligence; POS= Perceived Organizational Support; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; QWL= Quality of Work Life. OP=Organizational Performance; Dsg= Designation; Edu= Education; JE= Job Experience; ML= Management Level; FA=Functional Area; OS= Organization size **p<.001.

Table 1: The results of Pearson s' correlation in table 1 revealed that the national culture indices: power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity had significant negative correlation with OC, POS, organizational citizenship behaviors, QWL and OP (Hofstede, 2011; Ganesh & Paramasivam, 2014). Collectivism showed significant positive correlation to EI (Gunkel et al. 2014, Gunkel et al. 2016) and POS and significant negative correlation to demographic variables. The links in such networks enhance perceptions, if group favors them positive. There is a more chance to share emotions and thoughts leading expression of emotions. There is more dealing and handling with people and issues. This results in enhanced emotional intelligence. This means increasing age, education, management level, functional area, salary will decrease collectivism. The power distance, high uncertainty avoidance and high masculinity were negatively correlated to all variables including organizational factors and demographic variables. These are negative traits within a culture that bring with certain liabilities. They hinder innovation and creativity and bound people to rules and regulations (Hofstede, 2011). This means increasing power distance,

uncertainty avoidance and masculinity will reduce OC, emotional intelligence, perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship behaviors, quality of worklife and organizational performance. However increasing age, education, designation, job experience, management level, salary, functional area and organizational size will lower power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity then. Short term orientation had significant positive correlation with EI and POS but significant negative correlation with organizational citizenship behaviors and OP (Once & Almotome, 2014). Demographic variables showed non-significant relationship with short term orientation. It is because short term orientation focuses traditions and important life events. For a prosperous and growing organization long term commitments are required according to circumstances (Hofstede, 2011). According to An et al. (2010) there were significant correlations between OC, quality of work life, EI and organizational effectiveness. EI has a positive effect on job satisfaction while QWL has a direct positive effect on job satisfaction, which shows that EI and quality of worklife are inter-correlated.

A strong significant positive correlation was POS, organizational citizenship behavior, QWL and OP ranging from .39** to .84** (Aaltındağ & Köseadağı, 2015; Ahmed & Shafiq, 2014; Akhtar et al. 2015; An et al. 2010; Argote & Ingram, 2000; Aryanto et al. 2018; Danish et al. 2012; Dastjerdi, & Pour, 2015; Dhanalakshmi & Kohila, 2018; Huynh et al. 2018; Ilyas & Abdullah, 2016; Jeong & Kim, 2021; Kim et al. 2017; Kumar & Shah, 2015; Podsakoff et al. 1997; Riggle et al. 2009; Sadeghi et al. 2016). The correlation of demographic variables with study variables was exploratory. Organizational culture had weak significant negative correlation with management level but significant positive correlations with education, job experience, functional area and organizational size. EI had significant positive correlation with functional area. Organizational citizenship behaviors had significant positive correlation with education, job experience, salary, functional area and organizational size but significant negative correlation with management level. POS had significant positive correlation with education and organizational size but significant negative correlation with age and management level. QWL and OP had significant positive correlation with education, job experience, functional area and organizational size but significant negative correlation with management level. The table also depicted the alpha coefficients and mean of scales used in the study. The determined alpha reliability of scales ranged from .50 to .95 that is acceptable. National culture indices showed low reliabilities as compared to rest of values (Spector et al. 2001). The accepted value of Cronbach's alpha is 0.6 and above (Cortina, 1993; Griethuijsen et al. 2014; Hair et al. 2003; Taber, 2018).

found among OC, emotional intelligence,

Table 2: Table 2 revealed that gender differences were non-significant on all variables except POS with cohen's d value showed small effect size ($p < .05$). Previous researches showed non significant gender differences in POS (Amason & Allen, 1997; Yoshimura, 2003) and mixed of pattern of significance and non-significance for EI (Bar-On, 1997, 2000; Craig et al., 2009; Meshkat & Nejati, 2017) but significant gender differences in OCB (Punia & Shyam, 2017) and quality of worklife (Tabassum et al. 2012). It may be because men are habitual of working in different types of work settings as compared to women. One-way ANOVA showed that the organizational citizenship behavior, collectivism, OP and QWL had significant difference with small effect size on age but other variables had non-significant difference of age. The Post-hoc analysis showed that the participants with 20 to 30 years aged (young adults) had high mean and were significantly high in perceive organizational support than others. The participants with 46 years aged and above (late adulthood) were significantly low in collectivism but had high mean and were significantly high in organizational citizenship behaviors, OP and quality of worklife. It is because with increase in age years, employees have earned their potentials, so less tried to form more social networks, perceive the work environment better and engage in more citizenship behaviors. The results may explain the inspiration for the decisions and actions of employers in the field of personnel management and for creating workplace conditions, encouraging senior workers to continue working, even upon becoming entitled to old-

age pension, and having better work life balance (Richert-Kaźmierska, & Stankiewicz, 2016). As age year advances people generally struggle and

strive for better living that enhances QWL (Ahmad, 2017; Wright, 2002).

Table 2

Mean Comparison of Gender, Age and Education by t-test and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on (N=994)

s.no	Gender Mean Comparison				Age Mean Comparison						Education Mean Comparison						
	1	2	t	Cohen's d	1	2	3	F(3,990)	η^2	Post Hoc Tukey HSD	1	2	3	4	F (3,990)	η^2	Post Hoc Tukey HSD
	Male (N=904)	Female (N=90)			20 to 30 years (N=415)	31 to 45 years (N=426)	46 years & above (N=129)				Intrmediate	BA/BSc	MA/MSc	Post-Graduation			
M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M				
COLL	11.33	11.18	.41	.04	11.40	11.62	10.26	6.96***	.00	.02	11.22	11.67	10.73	12.04	5.29***	.01	3* < 2* < 4*
PDI	11.38	11.70	-1.08	.12	11.49	11.42	11.18	.77	-	n.s.	11.56	11.33	11.08	11.74	2.30	-	n.s.
UAI	10.81	11.40	-1.99	.22	10.93	10.88	10.60	.77	-	n.s.	10.96	10.80	10.63	11.23	1.48*	.00	n.s.
MAS	10.94	11.23	-.96	.18	11.02	11.09	10.50	1.79	-	n.s.	11.26	10.83	10.40	11.57	6.82***	.02	3* < 1 < 4*
TO	11.56	11.02	1.46	.16	11.59	11.58	11.15	.82	-	n.s.	11.49	11.55	11.57	11.40	.07	-	n.s.
OC	204.51	199.52	1.42	.15	203.20	202.73	210.07	2.19	-	n.s.	195.48	207.04	210.49	212.57	16.44***	.04	1* < 2 < 3 < 4
EI	100.32	98.58	1.08	.12	100.35	99.83	100.47	.26	-	n.s.	97.32	101.82	100.34	105.65	11.30***	.03	1* < 3 < 2* < 4*
POS	26.25	25.80	.86*	.10	74.56	72.31	78.86	6.87***	.02	2 < 1 < 3*	68.54	76.28	78.34	80.58	30.12***	.08	1* < 2 < 3 < 4
OCB	74.61	71.00	2.03	.22	26.70	25.76	26.13	2.76*	.00	2 < 1*	25.23	26.44	26.64	28.22	12.83***	.03	1* < 2 < 3 < 4*
QWL	150.69	142.56	3.02	.34	20.26	19.99	21.93	5.95**	.01	2 < 1 < 3*	19.29	20.80	21.39	21.11	11.08***	.03	1* < 2 < 3 < 4
OP	20.48	19.64	1.51	.16	148.80	148.71	156.37	4.59**	.01	2 < 1 < 3*	142.96	153.16	155.94	153.19	18.13***	.05	1* < 2 < 3 < 4

Note. COLL = collectivism; PDI= Power Distance; UAI= uncertainty avoidance; MAS = Masculinity; TO= Time Orientation; OC= Organizational Culture; EI=Emotional Intelligence; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; POS= Perceived Organizational Support; OP= Organizational Performance; QWL= Quality of Work Life., ***p < .001,* p< .05

The education mean values were compared also on variables. The results showed that the collectivism, masculinity, OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, POS and QWL had significant difference with large size effect on education but other variables had non-significant difference of education. The participants with post graduation qualification had high mean in collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, OC, and emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behaviors, POS. The Post-hoc analysis showed that the participants with MA/MSc qualification were significantly lowest in collectivism and masculinity than other groups. The participants with intermediate education were significantly low in OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, OP and quality of worklife than others. Participants with post graduation were significantly high in collectivism masculinity, EI and POS. Higher education increases QWL (Ahmad, 2017; Wright, 2002) and organizational effectiveness (Nazarian & Atkinson, 2012).

Table 3: The results of ANOVA in table 3 showed that all variables had significant difference with small to large effect on job experience. Although the mean differences were significant but comparisons of means values through post-hoc analysis reveals that all participants with different job experiences were same in collectivism, power distance, masculinity, time orientation, EI and POS. The participants with job experience of 4 to 5 years

were significantly low in OC, organizational citizenship behavior, QWL (Dalaney & Huselid, 1996) and OP but high in uncertainty avoidance. It is because at this stage the employees are learning about their jobs and organization, more cautious and careful of their jobs. They follow rules and regulations strictly which reduces their creativity, independence and enhances stress. They are in the start of the career where they try to handle the issues, learning duties and much concerned of holding the job. Participants with 6 years to 10 years of job experience had high mean in collectivism, power distance and masculinity than others. This is the stage where the maximum job experience, satisfaction and motivation have been achieved (Vineberg & Taylor, 1972; Schmidt et al. 1986). The participants with job experience of 11 to 15 years were significantly highest in organizational performance. The participants with job experience of 16 to 20 years were significantly highest in OC and quality of worklife but lowest in uncertainty avoidance (Ahmad, 2017; Bharti et al. 2010). The participants with job experience of 20 years had significant high mean in OC, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational performance. As job experience increases, it impacts and enhances work related emotions and behaviors with increase in life years (Robbins & Judge, 2013; Vineberg & Taylor, 1972; Schmidt et al. 1986).

Table 3

Mean, Standard Deviation and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Job Experience (N=994)

s.no	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		F(6,987)	p	η ²	Post Hoc Tukey HSD
	1 year (N=50)		2 to 3 years (N=153)		4 to 5 years (N=201)		6 to 10 years (N=413)		11 to 15 years (N=61)		16 to 20 years (N=58)		Above 21 years (N=58)					
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD				
COLL	10.26	2.60	11.07	2.95	11.19	2.86	12.12	3.36	10.61	3.32	11.03	3.42	8.59	3.74	13.16***	.00	.07	n.s.
PDI	10.92	2.09	11.52	2.27	11.52	2.44	11.62	2.65	11.25	2.73	11.57	3.11	9.64	3.74	5.25***	.00	.03	n.s.
UAI	10.20	2.12	10.94	2.77	11.53	2.87	10.94	2.54	10.23	2.20	9.45	2.41	10.48	2.90	6.38***	.00	.03	6* < 4* < 3*
MAS	9.82	2.18	11.16	2.88	11.21	2.77	11.30	2.51	10.20	2.83	10.59	2.72	9.47	3.20	7.02***	.00	.04	n.s.
TO	11.60	2.54	11.92	2.92	11.39	2.71	11.66	3.29	11.38	4.26	11.48	4.28	9.98	4.72	2.61**	.01	.01	n.s.
OC	219.8	25.88	199.99	36.33	191.76	31.93	204.1	29.04	213.16	26.59	217.6	25.32	220.38	32.67	13.60***	.00	.07	3* < 2* < 4* < 5* < 6*
EI	102.8	11.43	99.84	16.91	96.85	14.35	101.25	13.37	100.25	12.76	102.67	16.03	99.78	17.23	2.74**	.01	.01	n.s.
POS	28.9	4.39	26.19	5.34	25.20	4.25	26.33	4.66	26.05	4.36	27.24	4.66	25.76	5.35	4.93***	.00	.02	n.s.
OCB	82.16	15.02	72.45	17.44	67.42	16.76	73.99	14.5	77.84	14.61	82.86	13.97	85.84	11.77	18.37***	.00	.10	3* < 2* < 4* < 5* < 6* < 7
QWL	163.5	18.41	146.88	25.90	140.11	24.81	149.15	22.40	157.92	21.49	166.76	20.48	161.05	24.45	17.78***	.00	.09	3 < 4 < 2 < 5 < 6* < 7
OP	22.44	4.53	19.53	4.73	18.81	5.19	20.26	4.60	22.20	4.05	22.57	3.92	23.41	6.35	13.30***	.00	.07	3* < 2* < 4* < 6* < 5*

Note. COLL = Collectivism; PDI= Power Distance; UAI= Uncertainty Avoidance; MAS = Masculinity; TO= Time Orientation; OC= Organizational Culture; EI=Emotional Intelligence; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; POS= Perceived Organizational Support; OP= Organizational Performance; QWL= Quality of Work Life. n.s.=non significant
***p < .001, **p < .01

Table 4

Mean and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Salary, Management levels and Organizational Size (N=994)

S no	Salary Mean Comparison							Management levels Mean Comparison						Organizational Size Mean Comparison								
	1		2		3		4		1		2		3		4		1		2		3	
	≤PKR 20000/- (N=372)	PKR.21000/- (N=460)	PKR 51K (N=117)	≥PKR 100000/- (N=45)	F(4,989)	η ²	Post Hoc Tukey HSD	Lower (N=423)	Middle (N=358)	Senior (N=86)	Other (N=127)	F(3,990)	η ²	Post Hoc Tukey HSD	Small (N=383)	Medium (N=348)	Large (N=263)	F(2,991)	η ²	Post Hoc Tukey HSD		
COLL	11.85	11.16	10.90	9.45	6.83**	.02	4* < 3 < 2* < 1*	11.76	10.90	11.17	11.10	4.69*	.01	2* < 1	12.22	10.53	11.03	26.51**	.05	2 < 3 < 1*		
PDI	11.43	11.52	11.38	10.16	2.62*	.01	4* < 1 < 2	11.49	11.03	12.03	11.77	4.87*	.01	2* < 4* < 3*	11.89	10.54	11.86	29.81**	.05	2* < 3 < 1		
UAI	11.20	10.47	11.23	11.25	5.01**	.02	2* < 1 < 3	11.17	10.40	10.97	11.11	5.90*	.01	2* < 4 < 1*	11.39	10.07	11.15	25.30**	.04	2* < 3 < 1		
MAS	10.99	11.10	10.74	10.02	1.83	-	n.s.	11.10	10.41	10.81	12.20	14.67**	.04	2* < 3 < 1 < 4*	11.93	9.92	10.97	54.51**	.09	2* < 3 < 1*		
TO	11.64	11.59	11.15	10.68	1.22	-	n.s.	11.52	11.32	12.19	11.61	1.60	-	n.s.	11.79	10.92	11.90	8.66**	.01	2* < 1 < 3		
OC	208.24	199.48	203.01	219.32	6.73**	.02	2 < 3 < 1* < 4*	203.26	212.63	209.44	178.8	40.62**	.11	4* < 1 < 3 < 2*	192.07	218.42	202.50	72.29**	.12	1* < 3* < 2*		
EI	100.75	99.11	101.82	102.02	1.52	-	n.s.	99.04	101.48	105.29	96.69	7.97**	.02	4* < 1 < 2 < 3*	99.29	100.10	101.51	1.82	-	n.s.		
OCB	74.45	72.83	75.09	86.23	7.44**	.02	2 < 1 < 3 < 4*	74.00	78.73	74.92	62.28	36.09**	.09	4* < 1* < 3 < 2	67.93	80.28	75.61	61.41**	.11	1* < 3 < 2*		
POS	26.81	25.70	26.31	26.30	2.95**	.01	2* < 1	26.44	26.55	27.73	23.49	18.60**	.05	4* < 1 < 2 < 3	24.99	27.51	26.27	26.70**	.05	1* < 3* < 2*		
OP	20.65	19.87	20.86	22.55	3.92**	.01	2* < 4	20.16	21.68	21.28	17.00	31.58**	.08	4* < 1 < 3 < 2*	18.68	22.30	20.39	53.17**	.09	1* < 3* < 2*		
QWL	152.59	146.69	150.32	160.75	5.40**	.02	2* < 1 < 4	148.79	156.69	155.42	131.16	40.17**	.10	4* < 1* < 3 < 2*	141.32	161.29	147.54	71.69**	.12	1* < 3* < 2*		

Note. COLL = Collectivism; PDI= Power Distant; UAI= Uncertainty Avoidance; MAS = Masculinity; TO= Time Orientation; OC= Organizational Culture; EI=Emotional Intelligence; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; POS= Perceived Organizational Support; OP= Organizational Performance; QWL= Quality of Work Life.***p < .01, *p < .05

Table 4: The results of one-way ANOVA in table 4 showed that collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, OC, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, OP and QWL had significant difference with small effect size on salary but other variables had non-significant difference of salary. Post-hoc analysis revealed that participants with salary PKR. 100,000/- and above were significantly highest in OC, organizational citizenship behavior, OP and QWL but were significantly lowest in collectivism and power distance. The participants with salary PKR 21000/- to PKR

50000/- were significantly lowest in uncertainty avoidance, OC, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, OP and QWL than other variables. The possible reason for the results of salary can also be attributed to the hierarchical level in the organization where the high salary employees are at higher hierarchical levels having clear strategies and guidelines are better adaptable to cope with the problems and having empowerment thus enjoying authority and able to bring change. This means increasing salary enhances quality of worklife (Ahmad, 2017; Schmidt & Dantas, 2012; Okpara, 2005;

Wright, 2002). Low salary has less authority, low sense of ownership and less chances of skill development with resistance and hesitance. The employees with low salary tend to perform better. The results of management levels with one-way ANOVA showed that collectivism, power distance, masculinity, OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, uncertainty avoidance and QWL had significant difference with large and small effect size on management levels but other variables had non-significant difference of management level. Post-hoc analysis revealed that the middle management level participants were significantly lowest in collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity but were significantly highest in OC, OP and quality of worklife. The most prominent role of the *middle level managers* is that of an implementer and the role has a strong influence on *OP* (Dasgupta, 2015). The lower management level participants were significantly highest in uncertainty avoidance. It is because at this stage the employees are more cautious and careful of their jobs. They follow rules and regulations strictly. They are being socialized and learning more task. The senior management level participants were significantly highest in power distance and emotional intelligence. Langley (2000) found senior managers exhibited significantly higher emotional intelligence. The other (undifferentiated) management level participants were significantly lowest in OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, OP and quality of worklife. Moving up the management levels and designations impact work behaviors because of having greater job demands (DiRenzo et al. 2011). Organizational size mean differences determined by one-way ANOVA

were significant with large and small effect size on all variables except emotional intelligence. The participants working in small organization were significantly highest in collectivism and masculinity but they were significantly lowest in OC, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, OP and quality of work life. The participants working in medium organizations were significantly highest in OC, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, OP and quality of work life. Gray et al. (2003) found that small organizations of Australia have high OC. It might be due to the cultural differences and data was collected from organizational executives.

Table 5
Mean, Standard Deviation and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Functional Department (N=994)

Sno	1		2		3		4		5		6		F	p	η ²	Post Hoc Tukey HSD
	Personnel or HRM(N= 106)		Sales / Marketing (N=104)		General Admin / Management (N=239)		Production / Engineering (N= 418)		Finance / Accounting (N= 111)		Research & Development (N= 16)					
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD				
COLL	11.68	3.21	11.24	3.11	11.25	3.17	11.42	3.46	10.84	3.40	11.20	2.33	.74	.63	-	n.s.
PDI	11.60	2.48	11.03	2.78	11.99	2.38	11.11	2.73	11.21	2.89	13.33	2.49	4.17**	.00	.02	2<4<3*
UAI	11.24	2.52	11.20	2.64	11.37	2.87	10.48	2.51	10.56	2.74	10.80	2.73	3.23*	.00	.02	4<3*
MAS	11.43	2.34	12.31	3.02	10.79	2.71	10.62	2.64	10.98	2.87	10.87	2.16	5.51**	.00	.03	4<3<5<2*
TO	11.88	3.40	11.15	2.70	11.77	3.02	11.34	3.54	11.72	3.72	11.27	3.61	1.08	.37	-	n.s.
OC	201.03	41.44	192.60	28.61	197.37	33.63	212.62	28.02	200.39	25.59	198.53	19.85	9.43**	.00	.06	2<3<5<1<4*
EI	97.34	19.82	100.27	11.46	98.74	15.14	101.46	12.76	101.43	15.95	96.13	10.12	2.12*	.03	.01	n.s.
OCB	70.44	19.44	69.40	14.96	71.19	15.17	77.76	15.63	75.98	15.32	74.33	7.97	6.75**	.00	.04	2<1<3<5<4*
POS	26.91	5.72	24.56	4.20	25.77	4.88	26.76	4.45	26.05	4.92	25.47	3.13	3.61**	.00	.02	2*<4<1
OP	19.37	6.05	18.62	5.15	19.64	4.64	21.62	4.41	19.95	5.34	21.53	3.83	8.39**	.00	.05	2<1<3<5<4*
QWL	147.77	31.44	143.68	22.55	144.40	26.48	156.19	20.92	147.35	21.63	143.20	17.21	7.84**	.00	.05	2<3<5<1<4*

Note. COLL = collectivism; PDI= Power Distance; UAI= uncertainty avoidance; MAS = Masculinity; TO= Time Orientation; OC= Organizational Culture; EI=Emotional Intelligence; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; POS= Perceived Organizational Support; OP= Organizational Performance; QWL= Quality of Work Life.

**p < .01, * p < .05

Table 5: The results of one-way ANOVA in table 5 showed that uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity, OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, OP and QWL had significant difference with large and small effect size on functional area but other variables had non-significant difference. Post-hoc analysis revealed that participants working in production or engineering department were significantly highest in OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, OP and quality of work life. The participants working in general admin or management department were significantly highest in power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Being the administration department, the employees are more cautious and careful of their jobs. They follow rules and regulations strictly and make others to follow rules and hierarchy. The participants working in sales and marketing department were significantly highest in masculinity but

significantly lowest in OC. Being the sales agents, the employees become more assertive and persuade others. They tend to stick to their claims firmly and convince others. The departmental differences impact the organizational processes differently and significantly (Dalton et al. 1980).

Table 6

Multiple Regression Coefficients of Demographic Variables on Organizational Variables

Variables	COLL	PDI	UAI	MAS	TO	OC	EI	POS	OCB	QWL	OP
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Age	.01	.02	-.06	.05	.04	.06	.09	.04	.03	.15***	.09
Gender	-.06	.01	.05	-.01	-.06	-.06	-.09*	-.02	-.09*	-.11***	-.04
Designation	-.11**	-.04	-.18**	-.06	.07	.08*	.02	-.00	.09*	.11**	.11**
Education	.00	-.01	-.09*	-.03	.03	.07	.02	.08*	.00	.03	.07
Jobs Experience	-.05	-.01	-.06	-.03	-.06	-.06	-.18*	-.07	.04	-.06	-.05
Management Level	.01	.01	-.05	-.09	.17***	.17***	.22***	.11*	.01	.16***	.19***
Salary	-.08	-.11	.11	.07	-.17***	-.23***	-.18***	-.13*	-.03	-.16***	-.22***
Functional Area	-.11*	-.08	-.01	-.09	-.01	.01	-.04	-.15***	.05	-.04	.10*
Organizational Size	-.11**	.06	.05	.01	-.05	-.10*	-.00	-.02	-.05	-.17***	-.03
Adjusted R ²	.04	.01	.06	.008	.02	.09	.04	.09	.10	.13	.05
F (10, 471)	3.29***	1.60	4.29***	1.36	2.35**	6.01***	3.08***	6.23***	6.41***	8.55***	3.87***
<i>p</i>	.00	n.s.	.00	n.s.	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00

Collectivism; PDI= Power Distance; UAI= Uncertainty Avoidance; MAS = Masculinity; TO= Time Orientation; OC= Organizational Culture; EI=Emotional Intelligence; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; POS= Perceived Organizational Support; OP= Organizational Performance; QWL= Quality of Work Life, n.s. =non significant

***p < .001, ** p < .01

Table 6: Impact of Demographic Characteristics on Study Variables

The current research also explored the combined impacts of personal and organizational demographic variables on study variables among industrial employees. The multiple regressions analyses were computed. To explore the impact ANOVA s F-ratio as model –fit (Field, 2009) was used. Multiple regressions coefficients in table 6 showed that demographic characteristics significantly impacted collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, time orientation, OC, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, POS, organizational performance, and QWL with $p \leq .01$ except power distance and masculinity. These separate analyses showed significant model fit as evident from significant values of F-ratio and adjusted R² values as variance indicator. The significant variance in study variables due to demographic variables ranged from 2.7% to 13.6%. Age significantly predicted quality of life ($\beta = .15***$). Chen et al. (2016) confirmed impact of age on emotional intelligence and quality of worklife.

Gender significantly impacted emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior,

and QWL (Ganesh & Paramasivam, 2014). Designation significantly predicted collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, OC, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational performance, and quality of work life. Education significantly predicted uncertainty avoidance, and POS. Higher education level impacts work related behaviors (Ahmad, 2017; Schieman & Glavin, 2011; Wright, 2002). Job experience significantly predicted emotional intelligence. The management levels predicted time orientation, OC, emotional intelligence, POS, QWL and organizational performance. Higher positions were also associated with higher organizational effectiveness (Nazarian & Atkinson, 2012). The salary of employees impacted time orientation, OC, emotional intelligence, POS, QWL and OP significantly. The increase in salary or income enhances quality of worklife (Ahmad, 2017; Schmidt & Dantas, 2012; Okpara, 2005; Wright, 2002).

The functional area or department of employees significantly impacted collectivism, POS, and organizational performance. The departmental differences impact the organizational processes differently and significantly (Dalton et al. 1980). The organizational size predicted collectivism, OC and quality of worklife significantly. The organizational size impact organizational processes and behaviors (Dalton et al. 1980; Gray et al., 2003).

This research study also got a number of limitations. The sample included less female employees. There were major differences in the designations, structure and ownership of organization. The lack of understanding of importance of the research and the resistance to give information was another big problem. Suggestions for future researches included that cross-cultural studies should be conducted. The current research model can be reproduced in other work settings.

References

- Aaltındağ, E. & Köseadağı, Y. (2015). The relationship between emotional intelligence of managers, innovative corporate culture and employee performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 210. 270-282. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.367.
- Ahmad, S. (2017). The co-relation between QWL and demographic factors of private university employees in India. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 286- 305
- Ahmed, M., & Shafiq, S. (2014). The impact of organizational culture on organizational performance: A case study on telecom sector. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalofbusiness.org/index>
- Akhtar, S., Ibrahim, M., Riaz, M., & Hussain, S. M. (2015). Impact of organizational culture and emotional intelligence on educational sector performance. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol.5, No.15,
- An J. Y., Yom Y. H., & Ruggiero J.S. (2010). Organizational culture, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness in Korean university hospitals, *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 22(1) 22–30 Retrieved July 12, 2018 from <http://tcn.sagepub.com/content/22/1/22>
- An J. Y., Yom Y. H., & Ruggiero J.S. (2010). Organizational culture, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness in Korean university hospitals, *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 22(1) 22–30 Retrieved July 12, 2018 from <http://tcn.sagepub.com/content/22/1/22>
- Anjum, M., Zia, S. M., Shamsi, A. F., & Aziz, A. (2013). The impact of culture on the perception of employees and organizational productivity in pharmaceutical industries in Karachi. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies*, 03(01). Retrieved from <https://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs/63695.pdf>
- Argote, L.; Ingram, P. (2000)."Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms". *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), 150-169
- Aryanto, T., Asmawi, M., & Ramly, M. (2018). The effect of emotional intelligence, quality of work life, and stress on job satisfaction and turnover intention among the employees. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*. 6. 10.18535/ijstrm/v6i5.em08.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The Emotional Intelligence Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems
- Bharti, P. S. et al. (2010). *Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers*. Available at: <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27868>

- Bhuvanewari, P et al (2012). A study of quality of work life among employees in Neyeli Lignite corporation limited, Tamil Nadu. *The International Journal –Research Journal of Commerce & Behavioural Science*, 1(4), 29-32.
- Black, M. M., & Holden, E. W. (1998). The Impact of Gender on Productivity and Satisfaction Among Medical School Psychologists. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*. pp. 117–131.
- Chen Y, Peng Y, Fang P. (2016). Emotional intelligence mediates the relationship between age and subjective well-being. *Int J Aging Hum Dev*. Jul;83(2):91-107. doi: 10.1177/0091415016648705. PMID: 27199490; PMCID: PMC5442987.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98>
- Craig, A., Tran, Y., Hermens, G., Williams, L. M., Kemp, A., Morris, C., Gordon, E. (2009). Psychological and neural correlates of emotional intelligence in a large sample of adult males and females. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 111-115.
- Dalaney, J. T and Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of HRM practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 949-969.
- Dalton, D., Todor, W., Spendolini, M., Fielding, G., & Porter, L. (1980). Organization Structure and Performance: A Critical Review. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 49-64. doi:10.2307/257804
- Danish, R. Q., Munir, Y. and Butt, S. S. D. (2012). Moderating role of organizational culture between knowledge management and organizational effectiveness in service sector. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 20 (1): 45-53, 2012. Retrieved July 12, 2018
- Dasgupta, M. (2015). Middle level managers and strategy: Exploring the influence of different roles on organisational performance. *Journal of General Management*, 41(1), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030630701504100103>
- Dastjerdi, R. E. & Pour S. R. (2015). Relationship of work culture with improving quality of employees' work life in oil company. *Magnt Research Report*. Vol.3 (4). 325-345 Retrieved July 12, 2018 from <http://brisjast.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/April-34-2015.pdf>
- Denison, D. R. (2000). *Denison organizational culture survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.denisonculture.com>
- DeZilva L.C. (2014). *Psychological empowerment as a moderator of the effects on job attitudes and behaviours on service quality in the hotel industry: a Singapore context*. Unpublished DBA thesis, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW. Retrieved from <https://epubs.scu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1416&context=theses>
- DiNatale, M. & Boraas, S. (2002). The Labor Force Experience of Women from Generation X," *Monthly Labor Review*, pp. 1–15.
- DiRenzo, M. S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Weer, C. H. (2011). Job level, demands, and resources as antecedents of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 78(2), 305-314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.10.002>
- Downey, L. A., Roberts, J. & Stough, C. (2011). Workplace Culture Emotional Intelligence and Trust in the Prediction of Workplace Outcomes. *Int. Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, Volume 6, Issue 1. Retrieved from http://www.business-and-management.org/library/2011/6_1-30-40-Downey,Roberts,Stough.pdf

- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507. Retrieved from <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/the-survey-of-perceived-organizational-support-spos/>
- Gray, J., Densten, I., & Sarros, J. (2003). Size matters: organisational culture in small, medium, and large Australian organisations. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 17, 31-46. 10.1080/08276331.2003.10593311.
- Griethuijsen, R. A. L. F., Eijck, M. W., Haste, H., Brok, P. J., Skinner, N. C., Mansour, N., et al. (2014). Global patterns in students' views of science and interest in science. *Research in Science Education*, 45(4), 581–603. doi:10.1007/s11165-014-9438-6.
- Gunkel, M., Schlaegel, C., & Taras, V. (2016). Cultural values, emotional intelligence, and conflict handling styles: A global study. *Journal of World Business*, 51(4), 568–585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2016.02.001>
- Gunkel, M., Schlägel, C., & Engle, R. L. (2014). Culture's influence on emotional intelligence: An empirical study of nine countries. *Journal of International Management*, 20(2), 256-274. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1075425313000884>
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Babin, B., Money, A. H., & Samouel, P. (2003). *Essential of business research methods*. John Wiley & Sons: United States of America
- Halrynjo, S. (2009). Men's Work-Life Conflict: Career, Care and Self-Realization: Patterns of Privileges and Dilemmas. *Gender, Work & Organization* 16, no.1, pp. 98–125
- Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2008). Motherhood: A Potential Source of Bias in Employment Decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, no. 1 (2008), pp. 189–198.
- Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., Perrewe, P. L., Witt, L. A., & Kiewitz, C. (2001). A Note on the Nonlinearity of the Age–Job Satisfaction Relationship. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. pp. 1223–1237
- Hofstede, G. (1994). *Value Survey Module 1994 manual*. IRIC, University of Tilburg, Maastricht, The Netherlands
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=w6z18LJ_1VsC&oi=fnd&pg=PP17&ots=x7gxD7KpiZ&sig=v0nviDpbsbWYLsY8DZ9YhuHalh4
- Hofstede, G. (2021). *Hofstede 's Globe*. Reterieved from <https://exhibition.geerthofstede.com/hofstedes-globe/>
- Huynh, A. C., Oakes, H., & Grossmann, I. (2018). The role of culture in understanding and evaluating emotional intelligence. In K. V. Keefer, J. D. A. Parker, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in education: Integrating research with practice* (pp. 111–132). Springer International Publishing.
- Ilyas, M.A., & Abdullah, T. (2016). The effect of leadership, organizational culture, emotional intelligence, and job satisfaction on performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 5, 158-164. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v5i2.4534>
- Jamal, A. (1998). *Can we learn something from the perceptions and consumption practices of transnational South Asian Communities Living in the West?* Paper presented at the Inaugural Conference of Asia Academic of Management, Hong Kong.

- Jayson, S. (2009). Gender Roles See a 'Conflict Shift,'. *USA Today*. p. 1A.
- Jeong, Y., & Kim, M. (2021). Effects of perceived organizational support and perceived organizational politics on organizational performance: Mediating role of differential treatment, *Asia Pacific Management Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2021.08.002>.
- Jordan, G., Miglič, G., Todorović, I. & Marič M. (2017). Psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among lecturers in higher education: comparison of six CEE countries. *Organizacija*, Vol: 50, No 1, DOI: 10.1515/orga-2017-0004
- Jorm, A. F., Anstey, K. J., Christensen, H., & Rodgers, B. (2004). Gender Differences in Cognitive Abilities: The Mediating Role of Health State and Health Habits. *Intelligence*, pp. 7–23.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). Theoretical and Methodological Considerations in the Age–Job Satisfaction Relationship," *Journal of Applied Psychology*. pp. 201–207
- Khilji, S. E. (2004). Wither tradition? Evidence of generational differences in HR satisfaction from Pakistan. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 4(2):141. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1470595804044746>
- Kim, H.J., Hur, W., Moon, T., & Jun, J. (2017). Is all support equal? The moderating effects of supervisor, coworker, and organizational support on the link between emotional labor and job performance. *Business Research Quarterly*, 20 (2) , pp. 124–136, 10.1016/j.brq. 2016.11.002
- Kumar, M. M. & Shah, S. A. (2015). Psychometric properties of Podsakoff's organizational citizenship behaviour scale in the Asian context. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* Volume 3, Issue 1, No.9, retrieved from <http://oaji.net/articles/2015/1170-1449590099.pdf>
- Kunze, F., Boehm, S. A., & Bruch, H. (2011). Age Diversity, AgeDiscrimination Climate and Performance Consequences—A Cross Organizational Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 32, pp. 264–290.
- Kuo, T. (2011). How to improve organizational performance through learning and knowledge?. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 32 No. 5/6, pp. 581–603. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0143772111158215>
- Labich, K. (1993). *The New Unemployed*. Fortune. p. 43.
- Langley, A. (2000). Emotional intelligence—A new development for management development?. *Career Development International*. 5. 177–183. [10.1108/13620430010371937](https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430010371937).
- Meshkat, M., & Nejati, R. (2017). Does Emotional Intelligence Depend on Gender? A Study on Undergraduate English Majors of Three Iranian Universities. *SAGE Open*.
- Nazarian, A. & Atkinson, P. (2012). The relationship between national culture and organisational effectiveness: The case Iranian private sector organisations. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Academy*, 1. 73–81.
- Ng, T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2009). Re-examining the Relationship Between Age and Voluntary Turnover," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 74, pp. 283–294.
- Ng, T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The Relationship of Age with Job Attitudes: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology* 63 (2010), pp. 677–718.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Organizational tenure and job performance. *Journal of Management*. 36, pp. 1220–1250.

- Okpara, J.S. (2005). The impact of salary differential on managerial job satisfaction: A study of the gender gap and its implications for management education and practice in a developing economy. *Journal of Business Development Nations*, 8, 66-92.
- Once, S. & Almogtome, A. (2014). The relationship between Hofsted's national cultural values and corporate environmental disclosure: an international perspective . *Research Journal of Business and Management* , 1 (3) , 279-304 Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/rjbm/issue/32457/360944>
- Palmer, B. R., Stough, C., Harmer, R., & Gignac, G. E. (2009). The Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory: A measure designed specifically for the workplace. In C. Stough, D. Saklofske, & J. Parker (Ed.). *Assessing emotional intelligence: Theory, research & applications* (pp. 103-118). New York:
- SpringerLee, S.-K., Kim, D.-Y., & Kang, E.-G. (2013).The moderating effect of organizational culture on the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. *International Journal of Digital Content Technology and its Applications (JDCTA)*.Volume7, Number13
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 262. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/1997-03393-006.html>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1: 107–142.
- Punia, A. P., & Shyam, R. (2017). Gender difference in of organisational behaviour (OCB) and motives underlying OCB. *Psychol Behav Sci Int J.* ; 4(2) : 555633. DOI: 10.19080/PBSIJ.2017.04.555633
- Rehman, J. (2010). *Analyzing the Issue of Cultural and Religious Relativism: With Particular Reference to Muslim Women Rights in South Asia*. Study Visit Report to European Commission EURASIA-NET Project.
- Richert-Kaźmierska A, Stankiewicz K. (2016). Work-life balance: Does age matter? *Work*. Nov 22;55(3):679-688. doi: 10.3233/WOR-162435. PMID: 27814320.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 1027–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.003>
- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2013) *Organisational Behavior*. 15th edition, Pearson, Boston
- Sadeghi, G., Ahmadi, M. & Yazdi, M. T. (2016). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational performance (case study: Agricultural Jihad Organization of Mazandaran Province). *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 14(3-si), 317-324. doi:10.21511/ppm.14(3-si).2016.03
- Salajegheh, S., Chamanifard, R., Chamanifard, S., & Nikpour, A. (2015). The relationship between quality of work life and organizational performance: The moderating role of demographic variables (A case study of foreign exchange units of Tejarat Bank, Iran). *Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics and Management*, 5(9), 128–141.

- Santos, J., & Gonçalves, G. (2014). Organizational culture and perceived organizational support: The impact on professional satisfaction. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 3(1) 33-36
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260459959>
- Schieman, S., & Glavin, P. (2011). Education and work-family conflict: explanations, contingencies and mental health consequences. *Social Forces - SOC FORCES*. 89. 1341-1362. 10.2307/41290132.
- Schmidt & Dantas (2012). Quality of work life and work-related musculoskeletal disorders among nursing professionals. *Acta Paulista de Enfermagem*, 25(5),701-707.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., & Outerbridge, A. N. (1986). Impact of job experience and ability on job knowledge, work sample performance, and supervisory ratings of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 432–439. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.432
- Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment*, 8(4), 350–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.8.4.350>Reviewer 2
- Swamy, D. R., Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S. & Rashmi, S. (2015). Quality of work life: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences* Vol: 8:2 Retrieved from www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org
- Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., & Jahan, K. (2012). An evaluation of the quality of work life: a study of the employees of private universities in Bangladesh. *Int. Journal of Economics and Management* 32(3).
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(1), 1-24. DOI: 10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2.
- Tait, M., Padgett, M. Y., & Baldwin, T. T. (1989). Job and Life Satisfaction: A Reevaluation of the Strength of the Relationship and Gender Effects as a Function of the Date of the Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. pp. 502–507
- Taras, V., Kirkman, L. B., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of culture's consequences: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 95. 888. 10.1037/a0020939. DOI:10.1037/a0020939
- Taslimi, M. S. (2015). *Management of organizational development* (12th ed). Tehran: SAMT.
- Vineberg, R., & Taylor, E. N. (1972). Performance in four army jobs by men at different aptitude (AFQT) levels: 3. *The relationship of AFQT and job experience to job performance*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization (HUMRRO).
- Weiss, E. M., Kemmler, G., Deisenhammer, E. A., Fleischhacker, W. W., & Delazer, M. (2003). Sex Differences in Cognitive Functions. *Personality and Individual Differences*. pp. 863–875
- Wright, T.L (2002). Different faces of happiness unhappiness in organizational research. *Journal of Business Management*, 8(2), 109-126.
- Yoshimura, K. E. (2003). *Employee traits, perceived organizational support, supervisory communication, affective commitment, and intent to leave: Group differences*. Unpublished Thesis. North Carolina State University, Raleigh,US